सत्यमेव जयते
न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन
COURT OF THE 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 & Empowerment**
भारत सरकार/**Government of India**
5वाँ तल**,** एन.आई.एस.डी. भवन**,** जी**-2,** सेक्टर**-10,** द्वारका**,** नई दिल्ली**-110075;** दूरभाष **: (011)20892364**
5th Floor, N.I.S.D. Bhawan, G-2, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364
Email: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccdisabilities.nic.in

CCPD-OF-0016/1041/2026

In the matter of:

Ms. Sanjana

Email: sanjananaugain@gmail.com **...Complainant**

Versus

(1) The Secretary,

CBSE

Email: secy-cbse@nic.in, controller@cbse.gov.in, ctet.cbse@nic.in

(2) The Principal

Tagore Senior Secondary School

Email: tagoremayapuri@yahoo.com **...Respondents**

1. Gist of the Case:

1.1 Ms. Sanjana a person with 100% blindness filed a complaint dated 08.02.2026 regarding the non competence of the scribe provided by the CBSE.

1.2 The Complainant contended that the scribe provided by the examination centre was not proficient in Hindi, mispronounced words, became impatient when asked to repeat questions, interrupted her responses, and even suggested alternative answers, thereby adversely affecting her performance. She further alleged that after the

examination had commenced, she and other PwD candidates were shifted from a ground-floor room to a noisy first-floor room, resulting in disturbance and loss of approximately 5–8 minutes of examination time. Additionally, she claimed that the invigilators failed to maintain a conducive examination environment, allowing continuous disturbances despite the presence of multiple staff members. As relief, she sought a re-examination, permission to bring her own qualified scribe in future examinations, directions to ensure competent scribes and invigilators, a noise-free examination environment with no movement after commencement of the exam, and action against the Centre Superintendent and CBSE officials for the alleged violations.

2. Notice of admissibility:

2.1 The matter is listed for an admissibility hearing on 18.02.2026 to consider whether the present representation is maintainable and fit to be registered for further proceedings before the Court of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities (CCPD).

3. Hearing:

3.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted in hybrid mode on 18.02.2026 wherein following parties were present:

Sl. No.	Name and Designation of the Party/Representative	Parties	Mode
1.	Ms. Sanjana	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Vikas Arora- (JS) - TET- CBSE	Respondent	Online
3.	Mr. Kamal Kishore - (AO) - Tagore Sr. Sec. School.	Respondent	Online

3.2 The Complainant, Ms. Sanjana, submitted that appeared in a CBSE examination and had opted for the facility of a scribe. According to her, the scribe provided by the examination centre was not proficient in Hindi and was unable to properly understand and write her responses. She stated that she had to repeatedly explain questions and answers to the

scribe, which caused delay, confusion, and mental stress during the examination. The Complainant further submitted that she and other PwD candidates were shifted from one examination room to another, which created disturbance and affected her concentration. She contended that these circumstances adversely affected her performance in the examination and therefore requested that a re-examination be conducted.

3.3 The Representative of the examination centre submitted that the complainant was provided with a scribe in accordance with a CBSE guidelines. It was stated that the scribe was a student of Class XI and was assigned from the approved panel maintained by the centre. The Respondent further submitted that the shifting of candidates from one room to another was carried out before the commencement of the examination and was completed within a very short period of time. According to the Respondent, no complaint regarding the competence of the scribe or the room shifting was made by the complainant during the course of the examination. The Respondent also stated that CCTV footage was available to verify the timing of the room change. The Representative of CBSE submitted that candidates are permitted either to avail a scribe arranged by the examination centre or to bring their own scribe, subject to the prescribed guidelines. It was submitted that these provisions are clearly mentioned in the Information Bulletin and instructions issued to candidates. CBSE further stated that all examination centres are instructed to maintain a panel of scribes and that the qualification of the scribe should ordinarily be lower than that of the candidate. CBSE maintained that the relevant guidelines were already in place and available to candidates before the examination.

3.4 The Court observed that although the complainant had the option of bringing her own scribe, she had not availed herself of that facility. The Court further noted that no complaint regarding the quality or suitability of the scribe had been raised before the invigilator or the Centre Superintendent during the examination. Consequently, the authorities were not provided with an opportunity to address or rectify the grievance at the relevant time.

3.5 The Court also observed that the alleged room shifting appeared to have taken place before the commencement of the examination and therefore could not be considered a substantial factor affecting the

examination process. However, the Court found merit in the grievance relating to the suitability of the scribe. It observed that the complainant was pursuing a B.Ed. programme, whereas the scribe provided by the centre was a Class XI student. The Court noted that such a significant difference in educational qualifications could reasonably result in communication difficulties and may affect the effectiveness of the assistance provided. The Court emphasized that examination authorities should ensure that scribes are selected appropriately, taking into account the educational level of the candidate, and that they are adequately sensitized and trained to assist persons with disabilities.

3.6 Accordingly, while the Court did not find sufficient grounds to direct a re-examination as the Complainant didn’t raise her complaint during the exam and didn’t inform the authorities and Further, it recommended that CBSE and examination centres take necessary measures to ensure proper implementation of guidelines relating to the appointment of scribes and to provide fair and effective assistance to PwD candidates in future examinations.

4. Observations and Recommendations:

4.1 The Court observed that the complainant had the option, under the applicable CBSE guidelines, either to avail a scribe arranged by the examination centre or to bring her own scribe subject to the prescribed conditions. However, the complainant did not avail herself of the latter option. The Court further noted that no complaint regarding the competence, conduct, or suitability of the scribe was brought to the notice of the invigilator or the Centre Superintendent during the examination. Consequently, the examination authorities were deprived of an opportunity to address or rectify the grievance at the relevant time. The Court also found that the shifting of candidates from one room to another had been carried out before the commencement of the examination and within a short duration, and therefore could not be regarded as a substantial irregularity warranting a re-examination.

4.2 At the same time, the Court found merit in the Complainant's grievance concerning the suitability of the scribe provided by the examination centre. It was noted that the complainant was pursuing a B.Ed. programme, whereas the scribe assigned to her was a Class XI student. Such a considerable disparity in educational qualifications could

reasonably result in communication difficulties and adversely affect the effectiveness of the assistance provided to a visually impaired candidate. The Court observed that the provision of an appropriate scribe is an essential accommodation under Section 2(y) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, which defines "reasonable accommodation" as necessary and appropriate modifications and adjustments to ensure that persons with disabilities enjoy their rights equally with others. The Court further noted that under Sections 16 and 17 of the RPwD Act, educational institutions and examination authorities are obligated to provide inclusive and accessible educational opportunities and suitable support measures to persons with disabilities. Therefore, the effectiveness and competence of a scribe cannot be treated as a mere procedural formality but as a substantive component of equal participation in examinations.

4.3 The Court recommends that CBSE ensure wider dissemination and greater clarity regarding the options available to PwD candidates for arranging scribes, including the facility of bringing their own eligible scribe. Such information should be prominently communicated through examination notifications, application forms, information bulletins, and instructions issued to candidates so that candidates are able to effectively exercise their rights under the RPwD Act and avail suitable accommodations. The Court further recommends that CBSE and all examination centres establish an effective mechanism for addressing grievances raised by PwD candidates during examinations. Invigilators and Centre Superintendents should be adequately sensitized and trained to respond promptly to complaints relating to scribes, accessibility arrangements, or examination conditions. Such measures would be consistent with the obligations imposed under Sections 16 and 17 of the RPwD Act, which mandate equal opportunity, non-discrimination, and appropriate support measures in educational settings.

4.4 The Court also recommends that examination centres exercise due diligence while empanelling and assigning scribes. The educational qualifications, language proficiency, and ability of the scribe to effectively communicate with and assist the candidate should be carefully considered. CBSE should issue detailed operational guidelines to all examination centres requiring that scribes be selected in a manner compatible with the candidate's educational level and examination

requirements. Periodic sensitization and training programmes should also be conducted for scribes and examination staff to ensure compliance with the principles of reasonable accommodation under Section 2(y) and the mandate of accessibility and equal participation embodied in the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

5. The case is accordingly disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 01-07-2026
16:08:50

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities