

Panaji, 11th April, 2019 (Chaitra 21, 1941)

SERIES II No. 2

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are four Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 1 dated 04-04-2019 as follows:—

- (1) Extraordinary dated 04-04-2019 from pages 13 to 14 regarding Notifications from Department of Finance.
- (2) Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 08-04-2019 from pages 15 to 28 regarding Notifications from Department of Elections.
- (3) Extraordinary (No. 3) dated 09-04-2019 from pages 29 to 30 regarding Notification from Department of Elections.
- (4) Extraordinary (No. 4) dated 10-04-2019 from pages 31 to 36 regarding Order from Department of Home.

GOVERNMENT OF GOA
Department of Education, Art & Culture
Directorate of Education

—
Order

No. 1-1-(19)-2003/SE/22

Whereas, Smt. Pushpa S. Pawaskar alias R. S. Bandodkar, Principal, Dr. T. B. Cunha Government Higher Secondary Schools, Campal-Panaji under the Directorate of Education has changed her name to "Rashmi Subhash Bandodker" by execution of deed changing name/surname (under Registration No. 1064/18) on 27-10-2018 before Shri Govind U. Bhobe, Advocate & Notary, Panaji-Goa, State of Goa (India) V. No. A-1559/2018 and publication of the said changed name in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 31 dated 01-11-2018 and also in the local newspaper namely 'Herald' dated 29-11-2018 in accordance with the procedure of change of name by Government Employee as laid down in O.M. No. 19016/1/87-Estt(A) dated 12-03-1987 of Government of India, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi.

And whereas, the said Smt. Pushpa S. Pawaskar alias R. S. Bandodkar vide letter dated 26-11-2018

has further requested to enter her changed name i.e. "Rashmi Subhash Bandodker" in her service records.

Now therefore, sanction of the Government is hereby conveyed to change the name of "Smt. Pushpa S. Pawaskar alias R. S. Bandodkar" to "Rashmi Subhash Bandodker" in her service records.

This issues with the approval of the Government vide U. O. No. 10520/F dated 24-12-2018.

This supersedes Order No. 1-1-(19)-2003/SE/03 dated 11-01-2019.

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

Nagaraj G. Honnekeri, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Education).

Porvorim, 12th March, 2019.

—◆◆◆—
Department of Environment

—
Order

No. 1-25-2010/STE-DIR/02

In pursuance of Section 5 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act"), the following Officer is hereby appointed Public Information Officer (PIO) for Department of Environment to deal with the applications received from the public under the said Act.

Officer on Special Duty — Public Information
(Department of Environ- Officer.
ment)

The Director (Environment) will be the First Appellate Authority (FAA) under the said Act, against the decision as far as Department of Environment is concerned.

Sanjeev Joglekar, I/c Director & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Porvorim, 2nd April, 2019.

Department of General Administration

Order

No. 35/4/2005/GAD-III/1009

Read:- (1) Order No. 35/4/2005-GAD/III/372 dated 10-03-2017.
(2) Order No. 19/15/2009-GAD-III dated 05-03-2019.

In continuation to the Order read in preamble (1), the following Officers in the Secretariat are designated as Public Information Officer (PIO), Assistant Public Information Officer (APIO) and First Appellate Authority (FAA) in respect of the Central Registry, in the Secretariat as required under Section 5 of the Right to Information Act, 2005:-

Designation of the Officer appointed as FAA	Designation of the Officer appointed as PIO	Designation of the Officer appointed as APIO	For which Department/ Section
Additional/Joint Secretary (GA)	Section Officer, Central Registry	Sr. Assistant, Central Registry/Assistant, Record Room	Central Registry/Record Room/Visitors desk.

Manuel Barreto, Under Secretary (GA-I).

Porvorim, 3rd April, 2019.

Notification

No. 19/1/2019-GAD-III/680

Read: Notification No. 19/2/85-GA&C dated 07-06-1985.

In order to streamline the entry of Visitors/General Public into the Secretariat, Porvorim premises, it has been decided that the visitors timings and cash transactions timings in the Secretariat shall be as under:-

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| I) Visitor's timings:- | 10.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. | } Monday to Friday except on Holidays. |
| | 2.00 p.m. to 5.00 p.m. | |
| II) Cash transactions:- | 10.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. | |
| | 2.00 p.m. to 4.00 p.m. | |

The above contents have been brought to the notice of the public for information and compliance.

Manuel Barreto, Under Secretary (GA).

Porvorim, 27th March, 2019.

Department of Labour

Notification

No. 28/2/2019-LAB/256

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on

15-03-2019 in reference No. IT/70/89 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, 5th April, 2019.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND
LABOUR COURT

GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI

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

Ref. No. IT/70/89

Shri Chandrakant B. Arondekar,
Volpem, Post Vironda,
Pernem, Goa.

... Workman/Party I

V/s

The Personnel Officer,
M/s. Kadamba Transport
Corpn. Ltd.,
Panaji, Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I represented by Shri K. V. Nadkarny.

Employer/Party II represented by Ld. Adv. Shri Amit Palekar.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 15th day of the month of March of the year 2019)

By order dated 26-9-1989, bearing No. 28/33/89-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.

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. Kadamba Transport Corporation, Panaji, in terminating the services of Shri Chandrakant B. Arondekar, Conductor, with effect from 2-11-1989 is legal and justified.

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

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/70/89 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the parties. Pursuant to service of notices, Party I filed a Claim statement at Exhibit 2 and Party II filed a Written statement at Exhibit 3.

3. In short, the case of the Party I is that the Party I was employed as a Conductor with Party II and was posted on different buses and various routes in Goa and outside and has served the employer faithfully. It is also claimed that on 28-3-1987 while working on the bus bearing No. GDX-171 plying on Hubli-Margao route and was in the process of issuing tickets to the passengers, one of the passengers told him that his fare would be paid by the passenger seated on the back seat and when he approached them, a discussion ensued between them on the amount of fare and during the said discussion, the Line checking staff of Party II stopped the bus and started checking the passengers, at which time the workman had a few tickets in his hand which he wanted to issue to the passengers which fact was explained to the Assistant Traffic Inspector and the Ticket Inspector but they did not listen and issued him a default notice. The workman thereafter charged for committing misconduct and was directed to give written explanation, which he gave. A departmental enquiry was held and the Enquiry Officer submitted his report. A show cause notice was issued wherein it was stated that the charges made against him are proved and he was required to show cause why he should not be dismissed from service. The workman filed the reply but it was not considered before passing of the dismissal order dated 2-11-1988. The action on the part of Party II for dismissing him is illegal and unjustified. Hence, the dispute.

4. In the Written statement, the Party II has claimed that the Party I workman was working as a Conductor on the bus bearing No. GDX-171 and on 28-3-1987 during the inspection, it was noticed that he had collected fare from some passengers but did not issue tickets to them and also that he neither collected fare nor issued tickets to some of the passengers travelling in the bus. He was therefore issued a show cause notice and charge sheet but his explanation was not found satisfactory. A departmental enquiry was initiated and after completion of the enquiry, terminated his services. The action of the Party II is legal and justified and within the four corners of principle of natural justice and as per the provisions of Certified Standing orders of the corporation.

5. Issues were framed at Exh. 4 on 16-05-1990 and they were reframed on 13-3-2000 at Exh. 14 as follows:

- (1) Whether the Party I proves that the domestic enquiry held against him is not legal, fair and proper?
- (2) Whether the charges of misconduct levelled against the Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence?
- (3) Whether the Party I proves that the action of the Party II in terminating his services with effect from 2-11-88 is illegal and unjustified?
- (4) Whether the Party I is entitled to any relief?
- (5) What Award?

6. It is a matter of record that an additional issue was framed on 17-8-2015 at Exh. 30. It is as follows:

- (2A) Whether the Party I proves that the punishment of dismissal awarded to him is disproportionate as well as discriminatory in nature?

7. Admittedly, the preliminary issues No. 1 and 2 were answered vide Order dated 18-03-2013 at Exh. 22 and held that domestic enquiry conducted against the Party I workman, Shri Chandrakant B. Arondekar is fair and proper. It is further held that the Party I is guilty of the charges levelled against him in the charge sheet dated 28-4-1987.

8. It is a matter of record that the Party I filed an application for amendment on 20-3-2014 inter-alia claiming that the punishment of dismissal awarded to him is disproportionate as well as discriminatory in nature as number of conductors who were issued

several default notices, chargesheets for various irregularities have been let off with minor punishments like monetary fines or stoppage of increments and that even Sr. Executives of the Corporation involved in the financial irregularities and corrupt practices who were found guilty of the allegations made against them, were also let off. One Shri Nitin Gude was issued 31 default notices and thereafter an enquiry was conducted and after the enquiry, he was dismissed from the services, however he was taken back with minor punishment ignoring the fact that there were seven more default notices besides 31 default notices issued to him and also charge sheets for each default, which were all commuted to fine and thus leniency was shown to said conductor even though he was a habitual offender and his service records were bad, while the Party I workman was not given any opportunity and was discriminated in the matter of punishment meted out to him and therefore, he deserves a lenient punishment.

9. The Party I, Shri Chandrakant Arondekar examined himself and produced on record a copy of suspension order dated 24-12-1997 at Exh. 32, a copy of suspension order dated 8-4-2009 at Exh. 33, a copy of memorandum dated 2-2-1998 along with annexure at Exh. 34 colly, copies of memorandum dated 12-5-2009 along with annexure I, II and III at Exh. 35, copies of service records, orders, letters etc. of conductor Nitin Gude at Exh. 36 colly, copies of service records, orders, letters etc. of conductor Sanjay Dessai at Exh. 37 colly, copies of service records, orders, letters etc. of conductor Mahadev Dessai at Exh. 38 colly and copies of service records, orders, letters etc. of conductor Prakash L. Gaonkar at Exh. 39 colly. On the other hand, Party II examined Shri Vidhyadhar Harmalkar and produced on record a copy of approved Standing Orders at Exh. 43 colly and a copy of order dated 10-10-1985 at Exh. 44 and closed its case.

10. Heard arguments.

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

Issue No. 2A	...	In the Negative.
Issue No. 3	...	In the Negative.
Issue No. 4	...	As per final order.
Issue No. 5	...	As per final order.

REASONS

Issue No. 2A:

12. Shri K. V. Nadkarny for Party I has submitted that the punishment of dismissal from services as

awarded to Party I workman is disproportionate as well as discriminatory in nature as number of conductors even though their service records were very poor have been retained by letting off with minor punishment like fines and stoppage of increments, although they have been habitual offenders and have committed repeated misconducts during the service period, however, the Party I workman has been discriminated and punished with severe and harsh punishment of dismissal, even though the inspection carried out was faulty. He further submitted that the Party II Corporation has been very liberal and showed undue favouritism in the matter of punishment to one conductor by name Nitin Gude who continued to be employed, although he was issued 31 default notices but was let off without issuing charge sheets or ordering enquiry against him by the Senior Officers who were themselves found guilty of irregularities charged against them. He further submitted that there are some other conductors who have also been shown favouritism by the management in the similar manner who have been let off with minor punishment, even though they have been proved to be habitual offenders. Shri Nadkarny has further submitted that termination is illegal if it is based on discrimination or when the punishment is disproportionate and in support thereof, he relied upon the cases of (i) **Tata Engineering and Locomotive Co. Ltd. vs. Jitendra P.D. Singh and Another**, (2001) 10 SCC 530; (ii) **S. Ganapathy vs. Chairman Cum Managing Director**, (2017) 7 MLJ 390; and (iii) **Shri Ramdas Borkar vs. M/s. Goa Shipyard Ltd. and Another**, in W.P. No. 6/2004 dated 5-3-2013.

13. Per Contra, Adv. Shri Amit Palekar for Party II has submitted that the termination of the Party I workman is based on Certified Standing Orders of the Corporation. The misconduct of Party I is very grave and serious. The charges leveled against the Party I workman have been proved. Relying upon the case of **V. Ramana vs. A.P.S.R.T.C. & Ors**, in Appeal (Civil) No. 9904 of 2003 dated 05-09-2005, he submitted that the Apex Court has categorically held that it is the responsibility of the conductors to collect correct fare charges from the passengers and deposit the same with the Corporation. They act in fiduciary capacity and it would be a case of gross misconduct if they do not collect any fare or the correct amount of fare. A conductor holds a post of trust. A person guilty of breach of trust should be imposed punishment of removal from service. He also submitted that the Party I has committed a serious misconduct which called for major penalty. The

penalty imposed commensurate with the gravity of misconduct and therefore there is no scope for interference in the punishment as the breach of direction issued by the employer led to loss of revenue which is legitimately due to the Corporation.

14. The Party I has examined himself and produced on record the suspension order issued to Shri S. V. Naik, Dy. General Manager (Tech.) and Shri Pramod Gaonkar, Works Manager at Exh. 32, suspension order issued to Shri V. V. S. Kunkolekar, Dy. General Manager (Tech.) and Shri Pramod A. Gaonkar, Works Manager at Exh. 33, and Memorandum dated 2-2-1998 issued to Shri Pramod Gaonkar with annexure at Exh. 34 colly. It is however not explained the relevancy of the said documents to the present case nor it has been proved as to how the Party I workman was discriminated by the management. It is seen from the records that the Party I had filed an application for amendment which came to be incorporated in the claim statement on 20-3-2014 much after issue No. 1 and 2 were answered against the Party I workman. It is however not proved how the suspension orders and the memorandum issued to the management staff have anything to do with the punishment awarded to Party I workman.

15. The Party I has also produced on record copies of service records, orders, letters, etc. of conductor Shri Nitin Gude at Exh. 36 colly, conductor Shri Sanjay Desai at 37 colly, conductor Shri Mahadev Desai at Exh. 38 colly, and Shri Prakash L. Gaonkar at Exh. 39 colly., however none of the service records produced by Party I show that there is any discrimination vis-a-vis the Party I workman as far as the punishment is concerned as those are the individual cases which have been dealt with separately by Party II management. It is nowhere the case of Party I workman that he is the only conductor who have been treated differently or that he is innocent and is not involved in the alleged offence. The Party I Shri Chandrakant in the cross examination has admitted that there were more than 20 conductors who have been dismissed from service for similar default as that of his. The Party I cannot seek parity in the case of default which has been proved against him on the ground that there has not been any similar action against other workman nor he has shown that the action taken against him for dismissal of service is discriminatory or disproportionate. Even, if there is inaction or lenient action taken by the management against other co-workmen, it will not amount to discrimination on the part of Party II as it has not

been proved that his case is similar to that of Nitin Gude, Sanjay Desai, Mahadev Desai or Prakash Gaonkar or that it is pertaining to the same incident wherein he has been treated differently. The documents produced by him therefore do not support his act of retaining money of the Corporation by not issuing tickets.

16. It is well settled in the case of **V. Ramana**, supra that a person guilty of breach of trust should be imposed punishment of removal from service. The Apex Court has further observed that the Courts should not interfere with the administrator's decision unless it was illogical or suffers from procedural impropriety or was shocking to the conscience of the Court, in the sense that it was in defiance of logic or moral standards and would not go into the correctness of the choice made by the administrator open to him and the Court should not substitute its decision to that of the administrator. The scope of judicial review is limited to the deficiency in decision-making process and not the decision. To put differently unless the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority or the Appellate Authority shocks the conscience of the Court/Tribunal, there is no scope for interference. Similarly, in the case of **Dattatraya Mahadev Deshmukh vs. Maharashtra State Road Transport Corp. & anr., 2004 (3) Bom CR 343**, the Hon'ble Bombay High Court has held that ".....the conductor of a public Transport Corporation is entrusted with a vital function relating to the issuance of tickets and the collection of fares. He is obliged to comply with the administrative direction, which are issued by the Corporation to him scrupulously. A breach of the direction issued by the employer is liable to lead to a loss of revenue which is legitimately due and owing to the Corporation.

17. In the instant case, the preliminary issues No. 1 and 2 were answered in the affirmative and it was held that the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman, Shri Chandrakant Arondekar is fair and proper and that he was guilty of the charges leveled against him in the charge sheet dated 28-4-1987. There is no dispute that the Party I was issued a default notice dated 28-3-1987 stating that the Line checking staff checked the bus bearing No. GDX-171 plying on Hubli-Margao route on which he was the conductor and found that 10 passengers were travelling without tickets and the Party I conductor collected fare of Rs. 22/- from only six passengers but did not issue them tickets and remaining four did not pay any fare, although he was supposed to collect

Rs. 74/- from them and that the Party I has committed the said misconduct. Needless to mention, a conductor holds a post of trust and the person guilty of breach of trust should be imposed punishment of removal of service as held in the case of **V. Ramana**, supra. There is no discrimination in awarding punishment to Party I workman nor the citations relied above by Party I are applicable to the facts of the case.

18. The case of **Tata Locomotive and Engineering Ltd.** supra is clearly distinguishable as it was the case of drunkenness, fighting or riotous or disorderly or indecent behaviour involving as many as three workmen on almost identical charges in which one was punished with only one month suspension and the other was dismissed from service and the Apex Court has held that it would be the denial of justice to the appellants workman if he alone is singled out for punishment by way of dismissal of service, unlike in the present case where the Party I was involved in serious offence of embezzlement of the property of the Corporation. The reliance placed on the case of **S. Ganapathy**, supra is also not applicable as it turned on its own facts. Similarly, in the case of **Shri Ramdas Borkar**, supra the workers who were working in the rival union and involved in the same incident of assault were inflicted lenient punishment of warning, whereas the Petitioner was given the punishment of termination of service and it was held that the punishment was shockingly disproportionate to the misconduct attributed to the Petitioner, unlike in the present case. It is therefore, the submission of Shri Nadkarny that the punishment of dismissal from services as awarded to the party I workman is disproportionate as well as discriminatory in nature cannot be accepted having any merits. Hence, the above issue is answered in the negative.

Issues No. 3, 4, and 5:

19. Shri K. V. Nadkarny for Party I has also submitted that the Party II has terminated the services without considering the past records as required in terms of certified standing orders of the Corporation and is not only illegal but unjustified. He also submitted that while awarding punishment to the delinquent workman, the Disciplinary Authority has failed to consider clean and unblemished record of the workman, which will operate as a mitigating factor against the dismissal of the workman from service and in support thereof, he relied upon the case of **Indian Seamless Metal Tubes Limited (Tubes Works), Ahmednagar vs. Kailash Nampelli Ushakoyal &**

Anr., 2014 III CLR 47. He therefore submitted that the order of dismissal be set aside and the relief claimed by the Party I workman be granted.

20. Admittedly, the Party I workman worked for about four years before his termination of services. There cannot be any dispute that the employer is obliged to consider his past records since a clean and unblemished record operates as a mitigating factor to reduce seriousness and gravity of misconduct proved against the workman. Clause 29 (III) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Corporation at Exh. 43 colly stipulates that in awarding punishment under the standing orders, the Manager shall take into account the gravity of misconduct, previous records if any, of the workman and any other extenuating or aggravating circumstances that may exist. In the case of **Indian Seamless Metal Tubes Limited (Tubes Works), Ahmednagar**, supra the workman refused to perform the work, sat idle for the entire shift and was found speaking in an arrogant manner with the superior. The Hon'ble High Court observed that the workman had put in eight years of service and had not indulged in any act of misconduct previously and his past service record was clean and unblemished, which the Hon'ble High Court held is a mitigating factor which would result in reducing the seriousness and gravity of misconduct proved against him, unlike in the present case where the offence was serious in nature and it would not operate as an mitigating factor to reduce the gravity of the misconduct proved against him, although nothing has been brought on record that the past records of the Party I workman was clean and unblemished.

21. The Party I workman has committed a serious offence as it was responsibility of the conductor to collect the correct fare from the passengers and deposit the same with the Corporation and as such the Corporation cannot be burdened to pay back wages to the Party I workman. It is therefore not a fit case to pay any back wages to the Party I workman as his action or inaction resulted in financial loss to the Corporation. The order of dismissal therefore cannot be set aside. Be that as it may, it is an admitted fact that the Party I workman has superannuated in July, 2018. Therefore, having regard to the judgment passed by the Apex Court in the case of **Karnataka State Road Transport Corporation vs. B. S. Hullikatti, 2001 (1) SCR 487** which is a similar case like that of present one, where retiral benefits were awarded, so also considering that the above case is pending for last 20 years and that the Disciplinary authority had not considered the previous records

of the workman, if any, it would be proper and in the interest of justice that the Party II shall pay the retiral benefits to the Party I workman or a lumpsum amount of Rs. 60,000/- (Rupees sixty thousand only), whichever is more. Hence the above issues are answered accordingly.

22. In the result, I pass the following:

ORDER

- (i) The present reference stands partly allowed.
- (ii) The Party II is directed to pay the retiral benefits to the Party I workman, Shri Chandrakant Arondekar or a lumpsum amount of Rs. 60,000/- (Rupees sixty thousand only) whichever is more, within 60 days of the publication of the Award, failing which the Party II shall pay an interest @ 9% per annum.
- (iii) Inform the Government accordingly.

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

Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

Notification

No. 12/29/2013/LD(Estt.)/727

The following Notification No. P0703/2019 dated 25-02-2019 which has been issued by the Registrar (Admn.), High Court of Bombay at Goa, Panaji, is hereby published for general information of the public.

Amir Parab, Under Secretary (Establishment).

Porvorim, 5th April, 2019.

Notification of The High Court of
Judicature at Bombay

No. P. 0703/2019— In exercise of the powers conferred under Section 5(1) and (2) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 read with Rule 15 of the Bombay High Court, Right to Information (Revised) Rules, 2009 and in partial modification of the Notification dated 1 February, 2016, the Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to designate Shri K. A. Bagi, Registrar (Judicial), High Court of Bombay at

Goa, Panaji as First Appellate Authority in place of Shri P. M. Shinde, the then First Appellate Authority, High Court of Bombay at Goa, Panaji.

High Court of Bombay Surendra P. Tavade,
at Goa, Panaji Registrar General.

Date: February, 2019.

Department of Personnel

Order

No. 6/3/2002-PER(Vol.I)/980

Read: Order No. 6/3/2002-PER(Vol.I) dated 26-02-2019.

Approval of the Competent Authority is accorded to draw the salary of below mentioned officers promoted on ad hoc basis to Senior Scale of Goa Civil Service vide Order read in preamble, from the date of their joining, acceptance of the order of promotion in terms of F. R. 17:

Sr. No.	Name of the officer	Salary drawn against the post of
1	2	3
1.	Smt. Neetal P. Amonkar	Director, DSLR.
2.	Shri Arvind B. Khutkar	Director of Public Grievances.
3.	Shri Pipi T. Murgaonkar	Director of Social Welfare.
4.	Shri Sagun R. Velip	Leave & Training Reserve.
5.	Ms. Sushma D. Kamat	Director of NRI Affairs.
6.	Ms. Maria Seomara D'Souza	Joint Secretary (ARD).
7.	Shri Gourish J. Shankhwalkar	Additional Director of Vigilance-II.
8.	Shri Mahadev J. Araundekar	Superintendent of Central Jail, Colvale.
9.	Shri Harish N. Adconkar	Leave & Training Reserve.
10.	Smt. Sarita Sadashiv Marathe alias Gadgil	Additional Commissioner of Commercial Taxes-I.
11.	Smt. Sangeeta S. Rawool alias Smt. Sangeeta Porob	Director (Admn.), Higher Education.

This issues with the concurrence of Finance (R&C) Department vide their U.O. No. 5082 dated 26-03-2019.

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

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim, 27th March, 2019.

—————
Order

No. 6/9/2009-PER/Part-IV/1059

Shri Narayan Gad, Director (Admn.), Directorate of Education shall hold the charge of the post of Director, Directorate of Information & Publicity in addition to his duties in public interest, with immediate effect.

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

Harish N. Adconkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim, 4th April, 2019.

—————◆◆◆—————
Department of Public Health

—
Certificate

No. 44/25/2017-I/PHD/875

Read: Government Order No. 44/25/2017-I/PHD/560 dated 21-2-2019.

Certified that the character and antecedents of Dr. Sidhant Shripad Shet, Medical Officer (Group 'A' Gazetted) under Directorate of Health Services has been verified by the District Magistrate, South Goa, Margao vide letter No. 36/01/2019/MAG/239/3194

dated 08-3-2019 and it is revealed that there is nothing adverse reported against him.

Maria Seomara Desouza, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 28th March, 2019.

—————◆◆◆—————
Department of Revenue

—
Addendum

No. 1/1/17/2018-RD/769

Read: Notification No. 1/1/17/2018-RD/1316 dated 20-07-2018.

Imagine Panaji Smart City Development Ltd. (IPSCDL) is entrusted with the work of implementation of "Smart City" projects in Panaji. The Government has decided that all the developmental works undertaken by the IPSCDL in which co-ordination between various Government Departments is required keeping in the mind public safety and convenience, has to be referred to the District Level Road Digging Co-ordination Committee. The District Level Road Digging Co-ordination Committee is required to decide on IPSCDL proposals in not more than 7 days.

If the proposals of IPSCDL are not disposed by the District Level Road Digging Co-ordination Committee within the period of 7 days, the sanction of District Level Road Digging Co-ordination Committee shall be deemed to have been granted.

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

Sudin A. Natu, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 3rd April, 2019.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

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

PRICE—Rs. 8.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—12/160-4/2019.