

Panaji, 10th May, 2018 (Vaisakha 20, 1940)

SERIES II No. 6

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are three Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 5 dated 03-05-2018 as follows:—

- (1) Extraordinary dated 04-05-2018 from pages 119 to 120 regarding Notifications from Department of Finance.
- (2) Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 07-05-2018 from pages 121 to 124 regarding Notification from Department of Elections.
- (3) Extraordinary (No. 3) dated 09-05-2018 from pages 125 to 128 regarding Notification from Department of Elections.

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Civil Supplies and
Consumer Affairs

Order

No. DCS/ADCS/APPT/2018-19/46/23

In exercise of powers conferred under Section 16 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (68 of 1986) (hereinafter referred to as the Act) and on the recommendation of the Selection Committee under sub-section 1-A of the Act, the Government of Goa is pleased to appoint Shri Dhananjay Jog, as a Member of the Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Panaji-Goa on part-time basis subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The Member of State Commission shall hold office for a term of five years or up to the age of sixty-seven years, whichever is earlier.
2. The Member of the State Commission shall receive a remuneration of Rs. 1000/- (Rupees one thousand only) per day of the sitting inclusive of conveyance allowance.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Mahesh V. Corjuenkar, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs).

Panaji, 4th May, 2018.

Department of Education, Art & Culture
Directorate of Higher Education

Order

No. 8/1/2017-DHE/489

- Read: 1) Order No. 8/1/2017-DHE/3761 dated 15-02-2018.
2) Letter No. 9/19/99-HE/NOC/Teach-Staff/ /U-21/PF/Dempo/Part-III/4141 dated 08-03-2018.
3) Order No. 8/1/2017-DHE/4242 dated 16-03-2018.

Shri Krishnakumar Nanu Bandolkar appointed as Assistant Professor in Economics under Directorate of Higher Education and posted in Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Sanquelim vide Order read in preamble shall now discharge his duties at Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Quepem-Goa on working arrangement basis with effect from 03-05-2018 (b.n.) after joining to the said post in Directorate of Higher Education w.e.f. 03-05-2018 (b.n.).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Diwan N. Rane, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Porvorim, 3rd May, 2018.

Department of Fisheries

Directorate of Fisheries

Order

No. 2-1-81-FSH

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and (2) of Section 4 of the Goa,

Daman and Diu Marine Fishing Regulation Act, 1980 (Act No. 3 of 1981), the Government of Goa, having regard to the need to conserve fish; hereby prohibits fishing by fishing vessels fitted with mechanical means of propulsion and by means of trawl-net and purse-seine net, except fishing by registered motorized canoes using gill nets only, and fitted with outboard or inboard motors, of upto 10 HP capacity, as a means of propulsion, along the sea coast of the State of Goa and the territorial waters of the State of Goa, with effect from 1st June, 2018 till 31st July, 2018 (both days inclusive).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shri *Vinesh Arlenkar*, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Fisheries).

Panaji, 2nd May, 2018.

◆◆◆

Department of Forest

Notification

No. 5/1/2018-FOR/092

In consistency with the provisions of Article 95 of the Memorandum of Association and Articles of Association of the Goa Forest Development Corporation Limited, Government of Goa is pleased to constitute the Technical Committee for Technical guidance over the entire Botanical Garden Project work estimated to cost Rs. 15.00 crores to be taken up by the Corporation including the work of Musical Fountains at Botanical Garden-cum-Eco-Recreational Park at Salaulim, Sanguem Dam Site, consisting of the following:

- | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|
| 1. Chairman of Goa Forest Development Corporation, Panaji-Goa | — | Chairman. |
| 2. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Panaji-Goa | — | Member. |
| 3. Chief Engineer, WRD, Panaji-Goa | — | Member. |
| 4. Principal Chief Engineer, PWD, Panaji-Goa | — | Member. |
| 5. Chief Electrical Engineer, Panaji-Goa | — | Member. |
| 6. Director, Tourism, Panaji-Goa | — | Member. |
| 7. Managing Director, Goa Forest Development Corporation, Panaji-Goa | — | Member Secretary. |

Their terms of reference shall be as under:

1. To chalk out the Schedule of works as per G.S.R. norms.
2. To evaluate the technical bids keeping (1) in mind.
3. To evaluate the financial bids and suggest recommendation.
4. Random field check by them to ensure completion of works within the fixed time frame.
5. Any other aspect requiring further clarification/suggestion.
6. They shall periodically meet atleast once in 3 months to review the progress.

The payment of seating fee and other allowances to these members shall be as per their entitlement.

The Committee shall come into force with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shaila G. Bhosle, Under Secretary (Forests).

Porvorim, 30th April, 2018.

◆◆◆

Department of Labour

Order

No. 22/26/2006-Lab/306

Government is pleased to reconstitute a Committee consisting of the following members with a view to have uniformity in fixation of minimum rates of Wages in employment falling outside the purview of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 as under:

- | | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| 1. The Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Panaji-Goa | — | Chairman. |
| 2. The Principal Chief Engineer, PWD, Panaji-Goa or his authorized nominee | — | Member. |
| 3. The Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Panaji-Goa or his authorized nominee | — | Member. |
| 4. The Director of Planning, Statistics and Evaluation, Panaji-Goa | — | Member. |
| 5. The Joint Secretary (Fin-Exp.), Secretariat, Porvorim-Goa | — | Member. |

The Committee will study the issue of fixation of pay in detail and submit the report with the recommendations to the Government for fixation of Minimum Rates of Wages for daily rated casual labourers engaged in various Departments/

/Autonomous Bodies/Corporations and other institutions etc. They may take financial aspects into consideration while making their recommendations.

The Committee should submit its report/ recommendations within two months from the date of issue of this order.

This issues in supersession of earlier order dated 04-10-2013.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

A. S. Mahatme, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 7th May, 2018.

Notification

No. 28/3/2018-LAB/Part-II/296

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court at Panaji-Goa on 26-03-2018 in reference No. IT/21/02 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

A. S. Mahatme, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 30th April, 2018.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND LABOUR COURT GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI

(Before Mr. Vincent D'Silva, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Ref. No. IT/21/02

Shri Jatin U. Dessai & 34 Ors.,
Rep. by Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh,
Shetye Sankul, 3rd Floor,
Tisk, Ponda, Goa. ... Workmen/Party I

V/s

M/s. Easter Electronics Pvt. Ltd.,
Kakoda Industrial Estate,
Kakoda, Goa. ... Employer/Party II

Workmen/Party I represented by Shri P. Gaonkar.

Employer/Party II represented by Ld. Adv. Shri G. B. Kamat.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 26th day of the month of March of the year 2018)

By Order dated 08-03-2002, bearing No. 28/10/2002-LAB, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short The Act), has referred the following dispute to the Tribunal for adjudication.

“(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s Easter Electronics Pvt. Ltd., Kakoda-Goa, in terminating the services of the following workpersons with effect from 11-11-2001, is legal and justified?”

- (1) Shri Jatin U. Dessai, Production In-charge.
- (2) Shri Francisco Fernandes, Technician.
- (3) Shri Nilkant Pawaskar, Technician.
- (4) Miss Salunki U. Dessai, Final O.C.
- (5) Miss Savita Naik, Line Operator.
- (6) Shri Majid Shaikh, Line Operator.
- (7) Shri Firodoze Shaikh, Line Operator.
- (8) Shri Yesso Dessai, Machine Operator.
- (9) Shri Sudesh Dessai, I.O.C. In-charge.
- (10) Shri Guru Paste, Technician.
- (11) Shri Soccur Fernandes, Process.
- (12) Miss Kshama Naik, VCR Testing.
- (13) Miss Netra Naik, Checker.
- (14) Miss Hema Kakodkar, Checker.
- (15) Miss Almeira Misquita, Checker.
- (16) Miss Amita Naik, Checker.
- (17) Miss Reshma Khan, Line Operator.
- (18) Miss Reshma Naik, Line Operator.
- (19) Miss Lalita Naik, Line Operator.
- (20) Miss Usha Naik, Line Operator.
- (21) Miss Wahida Shaikh, Line Operator.
- (22) Miss Shanti Naik, Line Operator.
- (23) Miss Bhagee Naik, Line Operator.
- (24) Miss Nanda Naik, Line Operator.
- (25) Miss Shilpa Karmalkar, Line Operator.
- (26) Miss Rajashree Karmalkar, Line Operator.
- (27) Miss Sangeeta Fadte, Line Operator.
- (28) Miss Ujwala Naik, Line Operator.
- (29) Miss Meena Naik, Line Operator.
- (30) Miss Vishranti Naik, Line Operator.
- (31) Miss Hema Naik, Line Operator.
- (32) Miss Yasmin Shaikh, Line Operator.
- (33) Shri Sandesh Naik, Line Operator.
- (34) Shri Vahid Shaikh, Line Operator.
- (35) Shri Cirilo Fernandes, Electrician/Maintenance.

(2) If not, to what relief the workpersons are entitled?”

2. On receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/21/2002 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the parties. Upon appearance, Party I filed a Claim statement at Exh. 3 and Party II filed a Written statement at Exh. 5.

3. In short, the case of Party I in the claim statement is that the management of M/s. Easter Electronics Pvt. Ltd. was engaged in manufacturing of TV sets at Kakoda Industrial Estate, Kakoda in which the Party I workmen were employed, however the Party II did not pay the earned wages of the workers since February, 2001 till the date of termination. The workers have filed cases of recovery of earned wages and the management in order to victimize the workers illegally terminated the services of the workmen w.e.f. 11-11-2001 by disallowing the workers from entering the factory. The Party I after the refusal of their employment raised a dispute before Dy. Labour Commissioner, Margao and the matter was taken up for conciliation on several occasions, but the management failed to attend the proceedings. The Party II did not pay any legal dues such as notice pay, retrenchment compensation, gratuity, bonus, leave wages, etc., thereby violating the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The workers are entitled for the said legal dues. The Party I workmen are unemployed and are unable to get any jobs to maintain their families. Hence, the dispute.

4. In the Written statement, Party II claimed that the Union has no locus standi to sponsor the dispute or espouse the cause of the workmen. The Party II was engaged in business of assembling of black and white television sets by employing 35 workpersons but on account of non availability/ /paucity of work orders and consequent total cessation of manufacturing activities, the factory establishment of Party II was permanently closed and the services of the workpersons then remaining on the rolls of the company were terminated by one month's written notice dated 1-3-2001 w.e.f. 1-4-2001 by tendering all the legal dues due to each workperson, so also before closure of factory establishment, majority of the workpersons involved in the reference have already tendered their resignations.

5. In the rejoinder at Exh. 6, the Party I denied the case put forth by Party II in the written statement.

6. Issues came to be framed at Exh. 7 which are as follows:

- (1) Whether the Party I-Union proves that it has the authority to represent the workmen and raise industrial dispute or that it's General Secretary has the authority to sign the Claim Statement?
- (2) Whether the Party I-Union proves that the workmen at Sr. No. 8, 11, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of the Order of Reference were employed with the Party II?
- (3) Whether the Party I-Union proves that the Party II terminated the services of the workmen w.e.f. 11-11-2001 in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
- (4) Whether the Party I-Union proves that termination of the services of the workmen by the Party II w.e.f. 11-11-2001 is illegal and unjustified?
- (5) Whether the Party II proves that the reference is not maintainable because the Party I-Union has no locus standi to espouse the dispute on behalf of the workmen?
- (6) Whether the Party II proves that its factory is permanently closed from 1-3-2001 and the services of the workmen on its roll were terminated w.e.f. 1-4-2001 by tendering all the legal dues?
- (7) Whether the Party II proves that the majority of the workmen involved in the present reference resigned and accepted their final dues before the closure of the factory?
- (8) Whether the workmen are entitled to any relief?
- (9) What Order?

7. In support of the case, Party I examined Shri Puti Gaonkar, General Secretary of the Union and produced on record a copy of letter dated 5-2-2001 addressed to the President of GMS at Exh. W-1, a copy of letter raising dispute dated 11-11-2001 at Exh. W-2, a copy of Notice issued by DLC, Margao at Exh. W-3, a copy of notice dated 12-12-01 issued by DLC, Margao at Exh. W-4, a copy of Minutes of the meeting dated 26-12-2001 at Exh. W-5, a copy of Closure Notice at Exh. W-6, a copy of statement showing the amount due to the workers at Exh. W-7, a copy of letter dated 11-11-2001 raising dispute regarding illegal retrenchment at Exh. W-8 and a copy of Minutes of meeting dated 26-12-2001 at Exh. W-9. The Party I also examined Shri Jatin Dessai as their second witness.

8. Heard arguments. Notes of Written arguments came to be placed on record by Party I as well as Party II.

9. I have gone through the records of the case and have duly considered the arguments advanced. My answers to the above issues are as follows:

Issue No. 1	...	In the Affirmative
Issue No. 2	...	In the Affirmative
Issue No. 3	...	In the Negative
Issue No. 4	...	In the Negative
Issue No. 5	...	In the Negative
Issue No. 6	...	In the Negative
Issue No. 7	...	In the Negative
Issue No. 8	...	As per final order.
Issue No. 9	...	As per final order.

REASONS

Issue No. 1:

10. The Party I has claimed that the workmen have authorised the General Secretary of the Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh to represent them before the authorities including the Industrial Tribunal. The Party I has produced on record the letter dated 5-3-2001 at Exh. W-1 from the workers to the President, Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh requesting to enroll them as members of the Union and authorizing him to represent before Government authorities regarding any matters connected with the workers. Besides the above letter of authority, the Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh addressed a letter dated 11-11-2001 at Exh. W-2 to Deputy Labour Commissioner, Margao for intervention in the matter of proposed illegal retrenchment of the workers employed by M/s. Easter Electronics, Kakoda stating that the management has not complied with the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act and thereby violated the said Act. The letter dated 16-11-2001 at Exh. W-3 was addressed by Dy. Labour Commissioner to Party II as well as General Secretary, Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh for necessary conciliation proceedings under Section 12 of the Act with a view to bring about amicable settlement of the dispute. The above documents clearly show that Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh had authority to represent the workmen and raise the industrial dispute or to sign the claim statement. Ld. Adv. Shri G. B. Kamat for Party II has also submitted that he does not press for the said issue. The Party I having proved the above issue, it is answered in the affirmative.

Issue No. 2:

11. Shri P. Gaonkar for Party I has claimed that the Party I workers under reference have been retrenched and the said retrenchment is illegal. Shri Jatin Dessai has also claimed that the Party I

workmen have been retrenched and the complaint was made by the Union. It is not suggested to Shri P. Gaonkar as well as Shri Jatin Dessai that the workpersons at Sr. No. 8, 11, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of the order of reference were not employed with Party II nor Party II has disputed the said fact before the Conciliation Officer when Party I raised the dispute on behalf of the said workers. The said workers namely, Shri Yesso Dessai, Succoro Fernandes, Ms. Ujwala Naik, Ms. Meena Naik, Ms. Hema, Ms. Yashmin Shaikh, Shri. Sandesh Naik, Shri Wahid Shaikh were the parties before the Conciliation Officer wherein the Union has claimed that the Party II has refused the employment and that they are entitled for full back wages with continuity in service. The Party II has not led any evidence to dispute the said fact. It is therefore the Party I has proved that the said workmen at Sr. No. 8, 11, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of the order of reference are employed with Party II. Hence, the issue No. 2 is answered in the affirmative.

Issue Nos. 3, 4, 6 & 7:

12. Shri P. Gaonkar for Party I has submitted that the Party II terminated the services of the workmen w.e.f. 11-11-2001 in violation of provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act as they had joined the Union and that the cases of recovery of earned wages of the workers since February, 2001 have been filed and that the services of the workmen have been illegally terminated in order to victimize them. The Party II did not pay them any dues such as notice pay, retrenchment compensation, gratuity, bonus, leave wages, etc. thereby violating the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act nor conducted any enquiry before termination of their services and therefore termination is illegal, unjustified and bad in law. In support of his contention, he relied upon the case of **Bhuvnesh Kumar Dwivedi vs. M/s. Hindalco Industries Ltd., 2014 LLR 673.**

13. Per contra, Ld. Adv. Shri G. B. Kamat for Party II has submitted that even before the closure of the factory establishment, majority of the workpersons in the present reference have already tendered their resignations and had accepted the final settlement dues tendered to them in full and final settlement of their claim with Party II and in view of the resignations, the question of alleged refusal or termination of their services did not arise. He further submitted that the copy of the notice dated 14-1-2002 at Exh. W-5 and consequent termination of their services w.e.f. 15-1-2002 goes to prove that the establishment has ceased to function w.e.f. 14-1-2002 and the termination of

services of the workmen w.e.f. 15-1-2002 and therefore, the alleged case of Party I of illegal termination of their services w.e.f. 11-11-2001 has not been proved and since the termination of the services of the workpersons was on account of closure, the provisions of Section 25-FFF is applicable and requirement of paying compensation and of issuing a notice or wages in lieu thereof is not a condition precedent to a valid action of closure of an establishment. In support thereof, he relied upon the case of **Lal Bavta Hotel Aur Bakery Mazdoor Union vs. Ritz Private Limited and another, 2007(3) ALL MR 74.**

14. In view of the rival contentions, one claiming that the Party I workmen were terminated w.e.f. 11-11-2001 for filing cases for recovery of earned wages and the other claiming that they have closed the factory on account of non availability/paucity of work orders and that majority of the workmen have tendered their resignation and accepted their legal dues, it has to be seen whether the case of Party I of termination or case of Party II of closure has ring of truth or not. The Party I has examined only Jatin Dessai out of 35 workmen and Shri Puti Gaonkar in the capacity as General Secretary of the Union in support of the case of illegal termination. Shri Puti Gaonkar has deposed on the basis of documents and apparently had no personal knowledge of the alleged termination of the workers, except the fact that he had raised the dispute before the Dy. Labour Commissioner, Margao which ended in a failure. The documents produced by him are with respect to raising of the said dispute. He claimed that the legal dues of the workers have not been paid and the termination is illegal and unjustified. He denied the suggestion that the Party II closed their factory and that presently the factory is closed.

15. The Party I examined Shri Jatin Dessai who claimed that he was working as Junior Operator since July, 1996 and that he became the member of the Union and that there was a local committee and he was the President of the said local committee. He also claimed that they filed the complaint before Dy. Labour Commissioner regarding irregular payment of their wages and also proposed illegal retrenchment of the workers. He also claimed that the Party II fixed a notice at Exh. W-6 on 15-1-2002 on the gate of the factory premises informing the workers whose names were mentioned in the said notice that the services would be terminated from 15-1-2002. He also claimed that the Party II locked the gate from 15-1-2002 and that the notice at Exh. W-6 was fixed on the gate of the factory premises after the Union

made the complaint dated 11-11-2001. In the cross examination, he denied that he resigned from the services of Party II on 31-1-2001, however when confronted with the letter dated 20-5-2002 at Exh. E-1, he admitted that he had written the said letter to Party II informing that he has resigned from the services from 31-1-2001 and requested that his dues may be settled. He also identified his signature at point 'A' on the letter at Exh. E-1. He, however claimed that the letter was forcibly obtained from him by Party II, but admitted that he had not written any correspondence indicating that the said letter at Exh. E-1 was obtained from him, forcibly.

16. Shri Jatin Dessai was also shown a letter dated 20-5-2002 addressed to him by Party II showing payment of final dues along with the receipt indicating full and final settlement of the legal dues in respect of his services rendered to them. He has identified his signatures on the said letter and the receipt at point 'A'. He, however claimed that he had not received the said letter nor issued the receipt to them nor the signatures marked on the said letter and receipt at point 'A' are his. He denied the suggestion that he had issued the receipt to Party II acknowledging the amount of Rs. 5,245/- towards his legal dues. A bare perusal of the signatures on the letter of resignation dated 20-5-2002 at Exh. E-1 and the letter dated 20-5-2002 of payment of final dues along with the receipt also dated 20-5-2002 clearly show that Shri Jatin Dessai has resigned from the services and has been duly paid all the legal dues in full and final settlement and accordingly acknowledged the said letter and the receipt. If the signature of the Party I was forcibly taken on the letter of resignation dated 20-5-2002 at Exh. E-1, he would have protested or would have withdrawn the said letter claiming that it was forged. The letter of resignation was admittedly issued by him with his signature. The said signature also appears on the letter of payment of final dues and the receipt dated 20-5-2002 issued by Party II and that he has also acknowledged having received the said amount in full and final settlement of his dues. It is nowhere his case that the signatures on the letter of payment of final dues and the receipt thereof are forged. What therefore emerges from the above evidence of Shri Jatin Dessai and the documents produced through him is that he has resigned from his services and has accepted all the legal dues from the Party II.

17. Admittedly, except Shri Jatin Dessai none of the other workmen have been examined in support of alleged case of illegal termination of Party I workers with effect from 11-11-2001. Shri Jatin Dessai has nowhere stated that he is also deposing on behalf of the other workmen. It is well settled that mere filing of pleadings does not mean the case of the workmen has been proved. The evidence of Shri Jatin Dessai does not support the case of Party I workmen as he tendered his resignation and accepted the final settlement dues. None of the other workmen have stepped into the witness box to depose about the illegality of the termination of the services, which fact could have been personally known to them and therefore, in the absence of examination of the other workmen concerned in the reference, it cannot be said that their services with effect from 11-11-2001 were terminated and that the same was illegal and unjustified. Had they stepped in the witness box, the Party II would have confronted with the letters of resignation or would have opportunity to contest their respective pleas. The Party II was denied the opportunity of confronting with the letters of resignation, letters showing payment of legal dues and the receipts and therefore, adverse inference has to be drawn that the other workmen had resigned from the employment of the Party II and paid their legal dues and therefore, the case of Party I of illegal termination of their services falls flat.

18. There cannot be any dispute that the Party II had closed the factory establishment w.e.f. 14-1-2002 as claimed by them. The witness Shri Puti Gaonkar has produced on record a notice of closure at Exh. W-6. The said notice shows that the services of the workmen whose names are mentioned in the schedule stood terminated with effect from 15-1-2002. There is no dispute that the said notice was displayed by Party II informing the workpersons about the closure of the factory establishment and consequent termination of their services w.e.f. 15-1-2002, which goes to prove that the establishment of Party II had ceased to function w.e.f. 14-1-2002 and the termination of services of remaining workpersons named therein, consequent to the closure. The said notice falsifies the case of Party I about their alleged illegal termination w.e.f. 11-11-2001, in as much as, if the said case was true, then in that event the question of further termination of their services, with effect from 15-1-2002 would not have arisen at all, as rightly submitted by Ld. Adv. Shri G. B. Kamat for Party II. It is therefore the materials on record clearly point out that it is not the case of illegal termination of

services of Party I w.e.f. 11-11-2001 as claimed by it, but it is a case of closure of the factory establishment by Party II w.e.f. 14-1-2002 and termination of services w.e.f. 15-1-2002.

19. The next question is what would be the effect of closure of the factory establishment. It is well settled in the case of **Lal Bavta Hotel Aur Bakery Mazdoor Union**, supra that when the termination of services of workpersons was on account of closure of factory establishment, the provisions of Section 25-FFF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 are applicable and not Section 25-F of the Act and that in case of termination of service is on account of permanent closure, compliance with the provisions of 25-FFF is not by way of condition precedent, in that, non-payment of notice pay and retrenchment compensation does not render the termination of service or closure of the establishment illegal. Needless to mention, the right of workmen for compensation upon closure of an undertaking arises out of statute, viz. Section 25-FFF. Therefore, even if the closure is in accordance with the provisions of the standing orders and due to circumstances beyond the control of the management, the employer cannot refuse to pay compensation for the closure. However, it is nowhere the case of the Party I that they are entitled for compensation for closure of the establishment nor subjected themselves to cross examination, as it is pleaded by Party II that the majority of the workmen, including Shri Jatin Dessai, involved in the reference have already tendered their resignations and accepted their final dues. Moreover, the statement of legal dues at Exh. W-7 produced by Party I and prepared by General Secretary of the Union has also not been supported by any workmen. It is therefore, in such circumstances, it cannot be said that Party I workmen are entitled for any reliefs. Hence, the above issues No. 3, 4, 6 and 7 are answered accordingly.

Issue No. 5

20. Ld. Adv. Shri G. B. Kamat for Party II has submitted, so also it is stated in para 7 of the written arguments that the Party II do not press for the issue No. 5 as to 'whether the Party I Union has no locus standi to espouse the dispute on behalf of the workmen', in as much as the factory establishment of Party II is already closed in 2001 and the same is subsequently sold to the third Party. It is therefore issue No. 5 is answered accordingly.

Issue Nos. 8 & 9

21. The Party I workmen have failed to prove that the Party II have terminated their services with effect from 11-11-2001 in violation of provisions of Section 25-F of ID Act, 1947 and that the termination of services of the said workmen is illegal and unjustified. The Party I having failed to prove the above issues No. 3 and 4, no reliefs as claimed by Party I could be granted. It is therefore issues Nos. 8 & 9 are answered accordingly.

22. In the result, I pass the following:

ORDER

- (i) It is hereby held that action of the management of M/s Easter Electronics Pvt. Ltd., Kakoda-Goa, in terminating the services of the workpersons mentioned in the schedule with effect from 11-11-2001, is legal and justified?
- (ii) The Party I/Workpersons are therefore not entitled to any reliefs.
- (iii) No order as to costs.
- (iv) Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Vincent D'Silva),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal and
Labour Court.

Notification

No. 28/3/2018-LAB/Part-II/295

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 29-03-2018 in reference No. IT/37/97 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

A. S. Mahatme, Under Secretary (Labour).
Porvorim, 30th April, 2018.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND
LABOUR COURT
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Mr. Vincent D'Silva, Hon'ble Presiding
Officer)

Ref. No. IT/37/97

Shri Caitan D'Mello,
H. No. 628, Manguarar,
Carambolim, Goa.
V/s

... Workmen/Party I

M/s. I. F. B. Industries Limited,
Corlim,
Ilhas, Goa. ... Employer/Party II
Workman/Party I represented by Ld. Adv. Shri S. B.
S. Bhangui.
Employer/Party II represented by Ld. Adv. Shri G.
K. Sardessai.

AWARD

**(Delivered on this the 29th day of the month
of March of the year 2018)**

By Order dated 8-7-1997, bearing No. IRM/CON/ / (40)/1996/2977, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short The Act), has referred the following dispute to the Tribunal for adjudication.

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. I.F. B. Industries Limited, Corlim, Ilhas, Goa, in terminating the services of Shri Caitan D'Mello, with effect from 29-3-1996, is legal and justified?"

If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/37/97 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the parties. Pursuant to service of notices, Party I filed a Claim statement at Exhibit 4 and Party II filed a Written statement at Exhibit 5.

