



புதுச்சேரி மாநில அரசிதழ்

La Gazette de L'État de Poudouchéry The Gazette of Puducherry

அதிகாரம் பெற்ற வெளியீடு

Publiée par Autorité

Published by Authority

விலை : ₹ 20-00

Prix : ₹ 20-00

Price : ₹ 20-00

எண்	புதுச்சேரி	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை	2017 ௨௩	சூன் மீ	13 ௨
No.	24 Poudouchéry	Mardi	13	Juin	2017 (23 Jyaistha 1939)
No.	Puducherry	Tuesday	13th	June	2017

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

	பக்கம்		Page		Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள் ..	574	Sentence arbitral du travail de tribunal.	.. 574	Award of the Labour Court ..	574
அரசு அறிவிப்புகள் ..	580	Notifications du Gouvernement	.. 580	Government Notifications ..	580
ஒப்ப அறிவிப்புகள் ..	591	Avis d'Adjudications	.. 591	Tender notices ..	591
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் ..	592	Annonces	.. 592	Announcements ..	592

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 73/Lab./AIL/T/2017, dated 2nd May 2017)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D.(L) No. 38/2014, dated 21-3-2017 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the Management of Anglo French Textiles Limited, Puducherry and its workman Thiru A. Balachandiran over non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No.20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-91, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

E. VALLAVAN,

Commissioner of Labour-cum-
Additional Secretary to Government (Labour).

**BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT AT PUDUCHERRY**

Present : Thiru G. THANENDRAN, B.COM, M.L.,
Presiding Officer,

Tuesday, the 21st day of March, 2017

I.D. (L) No. 38/2014

D. Balachandiran,
No. 47, Maraimali Nagar,
Velrampattu,
Puducherry.

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Anglo French Textiles,
AFT Mill Premises,
Cuddalore Road,
Mudaliarpet,
Puducherry.

.. Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on 21-3-2017 before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru M/s. Vrintha Mohan, Counsel for the petitioner and Thiru B. Mohandoss, Counsel for the respondent on record, upon perusing the case records, this Court passed the following:

AWARD

1. This industrial dispute has been referred as per the G. O. Rt. No. 91/AIL/LAB/J/2014, dated 2-6-2014 for adjudicating the following:-

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru A. Balachandiran against the management of M/s Anglo French Textiles Limited, Puducherry over non- employment is justified? If justified, what relief, he is entitled?

(b) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. *The petitioner in his Claim Statement has stated as follows:-*

The petitioner submits that the respondent is a Government of Puducherry undertaking company and registered under the companies act and is represented by its Managing Director and is a leading industry engaged in the activity of production and export of quality cotton textiles.

The petitioner submits that the outset that the Chairman (A Honorary Political Posting) of the respondent management belongs to a political party and the petitioner belongs to a different political party and that due to this differences of opinion and political vendetta and ill will, the management along with the Chairman cooked a false case and in furtherance of it issued a false and malafide charge-sheet, dated 17-4-2013 with an immediate temporary suspension from service. The charge-sheet accompanied with an immediate suspension from service without even a show cause from this petitioner would itself reflect the guilty mind of the respondent management in its determination to remove this petitioner from the services with the respondent management by any unfair means. However, this petitioner had furnished a befitting reply, dated 20-4-2013 for the charges levelled as against him by the respondent management.

The petitioner was a permanent employee with the respondent in the capacity of Helper (Code No. 10175 D; T.No. GS 125) in its Waste Godown until he was malafidely dismissed from service *vide* dismissal order, dated 1-7-2013 by the respondent besides malafidely and willfully with holding the monetary benefits and arrears accrued upon this petitioner in consequence of his employment with the respondent management in glare contravention to the well established procedures laid down by the Labour Law and the principles of natural justice. Petitioner gave numerous representations to the respondent and the authorities for reinstatement,

payment of gratuity, provident fund, payment of bonus and when all his representations remained unheeded, the petitioner ventilated his grievances with the Labour Officer (Conciliation) and due to the adamancy of the respondent herein the matter was thereafter notified by the Labour Department - Government of Puducherry *vide* notification G.O. Rt. No.91/AIL/LAB/J/2014, dated 2nd June, 2014 with the following reference-

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru A. Balachandiran against the management of M/s Anglo French Textiles Limited, Puducherry over non-employment is justified?

(b) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

and thereafter was referred for adjudication before this Court.

The petitioner had legally joined the respondent's company as a worker on 12-6-1982 until he was dismissed on 1-7-2013 from employment malafidely by leveling false and malicious charges by the respondent using undue influence, coercion and threat against the principles of natural justice.

The petitioner submits that the alleged incident, dated 16-4-2013 was itself a false and fabricated drama staged by the respondent management and the respondent had cleverly and meticulously roped in the petitioner with their undue influence and conspiracy on the contract based security staffs employed by the respondent management. The allegations of the security guards and that of the security officer employed under the respondent management that the petitioner on 16-4-2013 along with some persons entered into the respondent's mill unauthorized and that the petitioner forcefully took a staff by name Munusamy who was being questioned by the said Security Officer in his office after threatening to do away with the security officer and other high officials of the administration and pushed the security officer down to the ground are all completely false and fabricated stories that never happened. The petitioner is a reputed person due to his good conduct and impeccable character, he was elected as the President of Panjallai Thozilallar Congress (RTU/723/92) and that the respondent became inimical and vindictive with the petitioner since he has to plead for the cause of justice of his colleagues against the unjust and anti labour activities of the respondent and the termination of the petitioner is only due to the grudge against the trade union in general and this petitioner in particular. In this context, the charge-sheet,

dated 16-04-2013 issued to one Munusamy (Code No. 11565) - which was issued by the respondent management at the earliest point of time would not disclose anything about the involvement of this petitioner in taking the said Munusamy outside the mill premises. However, as an afterthought, improved and colored version the respondent management had managed to fabricate a charge sheet belatedly on 17-4-2013 that the petitioner had taken forcibly the said Munusamy from the clutches of the security officials of the respondent mill besides threatening the management with dire consequences. This petitioner submit with great respect a perusal of the improvements made in the fictitious charge sheets issued to Munusamy dated 16-4-2013 and the petitioner Balachandar, dated 17-4-2013 would categorically and blatantly proved that the management had animated a false and concocted story to oust out the petitioner by unfair and illegal means.

The petitioner further submits that as a result of the abovesaid forged and false complaint by the contract security officer through the coercion of the respondent, the petitioner was served with a charge-sheet, dated 17-4-2013 terminating him temporarily from employment for which he had given a written explanation, dated 20-4-2013 wherein he had clearly explained that he had nothing to do with the allegations thrown at him by the respondent management and he had also clearly stated in the letter that he is being wantonly targeted by the Chairman of the respondent management company for no fault of his. The petitioner was being targeted by the respondent management and he was already once served with a similar fictitious and malicious notice, dated 31-1-2013 for which he had given a suitable reply on 4-2-2013 stating clearly that he had done nothing as stated in the notice.

Thereafter a namesake enquiry was held into the matter as against the petitioner and on 21-6-2013 the enquiry officer gave his common enquiry report in both the alleged offences of the petitioner and another staff namely Munusamy whom the petitioner is alleged to have taken out from the security officer's room on 16-4-2014.

The petitioner further submits that the enquiry conducted by the enquiry officer was only a formality done to shew a drama for the employees and during the so called domestic enquiry no procedures or legal formalities or any other principle enshrined under the labour laws or the basic principles of natural justice were followed nor was any opportunity much less fair opportunity was given to this petitioner nor was any contextual explanations with regard to the domestic

enquiry was given to him and no opportunity was even offered to him to produce any documents or witnesses on his side and he was not given any opportunity to explain the real facts and circumstances of the incident and unfortunately all the document which would substantiate the innocence of the petitioner are in the custody of the management and the so called dramatic enquiry proceedings would speak volumes of the high handed capitalism of the respondent and their integrity and respect for laws and labour welfare and that all the empty formalities followed by the respondent were just mockery on the established principles of the Labour Laws - depriving the petitioner off defending from even bare and minimum opportunity of projecting his *bona fide* case and as such great prejudice is caused to the petitioner by the fraudulent conduct of the respondent in not conducting the domestic enquiry as per legal norms and principles and as such the domestic enquiry was unilaterally concluded to suit the respondent's whims and fancies.

The petitioner submit that a mere perusal of the findings of the enquiry officer in the enquiry report would patently imply to this Court that the enquiry officer had conducted the enquiry as an empty formality and to some how arrive at a conclusion based on surmises and conjectures and not on any concrete evidence and that even the witnesses of the respondent management has not supported the management's case during the domestic enquiry.

The petitioner further submits that it is common knowledge that the contract security officer employed with the respondent management company are under the direct supervision and pay, of the respondent management, herein and that they are bound to dance to the tunes of the management and bound to speak as directed by the respondent management and their evidences are interested evidence with falsities. The enquiry officer never showed any inclination to listen to this petitioner's pleas of hatred of the Chairman of the respondent management towards this petitioner and the Enquiry Officer failed to take into the evidence the motive, conduct, previous enmity and prejudice of the respondent management in general and the Chairman's political enmity in particular towards this petitioner and the false allegations levelled on this petitioner on earlier occasions and the undue influence of the respondent management on the contractual securities employed at the respondent management company premises to make them dance to the tunes of the respondent. A perusal of

the enquiry report would patently evidence that the findings of the Enquiry Officer is diametrically opposite and self contradictory and no punishment could be based on this *mala fide* and unjust enquiry report.

Based on the Enquiry Officer's enquiry report, dated 21-6-2013 the respondent management sent its second show cause notice, dated 25-5-2013 and the petitioner had aptly replied to the respondent management by his letter, dated 28-6-2013 but, the respondent management without considering the legitimate and true averments of the petitioner by its *mala fide* and predetermined and premeditative order, dated 1-7-2013 terminated the petitioner from service devoid of any merits. In this context, the petitioner submits that a perusal of the termination order, dated 1-7-2013 served on this petitioner would rely only on the so called past antecedent records of the petitioner and would not rely on the findings of the enquiry report and on this count alone the termination order, dated 1-7-2013 is liable to be set aside.

The petitioner is filing chronologically all the available relevant documents as annexure to this claim petition and reserves his right to file appropriate petitions for taking inventories of documents that are essential for proper adjudication for the fact in issue which are in custody of the respondent.

The petitioner submits at the cost of repetition that it is only the political enmity and vendetta between the Chairman and this petitioner that had resulted in the fanciful dismissal of this petition which is unjust, unethical and illegal.

The petitioner further submits that in continuation of the enmity of the respondent management, it had once again lodged a false Police complaint in Crime No. 127/2013, dated 5-9-2013 registered with the Mudaliarpet Police Station, Pondicherry against this very petitioner under the influence of the Chairman and the petitioner was let out only on Bail and the same is pending enquiry.

The respondent management has not followed any of the principles laid down by the Labour Welfare Legislations/Model Standing Orders/the Principles of Natural Justice in sacking out the respondent from employment

The petitioner is aged about 54 years and has spent all his youth, energy, know how and a major part of his life with the respondent management's mill and he and his family consisting of his wife, aged parents and children are presently under going severe financial crisis and poverty and that he was not placed with any

employment with any other concerns since he was also fancifully thrown out with an aspersion in the dismissal order that his past records and antecedents are improper and at this advanced age of 54 years he could not obtain a new employment with a different technical knowhow right now and as such the petitioner is praying for reinstatement with continuity of service along with back wages and all benefits attached thereto in consideration of the reasons as stated above.

The petitioner submits that the conduct, hasty and biased behaviour of the respondent-management throughout would clearly show that the management had a preconceived mindset to ease out the petitioner from service. The dismissal order speaks for itself for its *mala fide* and prejudice against the petitioner and as such is liable to be set aside.

The petitioner further submits that it is a well settled principal of law that when a punishment has to be imposed on a employee prior to applying the procedure contemplated under the Labour Law along with the rules and regulations laid down by the standing orders appreciation of mitigating incriminating circumstances has to be impeccably taken care of but, in this case the dismissal order is disproportionate to the charges allegedly levelled as against the petitioner. On this ground to the order of dismissal is liable to be set aside. The extreme penalty of dismissal from service is totally unjustified, unwarranted besides being inversely proportional in the facts and circumstances of the alleged charge and also disproportionate to the gravity of the charge.

The petitioner was wrongfully terminated in violation of both the principle of natural justice coupled with the principles of Labour Legislation, and that this act of respondent in illegally terminating the petitioner amounts to unfair Labour practice besides a violation of Article 14 and 19 of the Indian Constitution and that the petitioner is rightfully entitled to reinstatement by the respondent company, with back wages and continuity of services and all the benefits attached there with from 1-7-2013.

The petitioner reserves his right to file additional documents besides letting in oral evidence with the help of relevant witnesses to disprove the respondent's false case and bring to light the petitioner's innocence since all the opportunity of fair enquiry was denied by the Enquiry Officer during the enquiry proceedings. The petitioner has no other alternative than to approach this Court for remedy.

3. *The respondent in his counter has stated as follows:-*

The claim made by the petitioner for directing the respondent to set aside the order of dismissal, dated 1-7-2013 and reinstate the petitioner in his original employment with continuity of service and other reliefs is not maintainable in law or on facts and hence liable to be dismissed.

The respondent admits the averment that the petitioner became a permanent employee of the respondent on 12-6-1982 and was working in the capacity of helper in the waste godown until he was terminated from his service on 1-7-2013. But, the respondent very categorically denies the allegation that the petitioner was malafidely dismissed from service by the respondent.

It is true that the respondent is a Government of Puducherry undertaking registered under the Companies Act, 1956, is represented by its Managing Director and is a leading industry engaged in the production and export of quality cotton textiles. But, there is no truth in the allegation that due to the relationship of the petitioner and the Chairman of the respondent company with different political parties and due to the difference of opinion and political vendetta and ill-will the management of respondent company along with its chairman cooked a false case and in furtherance of it issued a false and *mala fide* charge sheet, dated 17-4-2013 with an immediate temporary suspension from service. The allegation that the charge sheet accompanied with an immediate suspension from service without even a show cause notice reflects the guilty mind of the respondent lacks truth and substance. It may kindly be noted that the charge-sheet, dated 17-4-2013 was issued to the petitioner granting time to submit his reply to the charges framed under the charge sheet. Accordingly, the petitioner submitted his explanation, dated 2-4-2013. Then, what is the necessity for issuing another show cause notice again? The charge sheet itself served the purpose of the show cause notice and valid in law.

The petitioner has made several false and vexatious allegations against the respondent management with the bad motive of tarnishing the image of the respondent. It is significant to note that the tenor of the allegation made in the claim statement discloses that only the petitioner has got personal animosity and political enmity towards the chairman of the respondent company. The respondent denies the allegations made by the petitioner against the respondent and expects the petitioner to prove the same.

The respondent submits that the petitioner has made a distorted version of facts with jaundiced eyes, to suit his convenience. The fact remains that the petitioner has made his claim with suppression of material facts with a view to attract the sympathy of this Court. For the proper appreciation of facts and circumstances leading to the dismissal of the petitioner from service, the respondent hereby submits the following material facts.

The respondent very earnestly submits that as pointed out in the charge sheet, dated 17-4-2013, the petitioner on 16-4-2013 along with some persons entered into the respondent's mill unauthorized (when there was enquiry with workman Munusamy of processing department-A unit in connection with recovery of clothes belonging to the company from him) and spoke loudly along with the other persons to the security and also forcefully took away the employee by name Munusamy who was being questioned by the said Security Officer in his office. It is very significant to note in the above charge-sheet there were some other allegations of misconduct levelled against the petitioner by the respondent. To be specific it was alleged there on that on 16-4-2013 (a) the petitioner after entering into the room of the mill Security Officer threatened him and his family members with causing death, (b) threatened the Security Officer and his family members with causing death by fire, if he gives complaint, and (c) intimidated the security officer after pushing him down and uttering the following words:- "be it Managing Director or Chairman, tell all of them; we will only take away the things belonging to the mill continuously like this; if anybody asks about the same and prevents us from doing the same we will close their lives". However, the above charges were not taken into consideration while terminating the services of the petitioner. It is on account of the fact that in his report, dated 21-6-2013, the learned Enquiry Officer found the above additional charges not proved in the enquiry and the respondent management accepted the report of the Enquiry Officer holding the petitioner guilty of some of the charges only framed under the charge-sheet. In such a case the allegations leveled by the petitioner against the enquiry officer as well as respondent management in the conduct of the enquiry proceedings cannot be accepted as valid one. Had the allegation of bias against the enquiry officer been true, the learned Enquiry Officer could have very well given a finding of guilty of the petitioner in respect of all the charges framed against the petitioner. Similarly, if, the allegation against the respondent that the enquiry was conducted as an empty

formality were to be true, the respondent could have very well rejected the Enquiry Officer's report with reference to the finding of not guilty in respect of some of the charges of misconduct.

The respondent submits that the entire disciplinary proceedings starting from the issuance of the charge-sheet as well as suspension order and ending with the dismissal order are in accordance with law and the principles of natural justice. As due opportunity was granted to the petitioner to defend the charges in the domestic enquiry and the respondent also proved the charges through proper evidence in the enquiry, the petitioner cannot have valid objections for the penalty of dismissal imposed against him by the respondent. As the charges proved against the petitioner are grave ones, the quantum of punishment is not excessive. It is also pertinent to note that there is no extenuating circumstances warranting imposition of lesser punishment. On the other hand, the past conduct of the petitioner is not free from blemish, but with many incidents of misconducts for which the petitioner was given warnings and punishments. To add further, unless the petitioner makes out a case that the finding made by the learned Enquiry Officer is perverse one, no interference can be made in the report. The fact remains that the enquiry has been conducted by the learned Enquiry Officer Thiru G. Krishnan, a Senior Advocate of Puducherry in a fair manner.

It is further submitted that a careful perusal of the claim statement clearly reveals that in several places the petitioner has alleged that the main cause for the disciplinary proceedings initiated by the respondent against him is the personal animosity between him and the chairman of the respondent company on account of their position and relationship with different political parties. In so far as the petitioner has made vexatious allegations against the chairman of the respondent company there is obligation on the part of the petitioner to implead him as a party to the proceedings. The claim petition is not maintainable and deserves dismissal for not impleading the chairman Thiru Balan as a party.

The respondent further submits that it is a patently false allegation that the respondent has initiated disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner by way of victimization for the trade union activities of the petitioner. On the other hand, it is only the petitioner who is at fault for his unlawful acts in the guise of the trade union activities, thus exceeding his limits.

The respondent submits that it is a Government of Puducherry undertaking and its employees enjoy some facilities at par with the Government servants. If, the petitioner were to be reinstated in his original

employment, it will demoralize the several other employees who discharge their services faithfully in the respondent management. The petitioner has also lost his right to respondent-employment as the respondent has lost the confidence in the service of the petitioner.

4. In the course of enquiry on the side of the petitioner PW.1 and PW.2 were examined and Ex. P1 to Ex. P16 were marked and on the side of the respondent RW1 was examined and exhibits R1 to R15 were marked.

5. The point for consideration is that whether the petitioner is entitled for the Award of reinstatement with continuity of service and other attendant benefits and ₹ 10,00,000 (Rupees ten lakhs) towards compensation for the mental agony? or not?

6. Both sides are heard. At the time of the argument the petitioner has endorsed that he is willing to withdraw the case by not pressing the industrial dispute. In view of the endorsement of the petitioner that not pressing the case, this reference is liable to be closed as not pressed.

7. In the result, the industrial dispute is dismissed as not pressed by the petitioner. No cost.

Dictated to Stenographer, transcribed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 21st day of March, 2017.

G. THANENDRAN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Puducherry.

List of petitioner's witnesses:

PW.1—26-3-2015 A. Balachandiran

PW.2—8-12-2015 Murali

List of Respondent's witness:

RW.1—17-3-2016 B. Pragadeeswaran

List of petitioner's exhibits:

Ex.P1 — Copy of the Photo Identity Card, dated 12-6-1982.

Ex.P2 — Copy of the charge-sheet against the petitioner by the respondent, dated 31-1-2013.

Ex.P3 — Copy of the explanation letter, dated 4-2-2013 by the petitioner to the charge-sheet, dated 31-1-2013.

Ex.P4 — Copy of the charge sheet against the petitioner by the, respondent, dated 17-4-2013.

Ex.P5 — Copy of the explanation letter, dated 20-4-2013 by the petitioner to the charge-sheet, dated 17-4-2013.

Ex.P6 — Copy of the enquiry, dated 21-6-2013 on the alleged charge against the petitioner and another employee called Munusamy.

Ex.P7 — Copy of the show cause notice, dated 25-6-2013.

Ex.P8 — Copy of the explanation letter, dated 28-6-2013 sent by the petitioner to the respondent as reply for show cause notice, dated 25-6-2013.

Ex.P9 — Copy of the order dismissing the petitioner passed by the respondent, dated 1-7-2013.

Ex.P10 — Copy of the letter sent by the petitioner to the respondent in reply to the respondent's order of dismissal, dated 5-7-2013.

Ex.P11 — Copy of the letter sent by the petitioner to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry, dated 24-7-2013.

Ex.P12 — Copy of the complaint given to the Sub-Inspector of Police, Mudaliarpet by the petitioner, dated 5-9-2013.

Ex.P13 — Copy of the order in Cr.M.P. 1116/2013 (Bail Petition).

Ex.P14 — Copy of the letter sent by the Labour Officer (Conciliation) to the Labour Secretary, Puducherry, dated 29-3-14.

Ex.P15 — Copy of the Government of Puducherry, Labour Department, notification, dated 2-6-2014.

Ex.P16 — Copy of the letter sent by the petitioner to the respondent regarding his bonus and acknowledged by the respondent, dated 18-10-2014.

List of respondent's exhibits:

Ex.R1 — Copy of report of the Enquiry Officer Thiru G. Krishnan.

Ex.R2 — Copy of punishment order, dated 1-7-2013 sent by the respondent to the petitioner.

Ex.R3 — Copy of representation, dated 24-7-2013 made by the petitioner to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.

- Ex.R4 — Copy of reply letter, dated 5-12-2013 made by the respondent to the Labour Officer, (Conciliation), Puducherry.
- Ex.R5 — Copy of charge-sheet, dated 7-5-1990 given by the respondent to the petitioner.
- Ex.R6 — Copy of the warning letter, dated 16-5-1990 given by the respondent to the petitioner.
- Ex.R7 — Copy of the warning letter, dated 27-11-1999 given by the respondent to the petitioner.
- Ex.R8 — Copy of the charge-sheet, dated 31-1-2013 given by the respondent to the petitioner.
- Ex.R9 — Copy of the enquiry proceedings, dated 15-2-2013 in respect of charge-sheet, dated 31-1-2013.
- Ex.R10— Copy of the enquiry report, dated 15-2-2013 submitted by the Enquiry Officer Thiru R. Sridharan in respect of the charge-sheet, dated 31-1-2013.

- Ex.R11 — Copy of the order, dated 23-2-2013 imposing suspension as substantive punishment in respect of the charge-sheet dated 31-2-2013.
- Ex.R12 — Copy of the charge-sheet, dated 4-2-2013 given by the respondent to the petitioner.
- Ex.R13 — Copy of the enquiry proceedings, dated 15-2-2013 in respect of charge-sheet, dated 4-2-2013.
- Ex.R14 — Copy of the warning letter, dated 23-2-2013 given by the respondent to the petitioner in respect of charge-sheet, dated 4-2-2013.
- Ex.R15 — Copy of the enquiry proceedings, dated 24-5-2013.

G. THANENDRAN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Puducherry.

**புதுச்சேரி அரசு
தொழிலாளர் துறை**

எண் 747/தொ.து/இ/2017/224.

அறிவிக்கை

புதுச்சேரி (நெட்டப்பாக்கம், பாசூர் மற்றும் வில்லியனூர் உட்பட), காரைக்கால், மாணே மற்றும் ஏனாம் பகுதிகளில் உள்ள தொழிற்பயிற்சி நிலையங்களில் கீழ்க்கண்ட பொறியியல் மற்றும் பிற துறை பயிற்சிகளுக்கான, 1-ஆம் தேதி, ஆகஸ்ட், 2017-ல் துவங்கும் பயிற்சியில் சேர்வதற்கு விண்ணப்பங்கள் வரவேற்கப்படுகின்றன.

1. அரசினர் தொழிற்பயிற்சி நிலையம் (ஆண்கள்), மேட்டுப்பாளையம், புதுச்சேரி-605 009.

வரிசை எண்	தொழிற் பிரிவு	பயிற்சி இடங்கள்	பயிற்சி (ஆண்டுகளில்)	கல்வித் தகுதி
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	பொறிப்பகுதி பொருத்துபவர்	63	2	10
2	கம்மியர் (குளிர்பதனம் மற்றும் தட்பவெப்பநிலையை கட்டுப்படுத்துதல்)	26	2	10
3	மின்சாரப் பணியாளர்	21	2	10
4	கம்மியர் (இயக்க ஊர்திகள்)	42	2	10
5	கம்மியர் (மின் அணுவியல்)	26	2	10
6	கணிப்பொறி இயக்குபவர் மற்றும் செயல்திட்ட உதவியாளர்	26	2	10
7	பிளாஸ்டிக் செயல்முறை இயக்குபவர்	21	1	10
8	பிளாஸ்டிக் செயல்முறை பகுதி #	30	1	10
9	கட்டிடம் கட்டுபவர்	26	1	8
10	பற்ற வைப்பவர் (வாயு மற்றும் மின்வழி)	21	1	8
11	மின் கம்பியாளர்	21	2	8
12	* கணினி பதிவாளர்	26	1	10