**Diary No.** DNO/26/CCPD/6835 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

**In the matter of**

**Ms. Snigdha Agrawal**
**(Complainant)**

**Vs.**

**The Chairman**
**State Bank of India**
**(Respondent)**

## 1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, who is the caregiver of her father, a person with 75% permanent disability ( chronic neurological condition), stated that she is working as a Deputy Manager at the State Bank of India and was transferred from Bharatpur to the Administrative Office, Udaipur, vide transfer order dated 25.06.2026, a distance of approximately 579 km. She submitted that her father is completely dependent on others for his daily activities, medical treatment, hospital visits and emergency care, that his treatment is based at Bharatpur, and that there is no other family member available to look after him, making her his sole available caregiver.

1.2 The Complainant stated that, when the tentative list for long-stay transfers was issued in May 2026, she approached the HR authorities of the Bank and requested exemption from the transfer on the ground of her caregiving responsibility, but the final transfer order was issued without accommodating her request. She further stated that her father's disability certificate was still under process at that time and was issued on 16.07.2026, after which she again approached the HR authorities, but her request was rejected once more without any reasons being given. She also stated that her request for sabbatical leave was declined by the Zonal Office, Udaipur, on the ground that she would first have to join at Udaipur, and that she has not joined at Udaipur as it would leave her father without his only available caregiver.

1.3 The Complainant submitted that the transfer is contrary to the principle of reasonable accommodation and the protection available to caregivers of persons with disabilities under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (including Section 20(5)) and the instructions of the Government of India on exemption of caregivers from routine transfers, and that she was compelled to approach this Court for redressal.

**Diary No.** DNO/26/CCPD/6835 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

## 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 preliminary 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. Respondent's Submission

3.1 The State Bank of India (the Respondent), in its written reply dated 06.10.2026, submitted that transfers are an implicit part of recruitment and an incidence of service, and that transfer of officials on completion of stay is mandatory in line with the CVC and DFS guidelines on rotational transfers. It stated that the Complainant, posted at Bharatpur under the administrative control of AO-2, Alwar, completed her AO/Module stay of 10 years (excluding sabbatical leave) and became eligible for transfer under the Uniform Transfer Policy (UTP), and was therefore transferred to AO-4, Udaipur, vide order dated 25.06.2026, but has not reported yet. It further stated that the tentative list of eligible officials was circulated to the AOs to enable submission of exemption claims with supporting documents, that no claim or document was submitted by the Complainant, and that the final transfer list was published on 06.05.2026.

3.2 The Respondent stated that the Complainant applied by e-mail on 21.05.2026 seeking exemption from the routine transfer on several grounds, including the care of her father, but the application was supported only by prescriptions and not by a disability certificate of her father, which the UTP requires to be submitted for consideration as a caregiver of a person with disability. It submitted that her representation was referred to the Bank Medical Officer and placed before the Circle Grievance Redressal Committee on 06.07.2026, which did not accede to it in the absence of the certificate, and the rejection was communicated to her on 07.07.2026. It stated that the disability certificate, issued on 16.07.2026, was submitted only on 18.07.2026, after completion of the routine Inter Module Transfer exercise carried out in June 2026.

3.3 The Respondent submitted that, on the matter being referred again to the Bank Medical Officer after submission of the certificate, the opinion was that although the Complainant's father has a disability and is dependent on her, Udaipur is a more developed medical centre with more super-speciality doctors and five medical colleges with Neurology departments, and a patient managed at Bharatpur may be very well managed at Udaipur. It further submitted that the medical condition of her parents, as stated, is not in line with the history of medical bills claimed through HRMS, even though medical bills of dependents are fully reimbursable. The Respondent stated that cases of disability and medical emergencies are dealt with

empathetically, that exemptions on account of disability and caregiver status are duly approved by the appropriate authority and reviewed yearly, that the Complainant never claimed caregiver status before her name appeared in the transfer list, and that the certificate submitted on 18.07.2026 will be considered as per extant guidelines. It prayed that the complaint be rejected.

## 4. Hearing

4.1 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. | Ms. Snigdha Agrawal | Complainant | Online |
| 2. | Mr. Vishwanath Yadav, DGM & CDO, Jaipur Circle, State Bank of India | Respondent | Online |
| 3. | Shri Satish Choudhary, AGM (HR) and Shri Sudheer Sharma, AGM (Law), Jaipur Circle State Bank of India, | Respondent | Online |
| 4. | Shri Sanjeev Kumar, Liaison Officer & GRO for PwDs, Jaipur Circle, State Bank of India | Respondent | Online |

## 5. Record of Proceedings

5.1 The Complainant reiterated her grievance, stating that she is the sole available caregiver of her father and that the transfer to Udaipur would make it impossible for her to look after him. The Respondent stated that the Complainant joined the Bank as a Probationary Officer in 2012 and has been posted in the same AO since 2015, i.e., for more than eleven years, whereas under the UTP an officer can be retained in one AO for a maximum of ten years; that officers need to be moved across the approximately 1,400 branches in Rajasthan, with some areas having excess officers and others, such as Udaipur, being deficit centres; and that she was therefore transferred under the routine transfer exercise.

5.2 The Court asked the Respondent whether the Complainant had informed the Bank of her father's disability, at the time of appointment or before the transfer order, and whether she had submitted any

disability certificate of her father to the Bank. The Respondent replied that the Complainant had not informed the Bank, that her service record does not mention any disability of her father, and that the disability certificate was issued on 16.07.2026, i.e., after the transfer order was issued in June 2026. The Complainant stated that she had shown her father as a dependent in the service record in 2024, that the disability certificate was issued on 16.07.2026 and submitted by her to the Bank thereafter, and that the circular on caregivers was issued when she was on maternity leave, due to which she could not avail of it.

## 6. Observations & Recommendations

6.1 The Court observes that, for an employee to obtain caregiver status, the disability of the dependent family member should be mentioned in the service record and the relevant disability certificate should be submitted to the employer, and that the status and the consequent entitlement are available from the date of such submission. In the present case, the disability certificate of the Complainant's father was issued on 16.07.2026 and submitted to the Bank only after the transfer order dated 25.06.2026 had been issued. The Complainant therefore was not eligible to claim caregiver status at the time of the issue of the transfer order. In these circumstances, the Court finds no violation of the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016, or discrimination on the part of the Respondent in the matter of the transfer.

6.2 However, considering the humanitarian aspect of the case, namely the Complainant's father's 75% permanent disability and his need for continuous care, the Respondent is recommended to consider the Complainant's request for exemption as a caregiver, on the basis of the disability certificate and medical records submitted by her, to the extent possible and at the earliest, and to communicate a reasoned decision to her. The Complainant is requested to submit the disability certificate and all relevant proofs to the Grievance Redressal Officer of the Respondent to claim the caregiver entitlement. The Respondent is also recommended to ensure that transfers of employees who are caregivers of persons with disabilities are not effected merely citing administrative exigency, without due consideration of the rights, reasonable accommodation requirements and the principles of non-discrimination enshrined in the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

6.3 In exercise of the functions of this Court under Section 75(1)(b) of the RPwD Act, 2016, the Respondent is recommended to take necessary action on the above recommendations and to inform this Court of the Action Taken Report (ATR) within three months from the date of receipt of this Order, as provided under Section 76 of the Act.

6.4 In view of the above observations and recommendations, the case is disposed of.

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

**Diary No.** DNO/26/CCPD/6835 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

**Yours faithfully,**



**(S. Govindaraj)**
**Commissioner**

5वीं मंजिल, एनआईएसडी भवन, प्लॉट न०. जी-2, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075; दूरभाषः 011-20892364, 20892275
5th Floor, NISD Building, Plot No.G-2, Sector-10, Dwaraka, New Delhi-110075;Tele# 011-20892364, 20892275
E-mail: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccdisabilities.nic.in
(पया भविष्य मे पंत्राचार के लिए उपरोक्त फाईल/केस संख्या अवश्य लिखे)
(Please quote the above file/case number in future correspondence)