3. In short, the case of Party I in the Claim statement is that the Party II is the company manufacturing washing machines. The Party I joined the services of the company on 14-4-1998 as Trainee-Assembly Operator and thereafter confirmed as an Operator. The Party I has absolutely clean service record. The Party II issued a notice to him alleging that he had committed theft and asked for explanation. The Party II also issued a similar letter to one Tanu Kankonkar. The Party II appointed one G. M. Nagarsekar as Enquiry Officer in which said Tanu was examined. The Party I was not responsible for any theft. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report. The enquiry held against him is void and in violation of Certified Standing Orders of the company. The findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse and biased. The action of the management in dismissing the services of Party I workman w.e.f. 29-3-1996 is illegal and bad in law. The Party I is entitled for re-instatement along with full back wages.

4. In the written statement, the Party II has denied the case set up by Party I and has stated that on 1-10-1994, the Party I came to the security check post with a tempo which was loaded at Corlim industrial area and during the inspection

by the security staff, it was found that there was an extra box containing a large number of ball bearings of which there was no mention in the accompanying challan and after questioning the Party I, he threw the said box out of the tempo. The Party I was suspended and an enquiry was conducted in a fair and proper manner and after perusing the proceedings of enquiry and findings of the Enquiry Officer, the management dismissed Party I workman of the services w.e.f. 29-3-1996. The Party I is not entitled for any reliefs.

5. In the rejoinder at Exh. 6, Party I has denied the case set up by Party II in its defence.

6. Based on the averments of the respective parties, the following issues were framed at Exh. 7:

- (1) Whether the workman/Party I proves that the domestic enquiry held against him is not fair, proper and impartial?
- (2) Whether the charges of misconduct leveled against the workman/Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence?
- (3) Whether the workman/Party I proves that the action of the employer/Party II in terminating his services w.e.f. 29-3-96 is illegal and unjustified?
- (4) Whether the workman/Party I is entitled to any relief?
- (5) What Award?

7. It is a matter of record that my Learned Predecessor vide Order dated 15-2-2012 at Exh. 23 answered preliminary issues No. 1 and 2 and held that domestic enquiry initiated against the workman, Shri Caitan D'Mello is fair and proper. It was also observed that the workman is guilty of the charges leveled against him in the notice for enquiry/suspension dated 12-8-94, which are of committing 'theft or dishonesty in connection with employers business or property' and/or of 'indecent behaviour'.

8. The Party I in support of issues No. 3, 4 and 5 has examined himself and produced on record affidavit in evidence at Exh. 34. The Party II has not examined any witnesses.

9. Heard arguments. Notes of Written arguments came to be placed on record by Party I.

10. I have gone through the records of the case and have duly considered the arguments advanced. My answers to the above issues are as follows:

Issue No. 3	...	In the Negative.
Issue No. 4	...	As per Final order.
Issue No. 5	...	As per Final order.

REASONS

Issue No. 3, 4 & 5:

11. Ld. Adv. Shri S. B. S. Bhangui for Party I has submitted that the Party I has absolutely clean service record from the date he took the job with Party II. The Enquiry Officer has examined Shri Tanu Kankonkar to give false evidence against Party I as the witness of the management in the enquiry against Party I who was responsible for the loading and unloading the material from the store causing prejudice to Party I and was also held guilty by the Enquiry Officer. He further submitted that the management thereafter settled the dispute of Shri Tanu Kankonkar by paying him additional compensation before the office of Labour Commissioner and therefore, the punishment of dismissal meted out to him is too harsh and disproportionate to the charges levelled against him. He further submitted that under Certified Standing Orders, the management has to take into account the gravity of misconduct, the previous records, if any and any other extenuating or aggravating circumstances that may exist, which has not been considered and he has been discriminated between him and Shri Tanu Kankonkar while awarding punishment. He submitted that the punishment should not be disproportionate while comparing the involvement of co-delinquent who are parties to the same transaction or incident and in support thereof, he relied upon the case of **Rajendra Yadav vs. State of M.P. & Ors., 2013 I CLR 672.**

12. Ld. Adv. Shri S. B. S. Bhangui for Party I has also submitted that Party I was presently unemployed and deserved to be reinstated in service because of charge of attempt to commit theft as theft did not occur. The punishment of dismissal for attempt to commit theft is grossly disproportionate to the charges proved which amounts to victimization on the part of the management. He further submitted that when the person is made to suffer exceptional treatment, it would amount to victimization and in support thereof, he relied upon the case of **Colour-Chem Ltd. vs. A. L. Alaspurkar & Ors., 1998 I CLR 638.** He further submitted that the Party I workman was acquitted in the criminal case filed by the management against the workman by Judicial Magistrate First Class and therefore, the dismissal order passed by the Enquiry Officer is liable to be set aside and the Party I workman is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages from the date of dismissal till his reinstatement with continuity in service and in support thereof, he relied upon the case of **M. Ravindran vs. The Management of Bharat Electronics Ltd., 2002 LAB I.C. 1011.**

13. Per contra, Ld. Adv. Shri G. K. Sardessai for Party II has submitted that there is nothing on record that the case of Party I workman stands on the same footing with that of said Tanu Kankonkar for considering the sentence imposed on him as it is not known whether the employer chose to accept unqualified apology or regrets expressed by said Shri Tanu Kankonkar at the time of so called settlement and therefore same yardstick cannot be applied in the present case. He further submitted that the Court should not interfere with the quantum of punishment imposed by the employer unless an appropriate case is made out and that it would not be proper to allow the employee to break the discipline with impunity. He further submitted that in a case of stolen property of the employer, the delinquent employee does not deserve any sympathy when he was given fair and reasonable opportunity and the past conduct of the workman is not relevant in departmental proceedings, in cases of misconduct of theft. He therefore submitted that no case has been made out by Party I. In support thereof, he relied upon the cases of (i) **Obettee (P) Ltd. vs. Mohd. Shafiq Khan, (2005) 8 SCC 46**; (ii) **Hombe Gowda Educational Trust & Anr. vs. State of Karnataka and Ors., (2006) 1 SCC 430** and (iii) **A. P. SRTC vs. Raghuda Siva Sankar Prasad, (2007) 1 SCC 222**.

14. It is well settled in the case of **A. P. SRTC**, supra, relied upon by the Party II that once an employee has lost the confidence of the employer, it would not be safe and in the interest of the establishment to continue the employee in the service. The loss of confidence occupies the primary factor and not the amount of money, sympathy and generosity cannot be a factor which is permissible in law in such matters. When the employee is found guilty of theft, there is nothing wrong in the establishment losing confidence or faith in such an employee and awarding punishment of removal. In such cases, there is no place of generosity or place of sympathy on the part of the judicial forums in interfering with the quantum of the punishment. Past conduct of workman is not relevant in departmental proceedings. It is well settled that where the delinquent is guilty of serious misconduct, then even one single misconduct, like theft or connivance therein may warrant dismissal. It is not open to the Tribunal and Courts to substitute their subjective opinion in place of the one arrived at by the domestic Tribunal.

15. Admittedly, my Ld. Predecessor answered issues No. 1 and 2 and held that the workman, Shri Caitan D'Mello is guilty of charges levelled against him for committing theft in connection with the property of the employer. Even, if both Party I and

Tanu were involved in the same incident, it has been held by my Ld. Predecessor that the Party I workmen committed theft of box of ball bearing from the MSFC stores. The case of Party I that it is only an attempt to commit theft therefore cannot stand. There is no evidence led by Party I workman that Tanu Kankonkar who was chargesheeted for the same act of misconduct, settled the dispute in conciliation proceedings by giving heavy compensation and that the Party I workman has been discriminated by the management. It is also not disclosed as to how and in what manner the case of Shri Tanu Kankonkar who was co-accused in the enquiry was settled before the Conciliation Officer, whether the said Tanu Kankonkar had expressed regrets for committing the alleged offence or tendered apologies. There is no such regret on the part of Party I and on the contrary, he tried to justify his action by raising the dispute and claimed that it was merely an attempt to commit theft and not actually the theft, which is dehors the findings rendered by my Ld. Predecessor dated 15-2-2012 at Exh. 23. The Party I chose to contest charges levelled against him, while said Tanu Kankonkar settled the matter and therefore both Party I and said Tanu Kankonkar do not stand on the same footing and hence, same yardstick cannot be applied and therefore, it cannot be said that the Party II had discriminated against the Party I.

16. The case of Party I that he had unblemished past service track record with Party II since the beginning of his service and the same was not considered by the Enquiry Officer also holds no water as past conduct of the workman is not relevant in the departmental proceedings in cases of theft as held in the case of **Chandrakant K. Patil vs. Union of India & Ors., 1995 II CLR 445**. There cannot be any dispute that once the employee has lost confidence of the employer, it would not be safe and in the interest of the establishment to continue the employee in the service as theft committed by the employee amounts to misconduct. It needs no mention that the employee shall adhere to discipline as discipline at the workplace in an organization is the sine qua non for the efficient working of the organization and when an employee breaches such discipline and the employer terminates his services, it is not open to the Labour Court or the Industrial Tribunal to take the view that the punishment awarded is shockingly disproportionate to the charge proved.

