Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/7137 **Dated:** 21/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/7137

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Kovid Jagdeo Manohar

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Chairman, Airport Authority of India

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Kovid Jagdeo Manohar, a person with 40% visual impairment, submitted a grievance dated 25.09.2026 and stated that he applied for the post of Junior Executive (Operations), Post Code 14, under AAI Advertisement No. 12/2026/CHQ/DR-CBT. He stated that the recruitment notification identifies the post as suitable for Blind and Low Vision (B/LV) candidates but also makes an LMV driving licence mandatory. The online application portal does not allow submission without driving licence details. He stated that, due to this requirement and the lack of clarification from AAI, he entered his brother's driving licence details to submit his application before the deadline. He has voluntarily disclosed this and requested permission to correct the details. He has requested AAI to review the driving licence requirement for eligible B/LV candidates, modify the online application portal, allow correction of his application without cancellation of his candidature, and consider his application based on the other eligibility criteria.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 21.10.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

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

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/7137 **Dated:** 21/10/2026

1.	Shri Kovid Jagdeo Manohar	Complainant
2.	Shri Hira Lal Prate, GRO of PwDs, CHQ, Airport Authority of India	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant, Shri Kovid Jagdeo Manohar, reiterated his complaint and requested that the Respondent review the driving licence requirement for eligible candidates with blindness and low vision, enable correction of his application without cancellation of his candidature, and consider his application on the basis of the remaining eligibility criteria.

3.2 The Court sought clarification regarding the requirement of an LMV driving licence for a post identified as suitable for candidates with blindness and low vision. It observed that the online application process ought to provide a suitable mechanism for candidates with disabilities to seek clarification or complete their applications where a mandatory field creates a barrier to submission. The Court noted that, according to the Complainant, the absence of such a mechanism and the lack of a timely response had led him to enter another person's driving licence details. It observed that such an entry was not appropriate; however, the circumstances leading to it, including the design of the application portal and the absence of clarification, required consideration.

3.3 The Court observed that requiring candidates with blindness or low vision to furnish driving licence details for a post identified as suitable for them raised concerns regarding the sensitivity and accessibility of the recruitment process. While acknowledging that such a requirement might be intended to prevent fraudulent entries or verify the authenticity of applications, the Court emphasised that the process should not inadvertently disadvantage genuine candidates with disabilities. It observed that, where the application portal makes such details mandatory without providing an appropriate clarification or correction mechanism, candidates may face avoidable difficulties in completing their applications. The Court noted that the Complainant's entry of his brother's driving licence details was inappropriate; however, the circumstances leading to the entry, including the technical and procedural constraints stated by him, warranted consideration rather than an automatic adverse consequence.

3.4 The Court further observed that the issue might affect other candidates with blindness or low vision who could have been unable to submit their applications, or who might have entered incorrect information

due to the same requirement. It emphasised that the recruitment process should provide a fair and accessible opportunity to eligible candidates and that the Respondent should adopt a general corrective mechanism instead of restricting the relief to the Complainant alone. The Court also noted the urgency of the matter in view of the examination scheduled for 26.10.2026.

3.5 In view of the above, the Court recommended that the Respondent open a correction window for two days to enable the Complainant and other similarly affected candidates with blindness or low vision to correct their application details. The Respondent was also advised to issue a public notice on its official website informing eligible candidates who had been unable to complete their applications, or who had entered incorrect details due to the mandatory driving licence field, of the opportunity to complete or correct their applications, subject to the applicable eligibility criteria.

3.6 The Court recommended the Respondent to take urgent action to redress the Complainant's grievance and submit an Action Taken Report (ATR) by 24.10.2026, detailing the corrective measures undertaken, including the opening of the correction window, issuance of the public notice, and the status of correction of the Complainant's application. The Respondent was required to ensure that the corrective facility was made available sufficiently in advance of the scheduled examination so that affected candidates could avail themselves of the opportunity. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner