

Panaji, 22nd January, 2026 (Magha 2, 1947)

**SERIES II No. 43**

# OFFICIAL GAZETTE GOVERNMENT OF GOA



PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

*Note: There are two Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 42 dated 15-1-2026 as follows:-*

1. Extraordinary dated 16-1-2026 from pages 1395 to 1396 regarding Addendum from Department of Home.
2. Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 16-1-2026 from pages 1397 to 1398 regarding Notification from Office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

## GOVERNMENT OF GOA

### Department of Agriculture

Directorate of Agriculture

#### Order

No. 2/14/95/Agri(Part)/Vol.II/2025-26/1838

Date : 19-Jan-2026

Ref.: 1. Order No. 2/14/95/Agri(Part)/Vol.II/2025-26/553 dated 26-06-2025.

2. Order No. 2/14/95/Agri(Part)/Vol.II/2025-26/565 dated 30-06-2025.

The transfer Order of even No. 2/14/95/Agri(Part)/Vol.II/2025-26/553 dated 26/06/2025 which was kept in abeyance vide Order No. 2/14/95/Agri(Part)/Vol.II/2025-26/565 dated 30/06/2025 stands withdrawn with immediate effect.

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

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

Tonca, Caranzalem.



### Department of Co-operation

Office of the Asstt. Registrar of Co-op. Societies

List of Provisional Members of The Manor Park Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Ltd.

Reg. No. RCSNZ2025260113

dated 20-08-2025

Sr. No.	Block	Flat No.	Owner/Promoter member name	Date of admission	Category General/ SC/ST/OBC
1	A	A11	Arun Prabhu Verlekar	20-Aug-2025	General
2	A	A12	Savio Bryan De Mello	20-Aug-2025	General

3	A	A21	Dr. Santosh Rajalbandi	20-Aug-2025	General
4	A	A22	Mario Fernandes	20-Aug-2025	General
5	A	A31	Shekhar Gaonkar	20-Aug-2025	General
6	A	A32	Louisa D souza	20-Aug-2025	General
7	A	A41	Rupesh Kalangutkar	20-Aug-2025	General
8	A	A42	Crescent Paul Dsouza	13-Sep-2025	General
9	A	A51	Nazareth D'cunha	20-Aug-2025	General
10	A	A52	Om Prakash	20-Aug-2025	General
11	B	B12	Huzur Saran Nigam	13-Sep-2025	General
12	B	B22, B31	Milind Parab	20-Aug-2025	General
13	B	B32	Ryan S Q Dsouza	13-Sep-2025	General
14	B	B41	Anthony Victor Mendes	20-Aug-2025	General
15	B	B42	Rumilda Tavares	20-Aug-2025	General
16	B	B51	Sitaram B. Parab	20-Aug-2025	General
17	B	B52	Cedric Rodrigues	20-Aug-2025	General
18	C	C11	Aneeta Powar	20-Aug-2025	General
19	C	C13	Manpreet Sukhija	13-Sep-2025	General
20	C, E, F, G	C14, E13, F13, F14, F23, G13, G14	Vijay Samant	20-Aug-2025	General
21	C	C21	Monica J Parab	20-Aug-2025	General
22	C	C22	Mabel Dias	13-Sep-2025	General
23	C	C23	Ildio Borges	20-Aug-2025	General
24	C	C24	Gregorio Cardoso	13-Sep-2025	General
25	C	C31	Vignesh Pangam	20-Aug-2025	General
26	C	C32	Oliver Moniz	13-Sep-2025	General
27	C	C33	Gilbert Mascarenhas	20-Aug-2025	General
28	C	C34	Bruno Monteiro	13-Sep-2025	General
29	C	C41	Shailesh Bhadgaonkar	20-Aug-2025	General
30	C	C42	Tejinder Khurana	20-Aug-2025	General
31	C	C43	Maria Alzira Fernandes	20-Aug-2025	General
32	C	C44	Gourish Singbal	20-Aug-2025	General
33	C	C51	Sanjay Kumar Choudhary	20-Aug-2025	General
34	C	C52	Ashvy Bhardwaj	20-Aug-2025	General
35	C	C53	Julie Noronha	20-Aug-2025	General
36	D	D41	Josephine Vieira	20-Aug-2025	General
37	D	D51	Pradnya Potdar	20-Aug-2025	General
38	D	D52	Anisha Fernandes	13-Sep-2025	General

39	E	E11	Christina Keeranchira	20-Aug-2025	General
40	E	E12	Victor Braganza	20-Aug-2025	General
41	E	E14	Meena Pereira	20-Aug-2025	General
42	E	E21	Siddhesh Menon	20-Aug-2025	General
43	E	E22	Joshua Braganza	20-Aug-2025	General
44	E	E23	Mayur Dattadas Pednekar	20-Aug-2025	General
45	E	E24	Maria Ida Britto	20-Aug-2025	General
46	E	E31	Sandhya Bhasi	13-Sep-2025	General
47	E	E33	Amit Jain	20-Aug-2025	General
48	E	E34	Vincent Paes	20-Aug-2025	General
49	E	E41	Patrick D souza	20-Aug-2025	General
50	E	E42	Savio Tolentino Trindade	20-Aug-2025	General
51	E	E43	Hemant A. Nagwekar	20-Aug-2025	General
52	E	E51	Karan Lamba	20-Aug-2025	General
53	E	E52	Heather Amin	20-Aug-2025	General
54	E	E53	Eulalio Fernandes	20-Aug-2025	General
55	E	E54	Vinayak Dabholkar	13-Sep-2025	General
56	F	F11	Pritam Pednekar	13-Sep-2025	General
57	F	F12	Cleto Tito Fernandes	13-Sep-2025	General
58	F	F22	Maryann Dsouza	13-Sep-2025	General
59	F	F24	Smita R. Kamat	20-Aug-2025	General
60	F	F31	Floyd Fernandes	20-Aug-2025	General
61	F	F32	Shaira Banu	20-Aug-2025	General
62	F	F33	Cherion Coutinho	13-Sep-2025	General
63	F	F34	Kunal Mahale	20-Aug-2025	General
64	F	F41	Anna Rouchelle Fernandes	20-Aug-2025	General
65	F	F42	Anthony Fernandes	20-Aug-2025	General
66	F	F44	Ankita Prabhudesai	20-Aug-2025	General
67	F	F51	Sydel Lobo	20-Aug-2025	General
68	F	F52	Sylvia Lobo	20-Aug-2025	General
69	F	F53	Michael Pinto	13-Sep-2025	General
70	F	F54	Farrah Ann D souza	20-Aug-2025	General
71	G	G21	Swathi Hebbar	20-Aug-2025	General
72	G	G22	Dirk Victor D souza	20-Aug-2025	General
73	G	G25	Melanie Fernandes	20-Aug-2025	General
74	G	G31	Subhankar Misra	20-Aug-2025	General
75	G	G32	Tome Fernandes	13-Sep-2025	General
76	G	G33, G34	Gajendra Shenvi Desai	20-Aug-2025	General
77	G	G35	Sonal Aldangady	20-Aug-2025	General

78	G	G41	Vishwasrao G. Bhobe	20-Aug-2025	General
79	G	G42	Sanjeev Arora	20-Aug-2025	General
80	G	G43, G44	Ameya Deshpakhu	20-Aug-2025	General
81	G	G45	Flora D souza	20-Aug-2025	General
82	G	G51	Diya Asudani	13-Sep-2025	General
83	G	G52	M/s. Indo CN Imports, Gurdeep Singh	13-Sep-2025	General
84	G	G53, G54	Kush Medhora	20-Aug-2025	General
85	G	G55	Muriel Joan D souza	20-Aug-2025	General

Rajesh P. Parwar, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, North Zone.  
Mapusa.



### Department for Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities

#### Notification

No. 1/150/2025-26/DEPwD/Admn/Sect.38/1661

Date : 16-Jan-2026

In supersession of the Notification No. 1/150/2025-26/DEPwD/Admn/Sect.38/847 dated 9/09/2025 published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 32 dated 06-11-2025, whereby, in pursuance of sub-section (2) of Section 38 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (Central Act No. 49 of 2016), read with sub-rule (3) of Rule 14A of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Amendment) Rules, 2019, the Assessment Board for Goa Medical College, Bambolim was constituted, the Government of Goa hereby reconstitutes the Assessment Board for Goa Medical College, Bambolim with the following members:-

1. Medical Superintendent, Goa Medical College — Chairperson
2. Rehabilitation Specialist
  - a) Prof. & Head of Orthopedics, Goa Medical College — Member
  - b) Prof. & Head of Otorhinolaryngology, Goa Medical College & Hospital — Member
  - c) Prof. & Head of Ophthalmology, Goa Medical College & Hospital — Member
  - d) Prof. & Head of Medicine, Goa Medical College & Hospital — Member
  - e) Prof. & Head of Institute of Psychiatry & Human Behaviour, Bambolim — Member
3. Clinical Psychiatrist, Institute of Psychiatry & Human Behaviour, Bambolim — Member
4. Occupational Therapist, Disability Facilitation Centre (Dept. of Orthopedics), Goa Medical College & Hospital — Member
5. Medico Social Worker, Dept. of Orthopedics, Goa Medical College & Hospital — Member

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

By order and in the name of Governor of Goa.

Varsha Naik, Director & ex officio/Addl. Secretary (DEPwD).

Porvorim.

**Department of Home**

Home-General Division

**Order**

No. 30/1/2022-HD(G)/Cyber Crime/200

Date : 20-Jan-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 69 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (Act 21 of 2000) read with Rule 3 of the Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguards for Interception, Monitoring and Decryption of Information) Rules, 2009, the Government of Goa hereby authorizes the Inspector General of Police, Goa Police Department for the purposes of interception, monitoring and decryption of any information generated, transmitted, received or stored in any computer resource under the said Act, in case of emergencies only.

All such cases of interception, monitoring and decryption of any information in case of emergency, shall be informed in writing to the Home Secretary to the Government of Goa within three working days and obtain approval of the Home Secretary thereon within a period of seven working days. In case approval is not obtained, such interception, monitoring or decryption shall cease and the information shall not be intercepted or monitored or decrypted thereafter without the prior approval of the Home Secretary.

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

*Manthan Manoj Naik*, Under Secretary (Home-I).

Porvorim.

**Department of Labour****Notification**

No. 28/02/2025-LAB/Part-III/29

Date : 05-Jan-2026

The following Award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 27-11-2025 in Case Ref. No. LC-II/IT/35/2024 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.

**THE LABOUR COURT-II  
GOVERNMENT OF GOA  
AT PANAJI**

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

Case No. Ref. LC-II/IT/35/2024

Ms. Sheetal Rane,  
H. No. 105-1,  
Igrejewado, Carmona,  
Salcete-Goa-403717

..... Workperson/Party-I

V/s

The Director,  
M/s. Bombay Integrated Security (India) Ltd.,

H. No. 797, Rudraksh Building,  
Betim, Porvorim-Goa-403101

..... Employer/Party-II

Workperson/Party-I marked as Ex-parte.

Employer/Party-II represented by Ld. Rep. Shri G. J. Fernandes.

Panaji, Dated: 27-11-2025

### AWARD

1. 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, by Order dated 14-10-2024, bearing No. 28/70/2024-LAB/644 referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji, Goa.

- “(1) *Whether Ms. Sheetal Rane, Dy. Manager-HR, could be construed as “Workman” as defined under Clause (s) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?*
- “(2) *Whether the action of the management of M/s. Bombay Integrated Security (India) Limited, Betim, Porvorim, Goa in terminating the services of Ms. Sheetal Rane, Dy. Manager-HR, with effect from 22-04-2024, is legal and justified?*
- “(3) *If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?*

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/IT/35/2024 and registered A/D notice was issued to the parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the parties put in their appearance. The Party-I appeared in person the Workperson/ Party-I (for short ‘Workperson’) filed her Statement of Claim on 25/11/2024 at Exb.3. The facts of the case, in brief as pleaded by the Workperson are that the Employer/Party-II (for short, “Employer”) is a company incorporated under the Indian Companies Act, 1956 and is having its Branch office at Betim, Porvorim-Goa. She stated that the Employer is in the business of supplying of the manpower/security guards to various establishments in the state of Goa. She stated that she was a Workperson of the Employer and was appointed as Dy. Manager-HR at Goa branch she stated that she continued to work as same at the time of illegal termination of her services by the Management of the Employer. She stated that she has been appointed by the Employer vide appointment letter dt. 28/11/2020. She stated that she had worked with the Employer till the date of her illegal termination of services w.e.f. 22/4/2024. She stated that during her entire tenure with the Employer, she had worked with the full integrity and honesty and adhering to all the duties and responsibilities towards her job profile. She stated that although she is designated as a Dy. Manager-HR, she is performing the duties of the “Workman”. She stated that no employees were working under her, no employee was reporting to her and she was not supervising any of the staff of the Employer. She stated that as a Dy. Manager-HR, her duties were to keep records of the attendance of the employee, following the process of new recruitment, and for making compliance towards ESIC and EPF contribution. She stated that she was the sole lady staff who were working with the Employer among all the gents staff. She stated that since her joining with the Employer, in the initial period the work environment in the Employer’s establishment was normal. She stated that she was also working sincerely towards her duties, however subsequently by seeing her growth, the other gents staff started discrimination against her at the workplace. She stated that being a working lady, she was managing her job responsibility and she was also taking care of her old mother as her mother is constantly falling sick and she is the only have to take care of her. She stated that the said fact of her ill mother was also informed to the staff of the Goa location and also to the Head Office. She stated that although she was having the personnel problem, she was always managing her job responsibility and also fulfilling her duties upto the mark. She stated that as she was the sole lady staff working in the entire branch, all the gents staff of the organization were discriminating her in her workplace and as per her knowledge they were planning to terminate her from the organization for some or other reasons. She stated that to her surprise, she had received the transfer order dt. 22/3/2024 with immediate effect vide email from the Corporate office and she was directed to report at the Pune Branch. She stated that inspite of knowing the fact that she was the sole lady staff and also she has to take care of her aged mother, she has been purposely transferred by way of harassment and the act of victimization, as a result of which she will resign from the job. She stated that she has requested her superior on humanity ground to hold her transfer order and to keep it in abeyance till the further period, however her request were not considered by the management. She stated that to the transfer order, she replied to the same on 23/03/2024 vide email with a request to withhold transfer by citing the above mentioned reasons, however still her request was not considered by the Employer. She stated that from 26/03/2024 the management of the Employer started harassing her, all of sudden her ERP rights were withhold

by the management and she was also issued show cause notice to join the Pune location immediately. She stated that without her permissions or authority, the Employer removed all documents from her desk, her personnel computer was also removed from the system and she was removed from the system of making her attendance and she was also removed from the system access ERP. She stated that she was not even given time to hand over the charge and the same was taken forcefully without her concern. She stated that the staff of the management such as Director Mr. Anntesh R. Singh, Manager Accounts Mr. Sanjay Vengurlekar, HRD, Mr. Manoj Singh and Branch Head Mr. Vilas Gawas was not allowing her to join her duties or event to enter the gate of the Branch. She stated that in spite of knowing the fact that she is a working lady and she required some time to report at the new location which is at Pune, which is entirely new to her, she was not given time to settle down and she was directed to join the Pune location with immediate effect which is illegal and void. She stated that before issuing the transfer order she was forced to resign from her job and when he denies the same, she has been transferred to out of State with an only intention that she will resign from the job on her own. She stated that her personal locker which was allotted to her by the Employer was also broken by the management without her concern. She stated that the transfer order dt. 22/3/2024 issued to her is by way of harassment, mental torture and falsely targeting her without following the due procedures of the transfer policy applicable to the working women in India. She stated that subsequently the Employer issued her termination letter dt. 22/4/2024 terminating her services with the Employer. She stated that termination her services by the Employer is bad-in-law and void ab initio and non-est, since she was terminated without following the statutory mandate as required under Industrial disputes Act, 1947. She stated that the Employer has taken the shelter of the transfer order issued to her while terminating her services which is false, untenable and do not fulfilled the requirement of retrenchment as defined under the I.D. Act, 1947. She stated that at the time of issuing the termination letter, the Employer has not followed the statutory mandate of retrenchment as required under the I.D. Act, 1947. She stated that the Employer has neither given her notice prior to issuing the termination letter nor has paid in lieu of such notice. She stated that she has also not been paid any compensation as required under the act at the time of issuing the termination letter. She stated that she made a complaint of illegal termination of her services to the ALC, Mapusa Goa for requesting for the intervention which ended in failure. She submitted that the action of the Employer in terminating her services w.e.f. 22/4/2024 is illegal, bad-in-law and unjustified and is in contravention of section 25(f) of the I.D. Act, 1947. She stated that she is unemployed from the date of her termination. She stated that she had approached several organization, but due to bad remark of the Employer, she was not successful in securing the alternate employment. The Workperson therefore prayed for reinstatement in service with full back wages, consequential benefits and continuity in service.

3. The Employer controverted the claim of the Workperson by filing its written statement on 24/7/2025 at Exb.7. The Employer stated that the grievance/s raised by the Applicant/alleged Workman is entirely misconceived in fact and law. This Hon'ble Court has no jurisdiction in the matter referred for adjudication vide the reference made. The Employer stated that she was engaged in a managerial capacity by the Respondent/Employer herein. The Employer stated that she was designated as a Dy. Manager Personnel-HR with the Respondent /Employer. The Employer stated that the Workperson is not a "Workman" as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Employer stated that the details of the Workperson as represented by the Applicant herself in respect of her employment with the Employer Company is attached herewith marked as Annexure 'A' Colly. The Employer stated that the description of her job responsibilities by herself for the period that she was in the employment of the Respondent itself indicates that she was discharging functions that were managerial in nature. Both, prior to and subsequent to her employment with the Respondent/Employer herein, the Applicant was engaged in a managerial capacity. The Employer stated that the Applicant appears to have realized that this Labour Court has no jurisdiction and has failed to remain present consecutively for the proceedings fearing the consequences of making incorrect, false representations and/or the filing incorrect, false Affidavits. The Respondent/Employer reserves legal rights to adduce further material/evidence should the Applicant decide to pursue these proceedings. The Employer therefore prayed that reference be dismissed with costs.

4. Based on the pleading filed by the parties hereinabove, this Hon'ble Court was pleased to frame the following issues on 08/09/2025 at Exb.8.

1. Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that she is a 'workman' within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947?
2. Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that the action of the Employer/Party-II in terminating her services w.e.f. 22-04-2024 is illegal and unjustified?

3. Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that she is entitled to any relief?
4. What Order? What Award?
5. My findings to the aforesaid issues are as under:

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

Heard the oral arguments of Ld. Rep. Shri. G. J. Fernandes appearing for the Employer. On the contrary, the Workperson remained absent and hence marked as an ex-parte.

#### REASONS

*Issue No. 1, 2 & 3:*

1. In the case of **V.N.S. Engineering Services v/s. Industrial Tribunal of Goa, Daman and Diu and Anr.**, reported in 1987 II LLN 968, the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay has held that “*there is nothing in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 that indicates a departure from the general rule that he, who approaches a court for relief, should prove his case i.e. the obligation to lead evidence to establish an allegation. The test being that he, who does not lead evidence, must fail. The Hon'ble High Court of Bombay further held that the provisions of Rule-10-B of the I.D. (Central Rules), 1957 which requires the party raising a dispute to file a statement of demands relating only to the issue in the order of reference for adjudication within 15 days from the receipt of the order of reference and forward copies to the opposite party involved, clearly indicates that the party who raises the industrial disputes, is bound to prove the contention raised by him and an Industrial Tribunal or Labour Court would be erring in placing the burden of proof on the other party to the dispute*”.

2. In the case of **Airtech Pvt. Ltd. v/s. State of U.P. & Ors.**, reported in 1984 (49) FLR 38, the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad has held that “*the matter can be looked at from another angle, which party will fail if the evidence is not led before the Labour Court in proceedings in a reference made to it for adjudication by the State Government? The obvious answer is that the workman will fail. Here the reference was made by the State Government at the instance of the workman and for the benefit of the workman. In the absence of any evidence led by or on behalf of the workman, the reference is bound to be answered by the court against the workman. In such a situation it is not necessary for the employers to lead any evidence at all. This matter was dealt with by the Supreme Court in *Shankar Chaudhart v/s. Britania Biscuits Co. Ltd.* in paragraph 30<sup>th</sup> Court held that the Labour Court or Industrial Tribunal have all the trappings of a court. In paragraph 31 it held that any party appearing before a Labour Court or Industrial Tribunal 'Must' make a claim or demur the claim of the other side and when there is burden upon it to prove or establish the fact so as to invite a decision in its favour, it has to lead evidence. The obligation to lead evidence to establish an allegation made by a party is on the party making the allegation. The test would be, who would fail if no evidence is led. It must seek an opportunity to lead evidence*”.

3. In the case of **V.K. Raj Industries v/s Labour Court (I) and Ors.** reported in the year 1981 (29) FLR, 194 of Allahabad High Court has held that the proceedings before the Industrial Tribunal are judicial in nature, even though the Indian Evidence Act, is not applicable to the proceeding before the Industrial Court, but the principle underlying the said Act are applicable. The High Court has held that “*it is well settled that if a party challenges the validity of an order and if no evidence is produced, the party invoking the jurisdiction must fail. The High Court has also held that if the workman fails to appear or to file written statement or produce evidence, the dispute referred by the Government cannot be answered in favour of the workman and he will not be entitled any relief*”.

8. The principle laid down by the Hon'ble High Courts in its respective cases are still holds good. Applying the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court, in the instant case, the order of reference has been issued by the Government of Goa at the instance of the Workperson, who has raised the present dispute pertaining to her alleged termination of services by the Employer w.e.f. 22/04/2024 by contending to be illegal and unjustified. The Workperson appeared before this court and filed her pleadings, setting up the grounds of challenge to her alleged illegal termination of service. The Employer resisted the claim of the Workperson by contending that the Party I is not a 'workman' as defined under the I.D. Act, 1947. It was therefore incumbent upon the Workperson to prove her case by leading material evidence in support of the issues framed by this court.

9. The Workperson filed her claim statement on 16/12/2024 and thereafter failed to remain present before this Hon'ble Court and as such the Workperson was marked an ex-parte. Thus, the Workperson failed to file an affidavit-in-evidence in support of her claim to prove the issues framed by this court. The roznama proceedings maintained by this court indicates that several opportunities were given to the Workperson to lead evidence. The Workperson has however, failed to do so by remaining absent. The roznama proceedings maintained by this court further indicates that neither the Workperson, remained present before this court on and from 11/06/2025 on the scheduled dates of hearing, though ample opportunities were given to her. This court therefore constrained to mark an ex-parte order against her and closed her evidence. In the circumstances, there is absolutely no evidence on record to prove any of the issues framed by this court. Hence, it is held that the Workperson failed to prove that she is a 'workman' as defined under Section 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947, Consequently, the Workperson failed to prove that the action of the Employer in terminating her employment w.e.f. 22/04/2024 is illegal and unjustified. The issue No. 1, 2 and 3 are therefore answered in the negative. The Workperson is therefore not entitled to any relief.

In view of the above, I proceed to pass the following order:

#### ORDER

1. It is held that Ms. Sheetal Rane, HR-Manager is not a 'workman' as defined u/s 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).
2. It is further held that in the absence of any evidence on record, the action of management of M/s. Bombay Integrated Security (India) Limited, Betim, Porvorim, Goa in terminating the services of Ms. Sheetal Rane, Dy. Manager – HR, with effect from 22-04-2024, is legal and justified.
3. Ms. Sheetal Rane is not entitled to any relief.
4. No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

*Suresh N. Narulkar*, Presiding Officer, Labour Court-II.

Panaji.

---

#### Notification

No. 28/02/2025-LAB/Part-II/32

Date : 05-Jan-2026

The following Award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 27-11-2025 in Case Ref. No. LC-II/Appln./13/2023 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.

---

#### THE LABOUR COURT-II GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI

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

Case No. LC-II/Appln./13/2023.

Shri Amarnath Kamble,  
S/o Shri Shashikant Kamble,  
R/o Room No. 9 Sanmitra Co-op. Society,  
Utkarsh Nagar, Mumbai (400078).

..... Applicant/Party I

V/s

M/s. Marksans Pharma Ltd.,  
L-82, L-83, Verna Industrial Estate,  
Verna-Goa (403722).

..... Opponent/Party II

Applicant/Party-I present in person.

Opponent/Party-II represented by Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar.

Panaji, dated: 27-11-2025.

#### AWARD

1. By this Award, I shall dispose off the dispute of the Workman filed u/s 2A (2) of the I.D. Act, 1947.
2. It is the case of the Workman in short that he is a permanent Workman of the Employer having its factory situated as Verna Industrial Estate, Verna-Goa. He stated that the Employer is a leading Pharma Company and has presence globally in Pharmaceutical Market and is an export oriented Pharmaceutical Company having its Headquarters at Mumbai. He stated that the Employer manufactures/produces drugs that have wide – ranging applications across fields like Oncology, Gastroenterology, Gynaecology etc. He stated that he was working as a “Granulation Machine Operator” in the Granulation Department under the overall supervision and control of Production Officer and Shift In-charge. He stated that as a Granulation Machine Operator, he was performing duties such as to log-in into the Granulation Machine (FBD, RMG) by using his log-in Id, once log-in is done, the Granulation Machine is activated, than the raw material procured from R. M. store and than the raw materials is mixed HSMG/RMG machine this process is called “Granulation”. After this, the product is unloaded in polybags and it goes through various stages in different machines such as FBD, FBE, Shifter, Comill, Multimill, Stirrer, Octagonal Blender, Bin Blender etc. to get the required granules. The unloaded product is then put on the weighing balanced and the product then goes for blending and lubrication. The unloaded product is than labelled and tagged. The finished product is than sent to granulation storage area for further process. After this process the cleaning activity of the said batch / product done is carried out to make the machine ready for the next batch/product. All the aforesaid activities are undertaken by the Applicant himself under the supervision and control of Production Officer and shift In-charge.
3. He stated that he joined the services of the Employer on 10/12/2018 and since then he is performing his duties with clean and unblemished past service record. He stated that he was duly rewarded with appreciation time and again for his dedicated and sincere service. He stated that his last drawn salary was Rs. 22,000/- p.m. He stated that though he and his colleagues were working on extended hours, weekly-off days, Sundays, paid public holidays, they were not paid overtime wages in accordance with law at double the wage. He stated that the Workmen were also not given the benefits of leave, paid public holidays and as such being aggrieved, all the Workmen including himself unionized under the banner of “Goa Trade and Commercial Workers Union” (AITUC) having its Registered Office at Velho’s Building, Municipal Garden, Panaji-Goa. He stated that soon after coming to the knowledge that he and other Workmen have unionized themselves under the banner of Goa Trade and Commercial Workers Union, the Employer started selective harassment and victimization of union workers and the office bearer of local unit union committee members by using various illegal and unfair labour practices to discourage the formation of the Union. He stated that the Employer under the leadership of HR Manager, Mr. Shridhar Naidu, Mr. Pramod Sulakhe, Production Head, Mr. Nishant Kalambe and Mr. Vikram Tonde, Packing Head, Mr. Amit Rathi and Mr. Raman Jain, Softgel Department Head, Mr. Joginder Singh and Mr. Basappa Bentur resorted to various illegal and unfair labour practices in order to undermine and discourage the formation of the trade union of the choice of the Workmen employed in the factory of the Employer. He stated that the management team of the Employer started selectively threatening, illegally confining the union workers in factory and coercing the union member forcing them to resign from the membership of the AITUC. He stated that the Management Team of the Employer also started forcing, coercing and pressurizing him and his other colleague to do continuously 12 hours duty without paying overtime wages for working on extended hours. He stated that he was not given fixed weekly-off day and he was even made to work on public holidays without any benefits. He stated that when he and other colleague

objected to do above illegal working, he was threatened that his services will be terminated and he will be thrown-out of the employment. He stated that many active union member have been summarily terminated to take revenge on these workmen. He stated that the management of the Employer had threatened him of dire consequences that if he does not resign from the union membership, his services would be either transferred to far off place or his services would be terminated as an punishment and revenge. He stated that the HR Mr. Shridhar Naidu and Mr. Pramod Sulakhe gave three options to him that he must resign from the union membership from AITUC instantly or if he refused to resign, he will be transferred to far-off place or his services would be terminated or to submit resignation from the services of the Employer and take monetary compensation. He stated that one after another many active union members have illegally refused employment. He stated that almost 23 unionized workmen have been summarily issued termination letters and by way of harassment and victimization to take revenge and to punish these Workmen for forming the trade union with malafide intentions. He stated that he was on duty for first shift operation on 14/2/2023 from 7.00 a.m. to 3.00 p.m. He stated that when he reported for work on 14/02/2023 at around 9.00 a.m. he was taken to HR cabin by the General Manager, Mr. Shridhar Naidu and Mr. Pramod Sulakhe. He stated that he was told that he should take the work by deviating BMR process, to which he told the management team that if he deviates from the stipulated BMR process, then tomorrow he will be held accountable for deviation of BMR and action could be initiated against him. He stated that he informed the management that he will do work as per BMR process upon which the management team threatened and forced him to do deviation from the BMR process in the production area. He stated that the said Mr. Shridhar Naidu and Mr. Pramod Sulakhe then forced and pressurize him to resign from the union membership of AITUC and when he refused to resign, he was told that his services would be terminated with immediate effect. He stated that he was told to go out of the factory at around 11.30 a.m. and that he was told that he should not report for work any further. He stated that the above action of the management of the Employer amounts to illegal refusal of employment with effect from 14/02/2023. He stated that the refusal of employment to him is an act of hire and fire which is contrary to law.

4. He submitted that refusal of employment to him is patently illegal, unjust and bad-in-law as the refusal of employment w.e.f. 14/02/2023 is an act of victimization and outcome of the unionization done to him along with other co-workmen, that it is by way of punishment and as and by way of revenge for formation of trade union of his choice and that it smacks of malafide, malice and revenge for formation of union of his choice, that too pressurize and terrorize the unionized member to forsake union membership of AITUC. He stated that the industrial dispute of refusal of employment was raised by him before the office of the DLC, Margao-Goa on 14/02/2023. He submitted that the refusal of employment is nothing but an act of harassment, victimization done with malice and malafides, which is an act of unfair labour practice and termination is in violation of section 33 of the I. D. Act, 1947. He stated that the industrial disputes raised by him pertaining to refusal of employment w.e.f 14/02/2023 is presently pending in Conciliation before the office of DLC, Margao-Goa. He stated that similarly, various industrial disputes are also pending before the office of the DLC, Margao-Goa for its correct adjudication including complaints of unfair labour practice, complaints of harassment and victimization, complaints of changing the service conditions of workmen, non-settlement of Charter of Demands etc. are already admitted in the Conciliation by the Conciliation Officer as such the refusal of employment w.e.f. 14/02/2023 during the pendency of these industrial dispute is illegal, unfair and bad-in-law. He stated that he is presently unemployed and he is facing acute hardship, losses and financial crises and unable to maintain himself and his family. He stated that due to the illegal termination of his services, he is facing great injustice, losses, prejudice and besides social sigma on character in the society. He stated that he is ready and willing to resume for his normal duties unconditionally with immediate effect as he is in need of job and his entire family is dependent on him. The Workman therefore prayed that the action of the Employer in refusing his employment with effect from 14/02/2023 be held illegal, unjust and bad-in-law and that he may be reinstated back in the services of the Employer with full back wages, continuity in services along with all other consequential benefits.

5. The Employer controverted the claim of the Workman by filing its written statement on 28/11/2023. The Employer, as and by way of its preliminary objections filed in the written statement, submitted that the Party-I is not a "Workman" as defined u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947, that the present claim filed by the Applicant is not an "industrial dispute" as defined u/s 2(k) of the I.D. Act, 1947, that the Applicant has not given any justification for the demands/claims raised by him, that there is non application of mind by the Applicant while filing the present application, and that the appropriate Govt. has not referred the present dispute to this Hon'ble Court and as such the claim is wrongly filed by the Applicant before this Hon'ble Court, that the management has not refused the employment in the present dispute application and that the Applicant has abandoned his duties on his own after reporting for his duties at the transfer place in Navi

Mumbai and that this Hon'ble Court therefore does not have territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present dispute and that there is non application of mind by the Applicant while filing the present application that the dispute if any should have been filed in Navi Mumbai where the Applicant reported for his duties and marked his presence for two days.

6. The Employer stated that it is a Pharmaceutical Company having its factory at Verna Industrial Estate, Verna Goa and is manufacturing pharmaceutical products. The Employer stated that the Applicant was employed with them as a "Management Associate Production" and was predominantly discharging the Supervisory duties along with other ancillary duties and as such he cannot be construed as a "Workmen" as defined u/s 2(s) of the I. D. Act, 1947. The Employer stated that the claim filed by the Applicant is not maintainable before this Hon'ble Tribunal. The Employer stated that the Applicant duly signed, accepted and acknowledged the job description dt. 13/12/2018 issued to him by them. The Employer stated that the Applicant was accordingly discharging his duties as per the said job description which clearly suggest that he was also discharging supervisory duties. The Employer stated that they have not refused the employment to the Applicant as claimed in the present dispute application but the Applicant has abandoned his duties on his own after reporting for his duties at the transfer place in Navi Mumbai and worked for two days and thereafter without any intimation left the workplace. The Employer stated that the Applicant was reimbursed /paid for the travelling allowances which include travel tickets and travel allowances for reporting to his transferred location. The Employer stated that the payment for two days salary was also made to him which he has accepted without any protest or reservation. The Employer submitted that the present claim filed by the Applicant is not maintainable for territorial jurisdiction and as such the present dispute raised by the Applicant is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs. The Employer stated that they are employing various employees on its roll including supervisors and managerial staff. The Employer stated that the Applicant though working in the supervisory cadre at the behest of some union leaders instigated its honest employees and with the assistance of other employees of neighbouring companies have started with their illegal activities in and around their premises thereby causing law and order situation at company premises. The Employer stated that some of their employees are duly represented by the union namely, the Marksans Pharma Ltd., permanent workers internal union, Verna Goa and that they have already signed the settlement dt.03/11/2022 with regards to their Charter of Demands u/s 2 (p) r/w section 18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and the same has been registered with the office of the Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Govt. of Goa, as per the provisions of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Employer stated that they are functioning and operating in the state of Goa since the year, 2002 with all the legal compliances including the mandatory requirement for the purpose of production as well as with their employees. The Employer stated that as they have signed the settlement with the said internal union, all the eligible employees have received the benefits of the same and all the employees were happy since signing of the said settlement and everything was working smoothly. The Employer stated that suddenly for the first time on 02/12/2022 some of its employees alongwith some of the outsider persons including some union leaders who were not their employees and also were not familiar to its management has gathered outside of its main gate at around 17.10 hours till 18.30 hrs. and had started shouting slogans against them at the main gate thereby obstructing the entry and exit gate of the company. The Employer stated that after the said incident they had informed the local police station i.e. the Verna Police Station and briefed them about the said incident. The Employer stated that later they came to know that the majority of the persons who gathered outside the factory main gate were the members of the Trade Union by name AITUC from other companies including some of their leaders and few employees which includes the active participation of the Applicant. The Employer stated that the said union is having their members who are working in the neighboring companies gathered at the main gate and started involving themselves in illegal activities. The Employer stated that considering the said incident as first time, they have not taken any serious action on the same. The Employer stated that again for the second time on 04/01/2023 from about 17.30 hrs. till 18.35 hrs. the same union leaders along with the workers of the other companies as well as its few workers had unlawfully gathered outside the main gate and had started shouting slogans against the employees working in managerial cadre as well as against the management and disrupted the smooth entry exit movement of its other employees. The Employer stated that its security personnel had requested them including the Applicant not to assemble in front of the main gate as it obstruct the way in and way out of the factory gate. The Employer stated that they including the Applicant had not adhered to the instructions of the security personnel on the contrary, had threatened them with the dire consequences if they interfered with them and had continued to remain on the gate. The Employer stated that their above activities had disrupted its smooth function. The Employer stated that the unlawful gathering in front of the factory gate had created the atmosphere of unlawfulness, fear and insecurity amongst its employees and the visitors who were inside the company. The Employer stated that their above acts alongwith the Applicant resulted in stalling its regular

work. The Employer stated that the said unlawfulness gathering had taken place during the employees moving out of after their shift working hours and took place right in front of the main gate and therefore many of its employees had experienced a sense of fear and insecurity while moving outside its main gate including the vehicle parking area and few of them had faced hardships in reaching to their vehicles. The Employer stated that the few of its employees had even complained about the said incidents to its HR Department. The Employer stated that considering the situation which had arisen due to the unlawful gatherings of said outside workers, union leaders including the Applicant they had informed the police authorities to act against them. The Employer stated that by seeing the police authorities present at the spot and requested them not to hold the meeting near its main gate. The Employer stated that the police authorities informed them to gather little away from the factory main gate to which their union leaders reacted extremely in an aggressive manner and started questioning police officer as who is he to stop him / them and started abusing the police officer while on duty and started shouting slogans against the police personnel who were on duty. The Employer stated that the said union leaders and his other accomplice including the Applicant had even obstructed the police officials from discharging their lawful duties. The Employer stated that the said union leaders and his other accomplice including the Applicant gathered at the factory gate and created a terror situation in front of its factory premises and as such they filed police complaints from time to time seeking the police protection at factory premises. The Employer stated that they have many other loyal employees who are employed in the company for past several years and working for their livelihood. The Employer stated that their security personnel with great difficulties had taken few photographs from the mobile phone capturing some of their acts/video footage which clearly suggest that such incidents have happened at its factory gate premises which are not at all in its interest and its other loyal employees. The Employer stated that the Applicant with many outsiders including some of the union leaders were involved in doing all the coercive and illegal action in the presence of police authorities and have even given the threats and provoking statement against them. The Employer stated that the video recording of the said coercive and illegal actions are widely circulated on the social media and the same are downloaded on Digital Versatile Disc (DVD). The Employer stated that they informed the police authorities about the probable law and order situation which were created by the Applicant along with the said union leaders including their other supporters and as such considering the fact that it is engaged in manufacturing of Pharmaceutical products including the lifesaving drugs it is important that peace is prevailed in and around the factory premises for smooth functioning of its manufacturing activities. The Employer stated that the Applicant along with above mentioned persons created fear psychosis in the minds of all its other employees. The Employer stated that they have decided to transfer the services of the Applicant looking at the business exigency and the overall nature of business activities, its interest, considering the prevailing situation and interest of both the parties. The Employer stated that the Applicant even decided to report to his transfer place and reported at Mumbai in few days and thereafter without proper intimation to his superiors abandoned his duties for the reasons best known to him. The Employer stated that they even constrained to file an application before the civil court in Margao and obtained injunction order dt. 27/09/2023 against its such employees who have acted against the interest at the behest of the said union. The Opponent denied the overall case as pleaded by the Applicant and prayed for rejecting the claim of the Applicant with costs.

7. Thereafter, the Applicant filed his re-joinder on 20/12/2023 at Exb.7. The Applicant, as and by way of his rejoinder, denied each and every statement, averments and submissions made by the Opponent, vide its written statement filed in the present proceedings and reiterates and confirms the statements, averments and submissions made by him in his statement of claim.

8. This Hon'ble court framed the following issues on 08/01/2024 at Exb.8.

1. *Whether the party-I proves that he is a Workman as defined u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947?*
2. *Whether Party-I proves that the action of the Employer in refusing his services w.e.f. 14.02.2023 is illegal and unjustified?*
3. *Whether Party-I proves that the action of the Employer in refusing his employment is in violation of section 33 of the I.D. Act, 1947?*
4. *Whether Employer proves that the present order of reference is bad in law and not maintainable in view of the reasons stated in para (b to f) of the written statement?*
5. *Whether the Party-I proves that he is entitled to any relief?*
6. *What order? What award?*

9. On 01/08/2025 Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik appearing for the Applicant as well as Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar representing the Employer remained present. Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar files an application dt. 22/07/2025 at Exb. 32 stating that the Applicant had arrived at an amicable settlement with the management of the Opponent on 22/07/2025 and as such he do not wish to pursue the present matter and enclosed a copy of the settlement dt. 22/07/2025. Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik appearing for the Applicant submitted that he is not aware of the said development and is not having the knowledge of the same. Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik appearing for the Applicant therefore filed an application for discharging him from appearing the Applicant in the present matter which was allowed.

I have carefully perused the memorandum of settlement signed u/s 2(p) of the I. D. Act, 1947 between the Applicant and the Opponent which is on record at exb. 32-colly. It appears that the terms of settlement are beneficial to both the parties and hence I approve the same.

In view of above, I pass the following order:

**ORDER**

1. It is held that the present dispute filed by the Applicant stand disposed off as withdrawn. Consequently, the dispute raised by the Applicant is dismissed as withdrawn.
2. No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

*Suresh N. Narulkar*, Presiding Officer, Labour Court-II.

Panaji.

**Notification**

No. 28/02/2025-LAB/50

Date : 13-Jan-2026

The following Award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 27-11-2025 in Case Ref. No. LC-II/Appln/22/2023 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.

**THE LABOUR COURT-II  
GOVERNMENT OF GOA  
AT PANAJI**

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

Case No. LC-II/Appln/22/2023

Shri Gurunath Charadkar,  
S/o Shri Sadanand Charadkar,  
R/o At Post Yadoga, Taluka Haliya,  
Dist.-Karwar, Karnataka (581 329).

..... Applicant/Party I

V/s

M/s. Marksans Pharma Ltd.,  
L-82, L-83, Verna Industrial Estate,  
Verna-Goa (403722).

..... Opponent/Party II

Applicant/Party-I present in Person.

Opponent/Party-II represented by Ld. Adv. Shri. P. Chawdikar.

Panaji, Dated: 27-11-2025.

## AWARD

1. By this Award, I shall dispose off the dispute of the Workman filed u/s 2A (2) of the I.D. Act, 1947.
2. It is the case of the Applicant in short that he is a permanent worker of the Opponent having its factory situated as Verna Industrial Estate, Verna Goa. He stated that the Opponent is a leading Pharma Company and has presence globally in Pharmaceutical Market and is an export oriented Pharmaceutical Company having its Headquarters at Mumbai. He stated that the Opponent manufactures/produces drugs that have wide – ranging applications across fields like Oncology, Gastroenterology, Gynaecology etc. He stated that he was working as a “Granulation Machine Operator”, in the Granulation Department under the overall supervision and control of Production Officer and Shift In-charge. He stated that as a Granulation Machine Operator he was performing duties such as to log-in into the Granulation Machine (FBD, RMG) by using his log-in Id, once log-in is done, the Granulation Machine is activated, then the raw material procured from R. M. store and then the raw materials is mixed HSMG/RMG machine this process is called “Granulation”. After this, the product is unloaded in polybags and it goes through various stages in different machines such as FBD, FBE, Shifter, Comill, Multimill, Stirrer, Octagonal Blender, Bin Blender etc. to get the required granules. The unloaded product is then put on the weighing balanced and the product then goes for blending and lubrication. The unloaded product is then labelled and tagged. The finished product is then sent to granulation storage area for further process. After this process the cleaning activity of the said batch/product done is carried out to make the machine ready for the next batch/product. All the aforesaid activities are undertaken by the Applicant himself under the supervision and control of Production Officer and shift In-charge.
3. He stated that he joined the services of the Opponent on 05/08/2021 and since then he is performing his duties with clean and unblemished past service record. He stated that he was duly rewarded with appreciation time and again for his dedicated and sincere service. He stated that his last drawn salary was Rs.10,000/- p.m. He stated that though he and his colleagues were working on extended hours, weekly-off days, Sundays, paid public holidays, they were not paid overtime wages in accordance with law at double the wage. He stated that they were also not given the benefits of leave, paid public holidays and as such being aggrieved, all the Applicants including himself unionized under the banner of “Goa Trade and Commercial Workers Union” (AITUC) having its Registered Office at Velho’s Building, Municipal Garden, Panaji-Goa. He stated that soon after coming to the knowledge that he and other Applicants have unionized themselves under the banner of Goa Trade and Commercial Workers Union, the Opponent started selective harassment and victimization of union workers and the office bearer of local unit union committee members by using various illegal and unfair labour practices to discourage the formation of the Union. He stated that the Opponent under the leadership of HR Manager, Mr. Shridhar Naidu, Mr. Pramod Sulakhe, Production Head, Mr. Nishant Kalambe and Mr. Vikram Tonde, Packing Head, Mr. Amit Rathi and Mr. Raman Jain, Soft gel Department Head, Mr. Joginder Singh and Mr. Basappa Bentur resorted to various illegal and unfair labour practices in order to undermine and discourage the formation of the trade union of the choice of the Applicants employed in the factory of the Opponent. He stated that the management team of the Opponent started selectively threatening, illegally confining the union workers in factory and coercing the union member forcing them to resign from the membership of the AITUC. He stated that the Management Team of the Opponent also started forcing, coercing and pressurizing him and his other colleague to do continuously 12 hours duty without paying overtime wages for working on extended hours. He stated that he was not given fixed weekly-off day and he was even made to work on public holidays without any benefits. He stated that when he and other colleague objected to do above illegal working, he was threatened that his services will be terminated and he will be thrown-out of the employment. He stated that many active union member have been summarily terminated to take revenge on these Applicants. He stated that the management of the Opponent had threatened him of dire consequences that if he does not resign from the union membership, his services would be either transferred to far off place or his services would be terminated as an punishment and revenge. He stated that the HR Mr. Shridhar Naidu and Mr. Pramod Sulakhe gave three options to him that he must resign from the union membership from AITUC instantly or if he refused to resign, he will be transferred to far-off place or his services would be terminated or to submit resignation from the services of the Opponent and take monetary compensation. He stated that one after another many active union members have illegally refused employment. He stated that almost 23 unionized Applicants have been summarily issued termination letters and by way of harassment and victimization to take revenge and to punish these Applicants forming the trade union with malafide intentions. He stated that he was on duty for first shift operation on 13/02/2023 from 3.00 p.m. to 11.00 p.m. He stated that when he reported for work on 13/02/2023 at around 3.00 p.m. he was taken to HR cabin by the General Manager, Mr. Shridhar Naidu and Mr. Pramod Sulakhe. He stated that he was told that he should take the work by deviating BMR process, to which he told the management team that if he

deviates from the stipulated BMR process, then tomorrow he will be held accountable for deviation of BMR and action could be initiated against him. He stated that he informed the management that he will do work as per BMR process upon which the management team threatened and forced him to do deviation from the BMR process in the production area. He stated that the said Mr. Shridhar Naidu and Mr. Pramod Sulakhe then forced and pressurize him to resign from the union membership of AITUC and when he refused to resign, he was told that his services would be terminated with immediate effect. He stated that he was told to go out of the factory at around 5.15.p.m. and that he was told that he should not report for work any further. He stated that the above action of the management of the Opponent amounts to illegal refusal of employment with effect from 13/02/2023. He stated that the refusal of employment to him is an act of hire and fire which is contrary to law.

4. He submitted that refusal of employment to him is patently illegal, unjust and bad-in-law as the refusal of employment w.e.f. 13/02/2023 is an act of victimization and outcome of the unionization done to him along with other co-workmen, that it is by way of punishment and as and by way of revenge for formation of trade union of his choice and that it smacks of malafide, malice and revenge for formation of union of his choice, that too pressurize and terrorize the unionized member to forsake union membership of AITUC. He stated that the industrial dispute of refusal of employment was raised by him before the office of the DLC, Margao-Goa on 13/02/2023. He submitted that the refusal of employment is nothing but an act of harassment, victimization done with malice and malafides, which is an act of unfair labour practice and termination is in violation of section 33 of the I.D. Act, 1947. He stated that the industrial disputes raised by him pertaining to refusal of employment w.e.f 13/02/2023 is presently pending in Conciliation before the office of DLC, Margao-Goa. He stated that similarly, various industrial disputes are also pending before the office of the DLC, Margao-Goa for its correct adjudication including complaints of unfair labour practice, complaints of harassment and victimization, complaints of changing the service conditions of Applicants, non-settlement of Charter of Demands etc. are already admitted in the Conciliation by the Conciliation Officer as such the refusal of employment w.e.f. 13/02/2023 during the pendency of these industrial dispute is illegal, unfair and bad-in-law. He stated that he is presently unemployed and he is facing acute hardship, losses and financial crises and unable to maintain himself and his family. He stated that due to the illegal termination of his services, he is facing great injustice, losses, prejudice and besides social sigma on character in the society. He stated that he is ready and willing to resume for his normal duties unconditionally with immediate effect as he is in need of job and his entire family is dependent on him. The Applicant therefore prayed that the action of the Opponent in refusing his employment with effect from 13/02/2023 be held illegal, unjust and bad-in-law and that he may be reinstated back in the services of the Opponent with full back wages, continuity in services along with all other consequential benefits.

5. The Opponent controverted the claim of the Applicant by filing its written statement on 28/11/2023. The Opponent, as and by way of its preliminary objections filed in the written statement, submitted that the Party-I is not a "Workman" as defined u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947, that the present claim filed by the Applicant is not an industrial dispute as defined u/s 2(k) of the I.D. Act, 1947, that the Applicant has not given any justification for the demands/claims raised by him, that there is non application of mind by the Applicant while filing the present application, and that the appropriate Government has not referred the present dispute to this Hon'ble Court and as such the claim is wrongly filed by the Applicant before this Hon'ble Court, that the management has not refused the employment in the present dispute application and that the Applicant has abandoned his duties on his own after reporting for his duties at the transfer place in Navi Mumbai and that this Hon'ble Court therefore does not have territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present dispute and that there is non application of mind by the Applicant while filing the present application that the dispute if any should have been filed in Navi Mumbai where the Applicant reported for his duties and marked his presence for two days.

6. The Opponent stated that it is a Pharmaceutical Company having its factory at Verna Industrial Estate, Verna Goa and is manufacturing pharmaceutical products. The Opponent stated that the Applicant was employed with them as a "Management Associate Production" and was predominantly discharging the Supervisory duties along with other ancillary duties and as such he cannot be construed as a Applicants as defined u/s. 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Opponent stated that the claim filed by the Applicant is not maintainable before this Hon'ble Tribunal. The Opponent stated that the Applicant duly signed accepted and acknowledged the job description dt. 09/08/2021 issued to him by them. The Opponent stated that the Applicant was accordingly discharging his duties as per the said job description which clearly suggest that he was also discharging supervisory duties. The Opponent stated that they have not refused the employment to the Applicant as claimed in the present dispute application but the Applicant has abandoned his duties on his own after reporting for his duties at the transfer place in Navi Mumbai and worked for two days and thereafter

without any intimation left the workplace. The Opponent stated that the Applicant was reimbursed /paid for the travelling allowances which include travel tickets and travel allowances for reporting to his transferred location. The Opponent stated that the payment for two days salary was also made to him which he has accepted without any protest or reservation. The Opponent submitted that the present claim filed by the Applicant is not maintainable for territorial jurisdiction and as such the present dispute raised by the Applicant is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs. The Opponent stated that they are employing various employees on its roll including supervisors and managerial staff. The Opponent stated that the Applicant though working in the supervisory cadre at the behest of some union leaders instigated its honest employees and with the assistance of other employees of neighbouring companies have started with their illegal activities in and around their premises thereby causing law and order situation at company premises. The Opponent stated that some of their employees are duly represented by the union namely, the Marksans Pharma Ltd., permanent workers internal union, Verna Goa and that they have already signed the settlement dt. 03/11/2022 with regards to their Charter of Demands u/s. 2 (p) r/w section 18(1) of the I. D. Act, 1947 and the same has been registered with the office of the Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Govt. of Goa, as per the provisions of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Opponent stated that they are functioning and operating in the state of Goa since the year, 2002 with all the legal compliances including the mandatory requirement for the purpose of production as well as with their employees. The Opponent stated that as they have signed the settlement with the said internal union, all the eligible employees have received the benefits of the same and all the employees were happy since signing of the said settlement and everything was working smoothly. The Opponent stated that suddenly for the first time on 02/12/2022 some of its employees alongwith some of the outsider persons including some union leaders who were not their employees and also were not familiar to its management has gathered outside of its main gate at around 17.10 hours till 18.30 hrs. and had started shouting slogans against them at the main gate thereby obstructing the entry and exit gate of the company. The Opponent stated that after the said incident they had informed the local police station i.e. the Verna Police Station and briefed them about the said incident. The Opponent stated that later they came to know that the majority of the persons who gathered outside the factory main gate were the members of the Trade Union by name AITUC from other companies including some of their leaders and employees which includes the active participation of the Applicant. The Opponent stated that the said union is having their members who are working in the neighboring companies gathered at the main gate and started involving themselves in illegal activities. The Opponent stated that considering the said incident as first time, they have not taken any serious action on the same. The Opponent stated that again for the second time on 04/01/2023 from about 17.30 hrs. till 18.35 hrs. the same union leaders along with the workers of the other companies as well as its few workers had unlawfully gathered outside the main gate and had started shouting slogans against the employees working in managerial cadre as well as against the management and disrupted the smooth entry exit movement of its other employees. The Opponent stated that its security personnel had requested them including the Applicant not to assemble in front of the main gate as it obstruct the way in and way out of the factory gate. The Opponent stated that they including the Applicant had not adhered to the instructions of the security personnel on the contrary, had threatened them with the dire consequences if they interfered with them and had continued to remain on the gate. The Opponent stated that their above activities had disrupted its smooth function. The Opponent stated that the unlawful gathering in front of the factory gate had created the atmosphere of unlawfulness, fear and insecurity amongst its employees and the visitors who were inside the company. The Opponent stated that their above acts alongwith the Applicant resulted in stalling its regular work. The Opponent stated that the said unlawfulness gathering had taken place during the employees moving out of after their shift working hours and took place right in front of the main gate and therefore many of its employees had experience sense of fear and insecurity while moving outside its main gate including the vehicle parking area and few of them has faced hardships in reaching to their vehicles. The Opponent stated that the few of its employees had even complained about the said incidents to its HR Department. The Opponent stated that considering the situation which had arisen due to the unlawful gatherings of said outside workers, union leaders including the Applicant they had informed the police authorities to act against them. The Opponent stated that by seeing the police authorities present at the spot and requested them not to hold the meeting near its main gate. The Opponent stated that the police authorities informed them to gather little away from the factory main gate to which their union leaders reacted extremely in aggressive manner and started questioning police officer as who is he to stop him / them and started abusing the police officer while on duty and started shouting slogans against the police personnel who were on duty. The Opponent stated that the said union leaders and his other accomplice including the Applicant had even obstructed the police officials from discharging their lawful duties. The Opponent stated that the said union leaders and his other accomplice including the Applicant gathered at the factory gate and created terror situation in front of its factory premises

and as such they filed police complaints from time to time seeking the police protection at factory premises. The Opponent stated that they have many other loyal employees who are employed in the company for past several years and working for their livelihood. The Opponent stated that their security personnel with great difficulties had taken few photographs from the mobile phone capturing some of their acts/video footage which clearly suggest that such incident have happened at its factory gate premises which are not at all in its interest and its other loyal employees. The Opponent stated that the Applicant with many outsiders including some of the union leaders were involved in doing all the coercive and illegal action in the presence of police authorities and have even gave the threats and provoking statement against them. The Opponent stated that the video recording of the said coercive and illegal actions are widely circulated on the social media and the same are downloaded on Digital Versatile Disc (DVD). The Opponent stated that they informed the police authorities about the probable law and order situation which were created by the Applicant along with said union leaders including their other supporters and as such considering the fact that it is engaged in manufacturing of Pharmaceutical products including the lifesaving drugs it is important that peace is prevailed in and around the factory premises for smooth functioning of its manufacturing activities. The Opponent stated that the Applicant along with above mentioned persons created fear psychosis in the minds of all its other employees. The Opponent stated that they have decided to transfer the services of the Applicant looking at the business exigency and the overall nature of business activities, its interest, considering the prevailing situation and interest of both the parties. The Opponent stated that the Applicant even decided to report to his transfer place and reported at Mumbai in few days and thereafter without proper intimation to his superiors abandoned his duties for the reasons best known to him. The Opponent stated that they even constrained to filed an application before the civil court in Margao and obtained injunction order dt.27/09/2023 against its such employees who have acted against its interest at the behest of the said union. The Opponent denied the overall case as pleaded by the Applicant and prayed for rejecting the claim of the Applicant with costs.

7. Thereafter, the Applicant filed his re-joinder on 20/12/2023 at Exb.7. The Applicant, as and by way of his rejoinder, denied each and every statement, averments and submissions made by the Opponent, vide itswritten statement filed in the present proceedings andreiterates and confirms the statements, averments and submissions made by him in his statement of claim.

8. This Hon'ble court framed the following issues on 08/01/2024 at Exb.8.

1. *Whether the party-I proves that he is a Workman as defined u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947?*
2. *Whether Party-I proves that the action of the Employer in refusing his services w.e.f. 13.02.2023 is illegal and unjustified?*
3. *Whether Party-I proves that the action of the Employer in refusing his employment is in violation of section 33 of the I.D. Act, 1947?*
4. *Whether Employer proves that the present order of reference is bad in law and not maintainable in view of the reasons stated in para (b to f) of the written statement?*
5. *Whether the Party-I proves that he is entitled to any relief?*
6. *What order? What award?*

9. On 22/07/2025, Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik appearing for the Applicant as well as Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar representing the Opponent remained present. Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar files an application dt. 04/07/2025 at Exb. 33 stating that the Applicant had arrived at an amicable settlement with the management of the Opponent on 04/07/2025 and as such he do not wish to pursue the present matter and enclosed a copy of the settlement dt. 04/07/2025. Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik appearing for the Applicant submitted that he is not aware of the said development and is not having knowledge of the same. Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik appearing for the Applicant therefore filed an application for discharging him from appearing the Applicant in the present matter which was allowed.

I have carefully perused the memorandum of settlement signed u/s 2(p) of the I. D. Act, 1947 between the Applicant and the Opponent which is on record at exb. 33-colly. It appears that the terms of settlement are beneficial to both the parties and hence I approve the same.

In view of above, I pass the following order:

## ORDER

1. It is held that the present dispute filed by the Applicant stand disposed off as withdrawn. Consequently, the dispute raised by the Applicant is dismissed as withdrawn.
2. No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

*Suresh N. Narulkar*, Presiding Officer, Labour Court-II.

Panaji.



**Department of Law & Judiciary**

Law (Establishment) Division

**Order**

No. 8/5/2026-LD(Estt.)/233

Date : 15-Jan-2026

**Subject:** Appointment of Administrator under Section 20-AA of the Societies Registration Act, 1860 (Goa Amendment Act, 2023) in respect of Mathagramastha Hindu Sabha, Reg. No. 258 dated 31-01-1970.

Whereas, a complaint dated 19-08-2025 alleging mismanagement, financial irregularities and statutory violations was filed against Mathagramastha Hindu Sabha before the Inspector General of Societies/District Registrar (South), Margao;

And whereas, proceedings under Section 20-A of the Societies Registration Act, 1860 as in force in the State of Goa were initiated after issuance of notices and consideration of replies, rejoinders, written arguments, audit reports and records;

And whereas, the Inspector General of Societies/District Registrar (South), Margao, by Judgment and Order dated 07-01-2026, recorded findings of mismanagement and persistent violation of Section 12-C of the Act by the governing body of the Society and directed to submit report to the Government for appointment of an Administrator;

And whereas, the District Registrar (South) vide report dated 09-01-2026 and the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services vide note dated 12-01-2026 recommended appointment of an Administrator;

And whereas, the Government, upon examination of the material on record is satisfied that the conditions specified under Section 20-AA of the Societies Registration Act, 1860 as in force in the State of Goa are fulfilled.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 20-AA of the Societies Registration Act, 1860 as in force in the State of Goa, the Government of Goa hereby appoints Shri Bhushan Savaikar, Director, Directorate of Higher Education, Government of Goa, as the Administrator of Mathagramastha Hindu Sabha, Reg. No. 258 dated 31-01-1970.

Functions of the Administrator:

The Administrator shall:

- a) Manage the day-to-day administrative and financial affairs of the Society;
- b) Ensure compliance with statutory and financial requirements;
- c) Conduct elections to the Managing Committee strictly in accordance with the bye-laws of the Society;
- d) Hand over charge to the duly elected Managing Committee after completion of elections and submit a report to the competent authority for further orders.

**Effect:** Upon appointment of the Administrator, the existing governing body shall cease to exercise all powers and functions, which shall vest in the Administrator for the period of 06 (six) months from the date of issue of this Order.

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

*Gajanan X. Bhonsle*, Under Secretary (Estt.), Law.

Porvorim.

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

No. 7/27/2022-PER/3959

Date : 31-Dec-2025

Read: 1. Notification No. 16/29/1/2023-Rev-I/3258 dated 31-12-2025.

2. Notification No. 16/29/1/2023-Rev-I/3259 dated 31-12-2025.

Pursuant to the Notifications issued by the Revenue Department read in the preamble, Ms. Egna Cleetus, IAS (AGMUT:2020), Collector, South shall hold the charge of Collector, Kushavati District, in addition to her own duties, with effect from 01-01-2026 until further orders and till further arrangements are made the officer shall continue to perform the duties from the existing office in the South Goa District.

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

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

Porvorim.

**Order**

No. 13/13/2025-PER/145

Date : 12-Jan-2026

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/13/2025-PER/3007 dated 30-09-2025 had granted extension in service to Dr. Rajendra M. Borkar, Chief Medical Officer, Directorate of Health Services beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-10-2025 to 30-09-2026, 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 Dr. Rajendra M. Borkar, Chief Medical Officer, Directorate of Health Services.

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400121064 dated 25-12-2025 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Dr. Rajendra M. Borkar, Chief Medical Officer, Directorate of Health Services, subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXIX<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 07-01-2026 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Dr. Rajendra M. Borkar, Chief Medical Officer, Directorate of Health Services beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-10-2025 to 30-09-2026, in public interest.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No.13/13/2025-PER/3007 dated 30-09-2025 granting extension in service to Dr. Rajendra M. Borkar, Chief Medical Officer, Directorate of Health Services beyond the date of his superannuation for a period of one year w.e.f. 01-10-2025 to 30-09-2026, in public interest.

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

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

Porvorim.

**Order**

No. 13/12/2025-PER/186

Date : 16-Jan-2026

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/12/2025-PER/2633 dated 29-08-2025 had granted extension in service to Shri Vikramsingh Rajebhosle, Sr. Superintendent (Workshop & Traffic) 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 are pending against Shri Vikramsingh Rajebhosle, Sr. Superintendent (Workshop & Traffic).

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400117384 dated 06-01-2026 concurred the proposal for grant of extension in service to Shri Vikramsingh Rajebhosle, Sr. Superintendent (Workshop & Traffic), subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXIX<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 07-01-2026 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri Vikramsingh Rajebhosle, Sr. Superintendent (Workshop & Traffic) 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.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/12/2025-PER/2633 dated 29-08-2025 granting extension in service to Shri Vikramsingh Rajebhosle, Sr. Superintendent (Workshop & Traffic) 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.

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

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

Porvorim.

---

**Order**

No. 13/07/2024-PER/187

Date : 16-Jan-2026

Whereas, Government vide Order No. 13/07/2024-PER/2634 dated 29-08-2025 had granted extension in service to Shri. Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a further 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. Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department.

And whereas, the Finance Department vide its U. O. No. 1400103136 dated 25-12-2025 concurred the proposal for grant of further extension in service to Shri. Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department, subject to Cabinet approval.

And whereas, the Council of Ministers in its LXXXIX<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 07-01-2026 resolved to grant ex-post facto approval for extension in service to Shri. Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a further period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2025 to 31-08-2026, in public interest.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to confirm the Order No. 13/07/2024-PER/2634 dated 29-08-2025 granting extension in service to Shri. Vallabh Samant, Executive Engineer (Elect.), Electricity Department beyond the date of his superannuation for a further period of one year w.e.f. 01-09-2025 to 31-08-2026, in public interest.

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

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

Porvorim.

---

**Order**

No. 7/27/2022-PER/188

Date : 16-Jan-2026

Read:- Order No. 14020/04/2022-UTS.I dated 04-01-2026.

The Governor of Goa is pleased to relieve Ms. Ankita Mishra, IAS (AGMUT:2018), Secretary (Protocol) from this Administration w.e.f. 19-01-2026 (a.n.) to join her next posting in Arunachal Pradesh.

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. 6/1/2020-III/PHD/101

Date : 08-Jan-2026

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their Letter No. COM/II/11/3(1)/2025/367 dated 17-12-2025, Government is pleased to promote the following Assistant Professor in Psychiatry to the post of Associate Professor in Psychiatry in Institute of Psychiatry and Human Behaviour, Bambolim on regular basis in the Level 11 of Pay Matrix and other allowances to be fixed as per rules with immediate effect.

1. Dr. Nayana Sanjay Naik.
2. Dr. Anil Vishnu Rane.

The promotion of Incumbent No. 1 is made against the vacancy occurred due to voluntary retirement of Dr. Shilpa Waikar, Associate Professor w.e.f. 04-11-2024 (a.n.) vide Order No. 8/1/2003-III/PHD/3037 dated 04-10-2024.

The promotion of Incumbent No. 2 is made against the vacancy occurred due to promotion of Dr. Mary Conception D'Souza, Associate Professor to the post of Professor in Psychiatry on 21-02-2025 vide Order No. 6/9/2002-III/PHD/Part/449 dated 21-02-2025.

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

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

Porvorim.

## Notification

No. 1/13/2016-II/PHD/Part-I/71

Date : 05-Jan-2026

Read: Notification No. 1/13/2016-II/PHD/Part/3236/10888 dated 29-10-2024.

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 22 of the National Commission for Allied and Healthcare Professions Act, 2021, the Government of Goa hereby re-constitutes the Goa State Allied and Healthcare Council consisting of the following members, namely:-

(1)	Dr. Bharati C. Chavan, Associate Professor in Psychiatric Social Work, IPHB, Goa	Chairperson
(2)	Director, Directorate of Health Services, Goa	Ex officio Member
(3)	Dean, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Ex officio Member
(4)	Director Academics, Co-ordinator-AHSC, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Ex officio Member
(5)	Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Singh, Quality Manager, Blood Bank, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Member
(6)	Dr. Dilecta D'Costa, Vice Principal and Associate Professor of Microbiology, Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Khandola, Goa	Member
(7)	Dr. Sateeshkumar Kama, Head of Operations, Fleet and Training EMRI, Green Health Service, 108 Ambulance Services, Goa	Member
(8)	Ms. Rutuja Garge, Physiotherapist, PNRC, Department of Paediatrics, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Member
(9)	Ms. Sweezel D'Souza, Physiotherapist, Physiotherapeutic Centre, Panjim-Goa	Member

(10)	Ms. Ranju Kunkalikar, Associate Professor (Food Nutrition & Dietetics), Goa College of Home Science, Panjim, Goa	Member
(11)	Ms. Bernadette Rodrigues Pareira, Consultant Dietician and Nutritionist, JMJ Hospital and Galaxy Hospital, Porvorim, Goa	Member
(12)	Mr. Bharat Kumar Bhayal, Assistant Professor in Optometry, Department of Ophthalmology, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Member
(13)	Mr. Ashwin Jason D'souza, Optometrist, Curchorem, Goa	Member
(14)	Dr. Vivek P. Vajaratkar, PhD (OT), Associate Professor in Occupational Therapy, Department of Orthopaedics, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Member
(15)	Mrs. Priyanka Raikar, Occupational Therapist, Founder & Proprietor, Miracle-Paediatric Neuro Therapy Centre, Goa	Member
(16)	Mr. Sudesh Gaude, Assistant Professor in Psychiatric Social Work, IPHB, Goa	Member
(17)	Mrs. Sarita Patil, Core faculty, Goa Institute of Public Administration and Rural Development, Goa	Member
(18)	Dr. Mohit Pandey, Associate Professor in Medical Imaging Technology, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Member
(19)	Dr. Rahul Kothari, Assistant Professor in Medical Imaging Technology, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa	Member
(20)	Dr. M. S. Kulkarni, Associate Professor in Statistics and Demography, Department of Community Medicine, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Goa.	Member
(21)	Dr. T. Kalaichelvan, Dental Technologist, Goa Dental College & Hospital, Goa.	Member
(22)	Ms. Lorraine Fernandes, Physiotherapist, Sanjay Centre for Special Education, Porvorim, Goa and Member of Indian Association of Physiotherapist.	Member
(23)	Ms. Mahera Kantawalla, Occupational Therapist, Sethu Centre, Goa and Convenor, Goa Branch of AIOTA	Member

This Notification shall supersede the previous notification No. 1/13/2016-II/PHD/Part/3236 dated 29-10-2024 and 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.

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

Porvorim.

#### Notification

No. 24/2/2016-I/PHD/Part-II/55

Date : 12-Jan-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Goa Homoeopathy Council Act, 2001 (Goa Act 63 of 2001) and in supersession of the Government Notification No. 24/2/2016-I/PHD/PART-II/454 dated 24-02-2021 published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 49 dated 04/03/2021, the Government of Goa hereby establishes Goa Homoeopathy Council consisting of the following members, namely:-

(i)	Dr. Bipin Salkar	— Chairman
(ii)	Dr. Sameer Naik	— Member
(iii)	Dr. Asif Ali Narangi	— Member
(iv)	Dr. Rajendra Kanekar	— Member

(v)	Dr. Indira Fonseca	— Member
(vi)	Dr. Pratista Cunkolikar	— Member
(vii)	Dr. Rupali Vernekar	— Member
(viii)	Principal, Shri. Kamaxidevi Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital	— Member
(ix)	The Director of Health Services, Government of Goa	— Member

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.

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

Porvorim.

### Corrigendum

No. 9/1/2018-III/PHD/128

Date : 13-Jan-2026

Read: Notification No. 9/1/2018-III/PHD/2191 dated 07-10-2025

In the aforesaid Order, the names of the Non-Official Members as indicated at Sr. No. 10, 12 and 17 shall be corrected to read as under:-

10. Dr. Zoya Vinita Joao.

12. Dr. Nitasha Borah.

17. Dr. Richa Acharya.

The rest of the contents of the said Notification remains unchanged.

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

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

Porvorim.

◆◆◆

### Department of Revenue

#### Order

No. 16/01/01/2025-RD-I/PF-III/73

Date : 16-Jan-2026

The Government is pleased to constitute a committee consisting of following members:

1.	Collector (Kushavati District)	—	Chairperson
2.	Dy. Collector & SDM, Sanguem	—	Member
3.	Representative of Water Resources Department	—	Member
4.	Mamlatdar of Sanguem taluka	—	Member
5.	ISLR, Sanguem	—	Member
6.	Representative of Project Affected Persons	—	Member
7.	Sarpanch of concerned Village Panchayat	—	Member
8.	Director of Settlement and Land Records	—	Member Secretary

The terms of reference for the Committee are:

- a) Undertake verification and correction of survey numbers pertaining to allotted plots of rehabilitated families of Salaulim Dam Project/Salaulim Irrigation Project.

- b) Explore the possibility of amalgamating old survey numbers wherever required so that new survey numbers are issued.
- c) Process and complete pending mutation.
- d) Expediently dispose all pending issues related to survey numbers.

The Committee shall have a tenure of three months which shall be extended if required by the Government.

*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)/2017-19/153

Date : 16-Jan-2026

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	Transferred/Posted at
1.	Smt. Maria Roseann Diniz, Deputy Town Planner	Canacona Taluka Office, Canacona, with additional charge of Mormugao Taluka Office, Vasco and Quepem Taluka Office, Quepem	Canacona Taluka Office, Canacona, with additional charge of Quepem Taluka Office, Quepem.
2.	Shri. Ram alias Tanay Sandesh Timblo, Deputy Town Planner	TCP Headquarters, Panaji	TCP Headquarters, Panaji, with additional charge of Mormugao Taluka Office, Vasco.

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

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.

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

Panaji.

#### **Order**

No. 1/3/TCP(Part-File)/2017-19/154

Date : 16-Jan-2026

Government is pleased to give additional charge of the Senior Town Planner, South Goa District Office, Margao, to Shri Anand A. Deshpande, Town Planner, North Goa District Office, TCP Dept., Mapusa, in addition to his own duties, post retirement of Shri. Sandip P. Surlakar, Town Planner, South Goa District Office, TCP Dept., Margao, in public interest, with immediate effect.

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 (22F)/TCP/2025/44

Date : 21-Jan-2026

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./Chalita No.	Name of Village and Taluka	Published land use as per RPG-2021/ODP (Total Area) in m <sup>2</sup>	Proposed land use	Area proposed in sq. mts.	Decision of the Government
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Rasika R. Kadwadkar Abhishek Raghuveer Badkar	76/1-A-20	Fatorpa, Quepem	Partly Orchard (6 m <sup>2</sup> ) Partly Orchard with No Development Slope (605 m <sup>2</sup> ) Total Area (611)	Settlement Zone	611	Approved for change of zone an area of 605 m <sup>2</sup> from Partly Orchard with No Development Slope to Settlement, being within permissible gradient and 6 m <sup>2</sup> from Orchard to Settlement.
2.	Lalita Kambli alias Rakshita Govekar	103/2	Assagao, Bardez	Partly Settlement (13m <sup>2</sup> ), Partly Natural Cover (1665m <sup>2</sup> ), Partly Natural Cover with Irrigation Command Area (272m <sup>2</sup> ) Total Area (1950)	Settlement Zone	1937	Approved for change of zone an area of 1665m <sup>2</sup> from Natural Cover to Settlement zone and 272m <sup>2</sup> from Natural Cover with Irrigation Command Area to Settlement with Irrigation Command Area subject to NOC from Water Resources Department prior to secondary development.
3.	Shivali Financial Advisors Private Limited, Authorized Signatory Mr. Amit D. Shah	44/1	Sircaim, Bardez	Partly Settlement Zone (358m <sup>2</sup> ) Partly Playground (2879m <sup>2</sup> ) Total Area (3237)	Settlement Zone	2879	Approved for change of zone an area of 2879m <sup>2</sup> from Playground to Settlement Zone.
4.	Vijay Laxman Kangralkar	236/1 Plot No. 90-A	Usgao, Ponda	Natural Cover Total Area (105)	Settlement Zone	105	Approved for change of zone an area of 105m <sup>2</sup> from Natural Cover to Settlement Zone.

5.	Winston Bernardo Do Carmo Collaco	158/1-C	Nuvem, Salcete	Partly Settlement (2,181 m <sup>2</sup> ), Partly Orchard (102 m <sup>2</sup> ) Total Area (2283)	Settlement & Deletion of existing 6 mts. wide road	102	Approved for change of zone an area of 102m <sup>2</sup> from Orchard to Settlement Zone.
6.	Antoneta Pinto	174/1-W	Camurlim, Salcete	Orchard Total Area (282)	Settlement Zone	282	Approved for change of zone an area of 282m <sup>2</sup> from Orchard to Settlement Zone.
7.	Milagrina Fernandes	317/9	Aldona, Bardez	Orchard Total Area (2200)	Settlement Zone	2200	Approved for change of zone an area of 2200m <sup>2</sup> from Orchard to Settlement 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(16)/TCP/2025/78 dated 21/01/2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 43 dated 23-01-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 1);
- (ii) 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. No. 2 & 3)
- (iii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(1R)/TCP/2024/36 dated 05-11-2024, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 32 dated 07-11-2024 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 4);
- (iv) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (17)/TCP/2025/83 dated 18-02-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No.47 dated 20-02-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 5);
- (v) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (27)/TCP/2025/323 dated 16-07-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 16 dated 17-07-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 6);
- (vi) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(29)/TCP/2025/377 dated 13-08-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 21 dated 21-08-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 7); 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 215<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 04-06-2025, Sr. No. 2 & 7 in its 220<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 10-10-2025, Sr. No. 3 in its 224<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 13-11-2025, Sr. No. 4 in its 209<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 12-12-2024, Sr. No. 5 in its 214<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 24-04-2025, Sr. No. 6 in its 221<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 16-10-2025, 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 Women and Child Development**

Directorate of Women and Child Development

#### **Order**

No. 4/3/2019/DWCD/8044

Date : 24-Dec-2025

Vide Order No. 4/3/2019/DWCD/3194 dated 12-08-2024, Smt. Shilpa Naik (name changed to Smt. Shilpa M. Vernekar), Mukhya Sevika was promoted to the post of Child Development Project Officer/Social Welfare Officer (Group 'B' Gazetted) on "officiating basis" against the ST vacancy till ST Officer is found eligible by the department in the Pay Matrix Level 6 with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the post and posted as Child Development Project Officer, WCD Block Office Quepem against the vacant post on the recommendation of Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/59(1)/2018/93 dated 14-06-2024.

Now, on the recommendation of Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/59(1)/2018/134 dated 18-07-2025, the said ST vacancy has been filled on regular basis as ST Official is found eligible in the department.

Now therefore, Smt. Shilpa Naik (name changed to Smt. Shilpa M. Vernekar), CDPO/SWO (officiating basis) is hereby reverted back to the post of Mukhya Sevika (Group 'C' Non-Gazetted) in the Pay Matrix Level 6 and posted at WCD Block Office Tiswadi against her vacant post with immediate effect.

The expenditure in respect of above post shall be debited against the vacant post at WCD Block Office Tiswadi under Budget Head "2235-02-102-41-01" under Demand No. 58.

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

*Jyoti Desai, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary, Women & Child Development.*

Panaji.

#### **Order**

No. 4/3/2019/DWCD/8046

Date : 24-Dec-2025

On the recommendation of Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/11/59(1)/2018/134 dated 18-07-2025, Government is pleased to promote following Mukhya Sevikas to the post of Child Development Project Officer/Social Welfare Officer (Group 'B' Gazetted) on regular basis in the Pay Matrix Level 6 with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the post and posted them as follows:-

Sr. No.	Name	Category	Posting on Promotion
1.	Smt. Akshaya B. Naik	PwD	Child Development Project Officer, WCD Block Office Bicholim against vacant post.
2.	Smt. Sunita T. Velip	ST	Child Development Project Officer, WCD Block Office Canacona against vacant post.
3.	Smt. Soniya R. Gaude	ST	Child Development Project Officer, WCD Block Office Quepem against vacant post.

The newly promoted Officers shall be on probation period of two years. The above officials shall exercise their option for fixation of pay in promotional grade in terms of F.R. (22) (1)(a) (1), within a period of one month from the date of issue of promotion order. The option once exercised shall be final.

The expenditure in respect of above post shall be debited to the Budget Head of Account “2235—Social Security & Welfare, 02—Social Welfare, 102—Child Welfare, 41—Integrated Child Development Project Scheme including Health cover (Plan) (A), 01—Salaries” against the vacant posts at their respective place of posting.

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

*Jyoti Desai, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary, Women & Child Development.*

Panaji.

#### Notification

No. 2-107(177)24-25/Sponsorship/ICPS/DWCD/8602

Date : 16-Jan-2026

In exercise of the power conferred under the Section 44 & 45 of the Juvenile Justice Act 2015, (as amended in 2021) read with point (8) of Model Foster Care Guidelines, 2024 and Chapter 4 para 4.2.3 of Mission Vatsalya Guidelines, 2022, The Government of Goa is pleased to constitute the Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee (SFCAC) for a period of 3 years as per following:

#### **I. The Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee—North Goa**

1)	The District Magistrate/Collector-North Goa	Chairperson
2)	The Chairperson, Child Welfare Committee, North Goa	Member
3)	The Representative of SAA-OPM-Caritas, Nachinola, Bardez-Goa	Member
4)	The Representative of Child Rights in Goa (CRG)	Member
5)	The District Child Protection Officer – DCPU North Goa	Member Secretary
6)	The Protection Officer (Non- Institutional), District Child Protection Unit North Goa	Member

#### **II. The Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee – South Goa**

1)	The District Magistrate/Collector-South Goa	Chairperson
2)	The Chairperson, Child Welfare Committee, South Goa	Member
3)	The Representative of SAA- Matruchhya, Dhavli, Ponda Goa	Member
4)	The Representative of Child Rights in Goa (Jan Ugahi), Margao	Member
5)	The District Child Protection Officer – DCPU South Goa	Member Secretary
6)	The Protection Officer (Non- Institutional), District Child Protection Unit South Goa	Member

The Roles and Responsibilities of the Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee (SFCAC) is as follows:

- I. Every district will have a Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee (SFCAC) to implement and monitor the Sponsorship and Foster Care programme as provided under the Mission.
- II. The Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee will review each recommendation and approve cases of Sponsorship and Foster Care support in all cases found deserving by it. The deserving cases will then be referred to Child Welfare Committee for the final order for Sponsorship/Foster Care and as the case may be.
- III. A Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee (SFCAC) will be Responsible in each district to sanction sponsorship and foster care on receipt of final order from the CWC.
- IV. The decision upon a request shall be taken within three months from the date of the receipt of the application.
- V. An annual review will be conducted for each child under Sponsorship/Foster Care by the SFCAC to determine if the child is being well taken care of and has is well adjusted. On the basis of this review the approval for continued sponsorship support will be given.
- VI. The SFCAC will review and recommend the termination of the family based sponsorship service.

The Notification shall come into force with effect from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

This issues with approval of the Government vide U.O. No. 687 dated 05-12-2025.

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

*Jyoti Desai, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary, Women & Child Development.*

Panaji.

---

### Corrigendum

No. 4-3-2008/DWCD/Part/7841

Date : 15-Dec-2025

Read: i) Order No. 4-3-2008/DWCD/8262 dated 04-12-2018.

ii) Order No. 4-3-2008/DWCD/8263 dated 04-12-2018.

iii) Order No. 4-3-2008/DWCD/8264 dated 04-12-2018.

The word mentioned on the 5<sup>th</sup> line of the 1<sup>st</sup> para of above read Orders after the word “Panaji Goa” may be read as “**on temporary basis**” instead of “on Officiating basis”.

The rest of the contents remain unchanged.

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

*Jyoti Desai, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary, Women and Child Development.*

Panaji.