17. Learned Adv. Shri S. B. S. Bhangui relying upon the case of **Ramkrishna Shivram Gadekar vs. Board of Trustees of the Port of Mumbai & Anr., 2009 II CLR 866** has submitted that the Tribunal cannot examine as to whether the

acquittal was clean or was on account of benefit of doubt, however the so called judgment of Judicial Magistrate First Class has been produced on record nor Party I workman had made any reference of acquittal of any case by the Magistrate in the affidavit in evidence filed by him. It is also not the case of Party I workman that the facts involved in the departmental enquiry and the criminal trial were the same, so also the evidence in the departmental enquiry and the criminal trial were the same and that the departmental enquiry and the criminal prosecution were based on the same incident, unlike the case referred above. It is also well settled that the acquittal of the party in the case will not help the workman as the yardstick and standard of proof in a criminal case is different from the one in disciplinary proceedings, as while the standard of proof in a criminal case is proof beyond all reasonable doubts, the standard of proof in a departmental proceedings is preponderance of probabilities as held in the case of **West Bokaro Colliery (Tisco Ltd.) vs. Ram Pravesh Singh, (2008) 3 SCC 729**. It is therefore the above submissions of Ld. Adv. Shri S. B. S. Bhangui pales into insignificance.

18. The materials on record therefore clearly show that the delinquent employee has lost the confidence of the employer as he has committed the theft of property belonging to Party II and therefore it would not be proper, safe and in the interest of the management of Party II to continue the Party I/workman in the service. Needless to mention, when the employee is found guilty of theft, there is nothing wrong in the management losing confidence or faith in such an employee and awarding punishment of dismissal of such an employee. There is no place of generosity or sympathy for such an employee who was involved in the theft and therefore cannot interfere with the quantum of punishment. The punishment imposed by the management of dismissal considering that the Party I/workman was involved in the theft is not disproportionate and the punishment of dismissal from service is just, reasonable and proportionate to the proved misconduct as rightly submitted by Ld. Adv. Shri G. K. Sardessai for Party II. The Party I was given a fair and reasonable opportunity in the departmental enquiry, so also before the Court and after following the procedures and principles of natural justice, both the Enquiry Officer as well as the Tribunal have held that the enquiry conducted against Party I is fair, proper and impartial and that the charges of misconduct leveled against the Party I are proved. It is therefore, the above submissions of Ld. Adv. S. B. S. Bhangui cannot be accepted. Hence, the above issues No. 3, 4 & 5 are answered accordingly.

19. In the result, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i. The present reference stands dismissed.
- ii. It is hereby held that the action of the management of M/s. I.F.B. Industries Limited, Corlim, Ilhas, Goa, in terminating the services of Shri Caitan D'Mello, with effect from 29-3-1996, is legal and justified.
- iii. The Party I workman is therefore not entitled to any reliefs.
- iv. No order as to costs.
- v. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(Vincent D'Silva),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal and
Labour Court.



Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

—
Order

No. 1/6/2014-LD(Estt.)/Part-I/780

- Read: 1) Order No. 1/24/84-LD(Estt.)Vol. I/162 dated 30-01-2009.
2) Order No. 1/24/84-LD(Estt.)Vol. I dated 19-06-2009.

Government of Goa is pleased to appoint the following Advocates and authorize them to give legal opinion on the files of Government Employees pertaining to applications for House Building Advance for grant of Title Clearance Certificate for grant of House Building Advance.

1. Adv. Kishore L. Bhagat (North-Goa).
2. Adv. Prasad S. Naik (South-Goa).
3. Adv. Roya L. L. Ferrao (North-Goa).

All Heads of Departments/Offices shall give notice of this Order to their Subordinate staff, for necessary action while dealing with case for House Building Advance.

This is in continuation to the above read Orders.

By order and in the name of the Governor of
Goa.

Anju S. Kerkar, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 27th April, 2018.

Order

No. 1/6/2014-LD(Estt.)/Part-I/781

The Government of Goa is pleased to revise the panel of the Government Counsels defending the interest of the State, as given in the Annexure attached to the Order and as per terms and conditions prescribed by the Government vide Notification No. 1-24-84-LD(Estt.)Vol.II(B)/767 dated 16-06-2017 with immediate effect and until further orders, superseding all earlier orders issued in this regards.

The area of expertise of the empanelled Advocates is indicated in the Annexure. However, Department/s may make an independent assessment about the expertise of the Advocates in their indicated fields.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Anju S. Kerkar, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 27th April, 2018.

ANNEXURE**I. District Court (North Goa/South Goa)**

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Atanasio Monteiro	————	Land Acquisition	Panaji.
2.	Adv. Nishigandha Shet	Criminal, Civil, Negotiable Instrument, Mundkar, Partition, Rent, Accident, Children's Court, Consumer Court, Protection of Women	Land Acquisition & for other cases	Panaji, Mapusa, Margao, Ponda, Curchorem, Quepem and Vasco.
3.	Adv. Anirudha A. S. Borkar	Service Matters, Land Acquisition, Environment, Co-operative Law, Property Law, Income Tax, Land Acquisition, Municipality, TCP, Panchayat, Negotiable Instrument, LRC, Criminal	Land Acquisition & for other cases	Panaji and Mapusa.
4.	Adv. Prachi Joshi	Company matter, Property matter, Criminal, Civil, Mundkar Act, Rent Control Act, Negotiable Instrument Act, Insurance matters & Land Acquisition matters	Land Acquisition & for other cases	Panaji and Mapusa.
5.	Adv. Anil de Santana Rodrigues	Land Revenue, Land Acquisition, Recoveries, Taxation	Land Acquisition	Panaji.
6.	Adv. Vinay Dhuri	————	Land Acquisition	Mapusa.
7.	Adv. T. G. Jacques	————	Land Acquisition	Margao.
8.	Adv. Prakash Borkar	————	Land Acquisition & for other cases	Margao.
9.	Adv. Sarvesh Kalangutkar	Civil, Revenue, Land Acquisition	Land Acquisition & for other cases	Ponda.
10.	Adv. G. D. Kirtani	————	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.

1	2	3	4	5
11.	Adv. Agnelo Costa	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
12.	Adv. E. P. Lobo	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
13.	Adv. Nilima N. Narvekar	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
14.	Adv. Arun Naik	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
15.	Adv. Priyanka Kamat alias Priyanka R. Shetiya	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
16.	Adv. Harsha Naik	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
17.	Adv. Bhupesh Prabhu Dessai	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
18.	Adv. Amina Shaikh @ Phadte	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Income Tax	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
19.	Adv. Sulekha Kamat	Transfer of property, Land Acquisition, Specific Relief, Contract, CPC, Negotiable Instrument, Motor Vehicle, Consumer Protection, Mundkar, Agricultural Tenancy, Rent Control	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji/Mapusa.
20.	Adv. Vishwadh V. N. P. Sardessai	Civil, Criminal, Education, RTO, Excise	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji and Mapusa.
21.	Adv. Cipriano Barreto	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Mapusa.
22.	Adv. Ranjana C. Salgaonkar	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Mapusa.
23.	Adv. Surendra G. Narulkar	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Mapusa.
24.	Adv. Tolentina Xavier Afonso	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
25.	Adv. Rabindranath Menezes	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
26.	Adv. Joey Jose Rodrigues	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
27.	Adv. Vishwas G. Naik	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
28.	Adv. Vijay V. Alvenkar	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
29.	Adv. Rajkumar N. Naik	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
30.	Adv. Silvano Estibeiro	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
31.	Adv. Ramkrishna G. Bale	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.

1	2	3	4	5
32.	Adv. Sudesh Narsinv Borkar	————	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
33.	Adv. Priya Adpaikar	Civil & Revenue matters	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao, Vasco, Curchorem, Ponda and Quepem.
34.	Adv. Sagar R. Parab	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Consumer, Claim Petitions & matters under the N.I. Act	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao, Vasco, Quepem, Curchorem and Ponda.
35.	Adv. Sandra Vaz e Correia	————	Other than Land Acquisition	Vasco.
36.	Adv. Rajan Naik	————	Other than Land Acquisition	Vasco.
37.	Adv. Ramdas K. G. Temyekar	All type of Civil, Criminal and other matters	Other than Land Acquisition	Ponda.
38.	Adv. Roya L. L. Ferrao	Commercial Tax matters, Criminal and Civil matters, Motor Accidents claims, RTI matters, Revenue matters etc.	Land Acquisition and other cases	Ponda & Panaji.
39.	Adv. Andrea Sheela Fernandes	All type of Civil and Criminal matters	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji, Mapusa.
40.	Adv. V. H. Yelgar	Civil, Criminal, Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum, Consumer State Commission, Administrative Tribunal, Revenue Courts etc.	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji, Mapusa.
41.	Adv. Vidhati S. Shetye	All type of Civil, Criminal and other matters 1. MACT (i.e. Claims Tribunal) & Excise matters 2. Eviction matters	Other than Land Acquisition (pertaining to eviction and also MACT and excise matters)	Panaji.
42.	Adv. Sandesh Arabekar	All type of Civil and other matters	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji, Ponda.
43.	Adv. Anjali Naik e Salkar	All type of Civil, Criminal matters, including Claim Petitions and other matters	Other than Land Acquisition	Margao.
44.	Adv. Anuj A. Salkar	All type of Civil, Criminal matters and other matters	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji, Mapusa.

II. Before Arbitrators (North/South Goa)

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Ghanashyam V. Pai	————	Arbitration matters	Panaji.

1	2	3	4	5
2.	Adv. Sulekha Kamat	Transfer of property, Land Acquisition, Specific Relief, Contract, CPC, Negotiable Instrument, Motor Vehicle, Consumer Protection, Mundkar, Agricultural Tenancy, Rent Control	Arbitration matters	Panaji and Mapusa.
3.	Adv. Prachi Joshi	Company matters, Property matter, Criminal, Civil, Mundkar Act, Rent Control Act, Negotiable Instrument Act, Insurance matters & Land Acquisition matters	Arbitration matters	Panaji and Mapusa.
4.	Adv. V. M. Patkar	-----	Arbitration matters	Mapusa.
5.	Adv. G. D. Kirtani	-----	Arbitration matters	Mapusa.

III. Before Administrative Tribunal, Panaji

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. E. P. Lobo	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
2.	Adv. Priyanka Kamat alias Priyanka R. Shetiya	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
3.	Adv. Amina Shaikh @ Phadte	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Income Tax	All types of cases	Panaji and Mapusa.
4.	Adv. Ashok S. Mashelkar	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Panchayat, Corporative Law	All types of cases	Panaji and Mapusa.
5.	Adv. Prachi Joshi	Company matter, Property matter, Criminal, Civil, Mundkar Act, Rent Control Act, Negotiable Instrument Act, Insurance matters & Land Acquisition matters	All types of cases	Panaji and Mapusa.
6.	Adv. Anil de Santana Rodrigues	Land Revenue, Land Acquisition, Recoveries, Taxation	All types of cases	Panaji.

IV. All Courts, North Goa (other than High Courts & District Courts)

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Kishore Bhagat	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
2.	Adv. Nilima N. Narvekar	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
3.	Adv. Harsha Naik	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
4.	Adv. Nicholas Dias	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.

1	2	3	4	5
5.	Adv. Vishwadh V. N. Sardessai	Civil, Criminal, Education, RTO, Excise	All types of cases	Panaji.
6.	Adv. Ashok S. Mashelkar	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Panchayat, Corporative Law	All types of cases	Panaji, Mapusa, Bicholim and Valpoi.
7.	Adv. Geeta Payaji	————	All types of cases	Mapusa.
8.	Adv. Krishna N. Naik	————	All types of cases	Mapusa.
9.	Adv. Satish Phadte	————	All types of cases	Mapusa.
10.	Adv. Shilpa Bhikaji Salgaonkar	————	All types of cases (also in MACT)	Mapusa.
11.	Adv. Shri Parmanand Naik	————	All types of cases	Bicholim.
12.	Adv. Dipak G. Shet	————	All types of cases	Panaji.
13.	Adv. Kala Dalal	————	All types of cases	Valpoi.
14.	Adv. Aruni A. Nayak	All type of Civil and other matters	All types of cases	Panaji, Bicholim.
15.	Adv. V. H. Yelgar	Civil, Criminal, Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum, Consumer State Commission, Administrative Tribunal, Revenue Courts etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.
16.	Adv. Deepak S. Fadke	Criminal, Civil matters, Matters u/s 138 of N.I. Act Mundkar declaration, Mutation, OPartition, Tenancy cases, Panchayat Appeals, Claim Petitions, Inventory Proceedings etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.
17.	Adv. Mukeshbabu D. Navelkar	Company Laws, Consumer Laws, Property Laws, Contracts, Arbitration Laws, Land Laws, Motor Vehicle, Civil Laws, Criminal Laws, Revenue Laws Contract Wills, Taxation, Portuguese Laws, Labour Laws etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.

V. All Courts, South Goa (other than High Court & District Court)

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Shri Jayant Prabhu	————	All types of cases	Margao.
2.	Adv. Priya Adpaikar	Civil & Revenue matters	All types of cases	Margao.
3.	Adv. Sudir E. Tari	Civil, Criminal, Mundkar, Agricultural Tenancy, Rent Control, LRC, Land Acquisition, Panchayat, Motor	All types of cases	Margao and Ponda.

1	2	3	4	5
4.	Adv. Sagar R. Parab	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Consumer, Claim Petitions & matters under the N.I. Act	All types of cases	Margao, Quepem, Canacona, Vasco, Churchorem and Ponda.
5.	Adv. Shri Kishore Prabhu Dessai	-----	All types of cases	Quepem.
6.	Adv. Mahendra Gawas	-----	All types of cases	Quepem.
7.	Adv. Vijay Gaykar	-----	All types of cases	Canacona.
8.	Adv. Sandra Vaz e Correia	-----	All types of cases	Vasco.
9.	Adv. Shri B. V. Sukhtankar	-----	All types of cases	Ponda.
10.	Adv. Shri M. P. Sawaikar	-----	All types of cases	Ponda.
11.	Adv. Shilpa Bhikaji Salgaonkar	Civil, Criminal, Motor Accident, Labour matter	All types of cases (also in MACT)	Ponda.
12.	Adv. Sarvesh Kalangutkar	Civil, Revenue, Land Acquisition	All types of cases	Ponda.

VI. Before the Goa Human Rights Commission, Panaji

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Kishore Bhagat	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
2.	Adv. Nilima N. Narvekar	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
3.	Adv. Harsha Naik	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
4.	Adv. Nicholas Dias	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
5.	Adv. Vishwadh V. N. Sardessai	Civil, Criminal, Education, RTO, Excise	All types of cases	Panaji.
6.	Adv. Ashok S. Mashelkar	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Panchayat, Corporative Law	All types of cases	Panaji, Mapusa, Bicholim and Valpoi.
7.	Adv. Dipak G. Shet	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
8.	Adv. Gurunath V. Dhume	All type of Criminal and other matters	All types of cases	Panaji.
9.	Adv. Deepak S. Fadke	Criminal, Civil Matters, Matters u/s 138 of N. I. Act Mundkar declaration, Mutation, OPartition, Tenancy Cases, Panchayat Appeals, Claim Petitions, Inventory Proceedings etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.
10.	Adv. Mukeshbabu D. Navelkar	Company Laws, Consumer Laws, Property Laws, Contracts, Arbitration Laws, Land Laws, Motor Vehicle, Civil Laws, Criminal Laws, Revenue Laws Contract Wills, Taxation, Portuguese Laws, Labour Laws etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.

VII. Before the Goa State Information Commission, Panaji

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Kishore Bhagat	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
2.	Adv. Nilima N. Narvekar	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
3.	Adv. Harsha Naik	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
4.	Adv. Nicholas Dias	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
5.	Adv. Vishwadh V. N. Sardessai	Civil, Criminal, Education, RTO, Excise	All types of cases	Panaji.
6.	Adv. Ashok S. Mashelkar	Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Panchayat, Corporative Law	All types of cases	Panaji, Mapusa Bicholim and Valpoi.
7.	Adv. Aruni A. Nayak	All type of Civil and other matters	All types of cases	Panaji.
8.	Adv. Deepak S. Fadke	Criminal, Civil Matters, Matters u/s 138 of N. I. Act Mundkar declaration, Mutation, OPartition, Tenancy Cases, Panchayat Appeals, Claim Petitions, Inventory Proceedings etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.
9.	Adv. Mukeshbabu D. Navelkar	Company Laws, Consumer Laws, Property Laws, Contracts, Arbitration Laws, Land Laws, Motor Vehicle, Civil Laws, Criminal Laws, Revenue Laws Contract Wills, Taxation, Portuguese Laws, Labour Laws etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.

VIII. Before the Lokayukta

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Priyanka Kamat alias Priyanka R. Shetiya	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
2.	Adv. E. P. Lobo	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
3.	Adv. Prachi Joshi	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
4.	Adv. Vishwadh V. N. Sardessai	Civil, Criminal, Education, RTO, Excise	All types of cases	Panaji.
5.	Adv. Bhupesh Prabhu Dessai	-----	Other than Land Acquisition	Panaji.
6.	Adv. Gurunath V. Dhume	All types of Criminal and other matters	All types of cases	Panaji.
7.	Adv. Harsha Naik	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.

IX. Before Children's Courts

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Roya L. L. Ferrao	Commercial Tax matters, Criminal and Civil matters, Motor Accidents claims, RTI matters, Revenue matters etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.

X. Before the State Police Complaints Authority, Panaji

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocates	Area of Expertise indicated by the Advocates	Type of Cases	Area
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Adv. Kishore Bhagat	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
2.	Adv. Harsha Naik	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
3.	Adv. Vishwadh V. N. P. Sardessai	Civil, Criminal, Education, RTO, Excise	All types of cases	Panaji.
4.	Adv. Bhupesh Prabhu Dessai	-----	All types of cases	Panaji.
5.	Adv. Gurunath V. Dhume	All type of Criminal and other matters	All types of cases	Panaji.
6.	Adv. Deepak S. Fadke	Criminal, Civil matters, Matters u/s 138 of N. I. Act Mundkar declaration, Mutation, OPartition, Tenancy cases, Panchayat Appeals, Claim Petitions, Inventory Proceedings etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.
7.	Adv. Mukeshbabu D. Navelkar	Company Laws, Consumer Laws, Property Laws, Contract, Arbitration Laws, Land Laws, Motor Vehicle, Civil Laws, Criminal Laws, Revenue Laws Contract Wills, Taxation, Portuguese Laws, Labour Laws etc.	All types of cases	Panaji.

Note:

The following Advocates shall be allotted cases under Section 156(3) Cr. P. C. and other Criminal cases requiring the assistance of Government pleader.

1. Adv. Gurunath V. Dhume.
2. Adv. Aruni A. Nayak.

The above advocates fees shall be paid as per the Court of appearance.

Department of Personnel

Order

No. 7/48/2014-PER/1401

Read: Order No. 32013/3/2018-IFS-I (AGMUT) dated 26-03-2018.

The Governor of Goa is pleased to relieve Shri E. Venkat Reddy, IFS, Conservator of Forests and Managing Director, Goa Forest Development Corporation Ltd. (GFDC) from this Administration w.e.f. 30-04-2018 (a.n.) to take up his new assignment as Chief Conservator of Forests, Arunachal Pradesh.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 30th April, 2018.

Order

No. 22/5/2018-PER/1431

In pursuance to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi, Order No. 14020/01/2018-UT-I dated 12-02-2018, the Governor of Goa is pleased to appoint Shri Utkrisht Prasoon, IPS (AGMUT 2014), as Superintendent of Police (Training) with additional charges of Superintendent of Police (Special Branch) and Principal PTS with immediate effect, thereby relieving Shri Shekhar M. Prabhudessai, SP (HQ) and Shri Umesh Y. N. Gaonkar, SP (Security) of their additional charges.

Shri Utkrisht Prasoon, IPS, AGMUT 2014 has reported for duty to this Administration on 17-04-2018 (b.n.).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).
Porvorim, 2nd May, 2018.

Order

No. 5/12/2017-PER/1430

On the recommendation of the Goa Service Board and with the approval of the Government, Shri Rohit Kadam, Deputy Collector & SDM, Quepem shall hold the charges of Chief Officer, Curchorem Cacora Municipal Council & Member Secretary,

Ravindra Bhavan, Curchorem in addition to his own duties with immediate effect and in public interest.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 3rd May, 2018.

Order

No. 15/32/2012-PER/1524

On the recommendation of the Goa Services Board and approval of the Government, Shri Laxmikant R. Dessai, Mamlatdar, Sanguem shall hold additional charge of the post of Chief Officer, Sanguem Municipal Council in addition to his own duties, with immediate effect, in public interest.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 3rd May, 2018.

Order

No. 6/9/2009-PER/(Part I)/1458

On the recommendation of the Goa Services Board and with the approval of the Government, Shri Johnson B. Fernandes, Chief Officer, Margao Municipal Council shall hold additional charge of the post of Additional Collector-II (South Goa), with immediate effect.

Consequently, Shri Agnelo A. J. Fernandes, Additional Collector-II (South-Goa) shall report to Department of Personnel for further posting.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 7th May, 2018.

Corrigendum

No. 7/4/2007-PER(PF-I)/1289

Read: Order No. 7/4/2007-PER(PF-I) dated 05-01-2018.

In the Order referred to in the preamble, the phrase "w.e.f. 01-03-2018" referred in the first para, shall be substituted to be read as "w.e.f. 28-02-2018 (a.n.)".

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 16th April, 2018.

Corrigendum

No. 7/48/2014-PER/1421

Read: Order No. 7/48/2014-PER/1401 dated 30-04-2018.

The relieving date w.e.f. 30-04-2018 (a.n.), in the 3rd line of the order read in preamble shall be substituted to be read as 03-05-2018 (b.n.).

Shri N. D. Naik, General Manager, Goa Forest Development Corporation Ltd. (GFDC) shall hold the post of Managing Director, Goa Forest Development Corporation Ltd. (GFDC) in addition to his own duties, till further orders.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).
Porvorim, 2nd May, 2018.

◆◆◆

Department of Public Health

Order

No. 13/10/2007-I/PHD(Part File)/1119

In pursuance of Clause 2 of Rule 3.2.1. of the Food Safety and Standards Rules, 2011 and in consultation with the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay, conveyed vide letter No. 12/8/2015-LD/Estt./172 dated 19-02-2018, the Government of Goa hereby constitutes the Selection Panel for selection of the Presiding Officer for the Food Safety Appellate Tribunal for the State of Goa, consisting of the following members, namely:-

- 1) Hon'ble Shri Justice C. V. — Chairman.
Bhadang
- 2) Law Secretary — Member.
- 3) Secretary (Health) — Member.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Maria Seomara De Souza, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 27th April, 2018.

Order

No. 11/4/2017-IV/PHD/1304

Read: Memorandum No. 11/4/2017-IV/PHD dated 08-03-2018.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/14(3)/2017/1039 dated 25-01-2018,

Government is pleased to appoint Dr. Siya Gajanan Dukle to the post of Lecturer in Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry (Group "A" Gazetted) in Level-10 of Pay Matrix (Pre-revised Pay Band-3 of Rs. 15,600-39,100 with Rs. 5,400 Grade Pay) under Goa Dental College & Hospital with immediate effect as per the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

Dr. Siya Gajanan Dukle shall be on probation for a period of one year.

Dr. Siya Gajanan Dukle has been declared medically fit by the Medical Board and her antecedents have been verified by the Additional Collector & ADM, North Goa, Panaji.

The above appointment is made against the vacancy occurred due to promotion of Dr. Paul Chalakkal, Lecturer to the post of Assistant Professor in the Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, Goa Dental College & Hospital vide Order No. 11/4/2017-IV/PHD dated 08-09-2017.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Trupti B. Manerkar, Under Secretary (Health-I).
Porvorim, 3rd May, 2018.

Notification

No. 13/41/87-I/PHD/(Part File-II)/1148

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of Rule 18 of the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, the Government of Goa hereby designates following Inspectors appointed under Section 21 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (Central Act 23 of 1940) and specified in column (2) of the Table below as Inspectors appointed under Section 21 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (Central Act 23 of 1940) Medical Device Officers for the entire State of Goa.

TABLE

Sr. No.	Names of Inspectors
1	2
1.	Smt. Medha A. Dessai.
2.	Smt. Shweta S. Desai.
3.	Smt. Swati Vinayak Bhonsule.
4.	Smt. Kavita Sushant Surlakar.
5.	Shri Venkatesh M. Sinari.
6.	Smt. Kavita Vaibhav Borkar.
7.	Shri Mangesh Bhimrao Chodankar.
8.	Kum. Akshada Gurudas Naik Menkurkar.
9.	Smt. Natasha Narendra Shirodkar
10.	Shri Gaurang Gajanan Shirgaonkar.
11.	Smt. Leena Devendraprasad Kuvelkar.

This Notification shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Maria Seomara De Souza, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 30th April, 2018.

◆◆◆
Department of Revenue

—
Order

No. 1/1/10/2018-RD/867

State Executive Committee is pleased to constitute the following RFP Evaluating Committee for evaluation of RFP for selection of agency for implementation of GIS based Disaster Management System for the State of Goa:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Collector (North) | — Chairperson. |
| 2. Collector (South) | — Member. |
| 3. Director (IT) | — Member. |
| 4. MD-CEO (SPV), Smart City | — Member. |
| 5. Addl. Secretary (Finance) | — Member. |
| 6. Under Secretary (Revenue-I) | — Member. |
| 7. SIO, NIC | — Member. |

The above mentioned Committee shall do the necessary evaluation and submit its recommendations for finalizing bidder. The RFP shall accordingly be floated immediately.

Sagun R. Velip, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 27th April, 2018.

◆◆◆
Department of Water Resources

Office of the Chief Engineer

—
Order

No. 74-1-81/CE-WR/Adm.II/97

Government is pleased to transfer Shri Anant G. Bhagwat, Surveyor of Works, O/o. Addl. Chief Engineer, Irrigation Project, WRD, Porvorim-Goa to Works Div. XIV, Water Resources Department, Gogal-Margao, in public interest thereby relieving Shri Satish Pawooskar of the additional charge.

Shri Anant G. Bhagwat shall hold the charge of Surveyor of Works, O/o. Addl. Chief Engineer, Irrigation Project, WRD, Porvorim, in addition to his own duties, until further orders.

Both the officers shall complete handing over/taking over process within two days and submit the CTC/Joining report to this office immediately.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

S. T. Nadkarni, Chief Engineer & ex officio Additional Secretary (WR).

Porvorim, 2nd May, 2018.

◆◆◆
Department of Women & Child Development

Directorate of Women & Child Development

—
Notification

No. 2-536/2017-18/DWCD/NNM/1027

Subject: Constitution of State Convergence Committee, District Convergence Committees & Block Convergence Committees.

The Government of Goa, in pursuance of Government of India's decision on launch of National Nutrition Mission (NNM), herewith constitutes State Convergence Committee, District Convergence Committees & Block Convergence Committees for policy direction, review and effective co-ordination and convergence between Departments which have as Sectoral responsibility for the challenges of nutrition. Committee suggestions will be suggestive and the same shall be effective upon approval of the Government.

The composition of State Convergence Committee is as under:

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Senior most Principal Secretary | — Chairperson. |
| from line department
(To be nominated by Chief Secretary) | |
| 2. Secretary, Planning, Statistics and Evaluation | — Member. |
| 3. Secretary, Finance | — Member. |
| 4. Secretary, Public Works Department | — Member. |
| 5. Secretary, Education | — Member. |
| 6. Secretary, Rural Development Agency | — Member. |
| 7. Secretary, Panchayati Raj | — Member. |
| 8. Secretary, Health | — Member. |
| 9. Demonstration Officer, Food & Nutrition Board | — Member. |

10. Director General, Goa Institute of Public Administration and Rural Development — Member.
11. Director, Health Services — Member.
12. Director, Women and Child Development — Member Secretary.

Role of State/UT Convergence Committee:

- a) Consolidate and examine the requirements given in District Plans received from various Districts.
- b) Segregate the item-wise requirements and seek the financial commitment before inclusion in the State Convergence Plan.
- c) On the basis of examination, determine the final requirement and prepare a State/UT Convergence Plan.
- d) Indicate the roll-out plan; assign responsibilities of each department to avoid any over-lapping or consequent shifting of responsibilities of each department to avoid any over-lapping or consequent shifting of responsibility.
- e) To submit the State Convergence Plan for inclusion in State/UT APIP for approval by State/UT EPC before submission to the MWCD. The components which are to be funded from the State/UT budget need to be segregated and clearly mentioned in the APIP.
- f) Ensure timely issue of sanction by each Department.
- g) Prepare guidelines for release of funds for convergent actions directly to the DC/DM.

The composition of the North District Convergence Committee is as under:

1. District Magistrate/Collector, North — Chairperson.
2. Chief Executive Officer, North Goa Zilla Panchayat — Member.
3. Member, North Goa Zilla Panchayat to be nominated by North Goa Zilla Panchayat — Member.
4. Dy. Collector & SDM, Tiswadi Sub-Div. — Member.
5. Superintendent, District Hospital, Mapusa — Member.
6. Statistical Officer, Directorate of Planning and Statistics to be nominated by Director, Directorate of Planning and Statistics — Member.

7. District Social Welfare Officer, Directorate of Social Welfare — Member.
8. Program Officer, Rural Development Agency — Member.
9. Dy. Director, Directorate of Panchayat, North — Member.
10. Superintendent Engineer representative of Public Works Department, Circle V (PHE) — Member.
11. Dy. Director, North, Directorate of Education — Member.
12. Technical Officer, Food and Nutrition Board — Member.
13. District Programme Officer, Integrated Child Development Service — Member Secretary.

The composition of the South District Convergence Committee is as under:

1. District Magistrate/Collector, South — Chairperson.
2. Chief Executive Officer, South Goa Zilla Panchayat — Member.
3. Member, South Goa Zilla Panchayat to be nominated by South Goa Zilla Panchayat — Member.
4. Dy. Collector & SDM, Salcete Sub-Div. — Member.
5. Superintendent, District Hospital, Margao — Member.
6. Statistical Officer, Directorate of Planning and Statistics to be nominated by Director, Directorate of Planning and Statistics — Member.
7. District Social Welfare Officer, Directorate of Social Welfare — Member.
8. Program Officer, Rural Development Agency — Member.
9. Dy. Director, Directorate of Panchayat, South — Member.
10. Superintendent Engineer representative of Public Works Department, Circle VIII (PHE) — Member.
11. Dy. Director, Directorate of Education — Member.
12. Demonstration Officer, Food and Nutrition Board — Member.

13. District Programme Officer, — Member
Integrated Child Develop- Secretary.
ment Service

Role of District Convergence Committee:

- a) Examine the need assessment made by the BCP for essential interventions at the village/ /AWC Level and the availability of resources.
- b) Consolidate requirement of interventions at the District Level.
- c) Considering the need, each line Department to prepare their action plan at the District Level for delivering the interventions relating to them.
- d) Take inputs from PRI member including on the extent of community participation, etc.
- e) Submit the consolidated District Convergence Plan to the State Government for approval and for earmarking the financial provisions.
- f) Wherever required, the DCP committee may make physical inspection to assess the need projected.

The composition of Block Convergence Committees for Pernem, Bicholim, Satari, Bardez, Tiswadi, Ponda, Salcete, Mormugao, Canacona, Quepem and Sanguem & Dharbandora is as under:

1. Dy. Collector & SDO of — Chairperson.
respective Sub-Div.
2. Block Development Officer — Vice-Chairper-
of respective Taluka son.
3. Medical Officer, Primary — Member.
Health Centre/Community
Health Center to be nomi-
nated by Director, Directorate
of Health Services
4. Assistant District Education — Member.
Inspector of respective
Taluka
5. Social Welfare Officer, — Member.
Social Welfare Department
6. Executive Engineer, Public — Member.
Works Department
7. Assistant Programme Officer, — Member.
Rural Development Agency
8. Inspector, Civil Supplies, — Member.
Directorate of Civil Supplies
& Consumer Affairs
9. Mukhya Sevika, ICDS North — Member.
Block to be nominated by
concerned CDPO on rotation
basis

10. Child Development Project — Member
Officer, Integrated Child Secretary.
Development Service,
North Block

Role of Block Convergence Committees:

- a) Need assessment of essential interventions at the Village/AWC level i.e. water, sanitation, food, health interventions, immunization, ANC/PNC, Vitamin-A, IFA De-worming tablets, functioning of VHSNC, etc. and the availability of resources.
- b) The assessment at the village level will be done by AWW and supervisor in association with PRI representative under the supervision of concerned CDPO/DPO. CDPO/DPO would submit the inputs to the area SDM.
- c) Consolidate and assess requirement of interventions at the block level.
- d) Considering the need, each line Department at the block level to propose their action plan at the Block level for inclusion in the DCP.
- e) Involve PRI members actively in the assessing the need and seek their suggestions.
- f) Submit the Block Convergence Plan to the District authorities in the DCP and approval of DM.

The State Convergence Committee, District Convergence Committees & Block Convergence Committees shall submit report to the Minister for Health, Women & Child Development & Craftsman Training every 6 months.

This issued with the approval of the Government conveyed vide 486 dated 21-04-2018.

Dipak Desai, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary
(Women & Child Development).

Panaji, 3rd May, 2018.

Notification

No. 2-103(69)-2017/DW&CD/1078

Whereas vide Notification dated 09-12-2014 No. 2-103(69)-2014/DW&CD/10524, the Government has constituted Child Welfare Committee (CWC), North Goa with term of 3 years from the date of its constitution. The term of the said committee expired on 10-12-2017. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and delegated Rules made thereunder does not provide for extension of tenure of CWC. The Government

therefore as per Notification dated 26-12-2017 vide No. 2-103(69)-2014/DW&CD/6448 gave charge of CWC, North to CWC, South.

The Government now on recommendation of Selection Committee constituted under Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Model Rules, 2016 (Rule 87) read with relevant provisions of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Section 27) herewith constitutes Child Welfare Committee, North as given below w.e.f. 11-05-2018. The CWC, North & CWC, South shall take over/hand over complete charge on or before 11-05-2018.

Sr. No.	Name & address of the candidates	Designation
1	2	3
1.	Adv. Gurunath Vinayak Dhume, B6 Skylark Apts., M.B. Road, Panaji-Goa Mobile No. 9764768563	Chairperson.
2.	Ms. Audrey Pinto, G-2, Peace Haven 'A' Co-operative Housing Society, Alto-Porvorim, Goa 403521	Member.
3.	Adv. Dattaram Vithal Chari, H. No. 83/C-(P3), Xell Bastora, Mapusa, Bardez-Goa Mobile No. 764847579	Member.
4.	Mrs. Shabnam Adam Khan, H. No. E155, Bona De Vaca, Nr. Mahalaxmi Temple, Panaji-Goa Mobile No. 9890727244	Member.

1	2	3
5.	Adv. Nishigandha N. Shet, H-301, 4th Floor, Annabella wing, Sattadhar Basilos Complex, Behind Basilos Gym., St. Inez, Panaji-Goa Mobile No. 9921449856	Member.

- The tenure of Child Welfare Committee shall be 3 years to be reckoned w.e.f. 11-05-2018.
- The non-official members are entitled to a sitting allowance of Rs. 1500/- per sitting per day subject to fulfillment of other conditions. There will be no separate TA/DA.
- The CWC, North shall have sittings as provided under Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Section 28) and as per procedure provided under Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Model Rules, 2016 (Rule 16).
- The CWC, North shall have office/sitting in the premises of the Apna Ghar, Mercedes, Tiswadi, Goa and shall have jurisdiction over Child Care Institutions situated in North Goa.
- The CWC, North shall submit the quarterly information as per procedure provided under Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Model Rules, 2016 (Rule 17).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Dipak Desai, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary
(Women & Child Development).

Panaji, 7th May, 2018.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 25.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—43/200-05/2018.