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

Case No: CCPD-OF-0065/1021/2026

To,

The Managing Director and CEO,
Bank of Baroda, Vadodara
Email – md.ceo@bankofbaroda.com **... Respondent**

Sub: Notice to file comments in the complaint dated 11-08-2026 of Ms. Payal Jethra, a person with 100% Blindness regarding alleged discrimination in promotion process after interview stage and non-provision of accessible study materials

Madam /Sir,

I am directed to enclose a copy of documents related to the complaint dated **11-08-2026** o f **Ms. Payal Jethra**, a person **100% Blindness** on the above-mentioned subject, which is self-explanatory.

2. And whereas, a preliminary hearing in case no. CCPD-AD-0163/2026 was conducted on 03.09.2026 wherein the following parties were present:

Sl. No.	**Name of the Parties / Representatives**	**On Behalf of**
1.	Ms. Payal Jethra	Complainant
2.	Shri Dinesh Kumar (Deputy General Manager- HRM), Head Office Vadodara, Bank of Baroda	Respondent
3.	Shri Mandeep Kumar (Assistant General Manager- HRM), Head Office Vadodara, Bank of Baroda	Respondent
4.	Shri Himanshu Makwana, Chief Manager, Baroda Apex Academy	Respondent

2.1 The Complainant, an employee of Bank of Baroda, submitted that she had been facing discrimination in the promotion process. She stated that, despite consistently clearing the written promotion examination and diligently performing her duties at the branch front-line desks, she had been declared unfit for promotion after the interview stage on each occasion. She further submitted that she had been preparing for the promotion examinations despite the absence of adequately accessible study material and that the learning portal and other digital resources were not accessible to her. She stated that the study material was generally shared in PDF format at a late stage, requiring assistance for downloading and conversion into an accessible format, and that access to certain online resources and email facilities had also recently been discontinued. The Complainant further submitted that, although she had been provided training for persons with disabilities, the training arrangements and study material did not adequately address the accessibility requirements of visually impaired candidates. She also raised the issue of absence of a separate/relaxed cut-off for persons with disabilities.

2.2 The Respondent, Bank of Baroda, submitted that the Complainant had joined the Bank in January 2011 and was promoted as an Officer in 2017, and had appeared in the promotion process approximately six times thereafter. It was submitted that her written-test scores in the available records ranged between 48 and 62 marks out of 120 and that she had not met the prescribed cut-off. The Respondent further submitted that study material was being provided in video/PDF format and that the Complainant had access to a laptop and had also been provided four days of special training. With regard to the cut-off, the Respondent submitted that the prescribed cut-off was 40% in the written/online test and that, since the Complainant was seeking promotion to a Group ‘A’ post, no further relaxation was being provided to PwD candidates under the Bank’s existing guidelines.

2.3. The Hon’ble Commissioner observed that the Respondent’s position that relaxation provided to SC/ST candidates under the applicable promotion guidelines was not extended to PwD candidates required reconsideration. The Hon’ble Commissioner directed the Respondent to examine the matter with the Department of Financial Services (DFS) and extend to PwD candidates the corresponding benefit/relaxation available to SC/ST candidates, wherever applicable, in accordance with the applicable framework. It was further observed that, if the Complainant falls within the relevant coverage and is otherwise eligible under the relaxed standard, the benefit should be extended to her. The Hon’ble

Commissioner also observed that study and educational material provided to persons with disabilities is required to be made available in accessible formats and directed the Respondent to ensure that all relevant study material is provided digitally in an accessible manner and in formats usable by visually impaired candidates. Upon considering the submissions and the issues raised, the **Hon'ble Commissioner directed that the Complaint be registered for regular proceedings**.

3. Whereas Section 3 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 hereinafter referred to as "the Act" provides as under:

> *"3. (1) The appropriate Government shall ensure that the persons with disabilities enjoy the right to equality, life with dignity and respect for his or her integrity equally with others.*
>
> *(2) The appropriate Government shall take steps to utilise the capacity of persons with disabilities by providing appropriate environment.*
>
> *(3) No person with disability shall be discriminated on the ground of disability, unless it is shown that the impugned act or omission is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.*
>
> *(4) No person shall be deprived of his or her personal liberty only on the ground of disability.*
>
> *(5) The appropriate Government shall take necessary steps to ensure reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities."*

4. And whereas Section 21 of the Act, mandates that every establishment shall notify Equal Opportunity Policy and shall register a copy of the same with the Chief Commissioner.

5. And whereas Section 23 of the Act makes it mandatory for every government establishment to appoint a Grievance Redressal Officer and to inform the Chief Commissioner about such appointment.

6. And whereas Section 75(1) (a) and (b) of the Act mandates the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities to identify, suo motu or otherwise, the provisions of any law or policy, programme and procedures, which are inconsistent with this Act and recommend necessary corrective steps and to look into complaints inter-alia, concerning matters relating to deprivation of rights of persons with disabilities either on his own motion or on the application of any aggrieved person or otherwise.

7. And therefore, you are hereby advised to forward your comments on the Complaint on an **affidavit** signed by an officer of an appropriate seniority not below the level of Group 'A' officer and to produce all the requisite documents upon which you base your Comments or Claim and where you rely on any other document as evidence in support of your comments or claim, you shall enter such documents in a list to be annexed to the Comments on Complaint along with action taken in compliance with statutory provisions as mentioned at paras 3 & 4 above, to this Court within **30 days** from the date of issue of this communication, failing which, the Complaint may be disposed of ex-parte. **While responding to this notice due care may be taken of relevant provisions of the Act, other statutory provisions, and government instructions such as the ones mentioned above including but not limited to sections 20, 21 and 34 of the Act read with DoPT OM No. 36012/1/2020 - Estt. (Res-II) dated 17.05.2022 read with DoPT OM No. 36012/1/2020 – Estt. (Res-II) dated 28.12.2023.**

8. A copy of your reply should also be served to the Complainant **via email and by post and the proof of service be submitted to this Court along with your Reply**. You may also provide additional inputs, relevant to the case, if desired. However, it is to be informed that in case any statutory provision, any judgment of a High Court or the Supreme Court, rules formulated under any statute, Office Memorandum, or bye-law is relied upon, you shall attach a copy of the same along with your comments on the Complaint. The Complainant may file his rejoinder, if any, to this Court within 15 days with a copy to the Respondent(s).

Digitally signed by
Vikas Trivedi
Date: 12-10-2026
13:16:45

(Vikas Trivedi)
Dy. Chief Commissioner