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.ccpd.nic.in

Case No.: CCPD-AD-0017/2026

In the matter of:

Shri Satish Kumar **...Complainant**

Versus

The Joint Secretary, Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Delhi **…Respondent**

1. Hearing

1.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted on 18.06.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

S.NO	NAME /DESIGNATION OF THE PARTY	REPRESENTATIVE OF
1	Shri Satish Kumar	Complainant

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Ar. Satish Kumar, a working professional and an architect with a 40% locomotor disability, submitted a grievance regarding the systemic exclusion and non-identification of suitable professional roles for persons with disabilities within public service recruitment policies. He submitted that under Section 33 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016, the government is mandated to identify specific posts in establishments that can be reserved for persons with benchmark disabilities. The Complainant contended that despite possessing professional architecture qualifications and active working experience, he has been rendered ineligible to apply for multiple public service positions because the current policy frameworks and recruitment notifications have failed to identify and categorize suitable technical or professional scales, specifically within the field of architecture, as accessible roles for candidates with

his disability profile.

2.2 The Court evaluated the matter and observed that the list of identified posts established and announced under the gazette notification is inherently dynamic and non-exhaustive. The Court remarked that the legal framework explicitly permits the continual expansion and inclusion of newly identified positions at any later stage if a genuine case of professional suitability is established. The Court noted that the Complainant's active status as a practicing professional architect serves as a live, practical demonstration that individuals with similar disability profiles possess the necessary clinical and technical capacity to execute these specialized professional duties effectively within public establishments.

2.3 Accordingly, the Court recommended the Complainant to submit a detailed and comprehensive record of his professional history, technical qualifications, specialized skills, and an exhaustive description of major projects handled to this Court within seven (7) days. Upon receipt, the Court will formally forward the entire case dossier, along with the Complainant's professional profile and experiential evidence, to the Policy Division of the Department of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD) for necessary evaluation and policy intervention.

2.4 Consequently, the Department of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD) is granted a period of ninety (90) days to review the systemic grievance, assess the inclusion of such professional roles under the identified categories, and submit a definitive Action Taken Report to this Court. The matter stands adjourned pending the submission of the policy review outcomes within the stipulated timeline.

Digitally signed by
Vikas Trivedi
Date: 17-08-2026
12:47:20

(Vikas Trivedi)

Dy. Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities