Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6870 **Dated:** 21/10/2026

In the matter of

Amit Raj
(Complainant)

Vs.

The Director
Institute of Banking Personnel Selection
(Respondent)

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with 70 ?rebral palsy, stated that he applied for the post of HR/Personnel Officer (Scale I) under the Common Recruitment Process for Specialist Officers (CRP SPL-XVI) of the Institute of Banking Personnel Selection (IBPS) on 11.07.2026 and paid the requisite intimation charges. He submitted that, after the application process had closed on 21.07.2026, IBPS issued a clarification notice on 12.08.2026 excluding candidates with cerebral palsy from the said post, and that this notice was not individually communicated to him.

1.2 The Complainant further stated that he received a rejection e-mail on 21.08.2026, and that his representation against the rejection was turned down on 27.08.2026 without a reasoned order. He submitted that he meets the prescribed functional requirements for the post and had earlier qualified up to the interview stage for the same post under the previous notification.

2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A notice dated 06.10.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016, was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 15.10.2026 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 In its written reply dated 08.10.2026, the Respondent submitted that IBPS is a public trust registered under the Bombay Public Trust Act, 1950 and the Societies Registration Act, 1860, is not a statutory body or "State" under Article 12 of the Constitution, and merely performs a mandate for the

participating banks in conducting the selection process, the final selection/appointment being solely the decision of the participating banks.

3.2 The Respondent submitted that the Complainant applied under the category "OC/Locomotor Disability" with sub-type "Cerebral Palsy", whereas, as per the Gazette Notification dated 04.01.2021 and the Office Memorandum dated 08.11.2024 of the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, cerebral palsy is not a disability identified for the post of HR/Personnel Officer (Scale I). It was stated that a clarification notice dated 12.08.2026 was published on its website, that the eligibility criteria were applied uniformly to all applicants and no exception was made against the Complainant, that the notification itself provides that Government guidelines on benchmark disabilities are subject to change/clarification, and that IBPS has no authority to alter the identification of posts on its own. It was further stated that the online preliminary examination was concluded on 29.08.2026 and the results are yet to be declared.

3.3 The Respondent prayed that the Complaint be held not admissible and dismissed.

4. Hearing

4.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted on 15.10.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. A Ani Muthyalu, DGM (Legal & Admn), & Ms. Rajshree Kumari, Manager (Legal), IBPS	Respondent	Online

4.2 No representative appeared on behalf of the Complainant during the hearing

5. Record of Proceedings

5.1 The Respondent stated that IBPS issued the CRP notification dated 01.07.2026 for recruitment of Specialist Officers in participating banks, and that the Complainant applied for the post of HR/Personnel Officer (Scale I) under the category of Locomotor Disability with sub-type cerebral palsy. The Respondent stated that, as per the Gazette Notification dated 04.01.2021 and the Office Memorandum dated 08.11.2024, cerebral palsy is not an identified disability for the said post; that a public notice was issued to

all candidates on 12.08.2026 and the candidates concerned were also individually informed on 21.08.2026; that these guidelines are mandatory and IBPS has only implemented them; and that the Complainant's contention regarding his functional abilities, and the addition of the disability to the post, is beyond the purview of IBPS. The Respondent requested that the case may not be admitted.

5.2 The Court noted that the Respondent's written reply had been received. The Respondent stated that the reply was e-mailed to this Court on 08.10.2026 and a copy was marked to the Complainant on the same day. The Court noted that no rejoinder had been received from the Complainant so far. The Complainant is recommended to submit his rejoinder, if any, within 07 days, as a final opportunity. The Court will examine the matter on receipt of the rejoinder and, if required, may seek the opinion of DoPT & DePWD.

Yours faithfully,

(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner