Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6811 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

In the matter of

Shri Amit Shukla
(Complainant)

Vs.

The Managing Director, Indian Bank
(Respondent)

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with 45% locomotor disability, stated that he works as an Assistant Branch Manager at the Auraiya Branch of Indian Bank (the Respondent). He stated that he joined the Kanpur Zone on 11.09.2024 and was posted at the Auraiya Branch in June 2025, but was transferred by an order dated 25.06.2026 to the Zonal Office, Gonda, more than 250 km away, before completing the normal tenure. He submitted a representation on 26.06.2026 seeking cancellation of the transfer on the grounds of his disability and the applicable transfer guidelines, but was relieved on 04.07.2026 without the representation being decided.

1.2 The Complainant further stated that he approached the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court, which, by an order dated 31.07.2026, stayed the transfer and relieving order and directed the competent authority to decide his representation by a speaking order, and that the representation was thereafter rejected on the ground of administrative exigency. He alleged that, despite the High Court's order, his monthly salary and residential lease rent reimbursement have been withheld, causing him financial hardship and mental distress. He also alleged that other marketing specialists who joined the Kanpur Zone before him were retained while he was transferred, despite his disability and short tenure.

2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A notice dated 01.10.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016, was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 09.10.2026 to determine the admissibility of the case and find out if this can be resolved without further quasi-judicial intervention of this Court.

3. Hearing

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6811 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

3.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted on 09.10.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Shri Amit Shukla	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh, General Manager (HRM/HRD), Chennai Corporate Office, Indian Bank	Respondent	Online

4. Record of Proceedings

4.1 The Respondent submitted that the Complainant joined the Bank on 13.08.2019 as a Marketing Officer and was posted in the Hameepur & Banda Zone for about five years. After his promotion in 2024, he was transferred to the Kanpur Zone, his native district. The Respondent stated that Marketing Officers are to be posted in Zonal Offices, the field General Manager's Office or the Corporate Office, and that the Complainant was posted at Auraiya for a short period of about eleven months only as a special consideration, on account of his wife's health condition after delivery, as she is employed at Auraiya.

4.2 The Respondent further submitted that, as per the requirement of the Bank, the Complainant was thereafter transferred to Gonda Zone within the State of Uttar Pradesh, since there is no Marketing Officer in that Zone. The Respondent stated that the Complainant filed a writ petition No. 11413/2026 before the Allahabad High Court, which permitted him to submit a fresh representation to the Corporate Office; the representation was considered and rejected on administrative requirement, and the decision was communicated to him on 11.08.2026. The Respondent added that the Complainant has not joined at Gonda and is on unauthorised absence, and that he may approach the High Court again if he is not satisfied with the decision.

4.3 The Complainant stated that other Marketing Officers in the same Zone were retained and that the transfer was not made on a first-in, first-out basis, and that the transfer policy provides for a minimum tenure of three years.

5. Observations & Recommendations

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6811 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

5.1 This Court observed that, as per the guidelines, persons with disabilities are exempted from routine/rotational transfers; there is no bar on transferring them, but administrative exigency has to be established, and, to the extent possible, the transfer should be made in consultation with the employee with disability. This Court also noted that the matter relating to the transfer of the Complainant has been taken up before the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court (W.P No. 11413/2026) and therefore refrained from interfering in it. The Respondent is recommended to furnish to this Court the details of the writ petition filed by the Complainant before the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court and the directions given therein.

5.3 As the matter is sub judice before the Hon’ble Allahabad High Court, this Court refrains from intervening in the matter, and no further consideration is warranted at this stage. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner