Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6765 **Dated:** 13/10/2026

In the matter of

Shri Ishan Gupta
(Complainant)

Vs.

The Chairman, State Bank of India
(Respondent)

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with 69% locomotor disability, stated that the Respondent, State Bank of India (SBI), through its Retail Assets Central Processing Centre (RACPC), Jalandhar, tried to assign him the duty of joint custodian of the record room despite being aware of the nature of his disability. He stated that no suitable arrangements were made to make the workplace accessible, and that derogatory remarks regarding his disability were made in the department.

1.2 The Complainant further stated that he was transferred vide order dated 23.07.2026 on "administrative grounds" without any specific reason being given, which, according to him, was in violation of the DoPT Office Memorandum dated 02.02.2024 exempting employees with disabilities from routine rotational transfers. He stated that he submitted a grievance to the Bank's Human Resources authority on 26.07.2026, which was forwarded to the Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO) under Section 23 of the RPwD Act, 2016, but that no response or action was received within the prescribed time and no complaint reference number was provided to him.

1.3 The Complainant added that, despite the pending grievance, he was relieved from his post on 17.08.2026 and directed to join the new department on 18.08.2026.

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. Respondent's Submission

3.1 The Respondent, vide its reply dated 01.10.2026, submitted that the Bank has a Model Transfer Policy for officers and an Equal Opportunity Policy for Persons with Disabilities, in line with the DoPT Office Memorandum dated 02.02.2024, under which persons with disabilities are normally exempted from routine periodic transfers, subject to administrative exigencies. It stated that the Complainant joined the Bank in December 2017, has been posted at Jalandhar since joining, and had been posted at RACPC, Jalandhar since July 2023, and that the Bank's Uniform Transfer Policy provides that the cumulative stay of an officer in a branch/centre cannot exceed three years at a stretch. On completion of three years, the Complainant was moved by order dated 23.07.2026 to the adjacent building of Regional Business Office-3, Jalandhar, forming part of the same complex, and was therefore not transferred out of the town/city.

3.2 The Respondent stated that the Complainant was relieved on 17.08.2026 and joined the new posting on 05.09.2026. It further stated that his grievance dated 27.08.2026 was heard by the GRO on 29.08.2026 and disposed of by a speaking order dated 02.09.2026, which was communicated to him, and that the GRO also directed the Local Head Office, Chandigarh to properly display the designation of the GRO for persons with disabilities, which has since been done. As regards the allegations of the joint custodian duty and derogatory remarks, the Respondent submitted that these were raised for the first time only after the Complainant was relieved, without any specific details, and that the Complainant had himself requested through emails dated 26.07.2026, 28.07.2026, 30.07.2026 and 04.08.2026 to be retained at RACPC, stating that he was performing his duties to the best of his abilities. The Respondent denied any violation of the RPwD Act, 2016 or the Government of India guidelines, and requested that the matter be treated as dealt with and closed.

4. Hearing

4.1 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 Ishan Gupta	Complainant	Online

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6765 **Dated:** 13/10/2026

2.	Shri Amandeep Singh, AGM (HR), Shri Jogesh Mahesh Raval, DGM & CDO and Shri Ramakant Tandon, GRO, State Bank of India	Respondent	Online

5. Record of Proceedings

5.1 The Respondent reiterated that the Complainant had completed three years at RACPC, Jalandhar, that the Bank's guidelines do not permit a stay beyond three years in a processing centre as banking is a sensitive service, and that the Complainant was posted to the adjacent building within the same centre, which does not affect his mobility. It stated that the allegations regarding the joint custodian duty and derogatory remarks were raised only after the transfer and without details, and requested that the complaint be disposed of.

5.2 The Court observed that since the transfer was within the same city to an adjacent building, the Complainant's mobility was not affected, and that care needs to be taken in the allocation of work in view of his disability affecting the right hand. The Court further observed that derogatory comments by colleagues about a person with disability are a serious matter and may attract Section 92 of the RPwD Act, 2016, and that employees need to be sensitised in this regard.

6. Observations & Recommendations

6.1 The Respondent is recommended to ensure that transfers of persons with disabilities are not effected merely citing administrative exigency, without due consideration of the rights, reasonable accommodation requirements and the principles of non-discrimination enshrined in the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

6.2 The Respondent is recommended to ensure that the Complainant is allotted duties suited to his disability and that no duty which he cannot discharge on his own is assigned to him, and that the workplace is made accessible to him. The Respondent is also recommended to conduct sensitisation programmes for its employees to avoid derogatory remarks or comments against any person with disability, and to train its Human Resources officials and Grievance Redressal Officers on the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016, including acknowledging grievances with a reference number, maintaining the register of complaints and disposing of grievances within the prescribed time under Section 23 of the Act.

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6765 **Dated:** 13/10/2026

6.3 In exercise of the functions of this Court under Section 75(1)(b) of the RPwD Act, 2016, the Respondent is recommended to take necessary action on the above recommendations and to inform this Court of the Action Taken Report (ATR) within one month from the date of receipt of this Order, as provided under Section 76 of the Act, and, if any recommendation is not accepted, to furnish the reasons thereof to this Court and the Complainant.

6.4 The Complainant had sought that the transfer and relieving orders be kept in abeyance, that the Respondent produce records of the administrative exigency, that action be taken for the alleged violation of Section 23(3) of the Act, and that Human Resources officials and Grievance Redressal Officers be trained on the provisions of the Act. Since the Complainant has already joined the posting within the same city, and the above recommendations address the remaining concerns raised, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner