

Panaji, 06th August, 2026 (Sravana 15, 1948)

SERIES II No. 19

OFFICIAL GAZETTE GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

GOVERNMENT OF GOA**Department of Animal Husbandry**

Directorate of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services

Notification

No. GSPDC/2026-27/2517

Date : 03-Aug-2026

In terms of the provisions of Article 60 read with Article 77 of the Articles of Association of The Goa State Poultry Development Corporation Limited (a Government Company registered under the Companies Act, 2013) (hereinafter referred to as the said Company), the Government of Goa is pleased to constitute the Board of Directors for the said Company, with immediate effect and until further orders, namely:-

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Chief Minister, Government of Goa | — Chairperson |
| 2. Secretary (Finance Department), Government of Goa | — Director |
| 3. Secretary, Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services, Government of Goa | — Director |
| 4. Director, Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services, Government of Goa | — Director |
| 5. Dr. Rajesh G. Kenny, Deputy Director, Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services | — Director |
| 6. Mr. Jaikrishna Vishwanath Naik, President, All Goa Poultry Farmers & Traders Association | — Director |
| 7. Mr. Prisco Sequeira, President, All Goa Poultry Shopkeepers Association | — Director |
| 8. Mr. Timoteo Teixeira, President, South Goa Poultry Products Shopkeepers and Traders Association | — Director |
| 9. Mrs. Anisha Jenu Naik, r/o St. Cruz, Tiswadi-Goa | — Director |

Dr. Rajesh Kenny, Director of the said Company, shall function as the Chief Executive Officer of the said Company.

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

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

Panaji.

Department of Environment and Climate Change**Notification**

No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/199/621

Date : 28-Jul-2026

Climate Change Cell (CCC)

Ref.: Notification No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/528 dated 07/09/2021.

The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC), Government of India, had established the National Adaptation Fund for Climate Change (NAFCC) to support and scale up climate change adaptation interventions in accordance with the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) and the State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCCs). Pursuant to the decision taken in the 6th Meeting of the State Level Steering Committee (SLSC) for NAFCC held on 05th January, 2021, it was decided to constitute a Climate Change Cell to facilitate coordination, implementation, and monitoring of climate change initiatives in the State.

Further, the Government of Goa established a three-tier institutional governance mechanism to guide and oversee the State's climate action agenda under the State Action Plan on Climate Change (SAPCC), as notified in the Government of Goa Official Gazette (Series II No. 25 dated 16th September, 2021, Notification No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/527 to 529, Pages 516-518). The framework comprises the State Governing Council for Climate Change at the apex, supported by the Executive Committee, the State Level Steering Committee on Climate Change chaired by the Chief Secretary, Government of Goa, and the Climate Change Cell Committee chaired by the Secretary (Environment and Climate Change), Government of Goa, which serves as the technical and coordination arm for the implementation and monitoring of climate action in the State.

In continuation of the aforesaid notification and in furtherance of the State's efforts to strengthen institutional coordination and enhance the effectiveness of climate action across sectors through the inclusion of key officials, institutions, and domain experts, the Government of Goa hereby reconstitutes the Climate Change Cell Committee comprising the following members:

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Secretary, Environment & Climate Change | — | In-charge |
| 2. Representative, Forest Department, nominated by PCCF | — | Member |
| 3. Additional Secretary, Finance | — | Member |
| 4. The Collector, North Goa (Member Secretary, Disaster Management Cell, North) | — | Member |
| 5. The Collector, South Goa (Member Secretary, Disaster Management Cell, South) | — | Member |
| 6. Director/HoD, Directorate of Transport | — | Member |
| 7. Director/HoD, Renewable Energy | — | Member |
| 8. Director/HoD, Department of Agriculture | — | Member |
| 9. Director/HoD, Water Resources | — | Member |
| 10. Director/HoD, Tourism | — | Member |
| 11. Director/HoD, Waste Management | — | Member |
| 12. Director, Department of Environment & Climate Change | — | Convenor |
| 13. Member Secretary, Goa State Pollution Control Board | — | Member |
| 14. Member Secretary, Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority | — | Member |
| 15. Member Secretary, Goa Energy Development Agency | — | Member |
| 16. Member Secretary, Goa State Biodiversity Board | — | Nodal Officer |
| 17. Project Director, Climate and Disaster-Resilient Greener Goa (CDRGG) | — | Invitee |
| 18. Blended Climate Finance Facility SPV, Head | — | Invitee |
| 19. Goa SHORE PMU, Head | — | Invitee |

20.	Goa State Climate Change Cell, Team Leader	—	Invitee
21.	NABARD, Representative	—	Expert
22.	TERI, Representative	—	Expert

The Climate Change Cell will meet atleast thrice in a year.

The term of the Cell is for a period of 03 years.

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

Sachin S. Desai, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Env. & CC).

Panaji.

Note: The Committee may be empowered to co-opt additional members, as deemed appropriate.

Notification

No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/199/622

Date : 28-Jul-2026

State Level Steering Committee (SLSC) for Climate Change

Ref.: Notification No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/529 dated 07/09/2021.

The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC), Government of India, had established the National Adaptation Fund for Climate Change (NAFCC) to support and scale up climate change adaptation interventions in accordance with the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) and the State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCCs). In accordance with paragraph 7.2(iv) of the implementation guidelines issued by MoEF&CC under NAFCC, a State Level Steering Committee (SLSC) was constituted under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary, Government of Goa, with representatives of stakeholder departments and NABARD to coordinate the preparation, appraisal, and submission of climate change adaptation projects in the State.

Further, pursuant to the establishment of a three-tier institutional governance mechanism to guide and oversee the State's climate action agenda under the State Action Plan on Climate Change (SAPCC), as notified in the Government of Goa Official Gazette (Series II No. 25 dated 16th September, 2021, Notification No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/527 to 529, Pages 516-518), the State Level Steering Committee for Climate Change functions as the coordinating body under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary, Government of Goa, to facilitate inter-departmental coordination and implementation of climate actions in the State.

In continuation of the aforesaid notification and in furtherance of the State's efforts to strengthen institutional coordination and enhance the effectiveness of climate action across sectors, the Government of Goa hereby reconstitutes the State Level Steering Committee for Climate Change comprising the following members:

1.	Chief Secretary	—	Chairperson
2.	Secretary (Forest)	—	Member
3.	Principal Chief Conservator of Forest	—	Member
4.	Secretary (Environment & Climate Change)	—	Member
5.	Secretary (Agriculture)	—	Member
6.	Secretary (Health)	—	Member
7.	Secretary (Non-Conventional Energy)	—	Member
8.	Secretary (Transport)	—	Member
9.	Secretary (Revenue)	—	Member
10.	Secretary (Finance)	—	Member
11.	The Collector, North Goa (Member Secretary, Disaster Management Cell, North)	—	Member
12.	The Collector, South Goa (Member Secretary, Disaster Management Cell, South)	—	Member

13.	Director, Indian Meteorological Department, Panaji	—	Member
14.	Director, Department of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services	—	Member
15.	Director, Directorate of Health	—	Member
16.	Director, Directorate of Transport	—	Member
17.	Director, Department of Science and Technology	—	Member
18.	Director, Department of Tourism	—	Member
19.	Director, Department of Agriculture	—	Member
20.	Principal Chief Engineer, Public Works Department	—	Member
21.	Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department	—	Member
22.	Chief Town Planner (A), Town and Country Planning Department	—	Member
23.	Chief Electrical Engineer, Department of Electricity	—	Member
24.	Director, Directorate of Fisheries	—	Member
25.	Director, Department of Environment & Climate Change	—	Convenor
26.	Member Secretary, Goa State Pollution Control Board	—	Member
27.	Member Secretary, Goa Energy Development Agency	—	Member
28.	Member Secretary, Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority	—	Member
29.	Member Secretary, Goa State Biodiversity Board	—	Nodal Officer
30.	Managing Director, Goa Waste Management Corporation	—	Member
31.	Head of Nodal Agency, Goa State Wetland Authority	—	Member
32.	Dean, School of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences, Goa University	—	Member
33.	Chief General Manager, NABARD or his/her nominee	—	Member
34.	State-level Representative, UNDP	—	Member
35.	Project Management Officer, UNEP	—	Member
36.	Prof. Dr. Rajiv Kumar Chaturvedi, Associate Professor, BITS Pilani, Goa	—	Expert
37.	Dr. Lidita D.S. Khandeparker, Scientist-F, CSIR-NIO	—	Expert

The SLSC will meet at least twice a year.

The term of the Steering Committee is for a period of 03 years.

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

Sachin S. Desai, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Env. & CC).

Panaji.

Note: The Committee may be empowered to co-opt additional members, as deemed appropriate.

Notification

No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/199/623

Date : 28-Jul-2026

State Governing Council for Climate Change (SGCCC)

Ref.: Notification No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/527 dated 07/09/2021.

The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC), Government of India, had established the National Adaptation Fund for Climate Change (NAFCC) to support and scale up climate change adaptation interventions in accordance with the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) and the State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCCs). Pursuant to the decision taken in the 6th Meeting of the State Level Steering Committee (SLSC) for NAFCC held on 05th January, 2021, the Government of Goa established a three-tier institutional governance mechanism to guide and oversee the State's climate action agenda under the State Action Plan on Climate Change (SAPCC), as notified in the Government of

Goa Official Gazette (Series II No. 25 dated 16th September, 2021, Notification No. 20-3-2020/GSBB/OE/527 to 529, Pages 516-518). The framework comprises the State Governing Council for Climate Change at the apex, supported by the State Level Steering Committee for Climate Change and the Climate Change Cell Committee for coordination and implementation. In continuation of the aforesaid notification and in furtherance of the State's efforts to strengthen climate governance and align with emerging climate priorities through the inclusion of eminent experts and domain leaders, the Government of Goa hereby reconstitutes the State Governing Council for Climate Change comprising the following members:

1. Hon'ble Chief Minister, Government of Goa	—	Chairperson
2. Minister for Environment & Climate Change, Government of Goa	—	Co-Chairperson
3. Chief Secretary, Government of Goa	—	Co-Chairperson
4. Secretary (Forest)	—	Member
5. Principal Chief Conservator of Forest	—	Member
6. Secretary (Environment & Climate Change)	—	Member
7. Secretary (Agriculture)	—	Member
8. Secretary (Fisheries)	—	Member
9. Secretary (Transport)	—	Member
10. Secretary (Water Resources)	—	Member
11. Secretary (Non-Conventional Energy)	—	Member
12. Secretary (Town and Country Planning)	—	Member
13. Secretary (Finance)	—	Member
14. Secretary (Revenue)	—	Member
15. Chairperson, Goa State Pollution Control Board	—	Member
16. Member Secretary, Goa State Biodiversity Board	—	Nodal Officer
17. Director, Environment and Climate Change	—	Convenor
18. Vice Chancellor, Goa University	—	Expert
19. Director, CSIR-National Institute of Oceanography, Goa	—	Expert
20. Director, BITS Pillani, Goa	—	Expert
21. Director, National Institute of Technology (NIT), Goa	—	Expert
22. Director, Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Goa	—	Expert
23. Dr. Ashok Khosla, Development Alternatives and TARA	—	Expert
24. Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	—	Expert
25. Head, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), India	—	Expert
26. Chief General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD)	—	Expert
27. High-level Representative, Small Industries Development Bank of India (SIDBI)	—	Expert
28. High-level Representative, Power Finance Corporation (PFC)	—	Expert
29. Dr. Satish Shetye, Ex-VC Goa University, Ex-Director CSIR-NIO	—	Expert

The State Governing Council will meet atleast once in a year.

The term of the council is for a period of 03 years.

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

Sachin S. Desai, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Env. & CC).

Panaji.

Department of General Administration**Order**

No. 13/4/2014-GAD-III/3292

Date : 28-Jul-2026

On the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee as conveyed by the Goa Public Service Commission vide their letter No. S2GPSC-LPCF0GADM/1/2026 I/1083/2026/165 dated 08/07/2026 read with letter No. S2GPSC-LPCF0GADM/1/2026 I/1124/2026/188 dated 21/07/2026 and with the approval of the Secretary (General Administration), it is hereby declared that the following Section Officers (Group 'B' Gazetted) in Secretariat have satisfactorily completed their probation period of two years, with effect from the dates indicated against their names:-

Sr. No.	Names of the Officers	Date of joining the post of Section Officer	Date of completion of probation period
1	2	3	4
1.	Smt. Jyoti L. Sawant	13/08/2021	13/08/2023
2.	Smt. Vanessa D'Cunha e D'Souza	16/08/2021	15/08/2023
3.	Kum. Swapnita Arjun Naik	16/08/2021	15/08/2023
4.	Smt. Sneha A. Shirodkar	13/08/2021	13/08/2023
5.	Smt. Milagrina Estrochio e Braganza	15/07/2022	15/07/2024
6.	Shri Mahesh S. Velip (ST)	15/07/2022	15/07/2024
7.	Shri Dinesh G. Banaskar (SC)	30/06/2023	30/06/2025
8.	Shri Navnath N. Mardolkar (ST)	01/09/2023	31/08/2025

Shreyas Dsilva, Under Secretary (GA-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 13/4/2014-GAD-III/3293

Date : 28-Jul-2026

On the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee as conveyed by the Goa Public Service Commission vide their letter No. S2GPSC-LPCF0GADM/1/2026 I/1083/2026/165 dated 08/07/2026 read with letter No. S2GPSC-LPCF0GADM/1/2026 I/1124/2026/188 dated 21/07/2026 and with the approval of the Secretary (General Administration), it is hereby declared that the following Section Officers (Group 'B' Gazetted) in Secretariat have satisfactorily completed their extended probation period with effect from the dates indicated against their names:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Section Officer	Date of joining the post of Section Officer	Date of completion of extended probation period
1	2	3	4
1	Smt. Jessina Plamy Fernandes	29/09/2022	16/06/2025
2	Smt. Shreya R. Ghadi	28/09/2022	10/05/2025

Shreyas Dsilva, Under Secretary (GA-I).

Porvorim.

Department of Industries**Notification**

No. 3/23/2021-IND/142

Date : 31-Jul-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 and Section 4 of the Goa Investment Promotion and Facilitation of Single Window Clearance Act, 2021 (Goa Act 19 of 2021) read with Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 (Act No. 10 of 1897), the Government of Goa hereby amends the Government Notification No. 3/23/2021-IND/266 dated 26/11/2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 36 dated 04/12/2025 (hereinafter referred to as the “principal Notification”) as follows, namely:-

In the principal Notification, for the entries against Serial Nos. (xii), (xiii), (xiv), (xv) and (xvi), the following entries shall be respectively substituted, namely:-

- | | | |
|--|---|----------|
| “(xii) President/nominee, Goa Chamber of Commerce and Industry (GCCCI) | — | Member |
| (xiii) President/nominee, Goa State Industries Association (GSIA) | — | Member |
| (xiv) Chairman/nominee, Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) Goa | — | Member |
| (xv) President/nominee, Travel and Tourism Association of Goa (TTAG) | — | Member |
| (xvi) President/nominee, Goa Technology Association (GTA) | — | 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.

Manesh Hari Kedar, Under Secretary (Industries).

Porvorim.

Department of Labour**Order**

No. 24/18/2025-LAB-ESI/343

Date : 30-Jul-2026

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter Ref. No. COM/II/11/28(1)/2026/161 dated 08/07/2026, Government is pleased to promote Dr. Pandarinath Samant, Insurance Medical Officer to the post of Administrative Medical Officer (Group ‘A’ Gazetted) in ESI Scheme, Office of the Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Panaji, Goa under Labour Department on regular basis in the pay matrix Level 11 of the 7th Pay Commission Pay Structure with immediate effect.

The expenditure on pay and allowances shall be debited to the Budget Head of Account 2210—Medical and Public Health, 01—Urban Health Services-Allopathy, 102—Employees State Insurance Scheme, 01—Implementation of ESI Scheme, 00—General, 01—Salaries.

Consequent upon promotion, Dr. Pandarinath Samant shall take over the charge of the post of Administrative Medical Officer, in ESI Scheme, Office of the Commissioner, Labour and Employment, Panaji, Goa with immediate effect.

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

Manesh Hari Kedar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim.

Notification

No. 28/02/2026-LAB/Part-IV/338

Date : 27-Jul-2026

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 02/07/2026 in Case No. IT/41/1999 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.

Manesh Hari Kedar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim.

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

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

Case No. IT/41/1999

Shri Sainath Sawant,
Rep. by the President,
Goa MRF Employees Union,
Saidham Dhavalimol,
Ponda-Goa.

.... Workman/Party I

V/s

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

.... Employer/Party II

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

Employer/Party II represented by Learned Advocate Shri G. K. Sardessai along with Adv. Ms. N. Gaonkar.

ORDER

(On Preliminary Issues No.1 and 2)

(Delivered on this the 9th day of the month of June of the year, 2026)

By Order dated 5th April, 1999 bearing No. IRM/CON/P/(164)/97/2108, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act of 14 of 1947), has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

“(1) *Whether the action of the management of M/s MRF Limited, Usgao, Ponda-Goa, in terminating the services of the workman Shri Sainath Sawant, with effect from 25-2-1997, is legal and justified?*

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

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/41/1999 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Pursuant to service of notice, Party I filed his Claim Statement at Exhibit 3.

3. In his Claim Statement the Party I stated that he was issued a charge-sheet vide letter dated 22/10/1996 for alleging that the Workman had deliberately slowed down production without any justification. Thereafter, he was illegally suspended vide letter dated 21/10/1996. The Party I was issued another charge-sheet dated 28/10/1996 on the same ground of deliberately slowing down production without justification during the period 25/09/1996 till 25/10/1996. It was based totally on concocted charges solely to victimize him for his union activities and his continued allegiance to the Goa MRF Employees' Union. It is submitted at this juncture that the allegations leveled against him were based on conjecture and surmises.

4. The Party I stated that vide his letter dated 24/10/1996 he requested for time to file his reply, however the Party II proceeded to issue another charge-sheet dated 28/10/1996 on the alleged ground of he deliberately slowed down the production from 22/10/1996 to 24/10/1996. That vide letter dated 05/11/1996, the Party I filed his reply denying the charges set out in the charge-sheets. He called upon the Management to furnish to him the details of his performance of any other permanent workman during the alleged period and also requested information regarding breakdowns/material holdups on particular days for which he was charged with low production. However no copy/information was submitted to him and the Management sent him notice of enquiry dated 07/11/1996 and accordingly the enquiry was fixed on 22/11/1996. The Party I stated that he was not given an opportunity let alone reasonable opportunity to defend himself at the enquiry and the enquiry was conducted without following the principles of natural justice.

5. That vide letter dated 16/01/1997, the enquiry which was scheduled on 22/11/1996 was rescheduled to 22/01/1997 and the intimation to that effect was received by him through his wife at about 3.30 p.m. on 22/01/1997, as such he could not attend the enquiry. That, his request to be assisted by his co-worker, Mr. Pundalik Naik was rejected. Thereafter, the enquiry was adjourned nearly for two months at the behest of the Management. Thereafter the enquiry began on 03/02/1997 and the Management closed their evidence after examining the MR as their sole witness. The Party I's evidence was recorded pursuant to which the enquiry was concluded on 11/02/1997.

6. By letter dated 20/02/1997 show cause notice was issued to the Party I along with the Findings of the Enquiry Officer. The Party I's requested for time to reply to the show-cause notice was rejected and by letter dated 25/02/1997 the Workman was dismissed from service and he was illegally terminated by undue haste by the Management.

7. In the Amended Claim Statement, the Party I has stated that he had served a letter dated 29/08/1996 on the Labour Commissioner which was received by the Office of the Labour Commissioner on 30/08/1996 for conciliation proceedings in the matter of Charter of Demands dated 15/02/1996 concerning workmen's wage rise and better service conditions in which matter of conciliation he was the concerned workman covered in the dispute/demand raised before the Labour Commissioner as on 30/08/1996. That, despite pending conciliation, the Party II dismissed the services of the Party I which action of Party II is illegal and void and contrary to the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

8. It is stated that the termination of the Party I/Workman has been resorted by the company to victimize the said workman for his legitimate trade union activities. It is stated that the termination/dismissal of the Party I/Workman in the circumstances above also tantamount to act of unfair labour practices under items 5 (a), (b), (d), (f) & (g) as well as items 13 and 14 of the Fifth Schedule to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Hence, prayed that the Party I/Mr. Sainath Sawant be reinstated in services from 25/02/1997 with full back wages and continuity in services.

9. In the Written Statement at Exhibit 4 filed by the Party II, the Party II stated that Mr. Sainath Sawant was charge-sheeted vide Charge-sheet dated 22/10/1996 and 28/10/1996 for misconduct, whereby it is alleged that the despite the Warning Letters dated 07/10/1996 and 14/10/1996 for low performance, when he was assigned to build 10.20 MLN6 tyres, it was found that the Party I/Workman's performance was much below the average of the Department without any justified reason for the period 25/09/1996 to 21/10/1996 which production was below the normal expected average tyre production of 10.20 SMLN tyres which the Management believed and convinced that the average low production was deliberate on the part of the Party I without justified reason which constitute a misconduct under Item II, XV, XX, L and LII of Clause-21 of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company/Party II which reads as under:

Clause 21 Item II : *Striking work either singly or with other workmen in contravention of these Standing Orders, any statute law, rule or enactment for the time being in force or that may be framed from time to time or inciting any workman to strike work.*

Clause-21 Item XV : *Malingering or slowing down of work alone or in combination or with other workmen and includes any stoppage of work in violation of company's rules and regulations.*

- Clause-21 Item XX* : *Failure to perform his normal duties and/or responsibilities, any other work for which he has the basic skills or may be trained by the Company from time to time.*
- Clause-21 Item L* : *Habitual breach of any provisions of the Standing Order or any law applicable to the company or any instructions for the maintenance and the working of any department.*
- Clause-21 Item LII* : *Any act subversive of discipline and with which you are charged.*

10. The Party II submits that the above acts of misconduct being serious in nature likely to subvert the overall discipline of the Company, the Party I/Workman was placed under suspension pending enquiry and was subsequently issued the charge-sheet setting out the charges leveled against the Workman and proceeded to conduct enquiry into those charges.

11. The Party II submits that the enquiry was initially conducted by Mr. S. G. Kamat who was later on replaced by Mr. Claudio Fernandes who commenced the enquiry and recorded it till 22/01/1997 and then expressed his inability to continue the enquiry, he was then replaced by Mr. Ajit Naik. The request of the Party I to be represented by Mr. B. V. Nayak was denied in terms of Certified Standing Orders and he was allowed to be represented by his co-worker Mr. Bruno Mascarenhas.

12. The Enquiry Officer after considering the evidence on record submitted his findings dated 17/02/1997 holding the Party I/Workman guilty of the charges. The enquiry was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and that the management concurred with the findings of the Enquiry Officer. The Party II submits that the proved misconduct established at the enquiry warranted extreme punishment of dismissal of Party I/Workman from its service. The Party II states that the punishment of termination was consequent to properly conducted enquiry and based on proved acts of misconduct committed by the workman.

13. The Party II submits that the enquiry was fair and proper and was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The Party I was given every opportunity to defend himself and only after appreciating the evidence on record, the Enquiry Officer gave a reasoned finding on the basis of which any prudent person would come to the conclusion that the Party I was guilty of the charges leveled against him. The Party II submits that the suspension by way of punishment of Party I is pursuant to a charge-sheet and properly conducted enquiry by an impartial Enquiry Officer who has considered all the evidence on record and has submitted a reasoned findings and that the suspension by way of punishment of Party I/Workman is legal and justified.

14. Party II denied that there has been large scale harassment & victimization of the union office bearers and its other members due to their legitimate trade union activities as alleged. It is denied that there are any illegal changes in the service conditions or unjustified or unwarranted suspension or charge-sheets are issued to the workmen on false and fabricated charges or that there is refusal to negotiate in good faith as alleged. It is denied that there is commission of unfair labour practice. It is specifically denied that Mr. Sainath Sawant was an active member of the Union.

15. It is further denied that the workman's defence was prejudiced for non-issuance of show-cause notice as in any event, a reasonable opportunity was given to the workman during the course of the enquiry to present his defence. It is denied that the Enquiry Officer erred in coming to the conclusion of guilt as alleged and that the Enquiry Officer failed to appreciate the evidence of the workman or that he was biased. It is denied that the suspension order of the workman was for collateral purpose or was solely to victimize the workman for his continued allegiance to the said union as alleged. It is denied that there has been any gross discrimination in imposing the punishment of termination of the Party I/Workman as alleged and hence submitted that the Party I is not entitled to the relief sought in the Claim Statement and prays that the claim of the Party I/Workman may be rejected on the aforesaid grounds.

16. In the Rejoinder, the Party I/Workman denied all the facts stated by the Party II/Employer in the Written Statement and maintained his claim as pleaded in his Claim Statement.

17. On completion of the pleadings following Issues were framed at Exhibit 6 by this Tribunal which reads as under:

ISSUES

1. *Whether the Party I proves that the domestic enquiry held against him is not fair, proper and impartial?*
2. *Whether the charges of misconduct levelled against the Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence?*
3. *Whether the Party I proves that the termination of his services by Party II is by way of victimization and unfair labour practice?*

Additional Issue No. 3A: "Whether the Party I proves that the action of Party II of his dismissal without seeking approval of the Conciliation Officer/Labour Commissioner is contrary to Sec 33 of the Act and therefore illegal and void?"

4. *Whether the Party I proves that the action of the Party II in terminating the his services w.e.f. 25/02/1997 is illegal and unjustified?*
5. *Whether the Party I is entitled to any relief?*
6. *What Award?*

18. From the issues framed hereinabove, Issue No.1, 2 and additional Issue No. 3A have been taken up to be tried as preliminary issues and accordingly both the Parties to the proceeding led their evidence in respect of these preliminary Issues and my findings to the same with reasons are as follows:

Issue No. 1	:	In the Negative
Issue No. 2	:	In the Affirmative
Additional Issue No. 3A	:	In the Affirmative

REASONS

19. *Issue No. 1:* It is in the evidence of Shri Kenneth D'Souza, the then Manager (Mechanic Maintenance) working for Party II that the Party I was initially appointed as an Operator (Trainee) vide apprentice appointment letter dated 26/05/1984. The said Appointment Letter was signed by Sr. General Manager, Mr. E. M. Mathai who was authorised to do so. The Party I was issued with charge-sheet dated 28/10/1996. The appointment of the Party I was probationary appointment and later on he was confirmed in the service after completion of the probation period vide Confirmation Letter dated 30/11/1985. That pending enquiry, the Party I was placed under suspension. The Letter of Suspension dated 25/10/1996 was issued by the Plant Manager Mr. E. M. Mathai.

20. The Party I was paid Subsistence Allowance in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders. The Party I was issued 2nd Charge-sheet dated 28/10/1996 and the enquiry was conducted into both these charge-sheets. In the said enquiry, The Party II submits that the enquiry was initially conducted by Mr. Claudio Fernandes, he was then replaced by Mr. Ajit Naik. The Party I participated in the enquiry and he was represented by his co-worker Mr. Bruno Mascarenhas.

21. He further deposed that on completion of enquiry the findings at Exh.E-1 Colly holding the Party I guilty of the charges referred in the charge-sheet was submitted to the Management. The Management during the pendency of the enquiry paid subsistence allowance to Party I in terms of provisions of the Certified Standing Orders. In the cross-examination, Shri Kenneth D'Souza admitted that Party I had asked for the copies of the documents showing the break-downs/material hold-ups on particular days for which the Party I was charged for low production. He further admitted that the Party I had asked for the copies of the production for 10.20 SMLN6(Sea) tyres for both single and double building including working towards the same. Shri D'Souza denied the suggestion put to him that the said copy of the standard of production would show the average production. It was also suggested to him that the Management did not furnish to the Applicant the above documents as requested for either before the commencement of the enquiry or during the course of the enquiry.

22. The Management examined Shri Govind Mapari Govind Mapari who was working as a Accounts Assistant with Party II. His evidence reveals that the Party I was placed under suspension pending enquiry during which period he was paid subsistence allowance. Shri Mapari produced on record the Statement showing the components which were taken into consideration by him for calculating the subsistence allowance payable to Party I. According to him the subsistence allowance were calculated in terms of clause-22 of the Certified Standing Orders. The statement of Subsistence Allowance prepared by him and the extract of the Certified Standing Orders i.e. Clause-6(1) produced on record was identified by Mr. Mapari at Exh. E-8 Colly.

23. Mr. Mapari further affirmed that the subsistence allowance paid to the Party I during the suspension period were in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders and Settlement dated 20/11/1991. Mr. Mapari was cross-examined extensively on the components of Basic Pay and Subsistence Allowance wherein he stated that the wages were calculated on the average of Plant performance and not on the average of piece rate. He has given in detail all the components on the basis of which he had calculated and determined the basic pay as well as the subsistence allowance. He maintained his statement throughout that as a normal practice that is followed by the Management is to determine the subsistence allowance and the basic pay is on the basis of average wages of previous two months and which practice was made known to the workmen. As such, the Party I/Workman could not fetch much through the cross-examination of Mr. Mapari to say that the subsistence allowance and the wages paid were less than what was entitled to the Party I/Workman.

24. On behalf of the Party I, Shri Rohidas Naik deposed and stated that he is the President of Goa MRF Employees' Union who has raised the present dispute on behalf of the Workman, Shri Sainath Sawant. He further stated that the workman concerned in the present dispute is also a workman concerned/covered in the dispute/demand which were pending before the Labour Commissioner as on 30/08/1996.

25. Shri Rohidas Naik is the witness examined by the /Party I has supported the case of the Party I to the extent to state that workman concerned in the present dispute is also a workman concerned/covered in the dispute/demand for wage rise and better service conditions which were pending before the Labour Commissioner as on 30/08/1996.

26. The Party I when given opportunity before this Tribunal did not bring anything contrary to the records and proceedings that was held in the domestic enquiry to show that the Management did not follow/adopted the fair procedure while conducting the enquiry proceedings. The Party I also could not bring anything on record to show that he was not given fair opportunity to put his defence. As regards the charge-sheet being signed by the unauthorized person, it is suggested to the workman in his cross that the said charge-sheet was signed by Sr. General Manager, Shri E. M. Mathai who was competent and authorized to sign the charge-sheet on behalf of the Management/Party II, the knowledge of which was denied by this witness. Nothing contrary was brought on record either through the evidence of the Party I or through the witness of the Management/Party II to show that the charge-sheet in question was signed by the person not having the authority to do so or that the Enquiry Officer appointed by the Management was not competent to hold such an enquiry.

27. The Party I in the cross-examination has merely denied all the facts stated by the Management witness as regards to the enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer in respect of the charge-sheet. However, the Party I could not discard any of the facts by way of oral as well as by documentary evidence to show that no fair opportunity was given to the Party I to represent or defend himself in the said domestic enquiry conducted against him in respect of the alleged charges leveled against him in the charge-sheet. The enquiry reveals that the Party I was given opportunity to defend his case in the said domestic enquiry pursuance to which the Enquiry Officer submitted its findings. Absolutely, no evidence has been adduced to show that the enquiry was without following the principles of natural justice or that the same was against the Certified Standing Orders of the Party II.

28. In the case of **Cholan Roadways Ltd v/s G. Thirugnanasambandam reported in 2005 (I) CLR 524**, it was held that : *“There cannot, however, be any doubt whatsoever that the principle of natural justice are required to be complied with in a domestic enquiry. It is, however, well-known that the said principle*

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

29. Upon scrutiny, the enquiry proceedings conducted by the Enquiry Officer vis-a-vis the evidence led by both the Parties, it is seen that a due procedure was followed by the Management/Party II in the said domestic enquiry that was held pursuant to issuance of charge-sheets to Party I and he was also given opportunity to defend himself in the said proceeding. If one considers the chain of events, then one has to accept that the enquiry was conducted in accordance with the procedures laid down under the law by giving a fair opportunity to the Party I to defend himself in the matter. Hence, the Issue No. 1 stands answered in the negative.

30. *Issue No. 2:* It is the case of the Party I that both the charge-sheet issued to him were based totally on concocted facts solely to victimize him for his union activities. The Party II falsely leveled charges of low production by the Party I/Workman. The charge-sheet also spoke about the alleged misconduct of the Party I/Workman intentionally and deliberately slowing down the production of 10.20 SMLN6(Sea) tyre building causing loss to the Company.

31. The charges in the charge-sheets revealed that despite the Warning Letters dated 07/10/1996 and 14/10/1996 for low performance, when he was assigned to build 10.20 SMLN tyres, it was found that the Party I/Workman's performance was much below the average of the Department without any justified reason for the period 25/09/1996 to 21/10/1996 which production was below the normal expected average tyre production of 10.20 SMLN tyres which the Management believed and convinced that the average low production was deliberate on the part of the Party I without justified reason which constitute a misconduct under Item II, XV, XX, L and LII of Clause-21 of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company/Party II which reads as under:

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Clause 21 Item II</i> | : | <i>Striking work either singly or with other workmen in contravention of these Standing Orders, any statute law, rule or enactment for the time being in force or that may be framed from time to time or inciting any workman to strike work.</i> |
| <i>Clause-21 Item XV</i> | : | <i>Malingering or slowing down of work alone or in combination or with other workmen and includes any stoppage of work in violation of company's rules and regulations.</i> |
| <i>Clause-21 Item XX</i> | : | <i>Failure to perform his normal duties and/or responsibilities, any other work for which he has the basic skills or may be trained by the Company from time to time.</i> |
| <i>Clause-21 Item L</i> | : | <i>Habitual breach of any provisions of the Standing Order or any law applicable to the company or any instructions for the maintenance and the working of any department.</i> |
| <i>Clause 21 Item LII</i> | : | <i>Any act subversive of discipline and with which you are charged.</i> |

31. As against this, the Party I/Workman when examined himself in his defence stated that he is working in Tyre Building Department since 22/05/1984. As regards the charges pertaining to he

deliberately and intentionally slowing down the production when assigned to build 10.20 SMLN tyres or that his performance was much below the average of the Department without any justified reason for the period 25/09/1996 to 21/10/1996 and that the same was below the normal expected average tyre production of 10.20 SMLN tyres. He further stated that the charges leveled against him do not constitute misconduct and that there is no evidence against him to prove the alleged charges of low production. According to him, the enquiry was not fair and proper and that the Management did not follow the principles of natural justice.

32. In the cross-examination, the Party I admitted that the charge-sheet dated 28/10/1996 and 22/10/1996, the details about the low performance and production have been mentioned. The Party I also denied his knowledge that in the said charge-sheets the expected normal production is mentioned. He further admits that the copies of the Worksheets produced by the Management in the enquiry on 22/01/1997 were received by him through post during the course of enquiry but denied knowledge to the fact that the information details which were asked by him vide his letter dated 05/11/1996 were contained in the said Worksheets received by him. Considering the overall evidence of the Party I, it is seen that the sufficient reasonable opportunity was given to the Party I to defend himself as well as to counter the documents i.e. the Worksheets on which the Management kept reliance to prove the alleged charges of low production by the Party I.

33. The Enquiry Officer relied on the evidence produced on record by the Management, also considered the Worksheet produced on record by the Management Representative. The above documents vis-à-vis the testimony of all the Management witnesses were duly considered in coming to a finding of the Workman being guilty of the charges. Therefore it cannot be simply held that the Enquiry Officer committed a gross error in coming to a prima facie conclusion of charges of misconduct being proved against the Workman.

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

35. In the case of **State of Haryana v/s. Ratan Singh reported in 1977 (34) FLR 264**, it was held that : *“it is well settled that in a domestic enquiry the strict sophisticated rules of evidence under the Indian Evidence Act may not apply. All materials which are logically probative for a prudent mind are permissible. There is no allergy to hearsay evidence provided it has reasonable nexus and credibility. It is true that departmental authorities and administrative tribunals must be careful in evaluating such material and should not glibly swallow what is strictly speaking not relevant under the Indian Evidence Act. For this proposition it is not necessary to cite decisions nor text books, although we have been taken through case law and other authorities by counsel on both sides. The essence of a judicial approach is objectivity, exclusion of extraneous material or considerations and observance of rules of natural justice. Of course, fair play is the basis and if perversity or arbitrariness, bias or surrender of independence of judgment vitiate the conclusions reached, such finding, even though of a domestic tribunal, cannot be held good. However, the courts below misdirect themselves, perhaps, in insisting that passengers who had come in and gone out should be chased and brought before the tribunal before a valid finding could be recorded. The*

'residuum' rule to which counsel for the respondent referred, based upon certain passages from American jurisprudence does not go to that extent nor does the passages from Halsbury insist on such rigid requirement. The simple point is, was there some evidence or was there no evidence not in the sense of the technical rules governing regular court proceedings but in a fair commonsense way as men of understanding and worldly wisdom will accept. Viewed in this way, sufficiency of evidence in proof of the finding by a domestic tribunal is beyond scrutiny. Absence of any evidence in support of a finding is certainly available for the court to look into because it amounts to an error of law apparent on the record. We find, in this case, that the evidence of Chamanlal, Inspector of the flying squad, is some evidence which has relevance to the charge leveled against the respondent. Therefore, we are unable to hold that the order is invalid on that ground."

36. Considering the evidence on record, this Tribunal finds no reason to intervene into the Findings given by the Enquiry Officer. At the risk of repetition, this Tribunal would like to reproduce that the Workman has not taken a specific or justifying defence to overcome the alleged charges either before the Enquiry Officer or when he had an opportunity to bring all those facts before this Tribunal when he examined himself in his defence before the Tribunal. All this vital evidence was duly considered by the Enquiry Officer before holding the Workman guilty of the alleged misconduct. In the facts and circumstances and considering the evidence on record and the enquiry proceedings, this Tribunal is in agreement with the findings given by the Enquiry Officer that the charges as leveled in the charge-sheet against the Party I/Workman has been proved by legally acceptable evidence. Hence, the Issue No.2 stands answered in the affirmative.

37. *Additional Issue No. 3A:* The Party I/Workman amended the Claim Statement in the year, 2012 raising additional grounds in support of his Claim Statement which according to him were going to the root of the presence reference. In the amended pleadings, the Party I/Workman stated that he had served a letter dated 29/08/1996 on 30/08/1996 on the Labour Commissioner, Panaji calling for conciliation proceedings on Charter of Demands dated 15/02/1996 of the workmen for wage rise and better service conditions and the workman concerned in the present dispute is also a workman concerned/covered in the dispute/demand pending before the Labour Commissioner as on 30/08/1996. The Party I also stated that the Party II attended the conciliation proceedings on the said Charter of Demands on 24/10/1996. In the meanwhile, since the Management was not ready to accede to the demands of the Union, the Labour Commissioner, Panaji was pleased to call for further meetings between the Management and the Union and the last meeting to the best of Union's knowledge was held on 17/02/1997 for trying to conciliate and settle the dispute. The Party I also states that without waiting for the Conciliation Officer to record failure and without waiting for the appropriate Government to receive the report to consider the same or make reference of the dispute to the Tribunal, the Party II dismissed the Party I/Workman on 25/02/1997. Thereafter, the Government of Goa was pleased to refer the said dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication only on 05/06/1997.

38. It is further stated that in the Written Statement filed by Party II in reference IT/33/1997, the Party I had pleaded that the meetings were held independently with the representatives of the Management and the Union on 20/03/1997 and the joint meeting was held on 31/03/1997. As against this, it is on record that the Party I/Workman was dismissed on 25/02/1997 i.e. pending the conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer without waiting for receipt of the Failure Report or without the reference being forwarded to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Appropriate Government. Thus, according to the Party I, the dismissal of the Party I/Workman was done pending conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer. It is further stated that the Dismissal Order was passed in haste and without even waiting for the Conciliation Officer to forward the Report of Failure of conciliation on the general demands to the Appropriate Government or waiting for the Government of Goa to receive the same or consider the same or make a reference of the dispute is also an unfair labour practice.

39. In support of their above amended pleadings, the Party I/Workman examined Shri Rohidas Naik, their witness No. 2. The Management questioned the authority of Shri Rohidas Naik as it is their contention that Mr. Rohidas Naik had no authority to depose in the present reference as on account of cessation to be the Member of the Union. It is brought on record that Mr. Rohidas Naik was dismissed from service, hence, he ceases to be a member upon his dismissal from services in terms of the Bye-laws. In this connection, the Management extensively cross-examined Mr. Rohidas Naik but could not finally bring out

anything conclusively to say that once the Workman's services are terminated he ceases to be the member of the Union.

40. Further, the Management also questioned the issue of President-ship of Mr. Rohidas and contended that he is not the President of the Union and as such do not have any authority to depose in the present reference. As against this Shri Rohidas Naik stated that none of the Members of the Party I/Union resigned either individually or in mass from Party I/Union and that he in the capacity of President of the Party I/Union had addressed a letter dated 08/01/2000 to Mumbai Mazdoor Sabha clarifying that neither of the members of the Party I/Union nor he had resigned from the membership of the Party I/Union and the relevant corresponding letters have been produced on record. As such, he is competent to represent the Party I/Union as a President of the Union. To substantiate his above statement, he produced on record the letter dated 08/01/2000(Exh. 52), letter dated 23/12/1999 (Exh. 53), letter dated 30/12/1999 (Exh. 54), copy of the Order dated 08/03/2006 in SLP 853/2004 and C.A.1007/04(Exh. 55), copy of the Order dated 09.02.2004 in SLP 853/04 (Exh. 56), copy of the Order dated 02/05/2003 in Writ Petition 106/99 (Exh. 57), copy of the Order dated 12/08/2003 in LPA 05/2003 (Exh. 58) and copy of the Record of W.P. 283/99 (Exh. 59).

41. As such, the Management could not fetch much evidence in rebuttal to the claim of the Party I that Mr. Rohidas Naik having no locus standi to depose in this reference and accordingly this Tribunal has no other way but to consider the testimony of Mr. Rohidas Naik for the purpose of adjudicating the issues framed.

42. Shri Rohidas Naik in support of the Workman's case as regards to the issue concerning the violations of provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Management produced on record Exh.32, the letter dated 10/09/1996 addressed to the Sr. General Manager by Asst. Labour Commissioner. By this letter, the Asst. Labour Commissioner requested the Party II to offer their comments on the Charter of Demands raised by the Party I/Workmen. In response, the Plant Human Resource Manager, Shri George Nainan vide letter dated 19/09/1996 at Exh.33, requested for 3 weeks' time to give their comments. The Office of the Asst. Labour Commissioner vide letter dated 07/10/1996 (Exh.34) intimated to both the Parties that he shall hold discussions and if necessary conciliation proceedings u/s 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in respect of the dispute raised by the Party I and the date of hearing was fixed on 14/10/1996 at 11.00 a.m. Exhibit 35 is the Request Letter seeking time to file their comments by the Party II. Exhibit 36 is the copy of the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 14/10/1996 and Exhibit 38 is the copy of the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 24/10/1996 i.e. the Proceeding Sheet/write-ups of the business of the day before the Conciliation Officer whereby the Party I objected for the Management's request of seeking more time to give their comments on the Charter of Demands raised by the Union.

43. The Assistant Labour Commissioner considering the request of the Party II thereafter placed the matter for discussions/conciliation on 24/10/1996. On the said day, the proceeding before the Conciliation Authority reads *"the Management submitted their Written Statement on the Justification Statement given by the Union on Charter of Demands and asked for revised reasonable Charter of Demands as the present Charter of Demands stands @ increased wages of average of Rs.40,000/- per employee per month and the period of settlement effective for 2 years. The demands raised are unreasonable by any standards and further the Union has not given any reply to the Charter of Demands of the Management without which it is difficult to consider any proposals. Our reply to both is required to continue with the discussions else we did not like to say discussion in the presence of any other than our employees, employees who are on the rolls of the Company....."* Accordingly, the Minutes of Meeting were drawn detailing the business of the day and before concluding the Minutes, the Conciliation Officer held that both the Parties have stuck up to their own stand, as such suggested that they should both think about their stand taken by them so as to have amicable solutions and postponed the discussions on 28/10/1996 at 11.00 a.m.

44. The joint discussions continued on 28/10/1996 and in the Minutes of Meeting that was drawn on 28/10/1996 at Exhibit 39, the Officer again held that both the Parties have stuck up to their own stand as the Union was not ready to amend their demands and the Management was not ready to give any offer, as such the Officer was pleased to close the discussion and informed both the Parties to await for further report. The Assistant Labour Commissioner vide its letter dated 29/10/1996 forwarded to the Commissioner, Labour the report of failure of discussion of the Charter of Demands between both the Parties along with original File for its perusal and further necessary action. The Office of the

Commissioner, Labour vide their letter dated 15/11/1996 called upon the Party I/Union for discussion with reference to the report submitted to him by the Asst. Labour Commissioner.

45. The Office of the Labour Commissioner vide their letter dated 14/01/1997 (Exh. 42) informed the Party I/Union that the Hon'ble Minister for Labour wants to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement on the whole dispute. The Office of the Labour Commissioner vide letter dated 11/02/1997 (Exh. 43) called upon both the Parties for joint discussion on 17/02/1997 at 3.00 p.m. in the Office of the Labour Commissioner. There is no further correspondence nor is there any report or write-up produced before this Tribunal about the joint discussion that was proposed to be held on 17/02/1997 in the Office of the Labour Commissioner.

46. The submission of the Failure Report to the Labour Commissioner by the Conciliation Officer is an internal departmental affair. Even after submission of the Failure Report, the Office of the Commissioner thought it appropriate to call upon the Parties for further joint discussion. The matter did not stop at this stage but there was an intervention by the Hon'ble Minister for Labour who too probably felt it appropriate to have a joint discussion with both the Parties. However, thereafter there is absolutely nothing on record as to what happened to the said joint discussion, whether it continued or whether the discussion did not happen at all, that is the question which remained unanswered throughout.

47. In the event, the joint discussion had failed, it was incumbent upon the Conciliation Officer to submit Failure Report to the Government but it was not done till such time the Party I filed Writ in the Hon'ble High Court pursuant to which the Additional Government Advocate produced on record the reference dated 05/06/1997. Thus, it is quite obvious from the records that the Conciliation Officer did not send the Failure Report in view of the date being fixed for further discussions even after the Failure Report was sent by the Assistant Labour Commissioner to his Superior i.e. the Office of the Labour Commissioner and further from the Office of the Labour Commissioner the joint discussions were proposed to be held with the intervention of the Hon'ble Minister for Labour.

48. In rebuttal to the above stand by the Party I that the Workman in the present reference was terminated pending discussion/conciliation thereby the Party II has violated the provisions 33(2) of the Act. The Party II has relied upon letter dated 06/09/2007 (Exh.49 Colly) thereby placing on record the Outward Register of the Office of the Labour Commissioner to show that the Office of the Labour Commissioner had forwarded the Failure Report to the Government prior to the termination of the Workman under the present reference pending discussions/conciliation in the Charter of Demands raised by the Union to which the Workman in the present reference was also a Party.

49. On perusal of the said Outward Register, it says that the File ALC/Ponda/Demand/MRF was forwarded to addressee Labour Minister. Be that as it may, interestingly, the Office of the Labour Commissioner vide their letter dated 14/01/1997 (Exh.42) informed the Party I/Union that the Hon'ble Minister for Labour wants to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement on the whole dispute, therefore, an unsuccessful attempt has been made to show that the Failure Report was sent to the Government vide this Outward number by the Office of the Labour Commissioner which is devoid of any substance for the simple reason that the letter at Exhibit 42 confirms that the Hon'ble Minister wanted to have joint discussion with both the Parties and accordingly the Minutes of the Failure Report were forwarded to him for further discussion/settlement between the Parties, hence by no stretch of imagination it can be construed that the File containing the Minutes of the Failure sent to the Labour Minister is the Failure Report being sent to the Government of Goa u/s 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

50. Presuming without admitting that this Report was sent to the Government which infact was not, since the letter at Exh.49 clearly shows that the same had been addressed to the Labour Minister but still assuming for a moment that this is the Failure Report even then the Party II cannot escape the brunt of they having violated the requirements of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as the Outward Register seems to be sent on 04/06/1997 whereas the Workman in the present reference has been terminated on 25/02/1997 i.e. much prior to the date that is mentioned in the Outward Register. Therefore, the ratio laid down in the case of **Jaipur Zila Sahadari Bhoomi Vikas Bank Ltd. V/s Ram Gopal Sharma and Others (2002) 2 SCC 244** has come to the rescue of this Workman. The Party I/Workman since has been able to establish that his termination was illegal as the same was done pending the Charter of Demands which Charter of Demands he too was a concerned workman therefore the Party II ought to have refrained from taking any action pending such conciliation in view of Section 33(2) (b). Section 33 of

the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 therefore the question of violation of Section 33(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 requires to be considered in the light of the relevant statutory provisions. Section 33 of the I.D. Act, sub-section (1) reads as under:

“33. Conditions of service, etc., to remain unchanged under certain circumstances during pendency of proceedings.- (1) During the pendency of any conciliation proceeding before [an arbitrator or] a conciliation officer or a Board or of any proceeding before a Labour Court or Tribunal or National Tribunal in respect of an industrial dispute, no employer shall,- (a) in regard to any matter connected with the dispute, alter, to the prejudice of the workmen concerned in such dispute, the conditions of service applicable to them immediately before the commencement of such proceeding; or (b) for any misconduct connected with the dispute, discharge or punish, whether by dismissal or otherwise, any workman concerned in such dispute”.

51. The Ld. Adv. Shri G. K. Sardessai appearing for the Party II in support of their defence on the issue of alleged violation of Section 33 placed reliance in the case of **East Asiatic & Allied V/s Shelke (B.L.) (1961 ILLJ 162 Bom, Association of Engineering Workers v/s Iron & Metal Traders Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. (1996) I CLR 95 Bom, Pratap Chandra Mohanty v/s Union of India and Anr. 1971 II LLJ 196 Ori and Suresh VithooNare v/s DharamsiMorarji Chemicals 1991 Lab.I.C. 1932 Bom.**

52. Ld. Advocate Shri P. Agrawal on behalf of Party I submitted that all the citations relied upon by the Party II since prior to the Judgment in the case of **Lokmat Newspaper Pvt. Ltd. v/s Shankar Prasad (1999) 6 SCC**, they cannot be looked into as the issue as regards the violations of provisions of Section 33(2)(b) has been settled in the case of Lokmat (Supra) same being later in time than the one which has been relied upon by the Party II. In this case the respondent raised an industrial dispute by filing a complaint under Section 28 of the Maharashtra Act alleging that the impugned termination order amounted to unfair labour practice'.

Before the impugned termination order was passed by the management, it had already served a notice under Section 9-A of the I.D. Act to the respondents union to the effect that it proposed to introduce a change in the conditions of service of the respondent and other members of the union on the ground that it was proposing to rationalise the printing work at the appellant's concern at Nagpur by setting up photo-type machine for carrying out the work of composing, resulting in substantial reduction in the work of composing by hand. It may be stated that the respondent was employed as a foreman in the hand-composing department of the appellant at the relevant time. The respondent's union objected to the said notice of change and approached the Conciliation Officer under Section 12(1) of the I.D. Act which reads as under :- "12. Duties of Conciliation Officers.- (1) Where an industrial dispute exists or is apprehended, the conciliation officer may, or where the dispute relates to a public utility service and a notice under Section 22 has been given shall, hold conciliation proceedings in the prescribed manner." The Conciliation Officer took the dispute in conciliation within his discretion even though as appellant's concern was not a public utility service it was not mandatory for the Conciliation Officer to start conciliation proceedings. As the report of the Conciliation Officer submitted to the State Government shows, he invited the management and the respondent's union for preliminary discussions on 14.4.1982 in his office and thereafter the matter was adjourned during conciliation from time to time.

It can, therefore, be said that by 14th April, 1982 the matter was taken up for investigation and thus the conciliation proceedings had commenced. It is also well established on the record of the case that the parties could not come to any settlement with the result that on 22nd June, 1982 the investigation was closed by the Conciliation Officer at 4.35 p.m. at Nagpur. Immediately, thereafter, the appellant passed the impugned order of termination against the respondent and others on the very same day i.e. on 22.6.1982 at 5.00 p.m. The said order was placed on the notice board of the appellant's office at Nagpur on the evening of that day. It is not in dispute between the parties that thereafter the Conciliation Officer submitted his report to the Government which reached the State Government on 13.8.1982.

On the aforesaid facts, the question arises whether the impugned termination order dated 22.6.1982 was passed during the pendency of the conciliation proceedings. It is not in dispute between the parties that before passing such an order no express permission in writing was obtained by the appellant from the Conciliation Officer. The Labour Court, the Industrial Court and the learned Single Judge of the High Court have taken the view that because investigation was closed by the conciliator by 4.35 p.m. on 22.6.1982, immediately thereafter the conciliation proceedings could be said to have ended and were not pending before him. Consequently at 5.00 p.m. on that very day when the appellant issued the impugned

order, it did not violate Section 33 of the I.D. Act. While, on the other hand, the Division Bench of the High Court in the impugned judgment has taken the view that merely because the conciliator closed the investigation in the evening of 22.6.1982 till he prepared his report as per Section 12(4) of the I.D. Act and till that report reached the Government, conciliation proceedings were deemed to have continued and had not got terminated till 13th August, 1982 and as in the meantime on 22.6.1982, the impugned termination order was passed without following the procedure of Section 33(1) of the I.D. Act, it got vitiated in law.

Under these circumstances, a moot question arises whether the impugned retrenchment order was passed on 22.6.1982 during the pendency of conciliation proceedings. It cannot be disputed that the impugned order was directly connected with the matter in dispute before the Conciliation Officer wherein the question of legality of notice under Section 9-A of the I.D. Act was under consideration for the purpose of arriving at any settlement between the parties in this connection. The impugned order had definitely altered to the prejudice of the respondent his conditions of service. It was not a case of retrenchment simpliciter but was a consequential retrenchment on the introduction of the scheme of rationalisation as contemplated by Section 9-A read with Schedule IV item No.1 of the I.D. Act, that the question of violation of Section 33(1) of the I.D. Act has a direct nexus with the further question whether on 22/6/1982 when the impugned termination order was passed, conciliation proceedings were pending before the authority or not.

In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to note sub-section (4) of Section 12 of the I.D. Act which reads as under : "(4) If no such settlement is arrived at, the conciliation officer shall, as soon as practicable after the close of the investigation, send to the appropriate Government a full report setting forth the steps taken by him for ascertaining the facts and circumstances relating to the dispute and for bringing about a settlement thereof, together with a full statement of such facts and circumstances, and the reasons on account of which, in his opinion, a settlement could not be arrived at." A mere look at this provision shows that if the Conciliation Officer finds during conciliation proceedings that no settlement is arrived at between the disputing parties, then after closing the investigation he has, as soon as practicable, to send to the appropriate Government a full report setting forth the steps taken by him for ascertaining the facts and circumstances relating to the dispute and has also to mention all other details as required to be mentioned in the report under Section 12(4) of the I. D. Act.

The aforesaid statutory requirements leave no room for doubt that after closing the investigation and after having arrived at the conclusion that no settlement is possible between the parties, the Conciliation Officer has to spend some more time before submitting his detailed written report about failure of consideration for information and necessary action by the State Government. In the very nature of things, therefore, such requirement will take at least a couple of days, if not more, for the conciliator after closing the investigation to enable him to send an appropriate report to the State Government. It is, therefore, obvious that on 22.6.1982 when by 4.35 p.m. the Conciliation Officer declared that settlement was not possible between the parties and he closed the investigation, neither his statutory function did not come to an end nor did he become functus officio. His jurisdiction had to continue till he submitted his report as per Section 12(4) to the Appropriate Government. Even such preparation of the report and sending of the same from his end to the Appropriate Government would obviously have taken at least a few days after 22/06/1982. It must, therefore, be held that the conciliator remained in charge of the conciliation proceedings at least for a couple of days after 22/6/1982. It is, therefore, difficult to appreciate how within half an hour after the closing of investigation by the conciliator and before his getting even a breathing time to prepare his detailed written report about failure of conciliation to be sent to the Government as per Section 12(4), the appellant could persuade itself to presume that conciliation proceedings had ended and, therefore, it was not required to follow the procedure of Section 33(1) and straightaway could pass the impugned order of retrenchment within 25 minutes of the closing of the investigation by the conciliator on the very same day. It is difficult to appreciate the reasoning of the Labour Court that after the closer of investigation the conciliator became functus officio and the management could not have approached him for express written permission to pass the impugned order. It is easy to visualise that even on the same day i.e. on 22/6/1982 or even on the next day, before the conciliator had time even to start writing his report, such an express permission could have been asked for by the appellant as the conciliator by then could not be said to have washed his hand off the conciliation proceedings. He remained very much seized of these proceedings till at least the time the report left his end apart from the further question whether conciliation proceedings could be said to have continued till the report reached the State Government. Thus, on the

express language of Section 12(4) the conclusion is inevitable that closer of investigation by 4.35 p.m. on 22/6/1982 did not amount to termination of conciliation proceedings by that very time. The argument of learned counsel for the appellant was that closer of investigation automatically amounted to termination of conciliation proceedings. This argument proceeds on a wrong premise that closer of investigation by the conciliator is the same as closer of conciliation proceedings. The legislature while enacting Section 12(4) has deliberately not used the words 'closer of conciliation' but, on the contrary, provided that after closer of investigation something more was required to be done by the conciliator as laid down under Section 12(4) before he can be said to have done away with conciliation proceedings earlier initiated by him. On this conclusion alone the decision rendered by the Division Bench of the High Court that the impugned order of termination dated 22/6/1982 was issued by the appellant without following the procedure of Section 33(1) of the I.D. Act has to be sustained.'

53. The facts in question and the provisions of law involved in the case of Lokmat (supra) are the same as in the case of present reference, therefore directly applies to the case in hand, giving no room to this Tribunal to deviate from the ratio laid down in the citation above.

54. Ld. Advocate Shri G. K. Sardessai tried to carve out certain portion as relating to the date of commencement of the conciliation from the citation above to bring the case of the Party II within the ambit of Section 33 (2)(b) to show that there was no such violation and that the termination was done post sending of the Failure Report by the Conciliation Officer to the Government. It was also argued that the Assistant Labour Commissioner only sought to have joint discussions. The above arguments are unsustainable since this Tribunal has discussed in detail the contents of each and every correspondence between the Union and the Management and vice versa, the Union and the Conciliation Authority and vice versa, and the Minutes of the Meetings/Proceeding Sheets held during the conciliation. The notices issued and the letters issued from the Office of the Assistant Labour Commissioner clearly indicates that they have been issued with reference to the conciliation in the matter of Charter of Demands raised by the Union against the MRF Management. As such, this Tribunal is unable to accept the above contention of Learned Adv. Shri G. K. Sardessai that the ratio in the case of Lokmat does not support the case of the Party I/Union.

55. That, except a vague document i.e. a page of an Outward Register showing Failure Report being sent to the Hon'ble Minister of Labour from the Office of the Labour Commissioner, there is nothing placed on record to show that the Conciliation Authority forwarded to the Government of Goa the Failure Report prior to the date of termination of the services of the Party I/Workman. Be that as it may be, even the above vague document cannot come to the rescue of the Party II considering the date mentioned therein which date is again post the date of termination of the service of the Party I/Workman. Thus, this is a clear case of violation of mandatory provisions of Section 33 (2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

56. Hence, the ratio in the case of **Jaipur Zila** would be squarely applicable to the present reference wherein it is held "*Amendments to Section 33 of the ID Act in the year 1956 were made at a time when no remedy under the Industrial Disputes Act was available to the individual workman to challenge the termination of his employment. At that time, the dismissal of an individual workman could form the subject-matter of an industrial dispute only if it was espoused by the fellow workmen. In those days, dismissal of workmen who actively participated in raising an industrial dispute was not uncommon. In order to obviate this contingency, Section 33 imposed an obligation on the employer to seek approval or permission for the dismissal of any workman to be effected during the pendency of an industrial dispute. Apart from imposing an obligation on the employer to file such an application, in order to protect the workman against any termination which might be made without seeking approval or permission, Section 33-A was enacted creating a right in favour of the aggrieved workman to file a complaint which will be dealt with like adjudication of an industrial dispute. In other words, a right which was not available to the individual workman to approach the Labour Court or Tribunal for adjudication of a dispute relating to his dismissal was conferred by Section 33-A.*

The Supreme Court in the case under review has ruled that failure to apply for approval by the Employer would make the order of dismissal inoperative and that the workman may get wages and other benefits. It was also held that even if the application for approval is granted by the authority, still the aggrieved could make a complaint under Section 33-A challenging the approval. It is to be considered

whether an interpretation can be placed on Section 33 to the effect that even without a judicial declaration about the validity of the order of dismissal, as a result of the failure to seek approval or permission, the workman could straightaway proceed on the footing that the dismissal is invalid and inoperative and work out his rights for recovery of wages and other benefits. The case-law placed before the Supreme Court does not support the present ruling.

In order to dispel any doubt in the minds of the litigants and the lower courts, it may be clarified that no dismissed workman can claim the relief of reinstatement without a declaration by a competent court that the order of termination is not valid and no punitive order of termination be interfered without any technical grounds if such an order is otherwise justified on merits.

57. The Additional Government Advocate Ms. Coutinho in the Writ Petition No.135/97 filed by the Party I/Union against the Government of Goa, produced on record a copy of the Order of Reference No. ALC/Ponda/C.H. dated 05/06/1997 u/s 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Admittedly, the Workman in the present reference has been terminated on 17/02/1997. There is absolutely no document or any record which shows that the Failure Report was submitted to the Government of Goa by the Conciliation Officer prior to the date of termination of the Party I/Workman. On the other hand Party I/Workman has proved the conciliation/discussion on the demands continued even after the authority sent the minutes of meeting to its superiors which was only a internal correspondence between the Conciliation Officer and the Commissioner of Labour and the said correspondence by no stretch of imagination can be held to be a Report u/s 12(4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. That u/s 20(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 the conciliation proceedings shall be deemed to have concluded when the Failure Report of the Conciliation Officer is received by the Appropriate Government so as to put a full stop to the conciliation proceedings initiated u/s 12(1), till then the conciliation is treated to be continued, till such time the Failure Report reaches the Appropriate Government.

58. In the present reference, there is no such Failure Report till the time the Additional Government Advocate produced on record the copy of the reference which was done at much later stage i.e. after more than 3 months after the termination of the Party I/Workman. The Party I/Workman thus has been able to prove that there has been gross violation of the provisions of Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Hence, this issue stands answered in favour of the Party I/Workman in the affirmative.

59. In the case of **Jaipur Zila (Supra)** while referring to the case of *Strawboard Mfg. Co. v. Govind*¹ the Hon'ble Apex Court observed that "*the application for approval was rejected by the Tribunal*". *Dealing with the consequence of such rejection, the Supreme Court held: "If the Tribunal does not approve of the action taken by the employer, the result would be that the action taken by him would fail and thereupon the workman would be deemed never to have been dismissed or discharged and would remain in the service of the employer. In such a case no specific provision as to reinstatement is necessary and by the very fact of the Tribunal not approving the action of the employer, the dismissal or discharge of the workman would be of no effect and the workman concerned would continue to be in service as if there never was any dismissal or discharge by the employer."* Considering this observation, this Tribunal is of the opinion that no further purpose will be served if this Tribunal proceeds to pass the Part Award on the preliminary issues only and keep the reference alive for holding enquiry on other issues when the termination of the Party I/Workman itself is illegal, same being in violation of provisions of Section 33 (2) (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Hence, the final Award.

ORDER

- i. The reference stands allowed.
- ii. Consequently, the Party II is hereby directed to re-instate in service the Party I/Workman, Mr. Sainath Sawant with full back wages w.e.f. 25/02/1997.
- iii. No order as to cost.
- iv. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-, (Vijayalaxmi R. Shivolkar), Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court.

Panaji.

Corrigendum

No. 28/02/2025-LAB/Part-VI/318

Date : 15-Jul-2026

Read: Notification No. 28/02/2026-LAB/PART-VI/260 dated 08-06-2026.

On the 1st page of the Order dated 01-04-2026, the Clause Title shall be read as:-

Employer/Party-II represented by Learned Advocate Shri G. K. Sardessai along with Advocate Ms. M. Rao.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim.

**Department of Law & Judiciary**

Law (Establishment) Division

Corrigendum

No. 8/12/2020-LD(Estt.)/1778

Date : 28-Jul-2026

Read: Notification No. 8/12/2020/LD(Estt.)/286 dated 23/01/2026.

In the above read Notification published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 44 dated 29/01/2026 relating to remission of registration fees for the land purchased vide sale deed executed between Dr. K. B. Hedgewar Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Cujira, Bambolim, Goa (Purchaser) and Cherish Specialities Limited, Dona Paula, Goa (Vendor), for the property pertaining to Survey No. 27/1-A (Part) of Village Valpoi, Sattari Taluka, Goa.

The registration fee/remission amount appearing in the above referred Notification shall be read as “Rs. 3,30,000/- (Rupees Three lakhs thirty thousand only) instead of Rs. 3,33,680/- (Rupees Three lakhs thirty-three thousand six hundred and eighty only)”.

All the remaining contents of the above read Notification shall remain unchanged.

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

Porvorim.

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

No. 5/3/2026-PER/2279

Date : 27-Jul-2026

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

Sr. No.	Name and present posting of the Officer	Posted as
1.	Ms. Prajakta D. Goltekar, Deputy Chief Electoral Officer	Deputy Director (Admn.), Technical Education with additional charge of Deputy Director (Admn.), Legal Metrology
2.	Smt. Akshaya A. Amonkar, awaiting posting	Deputy Chief Electoral Officer

This is issued with the approval of the Election Commission of India vide letter No. 154/Goa/2026-P.Admn dated 10/07/2026.

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

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

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

Porvorim.

Order

No. 22/10/2018-PER/Vol-I/2365

Date : 03-Aug-2026

Read: Order No. 14020/04/2022-UTS.I dated 09/07/2026.

The Governor of Goa is pleased to relieve Shri Ajay Krishan Sharma, IPS (AGMUT:2008) and Smt. Varsha Sharma, IPS (AGMUT:2010) from this Administration w.e.f. 04/08/2026 (a.n.) to join their next posting in Delhi.

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

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

Porvorim.

Department of Public Health

Order

No. 2/22/97-II/PHD/1733

Date : 01-Jul-2026

Government is pleased to accept the notice of Voluntary Retirement dated 30/12/2025 tendered by Dr. Sanjay P. Korgaonkar, Medical Officer, Department of Blood Bank, Goa Medical College, under Rule FR 56(k) of the CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972 and is permitted to retire from service voluntarily w.e.f. 01/04/2026 (a.n.).

Dr. Sanjay P. Korgaonkar, Medical Officer, Department of Blood Bank, Goa Medical College, shall stand relieved from the Government Service w.e.f. 01/04/2026 (a.n.).

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

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

Porvorim.

Order

No. 6/11/2002-III/PHD/1920

Date : 29-Jul-2026

Read: Memorandum No. 6/11/2002-III/PHD/1037 dated 23/04/2026.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide letter No. COM/I/5/35(1)/2025/511 dated 12/03/2026, Government is pleased to appoint Shri. Nihal Baliga to the post of Lecturer in Psychiatry (Group “A” Gazetted) in Level-11 of Pay Matrix (Pay Band-3 Rs. 15600 + 39100 + Grade Pay of Rs. 6600/-) under the Institute of Psychiatry and Human Behaviour, Bambolim with immediate effect as per the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

Shri Nihal Baliga shall be on probation for a period of two years.

Shri Nihal Baliga has been declared medically fit by the Medical Board and also there is nothing adverse reported against him at the concerned Police Station, as per verification of character and antecedents report submitted by District Magistrate, North Goa, Panaji.

The recruitment is made against the vacancy occurred due to finalization of Sanctioned Strength of IPHB vide Order No. 6/3/2018-III/PHD/1339 dated 10/09/2019.

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

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

Porvorim.



Department of Rural Development

District Rural Development Agency, North Goa

Order

No. DRDA-N/MON./8-91/2025-26/1199

Date : 04-Aug-2026

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

The composition of the Committee is as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the person/designation	Name of the Department/Designation	Designation in the committee
1	Shri Shripad Yesso Naik	Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), North Goa District	Chairperson
2(i)	Shri Captain Viriato Fernandes	Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), South Goa District	Co-Chairperson
(ii)	Shri Sadanand Shet Tanavade	Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha)	Co-Chairperson
3	Members of the State Legislative Assembly (MLAs)	North Goa District Assembly Constituencies of Mandrem, Pernem, Bicholim, Tivim, Mapusa, Siolim, Saligao, Calangute, Porvorim, Aldona, Panaji, Taleigao, St. Cruz, St. Andre, Cumbharjua, Maem, Sanquelim, Poriem, Valpoi	Members
4(i)	Mayor	Corporation of the City of Panjim	Member
(ii)	Chairperson	Mapusa Municipal Council	Member
(iii)	Chairperson	Pernem Municipal Council	Member
(iv)	Chairperson	Bicholim Municipal Council	Member
(v)	Chairperson	Sanquelim Municipal Council	Member
(vi)	Chairperson	Valpoi Municipal Council	Member
5	Chairperson	Zilla Panchayat, North Goa District	Member
6	Chief Executive Officer	Zilla Panchayat, North Goa District	Member
7	Project Director	District Rural Development Agency, North Goa District	Member
8	Lead Bank Officer	State Bank of India, Panaji, North Goa District	Member
9	Senior Superintendent/ Superintendent	Postal Department, Mapusa, North Goa District	Member
10	District Collector	North Goa District	Member Secretary
11	Nodal Functionaries of all the Programmes under purview of DISHA, North Goa District		

(i)	Director	Directorate of Health Services	Member
(ii)	Director	Directorate of Education	Member
(iii)	Director	Sarva Siksha Abhiyan/Goa Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan	Member
(iv)	Director	Directorate of Women & Child Development	Member
(v)	Principal Chief Engineer	Public Works Department	Member
(vi)	Director	Directorate of Social Welfare	Member
(vii)	Director	Directorate of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs	Member
(viii)	Director	Directorate of Agriculture	Member
(ix)	Director	Directorate of Settlement & Land Records	Member
(x)	Member Secretary	Goa State Urban Development Agency	Member
(xi)	Managing Director & CEO	Imagine Panaji Smart City Dev. Ltd.	Member
(xii)	Director	Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship	Member
(xiii)	Director	Directorate of Information Technology	Member
(xiv)	Chief Engineer	Water Resources Department	Member
(xv)	Director	Directorate of Mines & Geology	Member
(xvi)	Director	Directorate of Panchayat	Member
(xvii)	Captain of Ports	Department of River Navigation	Member
(xviii)	Director	Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services	Member
(xix)	Director	Directorate of Transport	Member
(xx)	Director	Directorate of Sports and Youth Affairs	Member
(xxi)	Commissioner of Labour and Employment	Office of the Commissioner, Labour and Employment	Member
(xxii)	Director	Department for Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities	Member
(xxiii)	Director	Department of New & Renewable Energy	Member
(xxiv)	Director	Department of Tourism	Member
(xxv)	Director	Department of Environment & Climate Change	Member
(xxvi)	Director	Directorate of Art & Culture	Member
(xxvii)	Director	Directorate of Fisheries	Member
(xxviii)	Director	Department of Transport	Member
12	Joint Secretary	Department of Administrative Reforms	Member
13 (i)	Sarpanch	Village Panchayat Ibrampur, Pernem	Member
(ii)	Sarpanch	Village Panchayat Corlim, Tiswadi	Member
(iii)	Sarpanch	Village Panchayat Korgao, Pernem	Member
(iv)	Sarpanch (Women Representative)	Village Panchayat Old Goa, Tiswadi	Member
(iv)	Sarpanch (Women Representative)	Village Panchayat Nadora, Bardez	Member
14.	Shri Subhash Naik	Matrubhumi Seva Pratishthan, H. No. 206, Badem, Salvado-do-Mundo, Bardez-Goa	Member
15.	Shri Abhay Bhamaikar	Maluara, Agacaim	Member

16.	Shri Balchandra Usgaonkar	H. No. 421/1, Caraibhat, Carambolim, Tiswadi-Goa 403110	Member
17.	Smt. Arti Bandodkar	Mayem-Goa	Member

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

This Committee supersedes earlier Committee constituted vide Order No. DRDA-N/MON/8-91/2025-26/1490 dated 19/08/2025.

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

Arjun Mohan, IAS, Secretary (Rural Development).

Panaji.



Department of Town and Country Planning

Notification

No. 36/18/39A/Notification (43F)/TCP/2026/777

Date : 05-Aug-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./ Chalta No.	Name of Village and Taluka	Published land use as per RPG-2021/ODP (Total Area) in m2	Proposed land use	Area proposed in sq. mts.	Decision of the Government
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Chandahas Kushali Bolekar	269/1 Plot 2-A	Usgao, Ponda	Orchard Total Area (175)	Settlement Zone	175	Approved for change of zone.
2.	Amit Anand Chougule	269/1 Plot B-2	Usgao, Ponda	Orchard Total Area (115)	Settlement Zone	115	Approved for change of zone.
3.	Omprakash Patil & Others	269/1-AG (Part)	Usgao, Ponda	Partly Settlement (340m2), Partly Orchard (115m2) Total Area (455)	Settlement Zone	115	Approved for change of zone an area of 115m2 from Orchard to Settlement Zone.
4.	Gopal Shanta Velip & others	269/1 Plot 29	Usgao, Ponda	Orchard Total Area (420)	Settlement Zone	420	Approved for change of zone.
5.	Parasharam Maruti Hatakar	269/1-B-3	Usgao, Ponda	Orchard Total Area (116)	Settlement Zone	116	Approved for change of zone.
6.	Aparna Anand Patil & Pooja Parasharam Patil	269/1-AE	Usgao, Ponda	Orchard Total Area (428)	Settlement Zone	428	Approved for change of zone.
7.	Baburao Mahadev Gawas	202/1-E	Pilerne, Bardez	Orchard Total Area (280)	Settlement Zone	280	Approved for change of zone.
8.	Yogesh A Goyal	476/3-AC	Corgao, Pernem	Orchard Total Area (267)	Settlement Zone	267	Approved for change of zone.

9.	Yogesh A Goyal	476/3-AB	Corgao, Pernem	Orchard Total Area (264)	Settlement Zone	264	Approved for change of zone.
10.	Dattaprakasha P. Nagwekar	244/12 (Part) & 244/13 (Part)	Siolim, Bardez	Natural Cover Total Area (3779)	Settlement Zone	312	Approved for change of zone.

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

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

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

- (i) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification(28)/TCP/2025/354 dated 06-08-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 19 dated 07-08-2025 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5);
- (ii) 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. 6);
- (iii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (49)/TCP/2026/212 dated 01-04-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 1 dated 02-04-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 7);
- (iv) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (50)/TCP/2026/247 dated 08-04-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 2 dated 09-04-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 8);
- (v) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (55)/TCP/2026/341 dated 29-04-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 5 dated 30-04-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 9);
- (vi) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (38)/TCP/2025/704 dated 12-11-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 33 dated 13-11-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 10); 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, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6 in its 236th Meeting held on 29/06/2026, Sr. No. 7 in its 233rd Meeting held on 18/05/2026, Sr. No. 8, 9 & 10 in its 235th Meeting held on 10/06/2026 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 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 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.

Notification

No. 36/18/39A/Notification (4NF)/TCP/2026/781

Date : 05-Aug-2026

Whereas, the Town and Country Planning Department of the Government of Goa has issued direction 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 (6) of the Table below (hereinafter referred to as “the said Proposals”);

TABLE

Sr. No.	Survey No./Sub Division No./P.T. Sheet No./Chalta No.	Name of Village and Taluka	Published land use as per RPG-2021/ODP (Total Area) in m2	Proposed land use	Area proposed in sq. mts.	Decision of the Government
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	44/0, 43/0, 47/56, 47/57, 47/58, 46/1, 46/2, 46/3, 46/4, 46/5, 46/13, 46/19, 46/20, 46/60, 46/21, 46/22, 46/31, 46/32, 46/33, 46/34, 46/42, 46/41, 46/43, 46/52, 46/6, 46/14, 46/15, 46/7, 46/8, 46/9, 46/10, 46/11, 46/12, 46/16, 46/17, 46/18, 46/23, 46/24, 46/26, 46/25, 46/27, 46/28, 46/29, 46/29-A, 46/36, 46/35, 46/46, 46/37, 46/44, 46/47, 46/38, 46/48, 46/39, 46/45, 46/49, 46/30, 46/40, 46/50, 46/51, 46/58, 46/59, 46/53, 46/54, 46/55, 46/56, 46/57, 42/3, 42/1, 42/2, 42/4, 42/5, 42/8, 42/9, 42/10, 42/11, 42/12, 42/13, 42/14, 42/15, 42/16, 42/17, 42/18, 42/19, 42/30, 42/6, 42/7, 41/0, 40/0, 39/9, 39/10, 39/7, 39/8, 39/28, 39/11, 39/12, 39/13, 39/18, 39/15, 39/17, 39/16, 39/14, 39/27, 39/24, 39/20	Majorda, Salcete	44/0, 43/0 Sand Dunes. 47/56, 47/57 Partly Sand Dunes and Partly Paddy Field with Irrigation Command Area. 47/58, 42/6, 42/7 Orchard. 46/1 Partly Orchard, Partly Orchard with Irrigation Command Area, Partly Paddy Field, Partly Paddy Field with Irrigation Command Area. 46/2, 46/3, 46/4, 46/5, 46/13, 46/19, 46/20, 46/60, 46/21, 46/22, 46/31, 46/32, 46/33, 46/34, 46/42, 46/41, 46/43, 46/52, 46/6, 46/14, 46/15, 46/7, 46/8, 46/9, 46/10, 46/11, 46/12, 46/16, 46/17, 46/18, 46/23, 46/24, 46/26, 46/25, 46/27, 46/28, 46/29, 46/29-A, 46/36, 46/35, 46/46, 46/37, 46/44, 46/38, 46/48, 46/39, 46/45, 46/49, 46/30, 46/40, 46/50, 46/51, 46/58, 46/59, 46/53, 46/54, 46/55, 46/56, 46/57, 42/3, 42/1, 42/2, 42/4, 42/5, 42/8, 42/9, 42/10, 42/11, 42/12, 42/13, 42/14, 42/15, 42/16, 42/17, 42/18, 42/19, 42/30 Partly Paddy Field with Irrigation Command Area and Partly Water Body. 42/3 Paddy Field. 42/1, 42/2 Partly Paddy Field, Partly Orchard with Irrigation Command Area, Partly Water Body. 42/4, 42/5, 42/8, 42/9, 42/10, 42/11, 42/12, 42/13, 42/14, 42/15, 42/16, 42/17, 42/18, 42/19, 42/30 Partly Paddy Field	No Development Zone	250406	Approved as Non Developable Area an area of 2,49,704m2 as Non Developable Area excluding an area of 702m2 under settlement zone.

			with Irrigation Command Area. 41/0 Partly Paddy Field with Irrigation Command Area, Partly Orchard with Irrigation Command Area 40/0 Partly Paddy Field, Partly Paddy Field with Irrigation Command Area, Partly Orchard with Irrigation Command Area, Partly Settlement. 39/9, 39/10, 39/7, 39/8, 39/28, 39/11, 39/12, 39/13, 39/18, 39/15, 39/17, 39/16, 39/14, 39/27, 39/24, 39/20 Partly Paddy Field with Irrigation Command Area, Partly Settlement, Partly Water Body, Partly Paddy Field, Partly Orchard with Irrigation Command Area. Total Area (250406)			
2.	5/0, 10/1, 10/2, 10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6, 10/7, 10/8, 10/9, 10/11, 10/12, 10/13, 10/14, 10/15, 10/16, 10/17, 10/18, 10/19, 10/20, 10/21, 10/22, 10/23, 10/24, 10/25, 10/26, 10/27, 10/28, 10/29, 10/30, 10/31, 12/1, 12/2, 12/3, 12/4, 12/5, 12/6, 12/7, 12/8, 12/9, 12/10, 12/11, 12/12, 12/13, 12/14, 12/17, 12/18, 12/19, 12/21, 12/22, 12/23, 12/24, 12/26, 12/27, 12/28, 12/29, 12/30, 12/31, 12/32, 12/33, 11/4, 11/2-P, 11/1, 11/3-P, 6/2 (Part), 6/2-B, 6/3-B, 6/4, 6/3-A, 6/3, 6/5, 6/6, 6/7, 6/8, 6/11, 6/9, 7/1, 7/1-A, 7/1-B, 7/4, 7/2, 7/5, 7/6, 7/3, 7/8, 7/15, 7/9, 7/10, 7/11, 7/12, 7/13, 7/7, 7/14, 7/16, 7/17, 7/28, 7/33, 7/30, 7/38, 7/42, 7/44, 7/34, 7/18, 7/19, 7/23, 7/20, 7/21, 7/22, 7/24, 7/25, 7/26, 7/29, 7/31, 7/35, 7/36, 7/37, 7/39, 7/40, 7/41, 7/43, 7/32, 7/27, 4/1, 4/2, 4/4, 4/5, 4/7, 4/8, 4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/12, 4/13, 4/16,	Gonsua, Salcete	6/9, 7/1, 7/1-A, 7/1-B, 7/2, 7/3 Khazan. 7/8, 7/15, 7/16, 7/4, 7/5, 7/6, 7/7, 7/14, 7/32, 7/27, 7/23, 7/19, 7/18, 7/17, 6/2 (Part), 6/2-B, 6/4, 14/21, 14/18, 14/19, 14/20, 14/22, 14/23, 14/25, 14/26, 14/27, 14/28, 14/29, 14/30, 2/20, 2/21, 2/22, 5/17, 5/24, 5/31, 14/1, 14/10 Orchard. 6/3, 6/11, 6/3-B, 17/4, 17/8, 17/9 Partly Paddy Field, Partly Orchard. 11/1 Partly Orchard, Partly Paddy Field, Partly Settlement. 2/12 Partly Paddy Field, Partly Settlement. 5/0, 10/1, 10/2, 10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6, 10/7, 10/8, 10/9, 10/11, 10/12, 10/13, 10/14, 10/15, 10/16, 10/17, 10/18, 10/19, 10/20, 10/21, 10/22, 10/23, 10/24, 10/25, 10/26, 10/27, 10/28, 10/29, 10/30, 10/31, 12/1, 12/2, 12/3, 12/4, 12/5, 12/6, 12/7, 12/8, 12/9, 12/10, 12/11, 12/12, 12/13, 12/14, 12/17, 12/18, 12/19, 12/21, 12/22, 12/23, 12/24,	No Development Zone	195470	Approved as Non Developable Area an area of 1,95,029m2 as Non Developable Area excluding an area of 441m2 under settlement zone.

	2/12, 2/3, 2/4, 2/5, 2/6, 2/7, 2/8, 2/2, 2/1, 2/13, 2/14, 2/17, 2/18, 2/19, 2/20, 2/21, 2/22, 17/4, 17/8, 17/9, 14/10, 14/1, 14/2, 14/3, 14/4, 14/5, 14/6, 14/7, 14/8, 14/9, 14/11, 14/12, 14/13, 14/14, 14/15, 14/16, 14/17, 14/18, 14/19, 14/20, 14/21, 14/22, 14/23, 14/25, 14/26, 14/27, 14/28, 14/29, 14/30, 13/1, 13/2, 13/3, 13/4		12/26, 12/27, 12/28, 12/29, 12/30, 12/31, 12/32, 12/33, 11/4, 11/2-P, 11/3-P, 6/3-A, 6/5, 6/6, 6/7, 6/8, 7/9, 7/10, 7/11, 7/12, 7/13, 7/28, 7/33, 7/30, 7/38, 7/42, 7/44, 7/34, 7/20, 7/21, 7/22, 7/24, 7/25, 7/26, 7/29, 7/31, 7/35, 7/36, 7/37, 7/39, 7/40, 7/41, 7/43, 4/1, 4/2, 4/4, 4/5, 4/7, 4/8, 4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/12, 4/13, 4/16, 2/3, 2/4, 2/5, 2/6, 2/7, 2/8, 2/2, 2/1, 2/13, 2/14, 2/17, 2/18, 2/19, 14/2, 14/3, 14/4, 14/5, 14/6, 14/7, 14/8, 14/9, 14/11, 14/12, 14/13, 14/14, 14/15, 14/16, 14/17, 13/1, 13/2, 13/3, 13/4 Paddy Field. Total Area (195470)			
3.	1/0	Sao-Jorge-Island, Mormugao	Protected/Reserve Forest with Heritage Landscape Total Area (663802)	No Development Zone	663802	Approved an area of 5,28,575m2 as Non Developable Area.

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. 7 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 (5N)/TCP/2026/362 dated 06-05-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 6 dated 07-05-2026 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 1, 2 & 3); 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, 2 & 3 in its 236th Meeting held on 29-06-2026, 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 is hereby altered and modified as specified in Column No. (7) 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 (6) of above Table.

The alteration and modification of the Regional 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.

Office of the Chief Town Planner

Order

No. 1/3/TCP(Part-File)/2017-19/1565

Date : 31-Jul-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.	Shri K. Ashok Kumar, Dy. Town Planner	Member Secretary, North Goa Planning and Development Authority, Panaji with additional charge of Dy. Town Planner, Pernem Taluka Office, Pernem	Member Secretary, North Goa Planning and Development Authority, Panaji with additional charge as Dy. Town Planner, Tiswadi Taluka Office, Panaji
2.	Shri Zaidev R. Aldonkar, Dy. Town Planner	Dy. Town Planner, North Goa District Office, Mapusa with additional charge of Tiswadi Taluka Office, Panaji	North Goa District Office, Mapusa
3.	Shri Ram alias Tanay Sandesh Timblo, Dy. Town Planner	TCP Headquarters, Panaji, with additional charge of Mormugao Taluka Office, Vasco	TCP Headquarters, Panaji, with additional charge of Pernem Taluka Office, Pernem
4.	Shri Snoken Luis Caetano Dias, Dy. 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.



Department of Transport

Directorate of Transport

Notification

No. D.Tpt/STA/2565/2026/2485

Date : 03-Aug-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 68 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988) read with Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 (Act No. 10 of 1987), the Government of Goa, hereby amends the Government Notification No.

D.Tpt/STA/2565/2020/3105 dated 29/12/2020, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 40 dated 31/12/2020, and further re-constitute the Regional Transport Authority for Pernem hereunder:-

Regional Transport Authority for Pernem:

- | | | | |
|------|---|---|------------------|
| I. | Additional Director of Transport (South), Margao | — | Chairman |
| II. | The Asstt. Director of Transport, Pernem-Goa | — | Member Secretary |
| III. | Mr. Mahesh Sadanand Prabhu Desai, H. No. 207/A, Gaonwada,
Dhargalim, Pernem, Goa | | |

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.

Arvind B. Khutkar, Director/ex officio Additional Secretary (Transport).

Porvorim.