Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6515 **Dated:** 08/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6515

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Anupam Kumar Jaiswal

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Managing Director and CEO, Canara Bank

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Anupam Kumar Jaiswal, a Senior Manager in Canara Bank and a person with 40% low vision, submitted a grievance dated 21.07.2026 and alleged that the bank had posted him to Belthara Road, Ballia, which requires long daily travel and causes hardship despite the applicable Government guidelines and the bank's transfer policy. The Complainant submitted that the bank failed to provide reasonable accommodation, including suitable duties, assistive technology, and accessible working conditions, and instead assigned him strenuous Branch Head responsibilities involving extensive fieldwork. He further alleged that, after he submitted representations against his transfer, the bank issued repeated explanation letters and subjected him to retaliatory administrative actions. The complainant has requested the Court to direct the respondents to withdraw the explanation letters, repost him to Deoria or a nearby suitable station, conduct an inquiry into the alleged violations of the RPwD Act, 2016, and ensure the implementation of reasonable accommodation and disability-friendly policies in the bank.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 17.09.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6515 **Dated:** 08/10/2026

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Anupam Kumar Jaiswal	Complainant
2.	Shri BP Jatav CGM HR, Canara Bank	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 The Complainant, Shri Anupam Kumar Jaiswal, reiterated his grievance while the Respondent submitted that, pursuant to the Complainant's representations, he had been transferred back to a location near his native place and had joined at the said branch on 09.09.2026. The Respondent stated that the present posting was approximately 2 km from his native place.

3.2 The Complainant, however, submitted that he was not fully satisfied and raised concerns regarding the explanation letters, absence without leave (AWL) proceedings and the circumstances surrounding his transfer. He also alleged that the action against him was retaliatory and contrary to the applicable transfer policy for persons with visual impairment.

3.3 The Respondent submitted that an AWL-related matter was under consideration and that a Medical Board had already been constituted. The Complainant was required to appear before the Medical Board, following which his absence could be reassessed and, if found justified, treated as paid leave.

3.4 With regard to the alleged retaliatory action, the Respondent submitted that a written complaint had been received from a customer and that the Complainant had been temporarily displaced during the investigation. The Respondent stated that the investigation did not result in action against the Complainant as the allegations were not supported by written evidence/proof. The Complainant disputed this submission and stated that the customer complaint was subsequent to his transfer order and arose after he had declined to disburse an amount without corresponding work progress.

4. Observation and Recommendation

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6515 **Dated:** 08/10/2026

4.1 The Court noted that the primary grievance relating to the Complainant's posting had been addressed by the Respondent, as he had been reposted to a location near his native place and had already joined there. The said aspect was, accordingly, treated as redressed.

4.2 In respect of the allegations concerning the customer complaint and alleged harassment/retaliatory action, the Respondent was recommended to submit a written response, along with the relevant documents, within **seven days**, for consideration by the Court.

4.3 The Court observed that the Respondent should ensure that the Complainant is not subjected to harassment or ill-treatment on account of his disability. The Court further emphasised the need for sensitisation of officials regarding the rights of persons with disabilities and observed that appropriate action may be taken wherever any fault is established. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

5. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,



(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner