न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त
COURT OF CHIEF COMMISSIONER FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (DIVYANGJAN)
दिव्यांगजन सशक्तिकरण विभाग / Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan)
सामाजिक न्याय और अधिकारिता मंत्रालय / Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment
भारत सरकार/ Government of India

Case No. CCPD/16656/1022/26 **Dated:** 05/10/2026

Notice u/s 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016

CCPD/16656/1022/2026

In the matter of-

Shri Devabhai Paragbhai Patel **...Complainant**

Versus

The Managing Director & CEO
Bank of Baroda
Email: gm.ops.ho@bankofbaroda.bank.in; gm.hrm.ho@bankofbaroda.com; zm.ngz@bankofbaroda.com; rm.banaskantha@bankofbaroda.com **...Respondent**

Sub: Recommendation to look into the Complaint dated 12.08.2026 received from Shri Devabhai Paragbhai Patel, a person with 80% Locomotor Disability, regarding non-consideration of transfer request to Jagana Branch

Madam/Sir,

I am directed to refer to a complaint dated **12.08.2026 received from Shri Devabhai Paragbhai Patel, a person with 80% Locomotor Disability**, which is self-explanatory.

2. I am further directed to bring to your notice that the aforesaid complaint pertains to the conditions of service of an employee with disabilities, which, as per Section 23 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016, [“the Act,’’] read with Rule 10 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017 [“the Rules”], is required to be looked into by the Grievance Redressal Officer of your establishment.

3. And whereas, a preliminary was conducted on 10.09.2026 in Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6672 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Case No. CCPD/16656/1022/26 **Dated:** 05/10/2026

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Devabhai Paragbhai Patel	Complainant
2.	Shri Jagdish Meharchandani, DGM and Regional Head, Bank of Baroda, Banaskantha	Respondent

3.1 And whereas, the Complainant, Shri Devabhai Patel, Senior Customer Service Associate at Bank of Baroda, submitted that his request for transfer from Palanpur Branch to Jagana Branch had not been fairly considered. He submitted that another employee had been transferred to Jagana Branch on 28.04.2026 and joined there on 01.05.2026, whereas his own request was rejected on the ground of non-availability of vacancy. He alleged that despite his seniority and status as a person with disability, the Bank had not provided a clear and satisfactory explanation regarding the availability of vacancy and that his representations before the Bank authorities and the Union had not yielded a satisfactory resolution. The Respondent, Bank of Baroda, submitted that the Complainant's request for transfer had already been considered on two occasions and that he had previously been posted at Palanpur pursuant to his request. It was further submitted that the Complainant was presently working at a branch situated closer to his residence and had again sought transfer to Jagana Branch, which was approximately 8–10 kilometres from his residence. The Respondent stated that the Complainant had been asked to furnish reasons for the fresh request and that his reply had been received only recently and was under consideration.

3.2 And whereas, upon consideration of the submissions, the Hon'ble Commissioner observed that the Complainant had already been provided a posting at a place closer to his residence and that the present request appeared to be based substantially on convenience arising from traffic conditions rather than on the distance between the workplace and residence. The Hon'ble Commissioner observed that the entitlement relating to posting of persons with disabilities closer to their residence could not be treated as an unrestricted right to seek repeated transfers based on changing convenience or traffic conditions. The Hon'ble Commissioner further observed that no specific provision had been brought to the notice of the Court which would require transfer to be granted on the basis of such considerations. Accordingly, the Court did not find sufficient merit in the grievance warranting further intervention at this stage and left the Complainant's request to the discretion of the Bank, to be considered in accordance with the prevailing law, applicable guidelines and administrative requirements.

Case No. CCPD/16656/1022/26 **Dated:** 05/10/2026

4. Whereas Section 23 of the Act, 2016 provides as under:

23. (1) Every Government establishment shall appoint a Grievance Redressal Officer for the purpose of section 19 and shall inform the Chief Commissioner or the State Commissioner, as the case may be, about the appointment of such officer.

(2) Any person aggrieved with the non-compliance of the provisions of section 20, may file a complaint with the Grievance Redressal Officer, who shall investigate it and shall take up the matter with the establishment for corrective action.

(3) The Grievance Redressal Officer shall maintain a register of complaints in the manner as may be prescribed by the Central Government, and every complaint shall be inquired within two weeks of its registration.

(4) If the aggrieved person is not satisfied with the action taken on his or her complaint, he or she may approach the District-Level Committee on disability.

5. And whereas Rule 10 of the Rules provides as under:

10. Manner of maintenance of register of complaints by the Government establishments. - *(1) Every Government establishment shall appoint an officer not below the rank of a Gazetted Officer as Grievance Redressal Officer:*

Provided that where it is not possible to appoint any Gazetted Officer, the Government establishment may appoint the senior most Officers as a Grievance Redressal Officer.

(2) The Grievance Redressal Officer shall maintain a register of complaints of persons with disabilities with the following particulars, namely:-

(a) date of complaint;

(b) name of complainant;

(c) name of the person who is enquiring the complaint;

(d) place of incident;

(e) the name of establishment or person against whom the complaint is made;

(f) gist of the complaint;

(g) documentary evidence, if any;

(h) date of disposal by the Grievance Redressal Officer;

(i) details of disposal of the appeal by the district level committee; and

(j) any other information.

6. I am, accordingly, directed to forward this case to you to be entrusted to the Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO), who will take appropriate remedial measures. The Complaint shall be examined and disposed of with a speaking order of the Competent Authority within two weeks. While examining the matter, the GRO and the Competent Authority shall consider sections 3, 20, and 34 of the Act, read with DOP&T OM No.36012/1/2020-Estt/ (Res-II) dated 17.05.2022 and OM No. 36012/1/2020-Estt/ (Res-II) dated 28.12.2023, and/or any other corresponding instructions applicable in this regard.

7. If the Complainant is not satisfied with the resolution of her/his grievance, she/he will be at liberty to approach a Court or tribunal or a quasi-judicial authority having jurisdiction in the matter. The respondents are advised to submit an Action Taken Report in terms of Section 76 of the Act within 3 months from the date of issue of these recommendations.

8. Accordingly, the case is disposed of with the approval of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities.