Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6649 **Dated:** 06/10/2026

In the matter of—

Mr. Manoj
(Complainant)

Versus

The Chairman & Managing Director
M/s Sai Communication
(Respondent)

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Manoj, a person with 60% Locomotor Disability, is employed under a private outsourcing agency, M/s Sai Communication, deployed in the Laundry Department of Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi. He submitted that on 01.05.2023, while proceeding to hospital duty in the morning, he met with a serious train accident at Kosi Kalan Railway Station, as a result of which one of his legs had to be amputated below the knee.

1.2 The Complainant submitted that the outsourcing agency and the concerned contractor did not extend any financial assistance during his treatment, despite an expenditure of approximately ₹4-5 lakh borne by him through personal funds and borrowings. He stated that the Employees' State Insurance Corporation (ESIC) had reimbursed only ₹40,000 as per its prescribed rates, and that the agency's failure to extend support was in violation of Section 4 of the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923.

1.3 The Complainant further submitted that after prolonged treatment and fitting of an artificial limb, he learnt that the agency had terminated his services with effect from 31.03.2024, without notice, during the period of his medical treatment. He alleged that when he sought to claim his dues, the agency management attempted to intimidate him through indirect means, causing him apprehension regarding his life and physical safety.

2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A Notice dated 03.09.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (RPwD Act, 2016) was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 10.09.2026 to determine the admissibility of the case and find out if this could be resolved without further quasi-judicial intervention of

this Court.

3. Complainant's Withdrawal Communication

3.1 The Complainant, vide email dated 10.09.2026, informed this Court that the Employees' State Insurance Corporation (ESIC), under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, had extended to him full salary for the period of his treatment and a monthly Permanent Disability Pension for life. He submitted that since his principal financial grievance had accordingly been addressed by ESIC, he did not wish to pursue the matter further and voluntarily requested that the complaint be closed.

4. Observations & Recommendation

4.1 In view of the Complainant's communication dated 10.09.2026 confirming that he has been extended full salary for the treatment period and a monthly Permanent Disability Pension for life by ESIC, the Court notes that the grievance raised in the complaint stands redressed. The Court determines that no further intervention is necessary in the matter.

5. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner