Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6833 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

In the matter of

Shri Jitender Kumar
(Complainant)

Vs.

The Commissioner
Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan
(Respondent)

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with 100% locomotor disability, stated that he works as a teacher at PM SHRI Kendriya Vidyalaya No.1, Ambala Cantt, under the Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (the Respondent). He alleged that he was insulted and humiliated on three occasions in the official WhatsApp group of the school, which has about 74–80 members. He stated that he was removed from the group without any reason, that a remark was made comparing him with other PwD teachers of the school, and that he was told that he had no authority to give instructions and could leave the WhatsApp group.

1.2 The Complainant further stated that he was threatened that if he made complaints, he would be involved in old cases. He also alleged that, despite his 100% locomotor disability, he was assigned dispersal duty, which required him to stand for long hours, and that his request for exemption from such duty and his objection thereto were not considered. He stated that while performing this duty on 07.05.2026, he fell and injured his right knee and right shoulder, for which he later took medical treatment.

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

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

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6833 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Shri Jitender Kumar	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Amar Pal Singh Brar, Assistant Commissioner, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan HQ, New Delhi	Respondent	Online
3.	Shri Ajeet Kumar, Principal, PM SHRI Kendriya Vidyalaya No.1, Ambala Cantt	Respondent	Online

4. Record of Proceedings

4.1 The Respondent submitted that the removal of the Complainant from the WhatsApp group was a routine administrative process following the Complainant's transfer on 12th July 2026, as he no longer belonged to the school. The Respondent further stated that the Complainant had challenged the transfer before a court, which stayed it, and that he was thereafter allowed to rejoin the school.

4.2 Regarding the dispersal duty, the Respondent submitted that the Principal, as head of the institution, has to balance the requirements of PwD employees with the safety and security of students. The school has 42 sections and 49 teachers, of whom 8 are PwD teachers, and the remaining 41 teachers cannot manage dispersal of all the sections. It was submitted that a blanket exemption is not feasible, that the duty may be assigned on days when other staff are on leave, and that it takes only about fifteen minutes. The Respondent also stated that the Complainant has been allotted one designated classroom where students come to him, so that he need not move while taking classes, and that toilet facilities are available in the adjacent area. The Respondent added that all Principals and staff are being sensitized towards PwD employees and that a specific segment on this subject would be incorporated in the induction courses.

4.3 The Complainant reiterated his grievance. The matter of his transfer, being before another forum, was not taken up in the hearing.

5. Observations & Recommendations

5.1 This Court observed that it does not support blanket exemption of employees with disabilities from work, as the Government is entitled to take work that is suitable to them. At the same time, any duty which

is difficult for the employee on account of his disability, such as duties requiring standing for long periods, must be avoided and suitable alternate work should be provided. The Respondent is recommended to assign the Complainant duties suitable to his disability and, if he raises any concern about a particular duty, to shift him to alternate work, so that he is able to perform at par with others.

5.2 The Respondent is recommended to sensitize the Principal and the staff of the school towards the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities, including in communication on platforms such as WhatsApp groups, and to provide counselling to both the Complainant and the Principal. The Respondent is also recommended to proceed with incorporating a segment on sensitization towards PwD employees in the induction courses.

5.3 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.

5.4 With the above recommendations, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner