Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6855 **Dated:** 23/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6855

In the Matter of

Complainant

Ms. Eva Jain

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Director, All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS)

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 15.10.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Ms. Eva Jain	Complainant
2.	Mr. Tony George Jacobs, Associate Dean (Examinations), AIIMS	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Ms. Eva Jain, a candidate with 70% low vision and a person with benchmark disability, submitted that she appeared for the AIIMS CRE-5 examination on 25.07.2026 with her own scribe, whose engagement had been approved through the AIIMS portal after submission of the requisite

documents. She alleged that, during the examination, the scribe was repeatedly interrupted and was subsequently removed from the examination hall by the AIIMS observer, Shri Amrish Kumar. She further alleged that she was not provided the requisite compensatory time and, owing to these interruptions, could not complete the examination and scored 79 out of 400 marks. The Complainant further submitted that, despite making seven representations to AIIMS, she had not received a satisfactory response to her grievance. Accordingly, she sought a re-examination with her approved scribe and the requisite compensatory time, an inquiry into the incident, and appropriate action to safeguard the rights of candidates with disabilities.

2.2 The Respondent, represented by Mr. Tony George Jacob, submitted that a technical error in the examination system had resulted in the Complainant's scribe approval and entitlement to compensatory time not being reflected correctly, although the Complainant was eligible to use her own scribe as per the documents submitted. The Respondent stated that CCTV footage and examination logs indicated that the Complainant and her scribe had engaged in discussions beyond the assistance permissible for a scribe, despite warnings from the examination staff. It was submitted that the scribe was removed at approximately 4:20 PM and that the Complainant continued interacting with the observer and invigilator until approximately 4:27 PM. The Respondent further stated that the Complainant submitted her examination at approximately 4:30 PM, although the examination was scheduled to continue until 6:00 PM, and did not attempt further questions thereafter. According to the Respondent, the Complainant declined the alternative scribe stated to have been offered at the examination centre, and the action was taken to prevent the use of unfair means.

2.4 And whereas, the Complainant stated that she had not been discussing the questions with her scribe but had only asked the scribe to repeat certain terms that she could not understand because of pronunciation difficulties. She also denied that the scribe was her sister, clarifying that the scribe was her friend. The Complainant disputed the assertion that an alternative scribe had been offered and stated that she had remained at the centre after her own scribe was removed, without being clearly informed of the reason for the action. She further submitted that her parents had not been informed when the incident occurred and that signatures had subsequently been obtained from her and her scribe on a written account of the incident.

2.5 The Court observed that the submissions of the parties were contradictory and that it was not possible to arrive at a conclusion during the hearing without examining the relevant records. The Court accordingly recommended the Respondent to submit, within seven days, the CCTV footage and other

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6855 **Dated:** 23/10/2026

visual evidence through a pen drive, and the relevant documentary records by email. The records sought included the incident report, examination logs showing the questions attempted and the time spent per question, and the material relied upon by the Respondent in support of its contentions regarding the removal of the scribe and the alleged offer of an alternative scribe. The Complainant was granted three days from receipt of the Respondent's response to submit a rejoinder and place her submissions and supporting material on record.

Yours faithfully,



(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner