**Diary No.** DNO/26/CCPD/6762 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

**In the matter of**

Mr. Vishal Tiwari

Complainant

**Vs.**

The Managing Director
MetLife India Insurance Company Ltd.
Repondent

## 1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with 100% hearing impairment, stated that he has been working as Specialist- Technology Services with MetLife India Insurance Company Ltd., Noida (the Respondent), since 05.11.2018. He stated that for the last 90 days he was not provided proper training or work allocation despite repeatedly requesting the same through Teams and email, and that his requests for accessible training support, such as captions and written training material, were not considered. He further stated that other new employees, including two Deaf employees, had received face-to-face training, whereas he was not provided similar training.

1.2 The Complainant stated that when he requested reasonable accommodation under Sections 20 and 21 of the RPwD Act, 2016, HR replied that it did not understand his point on accommodation, and that he was informed in writing that the position was being “ramped down” and that this was not subject to any individual fault. He further stated that he was told that after 90 days on the bench he would be laid off, and alleged that the non-provision of proper training and reasonable accommodation, and the proposed layoff, amounted to discrimination on the ground of his disability.

## 2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A notice dated 22.09.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016, was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 01.10.2026 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/6762 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

3.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted on 01.10.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

| Sl.No. | Name of the parties/Representatives | For Complainant/Respondent | Mode of Attendance |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Mr. Vishal Tiwari | Complainant | Online |
| 2. | Adv Sourabh Leekha & Mr. Robin Clarence | Respondent | Online |

**4. Record of Proceedings**

4.1 The Complainant reiterated his grievance and submitted that accessibility support, such as captions and interpreters, was required for his training, but was repeatedly denied to him.

4.2 The Respondent submitted that training and redundancy are two different matters. It stated that training is a regular feature provided as and when required, including accessibility support, and that the Complainant had undergone training in parts till July 2026. It submitted that the Complainant was issued a redundancy letter in August 2026 solely because of the ramp-down of the entire project, that several other employees across different groups and projects were similarly placed, and that he was not singled out. It further submitted that, as the project was being ramped down, training on it was stopped, and that the Complainant was given a 90-day period, on regular salary, to look for other positions within the organization, during which his CV and skill profile were circulated to other project managers and departments and he was also free to apply on his own. According to the Respondent, the Complainant had not applied for any position, and the matter had been explained to him in a one-to-one meeting and by email.

4.3 The Court observed that no job or alternate job had been denied to the Complainant, that the continuation of an employee in a project which has been wound down is a concern of the private establishment, and that the grant of a 90-day period with regular salary and support for internal placement did not by itself indicate discrimination under Sections 20 and 21 of the Act. The Court, however, noted that training, whenever provided, must be accessible according to the requirement of the employee, such as captions, written or large-print material or interpreters, and that it was not clear what accessibility support, if any, had been lacking in the earlier trainings.

**Diary No.** DNO/26/CCPD/6762 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

4.4 After considering the submissions of both parties, the Court observes that the redundancy in question arises from the ramp-down of the project and is stated to affect other employees as well, that the Complainant continues to receive his regular salary during the 90-day period, and that he has not been denied any alternate position. On the material available, no discrimination on the ground of disability is made out in this regard.

4.5 The Court, however, reiterates that Sections 20 and 21 of the RPwD Act, 2016 require every establishment to provide reasonable accommodation and a barrier-free environment to its employees with disabilities. The Respondent is recommended to ensure that training, work allocation and communication for the Complainant, and for other employees with disabilities, are made accessible, including through captions, written material and sign language interpretation as required.

4.6 The Respondent is directed to submit its response in writing, covering all the details stated during the hearing, including the system followed, the treatment of the Complainant during the 90-day bench period and the justification for its action, within 7 days of the issuance of this Order, with a copy to the Complainant. The Complainant may file his rejoinder, if any, within a further 7 days thereafter. On completion of the above, the Court will issue the final order in the matter.

**Yours faithfully,**

**(VIKAS TRIVEDI)**
**Dy. Chief Commissioner**