



\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 11348/2023**

JAYA KUMAR K

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Paul Kumar Kalai, Advocate.**

versus

**THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER FOR PERSONS WITH
DISABILITIES**Respondent

Through: **Mr. Nishant Gautam, CGSC with Mr.
Vardhman Kaushik, Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi, Mr. Naman
Sharma and Ms. Theresa Shaji,
Advocates.**

Mr. Anil Nag, Advocate for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

25.02.2026

%

1. The Petitioner is employed with Neyveli Lignite Corporation of India Ltd. (“*NLCIL*”), a Government of India enterprise under the Ministry of Coal. He was initially appointed as DET/Electrical in the Supervisory Cadre and thereafter promoted to Junior Engineer Grade-I and Assistant Engineer. In 1999, he was promoted to the Executive Cadre as Additional Engineer/Electrical (E-2 Grade). Since 1st July, 2021, he has been holding the post of Chief Manager/Electrical (E-6 Grade).

2. The Petitioner suffered a spinal cord injury in an industrial accident in the year 2001. He has undergone multiple surgeries thereafter and, according to him, is a high-level (T3 complete) paraplegic with 85%



disability.

3. Owing to the aforesaid disability, the Petitioner asserts that he encountered several difficulties at his workplace. In this regard, he approached the Court of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities (“CCPD”) by filing a complaint seeking redressal of his grievances.

4. In the said proceedings, certain aspects of the Petitioner’s grievance were considered. However, it also emerges from perusal of the order of 11th July, 2023, that the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities proceeded on the premise that the unresolved grievances remained only with respect to three issues, viz., availability of ramp, accessible washrooms and assistance. Since Respondent No. 3 agreed to provide all the three facilities to the Petitioner, the proceedings were closed with a direction that the Respondent would comply with the assurances given. Liberty was nonetheless reserved for the Petitioner to approach the Court in case the Respondent failed to provide the said facilities.

5. Counsel for the Petitioner submits that several other grievances raised before the CCPD were neither heard nor adjudicated. It is contended that the Petitioner was constrained to approach this Court primarily seeking a direction to Respondent No. 1 to conduct a fresh hearing on the unresolved issues. It is further submitted that the Petitioner had also raised a grievance regarding his transfer to the Education Department/Library, which was not duly considered.

6. In the opinion of this Court, the grievances raised by the Petitioner would require examination by Respondent No. 1 at the first instance. It would, therefore, be appropriate to afford the Petitioner an opportunity to



agitate unresolved grievances before the CCPD.

7. It is also noted that the Petitioner has since been transferred to the Library. In view of the lapse of time since the filing of the present petition, if the Petitioner has any subsisting grievance in respect of his present posting or related service conditions, he shall be at liberty to raise the same before the CCPD.

8. Counsel for Respondent No. 3 submits that such a course would be appropriate.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of with the following directions:

9.1. The Petitioner shall submit a fresh representation/complaint to Respondent No. 1 within a period of four weeks from today, setting out all subsisting grievances.

9.2. Upon receipt of the same, the concerned Respondents shall file their response within six weeks. Thereafter, the Court of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities shall examine the Petitioner's grievances and pass a reasoned order in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible.

10. Disposed of in the above terms.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 25, 2026/hc