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

Case No. CCPD/16710/1040/26 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

Notice u/s 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016

Case No. CCPD/16710/1040/2026 and CCPD/16702/1040/2026

To,

The Director

Indian Institute of Banking and Personal Selection

Email: ibpsreg@ibpsin **...Respondent**

Sub: Notice to file comments in the complaint dated 19.08.2026 of Ms. Arti Tyagi, a person with 100% hearing impairment, and Shri Aditya Bose, a person with 90% Hearing Impairment regarding alleged rejection of candidature for CRP PO/MT-XVI and post-application narrowing of HI category criteria

Madam /Sir,

I am directed to enclose a copy of documents related to the complaint dated 19.08.2026 of **Ms. Arti Tyagi**, a person with **100% hearing impairment**, and **Shri Aditya Bose**, a person with **90% Hearing Impairment** on the above-mentioned subject, which is self- explanatory.

2. Whereas, a preliminary hearing was conducted in Diary Numbers DNO/26/CCPD/6778 and DNO/26/CCPD/6784 on 01.10.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Case No. CCPD/16710/1040/26 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Ms. Arti Tyagi	Complainant
2.	Mr. Aditya Bose	Complainant
3.	Shri K. Ani. Muthyalu, DGM (Legal & Admin.)	Respondent
4.	Ms. Rajshree Kumari, Manager (Legal), IBPS	Respondent

2.1 During the proceedings, the Complainants reiterated their grievances and the Respondent, IBPS, submitted that the applications in both cases had been made under the disability subtype “deaf” and not “hard of hearing”. It was submitted that the applicable Government notification and Office Memorandum prescribe the specific disability categories identified for the post and that IBPS had subsequently issued a clarification to the recruitment notification. According to the Respondent, the disability category declared by the Complainants did not fall within the category identified for the post and, accordingly, the applications were not considered valid. The Respondent further submitted that separate options for “deaf” and “hard of hearing” were available in the online application form, that candidates who had applied under “hard of hearing” were considered valid, and that the examination had already been conducted and the results declared. The Respondent also submitted that its replies in respect of both complaints had already been furnished and that the application fee had been refunded.

2.2 The Court sought clarification regarding the disability categories available in the online application form and the basis on which the respective applications were treated as invalid. The Court observed that the grievances raised in both complaints required examination with reference to the categories made available in the application form, the relevant recruitment notification and clarification, and the basis on which the candidature of the Complainants was cancelled/not considered. The Court recommended that the Respondent furnish, within seven (7) days, a consolidated response in respect of both complaints along with the relevant supporting material, specifically addressing the disability categories available in the application form and the basis for treating the respective applications as invalid. The Court further observed that, notwithstanding that the examination had already been conducted and the results declared, the grievances and the possibility of any appropriate remedial measure would be examined on the basis of the

Case No. CCPD/16710/1040/26 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

material placed on record.

3. And whereas Section 21 of the Act mandates that every establishment shall notify an Equal Opportunity Policy as prescribed under Rule 8 of the RPwD Rules, 2017, and shall register a copy with the Chief Commissioner.

4. And whereas Section 23 of the Act makes it mandatory for every government establishment to appoint a Grievance Redressal Officer and inform the Chief Commissioner about such appointment.

5. And whereas Section 75 (1) (a) and (b) of the Act mandates the Chief Commissioner to inter alia identify, suo motu or otherwise, the provisions of any law or policy, programme and procedures, which are inconsistent with the Act and to look into complaints inter-alia, concerning matters relating to deprivation of rights of persons with disabilities either on his own motion or on the application of any aggrieved person and recommend necessary corrective steps.

6. And therefore, you are hereby advised to forward your comments on the Complaint on an **affidavit** signed by an officer of an appropriate seniority not below the level of Group 'A' officer and to produce all the requisite documents upon which you base your Comments or Claim and where you rely on any other document as evidence in support of your comments or claim, you shall enter such documents in a list to be annexed to the Comments on Complaint along with action taken in compliance with statutory provisions as mentioned at paras 3 & 4 above, to this Court **within 7 days**, failing which, the Complaint may be disposed of ex-parte. **While responding to this notice due care may be taken of relevant provisions of the Act, other statutory provisions, and government instruction such as the ones mentioned above including but not limited to CHAPTER VIII- DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF APPROPRIATE GOVERNMENTS towards awareness campaigns, access to transport, access to information and communication technology, etc., and sections 89 and 93 of the Act.**

7. A copy of your reply should also be served to the Complainant **via email and by post, and the proof of service be submitted to this Court along with your Reply**. You may also provide additional inputs relevant to the case, if desired. However, it is to be noted that in case any statutory provision, any judgment of a High Court or the Supreme Court, rules formulated under any statute, Office Memorandum, or bye-law is relied upon, you shall attach a copy of the same along with your comments on the Complaint. **The Complainant may file his rejoinder, if any, to this Court within 7 days with a copy to the Respondent(s).**

Yours faithfully,

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**

Case No. CCPD/16710/1040/26 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner

Copy to:

1) **Aditya Bose**
MAHAVEER NAGAR A-5 BASANT VIHAR , PALASH HEIGHTS CORNER MAHAVEER NAGAR A-5 BASANT VIHAR , PALASH HEIGHTS CORNER
RAIPUR, CHHATTISGARH, 492006
adityabose9902@gmail.com
9826184546

2) **SHILPI BOSE**
A-5 basant vihar palash heights , A-5 basant vihar palash heights
RAIPUR, CHHATTISGARH, 492001
adityabose9902@gmail.com
9826184546

Enc. Copies:

1) Disability Certificate
2) Case Document - 1