Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6757 **Dated:** 06/10/2026

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Dyapa Srikanth Reddy
Complainant

Versus

The Managing Director & CEO
Indian Bank
Respondent

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with 85% Locomotor Disability stated that he is working as a Customer Service Associate at the Pahadishariff Branch, Hyderdabad, Indian Bank, that due to his medical condition he has to perform his duties using only one hand, and that the branch has a very high customer footfall. He submitted that he is experiencing considerable pain and facing severe difficulty in carrying out his official duties as well as his day-to-day activities.

1.2 The Complainant stated that he had submitted two requests to the Respondent for a transfer on medical grounds, but was informed by the HR Department that his transfer falls under the zonal transfer category and could not be processed at present. He submitted that his health condition is deteriorating and requested a transfer to the Santhosh Nagar Branch, which is closer to his residence and has comparatively lower customer footfall.

2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A notice dated 18.09.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016, was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 24.09.2026 to determine the admissibility of the case and find out if this can be resolved without further quasi-judicial intervention of this Court.

3. Hearing

3.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted on 24.09.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6757 **Dated:** 06/10/2026

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Shri Dyapa Srikanth Reddy	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh, DGM (HRM/HRD), Indian Bank	Respondent	Online

4. Record of Proceedings

4.1 The Respondent submitted that the Complainant is posted at a branch about fifteen kilometres from his residence, and that, considering his disability, an additional clerk has been posted at the branch, taking the strength to three clerks. The Respondent further submitted that the work at the branch can be rotated within the branch so that the Complainant is able to manage it.

4.2 The Respondent submitted that the Complainant is not yet due for a rotational transfer and is not eligible for the branch he has requested, and that when his rotation falls due he can be considered.

4.3 The Court observed that the Complainant's primary difficulty is working with a single functioning hand under heavy workload, which needs to be addressed, and asked the Respondent to consider an alternate role with less strenuous duties for him. The Respondent noted the suggestion.

5. Observations & Recommendations

5.1 The Respondent is recommended to identify and assign the Complainant a suitable alternate role with lesser workload and physical strain, within the same branch, within fifteen days from the issuance of this Order, and to submit a compliance report to this Court within a further fifteen days thereafter.

5.2 The Respondent is further recommended to ensure that requests of persons with disabilities for transfer or change of posting on medical grounds are considered with due regard to their rights, reasonable accommodation requirements and the principles of non-discrimination enshrined in the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and are not declined merely by citing the category of transfer or administrative exigency.

5.3 The Complainant had sought a transfer to the Santhosh Nagar Branch. In view of the relief recommended above, this Court does not consider that the case requires any further hearing or quasi-

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6757 **Dated:** 06/10/2026

judicial intervention. The case is accordingly disposed of.

Yours faithfully,



(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner