

Panaji, 11th September, 2025 (Bhadra 20, 1947)

**SERIES II No. 24**

# OFFICIAL GAZETTE



# GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

*Note: There are two Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 23 dated 04-09-2025 as follows:-*

- 1. Extraordinary dated 6-9-2025 from pages 747 to 748 regarding Notifications from Goa Legislature Secretariat.*
- 2. Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 10-9-2025 from pages 749 to 752 regarding Orders from Goa State Election Commission.*

## GOVERNMENT OF GOA

### Department of Agriculture

Directorate of Agriculture

#### Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2025-26/Part(II)/975

Date : 01-Sep-2025

On recommendation of the Local Departmental Promotion Committee, the following Agriculture Officers, Group 'B' Gazetted of this Directorate are hereby promoted to the post of Assistant Director of Agriculture/Scientist (Agronomy/Horticulture/Plant Protection), Group 'A' Gazetted on officiating basis for a period of not more than one year and in the public interest in the pay matrix at Level-10 of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission with immediate effect until further orders.

On promotion (officiating basis) they are posted as shown below:

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Present posting	Posted as
1.	Smt. Vaibhavi V. Desai	Assistant Director of Agriculture (Crops), Crops & PP Section, Head Quarter	Retained as Assistant Director of Agriculture (Crops), Crops & PP Section, Head Quarter.
2.	Shri. Saicesh Gandhi	As a Nodal Officer/In charge for Vidhya Samiksha Kendra on working arrangement in the O/o Director, State Council of Educational Research	Assistant Director of Agriculture (Extension), Extension & IT Section, Head Quarter by relieving Smt. Vismita Marathe from her additional charge.
3.	Shri. Adolfo Rajesh D'Costa	Zonal Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Margao, Goa	Assistant Director of Agriculture, District Agriculture Office, South, Margao against the vacant post under the B. H. 2401—Crop Husbandry, 00, 001—Direction & Administration, 03—Subordinate & Expert Staff, 01—Salaries.

Shri. Adolfo Rajesh D'Costa shall continue to hold the charge of Zonal Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Margao-Goa in addition to his own duties until further order.

The officiating promotion will not bestow on the above Officers any claim for regular promotion and the service rendered on officiating basis in the grade will not count for the purpose of seniority in that grade for eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade.

This is issued with approval of Government vide Entry No. 2821/F dated 25/08/2025.

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

*Sandeep B. Fol Dessai*, Director of Agriculture & ex-officio Jt. Secretary.

Tonca, Caranzalem.

### Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2025-26/Part(II)/976

Date : 01-Sep-2025

On recommendation of the Local Departmental Promotion Committee, the following Assistant Agriculture Officers, Group 'B' Gazetted of this Directorate are hereby promoted to the post of Agriculture Officers on officiating basis for a period of not more than one year and in the public interest in the pay matrix at Level-7 of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission with immediate effect until further orders.

On promotion (officiating basis) they are posted as shown below:

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Present posting	Posted as
1.	Kum. Santoshi B. Sawant Dessai	Assistant Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Quepem	Agriculture Officer, District Agriculture Office (South), Margao, against the vacant post under the BH: 2401—Crop Husbandry, 00, 105—Manures & Fertilizer, 02—Manures & Fertilizer, 01—Salaries.
2.	Shri Deepak G. Gadekar	Assistant Agriculture Officer, Extension Section, Head Quarter	Agriculture Officer (IT), Extension & IT Section, Head Quarter in place of Shri. Saieesh Gandhi, Agriculture Officer being promoted to the post of Assistant Director of Agriculture on officiating basis
3.	Shri Sharvanand R. Sarvankar	Assistant Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Canacona	Agriculture Officer, District Agriculture Office (North), Head Quarter, against the vacant post under the BH: 2402—Soil & Water Conservation, 00, 001—Direction & Administration, 01—Establishment, 01—Salaries.
4.	Kum. Jovita Rosada Siqueira	Assistant Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Quepem	Agriculture Officer, District Agriculture Office (South), Margao, against the vacant post under the BH: 2401—Crop Husbandry, 00, 105—Manures & Fertilizer, 02—Manures & Fertilizer, 01—Salaries.
5.	Shri. Mayuresh A. Bhat	NHM/WDC Section, Head Quarter	Agriculture Officer (Farm), Head Quarter, against the vacant post under the BH: 2401—Crop Husbandry, 00, 119—Horticulture & Vegetable Crops, 02—Vegetable, 01—Salaries.

1. Shri Sharvanand R. Sarvankar shall continue to hold the charge of Assistant Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Canacona-Goa in addition to his own duties until further order.
2. Kum. Jovita Rosada Siqueira shall continue to hold the charge of Assistant Agriculture Officer, Zonal Agriculture Office, Quepem-Goa in addition to her own duties until further order.

3. Shri. Mayuresh A. Bhat shall continue to hold the charge of Assistant Agriculture Officer, NHM/WDC Section, Head Quarter in addition to his own duties until further order.

The officiating promotion will not bestow on the above Officers any claim for regular promotion and the service rendered on officiating basis in the grade will not count for the purpose of seniority in that grade for eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade.

This is issued with approval of Government vide Entry No. 2821/F dated 25/08/2025.

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

*Sandeep B. Fol Dessai*, Director of Agriculture & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Tonca, Caranzalem.

◆◆◆

**Department of Archives**

—

**Notification**

4/1/83/2023/Man'B'-968

Date : 03-Sep-2025

Read: 1. Order No. 4/1/83/Man'B'-831 dated 27th August, 2024.

2. Addendum No. 4/1/83/2023/Man'B'-986 dated 27<sup>th</sup> September, 2024.

In addition to the Orders mentioned above, sanction of Government is hereby accorded for extension of the tenure of the Committee of Experts for a period of one year w. e. f. 27/08/2025 to 26/08/2026.

This order is issued with the approval of the Government vide U. O. No. 37 dated 25/08/2025.

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

*Arvind Khutkar*, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Archives).

Panaji.

◆◆◆

**Department of Co-operation**

Office of the Asstt. Registrar of Co-operative Societies

—

**Notification**

5-2083-2024/ARSZ/HSG/2827

Date : 13-Jan-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, "Peterpaul Enclave Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited", Near Dabolim Railway Station, Alto Dabolim, Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2024250129.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

"Peterpaul Enclave Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited", Near Dabolim Railway Station, Alto Dabolim, Goa has been registered on 13/01/2025 and its bears registration Code symbol No. RCSSZ2024250129 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2084-2024/ARSZ/HSG/3000

Date : 05-Feb-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “Jayden Residency Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Dramapur, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2024250133.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“Jayden Residency Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Dramapur, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 04/02/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2024250133 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2082-2025/ARSZ/HSG

Date : 06-May-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “Saldanha Rosa Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Ltd.”, Saldanha Rosa, Utorda, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260152.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“Saldanha Rosa Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Ltd.”, Saldanha Rosa, Utorda, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 06/05/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260152 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2094-2025/ARSZ/HSG/411

Date : 12-May-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “Wincons Premiun Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Bamado, Chinchinim, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260154.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“Wincons Premiun Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Bamado, Chinchinim, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 12/05/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260154 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2093-2025/ARSZ/HSG/412

Date : 12-May-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “Wincons Windjammer Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Digeband, Bandfoll, Chinchinim, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260153.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“Wincons Windjammer Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Digeband, Bandfoll, Chinchinim, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 12/05/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260153 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2109-2025/ARSZ/HSG/464

Date : 16-May-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “The Derajlaxmi ‘A’ Block Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Near Pandav Chapel, Aquem Alto, Margao, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260158.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“The Derajlaxmi ‘A’ Block Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Near Pandav Chapel, Aquem Alto, Margao, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 16/05/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260158 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2107-2025/ARSZ/HSG/464

Date : 16-May-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “The Hillside Apartments Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Opp. Jet International, St. Joaquim Road, Borda, Margao, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260156.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“The Hillside Apartments Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Opp. Jet International, St. Joaquim Road, Borda, Margao, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 16/05/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260156 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2108-2025/ARSZ/HSG/465

Date : 16-May-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “The Derajlaxmi ‘B’ Block Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Near Pandav Chapel, Aquem Alto, Margao, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260157.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“The Derajlaxmi ‘B’ Block Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Near Pandav Chapel, Aquem Alto, Margao, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 16/05/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260157 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2086-2025/ARSZ/HSG/1222

Date : 07-Aug-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “Lourenco Residency Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Comba, Margao-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260170.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“Lourenco Residency Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Comba, Margao-Goa has been registered on 07/08/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260170 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Notification**

5-2114-2025/ARSZ/HSG/1317

Date : 21-Aug-2025

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “Vian Residency Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Marlem, Borda, Margao-Goa is registered under code symbol No.- RCSSZ2025260171.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION**

“Vian Residency Co-op. Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Marlem, Borda, Margao-Goa has been registered on 21/08/2025 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2025260171 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

*Monal Manerikar*, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

**Department of Education**

Directorate of Higher Education

**Order**

DHE/ADMN/175/WA-Dy. Director/2025/1232

Date : 14-May-2025

Sanction of the Government is hereby accorded for availing the services on working arrangement basis of Mr. Ashok Mahadev Chodankar, Associate Professor, Govt. College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Sanquelim, Goa as Deputy Director of Higher Education.

Mr. Ashok Mahadev Chodankar shall draw his salary as Associate Professor in Govt. College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Sanquelim, Goa and his working arrangement shall be a temporary measure to cope up with the increased workload.

The Principal of Govt. College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Sanquelim, Goa shall relieve Mr. Ashok Mahadev Chodankar, Associate Professor with immediate effect.

This issues with the approval of the Government.

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

*Safal Shetye*, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Porvorim.

**Department of Forest****Order**

4/4/2024-FOR/226

Date : 05-Sep-2025

Government is pleased to order transfer and posting of following Officers of Goa Forest Department, with immediate effect, in public interest:

Sr. No.	Name of Officer and current posting	Transferred as/additional charge
1.	Shri Paresh Parab, Assistant Conservator of Forest, Zoo Manager, Bondla	Assistant Conservator of Forest, Social Forestry.
2.	Shri Vishwanath Pingulkar, Assistant Conservator of Forest	Assistant Conservator of Forest, Principal Goa State Forest Training School, Valpoi with additional charge of Zoo Manager, Bondla.

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

*Sitaram Gurudas Sawal*, Under Secretary (Forest).

Porvorim.

**Department of Industries****Notification**

3/7/2024-IND/208

Date : 03-Sep-2025

Read: Government Notification No. 3/7/2024-IND/166 dated 22-07-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series I No. 18 dated 31-07-2025 in respect of the Project Proponent M/s. Spark Healthline Private Limited.

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 43 of the Goa Investment Promotion and Facilitation of Single Window Clearance Act, 2021 (Goa Act 19 of 2021), the Government of Goa

hereby appoints a Planning, Development and Construction Committee, consisting of the following members, for the Investment Promotion Area declared by the Government vide Notification cited above, in respect of the Project Proponent M/s. Spark Healthline Private Limited for the purpose of setting up of a 5-Star and 4-Star Hotel, multilevel car parking in individual buildings of the hotels with 3 levels of car parking and landscaping illumination and approach road to the activities and facilities, in Reis Magos Village, Bardez Taluka, North Goa:-

(i)	Chief Secretary	—	Chairperson.
(ii)	Secretary (Industries)	—	Member.
(iii)	Director, Directorate of Industries, Trade and Commerce	—	Member.
(iv)	Chief Town Planner (Planning)	—	Member.
(v)	Director, Directorate of Health Services	—	Member.
(vi)	Director of Fire and Emergency Service	—	Member.
(vii)	Chief Inspector of Factories and Boilers	—	Member.
(viii)	Chief Electrical Engineer, Electricity Department	—	Member.
(ix)	Principal Chief Engineer, Public Works Department	—	Member.
(x)	Principal Chief Conservator of Forests	—	Member.
(xi)	Member Secretary, Goa State Pollution Control Board	—	Member.
(xii)	Member Secretary, Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority	—	Member.
(xiii)	District Collector, North Goa	—	Member.
(xiv)	District Collector, South Goa	—	Member.
(xv)	Chief Executive Officer of the Board	—	Member Secretary.

The said Committee shall exercise all the powers, such as, control or erection of building, etc. and all other powers conferred on it by the Goa Investment Promotion and Facilitation of Single Window Clearance Act, 2021 (Goa Act 19 of 2021).

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.

*Amalia O. F. Pinto*, Under Secretary (Industries).

Porvorim.



## Department of Labour

### Order

28/40/2025-LAB/518

Date : 02-Sep-2025

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Goldenglobe Hotel Pvt. Ltd., Panaji-Goa and it's workman Shri Vasant C. Mesta 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 the management of M/s. Goldenglobe Hotel Pvt. Ltd., Panaji-Goa in terminating the services of Shri Vasant C. Mesta, Engine Driver with effect from 13/09/2024, 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.

---

**Order**

28/42/2025-LAB/523

Date : 03-Sep-2025

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Cipla Limited, Verna Industrial Estate, Salcete-Goa and it's workman, represented by Bharatiya Kamgar Sena 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 (d) 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 Industrial Tribunal of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

- (1) "Whether the Bhartiya Kamgar Sena has locus standi to raise Industrial Dispute in respect of alleged punishment of suspension of 04 days of Shri Bandu Ade, Junior Operator-Production w.e.f. 24/06/2023 to 27/06/2023, before the management of M/s Cipla Limited situated at Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete-Goa?
- (2) If the answer to issue No. (1) is in affirmative, then whether Shri Bandu Ade, Junior Operator-Production could be construed as Workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
- (3) If the answer to the above issue No. (2) is in affirmative, then whether the action of Management of M/s Cipla Limited, Verna Industrial Estate, Salcete-Goa in imposing punishment of suspension on Shri Bandu Ade, Junior Operator-Production, for 4 days w.e.f. 24/06/2023 to 27/06/2023, is legal and justified?
- (4) If answer to the above issue No. (2) above is in negative, then 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.

---

**Order**

24/3/87-LAB-I (Vol-I)/ESI (Part)/526

Date : 03-Sep-2025

Government is pleased to order the transfer and posting of the following Insurance Medical Officers in E.S.I. Scheme, under office of Commissioner, Labour & Employment, in public interest, with immediate effect as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Insurance Medical Officer	Present place of posting	Place of posting on transfer
1.	Dr. Poornima M. Deshpande	E.S.I. Dispensary, Bicholim	E.S.I. Dispensary, Panaji
2.	Dr. Varsha Sawant	E.S.I. Dispensary, Panaji	E.S.I. Dispensary, Corlim
3.	Dr. Karishma Kalangutkar	E.S.I. Dispensary, Mapusa	E.S.I. Dispensary, Bicholim
4.	Dr. Vidhya Taleigaonkar	E.S.I. Dispensary, Corlim	E.S.I. Hospital, Margao

This order shall come into force with immediate effect.

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

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

Porvorim.

### Notification

28/02/2025-LAB/Part-I/530

Date : 04-Sep-2025

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 13/08/2025 in Case Ref. No. IT/32/2010 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.

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

(Before Mrs. Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Ref. No. IT/32/2010

Shri Chandrakant Daune (since deceased),  
Legal Heirs: Smt. Minaxi C. Daune,  
Daughter Ms. Diksha C. Daune,  
Son, Shri Reshab C. Daune,  
H. No. 880, Pandgal,  
Shiroda-Goa.

... Workman/Party I

V/s

The Chief Officer,  
M/s Margao Municipal Council,  
Margao-Goa.

... Employer/Party II

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

Employer/Party II represented by Learned Advocate Shri. P. Rao along with Adv. Ms. S. Drago.

## AWARD

**(Delivered on this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of the month of August of the year 2025)**

By order dated 19/11/2010 bearing No. 28/35/2010-LAB, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act of 14 of 1947), hereinafter referred to as the “said Act”), the existing dispute between the Margao Municipal Council, Margao-Goa and its workman Shri Chandrakant Daune, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa at Panaji Goa, constituted under Section 7-A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

1. “Whether the action of the Margao Municipal Council, Margao, Goa in terminating the services of its workman, Shri Chandrakant Daune, with effect from 13/11/2007, is legal and justified?
2. If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/32/2010 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Upon receipt of the notices, both the Parties put in their appearance. The Party I filed his Statement of Claim at Exhibit 8.

3. Briefly it is the case of the Party I/Workman that he was initially employed by the Party II with effect from 14/10/1997 for 30 days as per the Appointment Order No. 1703/97 which date of appointment in the Council has since been admitted and confirmed by the Chief Officer in his information under R.T.I. vide his Communication dated 22/05/2007. The Workman/Party I craves leave to rely upon and produce Xerox copies of the said Communication issued by the Chief Officer of the Council as and when required. Party I states that his employment with the Council was extended regularly with appointment orders for 30 days to 60 days at a time. Party I further states that he along with 38 other workers were employed on daily wages from time to time for various period of the year.

4. The Party I/Workman states that in view of a subsisting settlement between the Council and their workers, the Union had raised an industrial dispute with the Council/Party II on the matter of regularization of services of those daily rated workers who had completed continuous services of 240 days service in the Council and the matter was referred to the conciliation media as provided under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Party I/Workman stated that the issue of regularization of 39 employees which included the name of Party I was kept hanging along with some other issues and the Council remained defiant and adamant to solve the grievance of the workmen.

5. The Party I/Workman stated that he joined the services of the Party II/Council on 14/10/1997 and during the year 1998 itself having worked for more than 240 days without break in services, he was eligible for regularization in the services of the Party II/Council as per existing settlement.

6. In this reference the Party I/Workman has challenged the action of the Chief Officer of Margao Municipal Council in terminating his services by Order No. 1/115/88–Adm./Vol.IV/1857 dated 13/11/2007 alleging that the Workman/Party I is continuously absent from the date mentioned in the Column-3 where it is mentioned “April 2007 and prays for his reinstatement. The Party I/Workman however pending the reference since expired and his Legal Heirs, his wife, Smt. Minaxi Daune and his children, daughter, Smt. Disksha Daune and Son, Shri Reshab Daune were brought on record.

7. The Party II has disputed the Claim of the Party I/Workman in their Written Statement at Exhibit 11.

8. Considering the pleadings put forth by both the Parties, this Tribunal framed the following Issues.

## ISSUES

1. Whether the Party I proves that the action of Party II in terminating his services by order No. 1/115/88-Adm/Vol.IV/1857 dated 13/11/2007 alleging that he is continuously absent from April, 2007 is false, illegal and bad in law?
2. Whether the Party I proves that the action of Party II agreeing to reinstate him on or before 18/12/09 pursuant to understanding with Dy. Labour Commissioner, South Goa on 7/12/09 and thereafter not reinstating him is illegal?
3. Whether the Party II proves that since there are special terms and conditions of services/special rules and regulations of employment for municipal servants, the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 are not applicable in the present case?
4. Whether the Party II proves that as per the said special rules, the authority from the Directorate of Municipal Administration is the competent authority to entertain and adjudicate the disputes about the municipal servants including the Party I and therefore this court has no jurisdiction to entertain this dispute?
5. What relief? What Award?

9. Thereafter the Party I/Workman was examined and when the matter was pending for recording evidence of the Parties, this Tribunal thought it appropriate to intervene into the matter and accordingly impressed upon both the Parties to come to an amicable settlement. Accordingly, both the Parties after long negotiations arrived at a settlement by which the entire dispute was settled by paying an amount of Rs. 2,90,000/- to the Legal Heirs of the Party I/Workman and accordingly the terms of settlement along with the cheque were filed today duly signed by both the Parties which has been accepted by this Tribunal.

10. Both the Parties have filed the terms of Settlement along with the copy of the extract of the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Margao Municipal Council held on 18/07/2025 at Exhibit 50 Colly.

11. The terms of Settlement are as follows:

1. Both Parties submit that the matter has been settled between the Parties as per suggestions made by the Tribunal and that Party II has paid to Party I a sum of Rs. 2,90,000.00 by cheque No. 008799 dated 12/08/2025 drawn on HDFC Bank, Margao.
2. Party I hereby confirms that she has received the above cheque in settlement of the present dispute.
3. Both Parties pray that an Award may please be passed in terms of above settlement.
4. Party I shall file necessary Affidavits before the Party II for claiming legal dues.

12. I have gone through the application along with the copy of the extract of the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Margao Municipal Council held on 18/07/2025 at Exh. 50 Colly filed on record duly signed by both the Parties. The terms of settlement are acceptable to both the Parties which in my view, are just and fair to bring about harmony and industrial peace. As such the Settlement is accepted.

In view of above, I pass the following Order:

## ORDER

- (i) The reference at the instance of both the Parties stands disposed off in view of the Settlement arrived by both the Parties at Exhibit 50 Colly.
- (ii) No order as to costs.

(iii) Inform the Government accordingly.

*Vijayalaxmi R. Shivolkar*, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court.  
Panaji.

---

**Notification**

28/02/2025-LAB/PART-VI/531

Date : 04-Sep-2025

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 20/08/2025 in Case Ref. No. IT/26/2005 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.

---

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

(Before Mrs. Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Case No. IT/26/2005

Mr. Domnic Dias (since deceased),

1) Legal heirs Smt. Filomena Domnic Dias (wife)

2) Shri Rolan Dias (Son)

3) Renie Dias (Daughter)

Rep. by the Goa MRF Employees Union, Saidham Dhavalimol,  
Ponda-Goa

... Workman/Party I

V/s

M/s M.R.F. Limited, Curti,  
Ponda-Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I represented by Learned Adv. Shri P. Agrawal.

Employer/Party II represented by Adv. S. B. Karpe along with Adv. Ms. S. Vaigankar.

**AWARD**

**(Delivered on this the 20<sup>th</sup> day of the month of August of the year 2025)**

By order dated 19/07/2005 bearing No. 28/46/2003-LAB/361, 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 this Tribunal for adjudication:

**SCHEDULE**

“(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s MRF Limited, Usgao, in demoting Shri Domnic Dias, from the post of Operator IV Grade to the post of Operator III Grade, with effect from

24/11/2003, is legal and justified?

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

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/26/2005 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Pursuant to service of notice, Party I filed his Claim Statement at Exhibit 4.

3. It is the case of the Party I that since the formation of the Union, the Company has been attempting to disrupt the unity of the workmen employed by the Company and who are members of the Union. Of late there has been large scale harassment and victimization of the union office bearers and its other members due to their legitimate trade union activities. The harassment, inter-alia, include illegal changes in service conditions, unjustified and unwarranted suspensions, charge-sheets on false and fabricated charges, refusal to negotiate in good faith and impositions of unfair labour practices in the guise of following management policy etc. and further including the present illegal suspension of the Union's member Mr. Domnic Dias.

4. The Party I states that by letter dated 31-01-2003, the said workman was issued a charge-sheet cum order of suspension pending inquiry and final orders, which was illegal and untenable at law. It was based on the allegation that on 30/01/2003, in Shift II, the Party I/Workman had reported for work under the influence of alcohol and he was also charged for allegedly placing a wrong identification tag on the stock, which purportedly amounted to misconduct. The Party I states that the charges mentioned in the charge-sheet did not concur with the facts mentioned therein and the workman was called upon to submit his explanation within 48 hours and the charge-sheet was also signed by an unidentified person whom the workman believes to be incompetent to sign the same.

5. The Party I states that the enquiry into the aforesaid alleged charge of misconduct commenced from 13-03-2003 and concluded on 25-10-2003 and during the enquiry proceedings throughout, the Workman had co-operated fully and completely with the conduct of enquiry proceedings which is evident from the record of the enquiry proceedings and therefore it was totally unjustified, malafide and improper for the Enquiry Officer to have blamed the Workman and his defence representatives for the purported delay.

6. It is further the case of the Party I that the charge-sheet issued against the said Workman was ex-facie illegal and untenable at law. That the said workman was not allowed to be defended by person of his choice. That the Enquiry Officer had conducted the enquiry devoid of the principles of natural justice. Further, the Inquiry Officer did not afford any opportunity of defence to the said workman nor did he call upon the parties to give their final submission before closing the inquiry proceedings.

7. The Party I states that that there was no evidence supporting the charges leveled against the said Workmen and that the charges leveled did not constitute any misconduct under the Standing Orders at all, that the enquiry held against the said Workman was devoid of any rule of natural justice and was clearly ex-facie unfair and improper. That the said workman was prejudiced at each stage of the inquiry. That the illegal demotion of the said Workman is an act of unfair labour practice under Schedule V of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

8. The Party I states that the findings of the Enquiry Officer, if any, were not supplied to the workman and therefore denied him a chance to give his explanation against the said findings. Nor was he issued show-cause notice after completion of the enquiry proceedings neither sought explanation to the punishment of demotion and was served with the Order of Demotion. It is stated that the demotion of the said Workman had been resorted by the Company to victimize the said Workman for his legitimate trade union activities.

9. It is stated that the demotion of the said Workman imposed in the above circumstances also tantamount to act of unfair labour practices under items 5(a), (b), (d), (f) and (g) as well as Items 13 and 14 of the Fifth Schedule to the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. Hence, it is prayed that the punishment of demotion imposed on Mr. Domnic Dias be revoked, quashed forthwith and the said Mr. Domnic be paid full wages for the period of demotion imposed on him by Order dated 31/01/2003 with continuity of the service and other consequential reliefs.

10. In its Written Statement filed at Exhibit 5, the Party II submits that the Party I/Workman was charge-sheeted vide charge-sheet dated 31/01/2003 for reporting on duty under the influence of alcohol on 30/01/2003 in Shift II and also for his act of wrongly identifying stock without checking code printed on the stock and thus acting negligently which are serious acts of misconduct under the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. The Party II stated that as the charges were serious in nature, the Party I/Workman was suspended pending enquiry and till final orders.

11. The Party II submits that the Party I/Workman offered his explanation to the charge-sheet vide his letter dated 14/02/2003 and as the Management found the explanation unsatisfactory, a domestic enquiry was initiated to look into the charges leveled against the Party I/Workman. The Party II submits that the enquiry was conducted by Mr. Claudio Fernandes and the Management was represented by Mr. Crosby D'Souza which commenced on 13/03/2003 and was closed on 25/10/2003 after giving the Party I/Workman sufficient opportunity to defend the charges leveled against him.

12. The Party II submitted that during the entire enquiry proceedings beginning from 13/03/2003 till the conclusion on 25/10/2003, the Enquiry Officer conducted the proceedings in a fair and just manner and applied the principles of natural justice at each stage of the enquiry and the dates of the enquiry were fixed with the mutual consent of the Parties and therefore contended that no inconvenience was caused to the Party I/Workman. The Party II submits that the Workman was given sufficient opportunities to meet the charges and as such no show-cause notice was required to be given on completion of the enquiry proceedings. Based on the proceedings of the entire enquiry, the findings of guilt and the seriousness of the misconduct was proved at the enquiry and as such the Workman was demoted at work as punishment.

13. The Party II submitted that the charge-sheet dated 31/01/2003 is legal and as per the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. It is denied that the demotion is imposed to victimize the Workman for the legitimate trade union activities as alleged. The Party II submitted that the charge-sheet has been signed by Mr. Michael Ribeiro, the then Manager who was authorized and competent to do so. It is denied that the findings of the Enquiry Officer were not supplied to the Party I/Workman. The Party II denied that the illegal demotion of Party I/Workman is an act of unfair labour practice under Schedule V of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and further denied that the demotion of the Party I/Workman has been resorted by the Company to victimize the said Workman for his legitimate trade union activities. The Party II submits that the action of the Party II in demoting the Party I/Workman is legal and justified and no case is made out by the Party I/Workman in the present matter.

14. The Party II submits that the demotion by way of punishment was consequent to properly conducted enquiry and based on proved acts of misconduct committed by the workman. The Party II states that the enquiry was fair and proper and was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The Party I was given every opportunity to defend himself and only after appreciating the evidence on record, the Party II considered the findings of the Enquiry Officer and concurred with the same. The Party II also considered the past records of the Party I and considering the gravity of the proved misconducts, the management imposed a lighter punishment of demotion by way of punishment on the workman.

15. The Part II therefore states that the demotion by way of punishment of Party I is legal and justified. Party II specifically denied that there are any illegal changes in the service conditions or unjustified or unwarranted demotions or charge-sheets issued to the workmen on false and fabricated charges or that there is refusal to negotiate in good faith as alleged. It is denied that there is commission of unfair labour practices. It is denied that the charge-sheet issued against the said workman was ex-facie illegal and untenable at law. It is denied that the management has predicted punitive action against the workman or that the said workman was not allowed to be defended by a person of his choice.

16. It is further denied that the Enquiry Officer erred in coming to the conclusion of guilt as alleged. It is further denied that the Enquiry Officer failed to appreciate the evidence of the workman or that they were biased. It is denied that the Order of Demotion by way of punishment was for collateral purpose or was solely to victimize the workman for his continued allegiance to the said Union as alleged. It is denied that the Demotion Order was in violation of any unfair labour practices and further denied that there was no evidence supporting the charges leveled to the said workman. It is denied that the punishment imposed on the said workman was grossly disproportionate to the charges leveled against him.

17. The Party II submitted that the action of the Company is fair, legal and proper and the Party I is not entitled to any reliefs as prayed for. The Party II further prays that the reference may please be rejected.

18. The Party I in its Rejoinder at Exhibit 8 repeats and reiterates all averments made by him in the State of Claim and denies all the averments made by Party II in its Written Statement which run contrary to the pleadings in the Statement of Claim.

19. On completion of the pleadings, issues were framed at Exhibit 9 by this Tribunal which reads as under:

#### ISSUES

1. Whether the Party I proves that the charge-sheet issued against him was illegal?
2. Whether the Party I proves that the inquiry held against him was not fair and proper?
3. Whether the Party I proves that penalty of demotion is illegal, disproportionate, unfair labour practice and amounts to victimization?
4. Whether the findings of misconduct levelled against Party I are justified by the evidence led during the course of the enquiry or before the Tribunal?
- 4a. Whether the Party I proves that the findings of misconduct levelled against him are unjustified and illegal and same being not proved by legally acceptable evidence? (the issue No. 4 has been re-framed as the original Issue No. 4 did not cast burden on any Party to prove the same)
5. What Award?

20. From the issues framed hereinabove, Issue No. 1, 2 and 4 have been taken up to be tried as preliminary issues and accordingly Order dated 10/10/2024 has been passed by this Tribunal holding all the issues in the negative. Party I thereafter led evidence in respect of remaining Issue No. 3 and my findings to the same with reasons are as follows:

Issue No. 3	: In the Negative
Issue No. 5	: As per Final Order

#### REASONS

21. *Issue No. 3:* It is a matter of record that, this Tribunal has passed an Order dated 10/10/2024 on preliminary issue No. 1, 2 and 4 holding Issue No. 1 and 2 in the negative, by giving a finding that the Enquiry Officer had conducted the enquiry in consonance with the principles of natural justice, hence the enquiry was held to be fair and proper. By the said Order, dated 10/10/2024 this Tribunal was pleased to answer the Issue No.4 in the negative while concluding that the Enquiry Officer had analysed the evidence on record in depth and the findings of the Inquiry Officer are based on legally acceptable evidence.

22. After passing the order on the preliminary issues, opportunity was given to both the parties to the present reference to adduce further evidence in support of Issue No. 3. The Party I/Workman examined Shri Rohidas Naik and closed their evidence. Whereas the Party II made an endorsement stating that they do not wish to lead any further evidence in the matter. Accordingly, the matter proceeded to hear final arguments on merits on all the remaining issues.

23. This Tribunal while deciding the Issue No. 1 and 4 against the Workman/Party I has held that the Party I/Workman could not bring anything on record to show that the enquiry was not conducted in terms of principles of natural justice by not allowing assistance of his choice, to refute the said plea. The Party II relied upon **Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. v/s Maharashtra General Union and Ors.** reported in **AIR 1999 SC 401** wherein the Supreme Court has observed that “**In Kalindi and Ors. v. Tata Locomotive**



**& Engineering Company Ltd.**, (1960) II LLJ 228 SC, a Three-Judge Bench observed as under:- "we are unable to accept an argument that natural justice demands that in the case of enquiries into a charge-sheet of misconduct against a workman he should be represented by a member of his Union. Besides it is necessary to remember that if any enquiry is not otherwise fair, the workman concerned can challenge its validity in an industrial dispute. Our conclusion therefore is that a workman against whom an enquiry is being held by the management has no right to be represented at such enquiry by a representative of his Union: though of course an employer in his discretion can and may allow his employee to avail himself of such assistance." In another decision, namely **Dunlop Rubber Company v. Workmen**, (1965) ILL J 426 SC, it was laid down that there was no right to representation in the disciplinary proceedings by another person unless the Service Rules specifically provided for the same. In the present case the Standing Orders permitted an employee to be represented by a clerk or workman working in the same department as the delinquent. So also the right to representation can be regulated or restricted by statute. "The earlier decisions in **Kalindi and Others v. Tata Locomotive & Engineering Co. Ltd.** (supra); **Dunlop Rubber Co. v. Workmen** (supra) and **Brooke Bond India Ltd. v. Subba Raman (S.) and Anr.**, 1961 (2) LL J 417, were followed and it was held that the law in this country does not concede an absolute right of representation to an employee as part of his right to be heard. It was further specified that there is no right to representation as such unless the company, by its Standing Orders, recognizes such a right." As such, in-light of these observations the said contention of the Party I is unsustainable.

24. The inquiry proceeding at Exhibit E1 Colly further reveals that the Party I had participated in the said enquiry proceeding and when shown to him before the Tribunal, identified the signature on the said proceeding. As regards his allegation that the Management Representative did not submit the list of documents and the names of the witnesses who would be examined in the course of enquiry, the party I/Workman was again confronted with the enquiry proceedings at E-1 Colly and again he identified his signature on the said proceeding on Page 208 and 210. The Party I/Workman also stated he having examined one witness by name Ramesh Naik on his side in the said enquiry.

25. As regards the workman's allegations that he was not allowed to cross-examine the Management's witness, Mr. Martin Pires, it is in the evidence of Mr. Claudio Fernandes, Management witness who was the Enquiry Officer in the said proceeding that he did not allow the Workman to cross-examine the Management witness on behalf of Management, the MR had only produced the documents and there was no oral statement given by the MR.

26. In the case of **Managing Director, ECIL, Hyderabad and Ors vs. Karunakar and Ors.** reported in **AIR 1994 SC 1074** wherein it is held that "Hence, in all cases where the Inquiry Officer's report is not furnished to the delinquent employee in the disciplinary proceedings, the Courts and Tribunals should cause the copy of the report to be furnished to the aggrieved employee if he has not already secured it before coming to the Court/Tribunal, and give the employee an opportunity to show how his or her case was prejudiced because of the non-supply of the report. If after hearing the parties, The Court/Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the non-supply of the report would have made no difference to the ultimate findings and the punishment given, the Court/Tribunal should not interfere with the order of punishment the Courts/Tribunal should not mechanically set aside the order of punishment on the ground that the report was not furnished as is regrettably being done at present. The courts should avoid resorting to short-cuts. Since it is the Court/Tribunals which will apply their judicial mind to the question and give their reasons for setting aside or not setting aside the order of punishment, (and not any internal appellate or revisional authority), there would be neither a breach of the principles of natural justice nor a denial of the reasonable opportunity." And in **Jankinath Sarangiv State of Orissa 1999 (3) SCC 392** the SC observed that "we have to look what actual prejudice has been caused to a person by the supposed denial to him of a particular right". As such, it is submitted that the Opponent has failed to show any prejudice being occasioned on account of not serving the findings of the enquiry officer prior to passing of the Order of Dismissal.

27. As held in **Divisional Manager, Plantation Division, Andaman and Nicobar Islands vs Munnu Barrick and Ors** (reported in (2005) 2 SCC 237) "The principles of natural justice cannot be put in a strait-jacket formula. It must be viewed with flexibility. In a given case, where a deviation takes place as regard compliance of the principles of natural justice, the Court may insist upon proof of prejudice before setting

aside the order impugned before it. [**Bar Council of India v. High Court of Kerala, AIR blow your 90 2004 SC 2227**]

28. The workman was given an opportunity to demonstrate the prejudice caused to him on account of the Enquiry Officer not following the fair procedure and the inquiry being hit by principles of natural justice. The workman when examined himself before this Tribunal in his chief maintained his allegation of he being denied fair opportunity to be represented by the person of his choice, being denied fair opportunity to cross-examine the management witnesses as well as being denied fair opportunity to lead his defence. However, in the cross-examination he could not stand by his statement made in the examination-in-chief and contradicted his own version by admitting the relevant and material fact that has taken place during the inquiry when he was confronted with the inquiry proceeding at Exhibit E1 Colly. From the evidence above, it can be fairly concluded that the Party I/Workman could not place anything on record to substantiate his claim that the inquiry conducted against him was not fair and proper and that the same was conducted by violating the principles of natural justice. Hence this issue is answered in the negative.

29. That while deciding Issue No. 2 in the negative against the Party I/Workman and in favour of the management, this Tribunal held that the Management witness No.5, Mr. Irish Pinto, the Shift Foreman too has supported and corroborated the version of MW1 as regards the charges leveled against the Party I/Workman. It is at the instruction of Mr. Irish Pinto that the Party I/Workman was sent to the Ambulance Room by Mr. Undi for the Breath Analyzer Alcoholic Test when he found that the Party I/Workman was smelling of alcohol consumption when he came to meet him in the Banbury Dept. at his instruction. In the cross, when asked to MW5 whether he had any evidence to the effect as to who has written the timing on the tag to which he had replied that it is being done by the person who tags it and at the relevant time CSW was the Stacker and that he had written the timing on the tag which fact was again confirmed by Mr. Undi who identified the said writing as that of the CSW. The CSW in his cross-examination admitted that the stock on the Conveyor is identified by the Stacker from the code printed on the stock and the same is confirmed with the Millman which stock is running. On 28/01/2003, he said he was working in Shift II as a Stacker at Banbury No.2. Thus, the CSW identified that he was the Stacker on Banbury No.2 on 28/01/2003.

30. The CSW has taken a defence that he was sick and he had been examined by the Assistant Nurse for his alleged sickness, however, he demolished his own defence in the cross wherein he stated that he did not report sick to the Ambulance Room on 30/01/2003 nor does he recollect he taking any medication on 30/01/2003. When asked as to what was the exact time when he was subjected for Breath Analyzer Test after he reported for work, the Party I/Workman instead of denying that he was sent for Breath Analyzer Test, stated he does not recollect the timing. This shows that the CSW was infact referred to the Breath Analyzer Test, if not he would have straight away denied he being subjected to Breath Analyzer test. Thus, there is sufficient prima facie evidence brought on record through all the Management witnesses against the charges in the charge-sheet issued to the Party I/Workman.

31. In the case of the **Board of Trustees of the Port of Bombay and Ors. V/s Vijay Ratanrao Surve and Ors. reported in 2000 (2) Bom CR 453** wherein it has been held that “Once it is revealed that there was some evidence before the Enquiry Officer and the enquiry was conducted fairly, following the principles of natural justice, it cannot be said that the findings are bad-in-law”.

32. In the case of **State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur V/s Nemi Chand Nalwaya** reported in **AIR 2011 SC 1931** “It is now well settled that the Courts will not act as an Appellate Court and reassess the evidence led in the domestic enquiry nor interfere on the ground that another view is possible on the material on record. If the enquiry has been fairly and properly held and the findings are based on evidence, the question of adequacy of the evidence or the reliable nature of the evidence will not be grounds for interfering with the findings in departmental enquiries. Therefore, Courts will not interfere with findings of fact recorded in departmental enquiries, except where such findings are based on no evidence or where they are clearly perverse”.

33. In the case of **State Bank of India and Ors. V/s Narendra Kumar Pandey** reported in **AIR 2013 SC 904** holding that “In a departmental inquiry, the disciplinary authority is expected to prove the charges on preponderance of probability and not on proof beyond reasonable doubt.”

34. In the case of **State of Haryana v/s. Ratan Singh reported in 1977 (34) FLR 264**, it was held that :“it is well settled that in a domestic enquiry the strict sophisticated rules of evidence under the Indian Evidence Act may not apply. All materials which are logically probative for a prudent mind are permissible. There is no allergy to hearsay evidence provided it has reasonable nexus and credibility. It is true that departmental authorities and administrative tribunals must be careful in evaluating such material and should not glibly swallow what is strictly speaking not relevant under the Indian Evidence Act. For this proposition it is not necessary to cite decisions nor text books, although we have been taken through case law and other authorities by counsel on both sides. The essence of a judicial approach is objectivity, exclusion of extraneous material or considerations and observance of rules of natural justice. Of course, fair play is the basis and if perversity or arbitrariness, bias or surrender of independence of judgment vitiate the conclusions reached, such finding, even though of a domestic tribunal, cannot be held good. However, the courts below misdirect themselves, perhaps, in insisting that passengers who had come in and gone out should be chased and brought before the tribunal before a valid finding could be recorded. The ‘residuum’ rule to which counsel for the respondent referred, based upon certain passages from American jurisprudence does not go to that extent nor does the passages from Halsbury insist on such rigid requirement. The simple point is, was there some evidence or was there no evidence not in the sense of the technical rules governing regular court proceedings but in a fair commonsense way as men of understanding and worldly wisdom will accept. Viewed in this way, sufficiency of evidence in proof of the finding by a domestic tribunal is beyond scrutiny. Absence of any evidence in support of a finding is certainly available for the court to look into because it amounts to an error of law apparent on the record. We find, in this case, that the evidence of Chamanlal, Inspector of the flying squad, is some evidence which has relevance to the charge leveled against the respondent. Therefore, we are unable to hold that the order is invalid on that ground.

35. In the case of **Mahesh Pal Singh v. Superintending Engineer, Lower Chambal Circle & Ors. reported in 2001 (I) LLR 887** it was held that “It may, however, be noticed that it is by now well established that strict laws of evidence are not applicable to the departmental proceedings and the insistence on the observance of the rules of evidence by the disciplinary authorities, would rob the administrative law of its utility and the needed flexibility as it hinders or hampers them unduly in their task of weighing evidence and deciding on facts, besides resulting in the exclusion of much of the evidence of probative value. It may, however, be emphasized that the decision of the disciplinary authority must be based on material of some probative value which tends to logically show the existence of facts relevant to the issue to be determined. If the material relied upon by the disciplinary authority is capable of probative value, the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the said authority entrusted with the responsibility of deciding the issue. We are of the clear opinion that if the material relied upon is capable of having any probative value; the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the disciplinary authority entrusted with the responsibility of deciding the issue. It is the preponderance of probability that matters. In the matters regarding departmental proceedings, the expression to prove a charge has to be taken as distinguishable from the evidence which merely raises a suspicion. The proof has to be capable of scrutiny and should stand the test of reasonableness consistent with the normal conduct and probability. The rule followed in criminal trial that an offence is not established unless proved by evidence beyond reasonable doubt is not applicable to the departmental proceedings”.

36. The Party II/Employer thus by way of acceptable evidence on record could prove that the Enquiry Officer’s findings in respect of those charges were in terms of the procedures laid down under the Act and by following due procedure as per the Certified Standing Orders and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. However, on the other hand, the Party I/Workman could not prove that the grounds of misconduct alleged to have been conducted by him are false and has been leveled with a sole intent to victimize him. The Party I/Workman also could not prove that the enquiry conducted against him in respect of the charges and the findings given by the Enquiry Officer are illegal, improper, bad in law, malafide and unjustified and that the Management has failed to prove the same by way of legally acceptable evidence. Hence, the Issue No. 2 stands answered in the negative.

37. Shri Rohidas Naik in his Affidavit-in-Evidence though was required to bring before the Tribunal additional evidence on record with reference to Issue No. 3, to show that how the charge-sheet issued against the Party I/Workman was illegal and the findings of the misconduct levelled against him are illegal, but his evidence in the Affidavit-in-Evidence is in reference to the matter generally connected with the oral

demand of the Goa MRF Employees Union, on job requirement as per Industrial Engineering Standard and on the other issues such as Settlement dated 12/05/2004 in relation to its Tiruvottiyur Unit in Tamil Nadu, the standards fixed by the Department for Production, reference to IED Report. The additional evidence through Rohidas Naik did not touch any of the issues pertaining to Issue No.1, 2 and 4 nor it touched upon the subject as regards to Issue No. 3 to prove as to why and how the punishment given to the Party I/Workman was inappropriate or to prove that the penalty of demotion is illegal and disproportionate. The evidence brought on record through Rohidas Naik is not in consonance with the Claim Statement filed by the Party I/Workman nor it can be said that the evidence by Rohidas Naik is supporting or corroborating the evidence on record either in the enquiry proceedings or with the evidence of the workman and other witnesses recorded before this Tribunal. As such, the additional evidence on record does not in any manner support the Party I/Workman to say that the penalty of demotion is illegal or disproportionate.

38. Section 11 A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 reads as under: 11-A. Powers of Labour Courts, Tribunals and National Tribunals to give appropriate relief in case of discharge or dismissal of workmen. — Where an industrial dispute relating to the discharge or dismissal of a workman has been referred to a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal for adjudication and, in the course of the adjudication proceedings, the Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal, as the case may be, is satisfied that the order of discharge or dismissal was not justified, it may, by its award, set aside the order of discharge or dismissal and direct reinstatement of the workman on such terms and conditions, if any, as it thinks fit, or give such other relief to the workman including the award of any lesser punishment in lieu of discharge or dismissal as the circumstances of the case may require.

39. In the case of **Mahindra and Mahindra v/s N. B. Narawade 2005 I CLR 803** the Court has observed that "Whether it is open to the Industrial Tribunal or the labour court or the High Court to interfere with the quantum of punishment is, no longer, *res integra*, as the question has been answered by this Court several times in its various decisions in B.C. Chaturvedi Vs. Union of India [1995(6) SCC 749] a three-Judge Bench of this Court held that that Section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 confers power on the Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court to apply its mind on the question of proportion of punishment or penalty that this power is also available to the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution, though it was qualified with a limitation that while seized as a writ court, interference is permissible only when the punishment/penalty is shockingly disproportionate."

40. Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the citation above was pleased to set aside the order of dismissal and directs the reinstatement passed by Division Bench, Single Judge of the High Court and that of the Labour Court and uphold the order of the disciplinary authority dismissing the respondent- workman from service.

41. The relevant observation of the Hon'ble apex court in respect of Section 11-A in this Judgment reads "It is no doubt true that after introduction of Section 11-A in the Industrial Disputes Act, certain amount of discretion is vested with the labour court/Industrial Tribunal in interfering with the quantum of punishment awarded by the Management where the concerned workman is found guilty of misconduct. The said area of discretion has been very well defined by the various judgments of this Court referred to herein above and it is certainly not unlimited as has been observed by the Division Bench of the High Court. The discretion which can be exercised under Section 11-A is available only on the existence of certain factors like punishment being disproportionate to the gravity of misconduct so as to disturb the conscience of the court, or the existence of any mitigating circumstances which requires the reduction of the sentence, or the past conduct of the workman which may persuade the Labour Court to reduce the punishment. In the absence of any such factor existing, the Labour Court cannot by way of sympathy alone exercise the power under Section 11-A of the Act and reduce the punishment.

42. In this case records reveal that the Party I/Workman was given fair opportunity to defend himself in the domestic enquiry against the charges leveled against him in the charge-sheet. Before this Tribunal also the Party I was given opportunity to enable him to discard the allegations in the charge-sheet which was said to be proved by the Enquiry Officer in the said domestic enquiry by producing supporting evidence to show that the Party I under the influence of alcohol wrongly identified the stock without checking the code printed on the Stock and thereby committed an act of negligence.

43. Therefore, considering the overall evidence on record as well as considering the acts of misconduct as defined in the Certified Standing Orders coupled with the ratio laid in the judicial pronouncements as mentioned herein above, this Tribunal is of the opinion that the Party I has failed to prove that the action of the management of M/s. MRF Ltd Usgao, Ponda in awarding punishment of demotion of deceased Shri Domnic Dias from the post of Operator IV Grade to post of Operator III Grade w.e.f. 24/11/2003 is illegal and unjustified. As such, Party I is not entitled for any relief as claimed in the Statement of Claim and hence the Issue No.3 stands answered in negative.

Hence the Order:

#### ORDER

- (i) The punishment of demoting deceased Shri Domnic Dias from the post of Operator IV Grade to post of Operator III Grade is legal and justified.
- (ii) As such, the Legal Heirs of the deceased Party I/Workman, Mr. Domnic Dias are not entitled for any relief.
- (iii) No order as to cost.
- (iv) Inform the Government accordingly.

*Vijayalaxmi R. Shivolkar*, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court.

Panaji.



#### Department of Law

Law (Establishment) Division

#### Order

1/2/2022/LD(Estt.)/2099

Date : 02-Sep-2025

Government of Goa is pleased to appoint Adv. Yash Tembe, as Government Lawyer on behalf of State of Goa to appear and defend the interest of the State Government in the matters before the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Western Zone Bench, Pune with immediate effect and until further orders.

He shall be paid fees as per the existing terms and conditions laid down by the Government vide Order No. 1/19/2015/LD(Estt.)/1515 dated 05/09/2023, as applicable to Government Advocates/Additional Government Advocates and as amended from time to time, on submission of bills (in duplicate) along with the attendance certificate, issued by the Registrar of the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Western Zone Bench, Pune. He shall comply with the instructions contained in the Government Circular No. 4-43-99/LD dated 04/05/2000. He will appear in those matters, which would be allotted to him by the Ld. Advocate General of the State of Goa.

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

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

Porvorim.

**Department of Personnel****Order**

13/06/2024-PER/2635

Date : 29-Aug-2025

The Governor of Goa is pleased to grant further extension in service to Shri. Liladhar B. Dessai, Deputy Director, Directorate of Planning, Statistics & Evaluation, Porvorim beyond the date of his superannuation for further period of one year w.e.f. 01/09/2025 to 31/08/2026, in public interest. This order is subject to Vigilance Clearance from Vigilance Department, concurrence of Finance Department and approval of Council of Ministers.

The extension is further subject to termination without assigning any reasons during the period of extension.

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

*Durga Kinlekar*, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim.

**Order**

5/3/2025-PER/2663

Date : 02-Sep-2025

Shri Praveen Shirodkar, Deputy Commissioner of State Taxes shall hold the charges of Deputy Director (Admn.), PWD & Deputy Director, Department of Drinking Water (DDW) and Shri Krishnakant Sakharam Pangam, Deputy Director (Admn.), Panchayats shall hold the charges of SLAO, PWD & SLAO, National Highways in addition to their own duties with immediate effect.

This issues on the recommendation of the Goa Services Board.

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

*Raghuraj A. Faldesai*, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim.

**Order**

15/23/2023-PER/2747

Date : 08-Sep-2025

On the recommendation of the Goa Services Board, the Governor of Goa is pleased to order the transfer and posting of the following Officers in the cadre of Block Development Officer, in public interest, with immediate effect:-

Sr. No.	Name and present posting of the officer	Posted as
1.	Shri Pretesh Babu Shetye, BDO-I, Directorate of Panchayats, North (HQ)	BDO-II, Bardez

Shri Siddesh Surya Kerkar, BDO-II, Directorate of Panchayats, North (HQ) shall hold the charge of BDO-I, Directorate of Panchayats, North (HQ) in addition to his own duties.

The officers shall complete handing over and taking over process with immediate effect and submit compliance.

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

*Raghuraj A. Faldesai*, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim.

**Order**

No. 6/5/2023-PER/2749

Date : 08-Sep-2025

On the recommendation of the Goa Services Board, the Governor of Goa is pleased to order the transfer and posting of the following Senior Scale Officers of Goa Civil Service, in public interest, with immediate effect:-

Sr. No.	Name and present posting of the officer	Posted as
1.	Shri Rajesh Ajgaonkar, awaiting posting	Commissioner of Labour and Employment
2.	Smt. Siddhi T. Halarnkar, Director of Panchayat	Director of Civil Aviation
3.	Shri Mahadev Araundekar, Director of Civil Aviation	Director of Panchayat

Shri Bala T. Korgaonkar, Senior Scale Officer of Goa Civil Service, holding charge of Dy. Director (Admn.), Goa Medical College shall also hold the charge of Dy. Director (Admn.), Goa Dental College until further orders.

The officers shall complete handing over and taking over process with immediate effect and submit compliance.

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

*Durga Kinlekar*, Under Secretary (Personnel-I)/Link.

Porvorim.

**Department of Public Health****Order**

13/25/2002-I/PHD/1142

Date : 08-Sep-2025

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide letter No. COM/II/11/56(2)/07/160 dated 11/08/2025, the Government is pleased to promote following Assistant Chemists (Drugs) to the post of Chemist (Drugs) (Group 'B' Non-Gazetted) in the Directorate of Food & Drugs Administration on regular basis in the Level 6 of Pay Matrix of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission [PB-2 Rs. 9300-34800 + Grade Pay Rs. 4200/- (pre-revised)] on regular basis with immediate effect.

1. Smt. Tania A.P. Fernandes e Vales.

2. Shri Satyavan S. Naik.

The above Officers shall be on probation for a period of two years from the date of joining.

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

*Dr. Pooja Madkaikar*, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim.

**Department of Revenue****Order**

26/11/2015-RD(Part-I)/2653

Date : 04-Sep-2025

The Government of Goa is pleased to transfer the following Inspector of Survey & Land Records, in the public interest with immediate effect.

S/N	Name of the Officer	Present posting	New place of posting
1.	Shri Rajesh R. Pai Kuchelkar, ISLR	Inspector of Survey & Land Records, Ponda	Inspector of Survey & Land Records, Ponda with addl. charge of Inspector of Survey & Land Records, Dharbandora.
2.	Smt. Vinita Kambli, ISLR	Inspector of Survey & Land Records, Pernem	Assistant Survey & Settlement Officer, Panaji.
3.	Shri Babaji Parab, ISLR	Inspector of Survey & Land Records, Dharbandora	Inspector of Survey & Land Records, Pernem.

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

*Vrushika Kauthankar*, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim.



### Department of Rural Development

District Rural Development Agency, North Goa District

#### Order

No. DRDA-N/MON./8-91/2025-26/1490

Date : 19-Aug-2025

In terms of the Order issued by the Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi vide No. Q-13016/02/2019-DISHA dated 08<sup>th</sup> August, 2024, the District Development Co-ordination and Monitoring Committee (DDCMC) 'DISHA' is being constituted for North Goa District for monitoring and implementation of the programmes and schemes sponsored by Government of India in accordance with the prescribed procedure and guidelines.

The composition of the Committee is as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person/Designation	Name of the Department/Designation	Designation in the Committee
1.	Shri. Shripad Yesso Naik	Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), North Goa District	Chairperson.
2.	Shri. Captain Viriato Fernandes	Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), South Goa District	Co-Chairperson.
3.	Members of the State Legislative Assembly (MLAs)	North Goa District Assembly Constituencies of Mandrem, Pernem, Bicholim, Tivim, Mapusa, Siolim, Saligao, Calangute, Porvorim, Aldona, Panaji, Taleigao, St. Cruz, St. Andre, Cumbharjua, Maem, Sanquelim, Poriem, Valpoi	Members.
4(i)	Mayor	Corporation of the City of Panjim	Member.
(ii)	Chairperson	Mapusa Municipal Council	Member.
(iii)	Chairperson	Pernem Municipal Council	Member.
(iv)	Chairperson	Bicholim Municipal Council	Member.
(v)	Chairperson	Sanquelim Municipal Council	Member.
(vi)	Chairperson	Valpoi Municipal Council	Member.
5.	Chairperson	Zilla Panchayat, North Goa District	Member.
6.	Chief Executive Officer	Zilla Panchayat, North Goa District	Member.



7.	Project Director	District Rural Development Agency, North Goa District	Member.
8.	Lead Bank Officer	State Bank of India, Panaji, North Goa District	Member.
9.	Senior Superintendent/ Superintendent	Postal Department, Mapusa, North Goa District	Member.
10.	District Collector	North Goa District	Member Secretary.
11.	Nodal Functionaries of all the Programmes under purview of DISHA, North Goa District		
(i)	Director	Directorate of Health Services	Member.
(ii)	Director	Directorate of Education	Member.
(iii)	Director	Sarva Siksha Abhiyan/Goa Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan	Member.
(iv)	Director	Directorate of Women & Child Development	Member.
(v)	Principal Chief Engineer	Public Works Department	Member.
(vi)	Director	Directorate of Social Welfare	Member.
(vii)	Director	Directorate of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs	Member.
(viii)	Director	Directorate of Agriculture	Member.
(ix)	Director	Directorate of Settlement & Land Records	Member.
(x)	Member Secretary	Goa State Urban Development Agency	Member.
(xi)	Managing Director & CEO	Imagine Panaji Smart City Dev. Ltd.	Member.
(xii)	Director	Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship	Member.
(xiii)	Director	Directorate of Information Technology	Member.
(xiv)	Chief Engineer	Water Resources Department	Member.
(xv)	Director	Directorate of Mines & Geology	Member.
(xvi)	Director	Directorate of Panchayat	Member.
(xvii)	Captain of Ports	Department of River Navigation	Member.
(xviii)	Director	Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services	Member.
(xix)	Director	Directorate of Transport	Member.
(xx)	Director	Directorate of Sports and Youth Affairs	Member.
(xxi)	Commissioner of Labour and Employment	Office of the Commissioner, Labour and Employment	Member.
(xxii)	Director	Department for Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities	Member.
(xxiii)	Director	Department of New & Renewable Energy	Member.
12.	Joint Secretary	Department of Administrative Reforms	Member.
13. i.	Sarpanch	Village Panchayat Ibrampur, Pernem	Member.
ii.	Sarpanch	Village Panchayat Corlim, Tiswadi	Member.
iii.	Sarpanch	Village Panchayat Korgao, Pernem	Member.
iv.	Sarpanch (Women Representative)	Village Panchayat Old Goa, Tiswadi.	Member.
iv.	Sarpanch (Women Representative)	Village Panchayat Nadora, Bardez.	Member.

14.	Shri. Subhash Naik	Matrubhumi Seva Pratishthan, H.No. 206, Badem, Salvado-do-Mundo, Bardez-Goa	Member.
15.	Shri Abhay Bhamaikar	Maluara, Agacaim	Member.
16.	Shri. Balchandra Usgaonkar	H. No. 421/1, Caraibhat, Carambolim, Tiswadi-Goa 403110	Member.
17.	Smt. Arti Bandodkar	Mayem-Goa	Member.

The Committee shall meet once every quarter to monitor and review progress made by implementing Departments/Agencies.

This Committee supersedes earlier Committee constituted vide Order No. DRDA-N/MON./8-91/2020-21/237 dated 20/05/2020.

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

*Sanjay Goel*, IAS, Secretary (Rural Development).

Panaji.



### Department of Town and Country Planning

#### Notification

36/18/39A/Notification(9F)/TCP/2025/441

Date : 10-Sep-2025

Whereas, the Town and Country Planning Department of the Government of Goa received applications under sub-section (1) of Section 39A of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 (Act 21 of 1975) for change of zones in the Regional Plan for Goa 2021 in respect of the plots of land as specified in detail in column Nos. (2) to (7) of the Table below (hereinafter referred to as “the said Proposals”);

TABLE

Sr. No.	Name of the Applicant	Survey No./ Sub-Division No./P.T. Sheet No./Chalta No.	Name of Village and Taluka	Published land use as per RPG-2021/ODP (Total Area) in m2	Proposed land use	Area proposed in sq. mts.	Decision of the Government
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Prestige Acres Private Limited rep. by Mr. Kishor Kumar Kadrolkar	129/1	Sancoale, Mormugao	Transportation/ warehousing & communication (T) Total Area (24625)	Settlement Zone	24625	Approved for change of zone
2.	Santosh Sonu Gaonkar	39/2, Plot No. 20	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (270)	Settlement Zone	270	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.
3.	Nihal Suhas Parvatkar	39/2, Plot No. 25	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (270)	Settlement Zone	270	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.
4.	Nihal Suhas Parvatkar	39/2, Plot No. 21	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (270)	Settlement Zone	270	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.

5.	Santosh Sonu Gaonkar	39/2, Plot No. 24	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (270)	Settlement Zone	270	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.
6.	Santosh Sonu Gaonkar	39/2, Plot No. 22	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (281)	Settlement Zone	281	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.
7.	Nihal Suhas Parvatkar	39/2, Plot No. 26	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (270)	Settlement Zone	270	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.
8.	Nihal Suhas Parvatkar	39/2, Plot No. 19	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (270)	Settlement Zone	270	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.
9.	Nihal Suhas Parvatkar	39/2, Plot No. 21	Sanguem, Sanguem	Paddy Field Total Area (270)	Settlement Zone	270	Approved for change of zone as the property is not low lying.
10.	Tome Rosario Correia	314/8	Aldona, Bardez	Orchard Total Area (3250)	Settlement zone	3250	Approved for change of zone
11.	Imperial Northstar Exim LLP	42/1 (Part) 42/2 (Part)	Siridao, Tiswadi	Partly Natural Cover (3350m2) Partly Natural Cover with No Development Slope (1650m2) Total Area (5000)	Settlement zone	5000	Approved for change of zone
12.	Imperial Northstar Exim LLP	44/1	Curca, Tiswadi	Orchard Total Area (6000)	Settlement zone	6000	Approved for change of zone
13.	Imperial Northstar Private Limited	260/1-B	Morombi-O-Grande, Tiswadi	Partly Settlement, Partly Natural Cover with No Development Slope Total Area (2626)	Natural Cover with No Development Slope to Settlement	609	Approved for change of zone
14.	Ladlimashak Salim Nadaf	236/1 Plot No. 189-B	Usgao, Ponda	Natural Cover Total Area (125)	Settlement	125	Approved for change of zone
15.	Moirun Bi Modinsab Mulla	236/1 Plot No. 145	Usgao, Ponda	Natural Cover Total Area (225)	Settlement	225	Approved for change of zone
16.	Pyaranbi Abbas Nadaf	236/1 Plot No. 56-A	Usgao, Ponda	Natural Cover Total Area (130)	Settlement	130	Approved for change of zone

And whereas, in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 of the Goa Town and Country Planning (Change of zone of land in the Regional Plan or the Outline Development Plan) Rules, 2024 (hereinafter referred to as the “said Rules”), the Town and Country Planning Department after scrutinizing the said proposals placed such proposals alongwith its scrutiny reports before the Goa Town and Country Planning Board for its recommendations/approval/decision;

And whereas, the Goa Town and Country Planning Board approved the said proposals as specified in column No. 8 of the above Table;

And whereas, notices as required by sub-rule (2) of Rule 4 of the said Rules were published,—

- (i) vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(7)/TCP/2024/32 dated 28/10/2024, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 31 dated 01-11-2024 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 1);
- (ii) vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(11)/TCP/2024/53 dated 26-11-2024, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 35 dated 28-11-2024 (as regards proposals at Sr. Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9);
- (iii) vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(20)/TCP/2025/98 dated 30-04-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 05 dated 02-05-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 10);
- (iv) vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(23)/TCP/2025/236 dated 18-06-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 12 dated 19-06-2025 (as regards proposals at Sr. Nos. 11 & 12);
- (v) vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(10)/TCP/2024/52 dated 19-11-2024, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 34 dated 21-11-2024 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 13);
- (vi) vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(3R)/TCP/2024/43 dated 12/11/2024, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 33 dated 14-11-2024 (as regards proposals at Sr. Nos. 14, 15 & 16); and suggestions were invited from the public within a period of thirty days from the date of publication to the said Notifications in the Official Gazette.

And whereas, suggestions received from public were placed before the Goa Town and Country Planning Board in terms of sub-rules (3) of Rule 4 for its recommendation/approval and the Goa Town and Country Planning Board after due consideration of the suggestions received from the public recommended the proposals for change of zone as regards to Sr. No. 1 in its meeting 210<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 30-12-2024, Sr. No. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15 & 16 in its 211<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15-01-2025, Sr. No. 10 in its 216<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 13-06-2025, Sr. No. 11 & 12 in its 217<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 29-07-2025 and Sr. No. 13 in its 213<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 07-03-2025 and directed to take further action as per sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 of the said Rules;

And whereas, as required by sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 of the said Rules, the recommendation/approval/decision of the Goa Town and Country Planning Board along with the said proposals were placed before the Government for its decision and the Government has approved the same;

Now, therefore, in view of the recommendation of the Goa Town and Country Planning Board being approved by the Government and in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 39A of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 (Act 21 of 1975) read with sub-rule (5) of Rule 4 of the Goa Town and Country Planning (Change of zone of land in the Regional Plan or the Outline Development Plan) Rules, 2024, the Regional Plan and the Outline Development Plan is hereby altered and modified as specified in column No. (8) of above Table and as directed by the Government for carrying out change of zone of land in respect of the plots of land as specified in detail in column Nos. (2) to (7) of above Table.

The alteration and modification of the Regional Plan and the Outline Development Plan as notified in this Notification shall be subject to the outcome of the PIL Writ Petition Nos. 53 of 2024 and 54 of 2024 which are pending final disposal before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa.

*Vertika Dagur*, Chief Town Planner (Planning).

Panaji.



### Department of Urban Development

Directorate of Municipal Administration/Urban Development

#### Notification

10/671/2015-DMA/2045

Date : 08-Sep-2025

The Government has constituted a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) in the name and style of Imagine Panaji Smart City Development Limited (IPSCDL) for operationalizing the Smart City Projects with Board of Directors (BoD) vide Notification No. 10/671/2015-DMA/658 dated 9<sup>th</sup> June, 2016.

The Department of Urban Development/Directorate of Municipal Administration has to issue notifications reconstituting the board in respect of ex-officio Members of the Board as and when there is a change of the incumbents holding the posts and for the other members as per Government order from time to time.

Therefore, the Government of Goa hereby re-constitutes the Board of IPSCDL with ex officio members as per designation given in column [2] in Table A below and Non ex officio members as given in Table B below:

TABLE A

Sr. No.	Designation	Name	IPSCDL Board Designation
1	2	3	4
1.	Chief Secretary, Government of Goa	Dr. V. Candavelou, IAS	Chairman
2.	Secretary (Finance), Government of Goa	Dr. V. Candavelou, IAS	Director
3.	Secretary (Urban Development), Government of Goa	Shri. Yetindra M. Maralkar, IAS	Director
4.	Managing Director & CEO, IPSCDL	Shri. Sandip Jacques, IAS	Director
5.	Collector, North Goa	Shri. Ankit Yadav, IAS	Director
6.	Director/ex officio Joint Secretary (Urban Development), Government of Goa	Shri Brijesh Manerkar	Director
7.	Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Panaji	Shri Clen Madeira	Director
8.	Principal Chief Engineer, PWD, Government of Goa	Shri Uttam Parsekar	Director

TABLE B

Sr. No.	Name	IPSCDL Board Designation
1	2	3
1.	Shri. Sandip Jacques, IAS	Managing Director & CEO, IPSCDL
2.	Shri Subhash Chander, US IFD, Government of India	Director
3.	Shri Atanasio Monserrate, Minister for Revenue, Labour & Waste Mangement.	Director
4.	Shri Rohit Joe Monserrate, Mayor, Corporation of the City of Panaji	Director

This is issued in supersession of all earlier Notifications issued in this regard.

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

Shri *Brijesh Manerkar*, Director of Municipal Administration/Urban Development, ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji.