

Panaji, 9th January, 2025 (Pausa 19, 1946)

SERIES II No. 41

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There is one Extraordinary issue to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 40 dated 02-01-2025 namely, Extraordinary dated 02-01-2025 from pages 827 to 828 regarding Notification from Goa Legislature Secretariat.

101—Veterinary Services & Animal Health;
06—Veterinary Dispensaries & Hospitals (Non-Plan);
01—Salaries.”

The above Officer shall be on probation for a period of 2 years from the date of joining the post.

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

Dr. Nitin S. Naik, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (AH).

Panaji, 23rd December, 2024.

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Animal Husbandry
Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services

Order

No. 2/14/93-AH(Part V)/2024-25/6262

Read: No. 2/14/93-AH(Part V)/2024-25/3927 dated 23-09-2024.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/3(1)/2023/155 dated 31-07-2024, the Government of Goa is pleased to appoint Dr. Shiddesh Shivanand Pednekar to the post of “Veterinary Officer”, Group ‘B’ Gazetted under OBC Category in the Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services, Panaji, Goa on regular basis in the pay scale of PB-2: Rs. 9300-34800 with Grade pay of Rs. 4600/- plus 20% NPA (Level-7 of the 7th Pay Commission) and other allowances as applicable.

His appointment will take effect from the date of his joining the post. His character and antecedents have been verified by the District Magistrate North Goa and he has been declared medically fit by the Medical Board, Goa Medical College, Bambolim. He shall join at Veterinary Dispensary, Valpoi.

He shall draw his salary under Budget Head Demand No. 65 “2403—Animal Husbandry; 00—;

Order

No. 2/14/93-AH(Part V)/2024-25/6263

Read: No. 2/14/93-AH(Part V)/2024-25/3928 dated 23-09-2024.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/3(1)/2023/155 dated 31-07-2024, the Government of Goa is pleased to appoint Dr. Sourabh Prashant Naik to the post of “Veterinary Officer”, Group ‘B’ Gazetted under OBC Category in the Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services, Panaji, Goa on regular basis in the pay scale of PB-2: Rs. 9300-34800 with Grade pay of Rs. 4600/- plus 20% NPA (Level-7 of the 7th Pay Commission) and other allowances as applicable.

His appointment will take effect from the date of his joining the post. His character and antecedents have been verified by the District Magistrate South Goa and he has been declared medically fit by the Medical Board, Goa Medical College, Bambolim. He shall join at Veterinary Dispensary, Netravali.

He shall draw his salary under Budget Head Demand No. 65 “2403—Animal Health; 00—; 102—Cattle & Buffalo Development; 05—KVS; 01—Salaries.”

The above Officer shall be on probation for a period of 2 years from the date of joining the post.

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

Dr. Nitin S. Naik, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (AH).

Panaji, 23rd December, 2024.



Department of Captain of Ports

Notification

No. MS/F-77/CS/24-25/3320

The Government of Goa is pleased to reconstitute the "Coastal Shipping Promotion Cell" for the State of Goa with immediate effect.

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Secretary (Ports), Government of Goa | — Chairperson. |
| 2. Captain of Ports, Captain of Ports Department, Government of Goa | — Member. |
| 3. Dy. Conservator, Mormugao Port Authority | — Member. |
| 4. Director, Department of Tourism, Government of Goa | — Member. |
| 5. Representative from Confederation of Indian Industry, Goa | — Member. |
| 6. Representative from Konkan Maritime Cluster, Goa | — Member. |
| 7. Representative from Goa Mineral Owners and Exp. Asst. | — Member. |
| 8. Representative from Mormugao Ship Agents Association | — Member. |
| 9. Representative from Goa Barge Owners Association | — Member. |
| 10. Representative from Goa Chamber of Commerce & Industries | — Member. |

This is issued in supersession of the notification No. MS/F-77/CS/2024-25 vide Series II No. 17 dated 25th July, 2024.

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

Octavio A. Rodrigues, ex officio Joint Secretary (Captain of Ports).

Panaji, 18th November, 2024.



Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs

Order

No. DCS/EST/Asst. Director/2024-25/2624

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/1/5/7(1)/2022/192 dated 06-09-2024, the Government is pleased to appoint and post the following Officers to the post of Assistant Director, Civil Supplies in the Department of Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs, (Group "B" Gazetted on temporary basis in the Level-7 of Pay Matrix of 7th CPC [Pre-revised: Pay Band-7 Rs. 9300-34800+Grade Pay of Rs. 4600/-] of Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2016, with immediate effect and as per the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum.

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Category	Place of posting
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri Vijaykumar Hanumantrai Jamadar	General Category	Civil Supplies Office, Salcete, Taluka, Margao, Goa thereby relieving Shri Bhanu Naneshwar Goltekar of additional charge.

1	2	3	4
2.	Shri Gaurav Gopal Naik	General Category	Civil Supplies Office, Ponda Taluka, Ponda, Goa with additional charge in Civil Supplies Office, Dharbandora, Taluka, Dharbandora, Goa, thereby relieving Shri Rajesh Ankush Arlekar, since transferred to ADCS, Sattari.
3.	Shri Nikil Narayan Naik	General Category	Assistant Director (HQ-II), thereby relieving Smt. Deepa Rajaram Fulari, since transferred to ADCS, Bardez.
4.	Shri Ketan Kashinath Phal Dessai	General Category	Assistant Director (HQ-V), Consumer Affairs Section, thereby relieving Shri Arun Kumar Ravindran Pillai of additional charge.
5.	Shri Raunak Madhav Kamat	General Category	Assistant Director (HQ-IV), Supply Section, thereby relieving Smt. Deepa Rajaram Fulari, since transferred to ADCS, Bardez.
6.	Shri Maheshkumar Anand Naik	OBC Category	Assistant Director (HQ-I), thereby relieving Smt. Shristhi Santosh Vaingankar, since transferred to ADCS, Tiswadi.
7.	Kum. Pooja Shivanand Naik Gaonkar	PwD Category	Civil Supplies Office, Quepem Taluka, Quepem, Goa, thereby relieving Shri Tulshidas Vasant Dabholkar of additional charge.

The above Officers shall be on probation for a period of two years.

The above Officers have been declared medically fit by the Medical Board.

The character and antecedents has been verified from the Office of the District Magistrate, North Goa, Panaji, Goa/South Goa District, Margao, Goa and there are no adverse remarks against them.

The expenditure shall be debited to Head of Accounts under Demand No. 70.

“3456—Civil Supplies;

00—;

001—Direction and Administration;

01—Civil Supplies Department;

01—Salaries”.

This issued with the approval of the Government vide U. O. 2362 dated 06-12-2024.

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

Jayant G. Tari, Director (Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs) & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Panaji, 17th December, 2024.

Department of Environment & Climate Change

—
Notification

No. 5/20/87/STE/P-IV/1827

- Read: 1. No. 5/20/87/STE/P-IV/741 dated 15-12-2017 published in Gazette, Series II No. 38 dated 21-12-2017.
2. No. 5/20/87/STE/P-IV/229 dated 08-07-2019 published in Gazette, Series II No. 15 dated 11-07-2019.
3. No. 5/20/87/STE/P-IV/1098 dated 29-12-2020 published in Gazette, Series II No. 40 dated 31-12-2020.
4. No. 5/20/87/STE/P-IV/01 dated 01-04-2021 published in Gazette, Series II No. 2 dated 8-04-2021.
5. No. 31-9-2017/STE-DIR/Part-I/1060 dated 05-01-2022, published in Official Gazette, GOG, Series II No. 41 dated 06th January, 2022.

In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 4 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (Central Act 6 of 1974) read with sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Act and in order to maintain continuity in the smooth functioning of the Goa State Pollution Control Board (GSPCB), the term of the Board is extended for a period of 3 months w.e.f. 06-01-2025 or upto the date of notification of the re-constitution of the Goa State Pollution Control Board, whichever is earlier.

This is issued vide approval of the Government under U.O. 7510/F dated 24-12-2024.

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

Johnson B. Fernandes, Director (Environment & CC) & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Panaji, 3rd January, 2025.

—
Corrigendum

No. 7/17/92/STE/Part/1796

Read: Notification No. 7/17/92/STE/Part/1715 dated 20-12-2024 published in Official Gazette, Series II No. 39 dated 26th December, 2024.

In the Notification read above, in the existing table listed, the following shall be substituted as below:—

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. The existing "Sr. No. (9)", shall be substituted as: | Expert Member. |
| "9. Shri Nelson Figueiredo, Aldona, Bardez-Goa | |
| 2. "Sr. No. (12) shall be substituted as: | Expert Member. |
| "(12) Dr. Manoj Borkar, Professor, Carmel College | |
| 3. "Sr. No. (13) shall be substituted as: | Expert Member. |
| "(13) Dr. Parveen Kumar, Director, Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) | |
| 4. "Sr. No. (14) shall be substituted as: | Expert Member. |
| "(14) Ms. Akshata Pracy Fernandes, Assistant Professor, Ganpat Parsekar College of Education | |

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

Johnson B. Fernandes, Director (Environment & CC).
Panaji, 1st January, 2025.

Department of Home
(Foreigners & Citizenship Division)—
Order

No. 11/2/2019-HD(F&CD)/Enemy Property/Part/1439
Read: Order No. 11/2/2019-HD(F&CD)/Enemy Property/
/337 dated 22-11-2019.

The Government of Goa is pleased to designate Secretary (Revenue) as the Nodal Officer for co-ordination, supervision and monitoring the implementation of the Enemy Property Act, 1968, as amended by the Enemy Property (Amendment and Validation) Act, 2017 (3 of 2017) for the State of Goa.

This order supersedes the order read in the preamble above.

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

Tushar Halarnkar, Joint Secretary (Home).
Porvorim, 24th December, 2024.

Notification

No. 6/2/2011-HD(F&CD)/Haj/02

Read: Notification No. 6/2/2011-HD(F&CD)/HAJ/91 dated 22-02-2023.

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 25 of the Haj Committee Act, 2002 (Central Act No. 35 of 2002), the Government of Goa hereby removes the following members of the Goa State Haj Committee from the said committee constituted vide Government Notification No. 6/2/2011-HD(F&CD)/HAJ/91 dated 22-02-2023, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 48 dated 02-03-2023, namely:-

Mr. Mulla Hussain Muzawar.

Mr. Maula Ali Shaikh.

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

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

Manthan Manoj Naik, Under Secretary (Home-II).
Porvorim, 01st January, 2025.

Home—General Division

Order

No. 19/07/2023-HD(G)/Misc. Appln. No.393 of 2023/21

In pursuance of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Order dated 07-11-2024 in case of Miscellaneous Application No. 393 of 2023 in Special Leave Petition(Crl) No(S) 12831 of 2022 filed by Rajendra Singh V/s. the State of Uttar Pradesh & Others, the Government of Goa hereby constitutes a Committee consisting of following, namely:-

- | | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| 1. Chief Secretary (Home Secretary) | — | Chairman. |
| 2. Director General of Police | — | Member. |
| 3. Law Secretary | — | Member. |
| 4. Shri Gauresh V. Mapari, Assistant Director, Goa Forensic Science Laboratory | — | Member. |

The Committee shall submit an action plan on the task to be undertaken as stated in the said Order with time schedule.

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

Manthan Manoj Naik, Under Secretary (Home-II).
Porvorim, 1st January, 2025.

Inspectorate of Factories and Boilers**Order**

No. VI/FAC-3/(GOA/170)Part-I/2024-IFB/3534

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 65 of the Factories Act, 1948 (Central Act No. 63 of 1948), as in force in the State of Goa (hereinafter called the "said Act") I, Shri Anant S. Pangam, the Chief Inspector, hereby exempt all of the adult workers working in the Production, Engineering and Supply Chain Department of the factory, namely, M/s. Goa Carbon Limited, Survey No. 68, Sao Jose de Areal, Margao, Salcete, South Goa, except the person who are holding positions of supervision or management and or employed in a confidential position within the meaning of sub-section (1) of Section 64 of the said Act, from the provisions of Sections 51, 54 and 56 of the said Act, for a period of three years with effect from the date of publication of this order in the Official Gazette.

Anant S. Pangam, Chief Inspector of Factories and Boilers.

Panaji, 01st January, 2025.

Department of Labour**Order**

No. 28/55/2024-LAB/25

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Prasanta Kumar Behera, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial

Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Prasanta Kumar Behera, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

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

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/49/2024-LAB/26

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Riyaj Sathavilkar, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

(1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Riyaj Sathavilkar with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

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

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 26th December, 2024.

Order

No. 28/47/2024-LAB/27

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna

Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Shri Mahesh M. Naik, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

(1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Shri Mahesh M. Naik with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

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

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/46/2024-LAB/28

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Shri Rohan Nagekar, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

(1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private

Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Shri Rohan Nagekar, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

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

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/52/2024-LAB/6

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Shamshuddin Lanjekar, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

(1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Shamshuddin Lanjekar, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

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

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/56/2024-LAB/7

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine

Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Sameer A. Jadhav, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

(1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Sameer A. Jadhav with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

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

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 26th December, 2024.

Notification

No. 28/02/2024-LAB/663

The following Award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa, on 19-09-2024 in Case No. LC-II/Appln/07/2018 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

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

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 24th October, 2024.

THE LABOUR COURT-II
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

**(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble
Presiding Officer)**

Case No. LC-II/Appln/07/2018

Shri Audumber G. Naik,
H. No. 1753, Near the Church,
Penha de Fraçna, Virlossa,
Britona, Bardez-Goa (403 101) Workman/Party I.

V/s

M/s. G.V.K., EMRI Goa 108 Operations,
1st Floor, Block No. 5,
Old Library Block, Goa Medical College,
Bambolim-Goa (403402) ... Employer/Party II.

Workman/Party I represented by Ld. Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat.

Employer/Party II represented by Ld. Adv. Shri S. Gaonkar.

Panaji, dated: 19-09-2024.

AWARD

1. By this Award, I shall dispose off the present application dated 02-05-2018 filed by the Party I/Workman u/s 2A (2) of the ID Act, 1947.

2. It is the case of the Workman/Party I (for short the 'Applicant'), in brief as per his statement of claim filed in the present proceedings on 02-05-2018, that he was employed as 'the Pharmacist' with the Employer/Party II (for short 'Employer') w.e.f. 01-05-2013, at its establishment at Goa Medical College, Hospital, Bambolim, Goa, vide letter dated 29-04-2013. He stated that his services were confirmed w.e.f. 01-05-2014 vide letter of confirmation dated 13-06-2014. He stated that the Opponent is a public private partnership establishment with its office at Goa Medical College, Bambolim-Goa. He stated that since the time of his appointment as a Pharmacist he was working at GMC, Bambolim. He stated that on 02-06-2017, he was issued a show cause notice alleging failure to complete the work on time which has hampered the operations. He filed reply dated 03-06-2017 to the said show cause notice dated 02-06-2017. He gave the facts and denied allegations made by the Opponent. He stated that thereafter, the Opponent gave a notice of enquiry on 13-06-2017 at 10.00 a.m. and appointed Shivaji Patnaik U. as an Enquiry Officer. He stated that vide his letter dated 13-06-2017, he requested the Ld. Enquiry Officer to direct the Opponent to furnish him the documents mentioned therein before proceedings with inquiry. He stated that the Opponent did not furnish him the documents asked for and also did not proceed with the inquiry on the alleged act misconduct.

3. He stated that the Opponent thereafter adopted an easy mode to get rid of him. He stated that on 25-07-2017, he reported for work as usual at

9.30 hours and that at about 12.30 hours, he was called by Mr. Hemant Naik, HR Executive of the Opponent in his cabin where Dr. Geeta Deshmukh, Incharge Operations and Mr. Gurupradhan Shetty were also present. He stated that Mr. Hemant Naik instructed him to resign from the services w.e.f. 26-07-2017. He stated that he refused to submit his resignation and went for his work. He stated that on the same date at about 16.30 hours Hemant Naik again called him and informed him that if he did not submit resignation before leaving, he will not be allowed to report for work from 26-07-2017. He stated that he did not submit his resignation and after close of his working hours, he left the office for his home. He stated that on 26-07-2017 he went to report for work at about 9.30 hours but he was not allowed to enter the premises by the Security on duty. He stated that when he asked the Security on duty the reasons for not allowing him to report work, the said Security told him that as per the instructions of the Executive he is not allowed to report for work. He stated that he waited for about half an hour and then came back to his home. He stated that thereafter he sent a letter dated 26-07-2017 to the Opponent narrating the incident of refusal to allow him to report for work and informing the Opponent that their action of refusing employment to him is illegal termination of his service w.e.f. 26-07-2017.

4. He stated that he also informed the Opponent that such an act on their part also amounts to retrenchment of his services without following the mandatory provisions of Section 25F and 25G of the I.D. Act, 1947. He stated that he also called upon the Opponent to allow him to report for work immediately on receipt of the said demand. He stated that though the Opponent received the said letter sent by Registered A.D. post did not act on the same and after waiting for a reasonable period, he raised a dispute vide letter dated 14-08-2017, before the Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Government of Goa, Panaji, Goa for intervention. He stated that the Asst. Labour Commissioner and Conciliation Officer at Panaji, took up the matter and called the parties for discussion on 06-12-2017. He stated that on 23-01-2018 the Opponent neither attended the proceedings nor filed its reply and the proceedings were adjourned to 01-02-2018. He stated that on 01-03-2018, the parties attended the proceedings and the representatives of the Opponent stated that the Opponent has not terminated his services and that and he can join the services with immediate effect. He stated that he agreed to report for work immediately and accordingly reported for work w.e.f. 03-03-2018 with a letter

dated 03-03-2018 to that effect. He stated that the matter of refusal of employment w.e.f. 26-07-2017 and the entitlement of back wages was to be decided by the appropriate Forum. He stated that the dispute raised by him was fixed for discussions/ conciliation for sometimes.

5. He stated that on 01-03-2018, the Opponent offered him to report for work and accordingly he reported for work w.e.f. 03-03-2018. He stated that the dispute of illegal refusal of employment and payment of back wages for the period of forced unemployment continued as the Opponent did not settle the said issues before the Conciliation Officer. He stated that u/s 12(2) of the I. D. Act, 1947, the Conciliation Officer is duty bound to investigate the dispute without delay. He stated that in case where no settlement is possible the Conciliation Officer has to close the investigation as soon as possible and send a report to the Government setting forth the steps taken by him under sub-section 6 of Section 12 within 14 days of the commencement of proceedings or within such shorter period. He stated that as the Opponent did not agree to reinstate him in service with full back wages, continuity in service and consequential benefits w.e.f. 26-07-2017, it was mandatory on the part of the ALC and Conciliation Officer to record failure of discussions and report the same to the appropriate Government within 14 days of such failure. He stated that even though the Opponent had reinstated him in service, the dispute of refusal of employment w.e.f. 26-07-2017 still subsists and has to be adjudicated by the appropriate Forum. He stated that as the ALC and Conciliation Officer, Panaji did not record the failure of conciliation in the dispute of refusal of employment even after about 8 months, great prejudice is caused to him and as sufficient time has gone after his termination, he approaches this Hon'ble Court directly u/s 2A(2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute as to whether the action of the Opponent in refusing employment to him w.e.f. 26-07-2017 is legal and justified and whether he entitled for full back wages up to the date of reinstatement i.e. 03-03-2018. He submitted that the action of the Opponent in refusing him employment w.e.f. 26-07-2017 is non-est, illegal, unjust and malafide. He stated that he is unemployed from the date of his refusal of employment til 02-03-2018. He stated that on 03-03-2018 he was reinstated in service without back wages and continuity in his service. The Workman therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to make an Award holding that the action of the Opponent in terminating his services is non-est, illegal, malafide and unjust and that he continues to be in service with full back wages, other benefits, continuity in services and consequential benefits.

6. The Opponent resisted statement of claim of the Workman by filing reply dated 30-07-2018. The Opponent stated that a registered society at Hyderabad under the Andhra Pradesh Societies Registration Act, 2001 bearing registration No. 187/ /2005 dated 07-02-2005. The Opponent stated that it is a 'not-for-profit' organization having its Head Office at Secunderabad, Telangana. The Opponent stated that it had initially entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated 14-06-2008 with the Government of Goa to provide comprehensive emergency response services to the State of Goa. The opponent stated that it has been appointed as a State Level Nodal Agency to operationalize the emergency response services. The Opponent stated that subsequently supplementary MOU's and additional agreements have been entered into between themselves and the Government of Goa under which these services are being provided. The Opponent stated that it is not charging the State Government any fee or taking any money for providing the service under the said MOUs. The Opponent stated that the operational costs of providing the service including the salaries of employees engaged by them to provide the services under the MOU are being paid by the State of Goa. The Opponent stated that the State of Goa has direct control over every aspect of the said service provided by them. The Opponent stated that the ambulances and all equipment used by them are owned by the Government of Goa. The Opponent stated that to provide these services under the said MOU, they engages the services of drivers, technicians etc. and that these workers are engaged specifically to provide the services under the said MOU and that it is not their 'employer' under the I.D. Act, 1947. The Opponent stated that the services provided by them under the said MOU's is not an 'industry' under the I.D. Act, 1947. The Opponent stated that assuming (without admitting) that this service is an industry then it is an industry carried on by and under the authority of the State Government. The Opponent stated that thus for the purposes of the I.D. Act, 1947, the State Government is the Employer and not them. The Opponent stated that it is not being the Employer under the I.D. Act, 1947, and therefore has no obligation under the said Act. The Opponent stated that it is not the Employer as envisaged u/s. 2 (g) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Opponent stated that the present reference as made by the State Govt. is not maintainable on facts as well as in law. The Opponent stated that it is engage in providing

emergency service in the nature of medical attendants/treatment in emergent situation. The Opponent stated that it operates about 64 ambulances throughout the State of Goa and that these ambulances are equipped with medicines and medical staff to provide immediate treatment and/or medical attendance to the patients till the time the patient is brought to the Goa Medical College or the closest medical facility/hospital. The opponent stated that every Workman associated with them therefore plays a vital role in this process of rendering emergency medical services to the public at large in the State of Goa. The Opponent stated that the slightest negligence's and/or failure on the part of a Workman could expose the patients to the risk of their life and well-being.

7. The Opponent stated that the Workman engaged in the designation of a pharmacists is no exception to the said fact in as much as providing of adequate medicines to each of the ambulance is dependent upon efficient and prompt discharge of his duties by a pharmacist. The Opponent admitted that the Applicant is employed as a pharmacist which demands ut-most care, attention and devotion towards the duty. The Opponent stated that the performance of the Applicant till June, 2014 was normal and that upon being confirmed in service, he started displaying his true colours. The Opponent stated that the Applicant would regularly fail to perform his duty as a result of which the work of the establishment would get hampered in as much as the efficiency of the establishment suffered. The Opponent stated that the Applicant was warned orally every time when he displayed negligence in the performance of his duty. The Opponent stated that however he failed to show any improvement. The Opponent stated that in the course of routine checking, it was found that the Applicant had failed to update the stock position. The Opponent stated that updating the stock position is also one of the important duty to be performed by a pharmacist. The Opponent stated that it is only when the stock of medicine is updated, the Applicant can ensure that the medicines are kept in stock and are always available promptly and regularly so that the patients are not exposed to risk on account of non-availability of the medicines in stock. The Opponent stated that the Applicant failed to perform the said function which could expose the patients to a serious risk and hence the failure on the part of the Applicant in discharging the said duty was a serious misconduct, which the Applicant could not ignore. The Opponent stated that they therefore issued a show cause notice dated 02-06-2017 to the Applicant

whereby his attention was invited to the acts of misconduct on his part and was called upon to show cause as to why an action should not be taken against him. The Opponent stated that the Applicant submitted his reply dated 03-06-2017. The Opponent stated that in his reply the Applicant defended himself by stating that the failure to discharge the obligations in time was on account of an accident that he had suffered which used to cause pain in his hands and therefore he could not do the computer feeding. The Opponent stated that the Applicant also attributed the pendency of work stating that he was busy in other work which was more important. The Opponent stated that being not satisfied with the reply that was submitted by the Applicant they decided to hold an enquiry. The Opponent stated that they appointed Mr. Shivaji Patnaik as the Enquiry Officer. The Opponent stated that all of a sudden on and from 26-07-2017 the Applicant stopped reporting for duty without any intimation and/or prior approval. The Opponent stated that having done so, the Applicant approached the office of the Labour Commissioner with a false complaint to the effect that he has been stopped for reporting for duty on and from 26-07-2017 along with other allegations of similar nature against its officers.

8. The Opponent stated that the Applicant was never instructed by any of its officer including Mr. Hemant Naik to submit his resignation nor he was told that he would not be permitted to report for duty in the event he does not resign. The Opponent stated that at no point of time the Applicant stopped from reporting for duty at any time by any of its officers or by their security. The Opponent stated that the Applicant abandoned the employment on and from 26-07-2017 willfully, deliberately and thereafter caused to file a false complaint before the office of the Labour Commissioner on 14-08-2017. The Opponent stated that in the course of hearing before the authority, they informed the authority that they have not committed any such act so as to restrict/prohibit the Applicant from reporting for duty, but it is the Applicant who has abandoned the employment. The Opponent stated that they also informed the authority that the Applicant can report for duty immediately. The Opponent stated that considering the fact that the Applicant was never dismissed from service the continuity of his employment in their records was never effected at any point of time. The opponent stated that subsequently the Opponent reported for duty on 03-03-2018. The Opponent stated that on 06-03-2018 he submitted a letter to say that he is joining the duty w.e.f. 03-03-2018 and that the

matter of payment of back wages will continue before the appropriate forum. The Opponent stated that after having reported for duty on 03-03-2018, the Applicant attended the duty till 05-04-2018 for a period of 34 days. The Opponent stated that on 06-04-2018 the Applicant did not report for duty. The Opponent stated that on 11-04-2018 they were in receipt of an application dated 09-04-2018 seeking "sick leave" for a period of 30 days. The Opponent stated that they called upon the Applicant to submit medical fitness in support of his application. The Opponent stated that the Applicant submitted medical certificate dated 09-04-2018 vide his letter dated 14-04-2018. The Opponent stated that vide letter dated 19-04-2018, they informed the Applicant that his application for leave has been granted. The Opponent stated that the leave applied by the Applicant vide his application dated 09-04-2018 expired on 05-05-2018, leave period being 06-04-2018 to 05-05-2018. The Opponent stated that the certificate issued by the doctor was to the effect that the Applicant is suffering from "periarthritis (Lt. Shoulder)" and that rest of atleast two weeks is necessary to restore his health completely. The Opponent stated that on 23-04-2018, the Applicant submitted another certificate date 23-04-2018 vide his application date 23-04-2018 whereby the very same doctor certified that further rest of two weeks is essential w.e.f. 25-04-2018 to restore his health completely. The Opponent stated that on 07-05-2018, the Applicant requested for extension of leave by further 30 days. The Opponent stated that on 22-05-2018 they called upon the Applicant to submit himself for medical check up to the doctor named by them on 28-05-2018. The Opponent stated that the applicant reported for medical checkup, however he was not checked on account of mis-communication with the office of the doctor and the Applicant with regard to the payment of clinical fees. The opponent stated that the Applicant submitted the endorsement made in that regard by the office of the doctor vide his letter dated 29-05-2018. The opponent stated that the vide letter dated 31-05-2018 they again advised the applicant to report to their office to facilitated medical check-up on 01-06-2018. The Opponent stated that the Applicant though came late refused to wait till the arrival of the doctor and went back without submitting himself for medical check-up. The Opponent stated that they therefore once again vide their letter dated 02-06-2018 called upon the Applicant to remain present for medical check-up on 04-06-2018. The Opponent stated that however the Applicant refused to do so and that he was again required to attend the medical check-up

on 08-06-2018 vide a letter dated 05-06-2018. The Opponent stated that vide letter dated 04-06-2018 addressed by the Applicant to them, the delivery of which was received by post on 07-06-2018 the Applicant communicated to them that he will not attend the medical check-up citing flimsy reasons. The Opponent stated that vide application dated 07-06-2018 addressed by the Applicant which was delivered to them by post on 12-06-2018, the Applicant again requested for extension of leave for a period of thirty days. The Opponent stated that vide letter dated 14-06-2018, they communicated to the Applicant that his application dated 07-06-2018 stands rejected. The Opponent stated that the said communication was dispatched on the address registered by the Applicant with them, by registered A.D. post under receipt No. RM547539936 dated 14-06-2018. The Opponent stated that the same has been returned by the postal authority with an endorsement "intimated on 15-06-2018" "House closed, returned to sender".

9. The Opponent stated that the Applicant submitted another letter dated 07-07-2018 requesting for extension of leave for a period of thirty days. The Opponent stated that the said letter was addressed by the Applicant inspite of the fact that his application dated 07-06-2018 for extension of leave was rejected, consequently his absence on duty continued to be unauthorized. The Opponent stated that vide letter dated 11-07-2018 they rejected the application dated 07-07-2018 of the Applicant being without merits and the same is communicated to the Applicant vide registered A.D. post receipt No. RM511810365 dated 11-07-2018. The Opponent stated that the same is dispatched on the address registered by the Applicant with them. The opponent stated that vide letter dated 07-07-2018 the Applicant requested for thirty days leave once again on grounds of sickness. The opponent stated that they decided to give one more opportunity to the Applicant to appear for medical examination. The Opponent stated that they therefore vide letter dated 23-07-2018 requested the North District Hospital, Mapusa to examine and verify the medical condition of the Applicant. The Opponent stated that in furtherance of their said request the North District Hospital, Mapusa vide their letter dated 27-07-2018 under Ref. No. AH/ADM/ /2018-19/1636, communicated to the Applicant and them that the schedule date for the medical examination of Applicant has been fix on 01-08-2018 at 11.00 a.m. at the North District Hospital, Mapusa. The Opponent stated that they also communicated the Applicant about the said

schedule vide their letter dated 30-07-2018 by registered A.D. post. The Opponent stated that the Applicant however failed to report to the hospital on the given date and time as conveyed to them by the Asilo, North District Hospital, Mapusa vide letter dated 01-08-2018. The Opponent stated that its representative had even registered the name of the Applicant in the North District Hospital, Mapusa on 01-08-2018 for clinical check-up and got the registration document done. The Opponent stated that on 07-08-2018 they received an application for grant of further leave of thirty days on ground of sickness. The Opponent stated that on 27-08-2018 the Applicant submitted his resignation effective from 25-09-2018. The Opponent stated that on 08-09-2018 they accepted the resignation and conveyed the same to the Applicant vide their letter dated 08-09-2018 delivered to the Applicant by registered post vide Receipt No. RM4B1596480IN. The Opponent stated that the sequence of events demonstrate that the conduct of Applicant has been mischievous and suspicious. The Opponent stated that he first moved an application for leave on 09-04-2018, though he absented himself from 06-04-2018 requesting sick leave for a period of thirty days, The Opponent stated that the said leave application was accompanied by a private practitioner though the Applicant is member who is entitled for the benefits flowing from the Employees State Insurance Act, 1948 in as much as it's establishment is covered under the provisions of the said Act and they are contributing towards the medical benefits to the Applicant. The Opponent stated that thereafter he kept on moving application for extension of leave vide his application date 07-05-2018 and 07-06-2018.

10. The Opponent stated that the Applicant has conveniently stayed away from duty on false and flimsy grounds, unauthorizedly and an illegal manner. The Opponent stated that this conduct of the Applicant shows that having failed on his strategy of claiming an illegal dismissal and staying away from employment, he has again resorted to staying away from duty on false medical ground. The Opponent stated that the nature of activity in which they are engaged involves rendering "emergency medical services" to the members of the public. The Opponent stated that the very nature of these activities are such that every Workman associated with them is required to render service with utmost care, diligence and sincerity. The Opponent stated that negligence in performing of duty of the slightest degree would render Workman unbecoming of their Workman. The Opponent stated that the conduct of the Applicant

only demonstrates that he is not interested in employment with them. The Opponent stated that at the first instance the Applicant himself abandoned the employment, thereafter he files a complaint to say that he has been prohibited from joining duty. The Opponent state that upon being asked to join duty, he chooses to stay away from work on medical ground. The opponent stated that they have been liberal in as much as though they initiated an inquiry against the Applicant, they chose to abandon the enquiry only to give an opportunity to the Applicant to fall in line. The Opponent stated that the Applicant however failed to make the best use of the courtesy extended by them in as much the Applicant has stayed away from work on false medical grounds. The Opponent stated that in view of the above facts and circumstances, no dispute as is claimed by the Applicant at all exists. The Opponent stated that the alleged dispute is the creation and/or a product manufactured by the Applicant, on the basis false story authored by him. The Opponent therefore submitted that the claim of the Applicant for payment of wages during the period 26-07-2017 to 02-03-2018 deserves to be rejected. The Opponent finally denied the overall case as pleaded by the Applicant and prayed that the Applicant is not entitled for any award and the dispute raised by the Applicant deserves to be dismissed.

11. Thereafter, the Applicant filed his rejoinder on 06-09-2018 at Exb. 8. The Applicant, as and by way of his rejoinder, denied each and every statement, averments and submissions made by the Opponent, vide in written statement filed in the present proceedings and reiterates and confirm the statements, averments and submissions made by him in his statement claim.

12. This Hon'ble court framed the following issues on 27-09-2018 at Exb. 9. The said issues have been updated on 22-01-2019.

1. Whether the Workmen/Party I proves that the action of the Employer in termmating his services with effect from 26-07-2017 is illegal and unjustified?
- 1A. Whether the Employer/Party I proves that his services were terminated by the Employer as on 26-07-2017?
2. Whether the Employer/Party II proves that the Party I abandoned the employment on and from 26-07-2017?
3. Whether the Workman/Party-I is entitled to any relief?
4. What order? What award?

13. My findings to the aforesaid issues are as under:

- (a) Issue No. 1 : In the affirmative.
- (b) Issue No. 1A : In the affirmative.
- (c) Issue No. 2 : In the negative.
- (d) Issue No. 3 & 4 : As per final order.

REASONS

I have heard the oral arguments of Ld. Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat, appearing for the Applicant as well as Ld. Adv. Shri S. Gaonkar representing for the Opponent. Both the parties also filed the synopsis of written submissions. I have carefully perused the entire records of the present case including the synopsis of arguments filed by both the parties.

14. Ld. Adv. Shri S. Gaonkar who took over from the late Adv. Shri Palekar has raised an issue of subject jurisdiction of this Court. Though belated, the issue of jurisdiction has been examined herein. It is his contention that this Labour Court has no subject jurisdiction to try and decide this matter.

His specific contention is that the Labour Court has no jurisdiction to decide the issue of retrenchment. The jurisdiction per the Ld. Advocate lies with the Industrial Tribunal. He pointed out to the Schedule-II and Schedule-III of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is his contention that from the pleadings made by the Applicant it appears that the termination from service of the Applicant amounts to retrenchment.

On examining the pleadings, it is noticed that the Applicant has however, prayed for continuity in service with back wages, other benefit continuity in service and consequential benefits.

The Industrial Tribunal gets jurisdiction under the Third Schedule Item No. 10 of the Third Schedule which reads as retrenchment of Workman and closure of establishment.

Similarly, Labour Court gets jurisdiction under Second Schedule. Item No. 3 of the Second Schedule reads as i.e. "discharge or dismissal of Workman including reinstatement, or grant of relief to, Workmen wrongfully dismissed".

In the present case, it is noticed that the Applicant has prayed for back wages as he has already been reinstated. As such the Labour Court would get jurisdiction to try the present dispute as per item No. 3 of the Second Schedule under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The issue of subject jurisdiction having been decided, I now proceed to the other contentions raised relating to jurisdiction. Thereafter, to the issued in this matter.

15. Ld. Adv. Shri S. Gaonkar also submitted that the Party-II is not an industry as defined u/s 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

It is noticed that the term "industry" has been defined u/s 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and it means:

(j) any systematic activity carried on by co-operation between an employer and his workmen (whether such workmen are employed by such employer directly or by or through any agency, including a contractor) for the production, supply or distribution of goods or services with a view to satisfy human wants or wishes (not being wants or wishes which are merely spiritual or religious in nature), whether or not,—

- (i) any capital has been invested for the purpose of carrying on such activity; or
- (ii) such activity is carried on with a motive to make any gain or profit, and includes

(a) any activity of the Dock Labour Board established under Section 5-A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948);

(b) any activity relating to the promotion of sales or business or both carried on by an establishment, but does not include—

- (1) any agricultural operation except where such agricultural operation is carried on in an integrated manner with any other activity (being any such activity as is referred to in the foregoing provisions of this clause) and such other activity is the predominant one.

Explanation:- For the purposes of this sub-clause, "agricultural Operation" does not include any activity carried on in a plantation as defined in Clause (1) of Section 2 of the Plantations Labour Act, 1951; or

- (2) hospitals or dispensaries; or
- (3) educational, scientific, research or training institutions; or
- (4) institutions owned or managed by organisation wholly or substantially engaged in any charitable, social or philanthropic service; or
- (5) khadi or village industries; or
- (6) any activity of the Government relating to the sovereign functions of the Government including all the activities carried on by the departments of the Central Government dealing with defence research, atomic energy and space;

- (7) any domestic service; or
- (8) any activity, being a profession practised by an individual or body of individuals, if the number of persons employed by the individual or body of individuals in relation to such profession is less than ten; or
- (9) any activity, being an activity carried on by a co-operative society or a club or any other like body of individuals, if the number of persons employed by the co-operative society, club or other like body of individuals in relation to such activity is less than ten.

16. In the case in hand, the Employer had signed MOU with the Government of Goa and had agreed to provide emergency management and research services and for that purpose the Employer has engaged certain staff. Thus the Party-II Employer undertook systematic activities with the help of the employees engaged by the Employer/Party-II with a view to satisfy human wants or wishes. The agreement which is on record indicates that there were reciprocal promises between the Party-II and the Government of Goa. These reciprocal promises formed the basis of consideration between the Party-II and the Government of Goa thus, amounting to an agreement under the Indian Contract Act, 1872.

Transporting Road Accident Victims is not the sole preserve of the State Government. It is noticed that there are private individuals also running ambulance services to fulfil human wants and wishes. The Party-II is also one of such Service Provider. It provides the services and to do so it has taken the format prescribed under Andhra Pradesh Society's Registration Act.

Per the said Act, the said society can sue and be sued per Section 19 of the Andhra Pradesh Societies Registration Act, the said society "may bring or defend of other legal proceeding touching or concerning any property or any right or claim of the society and may sue and be sued in its name".

The Employer is an "industry as defined u/s 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

The witness No. 1 of the Party-II has stated that the Party-II operates 64 numbers of ambulances in the State of Goa. It is obvious that to operate 64 ambulances more than 10 persons (Drivers & other Employees) would necessarily be required to keep the 64 ambulances operational over the road network in the State of Goa around the clock. It is

inconceivable that 64 ambulances can be operated over the road network in the State of Goa around the clock by employing less than 64 employees (Driver, Cleaners, Maintenance staff, Pharmacists, Ambulance stretcher bearers and other support staff).

In the course of the proceedings the attendance registers of the Party-II was sought to be produced by the Party-I for the examination in the proceedings. The Party-II has not produced the said attendance registers which were in the possession of the Party-II/Employer or the purposes of compliance with labour legislation like the Payment of Wages Act and other cognate labour legislation applicable in the State of Goa and adverse inference on this account is necessary to be drawn against the Employer/Party-II.

In view of above, I do not find any merit whatsoever in the submission of Ld. Adv. Shri S. Gaonkar representing the Employer that the Party-II is not an Industry as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

17. Ld. Adv. Shri S. Gaonkar representing the Employer submitted that the Party-II is not the Employer of the Applicant under the I.D. Act, 1947. The term "Employer" has been defined u/s 2(g) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and it means—

- (i) in relation to an industry carried on by or under the authority of any department of (the Central Government or a State Government), the authority prescribed in this behalf, or where no authority is prescribed, the head of the department;
- (ii) in relation to an industry carried on by or on behalf of a local authority, the Chief Executive Officer of that authority;

18. In the case in hand, the Party-II is a Society established under the Registration of Societies Act and is engaged in providing emergency services in the nature of medical attendance/treatment in emergent situations. The MOD (Exb. 54) on record indicates that the responsibility of the Party-II to operate the ambulances and ensure ambulances services are available on 24 hours per day and 365 days a year basis and to provide the emergency health transportation services to ambulances of the public and for that purpose recruit, position and train required human resources including pilots (drivers) and medically trained person (Emergency Medical Technician).

The Second Witness of the Party-II Shri Adolf Pacheco, in his evidence on record indicates that

the Party-II is a registered society at Hyderabad under the Andhra Pradesh Society's Registration Act, 2001. He deposed that Government of Goa has direct control over every aspect of the said services provided by the Employer/Party-II. In his cross examination, he admitted that under Clause 1(b) it is provided that the development, management and functioning of all the facilities and services here within provided shall be responsibility of the Employer/Party-II. He admitted that under Clause III (10) on Exb. 54 it is provided that the Employer/Party-II shall maintain separate financial accounts and records of its operation in Goa. He admitted that under Clause III(6) of Exb. 54 it is provided that the Employer/Party-II shall recruit, position and train required human resources, including pilots (drivers) and medically trained person (Emergency medical technician) who will be present in every trip made by the ambulances while transporting an emergency case to a hospital. He admitted that the MOU produced on records by him nowhere provides for recruitment of employees by the Government of Goa for Employer/Party-II. He admitted that under Clause XIII of Exb. 57 it is the responsibility of Employer/Party-II to observe all the rules and regulations regarding recruitment of staff, purchase of store, awarding of contracts etc. and other expenditure as per the rules framed by the Govt. He admitted that under Clause 2(7)b in Exb. 58 it is provided that annual increments, pay package and pursuits to its employees are the responsibility of Employer/Party-II. He admitted that under Clause 4(2) of Exb. 60 it is provided that the Employer/Party-II shall have autonomy and operational freedom towards selection, hiring appraisals, transfers and termination/dismissal of staff, freedom to avail the staff-cum-HR agencies, preparation of training modules. He admitted that the notice of inquires was issued to the Workman by the Employer/Party-II. He further admits that none of the letters have been issued by the Government of Goa to the Workman and that the aforesaid documents shown to him have not been issued with the concurrence of the Government of Goa.

He admitted that all the employees of Employer/Party-II were appointed by the Party-II. He also admits that the day today attendance of the employees has been maintained by the Employer/Party-II. Thus, the Employer has not signed/execute tripartite agreement with the Government of Goa and the Applicant.

The aforesaid evidence on record clearly indicates that the Employer/Party-II is the "Employer" as has been defined u/s 2(g) of the I. D.

Act, 1947 in respect of the Applicant and the Government of Goa was not the Employer of the Workman.

19. *Issue No. 1 A and Issue No. 2:* I decide the Issue No. 1A and Issue No. 2 simultaneously as both the said issues are co-related to each other. I decide the Issue No. 1A and Issue No. 2 first, prior to the issue No. 1 as the said issue No. 1A and the Issue No. 2 goes to the root of the present matter.

20. The evidence on record the Workman was employed with the Employer as a Pharmacist w.e.f. 01-05-2013 at its establishment at Goa Medical College, Bambolim vide letter of appointment dated 29-04-2013. The services of the Workman were confirmed w.e.f. 01-05-2014 vide letter of confirmation dated 13-06-2014.

The Applicant pleaded as well as in his oral evidence on record indicates that on 25-07-2017 the Applicant reported for work at 9.30 hours and at about 12.30 hours he was called by Mr. Hemant Naik, HR Executive, of the Employer in his cabin where Dr. Geeta Deshmukh, In-charge Operations and Gurupradhan Shetty was also present and that Mr. Hemant Naik instructed the Applicant to resign from the service w.e.f. 26-07-2017. The evidence on record indicates that the Applicant refused to submit his resignation. The evidence on record indicates that on the same day at about 16.30 hours Mr. Hemant Naik again called the Applicant and informed him that if he do not submit his resignation before leaving he would not be allowed to report for work from 26-07-2017. The evidence on record indicates that the Applicant did not submit his resignation and at the close of his working hours, he left the office for his home. The evidence on record indicates that on 26-07-2017 the Applicant went to report for his work on 9.30 hours, but he was not allowed to enter the premises while the security on duty and that when he asked the security on duty the reasons for not allowing him to report for work, the said security told him that as per instructions of the HR Executive he was not allowed for work. The evidence on record indicates that the Applicant waited for about half an hour and then came back to his home and thereafter he sent a letter dated 26-07-2017 to the Employer narrating the incident of refusal to allow him to report for work and informing the Employer that their action of refusing employment to him is illegal termination of his services w.e.f. 26-07-2017. The oral evidence on records indicates that the Applicant was also called upon the Employer to allow him to report for work immediately on receipt of the same demand and that since the Employer did not act on

the same and after waiting for a reasonable period the Applicant raised a dispute vide his letter dated 14-08-2017. The Applicant has also produced on record a copy of his representation dated 26-07-2017 (Exb. 24-colly) and copy of which has been addressed to the Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Panaji-Goa. The aforesaid incident on record clearly indicates that the Applicant was refused employment by the Employer w.e.f. 26-07-2017. Ld. Adv. Shri S. Gaonkar representing the Employer also relied upon certain judgments of the Supreme Court of India. However, the facts of the said case are different the case in hand and as such, the said judgments are not applicable to the case in hand. It is therefore held that the Applicant proved that he was refused employment by the Employer w.e.f. 26-07-2017. It is further held that the aforesaid evidence on record indicates that the Employer failed to prove that the Applicant had abandoned his employment on and from 26-07-2017. The Issue No. 1 is therefore answered in the affirmative and issue No. 2 is answered in the negative.

21. *Issue No. 1:* While deciding the issue No. 1A as well as Issue No. 2, I have discussed and come to the conclusion that the Applicant was refused the employment by the Employer w.e.f. 26-07-2017.

The evidence on record indicates that the Applicant was issued a show cause notice dated 02-06-2017 (Exb.20) stating his failure to complete the work on time as hampered the operations and the aforesaid act on his part attract violation of Employer service rule, i.e. Rule 72(A) 6, Rule 72(B) 18 and he was directed to file his written explanation within 48 hours as to why disciplinary action should not be initiated against him for the said misconduct. The Applicant filed his reply dated 03-06-2017 (at Exb. 21) to the aforesaid show cause notice denying the allegations levelled against him.

The evidence on record indicates that the Employer also gave a notice of enquiry dated 07-06-2017 (at Exb. 22) by appointing Shri Shivaji Patnaik U. as Enquiry Officer. Thereafter, the Applicant, vide his letter dated 13-06-2017 (Exb. 25) addressed to the inquiry officer and requested to direct the Employer to furnish certain documents which are relevant in the enquiry.

Thereafter the Employer/Enquiry Officer could not conduct inquiries but the Employer suddenly refused employment to the Applicant w.e.f. 26-07-2017 without any cause or any valid justification. The aforesaid action on the part of the Employer amounts to illegal retrenchment of the services of the Applicant w.e.f.

26-07-2017. Hence, it is held that Applicant proved that the action of the Employer in refusing him employment w.e.f. 26-07-2017 is illegal and unjustified. The Issue No. 1 is therefore answered in the affirmative.

22. *Issue No. 3:* While deciding the Issue No. 1 hereinabove, I have discussed and come to the conclusion that the action of the Employer in terminating the services of the Workman is illegal and unjustified.

The evidence of record indicates that the Workman was reinstated service on 03-03-2018 and as such the Workman has already been granted reinstatement in service. The Workman remained unemployed for the period from 26-07-2017 till 02-03-2018. The evidence on record indicates that Workman stated in his pleading that he is unemployed. The evidence on record indicates that the Workman is a "Pharmacist Graduate". Workman is entitled for wages for the period from 26-07-2017 to 03-02-2018. Since he has admittedly made no effort to reach alternate employment it would be proper to only grant 50% of back wages.

In view of above, I pass the following order:

ORDER

It is held that the action of the Employer in terminating the services the Workman w.e.f. 26-07-2017 is illegal and unjustified. It is further held that the Workman Shri Audumber Naik is entitled to back wages @ rate of 50% of wages for the period he was rendered out employment by the Party-II.

No order as to cost.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Suresh N. Narulkar),
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court-II.

◆◆◆
Department of Law & Judiciary
Law (Establishment) Division

Order

No. 8-2-2023-LD(Estt.)/2473

Whereas, the Government vide Notification No. 8-7-2014-LD(Estt)(111)/1416 dated 08-07-2014 and Certificate of Practice dated 08-07-2014, appointed Ms. Madhumita Avadhut Nayak Salatry, Advocate

(hereinafter referred to as the "Applicant") as a Notary for a period of five years with effect from 08-07-2014, for the area of Bardez Taluka;

And whereas, the Government, upon the Applicant's request, had previously renewed her Certificate of Practice as a Notary for a further period of five years with effect from 08-07-2019 with jurisdiction limited to Bardez Taluka and a corresponding Endorsement dated 03-07-2019 was issued to the Applicant, which has subsequently expired on 08-07-2024;

And whereas, the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services vide letter No. 3/1/2022-Registration/2566 dated 04-11-2022 had forwarded letters received from Police Inspector, SIT Land Grabbing, Crime Branch, Ribander, Goa and requested to take action against the Applicant, as per the Notaries Act, 1952.

And whereas, this Department vide letter No. 8/7/2014-LD(Estt.)(111)/2024 dated 09-12-2022 had requested State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services, to conduct an inquiry in the matter, as per Rule 13 (1) of the Notaries Rules, 1956 and to submit a report after following due procedure of law.

And whereas, this Department was in receipt of another complaint dated 19-11-2022 alongwith its enclosures filed by Mrs. Matilda Leopoldina Coutinho in Form XIII against the Applicant and this Department vide letter No. 8/2/2023-LD(Estt.)/639 dated 13-04-2023 had again requested the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services, to furnish the inquiry report in order to place it before the Government for appropriate decision.

And whereas, the application for renewal of Certificate of Practice as Notary submitted by the Applicant was forwarded to this Department by the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services for Government consideration;

And whereas, this Department, vide letter No. 8-7-2014-LD(Estt.)(111)/1723 dated 28-08-2024 informed the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services that the Government has deferred consideration of the Applicant's renewal proposal until the ongoing inquiries into the complaints are concluded and disposed of.

And whereas, pursuant to Inquiry Reports Nos. REG/Notary-Complaint/2024/51 and REG/Notary-Complaint/2024/50, both dated 03-10-2024, the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services has determined that the Applicant's actions constituted negligence and collusion in notarizing forged documents, thereby facilitating fraudulent property transfers. The inquiry findings, as detailed in the

report of Hon'ble Justice V. K. Jadhav (Retd.), revealed a clear breach of notarial duties, including an affidavit from a deceased person and inconsistent signatures on other affidavits. Moreover, the report suggests potential involvement in broader fraudulent activities, as evidenced by suspicious financial transactions.

And whereas, considering all the facts on record and the observations made in the Commission of Inquiry Report submitted by Justice V. K. Jadhav (Retd.), the Government hereby cancels the certificate of practice dated 08-07-2014, perpetually debaring the Applicant from practice as a Notary as per Rule 13 Clause 12 (b) (i) of Notaries Rules, 1956.

Now therefore, in pursuance of Clause (d) of Section 10 of the Notaries Act, the Government of Goa, hereby removes the name of the Applicant entered as a Notary, from the Register maintained by it under Section 4 of the Notaries Act, 1952.

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

Amir Y. Parab, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 31st December, 2024.

—————
Notification

No. 14-17-2022-LD (Estt.)/2446

The Order No. HCB/GOA/G-P-108/2024/2153 dated 30-11-2024 which has been issued by High Court of Bombay at Goa, Porvorim, Goa is hereby published for general information of the public.

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

Amir Y. Parab, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 30th December, 2024.

—————
HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

—
Order

No. HCB/GOA/G-P-108/2024/2153

Mr. Santosh Shridhar Mhamal, Senior Private Secretary to the Hon'ble Judge, High Court of Bombay at Goa, shall stand retired from service on the afternoon of 30th November, 2024 on superannuation.

D. P. Satawalekar, Registrar (Admin.).

30th November, 2024.

Department of Personnel

Order

No. 13/08/2024-PER/33

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/08/2024-PER/3056 dated 27-08-2024 had granted extension in service to Shri Nitin V. S. Neurekar, Superintending Engineer and Chief Engineer (Ad-hoc), Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest subject to vigilance clearance, concurrence of Finance Department and approval of Council of Ministers;

And whereas, the Vigilance Department has submitted vigilance clearance stating that no disciplinary proceedings/vigilance cases are pending or being contemplated against Shri Nitin V. S. Neurekar;

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U.O. No. 1400104430 dated 08-12-2024 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Nitin V. S. Neurekar, Superintending Engineer and Chief Engineer (Ad-hoc), Public Works Department subject to Cabinet approval;

And whereas, the Council of Ministers, in its LXth meeting held on 18-12-2024 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Nitin V. S. Neurekar, Superintending Engineer and Chief Engineer (Ad-hoc), Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest;

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/08/2024-PER/3056 dated 27-08-2024 granting extension in service to Shri Nitin V. S. Neurekar, Superintending Engineer and Chief Engineer (Ad-hoc), Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest.

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

Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).
Porvorim, 1st January, 2025.

Order

No. 13/10/2024-PER/28

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/10/2024-PER/3093 dated 29-08-2024 had granted extension in service to Shri Savio Reis Gomes, Executive

Engineer, Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest subject to vigilance clearance, concurrence of Finance Department and approval of Council of Ministers;

And whereas, the Vigilance Department has submitted vigilance clearance stating that no disciplinary proceedings/vigilance cases are pending or being contemplated against Shri Savio Reis Gomes;

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U.O. No. 1400104232 dated 20-11-2024 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Savio Reis Gomes, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department subject to Cabinet approval;

And whereas, the Council of Ministers, in its LXth meeting held on 18-12-2024 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Savio Reis Gomes, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest;

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/10/2024-PER/3093 dated 29-08-2024 granting extension in service to Shri Savio Reis Gomes, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest.

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

Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).
Porvorim, 1st January, 2025.

Order

No. 13/12/2024-PER/31

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/12/2024-PER/3382 dated 30-09-2024 had granted extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forest (Planning & Statistics), Forest Department, beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-10-2024 to 31-03-2025, in public interest subject to vigilance clearance, concurrence of Finance Department and approval of Council of Ministers;

And whereas, the Vigilance Department has submitted vigilance clearance stating that no disciplinary proceedings/vigilance cases are pending or being contemplated against Shri Santosh H. Fadte;

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U.O. No. 1400102905 dated 22-10-2024 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forest (Planning & Statistics), Forest Department, beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-10-2024 to 31-03-2025, subject to Cabinet approval;

And whereas, the Council of Ministers, in its LXth meeting held on 18-12-2024 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forest (Planning & Statistics), Forest Department, beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-10-2024 to 31-03-2025, in public interest;

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/12/2024-PER/3382 dated 30-09-2024 granting extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forest (Planning & Statistics), Forest Department, beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-10-2024 to 31-03-2025, in public interest.

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

Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).
Porvorim, 1st January, 2025.

Order

No. 13/07/2024-PER/5134

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/07/2024-PER/3044 dated 26-08-2024 had granted extension in service to Shri Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest subject to vigilance clearance, concurrence of Finance Department and approval of Council of Ministers;

And whereas, the Vigilance Department has submitted vigilance clearance stating that, no disciplinary proceedings/vigilance cases are pending or being contemplated against Shri Vallabh Samant;

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400103136 dated 22-10-2024 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department subject to Cabinet approval;

And whereas, the Council of Ministers, in its LIXth meeting held on 28-11-2024 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest;

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/07/2024-PER/3044 dated 26-08-2024 granting extension in service to Shri Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2024 to 31-08-2025, in public interest.

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

Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).
Porvorim, 6th December, 2024.

Order

No. 13/11/2024-PER/29

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/11/2024-PER/3381 dated 30-09-2024 had granted extension in service to Shri Shrikant B. Gaonkar, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-10-2024 to 30-09-2025, in public interest, subject to vigilance clearance, concurrence of Finance Department and approval of Council of Ministers;

And whereas, the Vigilance Department has submitted vigilance clearance stating that, no disciplinary proceedings/vigilance cases are pending or being contemplated against Shri Shrikant B. Gaonkar;

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400104272 dated 20-11-2024 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Shrikant B. Gaonkar, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department subject to Cabinet approval;

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXth meeting held on 18-12-2024 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Shrikant B. Gaonkar, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-10-2024 to 30-09-2025, in public interest;

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/11/2024-PER/3381 dated 30-09-2024 granting extension in service to

Shri Shrikant B. Gaonkar, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-10-2024 to 30-09-2025, in public interest.

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

Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim, 1st January, 2025.

Order

No. 13/04/2024-PER/32

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/04/2024-PER/921 dated 15-03-2024 had granted extension in service to Smt. Sadhana Shet, Superintending Engineer, CO V, Public Works Department beyond the date of her superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2024 to 31-10-2024, in public interest, subject to vigilance clearance, concurrence of Finance Department and approval of Council of Ministers;

And whereas, the Vigilance Department has submitted vigilance clearance stating that, no disciplinary proceedings/vigilance cases are pending or being contemplated against Smt. Sadhana Shet;

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400103632 dated 30-10-2024 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Smt. Sadhana Shet, Superintending Engineer, CO V, Public Works Department beyond the date of her superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2024 to 31-10-2024 subject to Cabinet approval;

And whereas, the Council of Ministers, in its LXth meeting held on 18-12-2024 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Smt. Sadhana Shet, Superintending Engineer, CO V, Public Works Department beyond the date of her superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2024 to 31-10-2024, in public interest;

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/04/2024-PER/921 dated 15-03-2024 granting extension in service to Smt. Sadhana Shet, Superintending Engineer, CO V, Public Works Department beyond the date of her superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2024 to 31-10-2024, in public interest.

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

Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim, 1st January, 2025.

Department of Public Grievances

Notification

No. 41/1/2022/PG(Notification)/858

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 4 and Clause (b) of Section 2 of the Goa (Right of Citizen to Time-Bound Delivery of Public Services) Act, 2013 (Goa Act 19 of 2013), read with Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 (Central Act 10 of 1897), the Government of Goa hereby amends the Government Notification No. 41/1/2022/PG(Notification)/235 dated 31-10-2022, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 31 dated 03-11-2022 (hereinafter referred to as the "Principal Notification"), as follows, namely:—

In the schedule to the principal Notification, under the heading "Department of Labour Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Chief Inspector of Factories and Boilers", for the existing entries at Serial Nos. 160 to 168J, the following entries shall be substituted, namely:—

1	2	3	4	5
"160.	Approval of Factory Plans	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	90 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
161.	Registration & Grant of Factory License	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
162.	Renewal of Factory License	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).

1	2	3	4	5
163.	Amendment of Factory License	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
164.	Transfer of Factory License	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
165.	Approval of Notice of Period of Work for Adult Workers	Inspector of Factories	21 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
166.	Issue of Certificate of Fitness to Young Person	Medical Inspector of Factories/Certifying Surgeon	21 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
167.	Confirmation of appointment for conducting Medical Examination of Workers	Medical Inspector of Factories/Certifying Surgeon	05 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
168.	Confirmation of appointment for conducting Industrial Hygiene Survey	Chemist	05 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
169.	Confirmation of dates of training programme to be organised	Training Assistant	05 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
170.	Recognition as Competent Person/Safety Officer/ /Factory Medical Officer/ /Welfare Officer/Occupational Health Laboratory/ /Occupational Safety & Health Auditor	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	60 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
171.	Registration of boiler having heating surface area of less than 1000 sq. meter	Inspector of Boilers	30 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
172.	Registration of boiler having heating surface area of more than 1000 sq. meter	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	30 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
173.	Renewal of Certificate for use of boiler	Inspector of Boilers	21 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
174.	Permission to carry out repairs/ /alterations to boilers	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
175.	Inspection of material as per Indian Boiler Regulations, 1950	Inspector of Boilers	21 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
176.	Approval of drawings related to steam pipeline connected to boilers having heating surface area of less than 1000 sq. meter	Inspector of Boilers	21 days	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers.
177.	Approval of drawings related to steam pipeline connected to Boilers having heating surface area of more than 1000 sq. meter	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).
178.	Approval of firm as repairer/ /erector/pipe fabrication/ /manufacturer/testing laboratory related to boiler, its components and fittings.	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers).

1	2	3	4	5
179.	Renewal of firm as repairer/erector/pipe fabrication/manufacturer/testing laboratory related to boiler, its components and fittings.	Chief Inspector of Factories & Boilers	21 days	Secretary (Factories & Boilers)."

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.

Prasad Volvoikar, Director (Public Grievances) & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Porvorim, 6th November, 2024.

◆◆◆

Department of Transport

Directorate of Transport

Order

No. 5/2/93-Tpt/P.F./2024/Part File/3104

The following Assistant Directors of Transport (Group 'B' Gazetted) are transferred with effect on administrative grounds and in public interest as detailed hereunder:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Assistant Director of Transport	Present posting	Posting on transfer
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri Rajesh G. Naik	O/o. A.D.T., Pernem	O/o. A.D.T., Ponda.
2.	Shri Santosh Gawde	O/o. A.D.T., Ponda	O/o. A.D.T., Vasco.
3.	Shri Ladu Gaonkar	Newly promoted	O/o. A.D.T., Pernem.

The above Assistant Directors of Transport are directed to join the new place of posting immediately and complete handing over/taking over formalities accordingly.

Further, the said Officers are directed not to avail joining period or any type of leave till they assume charge at the new place of posting.

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

P. Pravimal Abhishek, IAS, Director & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Transport).

Panaji, 31st December, 2024.

Order

No. D. Tpt./EST/244/Addl. D.T./Part File-I/2024/3102

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission, Panaji conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/49(1)/2006/336 dated 16-12-2024, the Government is pleased to promote Shri Ramkrishna @ Rajesh B. Naik, Assistant Director of Transport to the post of Additional Director of Transport (Group 'A' Gazetted) in the Pay Matrix Level 10 of the 7th Pay Commission on regular basis with immediate effect and post him as Additional Director of Transport, South, Margao-Goa.

The said Officer shall be on probation for a period of two years.

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

P. Pravimal Abhishek, IAS, Director & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Transport).

Panaji, 31st December, 2024.

Order

No. D. Tpt./EST/285-V/2024/3103

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission, Panaji conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/49(1)/2022/335 dated 16-12-2024, the Government is pleased to promote Shri Ladu H. Gaonkar, Motor Vehicles Inspector to the post of Assistant Director of Transport (Group 'B' Gazetted) in Pay Matrix Level 7 of the 7th Pay Commission on

regular basis with immediate effect and post him as Assistant Director of Transport, Pernem-Goa.

The said Officer shall be on probation for a period of two years.

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

P Pravimal Abhishek, IAS, Director & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Transport).

Panaji, 31st December, 2024.

**The Dhargal Urban Co-operative Credit Society Ltd.**

Dhargal, Pernem-Goa

Registration No. Res.-(a)-37/NZ/GOA.

Email-dhargalurbancoopcreditsociety@gmail.com

FORM-24

(See Rule 111A)

Form for declaration of result

In pursuance of powers conferred by sub-section 6 of Section 66 of the Goa Co-op. Societies Act, 2001, I declare the result of office bearers as follows:

Election of Office Bearer of: "The Dhargal Urban Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Dhargal, Pernem-Goa"

Sr. No.	Name of the candidate	Designation	Address, contact number & email ID of the candidate
1	2	3	4
1.	Benkar Audumbar Vishnu	Chairman	Bhendali Ozarim, Pernem, North Goa 9145064255
2.	Kamat Nandkishor Shivram	Vice-Chairman	H. No. 192, Govwada, Dhargal, Pernem, North Goa. 9423314121

Tanshu R. Mayekar, Authorised person & Jr. Auditor/Inspector, O/o. Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 1st January, 2025.

V. No. AP-1212/2025.

**Guirim Sangolda M. P. Co-op. Service Society Ltd.**

"Suryakiran", Gonsalves Mansion, First floor, Flat No. AF-4, St. Anthony Waddo, Guirim,
Bardez-Goa 403507

Reg. No. RES-(C)-127/GOA

FORM-24

(See Rule 111A)

Form for declaration of result

In pursuance of powers conferred by sub-section 6 of Section 66 of the Goa Co-op. Societies Act, 2001, I, declare the result of office bearers as follows.

Election of Office Bearer of the “Guirim-Sangolda M.P. Co-op. Service Society Ltd., Suryakiran, Gonsalves Mansion, First floor, Flat No. AF-4, St. Anthonywaddo, Guirim, Bardez-Goa.”

Sr. No.	Name of the candidate	For the post of	Address, contact number & e-mail ID of the candidate
1.	Mr. Peter Vincent Afonso	Chairman	H. No. 418/1, Sangolda, Morod, Bardez-Goa. Ph. 9890176446
2.	Mrs. Gauri Dattarao Dessai	Vice-Chairman	H. No. 506, Agni wado, Guirim, Bardez-Goa. Ph. 9923036356

Rameshwar R. Dabholkar, Authorised person.

Mapusa, 18th December, 2024.

V. No. AP-1217/2025.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

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

PRICE—Rs. 24.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—321/80—01/2025.