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-AD-0184/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Balagoni Jagan

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Commissioner, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan

1. Background of the Case

1 . 1 The Complainant submitted that his son, Master Balagoni Krutik Goud, a Class 1 student at Kendriya Vidyalaya Gachibowli, Hyderabad, has 70% benchmark disability due to Autism Spectrum Disorder. He alleged that the class teacher has been repeatedly harassing his son and secretly recording videos of him during distress without parental consent. He further alleged that the Principal has threatened to issue a Transfer Certificate (TC) to the child due to his behaviour, which the Complainant stated is related to his autism. He also submitted that no Special Educator has been provided in the school to support the child and provide reasonable accommodation. The Complainant requested intervention to stop the alleged harassment and unauthorized video recording, prevent the issuance of TC, appoint a Special Educator at the school, and ensure a safe, inclusive and supportive learning environment for his son.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 24.09.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of

1.	Shri Balagoni Jagan, father of Balagoni Kruthik Goud	Complainant
2.	Shri Deepak Kumar Dabral, Assistant Commissioner, KVS, Head Office	Respondent
3.	Smt. G Krishnaveni, Assistant Commissioner, KVS Regional Office, Hyderabad	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant further submitted that no Special Educator had been provided in the school to support the child and facilitate reasonable accommodation and an Individualised Education Programme. He sought intervention to prevent harassment and unauthorised recording, ensure that no Transfer Certificate was issued on account of the child's disability-related behaviour, appoint a Special Educator and ensure a safe and inclusive educational environment.

3.2 The Respondents submitted that no unauthorised video recording or threat to issue a Transfer Certificate had been made. The Principal submitted that efforts had been made on several occasions to recruit a Special Educator through advertisements, but the school had not been able to secure one. It was stated that the school counsellor was presently extending support to students.

3.3. The Court sought clarification regarding the alleged recording of the child and the action taken by the school in relation to the alleged harassment. The Complainant, through his translator, reiterated that the teacher had informed the parent that videos had been recorded and were available with the school, although the Respondents disputed that any such recording had taken place. The Complainant confirmed that the child continues to attend the school.

4. Observation and Recommendation

4.1. The Court observed that, irrespective of the dispute regarding the alleged video recording or threat of issuance of a Transfer Certificate, the matter highlights the need for adequate sensitisation of teaching and non-teaching staff regarding children with disabilities, particularly children with ASD, and the need for an inclusive and supportive school environment.

4.2. The Court expressed concern regarding the continued absence of a Special Educator in the school despite the requirements of inclusive education and the

need for appropriate support and reasonable accommodation for children with disabilities.

4.3. The Court observed that sensitisation and capacity-building programmes concerning the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, inclusive education, disability-related behaviour and appropriate engagement with children with disabilities should not be limited to schools against which complaints are received, but should be undertaken regularly across the educational system.

4.4. The Respondent was accordingly advised to institute regular sensitisation/capacity-building programmes, at least twice a year, for all relevant stakeholders in the education community, including Principals, teaching and non-teaching staff, and other personnel dealing with children with disabilities. The Court further recommended that the child shall not be subjected to any retaliation, adverse treatment or discriminatory action on account of the present complaint or the disability-related behaviour alleged in the complaint.

4.5. The Respondent was recommended to undertake necessary action for sensitisation of its schools and personnel on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, inclusive education and appropriate support for children with disabilities, and to submit a comprehensive report on the action taken within three months. In the event of failure to submit the requisite report within the stipulated period, the Court may consider further proceedings in the matter, including requiring appropriate action at the level of KVS, until compliance is satisfactorily established.

5. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 15-10-2026
10:09:22

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities