



2026:DHC:3385



\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 14735/2023, CM APPL. 66430/2023 & CM APPL. 6270/2024**

Date of Decision: **16.04.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

AMAR JAIN AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amritesh Mishra, Adv.

versus

ROPEN TRANSPORTATION SERVICES PVT LTD (RAPIDO)
AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Apoorv Kurup, Senior Advocate with Mr. Vardhman Kaushik, Mr. Dhruv Joshi, Ms. Nidhi Mittal, Mr. Vineet Negi, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Mukul Singh, CGSC with Mr. Aryan Dhaka, Mr. Vikrant Badesra, Ms. Sunidhi Tyagi, Advs. for R-2.
Mr. Nishant Gautam, CGSC with Ms. Kavya Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi, Mr. Vibhav V. Nath, Ms. Theresa, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

JUDGEMENT

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

a) *ISSUE an appropriate Writ, direction or order, including one directing the Respondents No.2 and 3 to direct Respondent No. 1 to*



take immediate, effective, and comprehensive steps in effecting the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, ensuring that the rights and accessibility of persons with disabilities are safeguarded. These steps should include, but not be limited to, mandating accessibility audits, providing accessibility training for staff, implementing clear and enforceable accessibility standards, and improving the features of the app as suggested earlier, all within a strict timeframe of 1 month.

b) ISSUE an appropriate Writ, direction or order, including one directing the Respondent No. 2 and 3 to direct Respondent No.1 to immediately conduct a comprehensive accessibility audit of its ride booking mobile app to identify and address all accessibility barriers for individuals with disabilities, especially those with visual impairments and ensure that the issues are promptly rectified within a reasonable timeframe of 6 months.

c) ISSUE an appropriate Writ, direction or order, including one directing the Respondent No. 2 and 3 to direct Respondent No. 1 to collaborate with experts in the field of digital accessibility and provide specialized training to its customer care representatives to effectively address accessibility-related concerns and provide timely resolutions to customers with disabilities and ensure comprehensive and holistic end-to-end accessibility of its offering.

d) ISSUE an appropriate Writ, direction or order, including one imposing penalty on Respondent No. 1 under Section 89 of the RPWD Act, 2016 for failing to make their app accessible despite repeated attempts by the petitioners to address the same.

e) Directed the Respondent No.2 to put in place a strong legal mandate and operational guidance on all app aggregators, to ensure that their digital offerings and functional processes are disabled friendly.

2. The petitioner no. 1 is a corporate lawyer, policymaker and a disability rights activist. He has been blind since birth. Petitioner no. 2 is a banker at the Indian Bank at Siliguri, West Bengal and has total visual impairment. The respondent no. 1 is a mobile application that provides Indian-type taxis and logistic services.

3. The present petition arises out of the grievances relating to the alleged inaccessibility of the mobile application operated by respondent no. 1, particularly for persons with visual impairments.



2026:DHC:3385



4. The principal grievance of the petitioners is that the application of respondent no. 1 is not fully compatible with assistive technologies such as screen readers and lacks essential accessibility features, thereby making it difficult for visually impaired users to perform core functions such as booking, cancelling, tracking rides, or interacting with various interface elements without assistance. The petition, thus, seeks directions on the strength of the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disability Act 2016 (**hereinafter ‘the Act’**).

5. The petitioners have highlighted the difficulties in daily commuting needs, who are essentially relying on Roppen Transportation Services Pvt Ltd. (“**hereinafter Rapido**”) mobile ride application. According to them, the mobile application fails to cater to the accessibility needs of disabled individuals, raising serious concerns.

6. During the pendency of the petition, the Court had issued various directions. The suggestions made by the petitioners were also considered by the respondents. The Court lastly, on 19.03.2025 and on 29.01.2026, directed the respondent no. 1, Rapido, to place on the record the compliance affidavit. The affidavit placed on the record would indicate that the issues raised by the petitioners have been appropriately reviewed. The suggestions/feedbacks were deeply incorporated in Android and updated in March 2026 version and the same was subsequently communicated to the petitioners.

7. Mr. Amar Jain, who is petitioner no. 1 and appears in person, also hands over a brief note of his submissions and highlights that further suggestions be directed to be considered by respondent no. 1 within a time-bound manner. He submits that the order dated 19.03.2025, particularly



2026:DHC:3385



paragraph 6 thereof, records the assurance of the respondents to ensure that the application continues to be ‘disabled friendly’ in all respects. He further submits that periodic accessibility audits, preferably on a quarterly basis, ought to be undertaken.

8. Section 42 of the Act, casts a clear and affirmative obligation to ensure access to information and communication technology for persons with disabilities. The statutory mandate is not merely aspirational in character but is a substantive equality-driven obligation flowing from the principle of non-discrimination enshrined under Section 3 of the Act. The breadth of the provision demonstrates that accessibility is not confined to traditional or static forms of communication but extends to dynamic and technology-driven platforms which form part of everyday civic and commercial life. In the present digital age, mobile applications offering essential services such as transport and mobility fall squarely within the ambit of ‘information and communication technology’ contemplated under Section 42.

9. The obligation under Section 42 read with Sections 40 and 43 of the Act must be understood as imposing a positive duty upon service providers to ensure that digital interfaces are inherently accessible and compatible with assistive technologies, including screen readers and other accessibility tools used by persons with visual impairment. Any failure to incorporate such design principles would amount to a denial of effective access, thereby undermining the substantive equality guaranteed under the Act.

10. Mr. Mukul Singh, learned CGSC who is appearing on behalf of respondent no. 2 submits that the necessary affidavits have been filed.

11. The suggestions made by Mr. Amar Jain, a copy whereof has been



2026:DHC:3385



handed over to the respondents, be duly considered and all possible endeavour shall be made to implement the same. If for any reason, any suggestion is technically not feasible, the reasons thereof shall be communicated to the petitioners. The petitioners shall thereafter be at liberty to put forth further suggestions, if any.

12. The directions and the undertaking of the respondent contained in paragraph no. 6 of the order dated 19.03.2025 shall remain in force so long as the application stays in operation.

13. The respondent shall continue to undertake accessibility audits in accordance with the provisions of the Act and the Rules framed thereunder.

14. The affidavit filed on behalf of the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways indicates that it has discharged its regulatory role by issuing the Motor Vehicle Aggregator Guidelines under Section 93 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, which, *inter alia*, require aggregator applications to include accessibility features for persons with disabilities. Reference is made to Clause 40.8 of the said guidelines. The affidavit addresses the grievance of the petitioners in relation to the aforesaid regulatory framework. However, Sub-Rule (2) of Rule 15 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017 casts a continuing obligation on the Ministries and Departments to ensure compliance with accessibility standards.

15. The statutory obligation cast upon the appropriate Government under the Act, particularly when read with Rule 15(2) of the Rules framed thereunder, is not discharged upon mere formulation or issuance of guidelines, but extends to ensuring their effective, uniform and verifiable implementation across all stakeholders operating within the digital and transport ecosystem. The regulatory framework, therefore, must necessarily



2026:DHC:3385



incorporate mechanisms for periodic monitoring, compliance verification and, where required, corrective enforcement, so as to ensure that accessibility standards are meaningfully adhered to in practice. In the context of app-based aggregators and similar technology-driven platforms, such oversight assumes greater significance, as accessibility is inherently dynamic and requires continuous upgradation in line with evolving technological interfaces.

16. The concerned Ministry shall, therefore, to ensure that the mandate of accessibility with reference to Rule 15(2) framed thereunder, is operationalised in a manner that secures real and substantive access for persons with disabilities, so that the benefits of the Act and Rules are effectively extended to Persons with disabilities and does not remain confined to normative or policy-level compliance.

17. In future, if any further grievances arise, the petitioner shall be at liberty to file a fresh petition.

18. With these observations, the instant petition, along with the pending applications, stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 16, 2026/SH/ss