Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6741 **Dated:** 23/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6741

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Prashant Kumar

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Managing Director and CEO, Indian Bank

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 Prashant Kumar	Complainant
2.	Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh, General Manager (HR), Indian Bank	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Prashant Kumar, a person with 100% visual impairment and an employee of Indian Bank, submitted that on 15.06.2026, the HR Officer, Ms. Hina Bansal, informed him of his transfer to another branch and relieved him in the absence of the Branch Manager. He stated that the transferee

branch at Rana Pratap was inaccessible to him on account of its raised entrance, deep drains in the vicinity, heavy traffic on the adjoining highway, and unsuitable cabin and toilet arrangements, which allegedly posed a risk of falls and injury.

2.2 The Respondent, represented by Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh, General Manager (HR), Indian Bank, submitted that the Complainant joined the Bank on 11.07.2016 and was transferred to his home location, Bisnoe, in July 2017, where he continued to work for approximately nine years. He stated that the Complainant was promoted to Manager on 01.04.2023 but was permitted to continue at the same branch. The present transfer was stated to be to another branch within the same city, approximately two kilometres from the existing branch, and the Complainant was posted as an Additional Officer. The Respondent maintained that the transferee branch had facilities for persons with disabilities, including handrails and a ramp, and expressed willingness to provide the necessary support if the Complainant joined. The Respondent further stated that the Complainant had been on unauthorised leave since 31.07.2026.

2.3 During the proceedings, the Court sought clarification from the Respondent regarding the specific accessibility concerns raised by the Complainant, particularly the raised entrance and the drains near the branch. The Respondent disputed the alleged inaccessibility and stated that a ramp was available at the entrance and that photographs of the branch could be submitted. The Court observed that, although the transfer was within the same city and the Bank could transfer the Complainant on administrative grounds (maintaining that the grounds should be explicitly described), the accessibility of the transferee branch had to be independently examined. The Court emphasised that the Complainant's inability to articulate his accessibility concerns in precise terms would not, by itself, establish that no accessibility issue existed.

2.4 The Court observed that the proceedings were not intended to prevent the Bank from transferring the Complainant within the city, but to ensure that any such posting was accessible and suitable for an employee with 100% visual impairment. The Court further observed that persons with disabilities should be exempted from routine and rotational transfers, and that, where a transfer is made, the posting should be at the closest feasible location, subject to the applicable administrative requirements.

2.5 Accordingly, the Respondent was recommended to examine and report on the following within 30 days:

1. Verify the accessibility of the transferee branch, including the entrance, ramp, surrounding drains and other concerns raised by the Complainant, and submit supporting photographs and relevant details;

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6741 **Dated:** 23/10/2026

1. If the transferee branch is found inaccessible, consider posting the Complainant to another accessible branch within the same city; and

2. If the Complainant's concerns are found to be justified and the transferee branch requires accessibility-related modifications, retain him at his previous branch until the transferee branch is made accessible.

The Respondent was recommended to submit a report to the Court within the stipulated period, indicating the action taken and the relief provided to the Complainant.

Yours faithfully,



(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner