न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त
COURT OF 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 and Empowerment
भारत सरकार/ Government of India

Case No. CCPD/16555/1021/26 **Dated:** 21/09/2026

Case No: CCPD/16555/1021/26

In the matter of-

Shri Pankaj P Panchal **...Complainant**

Versus

Chairman,

Indian Oil Corporation
Email – sahneyas@indianoil.in **...Respondent**

Sub: Recommendation to look into the Complaint dated 01.05.2026 received from Mr. Pankaj P Panchal, a person with 50% Locomotor Disability, on the issue of denial of promotion

Madam/Sir,

I am directed to refer to a complaint dated **01.05.2026 received from Mr. Pankaj P Panchal, a person with 50% Locomotor Disability**, which is self-explanatory.

2. And whereas, a preliminary hearing was conducted in Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6355 on 17.08.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1	Shri Pankaj P Panchal	Complainant

Case No. CCPD/16555/1021/26 **Dated:** 21/09/2026

2	Shri T.V. Shivan, DP-HR	Respondent
3	Shri Ajit Kumar, CGH-HI	Respondent
4	Shri Shubham Kumar, Asst. Manager (HRD)	Respondent
5	Smt. Geeto, DGM (HRD)	Respondent

2.1 And whereas, The Court noted that the Complainant, Shri Pankaj P. Panchal, an employee of Indian Oil Corporation Limited (IOCL) with 50% locomotor disability, raised grievances regarding alleged unfair assessment in the EPMS Planning System for the year 2025–26, denial of promotion from Grade C to Grade D, and administrative harassment. He submitted that his reporting officer deliberately altered the Hindi performance parameter from an optional criterion to a mandatory one with a view to obstruct his promotion, and subsequently marked his report as unsatisfactory due to non-submission of proof regarding the formation of a Hindi Committee, despite compliance indications and lack of requisite operational support from the State/Regional Office. He further alleged that four officers jointly marked his appraisal as failed without prior counseling or providing an opportunity to explain, thereby rendering him ineligible for promotion, and that his medical reimbursement claims had been deliberately delayed by the local office. The Complainant accordingly sought intervention against the alleged discriminatory assessment and denial of promotion.

2.2 The Court observed from the submissions of the Respondent that the performance evaluation system in IOCL contains an established multi-tier review mechanism, checks and balances, and a formal appellate procedure, and that the final appraisal ratings for 2025–26 were yet to be finalized and communicated. The Court further noted that the Complainant had not exhausted the internal administrative remedies, nor had he submitted his representation to the designated Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO) for Persons with Disabilities appointed in the Marketing Division under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. The Court observed that an aggrieved employee must first utilize and exhaust all available internal grievance redressal mechanisms and statutory appellate avenues within the organization before approaching this Court. Accordingly, the Court advised the Complainant to approach the Grievance Redressal Officer and exhaust the departmental appeal mechanisms, with liberty to approach this Court as a measure of last resort if his grievances remain

unaddressed or if there is an established violation of his statutory rights. With these observations, the present case was closed.

3. I am further directed to bring to your notice that the aforesaid complaint pertains to the conditions of service of an employee with disabilities, which, as per Section 23 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016, ["the Act,''] read with Rule 10 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017 ["the Rules"], is required to be looked into by the Grievance Redressal Officer of your establishment.

4. Whereas Section 23 of the Act, 2016 provides as under:

23. (1) Every Government establishment shall appoint a Grievance Redressal Officer for the purpose of section 19 and shall inform the Chief Commissioner or the State Commissioner, as the case may be, about the appointment of such officer.

(2) Any person aggrieved with the non-compliance of the provisions of section 20, may file a complaint with the Grievance Redressal Officer, who shall investigate it and shall take up the matter with the establishment for corrective action.

(3) The Grievance Redressal Officer shall maintain a register of complaints in the manner as may be prescribed by the Central Government, and every complaint shall be inquired within two weeks of its registration.

(4) If the aggrieved person is not satisfied with the action taken on his or her complaint, he or she may approach the District-Level Committee on disability.

5. And whereas Rule 10 of the Rules provides as under:

10. Manner of maintenance of register of complaints by the Government establishments. - *(1) Every Government establishment shall appoint an officer not below the rank of a Gazetted Officer as Grievance Redressal Officer:*

Provided that where it is not possible to appoint any Gazetted Officer, the Government establishment may appoint the senior most Officers as a Grievance Redressal Officer.

(2) The Grievance Redressal Officer shall maintain a register of complaints of persons with disabilities with the following particulars, namely:-

(a) date of complaint;

(b) name of complainant;

Case No. CCPD/16555/1021/26 **Dated:** 21/09/2026

(c) name of the person who is enquiring the complaint;

(d) place of incident;

(e) the name of establishment or person against whom the complaint is made;

(f) gist of the complaint;

(g) documentary evidence, if any;

(h) date of disposal by the Grievance Redressal Officer;

(i) details of disposal of the appeal by the district level committee; and

(j) any other information.

6. I am, accordingly, directed to forward this case to you to be entrusted to the Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO), who will take appropriate remedial measures. The Complaint shall be examined and disposed of with a speaking order of the Competent Authority within two weeks. While examining the matter, the GRO and the Competent Authority shall consider sections 3, 20, and 34 of the Act, read with DOP&T OM No.36012/1/2020-Estt/ (Res-II) dated 17.05.2022 and OM No. 36012/1/2020-Estt/ (Res-II) dated 28.12.2023, and/or any other corresponding instructions applicable in this regard.

7. If the Complainant is not satisfied with the resolution of her/his grievance, she/he will be at liberty to approach a Court or tribunal or a quasi-judicial authority having jurisdiction in the matter. The respondents are advised to submit an Action Taken Report in terms of Section 76 of the Act within 3 months from the date of issue of these recommendations.

8. Accordingly, the case is disposed of with the approval of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities.

Copy to:

Shri Pankaj P Panchal – For information

न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त
COURT OF 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 and Empowerment
भारत सरकार/ Government of India

Case No. CCPD/16555/1021/26 **Dated:** 21/09/2026

Yours faithfully,



(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner

Copy to:

1) **Pankaj P Panchal**
VILLA 90, ELYSIUM VILLA VILLA 90, ELYSIUM VILLANandan Park, Bopal Road,VILL ISHWARIYA, TAL PADDHARI DIST RAJKOT
RAJKOT, GUJARAT, 360110
pppanchal@indianoil.in
9099066017

Enc. Copies:

1) Disability Certificate