

Panaji, 16th April, 2026 (Chaitra 26, 1948)

SERIES II No. 3

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Education

Directorate of Technical Education, Polytechnic Section

Order

No. 17/3/99/2026/DTE/107

Date : 09-Apr-2026

Read: Memorandum No. 17/3/99/2026/DTE/3444 dated 29-01-2026.

On the recommendations of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/18(4)/2024/405 dated 13-01-2026, Government is pleased to appoint Ms. Rita Perpetua J. Vaz, on temporary basis to the post of Lecturer in Architectural Assistantship (Group 'A' Gazetted) at Government Polytechnic Panaji, Goa on an initial pay in the pay matrix level 9A w.e.f. the date of joining as per the terms & conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

The appointment is against the vacant post of Lecturer in Architectural Assistantship at Government Polytechnic, Panaji.

Ms. Rita Perpetua J. Vaz will be on probation for a period of two years.

She should join duties within 30 days of the receipt of this order, failing which this order is liable to be cancelled without further notice.

She has been declared fit by Medical Board, Goa Medical College & Hospital, Bambolim vide letter No. 4/105/85-H/GMC/2026/116 dated 24-02-2026.

Her character and antecedents have been verified and nothing adverse is reported against her as conveyed by the Deputy Collector & DRO, South Goa District, Office of the Collector & District Magistrate, South Goa District, Magisterial Section, Matanhy Saldanha Administrative Complex, Margao-Goa vide letter No. 36/01/2006/SG/MISC/VCA/MAG/M.O.772 dated 12-03-2026.

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

Bhushan. K. Savoikar, Director of Technical Education and ex officio Additional Secretary.

Porvorim.

Department of Forest

Office of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests

Order

No. CWLW-56/WL-WLCCB-FD-2025-26/5172

Date : 06-Mar-2026

In pursuance of the provisions contained in Clause (b) of Rule 3 of the Wildlife Disposal of Wild Animal Article Rules, 2023, I, Shri K. Ramesh Kumar, IFS, Chief Wildlife Warden, Goa hereby constitute the committee consisting of the following members, namely:-

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| i) Deputy Conservator of Forests (Concerned Division in-charge) | — Chairman |
| ii) A representative of the local Gram Panchayat | — Member |
| iii) Mamlatdar of concerned Taluka | — Member |
| iv) Wildlife Expert (as decided by the Committee) | — Member |
| v) Range Forest Officer (Concerned Range) | — Member Secretary |

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

K. Ramesh Kumar, IFS, Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests & Chief Wildlife Warden, Goa.

Panaji.

Order

No. 4/1/2024-FOR/170

Date : 25-Mar-2026

The Governor of Goa is pleased to promote the following Range Forest Officer (RFO), to the post of Assistant Conservator of Forest (ACF) (Group “A” Gazetted), in the Office of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Forest Department, Panaji, on regular basis in the Level 10 of the Pay Matrix as per C.C.S. (Revised Pay) Rules, 2016, with immediate effect:-

- 1) Shri Vilas P. Gawas.
- 2) Shri Shamsundar L. Gauns alias Shri Shamsunder Laxman Gawas.
- 3) Shri Siddesh Upaso Gaude (ST).
- 4) Shri Rudyard D’Silva.

The above officers shall be on probation for a period of 02 years from the date of joining the post. The officers shall exercise the option for fixation of pay within one month from the date of this Order in terms of F. R. 22(I)(a)(1).

This issues in consultation with the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide its letter No. COM/II/11/22(1)/2022/512 dated 13-03-2026.

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

Sitaram Gurudas Sawal, Under Secretary (Forest).

Porvorim.

Memorandum

No. 4/4/2012/Seniority-FOR/Part/28

Date : 27-Jan-2025

Read: (1) Order No. 4/2/2024-FOR/202 dated 04-09-2024.

(2) Order No. 4/2/2002-FOR(Part)230 dated 24-08-2023.

(3) Memorandum No. 4-4-2012/Seniority-FOR dated 13-04-2023.

(4) Memorandum No. 4/4/2012/Seniority-FOR/Part/01 dated 02-01-2025.

Whereas, the Seniority of Assistant Conservator of Forest in the Forest Department was last finalized vide Memorandum read in the preamble at Sr. No. (3).

And whereas, from 2023 to till date, a total number of 02 officers have been appointed to the Assistant Conservator of Forest Department by direct recruitment and promotion vide orders read in the preamble at Sr. No. (1) to (2).

And whereas, a Tentative Seniority of Assistant Conservator of Forests in the Forest Department was circulated and objections, if any, were invited vide Memorandum No. 4/4/2012/Seniority-FOR/Part/01 dated 02-01-2025, read at Sr. No. (4) above.

And whereas, no representations/objections have been received from the officials of the Goa Forest Department.

Now therefore, the final seniority list of Assistant Conservator of Forests is hereby finalized as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of the officials	Promote/direct	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Remarks
1.	Shri Amar A. Heblekar	P	18-08-1968	28-03-2016	
2.	Shri Deepak Pednekar	P	06-04-1970	01-04-2016	
3.	Shri Damodar Prakash Salelkar	D	01-10-1982	21-11-2017	
4.	Kum. Clifff D'Costa	P	18-04-1967	06-06-2019	
5.	Shri Vishwas K. Chodankar	P	04-09-1968	06-06-2019	
6.	Shri Jose Colaco (ST)	P	05-10-1966	06-06-2019	
7.	Shri Paresh C. Porab	P	15-04-1974	09-09-2020	
8.	Shri Dyaneshwar M. Kudalkar (SC)	P	08-03-1967	15-12-2020	
9.	Shri Minguel A. Fernandes	P	16-05-1973	15-12-2020	
10.	Shri Vishwanath Pingulkar	P	03-05-1968	24-08-2023	
11.	Shri Harsh Damodar Phadte	D	26-07-1999	04-09-2024	

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

Dr. Pooja M. Madkaikar, Under Secretary (Forest).

Porvorim.

◆◆◆

Department of Home
Home-General Division

Order

No. 2/2/2024-HD(G)/1002

Date : 08-Apr-2026

Pursuant to the Order dated 26-02-2026 passed in Miscellaneous Application No. 729/2025 in Crl. Appeal No. 1927/2025 tilted as 'Pinki Vs. State of U.P. & Anr. passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Government of Goa is pleased to constitute a Review Committee comprising of following:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Principal Secretary (Home) | — Chairman |
| 2. Director General of Police | — Member |
| 3. Secretary (Women and Child Development) | — Member |

4. Secretary (Social Welfare)	— Member
5. District Magistrate (North)	— Member
6. District Magistrate (South)	— Member
7. District Magistrate (Kushavati)	— Member
8. Superintendent of Police (North)	— Member
9. Superintendent of Police (South)	— Member
10. Superintendent of Police (Kushavati)	— Member
11. Director, Women and Child Development	— Member
12. Director, Social Welfare	— Member
13. Secretary, Goa State Commission for Protection of Child Rights	— Member
14. Superintendent of Police (AHTU)	— Member Secretary

The above Committee is entrusted with the task of periodical review of the vulnerable areas, more particular, those areas which are prone to child trafficking and monitor the progress of action.

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

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

Porvorim.



Department of Labour

Order

No. 28/07/2026/LAB/193

Date : 08-Apr-2026

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Cipla Limited, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete-Goa and it's workmen represented by Bhartiya Kamgar Sena Union in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

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

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

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the Bhartiya Kamgar Sena Union has locus standi to raise Industrial Dispute in respect of alleged illegal deduction/non-payment of wages and non-payment of overtime, on behalf of the 11 workmen, as shown in "Annexure A", before the management of M/s Cipla Limited, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete-Goa?
- (2) If answer to issue No. (1) above is in affirmative, then whether the 11 workmen, as shown in "Annexure A", could be construed as Workman as defined under Section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
- (3) If the answer to the above issue No. (2) above is in affirmative, then, whether the deduction/non-payment of wages and non-payment of overtime of the 11 workmen, as shown in "Annexure A", is legal and justified?
- (4) If yes, to what relief the 11 workmen are entitled to?

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

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

Porvorim.

“ANNEXURE A”

Sr. No.	Name of the Workmen	Designation
1.	Shri Anil Kumbar	Executive (Junior Operator)
2.	Shri Yashwant Bhise	Executive (Junior Operator)
3.	Shri Kiran Dhepi	Executive (Junior Operator)
4.	Shri Shriram Mane	Executive (Junior Operator)
5.	Shri Amol Navle	Executive (Junior Operator)
6.	Shri Suyog Palav	Executive (Senior Operator)
7.	Shri Akshay Pawar	Executive (Senior Operator)
8.	Shri Dinesh Kothavale	Executive (Senior Operator)
9.	Shri Karedeen Choudhary	Executive (Senior Operator)
10.	Shri Santosh Rane	Executive (Senior Operator)
11.	Shri Dattaram Ansurkar	Executive (Senior Operator)

Notification

No. 28/02/2026-LAB/Part-IV/196

Date : 08-Apr-2026

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 25-03-2026 in Ref. No. IT/06/2007 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

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

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

Porvorim.

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

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

Ref. No.: IT/06/2007

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

..... Workmen/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.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 25th day of the month of March of the year, 2026)

By Order dated 24th February, 2006 bearing No. 28/44/P/2004-LAB-Part/114, 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 14 of 1947), has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

- (1) *“Whether the action of M/s MRF Limited, Usgao, Ponda-Goa, in deducting wages and imposing fines on those workmen who were absent from work on polling days i.e. on 05/09/1999 and 30-05-2002, is legal and justified?”*
- (2) *“If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?”*

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/06/2007 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Pursuant to service of notice, Party I filed their Claim Statement at Exhibit 5.

3. The Party I stated that the Party II/M/s MRF Limited is a limited Company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956 having its registered Office at 124, Greams Road, Madras. The present dispute is in respect of the said workmen who are employees of their Company/Factory in Ponda, Goa where the Company employs approximately 970 workmen.

4. The Party I stated that the Company is engaged in the manufacture of Tyres and is one of the most reputed concerns in the manufacture of tyres and is well established in its line of business. The Company has several factories all over India and employs a large workforce and due to the increase in its business activities and profits from year to year, it is financially very sound.

5. The Party I stated that since the formation of the Union, the Company has been attempting to disrupt the unity of the workmen employed by the Company who are members of the Union. Of late, there has been large scale harassment and victimization of the Union Office bearers and its other members due to their legitimate trade union activities. The harassment, inter-alia, include illegal changes in service conditions, unjustified and unwarranted suspensions, charge-sheets based on false and fabricated charges, refusal to negotiate in good faith, and impositions of unfair labour practices in the guise of following management policy, etc., and further including the present illegal termination of the 0members of the Union.

6. The Party I stated that by Notification dated 30/08/1999, the Government of Goa was pleased to notify under the provisions of Section 135-B of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 that 05-09-1999 as “Polling Day” for general elections to the Lok Sabha in the State of Goa as a “Paid Holiday” for all the industrial workers in the State of Goa.

7. The Party I states that the Party II/Management issued an illegal notice dated 03/09/1999 contrary to the provisions of Section 135-B and the said Notification under the Representation of the People Act declaring 05/09/1999 a holiday, by declaring only Shift I (8.00 hrs. to 16.00 hrs.) as a holiday and Shift II (16.00 hrs to 19.00 hrs.) being a holiday and that the workmen were required to report for work between 00.00 hrs and 8.00 hrs (III Shift) of 04/09/1999 and 19.00 hrs. to 24.00 hrs. (part of II Shift of 05/09/1999). The Party I states that since the workmen were conferred with a paid holiday on the said polling day by virtue of Section 135-B of the said Act, they accordingly did not report for work on all 3 Shifts between 00.00 hrs. and 24.00 hrs. of 05/09/1999, irrespective of the Shift that the Party II/Management had assigned them to work in.

8. The Party I/Workmen further states that a Clarification issued by the Election Commission of India by Circular dated 06/04/1999 was quashed by the Hon’ble High Court of Bombay vide Order dated 23/02/2004 in Writ Petition No. 283/99 to the extent of Para-4 of the said Circular which clarified that the paid holiday may be declared only for the Shift during which a poll is to be taken, making it clear that the notice dated 03/09/1999 issued by the Party II/Management is illegal and contrary to law.

9. The Party I stated that the Party II/Management issued show-cause notice dated 23/09/1999 to the workmen alleging therein that more than 221 workmen acting in concert at remaining absent authorised on the Polling Day and had gone on strike without notice and consequently an illegal fine equivalent to eight (8) days’ wages was proposed as punishment in the said show cause notice. The Party I stated that this action of the Party II/Management in illegally imposing a fine as a punishment is contrary to law and

accordingly demanded that they be restored and paid the wages illegally deducted by the Party II/Management as a fine.

10. The Party I stated that a similar situation arose on 21/05/2002 when the Government of Goa issued a Notification under the same provision declaring 30/05/2002 as a public holiday and a paid holiday for all the industrial workers in the State of Goa. The Party II/Management issued an illegal notice dated 20/05/2002 contrary to the provisions of Section 135-B and the Notification issued thereunder by requiring the workmen to work in Third Shift of 29/05/2002 from 00.00 hrs. to 08.00 hrs. and in Second Shift of 30/05/2002 from 19.00 hrs., to 24.00 hrs. when the said entire day should have been declared a holiday and all the workmen be allowed to stay away from work.

11. The Party I states that while imposing the illegal penalty of fine, the Company has failed to conduct any enquiry on the show-cause notice issued to the workmen and has neither given the workmen an opportunity to defend themselves at any enquiry nor were the principles of natural justice followed before imposing the illegal punishment.

12. The Party I further states that thereafter the Party II/Management illegally and contrary to law, paid the workmen who had reported for duties according to the notice, only for the period that they worked on that day instead of actually paying the workmen their entire wages as on 30/05/2002 which had been declared as a paid holiday. The deductions of wages from the workmen who did not report for work on that day is illegal and contrary to law as the workmen would be entitled to full wages on the said paid holiday so also consequential benefits that would accrue to the workmen during a paid holiday were required to be given to the workmen.

13. The Party I/Union raised an industrial dispute before the Labour Commissioner, Panaji vide their letter dated 05/05/2004 enclosing the Demand Letter dated 16/04/2004 along with the Justification Statement for the claims.

14. The Party II in their Written Statement filed at Exhibit 6 denied that they are attempting to disrupt the unity of the workmen employed by them and also denied that there has been large-scale harassment or victimisation of the union office bearers or its other embers for their alleged union activities. Party II denied that there are changes in service conditions and that there are unjustified or unwarranted suspensions as alleged. It is denied that there is imposition of unfair labour practices or that it has refused to negotiate in good faith with the workmen as alleged. It is denied that any termination of any member of the Union has been effected in so far as the present matter is concerned.

15. The Party II submits that the Government of Goa had declared 05/09/1999 as a paid holiday for the industrial establishments u/s 135-B of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and that by notice dated 01/09/1999, the Office of the Commissioner, Labour and Employment circulated the clarifications/circular dated 06/04/1999 issued from the Election Commissioner's Office to all the industries and the Party II also received the said Circular.

16. The Party II submits that the Circular of the Election Commissioner in respect of the paid holiday was circulated through the Office of the Labour Commissioner to all the industries including the Party II Company and based on the said Circular of the Election Commissioner, paid holiday was declared by the Party II for all its workmen in terms of the said Circular and accordingly notice dated 03/09/1999 was displayed. The Party II submits that a section of the workmen represented by the Goa MRF Employees Union filed a Writ Petition challenging the notice displayed by the Party II and that the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa Bench after hearing the Parties was pleased to uphold the validity of the notice dated 03/09/1999 and as a measure gave further concession in terms of time to enable the employees working in the preceding shift of 05/09/1999 to vote at the election by its Order dated 04/09/1999.

17. The Party II submits that the Company accordingly by notice dated 04/09/1999 intimated its employees that the paid holiday would be between 4.00 a.m. till 7.00 p.m. of 05/09/1999 as directed in the Order of the High Court and made necessary additional transport arrangements for the concerned employees incurring additional expenses/cost thereof. The Party II submits that despite the directions of the Hon'ble High Court and the relevant notice displayed by the Party II, a large section of the workmen at the behest of the Union did not attend work on 05/09/1999 which resulted in heavy financial loss to the tune of over 20 Lakhs to the Party II.

18. The Party II submits that some of the workmen who absented from work deliberately and in clear defiance of the High Court Order were asked to show cause as to why disciplinary action should not be taken against them as the same amounted to a serious act of misconduct in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders of the Company and the workmen who were found guilty of the misconduct as above were punished by way of fines imposed on them as provided for in the Certified Standing Orders of the Company.

19. The Party II submits that from the above, it is apparent that the Company merely relied on the representation/clarification of the Election Commissioner and declared paid holiday for the polling hours of 05/09/1999 and beyond thereby allowing every employee to vote at the Election. The Company merely based its grant of paid holiday to its employees on the Circular of the Election Commissioner which had been communicated through the Office of the Commissioner of Labour and therefore it cannot be said that the Company acted or even intended to act in derogation of the provisions of the Representation of People's Act, 1951.

20. The Party II submits that the fines and deduction of wages were made in view of the acts of misconduct committed by the concerned workmen by absenting unauthorisedly from work without leave or intimation on 04/09/1999 and 05/09/1999 and thereafter as the same amounted to serious acts of misconduct in violation of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company and that the disciplinary action initiated against its employees was taken in accordance to law and the same is justified.

21. The Party II submits that the Government of Goa by Notification in the Official Gazette declared 30/05/2002 as the paid holiday in the State of Goa in view of the State Assembly Elections. The Party II relying on the decision of the Hon'ble High Court on 04/09/1999 declared 30/05/2002 as a paid holiday as was done for 05/09/1999 as the law on declaration of holiday on a Polling Day was laid down in the Order dated 04/09/1999 of the Hon'ble High Court. It is submitted that the holiday on 30/05/2002 had been declared exactly as per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court given earlier and according to which the entire day was not to have been declared a holiday as contended by Party I. It is denied that notice dated 20/05/2002 displayed by the Party II was contrary to the provisions of Section 135-B of the Representation of People's Act, 1951 or contrary to any other law in force.

22. The Party II submits that Paid Holiday wages were paid to all the workmen scheduled to work from 4.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m. of 30/05/2002 and obviously those workmen who did not attend work for the period for which paid holiday was not declared were not paid wages as provided under the Payment of Wages Act. It is submitted that there cannot be any illegality as regards to the payment of wages to the workmen in the present matter. The Party II submits that the Union after nearly 5 years had raised a demand by their letter dated 16/04/2004 and that meanwhile by Order dated 23/02/2004, the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to hold that a day is 24 hours.

23. The Party II submits that the imposing of fines and deduction of wages has been effected as provided for in the Certified Standing Orders of the Company as the section of workmen had unauthorisedly absented from work without leave or intimation on 04/09/1999 and 5/09/1999 in defiance of notice dated 04/09/1999 and the Order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 04/09/1999. The Party II has denied that the deduction of wages an imposition of fines on the workmen has been resorted to by the Company to victimize the workmen as alleged and that such deductions caused any discrimination among the different workmen as alleged. It is denied that that the Party I/Union has made out a prima facie case in support of its demand.

24. In the Rejoinder filed by the Party I/Union at Exhibit 7, the Party I denied the defence taken by Party II in their Written Statement and maintained and reiterated the facts stated in their Claim Statement.

25. Considering the Claim Statement of Party I, the Written Statement filed by the Party II and the Rejoinder filed by Party I, following issues were framed at Exhibit 8 on 04.10.2007.

ISSUES

1. Whether the Goa M.R.F Employees Union has locus standi to raise present dispute?
(*Corrected Issue): Whether the Party II proves that the Goa M.R.F. Employees Union has no locus standi to raise present dispute?

2. Whether dispute under the reference is an Industrial Dispute within the meaning of Sec. 2(K) of the I. D. Act, 1947?
(*Corrected Issue): Whether the Party II proves that the dispute under the reference is an industrial dispute within the meaning of Sec. 2(K) of the I. D. Act, 1947?
3. Do the Workmen/(Party I) prove that the entire day falling on 5-9-1999 was paid holiday for them?
4. Do the Workmen/(Party I) prove that the entire day falling on 30-5-2002 was paid holiday for them?
5. Do the Workmen/(Party I) prove that the notices dated 3-9-1999 and 30-5-2002 issued by Party II are illegal and contrary to law?
6. Do the Workmen/(Party I) prove that fine imposed upon them by Party II for absence from duty on 5-9-99 is illegal and without procedure?
7. Do the Workmen/(Party I) prove that deduction of wages by the Party II from those who did not report to duty on 30-5-2002 is illegal and contrary to law?
8. Whether Workmen/(Party I) are entitled to the reliefs as prayed for?
9. What Award?

26. I have gone through the records i.e. the pleadings, the oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by both the Parties, the written synopsis filed as well as the oral arguments advanced by both the Parties and after considering the same my findings on the issues with reasons are as follows:

Issue No. 1 & 2	:	In the Negative
Issue No. 3 to 7	:	In the Affirmative
Issue No. 8	:	In the Affirmative
Issue No. 9	:	As per Final Order

REASONS

27. *Issue No. 1 & 2:* The Learned Predecessor, Presiding Officer of this Tribunal was pleased to frame altogether 9 issues, however, in respect of Issue No.1 and 2, it is not stated as to on whom the burden to prove both these issues lies on. On perusal of the Written Statement it is seen that it is the Party II/Management who has taken the plea of Union's no locus standi to raise the present dispute and that the subject matter cannot be an industrial dispute. Being so, the burden to prove both these issues though specifically not mentioned in both these issues is on the Management, hence necessary correction of both these issues is carried out accordingly and both these issues are taken together for discussion.

28. It is in the evidence of the Management witness Shri Govind Mapari that the demands raised by the Union were not responded by the Management because it is their contention that the disputant union had no authority to do so. The Party II in its letter dated 12/06/2004 had invited the attention of the Asst. Labour Commissioner that the disputant union had no locus standi to raise any demand on behalf of their workmen and that the Authority of the signatory of the Justification Statement dated 06/05/2004 was also challenged. The Party II/Company had justified in the same letter that the fines imposed as well as deduction of wages on the polling days were done within the framework of law and the conditions of employment applicable to the workmen.

29. Apart from the averments made in the Affidavit in Evidence of the Management witness, Mr. Mapari, the Management did not bring any other relevant material including any document on record to show that the said Rohidas Naik is not the President of the Union or that he did not have any locus standi to represent the workmen as well as the Union in the present reference.

30. On the other hand, the Party I/Workmen produced on record the letter dated 14/10/2013 at Exh. 113 addressed by the Company to the ALC wherein the ALC had been informed about the pending dispute in IT/33/1997 by the Company in which the issue of Presidentship of Rohidas is involved. The Party I/Workman also produced on record two Award at Exh.114 and 115 passed in IT/33/1997 and C-IT/04/1998 respectively. When put to the witness of the Management, Mr. Mapari in his cross-examination

that the issue pertaining to Rohidas Naik being the President of the Union has been decided in the said Award, Mr. Mapari stated that he cannot say anything on the said suggestion.

31. Similarly, Mr. Mapari in the cross-examination stated that he cannot say anything to the suggestion that in terms of Exh.115 i.e. the Award passed in C-IT/04/1998, the locus standi of Rohidas Naik as the President of the Union has already been decided. Thus, there is no clear denial of the fact of the issue of Presidentship of Rohidas Naik being decided in both the above Awards from the Management side nor the Management could bring any material on record to prove that Shri Rohidas Naik was not the President of the Union and that he could not have represented the Union and that he lacks locus standi to represent the workmen as well as the Union. As such, for want of sufficient evidence, both the Issues taken for discussion together stands answered in the negative.

32. *Issue No. 3 to 7:* It is in the evidence of Shri Rohidas Naik that the Party II/Management had issued an illegal notice dated 03/09/1999 contrary to the provisions of Section 135-B and the said Notification under the Representation of the People Act declaring 05/09/1999 a holiday, by declaring only Shift I (8.00 hrs. to 16.00 hrs.) as a holiday and that the workmen were required to report for work between 00.00 hrs and 8.00 hrs. (III Shift) of 04/09/1999 and 19.00 hrs. to 24.00 hrs. (part of II Shift of 05/09/1999.) The Party I states that since the workmen were conferred with a paid holiday on the said polling day by virtue of Section 135-B of the said Act, they accordingly did not report for work on all 3 Shifts between 00.00 hrs. and 24.00 hrs. of 05/09/1999, irrespective of the Shift that the Party II/Management had assigned them to work in.

33. It is further stated that the Clarification issued by the Election Commission of India by Circular dated 06/04/1999 was quashed by the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay vide Order dated 23/02/2004 in Writ Petition No. 283/99 to the extent of Para-4 of the said Circular which clarified that the paid holiday may be declared only for the Shift during which a poll is to be taken, making it clear that the notice dated 03/09/1999 issued by the Party II/Management is illegal and contrary to law. That the Party II/Management issued show-cause notice dated 23/09/1999 to the workmen alleging therein that more than 221 workmen acting in concert at remaining absent unauthorisedly on the Polling Day and had gone on strike without notice and consequently illegal fine equivalent to eight (8) days' wages was proposed as punishment in the said show cause notice. Thus according to Party I the action of the Party II/Management in illegally imposing a fine as a punishment is contrary to law. That a similar situation arose on 21/05/2002 when the Government of Goa issued a Notification under the same provision declaring 30/05/2002 as a public holiday and a paid holiday for all the industrial workers in the State of Goa. The Party II/Management issued an illegal notice dated 20/05/2002 contrary to the provisions of Section 135-B and the Notice issued therein required the workmen to work in Third Shift of 29/05/2002 from 00.00 hrs. to 08.00 hrs. and in Second Shift of 30/05/2002 from 19.00 hrs., to 24.00 hrs. when the said entire day should have been declared a holiday and all the workmen be allowed to stay away from work.

34. In support of their case as set out in the Claim Statement as well as in support of deposition by their witness the Party I/Workman placed reliance on both the Circulars dated 01/09/1999 and 06/04/1999 at Exh. 84 and Exh. 85 respectively, also produced on record the Notice dated 03/09/1999 at Exh. 87, the Order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 04/09/1999 at Exh. 88, the Show-cause Notice dated 23/09/1999 at Exh. 90 and the Charge-sheet cum Notice dated 20/09/1999 at Exh. 91. The Party II witness Shri Mapari in the cross-examination admitted that no enquiry was conducted into the said charge-sheet and that only show-cause notice was issued in terms of Certified Standing Orders. When there is no enquiry, obviously, there is no opportunity to defend their stand and therefore the contention of the Party I that they were not given opportunity to defend themselves and consequently the principles of natural justice were not followed before imposing the fine by way of punishment needs to be accepted and appreciated in view of the admitted position that no enquiry was conducted into the charge-sheet that was issued to the Party I/Workmen. On the other hand the Party II/Management could not justify that the action taken by them by imposing a fine on the Polling dates i.e. on 05/09/1999 and 30/05/2002 was not in contravention of the Notification issued by the Government of Goa on the Polling Day or that the action taken by them against the workmen was based on the findings of the enquiry conducted pursuant to the show-cause notice issued to the Workmen as the evidence on record reveals that no such enquiry was conducted either into the show-cause notice or in respect of the charge-sheet issued to the workmen. In the circumstances above, it

cannot be held that the action of the Management in imposing fine for their absenteeism on the Polling Day was legal and justified.

35. Mr. Mapari by way of his own statement in his Affidavit confirmed that the Hon'ble High Court vide its Order dated 23/02/2004 was pleased to hold a day is 24 hours while disposing off the Writ Petition filed by the Party I/Union. Being so, nothing more remains to be proved by the Party I/Union in rebuttal to the contention of the Management that they had paid holiday wages to all workmen scheduled to work from 4.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m. on 30/05/2002 and wages were not paid to the section of workmen as they did not report for work for the period for which paid holiday were not declared and were not paid wages. Hence, all the issues taken together for discussions stand answered in favour of the Workmen in the affirmative.

36. *Issue No. 8:* For the reasons stated in Issue No. 3 to 7 this issue stands answered in favour of the workmen in the affirmative.

Hence the following Order.

ORDER

- i. The Management is hereby directed to pay to the workmen their entire wages with consequential benefits for the paid polling holiday of 05-09-1999 and shall pay to the workmen their entire wages with consequential benefits for the paid polling holiday of 30-05-2002.
- ii. Further, the Management is hereby directed to pay to the workmen the fine equivalent to the illegal fine imposed on them for their alleged absence of work on 05-09-1999 with interest on the same day from 05-09-1999 till actual payment.
- iii. Inform the Government accordingly.

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

Panaji.



Department of Law

Law (Establishment) Division

Order

No. 8/5/2026/LD(Estt.)/873

Date : 08-Apr-2026

Read:- File No. 8/5/2026-LD(Estt.)/233 dated 15-01-2026.

In continuation to the above referred Order, the Government is pleased to appoint Shri. Vimod Dalal, Chief Officer, Cuncolim Municipal Council, Cuncolim, Goa to look after day-to-day functioning of Mathagramastha Hindu Sabha by assisting Shri. Bhushan K. Savoikar, Administrator, Mathagramastha Hindu Sabha in performing his functions as an Administrator.

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

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

Porvorim.

Order

No. 5/40/97/LD(5)/880

Date : 09-Apr-2026

Whereas, the Government vide Notification No. 5/40/97/LD(5) dated 17-09-1997, appointed Shri Ramakant Mahadeo Lotlikar, Advocate (hereinafter referred as the "Applicant") as a Notary for period of three years with effect from 17-09-1997, for the area of Judicial Division of Salcete Taluka;

And whereas, the Government vide Certificate of Practice dated 17-09-1997 has certified that the Applicant is authorized to practice as a Notary for a period of three years from 17-09-1997, for Judicial Division of Salcete Taluka;

And whereas, the Government on the request of the Applicant had renewed his Certificate of Practice as a Notary for subsequent 05 terms and the period of validity of the Certificate of Practice expired on 17-09-2025 in the Endorsement dated 03-08-2020 issued to the Applicant. However, vide letter dated 21-01-2026 Adv. Mandar S. Lotlikar, has informed that the above applicant Shri Ramakant Mahadeo Lotlikar, Advocate who was practicing as a Notary expired on 03-09-2025;

And whereas, the validity of the Endorsement dated 03-08-2020 to the Certificate of Practice issued to Shri Ramakant Mahadeo Lotlikar stands withdrawn and cancelled, as per the Notaries Act, 1952 (Central Act 53 of 1952) and Notaries Rules, 1956 (hereinafter referred as the “said Act” and “said Rule”), since the said Advocate expired on 03-09-2025.

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

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

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

Porvorim.

◆◆◆

Department of Personnel

—

Order

No. 5/8/2022-PER/Part/362

Date : 04-Feb-2026

In terms of Rule 28 of the Goa Civil Service Rules, 2016 and on the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide its letter No. S2GPSC-LPCF0DOPE/1/2025/I/529/2026/391 dated 06-01-2026 and letter No. S2GPSC-LPCF0DOPE/1/2025/407/I/545/2026 dated 15-01-2026, the Governor of Goa is pleased to declare the Junior Scale Officers of Goa Civil Service from Sr. No. 1 to 13 below to have satisfactorily completed their period of probation and Officers at Sr. No. 14 to 15 to have satisfactorily completed their period of probation and confirmed in the cadre of Junior Scale Officers of Goa Civil Service with effect from the date of completion of probation period mentioned against their name in column 3 below:-

Sr. No.	Name of the probationers	Date of completion of probation period
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Shri Shivprasad S. Naik	20-02-2025
2.	Shri Krishnakant Sakharam Pangam	20-02-2025
3.	Shri Manesh Hari Kedar	20-02-2025
4.	Kum. Prajakta Dina Goltekar	20-02-2025
5.	Shri Bhagwant Anay Karmali	20-02-2025
6.	Shri Prasiddh Prakash Naik	20-02-2025
7.	Shri Shrikant Babi Pednekar	20-02-2025
8.	Shri Amitesh Anant Shirvoikar	20-02-2025
9.	Shri Milindra Ganesh Velip	20-02-2025
10.	Shri Sandeep Sahadev Gawde	20-02-2025
11.	Shri Raghuraj Arun Faldesai	20-02-2025

12.	Smt. Avelina D'sa E Pereira	20-02-2025
13.	Smt. Durga Dwarkanath Kinlekar @ Durga A. Naik	20-02-2025
14.	Shri Pankaj Rane	12-12-2024
15.	Shri Belwadi Samiullah Nishat	11-12-2024

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

Eshant V. Sawant, Joint Secretary (Personnel).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 5/3/2026-PER/936

Date : 31-Mar-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:-

Sl. No.	Name and present posting of the officer	Posted as
1.	Shri Prataprao Gaunkar, Deputy Collector & SDM, Canacona with additional charge of Chief Officer, Quepem Municipal Council and Member Secretary, Ravindra Bhavan, Canacona	Deputy Collector & SDM, Mormugao.
2.	Shri Bhagwant Anay Karmali, Deputy Collector & SDM, Mormugao	Deputy Collector & SDM, Canacona with additional charge of Chief Officer, Quepem Municipal Council and Member Secretary, Ravindra Bhavan, Canacona.

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. 5/23/2022-PER/949

Date : 01-Apr-2026

Shri Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary, Personnel-I, shall hold the charge of Under Secretary, Handicrafts, Textile & Coir and Shri Ratnakant D. Govenker, Deputy Director, Mines-I, shall hold the charge of Deputy Director, Mines-II, in addition to their own duties with immediate effect.

This issues on the recommendation of Goa Services Board.

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

Durga Kinlekar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 15/7/2025-PER/975

Date : 06-Apr-2026

On the recommendation of the Goa Services Board, the Governor of Goa is pleased to order posting of the following officers in the cadre of Mamlatdar/Joint Mamlatdar/Vigilance Officer, in public interest, with immediate effect:-

Sr. No.	Name & present posting of the Officer	Posted as
1.	Shri Shukr Sudin Sinai Usgaonkar, awaiting posting	Joint Mamlatdar-II, Pernem with additional charge of Joint Mamlatdar-III, Pernem
2.	Shri Sandesh Thulo Velip, awaiting posting	Joint Mamlatdar-II, Sanguem

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.

**Department of Public Health****Notification**

No. 25/1/2022-I/PHD/260

Date : 25-Feb-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 26 read with Section 27 of the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 (Central Act No. 47 of 2021), the Government of Goa hereby reconstitutes the Goa State Assisted Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Board consisting of the following members, namely:-

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| (1) Minister for Health | — Chairperson (Ex. Officio) |
| (2) Secretary (Health) | — Vice Chairperson (Ex. Officio) |
| (3) Secretary (Law) | — Member (Ex. Officio) |
| (4) Secretary (Women and Child Development) | — Member (Ex. Officio) |
| (5) Secretary (Social Welfare) | — Member (Ex. Officio) |
| (6) Secretary (Home) | — Member (Ex. Officio) |
| (7) Director of Health Services | — Member (Ex. Officio) |
| (8) Mrs. Jennifer Monserrate, Member of Legislative Assembly of Goa | — Member |
| (9) Dr. (Mrs.) Deviya Rane, Member of Legislative Assembly of Goa | — Member |
| (10) Mrs. Delilah Lobo, Member of Legislative Assembly of Goa | — Member |
| (11) Miss Shreya Arundekar, Embryologist | — Member |
| (12) Mr. Chandan Salunke, Embryologist | — Member |
| (13) Dr. Kedar Padte, Obstetrician/IVF Specialist, Panaji | — Member |
| (14) Dr. Muriel Cardoso, HOD, Dept. of OBG, GMC | — Member |

- | | | | |
|------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| (15) | Mrs. Shaila D'Souza, Prof. & HOD, Dept. of Women's Studies, Goa University | — | Member |
| (16) | Prof. K. A. Geetha, Faculty-BITS Pilani, Goa | — | Member |
| (17) | Mrs. Ketki Gadekar- "WOW-Wonders of Outstanding Women Foundation | — | Member |
| (18) | Ms. Sayonara Telles-Laad-Beyond Barriers-Towards Hope | — | Member |
| (19) | Mrs. Savita Desai – Lok Vishwas Pratistan | — | Member |
| (20) | Prachi Khandeparkar – 'Sangath' | — | Member |
| (21) | Joint Secretary/Addl. Secretary (Health) | — | Member Secretary (Ex. Officio) |

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.

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

Porvorim.



Department of Revenue

Notification

No. 28/4/1/2026/RD-I/460

Date : 07-Apr-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by the second proviso to Clause (ii) of sub-section (6) of Section 32 of the Goa Land Revenue Code, 1968 (Goa Act No. 9 of 1969), the Government of Goa hereby exempts St. Joseph's Province Society, 7, Nagar Road, Yervada, Pune, a charitable trust registered under the Bombay Public Trusts Act, 1950, under Registration Number F-22386 dated 21-08-2007, from the payment of fees amounting to Rs. 2,01,320/- (Rupees Two lakhs, one thousand, three hundred and twenty only) payable under the said Code, for conversion of the land admeasuring an area of 1,438 sq. mts., surveyed under Survey No. 13 sub-division No. 1-AA of Assolda Village of Quepem Taluka, District Kushavati, State of Goa, subject to the condition that the said land shall be used exclusively for institutional purpose i.e. construction of a Charitable Old Age Home.

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

Vrushika Kauthankar, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

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

Price—Rs. 15.00