Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6814 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6814

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri L. Kannan

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The Secretary, Ministry of Shipping

2. The Secretary, Chennai Port Authority

Record of Proceedings

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 09.10.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Balvinder Singh, Senior Personnel Officer, Chennai Port Authority	Respondent 2

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6814 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

No representatives on behalf of the Complainant and Respondent No. 1 were present during the proceedings.

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant's grievance was taken up. The Complainant, Shri L. Kanan, a person with 60% locomotor disability, submitted that he was appointed as a Mechanic under the Persons with Benchmark Disabilities (PwBD) quota. He alleged that during the recent promotion process for the post of Mechanic HS Grade-I, the reserved PwBD roster point was not allocated to an eligible PwBD candidate despite the availability of such a candidate. He contended that the same was contrary to the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and adversely affected the reservation rights of persons with benchmark disabilities. The Complainant requested that the PwBD reservation roster of Chennai Port Authority be examined, an inquiry be conducted into the matter, and suitable posts, including Mechanic, Welder and Carpenter, be identified for candidates with benchmark disabilities. He further sought the filling of backlog PwBD vacancies for the year 2025 and subsequent years in accordance with the applicable provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016.

2.2 The representative appearing on behalf of the Respondents submitted that the Complainant was initially appointed in 1988 under the PwBD quota and was subsequently appointed as an Oil Greaser in 1997 against an OBC vacancy. He further submitted that the Complainant was appointed as a Mechanic Grade-III in 1998 against an OBC vacancy in the Port Authority and thereafter received promotions to the posts of Mechanic Grade-II, Mechanic Grade-I and Mechanic Higher Grade-II.

2.3 The Respondent submitted that a Departmental Promotion Committee (DPC) was held on 23.07.2026 against two vacancies arising due to superannuation. However, the post of Mechanic Higher Grade-I had not been identified as suitable for persons with benchmark disabilities by the competent controlling authority/Head of Department, considering the physical requirements associated with the nature of the work, including climbing structures, accessing overhead tanks using metal ladders, and working with cranes and other equipment. The Respondent further submitted that the Complainant was placed at Serial No. 3 in the zone of consideration and that further promotional opportunities were expected to arise in the subsequent year. They stated that the vacancies under consideration were proposed to be filled on an unreserved basis, as the post in question had not been identified as suitable for persons with benchmark disabilities.

2.4 Upon consideration of the submissions, the Court recommended the Respondents to furnish a copy

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6814 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

of their written response, along with the relevant documents, to the Complainant. The Complainant was granted seven days from the date of receipt of the Respondents' response to submit a rejoinder, if any. Court observed that the matter involved technical issues requiring examination of the relevant records, including the identification of posts suitable for persons with benchmark disabilities and the applicability of the PwBD reservation roster in the promotion process.

Yours faithfully,



(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner