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 20892364(011) :
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.14038/1024/2023

Complainant:

Shri Balasubramanian Venkataraman Iyer

Respondent:

The Director (Admin and HR)
Khadi and Village Industries Commission Gramodyog,
Mumbai

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1 . 1 Shri Laxman Chinnana Shirke, Secretary of the Divyang Development Federation, filed a complaint on 26.03.2023 on behalf of Shri Balasubramanian, who has 50% locomotor disability, regarding the grant of family pension. It was stated that the Complainant's father, Late Shri N.S. Venkatraman Iyer, had served as an Accounts Officer at KVIC, Mumbai, and passed away on 02.03.1994. Thereafter, his mother, Smt. Almelu Venkatraman Iyer, received the family pension until her death on 30.01.2008. However, following her demise, the family did not apply for continuation of the pension in favour of the Complainant due to lack of awareness of the applicable provisions, and he has since been facing financial hardship.

1.2 It was further submitted that the Complainant has had a locomotor disability since birth and was issued a disability certificate on 20.08.1992. In an effort to pursue his claim, he visited the KVIC office more than 20 times over the past five months, but was repeatedly informed that the original PPO file could not be traced, thereby delaying consideration of his request for family pension.

2. Reply made by the Respondent:

2.1 The State Director of the Khadi & Village Industries Commission filed their reply on 10.08.2023, stating that following the death of the late Shri N.S. Venkatraman on 02.03.1994, his wife, Smt. Almelu Venkatraman, was receiving the family pension from the State Bank of India, which is recorded in the official records. However, it was noted that after Smt. Almelu Venkatraman's death on 30.01.2008, no claim for the family pension had been received from any family members. Additionally, as per the records, the children were considered adults, leading to the closure of the pension file for Late Shri N.S. Venkatraman in August 2017.

2.2 The Respondent further stated that the original file of Late Shri N.S. Venkatraman is untraceable. However, the office has retrieved relevant records from scanned copies of the pension file, which are now under examination.

3. Submissions made in Rejoinder:

3.1 The Complainant filed a rejoinder on 10.08.2023, reiterating his complaint and stated that his disability certificate was issued on 20.08.1992 prior to his father's death. He clarified that all his siblings were adults at the time of his mother's death and his family was completely unaware of the provision allowing family pension for physically challenged children. He thus submitted an application for the granting of family pension on 28.10.2022

4. Hearing:

4.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on**07.04.2025** wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

S. No.	Name/Designation of the Attendees	On Behalf of	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr Lakshman Shirke	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr Anil Kumar – Director HR & Administrator, KVIC Mumbai		Online

		Respondent	

5. Record of the Proceedings:

5.1 When the matter was called, the Complainant was absent, and Shri Lakshman Shirke appeared on his behalf, stating that the Complainant, a person with disability, had applied for grant of lifetime family pension as a dependent child, but the same had not been sanctioned despite submission of the required documents. The Court examined Rule 50(9) of the CCS (Pension) Rules, 2021, and observed that lifetime family pension is admissible to a son or daughter with a disability rendering them incapable of earning a livelihood, subject to prescribed conditions. The Respondent submitted that the Complainant's father had passed away in 1994 and pension was granted to the mother, but the Complainant's name was not recorded in family or nomination details at that time, and his disability had not been declared earlier. Concerns were also raised regarding reassessment of eligibility, including income and dependency.

5.2 The Court clarified that the key criterion for eligibility is the inability to earn a livelihood, not merely the percentage of disability, and directed both parties to place relevant documents on record, including pension records of the mother, nomination and family details, disability certificates, and proof of livelihood and dependency. The Respondent was also asked to clarify whether the Complainant's disability was recorded earlier and how the case would have been assessed under the applicable rules at that time. The matter was adjourned, granting both parties 15 days to submit the required documents, and the Court directed that the Complainant must remain personally present at the next hearing with proper authorisation, failing which the matter may not be taken.

6. Observations and Recommendations:

6.1 It is observed that before the scheduled hearing, vide email dated 02.01.2026, the Complainant informed this Court that he had filed a case before the Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT), Mumbai, bearing Case No. 2972/2025 (CAT), concerning the subject matter of the present complaint. As the case is subjudice, the Court considers that no further intervention is warranted in the present complaint at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 19-10-2026
11:20:26

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities