Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6651 **Dated:** 17/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6651

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Yogesh Sopan Kurhe

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The Managing Director and CEO, Union Bank of India

2. The Chief General Manager (HR), Union Bank of India

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Yogesh Sopan Kurhe, Assistant Manager, Union Bank of India, submitted a grievance dated 12.08.2026 and stated that he has been transferred from Pune Zone to Hyderabad Zone. He stated that he is the primary caregiver of his mother, who has 69% permanent multiple disabilities and requires an attendant for her daily activities. She has also undergone hip replacement surgery and is continuing treatment in Pune. He further submitted that his father, aged about 78 years, is also suffering from serious health problems and needs regular medical care and assistance. As he is the primary caregiver of both his parents, he stated that it would be very difficult for him to take care of them if he is transferred to Hyderabad. The Complainant stated that he had submitted several representations and an appeal to the Bank requesting exemption from the transfer on humanitarian and disability grounds. However, his requests have not been accepted by the Bank.

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6651 **Dated:** 17/10/2026

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 07.10.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Yogesh Sopan Kurhe	Complainant
2.	Shri Saurabh Agarwal, DGM-HR	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1. During the proceedings, the Complainant reiterated his grievance and the Respondent, represented by Shri Saurabh Agrawal, Deputy General Manager, Human Resources, Union Bank of India, submitted that officers who have served in a zone for a period of five to nine years are liable to be transferred under the Bank's long-tenure transfer policy. As the Complainant had served in Pune Zone since June 2019 and completed approximately seven years, he was transferred to Hyderabad under the applicable policy.

3.2 The Respondent further submitted that an exemption window had been opened from 13.04.2026 to 16.04.2026. Although the Complainant submitted an exemption request on 15.04.2026, his mother had not been registered as a dependent in the Bank's HR portal, along with the requisite particulars of her disability. The Respondent stated that such registration was a mandatory requirement for consideration of an exemption.

3.3 During the hearing, the Court sought clarification regarding the date on which the Complainant had submitted his mother's disability certificate and disclosed her dependent status to the employer. The Respondent confirmed that a disability certificate issued by the competent medical authority had been submitted with the exemption request; however, the UDID card was issued on 06.07.2026, after the exemption window had closed. The Respondent further confirmed that, as of the date of hearing, the Complainant had not registered his mother as a dependent in the Bank's HR portal.

3.4 The Complainant submitted that he had provided medical documentation concerning his mother while seeking exemption. However, the record before the Court did not establish that her disability and dependent status had been duly registered in the Bank's service records in accordance with the prescribed procedure.

4. Observation and Recommendation

4.1 The Court observed that an employee seeking benefits or exemptions on the basis of the disability of a dependent family member is required to submit the relevant documents and ensure that the dependent's disability status is duly recorded in the employer's service records. The Complainant was accordingly advised to update his service records by registering his mother as a dependent and submitting the requisite disability certificate and supporting documents together.

4.2 The Court observed that, in terms of DoPT Office Memorandum No. **F. No. 42011/3/2014-Estt.(Res), dated 08.10.2018**, read with DoPT O.M. No. **36035/44/2023-Estt.(Res-II), dated 02.02.2024**, exemption from the routine exercise of transfer/rotational transfer may be considered for a Government employee who is the caregiver of a dependent person with a specified disability, certified as a person with benchmark disability under Section 2(r) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, subject to administrative constraints. Accordingly, the Complainant was advised to ensure that the requisite disability documents and the dependent's status were duly submitted and recorded in the relevant service records. The Court observed that the claim for caregiver-related benefits would be considered in accordance with the applicable instructions and eligibility conditions upon submission and verification of the prescribed documentation. In the absence of the requisite documentation and registration during the relevant transfer exercise, the Court was unable to recommend retrospective extension of the claimed exemption.

4.3 The Court further observed that the transfer and posting of employees who are caregivers of persons with disabilities should be considered in light of DoPT O.Ms particularly the provisions concerning exemption from routine transfer/rotational transfer for eligible caregivers, subject to administrative constraints. The Court also emphasised that the objectives of equality and non-discrimination under Sections **3 and 20** of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, should inform the consideration of disability-related caregiving circumstances, as applicable. While administrative exigencies may necessitate changes in posting, the competent authority should duly consider the caregiving responsibilities and the practical implications of the proposed transfer. Wherever feasible and consistent with applicable service rules and administrative requirements, consideration may be given to a posting within the same city or at a location that avoids unnecessary geographical separation from the dependent person with disability.

4.4 The Complainant was advised to approach the Bank's concerned Regional Office for assistance in updating his service records and completing the prescribed formalities. The Respondent shall consider his claim for caregiver-related benefits and any exemption in future transfer exercises in accordance with the applicable rules and the duly submitted documentation.

4.5 In view of the above, the Court has determined no further action necessary with the Complainant at liberty to pursue his claim upon completing the prescribed documentation and registration formalities.

5. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner