

Panaji, 20th November, 2025 (Kartika 29, 1947)

SERIES II No. 34

OFFICIAL GAZETTE GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note: There are four Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 33 dated 13-11-2025 as follows:-

- 1. Extraordinary dated 14-11-2025 from pages 1107 to 1110 regarding Orders from State Election Commission, Goa.*
- 2. Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 18-11-2025 from pages 1111 to 1112 regarding Order from Department of Home and Order from Department of Panchayati Raj and Community Development.*
- 3. Extraordinary (No. 3) dated 19-11-2025 from pages 1113 to 1114 regarding Notification from Department of General Administration.*
- 4. Extraordinary (No. 4) dated 19-11-2025 from pages 1115 to 1116 regarding Order from State Election Commission, Goa.*

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Agriculture

Directorate of Agriculture

Order

No. 2/14/95/Agri(Part)/Vol.II/1491

Date : 13-Nov-2025

Government is pleased to order the transfer of the following Agriculture Officers, Group 'B' Gazetted of this Directorate as indicated below against their names with immediate effect in public interest:

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer & present place of posting	Place of posting on transfer
1.	Smt. Siddhi Prabhu Gaonkar, Farm Superintendent, Government Agricultural Farm, Kalay, Sanguem-Goa	As Agriculture Officer (RKVY), Crops & PP Section, Directorate of Agriculture, Krishi Bhavan, Tonca vice Shri. Sachin Gaonkar being transferred.
2.	Shri. Sachin Gaonkar, Agriculture Officer (RKVY), Crops & PP Section, Directorate of Agriculture, Krishi Bhavan, Tonca	As Farm Superintendent, Government Agricultural Farm, Kalay, Sanguem-Goa vice Smt. Siddhi Prabhu Gaonkar being transferred.

The above Officers are hereby stands relieved from their respective post w.e.f. 13-11-2025 (a. n.) to join new place of posting on transfer.

This is issued with the approval of Government vide entry No. 8034/F dated 06-11-2025.

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 Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services

Directorate of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services

Order

No. 6-2(2)/Veterinary College/Part III/2025-2026/5203

Date : 14-Nov-2025

Whereas the Government has approved for setting up of Goa College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences under the aegis of the Department of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services.

Now therefore, in view of the decision in the LXXXVIIth Cabinet Meeting the Council of Ministers have accorded approval to allotment of land admeasuring 66,595 sq. mts. of area in Survey No. 79 of village Curti, Ponda along with buildings etc. and land admeasuring 1,00,000 Sq. mts. in Survey No. 45/0, 46/0, 47/1(Part) and 47/2(Part) of village Codar, Ponda-Goa belonging to the Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services to the Goa College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences on lease basis for 30 years for the establishment of “The Goa College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences”.

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

Sd/-, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (AH).

Panaji.

Order

No. 5-1(15)/upgradation/KVSC-Ela/2025-26/5279

Date : 17-Nov-2025

Sanction of the Government is hereby conveyed for upgradation of the Key Village Sub Centre, Old Goa to Veterinary Dispensary, Old Goa. The jurisdictional area of Veterinary Dispensary, Old Goa shall consist of the area which was under the existing Key Village Sub Centre, Old Goa, area under Key Village Sub Centre, Goa Velha and area under Key Village Sub Centre, Cumbharjua.

Key Village Sub Centre, Goa Velha and Key Village Sub Centre, Cumbharjua shall report to the Veterinary Dispensary, Old Goa.

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

Sd/-, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (AH).

Panaji.

Department of Co-operation

Office of the Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies

Order

No. 5-1816-2019/ARSZ/IND/2061

Date : 12-Nov-2025

Read: 1. Order No. ARCS/SZ/GENERAL CORRES./2023/626 dated 12-06-2024 appointing Official Assignee of the Pragati Readymade Garments Co-operative Society Ltd., Vasco-Goa.

2. Final report dated 24-10-2025 received from Official Assignee of the Pragati Readymade Garments Co-operative Society Ltd., Vasco-Goa.

In exercise of powers vested in me under Section 19 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, I, Monal Manerikar, Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies, South Zone, Fatorda, Margao-Goa, in furtherance to final report referred at Sr. No. 2 by the Official Assignee appointed vide order referred at Sr. No. 1 cancel the registration of the Pragati Readymade Garments Co-operative Society Ltd., Vasco-Goa, bearing number PRD(IND)-(a)-001/South Goa/2019 dated 17-01-2019. The society shall from the date of order of cancellation, deemed to be dissolved and shall cease to exist as corporate body.

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

Margao.

Department of Education

Directorate of Education

Addendum

No. DE/VOC/Sans.Path./Rev.Sch/977/2020-21/464

Date : 14-Nov-2025

Read: Order No. DE/VOC/Sans.Path./Rev.Sch/977/2020-21/257 dated 17-10-2023.

The 'term and condition' No. (iv) is hereby added in the third para of above Order to read as:

(iv) The Sanskrit Pathshala(s)/Kendra(s) are the employers of their staff. The current incumbents who were already paid consolidated remuneration under the prevalent Pattern of Assistance shall continue to draw the same consolidated remuneration under this Pattern of Assistance, however the 5% of increase every year shall be absorbed in their respective consolidated remuneration till the consolidated remuneration of teachers as detailed table below for Sanskrit Pathshalas attains equilibrium (thereafter they will be eligible for said increase of 5%). Only the new recruitments, if any, under this scheme shall require prior permission from the Directorate of Education & Finance Department and the salary grants in respect of such new recruitments, if any, shall be released only after ascertaining that they possess the essential educational qualifications and experience and due recruitment process is followed. The consolidated remuneration for teachers shall be Rs. 40,000/- per month with 5% increase every year. All the staff appointed since the inception of scheme by the Sanskrit Pathshala(s)/Kendra(s) registered with the Directorate of Education shall be treated purely on contract basis in their respective institutes only, with the provision of renewal of the contract without any provision for regularisation. The Sanskrit Pathshala(s)/Kendra(s) should register 'themselves under Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provision Act, 1952, under this Pattern of Assistance no grant-in-aid will be admissible for the employers share. All the teaching staff shall be designated/re-designated as 'Sanskrit teachers purely on contract basis'. Each Sanskrit Pathshala may have one 'Pradhanadyapak' purely on contract basis with consolidated remuneration of Rs. 50,000/- per month with 5% increase every year.

The existing designations such as Bahukaryakari/helper/Ayah/Sevika shall be re-designated as Bahukaryakari (Multi-Tasking Staff).

The fixed consolidated remuneration per month for staff in 'Sanskrit Pathshala' and 'vasati guruh' functioning full time on all working days shall be as under:

Sr. No.	Designation of staff	Consolidated fixed remuneration per month	Essential qualifications
1.	'Pradhanacharya' purely on contract basis (01 per Sanskrit Pathshala)	Consolidated remuneration of Rs. 50,000/- per month with 5% increase every year	Degree in Sanskrit or equivalent from any recognized university or institution with 7 years teaching experience in reputed institution. OR Completion of full course of 7 years from any recognized Sanskrit Pathshala.
2.	'Sanskrit teacher purely on contract basis' (minimum 02 per Sanskrit Pathshala) the teacher pupil ratio may be fixed by the Director of Education subsequently with the approval of Government and inform by a circular	Consolidated remuneration of Rs. 40,000/- per month with 5% increase every year	Degree in Sanskrit or equivalent from any recognized university or institution. OR Completion of full course of 7 years from any recognized Sanskrit Pathshala.

3.	‘Lipic’ purely on contract basis (01 per Sanskrit Pathshala)	Consolidated remuneration of Rs. 19,000/- per month with 5% increase every year	H.S.S.C. from recognized board (preferably of Commerce stream).
4.	Swayampaki purely on contract basis (01 per Sanskrit Pathshala with vastighrha)	Consolidated remuneration of Rs. 19,000/- per month with 5% increase every year	3 years experience in cooking in large establishment.
5.	Sahayyak Swayampaki purely on contract basis (01 per Sanskrit Pathshala with vastighrha)	Consolidated remuneration of Rs. 15,000/- per month with 5% increase every year	1 year experience in cooking in large establishment.
6.	Bahukaryakari (helper/sevika/Multi-Tasking Staff) purely on contract basis (02 per Sanskrit Pathshala)	Consolidated remuneration of Rs. 15,000/- per month with 5% increase every year	Std. X pass or ITI certificate. (relaxable for existing incumbents as on)

Further, the fixed consolidated honorarium per annum or per day as the case may be for staff in ‘Sanskrit Kendras’ functioning for limited period of time on a couple of days in a week is proposed as under (essential qualifications as mentioned against their respective posts at Para. 2 above):

Sr. No.	Post	Fixed Honorarium	Details	
1.	Samanvayak (purely on contract basis)	Rs. 29,400/- (lumpsum)	Only one (01) Samanvayak to manage the Kendra’s Head Office	Consolidated honorarium per annum.
2.	Sanskrit teacher purely on contract basis	Rs. 300/- x number of days	One Sanskrit teacher per Kendra	Upto 70 days in a year.
3.	Lipic purely on contract basis	Rs. 19,000/- per month	Only one (01) lipic to manage the Kendra’s Head Office	On annual basis.
4.	Bahukaryakari purely on contract basis	Rs. 125/- x number of days	One (01) Bahukaryakari per Kendra	Upto 70 days in a year.

The minimum qualification/essential qualifications as detailed against the designations shall be mandatory.

The Societies which runs Sanskrit Kendras/Sanskrit Pathshalas shall be registered under the Society Registration Act, 1860 to be eligible to receive grants under this pattern of assistance. However, the said clause shall be relaxed for the trust who manage the Sanskrit Kendras/Sanskrit Pathshalas as on 02-11-2023.

Any revision in the staffing strength or quantum of grants may be done by the Director of Education with the prior approval of the Government and concurrence of the Finance (Expenditure) Department.

The quantum of grants released as per the pattern of assistance sanctioned earlier to the Sanskrit Pathshalas/Sanskrit Kendras shall be protected in the event that quantum of grants released as per this pattern of assistance works out to be less.

The rest of the contents of the main Order dated 17-10-2023 remain unchanged.

This issues with the concurrence of Finance (Expenditure) Department vide their U. O. No. 1400115576 dated 11-11-2025.

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

Shailesh R. Sinai Zingde, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Education).

Porvorim.

Department of Forest**Notification**

No. 19/1/2025/FOR/291

Date : 29-Oct-2025

Whereas, the Bondla Zoo Foundation is registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 vide Registration No. 111/Goa/2023 on 01-08-2023.

And whereas, the said Society has appointed General Body and Managing Committee members as per the provisions of the Societies Registration Act, 1860 and the Society's By-laws;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Societies Registration Act, 1860, the Government of Goa hereby notifies the Managing Committee and General Body of the Bondla Zoo Foundation with the following members.

The General Body of the Foundation shall consist of the following members:-

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Minister of Forests, Government of Goa | — Chairman. |
| 2. Principal Secretary/Secretary (Forests) | — Member. |
| 3. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests | — Member. |
| 4. Principal Secretary/Secretary (Finance) | — Member. |
| 5. Secretary (Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services) | — Member. |
| 6. Two representatives from Corporates/reputed organizations nominated by Government viz. | |
| i) Dr. Kedar Padte, Kedar Hospital, Panaji, Goa | — Member. |
| ii) Shri Mahesh Patil, Ex-Chairman, Goa State Pollution Control Board | — Member. |
| 7. Representative of WWF India, Goa Chapter, Reputed NGO in the field of Ex-situ Conservation | — Member. |
| 8. Chief Wildlife Warden | — Member Secretary. |

Role, Responsibilities and Terms of General Body:-

- The General Body shall provide the policy directives and exercise overall control over finance, programs, schemes and activities as per the Articles of deeds and the operation manual of the Foundation.
- To facilitate scientific management and improvement of the Zoological Park as per the guidelines of Central Zoo Authority (CZA).
- To support the implementing agency on eco-development, ecotourism, research, training and management in all related fields.
- To solicit technical, financial and other supports from diverse sources in conformity with the law.
- To guide and approve the developmental plans, schemes and budget of the Foundation.
- To approve the annual report of the Foundation.
- Term of General Body: Chairman and Members at Sr. No. 2, 3, 4, 5 & 8 are ex-officio members. The term of the member at Sr. No. 6 is five years and at Sr. No. 7 is three years.
- The General Body Meeting will be held once in a year.

The Managing Committee of the foundation shall consist of the following members:-

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Chief Wildlife Warden | — Chairperson. |
| 2. Chief Conservator of Forests/Conservator of Forests (Wildlife circle) | — Member. |
| 3. HOD (Zoology) from Goa University | — Member. |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 4. Director (Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services) | — Member. |
| 5. Veterinary Officer/Zoo Manager of Bondla Zoo | — Member. |
| 6. Account Officer/Divisional Accountant (DCF Wildlife & Ecotourism, North Division) | — Member. |
| 7. Representative of WWF India, Goa Chapter, Reputed NGO in the field of Ex-situ Conservation | — Member. |
| 8. Director, Bondla Zoo | Member Secretary
(Managing
Director of the
Foundation). |

Role, Responsibilities and Terms of the Managing Committee:-

1. To assist the General Body for the overall management of the Foundation.
2. To place the Annual Plan of Operations (APO), Schemes, Accounts and Annual Report of the Bondla Zoo Foundation before the General body for approval
3. To monitor the implementation of the APOs, Schemes as well as routine maintenance works as approved by the General body and in accordance with the regulations issued from time to time.
4. The managing committee may seek participation and financial support from any Government or semi Government agencies, voluntary or private organization, institution or individual for implementation of its program, schemes and activities.
5. To carry out annual audit of the account of the foundation.
6. Term of Managing Committee: Chairman and Members at Sr. No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 8 are ex-officio members. The term of the member at Sr. No. 7 is for three years.
7. Tenure of Managing Committee if five years.
8. Meeting of the Managing Committee will be held once in six months.

The Bondla Zoo Foundation shall function accordingly to the Operation Manual approved by the State Government.

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

Sitaram Gurudas Sawal, Under Secretary (Forest).

Porvorim.



Department of General Administration

Notification

No. 2/2/2009-GAD-III/4912

Date : 17-Nov-2025

The Government of Goa is pleased to declare half-day holiday on the afternoon of 20th November, 2025 for all the Government Offices, Autonomous Bodies, Public Sector Undertakings situated within Panaji city limits, in view of the IFFI 2025 Opening Parade scheduled on 20th November, 2025, in order to avoid inconvenience to the general public, reduce traffic congestion and to facilitate smooth conduct of the parade and security arrangement.

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

Shweta R. Harmalkar, Under Secretary (GA-I).

Porvorim.

Department of Labour**Order**

No. 28/47/2025-LAB/626

Date : 06-Nov-2025

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Netzsch Technologies India Private Limited, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Goa and its workman Shri Asalam Antarangangi 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. Netzsch Technologies India Pvt. Limited, L-10, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Goa in dismissing Shri Asalam Antarangangi, Technician, with effect from 15-01-2025, 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

No. 24/8/2015/LAB/ESI/635

Date : 12-Nov-2025

Read: Order No. 24/8/2015-Lab/ESI/314 dated 10-05-2016.

In continuation to Government Order referred in the preamble, Government is pleased to extend the approval for counting the past services rendered by Dr. Naresh S. Fadte, Insurance Medical Officer in the grade of Assistant Lecturer in Anesthesiology (ICU), in Goa Medical College for the period from 11-07-2012 to 19-07-2015, for benefits entitled under Dynamic Assured Career Progression Scheme, also.

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

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

Porvorim.

Notification

No. 28/02/2025-LAB/Part-IV/629

Date : 06-Nov-2025

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 15/10/2025 in Case Ref. No. IT/67/2000 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/67/2000

Mr. J. C. Uttapa,
Rep. by the Goa MRF Employees Union,
Saidham, Dhavalimol,
Ponda-Goa.

... Workman/Party I

V/s.

M/s. M.R.F. Limited,
Tisk, Usgao,
Ponda-Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I represented by Learned Adv. Ms. S. Narvekar.

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

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 15th day of the month of October of the year 2025)

By Order dated 22nd September, 2000 bearing No. IRM/CON/PONDA/(273)/1999/4759, 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, Ponda-Goa, in demoting Shri J. C. Uttappa, with effect from 30.1.97, by way of punishment, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/67/2000 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Pursuant to service of notice, Party I filed his Claim Statement at Exhibit 3.

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 and of late there has been large scale harassment and victimization of the office bearers of the Union 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 demotion of the Union's active member Mr. J. C. Uttappa.

4. The Party I/Union states that by letter dated 29-10-1996, the Party I/Workman was issued a charge-sheet which was illegal and untenable at law and it was based totally on concocted charges solely to victimize him for his union activities. The charge-sheet was based on the allegation that the said Party I/Workman had, on 12-10-1996, misbehaved with the Supervisor, Mr. Ninan Abraham, when he allegedly questioned the Party I/Workman about excess piece of metal found in stock 23754. At that time the Party I/Workman is alleged to have spoken arrogantly and started arguing with the said Supervisor for questioning him further. The Party I/Workman is also charged for allegedly threatening the Supervisor. The charges mentioned in the charge-sheet did not concur with the facts mentioned therein. The Party I/Workman was called upon to submit his reply in writing within 48 hrs. The misconducts alleged, even if proved, would not be grave enough to warrant the punishment of demotion. The charge-sheet was signed by an unnamed person who the said workman believes to be an unauthorized person. Surprisingly, before even calling for an explanation, the Party II/Management had decided to hold an enquiry which was to be held on 15-11-1996.

5. As such, it is the contention of the Party I that the demotion of the said Workman in the circumstances above 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 Disputes Act, 1947 and further states that the demotion order be quashed and the Party I/Workman be given compensation in lieu of forced demotion as if he was working in the same grade from 30-01-1997 with full back-wages and continuity of service and consequent reliefs.

6. In its Written Statement filed at Exhibit 6, the Employer/Party II has submitted that the workman was charge-sheeted vide charge-sheet dated 16-10-1996 wherein it was alleged that on 12-10-1996 at around 6.00 pm. when Shift Supervisor, Mr. Ninan Abraham questioned the Workman/Party I about the metal piece found in the stock 23574, the Workman/Party I misbehaved with him in complete arrogance and started arguing with him in loud voice thereby not allowing him to question him any further and in threatening voice stating that “if You make the report against me, I will see you”.

7. The Party II submits that the batch of 49206 which was already compounded by Workman/Party I was found excess in weight (about 2.5 kg. more) to which Workman/Party I had no explanation to offer and which act on the part of the Workman/Party I if proved, constitute a grave act of misconduct as per Clause-21, Items I, IV, V, VII, XI, and LII of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company.

Clause 21 of Item No. I	:	Wilful insubordination or disobedience, whether alone or in combination with another or other, of any lawful and/or reasonable order of superior.
Clause 21 of Item No. IV	:	Causing damage to work in process or to any property of the company either wilfully or through negligence.
Clause 21 of Item No. V	:	Drunkenness’ or riotous or disorderly or indecent behavior within the precincts of the Company.
Clause 21 of Item No. VII	:	Use of impolite or insulting or abusing language, assault or threat of assault, intimidation or coercion within the precincts of the Company against any supervisory Staff, workman or any other person authorized to work in the Company and any such act outside the premises of the Company if directly affect the discipline of the Company.
Clause 21 of Item No. XI	:	Negligence of work.
Clause 21 of Item No. LII	:	Any act of subversive of discipline.

8. The Party II submits that Party I/Workman was given an opportunity to explain against the charges levelled against him. It is denied that the Order of Suspension was illegal and unjustified and the charges levelled against the workman were false and fabricated as alleged. It is submitted that the copy of the findings was supplied to the workman during the conciliation proceeding of the dispute raised by the Workman and therefore no prejudice can be said to have been caused to the workman. It is denied that the charge-sheet was not signed by the person authorized to do so.

9. The Party II denies that the enquiry was closed in violation of principles of natural justice and that the conclusion of guilt is ex-facie erroneous and untenable at law. It is denied that the Workman was denied reasonable opportunity to defend himself at the enquiry and that the Order of Demotion is in violation of the procedure set out in the Standing Orders and that the demotion of the workman has been resorted by the Company to victimize the said Workman for his legitimate trade union activities.

10. The Party I in its Rejoinder filed at Exhibit 7 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.

11. On completion of the pleadings, Issues were framed at Exhibit 8 by this Tribunal which reads as under:

ISSUES

1. Whether the applicant proves that the domestic enquiry held against him is not fair and proper?

2. Whether the charges of misconduct levelled against the Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence?
- 2a. Whether the Party II proves that the charges of misconduct levelled against the Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence? (Issue No. 2 corrected and re-framed at the time of passing of the order on the preliminary issues No. 1 and 2).
3. Whether the Party I proves that his demotion is by way of victimisation and unfair labour practice?
4. Whether the Party I proves that his demotion by way of punishment is illegal and unjustified?
5. Whether the Party I is entitled to any relief?
6. What Award?

12. From the issues framed hereinabove, Issue No. 1 and 2 (2a) had been taken up to be tried as preliminary issues and accordingly Order dated 16-10-2024 has been passed by this Tribunal holding both the issues in the negative. Hence, my findings with reasons on the remaining issues are as follows:

Issue No. 3, 4 and 5 : In the Affirmative
 Issue No. 6 : As per Final Order

REASONS

13. *Issue No. 3, 4 and 5:* It is a matter of record that, this Tribunal has passed an Order dated 16/10/2024 on preliminary issue No. 1, 2 (2a) holding Issue No. 1 and 2 in the negative, by giving a finding that due procedure was followed by the Party II in the said domestic enquiry that was held in pursuance to issuance of the charge-sheet to Party I/Workman and that he was also given an opportunity to defend himself in the said proceeding. It was held 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 16-10-2024, this Tribunal was pleased to answer the Issue No. (2a) in the negative while concluding that the Enquiry Officer had analysed the evidence on record in depth and the findings of the Inquiry Officer were based on legally acceptable evidence.

14. 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, 4 and 5. The Party I/Workman did not avail the opportunity, hence the evidence was closed. 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.

15. This Tribunal while deciding the Issue No. 1 against the Workman/Party I had 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 Tribunal duly considered the citation relied upon by Party II in the case of **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/s 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/s. 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.

16. The Tribunal further observed that in the evidence, the Party I/Workman could not stand by to his own version stated in examination-in-chief, he admitted several vital facts such as delay in receiving the charge-sheet by him was on account of his mentioning the wrong address and the same was delivered to him upon he submitting the correct address. He further admitted that the Suspension Order did mention the grounds of suspension and also admitted that the enquiry did not start when he objected for the same vide letter dated 12-11-1996 and that his letter was responded by the management vide letter dated 30-11-1996. The Party I/Workman admitted of having signed the proceeding dated 15-11-1996 wherein it is stated that the copies of the proceeding of that day along with the copies of the documents exhibited were given to him and further admitted that the Management Representative had not given any statement in the enquiry but produced on record only the documents. He further admitted that in the proceeding of 15-11-1996 it is stated that he was explained the procedure of the enquiry. He further goes on to admit that he and his co-worker signed all the proceeding of 10-01-1997. The CSW further admitted that his request for adjourning the matter for cross-examination of the 2nd Management witness was accepted by the Enquiry Officer and accordingly the matter was adjourned. Last but not the least, the Party I admitted that he and his co-worker having not attended the enquiry on 15-01-1997 and the same being adjourned on 18-01-1997, on which date also he along with his co-worker did not attend the hearing on 18-01-1997. Thus, the contention of the Party I/Workman that he was not given the opportunity to cross examine the management witness or that he was not given the opportunity himself and his witness in defence as the Enquiry Officer closed the enquiry is devoid of any merits.

17. The enquiry reveals that the Party I/Workman was given fair opportunity pursuance to which the witnesses on the either side were cross-examined by the Representative of the Management as well as by the Representative of the Workman. The enquiry was concluded by taking on record all the relevant and material evidence adduced by the Management witnesses as well as by the witnesses of the Party I/Workman. Accordingly, the Enquiry Officer gave its findings. Absolutely no evidence has been adduced to show that the enquiry was without following the principles of natural justice or that the same was against the Certified Standing Orders of the Party II.

18. 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) BomCR 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".

19. In the Case of **Cholan Roadways Ltd vs. G. Thirugnanasambandam reported in 2005 (I) CLR 524**, it was held that *"There cannot, however, be any doubt whatsoever that the principle of natural justice are required to be complied with in a domestic enquiry. It is, however, well-known that the said principle cannot be stretched too far nor can be applied in a vacuum. The jurisdiction of the Tribunal while considering an application for grant of approval has succinctly been stated by this Court in Martin Burn Ltd. V/s R.N. Banerjee (AIR 1958 SC 79). While exercising jurisdiction under Section 33(2)(b) of the Act, the Industrial Tribunal is required to see as to whether a prima facie case has been made out as regard the validity or otherwise of the domestic enquiry held against the delinquent; keeping in view the fact that if the permission or approval is granted, the order of discharge or dismissal which may be passed against the delinquent employee would be liable to be challenged in an appropriate proceeding before the Industrial Tribunal in terms of the provision of the Industrial Disputes Act. In Martin Burn's case (supra) this court stated: "A prima facie case does not mean a case proved to the hilt but a case which can be said to be established if the evidence which is led in support of the same were believed. While determining whether a prima facie case had been made out the relevant consideration is whether on the evidence led it was possible to arrive at the conclusion in question and not whether that was the only conclusion which could be arrived at on that evidence. It may be that the Tribunal considering this question may itself have arrived at a different conclusion. It has, however, not to substitute its own judgment for the judgment in question. It has only got to consider whether the view taken is a possible view on the evidence on the record"*.

20. Upon scrutiny, the enquiry proceedings conducted by the Enquiry Officer vis-a-vis the evidence led by both the Parties, it is seen that due procedure was followed by the Party II in the said domestic enquiry that was held in pursuance to issuance of the charge-sheet to Party I/workman and he was also given an opportunity to defend himself in the said proceeding. If one considers the chain of events, then one has to accept that the enquiry was conducted in accordance with the procedure laid down under the law by giving a fair opportunity to the Party I/Workman to defend himself in the matter and accordingly the Tribunal proceeded to decide the Issue No.1 in the negative.

21. That while deciding Issue No. 2 in the favour of the PartyI/Workman, this Tribunal held that the Management witness-1 who has been examined in the enquiry to prove the alleged charges has stated that he was informed by Millman Mr. Manjunath Naik about the metal piece contamination in the Stock, however, when asked as to what was the material of the said metal piece that was found in the Stock, he responded saying that he does not know. The said metal piece was produced in the enquiry, however, there is absolutely no whisper as to how the said metal piece travelled from the Millman to the Supervisor as there was no Panchanama drawn neither the said metal piece was shown to the CSW nor he was confronted with the said piece. Thus, the recovery of the said metal piece from the Stock 23754 is an one-sided story and the evidence to that effect is an hear say evidence by Mr. Ninan Abraham. The Management has failed to examine the key witness i.e. the Millman Mr. Manjunath on basis of whose report/information Mr. Ninan Abraham had confronted Party I/Workman. Considering the allegation levelled on the Party I/Workman, it was incumbent upon the Management to examine the Millman, Mr. Manjunath Naik instead of merely relying upon the Internal Report i.e. Exh. M-10. Moreover, in the enquiry many of the relevant facts asked to Mr. Ninan Abraham in respect of the alleged incident has been answered saying he does not know.

22. Later on during the enquiry it was revealed that the said metal piece was to be a 12” knife which is being used in the Compounding as well as the Stacking Area. Mr. Abraham was confronted with his statement when he said that Millman came and gave him the said metal piece i.e. 12” knife which fact had not been mentioned in his report to which he gave a casual answer stating that usually the Millman gives him whatever things he is getting in the Mill which is again an vague answer not supported by the statement of the Millman. A specific suggestion was put to Mr. Abraham that the said metal piece i.e. the knife was put by the Millman while the batch was being dumped to which he again gave an answer saying “I do not think that”. Such type of vague answers cannot be appreciated to prove the serious charges levelled against the PartyI/Workman to say that the charges have been proved by way of acceptable evidence.

23. The evidence further reveals that the Banbury Crew is being operated by three members of Banbury and that at the relevant time the Crewmembers present over there were, 1 Operator, 1 Operator Reliever, Compounder, Compounding Reliever, General Helper, Millman, Stacker and the Trucker. Interestingly, when asked to Mr. Abraham that why is that you did not investigate the incident with all the Crew Members to which the answer of Mr. Abraham was “it was not necessary to investigate all the Crew Members of Banbury on this incident”. Thus, it comes from the Management’s own mouth that there was no fair investigation done into the charges levelled against the Party I/Workman and that probability of the Party I/Workman being falsely implicated in the alleged incident cannot be ruled out. Therefore, the findings given by the Investigating Officer in respect of alleged incident cannot be construed as a reasonable finding on the basis of legal admissible evidence.

24. **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.

25. 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) SCC749] 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”.

26. Further, the Hon’ble Apex Court in the citation above was pleased to sets 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.

27. 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 fact or existing, the Labour Court cannot by way of sympathy alone exercise the power under Section 11-A of the Act and reduce the punishment”.*

28. In this case though the Management could prove the inquiry conducted to the alleged charges against the workman was fair and proper, however, failed to prove the charges levelled against the Party I workman for which this Tribunal had already given a finding in the negative in the Order passed on the preliminary issues. That, given opportunity, the Management failed to adduce more evidence so as for this Tribunal to consider the same in the final Award. The management having failed to prove that the charges of misconduct against the workman under clause 21 under item No. I, IV, V, VII, X and LII of the Certified Standing Orders, the defence taken by the Party I Workman that his demotion is by way of victimization and unfair labour practice thus stands proved. Consequently, this Tribunal need not be committing any error in holding that the demotion of the Party I/Workman by way of punishment is illegal and unjustified and as such the Party I is entitled for the relief as prayed in the present reference. Hence, this Tribunal shall answer all the issues taken together for discussion in the affirmative in favour of Party I Workman.

29. Therefore, considering the overall evidence on record, as well as, considering the findings given on all the issues coupled with the ratio laid in the judicial pronouncements as mentioned herein above, this Tribunal is of the opinion that the Party/Workman has proved that the action of the management of M/s. MRF Ltd., Usgao, Ponda in awarding punishment of demotion to Shri J. C. Uttapa w.e.f. 30-01-1997 is illegal and unjustified. As such, Party I is entitled for the reasonable compensation.

Hence the Order:

ORDER

- (i) The punishment of demoting Shri J. C. Uttapa w.e.f. 30-01-1997 by the Party II/M/s. MRF Ltd., Tisk, Usgao, Ponda-Goa is held to be illegal and unjustified.
- (ii) The Party II/ M/s. MRF Ltd., Tisk, Usgao, Ponda-Goa is therefore directed to quash the demotion order against Shri J. C. Uttapa and to grant him, in lieu of forced demotion, as if he was working in the same grade from 30-01-1997 with full back wages, continuity of service and other consequential relief.
- (iii) Further the Management/Party II is hereby directed to pay compensation amounting of Rupees Two Lakhs for mental torture and harassment caused to Shri J. C. Uttapa and his family on account of illegal, unjustified and forced demotion.
- (iv) Inform the Government accordingly.

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

Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

Order

No. 22/2/2009/LD (Estt.)/LC/Part/2870

Date : 31-Oct-2025

The Government of Goa is pleased to nominate Shri Aleixo Sequeira, MLA, as the Chairperson of the Law Commission for the State of Goa constituted vide the Government Order No. 22/2/2009/LD (Estt.)/LC/Part/2869 dated 31-10-2025.

This Order shall come into force with immediate effect.

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

Arvind Vasant Bugde, Joint Secretary (Estt.), Law.

Porvorim.

Department of Personnel**Order**

No. 13/09/2025-PER/3420

Date : 11-Nov-2025

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/09/2025-PER/1204 dated 30-04-2025 had granted extension in service to Shri Abdul Wahab, Assistant Engineer, Technical Section, Circle-I, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2025 to 31-10-2025, 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 Abdul Wahab, Assistant Engineer, Technical Section, Circle-I, Water Resources Department.

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400118430 dated 11-10-2025 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Abdul Wahab, Assistant Engineer, Technical Section, Circle-I, Water Resources Department, subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXVIth meeting held on 05/11/2025 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Abdul Wahab, Assistant Engineer, Technical Section, Circle-I, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2025 to 31-10-2025, in public interest.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/09/2025-PER/1204 dated 30-04-2025 granting extension in service to Shri Abdul Wahab, Assistant Engineer, Technical Section, Circle-I, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2025 to 31-10-2025, in public interest.

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

Durga Kinlekar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 13/06/2024-PER/3421

Date : 11-Nov-2025

Read:- Order No. 13/06/2024-PER/3486 dated 10-10-2024.

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/06/2024-PER/2635 dated 29-08-2025 has granted further extension in service to Shri Liladhar B. Dessai, Deputy Director, Directorate of Planning, Statistics & Evaluation, Porvorim beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2025 to 31-08-2026, 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 Liladhar B. Dessai, Deputy Director, Directorate of Planning, Statistics & Evaluation, Porvorim.

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400101927 dated 07-10-2025 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Liladhar B. Dessai, Deputy Director, Directorate of Planning, Statistics & Evaluation, Porvorim, subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa vide Oral Order dated 25-09-2025 in Writ Petition No. 2323/2025 (F), directed that the entire procedure for filling up the post of Deputy Director, Directorate of Planning, Statistics & Evaluation shall be completed on or before 15-11-2025. Further directed that if for any reason if the process is not completed, rule of seniority to be followed from amongst those who are entitled for consideration of promotional post but there shall be no further extension in favour of respondent No. 4 i.e. Shri Liladhar Dessai.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXVth meeting held on 24-10-2025 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for 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 w.e.f. 01-09-2025 to 14-11-2025 or till the post is filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

Now, therefore, the Government 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 w.e.f. 01-09-2025 to 14-11-2025, or till the post is filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

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

Durga Kinlekar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 13/10/2025-PER/3427

Date : 11-Nov-2025

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/10/2025-PER/2406 dated 31-07-2025 had granted extension in service to Shri Dilip R. Naik, Superintending Engineer, Circle III, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-08-2025 to 31-07-2026, 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 Dilip R. Naik, Superintending Engineer.

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400118428 dated 11-10-2025 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Dilip R. Naik, Superintending Engineer, Circle III, Water Resources Department, subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXVIth meeting held on 05-11-2025 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Dilip R. Naik, Superintending Engineer, Circle III, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-08-2025 to 31-07-2026, in public interest.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/10/2025-PER/2406 dated 31-07-2025 granting extension in service to Shri Dilip R. Naik, Superintending Engineer, Circle III, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-08-2025 to 31-07-2026, in public interest.

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

Durga Kinlekar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 13/08/2025-PER/3449

Date : 13-Nov-2025

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/08/2025-PER/1203 dated 30-04-2025 had granted extension in service to Shri Mohan Raikar, Executive Engineer, WD XII, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2025 to 31-10-2025, 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 Mohan Raikar, Executive Engineer, WD XII, Water Resources Department.

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400118247 dated 11-10-2025 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Mohan Raikar, Executive Engineer, WD XII, Water Resources Department, subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXVIth meeting held on 05-11-2025 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Mohan Raikar, Executive Engineer, WD XII, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2025 to 31-10-2025, in public interest.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/08/2025-PER/1203 dated 30-04-2025 granting extension in service to Shri Mohan Raikar, Executive Engineer, WD XII, Water Resources Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-05-2025 to 31-10-2025, in public interest.

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

Durga Kinlekar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 13/12/2024-PER/3452

Date : 13-Nov-2025

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/12/2024-PER/911 dated 28-03-2025 had granted further extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forests (Planning and Statistics), Forest Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a further period of six months w.e.f. 01-04-2025 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 are pending as on date against Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forests (Planning and Statistics), Forest Department.

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400102906 dated 11-10-2025 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forests (Planning and Statistics), Forest Department, subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXVIth meeting held on 05-11-2025 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for further extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of

Forests (Planning and Statistics), Forest Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a further period of six months w.e.f. 01-04-2025 to 30-09-2025, in public interest.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/12/2024-PER/911 dated 28-03-2025 granting further extension in service to Shri Santosh H. Fadte, Deputy Conservator of Forests (Planning and Statistics), Forest Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a further period of six months w.e.f. 01-04-2025 to 30-09-2025, in public interest.

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

Durga Kinlekar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 15/23/2023-PER/3430

Date : 12-Nov-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 Pranit Satyavan Naik, BDO, Canacona	BDO, Dharbandora
2.	Shri Gurudatta P. Naik, BDO-III, Directorate of Panchayats, North (HQ)	BDO, Canacona

Shri Siddesh S. Kerkar, BDO-II, Directorate of Panchayats, North (HQ) holding additional charge of BDO-I, Directorate of Panchayats, North (HQ) shall also hold the charge of BDO-III, 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/3391

Date : 07-Nov-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.	Smt. Aisha A. Vaingankar, Director (Admn.), Education	State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services
2.	Shri Amir Parab, State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services	Director (Admn.), Education

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. 6/8/2022-PER/3408

Date : 10-Nov-2025

Shri Dipak Desai, Director, Social Welfare shall hold the charge of Managing Director, Goa State Minorities Finance and Development Corporation, in addition to his own duties with immediate effect.

This issues with the approval of Goa Services Board.

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

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

Porvorim.

Department of Public Health

Order

No. 4/13/2020-II/PHD/2542

Date : 17-Nov-2025

Government is pleased to accept the resignation dated 01-10-2025 tendered by Dr. Akshay Pratap Anchan, Assistant Professor, Department of Plastic Surgery and Burns, Goa Medical College and he stands relieved from the said post with immediate effect.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 7/4/91-I/PHD-I/1465

Date : 10-Nov-2025

Read: Order No. 7/4/91-I/PHD/Part-I dated 18-06-2025.

Sanction of the Government is accorded for grant of charge allowance under F. R. 49 to Smt. Sushmita D'souza, Junior Scientific Officer (Drugs), for holding additional charge of the Senior Scientific Officer (Drugs), Directorate of Food and Drugs Administration, in terms of point No. 2 of O. M. No. 2/38/75-PER(Vol. III) dated 09-06-2008, subject to limits prescribed by the Government vide Office Memorandum No. 2/38/75-PER(Vol. III) dated 25-08-2004.

This supersedes earlier Order No. 7/4/91-I/PHD/Part-I/1320 dated 07-10-2025.

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

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

Porvorim.

Order

No. 45/4/2008-I/PHD/Part-I/1493

Date : 14-Nov-2025

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/24(1)/2025/230 dated 29-09-2025, Government is pleased to promote Dr. Sandesh K. Madkaikar,

Health Officer to the post of Chief Medical Officer under Directorate of Health Services (Group “A” Gazetted), Panaji on regular basis in the Level 11 of Pay Matrix (PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100/- + GP: Rs. 6600/-) and other allowances to be fixed as per rules with immediate effect.

The promotion is made against the vacancy occurred due to retirement on attaining the age of superannuation of Dr. Mohanrao Putu Desai, Chief Medical Officer w.e.f. 31-03-2025.

Consequent upon promotion, Dr. Sandesh K. Madkaikar is posted at Non Communicable Diseases Control Programme, Directorate of Health Services, Panaji-Goa.

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

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

Porvorim.



Department of Revenue



Notification

No. 28/4/2025/RD-I/3047

Date : 14-Nov-2025

In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (a) of Section 35 of the Goa Land Revenue Code, 1968 (Goa Act No. 9 of 1969) (hereinafter referred to as the “said Code”), the Government of Goa, being of the opinion that it is necessary in the public interest for the purpose of carrying out the objects of the said Code, hereby exempts the land admeasuring an area of 9,281 sq. mts., surveyed under Survey No. 270/12 of Usgao Village of Ponda Taluka, District South Goa, State of Goa, from the payment of fees amounting to Rs. 22,27,440/- (Rupees twenty-two lakhs, twenty-seven thousand, four hundred and forty only) payable under Clause (ii) of sub-section (6) of Section 32, and penalty amounting to Rs. 1,44,000/- (Rupees one lakh, forty-four thousand only) payable under Section 33, of the said Code subject to the condition that the said land shall be used exclusively for setting up of educational, medical, cultural and spiritual activities.

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.

Vrushika Kauthankar, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim.



Notification

No. 28/4/10/2025/RD-I/3057

Date : 14-Nov-2025

In exercise of the powers conferred by the second proviso to Clause (ii) of sub-section (6) of Section 32 of the Goa Land Revenue Code, 1968 (Goa Act No. 9 of 1969), the Government of Goa hereby exempts Shree Shantadurga Kunkallikarin Saunsthan, Fatorpa, Goa, a trust registered under Registration/Approval Number (Unique Registration Number) AALTS8351F23BL01 dated 07-10-2023 in terms of the Income Tax Act, 1961, from the payment of fees amounting to Rs. 8,11,160/- (Rupees Eight lakhs, eleven thousand, one hundred and sixty only) payable under the said Code, for conversion of the land admeasuring an area of 5,794 sq. mts., surveyed under Survey No. 1 sub-division No. 1 of Fatorpa Village of Quepem Taluka, District South Goa, State of Goa, subject to the condition that the said land shall be used exclusively for construction of a community hall for public purpose.

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

Vrushika Kauthankar, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim.

Notification

No. 28/4/7/2024/RD-I/3058

Date : 14-Nov-2025

In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (a) of Section 35 of the Goa Land Revenue Code, 1968 (Goa Act No. 9 of 1969) (hereinafter referred to as the “said Code”), the Government of Goa, being of the opinion that it is necessary in the public interest for the purpose of carrying out the objects of the said Code, hereby exempts the land admeasuring an area of 900 sq. mts., surveyed under Survey No. 150/2 of Chorao Village of Tiswadi Taluka, District North Goa, State of Goa, from the payment of fees amounting to Rs. 2,16,000/- (Rupees Two lakhs and sixteen thousand only) payable under Clause (ii) of sub-section (6) of Section 32, and penalty amounting to Rs. 4,36,800/- (Rupees Four lakhs, thirty-six thousand and eight hundred only) payable under Section 33, of the said Code subject to the condition that the said land shall be used exclusively for institutional i.e. sports and education purpose.

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.

Vrushika Kauthankar, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim.

**Department of Town and Country Planning**

Office of the Chief Town Planner

Order

No. 1/3/TCP(Part-File)/2017-19/2289

Date : 13-Nov-2025

Government is pleased to order transfer of the following Officers of the Town and Country Planning Department, in public interest, with immediate effect:

Sr. No.	Name and Designation of the Officers	Present posting	Proposed posting
1.	Shri. Yugandraj V. Redkar, Deputy Town Planner	Quepem Taluka Office, Quepem, with additional charge of G.I.D.C.	TCP Headquarters, Panaji, with additional charge of G.I.D.C.
2.	Smt. Maria Roseann Diniz, Deputy Town Planner	Canacona Taluka Office, Canacona, with additional charge of Mormugao Taluka Office, Vasco	Canacona Taluka Office, Canacona, with additional charge of Mormugao Taluka Office, Vasco and Quepem Taluka Office, Quepem

The Officers shall join the new place of posting with immediate effect without availing joining time.

The Officers shall complete handling over and taking over process with immediate effect and submit compliance.

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

Vertika Dagur, Chief Town Planner (Administration/Planning/Land Use)/HoD & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji.

Notification

No. 36/18/39A/Notification (19F)/TCP/2025/722

Date : 19-Nov-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.	Cosmos Premises Private Limited rep. by Shiwam Verma	49/1	Utorda, Salcete	Orchard zone Total Area (5275)	Settlement Zone	5275	Approved for change of zone an area of 5275m2 from Orchard to Settlement Zone.
2.	Sayyed Shabudding	66/14	Salvador-do-Mundo, Bardez	Partly Natural Cover (4062m2), Partly Natural Cover with No Development Slope (888m2) Total Area (4950)	Settlement Zone	4950	Approved for change of zone an area of 4062m2 from Natural Cover to Settlement Zone and an area of 888m2 from Natural Cover with No Development Slope to Settlement Zone being within permissible gradient.
3.	Shaikh Alam	27/1-O	Chimbel, Tiswadi	Natural Cover Total Area (207)	Settlement Zone	207	Approved for change of zone an area of 207m2 from Natural Cover to Settlement Zone.
4.	Anand A. Chindarkar	427/3	Corgao, Pernem	Paddy Field Total Area (2025)	Settlement Zone	2025	Approved for change of zone an area of 450m2 from Paddy Field to Settlement Zone being not low lying land.
5.	Sachin Vallabh Salkar Savio Monteiro	192/6	Malar, Tiswadi	Orchard Total Area (2650)	Settlement Zone	2650	Approved for change of zone an area of 2650m2 from Orchard to Settlement Zone.
6.	Luis Gonzaga Feleciano Baptista Eunice Baptista	188/6-C	Assagao, Bardez	Partly Settlement (310m2) Partly Natural Cover with Irrigation Command Area (817m2) Total Area (1127)	Settlement	817	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 (26)/TCP/2025/292 dated 09-07-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 15 dated 10-07-2025 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 1);
- (ii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(28)/TCP/2025/354 dated 06-08-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 19 dated 07-08-2025 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 2 & 5);
- (iii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(30)/TCP/2025/442 dated 13-08-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 24 dated 11-09-2025 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 3);
- (iv) 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. No. 4);
- (v) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(15)/TCP/2024/71 dated 15-01-2024, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 42 dated 16-01-2025 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 6); 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-rule (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 219th meeting held on 30-09-2025, Sr. No. 2 & 3 in its 221st meeting held on 16-10-2025, Sr. No. 4 in 212th meeting held on 03-02-2025, Sr. No. 5 & 6 in 223rd meeting held on 06-11-2025 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.