Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6482 **Dated:** 13/10/2026

In the matter of—

Shri Vivek

(Complainant)

Versus

The Secretary

Union Public Service Commission

(Respondent)

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with cerebral Palsy, stated that he had applied for the post of Junior Scientific Officer advertised by the Respondent, Union Public Service Commission (UPSC), under Vacancy No. 25060804228. He submitted that, pursuant to a scrutiny notice dated 17.04.2026 seeking documents relating to eligibility and experience, he furnished within the stipulated time the experience certificate issued by Energy Efficiency Services Limited (EESL), a Government of India PSU, which according to him is the standard certificate issued by EESL to its employees and the only one ordinarily issued by it.

1.2 The Complainant further stated that the scrutiny notice did not prescribe any specific format or mandatory particulars for the experience certificate, but UPSC rejected his candidature on 02.07.2026 on the ground that the certificate did not mention the nature of his duties. He submitted that he had no control over the contents of a certificate issued by EESL in its standard format, that UPSC neither informed him of the deficiency nor gave him an opportunity to submit a clarification or an additional certificate before rejecting his candidature, and that his grievances raised before UPSC through CPGRAMS did not bring him relief.

1.3 The Complainant also alleged that another PwBD candidate was given additional time to rectify a deficiency in the disability certificate, whereas he was not given a similar opportunity, which he submitted was arbitrary and discriminatory and defeated the object of reservation and equal opportunity for persons with disabilities.

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6482 **Dated:** 13/10/2026

2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A notice dated 22.09.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016, was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 01.10.2026 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 01.10.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1	Shri Amar Deep	Representative of Shri Vivek (Complainant)	Online

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

4. Record of Proceedings

4.1 The Complainant's representative stated that no update had been received from the Respondent. He submitted that the Complainant's grievance on CPGRAMS had been closed by the Respondent on the ground that the certificate did not mention the nature of duties, whereas the certificate issued by EESL was a general one in its standard format. He stated that the Complainant had written to EESL on 03.07.2026, followed by a reminder on 18.08.2026, requesting an amended certificate stating the nature of his duties, but EESL had not responded and does not entertain such special requirements.

4.2 The representative placed on record the Respondent's response on CPGRAMS dated 05.08.2026, according to which an experience certificate furnished by a candidate is expected to state the nature of duties so as to allow assessment of the claims made, a period of 10 days is allowed to candidates to submit representations against the assessment, and no further time beyond it could be given. On being asked by the Court, the representative stated that the experience certificate had been issued to the Complainant in 2025 and that no modification had been sought before the scrutiny notice dated 17.04.2026, in response to which the certificate already available with the application was furnished; the Respondent thereafter rejected the candidature directly, without issuing any further scrutiny notice.

4.3 The representative added that EESL, being a PSU, issues experience certificates only in a standard format, and that the Respondent should at least have indicated a timeline within which the Complainant could obtain the required details from the employer.

5. Observations & Recommendations

5.1 The Court observes that an experience certificate is ordinarily expected to disclose the role, functions and responsibilities of the employee, and not merely the period of service, so that the recruiting agency can assess the experience claimed. The Complainant had been in possession of the certificate issued in 2025 and could have examined it against the requirements of the post and sought the necessary modification from EESL well before the scrutiny. Recruiting agencies are free to adopt their own methods of shortlisting, and the requirements of different departments and organisations vary. The Court does not find any fault on the part of the Respondent in the matter.

5.2 The Complainant had sought withdrawal of the rejection of his candidature, its reconsideration under the PwBD category, an opportunity to submit additional documents or a clarification from EESL, issue of guidelines on experience certificates issued by Government departments and PSUs, and keeping one post vacant subject to the outcome of the complaint. The Court does not find merit in the complaint and, therefore, does not find any of these reliefs warranted.

5.3 Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner