सत्यमेव जयते
न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन
COURT OF THE 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 & Empowerment**
भारत सरकार/**Government of India**
5वाँ तल, एन.आई.एस.डी. भवन, जी-2, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075; दूरभाष : (011)20892364
5th Floor, N.I.S.D. Bhawan, G-2, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364
Email: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccdisabilities.nic.in

CCPD-AD-0175/2026

In the matter of—

Shri Ankit Kumar Pandey
(Complainant)

Versus

The MD & CEO
Punjab & Sind Bank
(Respondent)

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, an employee of Punjab & Sind Bank and the father of a child with Cerebral Palsy, stated that his son requires continuous care, regular medical treatment, physiotherapy, occupational therapy and rehabilitation, for which the specialist facilities are available in Lucknow city, and that his physical presence and support are essential for the child's well-being and development. He stated that he accordingly requested the Respondent for a posting at Lucknow city on dependent medical and humanitarian grounds, enclosing the relevant disability and medical documents, but the request was declined without the relief sought.

1.2 The Complainant further stated that he is presently posted at a branch outside Lucknow city and that, despite his request, he has been transferred thrice in three years to places away from Lucknow. He submitted that the denial of transfer has caused significant hardship to his family and has adversely affected his son's treatment, therapy, education and overall welfare, and requested that his request for transfer to Lucknow be reconsidered on compassionate grounds.

2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A notice dated 14.09.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016, was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 17.09.2026 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 17.09.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Shri Ankit Kumar Pandey	Complainant	Online

3.2 No representative appeared on behalf of the Respondent during the hearing.

4. Record of Proceedings

4.1 The Complainant reiterated his grievance and submitted that he had applied for a posting at Lucknow city, but was instead transferred thrice in three years to places away from the city, which has seriously disturbed his family life and his son's treatment. In response to queries from the Court, he stated that his present place of posting is a rural branch located at a considerable distance from Lucknow city and that Lucknow is where his son's treatment and physiotherapy are being availed.

4.2 The Court noted that no response had been received from the Respondent and that no one appeared on its behalf.

4.3 The Court notes that, as per the Office Memorandum dated 08.10.2018 of the Department of Personnel & Training, a Government employee who is the care-giver of a dependent son or daughter with a Specified Disability, certified as a Person with Benchmark Disability, may be exempted from routine transfer/rotational transfer, subject to administrative constraints. The Court further notes that the ground of continuous medical care and therapy of the Complainant's child, as put forth by the Complainant, appears to merit consideration, subject to the response of the Respondent.

4.4 The Respondent is accordingly recommended to submit its written response to the grievance within seven days of the issuance of this Order, with a copy to the Complainant, clearly indicating the reasons for which the Complainant's request for posting at Lucknow city has not been acceded to, including whether the above Office Memorandum and the principles of reasonable accommodation under the RPwD Act, 2016 were considered. The Complainant may submit his rejoinder, if any, within five days of receipt of the Respondent's response, whereafter the matter shall be taken up for final order.

Digitally signed by Vikas Trivedi
Date: 12-10-2026 13:13:44

(Vikas Trivedi)
Deputy Chief Commissioner