Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6863 **Dated:** 23/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6863

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri A Ravinder

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Central Provident Fund Commissioner

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.	Shri A Ravinder	Complainant
2.	Shri Karikey Singh, HRM-I, EPFO	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant submitted that he was appointed as an Enforcement Officer in EPFO on 26.10.1999 and was presently serving as Regional Provident Fund Commissioner-II at the Regional Office, Kochi. He stated that he has 55% locomotor disability and is a person with benchmark

disability. He alleged that, owing to the non-implementation of reservation in promotion for Persons with Benchmark Disabilities, he was denied timely career progression. He sought notional promotion to the post of Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner (APFC) from 26.10.2006, notional promotion to RPFC-II from 2010, restoration of seniority above his juniors, consideration for promotion to RPFC-I, and consequential benefits, including pay fixation and arrears.

2.2 The Respondent, EPFO, submitted that, pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT), a Departmental Promotion Committee (DPC) had been convened to consider notional promotions of eligible Persons with Benchmark Disabilities. The Complainant was considered by the DPC and found eligible for notional promotion from 2019, whereas his regular promotion was granted in 2021. The Respondent stated that the DPC's recommendation was subject to approval by the competent authority. It further submitted that verification of the Complainant's disability certificate, issued in July 1983 by the Medical Superintendent, Area Hospital, Golconda, Hyderabad, could not be completed because the concerned Telangana Government office had informed EPFO that the relevant records were unavailable owing to the passage of time and applicable record-retention norms. The Respondent stated that the matter was being referred to DoPT through the Ministry of Labour and Employment for guidance regarding verification of the certificate and the further course of action.

2.3 The Complainant stated that he had submitted his original disability certificate at the time of joining service and had subsequently obtained and submitted a UDID card in 2026, reflecting 55% locomotor disability. In response to the Court's queries regarding his promotion history, the Complainant stated that he had not received promotion until 2021. The Respondent explained that several officers recruited in the same batch in 1999 had also experienced delays in promotion owing to cadre-management issues, and that promotions were subsequently undertaken following cadre restructuring and the creation of additional posts. However, upon being asked why the Complainant had not been considered for promotion in 2017 when other officers were promoted, the Respondent was unable to provide a complete justification during the hearing. The Respondent subsequently stated that the Complainant had been under a penalty up to June 2019, which was cited as the reason for considering him for notional promotion only from 2019. The Respondent was unable to provide the specific details of the penalty during the hearing.

2.4 The Court observed that the Respondent was required to explain the basis on which the Complainant was considered eligible for notional promotion from 2019 rather than 2017, including the applicable rules, the effect of the penalty imposed on him, and the reasons for his non-consideration for

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6863 **Dated:** 23/10/2026

promotion in 2017. The Court recommended the Respondent to submit a detailed written response, supported by relevant rules and documentary evidence, addressing the reasons for the prolonged delay in promotion, the Complainant's non-consideration in 2017, and the justification for granting notional promotion from 2019. The Respondent was recommended to file the response within 15 days, following which the Complainant would be permitted 7 days to file a rejoinder.

Yours faithfully,

(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner