



# புதுச்சேரி மாநில அரசிதழ்

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

அதிகாரம் பெற்ற வெளியீடு

Publiée par Autorité

Published by Authority

எண்	புதுச்சேரி	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை	2023 ௪ <sup>ம்</sup>	ஏப்ரல் ௪	4
No.	14 Poudouchéry	Mardi	4	Avril	2023 (14 Chaitra 1945)
No.	Puducherry	Tuesday	4th	April	2023

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

	பக்கம்		Page		Page
மாவட்ட நீதிபதியால் எடுக்கப்படும் .. மேல்நடவடிக்கைகள்	296	Procédure du Magistrate de District ..	296	Proceedings of the District Magistrate	296
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள் ..	298	Sentence arbitral du Travail ..	298	Award of the Labour Court ..	298
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் ..	302	Notifications du Gouvernement ..	302	Government Notifications ..	302
ஆபத்தான நிறுவனங்கள் ..	304	Etablissements dangereux ..	304	Dangerous Establishments ..	304
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் ..	306	Annonces ..	306	Announcements ..	306

DILIP KUMAR JAIN BHAG CHAND BANKER No.63, CARPENTER STREET NELLITHOPE PUDUCHERRY L.No.475 SALES OF TIME BARRED JEWELS AND ARTICLES (CATOLOGUE)											
S.No	Catalogue S/No	Pledge Loan			Pawner			Pledge Article		Approximate Value	
		Date	No.	Amount	Name	F/o, H/o, D/o Name	Address	Description of the Article	Weight		
										Gold	Silver
SALES OF TIME BARRED JEWELS AND ARTICLES (CATOLOGUE)											

CATALOGUE CONSOLIDATION STATEMENT				
S.No.	Article Detail	No of Articles	1	Approximate Value Rs. P.
1	Gold Jewels	50	1756670	3140106
2	Silver Jewels	0	0	0
3	Brasses Vessels	0	0	0
		50	1756670	3140106

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY  
**LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 07/AIL/Lab./T/2023,  
Puducherry, dated 19th January 2023)

**NOTIFICATION**

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 07/2020, dated 12-12-2022 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of dispute between Tmt. S. Vani, Arumbarthapuram, Puducherry against the management of M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Private Limited, Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune, Puducherry, over non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7,00,000 with 24% interest 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. 20/9/Lab./L, dated 23-05-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

**P. RAGINI,**  
Under Secretary to Government (Labour).

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

Present : Tmt. V. Sofana Devi, M.L.  
Presiding Officer.

Monday, the 12th day of December, 2022.

**I.D. (L) No. 07/2020**  
**C.N.R. No. PYPY06-000039-2020**

Tmt. S. Vani,  
No. 139, Main Road,  
Arumbarthapuram,  
Puducherry-605 110.

. . Petitioner

Vs.

The Managing Director,  
M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Private Limited,  
R.S. No. 141/4 & 142/5, Whirlpool Road,  
Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune,  
Puducherry-605 102.

. . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on 07-11-2022 before me for final hearing in the presence of Thiruvaragal S. Nagarajan & A.P. Ilangovan, Counsels for the Petitioner, Thiruvallargal L. Sathish, S. Velmurugan and E. Karthik, Counsels for the Respondent, Reported No Instruction, Court Notice sent and same served on the Respondent, Respondent remained *ex parte* and after hearing the Petitioner side and perusing the case records, this Court delivered the following:

**A W A R D**

This Industrial Dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry, vide G.O. Rt. No.69/AIL/Lab./T/2020, dated 15-07-2020 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioner and the Respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner Tmt. S. Vani, Arumbarthapuram, Puducherry against the Management of M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Private Limited, Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune, Puducherry over non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7,00,000 with 24% interest is justified or not? If justified, what relief the Petitioner is entitled to?

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

2. *Brief facts of the case of the Petitioner:*

The Petitioner Workman was joined as operator in the Respondent Management company on 26-03-2002 and the Petitioner kept maintained her good conduct and best service to the fullest satisfaction of the Respondent Management being a regular employee ever since of joining to the employment as operator under the Respondent Management. The Respondent company was engaged in manufacturing a herbal capsules in the name and style of "R.G. & G.L." and being a multi-national company was having surge of customers over the world for the reason of the health product of the Respondent Management.

(ii) The Respondent Management was engaged more than 60 employees in a shift per day for manufacturing process and apart from other employees for operational purpose. Few employees among other were taken effort for formation of Union in the year 2006 and by name "DXN Herbal Manufacturing (India) Private Limited Labour Union". 17 employees were targeted by the Respondent Management for victimization for the sole reason that they were being stubborn to membership to the said Union. 17 employees were terminated from service without any valid cause and reason except their bare eager for membership into the Union. The said dispute was referred to Labour Officer, Conciliation, from time to time.

(iii) On 01-03-2011 at about 05.30 p.m the Respondent Management was surprisingly displaced a notice on the board that "The office of Management will not function from 02-03-2011 and the services of notice mention employees are not required from 02-03-2011 and their terminal benefits will be settle down on 08-03-2011 at the office". The statutory machineries *viz.* the Labour Commissioner and Conciliation Officer took cognizance upon the unlawful act the Respondent Management immediately. The Respondent Management was failed to appear before the officials for many hearing and bluntly ignored them. On around 08-04-2011, the Respondent Management filed its counter before the Conciliation Officer in respect of the said industrial dispute. *Vide* the said counter, the Respondent Management stated that due to certain unavoidable circumstances had forced the management to cease to run the factory and in view the management has proposed to transfer the staff and their workmen to Himachal Pradesh unit.

(iv) Some of the employees filed a Civil Suit *vide* O.S. No.45/2011 before the Sub-Court, Puducherry against the Respondent Management and won the Suit *vide* Judgment and Decree, dated 12-04-2012. In view of the vengeance target the Respondent Management assailed a baseless allegation against the Petitioner *vide* charge-sheet, dated 25-06-2010 for the reason of slow down the work. A similar charge-sheet was launched upon many employees who showed their sheer inclination for membership into the Union. Apart from the said issue was got the shape of industrial dispute before this Court *vide* I.D. No. 21/2011 and I.D. No. 10/2020. In fact the present Petitioner was party to the Industrial Dispute I.D. No. 10/2020. Whilst pending the above disputes before this Court, the Respondent Management desired for tripartite agreement under section 12(3) of Industrial Disputes Act so as to evade and escape from the stringent liabilities for illegal closure of the company and illegal termination of the employees including non-employment *etc.*

(v) Accordingly, on 04-12-2017, a settlement under section 12(3) arrived between the Respondent Management and its Labour Union in the presence of the Labour Commissioner. A final settlement including terminal benefits was decided for all the employees as a compensation measure against the illegal closure, non-employment, termination, unfair labour practice, victimization, *etc.*, In view of arrival of settlement, the Respondent Management was uniquely decided to cease the service of employees against the amount agreed for compensation towards the employees. Accordingly, an amount of ₹ 3,50,000 (Rupees Three Lakhs Fifty Thousand Only) was decided as compensation quantum for each employees irrespective of their status. The requisite condition for the said settlement was cessation of employment of all employees against the effect of illegal closure and the Management was not intent to reopen the said factory forever.

(vi) Whereas, the present nomenclature as to refusal for employment with the Respondent Management @ ₹ 3,50,000 as compensation and who are willing to continue the service similar to the Petitioner was paid nothing. Hence, the discriminative classification for settlement of compensation among the employees who were set to same foot for same dispute upon same issue but, the ramified amount for compensation among the employees was irrational and illogical.

(vii) The Petitioner opted to continue service with Respondent management. However, the Petitioner was not in a position to join and report duty *in lieu* of the

12(3) settlement against her personal inconvenience upon her two school going kids and her husband was in employment out of the State. Accordingly, *vide* letter, dated 21-12-2017, the Petitioner requested time for same. However *vide* letter, dated 28-12-2017, the Respondent Management informed the Petitioner that merely 5 days only would be given to join and report duty and in case of her failure within the set time, the Management would consider that she is not interested to continue as its employee and resigned the job. In addition Respondent Management sought the Bank details of the Petitioner to deposit the one time compensation/terminal benefits @ ₹ 40,000.

(viii) As a response to the Respondent management's letter content, the Petitioner submitted her letter, dated 02-01-2018 for seeking one month time for joining duty. The Respondent Management was not in function yet then in *lieu* of the 12(3) settlement, dated 04-12-2017 for the reason that the Respondent Management and the factory unit was completely closed down for more than 7 years continuously. The Respondent Management was stepped into the shoes of various authorities for sanctioning the orders to resume the work at the closed factory premise *viz.*, the Electricity, Water, Municipal tax, environmental clearance, underground water, measuring the safety clearance *etc.*

(ix) The letter, dated 09-01-2018 refused the request of the Petitioner for one month time and allowed just days time to join the duty. The Petitioner had exposed her uncontrollable situation and against which she sought considerable time around one month *vide* letter, dated 02-02-2018 to the Respondent management. Whereas, against receipt of the above letter from the Petitioner, the Respondent Management *vide* its letter dated 02-02-2018 by terminating the Petitioner from the employment along with a Demand Draft bearing No. 078387, dated 01-02-2018 for ₹ 40,000 as one time compensation/terminal benefit. The Petitioner was insisted to receive the said termination letter by the Respondent Management along with the Demand Draft. But, the Petitioner was however refused the termination letter and the Demand Draft unlawfully assailed by the Respondent management. But, with no option against irksome insistence of the Respondent management, the Petitioner received the same with objection as to no prejudice to her legal rights upon litigation lie on the cause of action for the present industrial dispute.

(x) The premediated decision of the Respondent Management for terminating her employment by ceasing the employment and loosing the *lieu* over

employment in an unjust and unlawful manner pertinently in *lieu* of effect of 12(3) settlement, dated 04-12-2017 between the Management and its Labour Union after long illegal closure and illegal termination of the employment of the employees. In precise, the act of the Respondent Management is sheer victimization to the Petitioner and her employment rights as per Industrial Disputes Act.

(xi) The letter, dated 18-05-2018, the Petitioner submitted an appropriate complaint as to the Industrial Dispute before the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry with the request for reinstatement to the employment with compensation of ₹ 7,00,000. The Respondent Management *vide* letter, dated 10-05-2019 replied to the Labour Officer (Conciliation) upon the Industrial Dispute of the Petitioner and through with stoutly refused the demands of the Petitioner and sought a failure report from the Conciliation Officer. Against which a reply by the Petitioner *vide* letter dated 05-08-2019 was submitted before the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.

(xii) The Labour Officer (Conciliation) *vide* his proceedings No.740/LO(C)/AIL/018, dated 16-03-2012 submitted the failure report upon the Industrial Dispute raised by the Petitioner *vide* her petition dated 18-05-2018. An illegal termination of the Petitioner's employment by the sole Respondent herein pertinently without conducting even a domestic enquiry against the Petitioner who infact was regular employee working since 26-03-2002 *i.e.*, for more that 15 years. The Petitioner was drawn her wage around ₹ 6,500 after deducting the admissible contribution *viz.*, the ESI, the P.F *etc.*, before the effect of the 12(3) settlement, dated 04-12-2017. Whereas, ₹ 10,500 was fixed as her wage in *lieu* of the 12(3) settlement, dated 04-12-2017 apart from other allowances admissible under the Respondent Management from time to time. Hence, the claim for the reinstatement.

3. Respondent Company was set *ex parte* on 11-08-2022.

#### 4. Point for determination:

Whether the Petitioner Workman is entitled for the prayer of reinstatement and compensation of ₹ 7,00,000 with 24% interest as prayed in the claim Petition?

#### 5. On the Point:

Respondent Counsel reported no instruction on 20-07-2022. Court notice ordered and served on the Respondent. Since service sufficient, Respondent

called but not appeared on 11-08-2022. Hence, Respondent Management set *ex parte*. Proof affidavit of the Petitioner filed and Ex.P1 to P13 marked.

6. Heard the Petitioner Counsel. Perused the case records and Ex.P1 to P13 marked on the side of the Petitioner.

7. The prayer in the Industrial Dispute is for reinstatement with back wages and other benefits along with the compensation of ₹ 7,00,000 with 24% interest over the illegal termination and non-employment of the Petitioner with cost. According to the Petitioner, in I.D. No. 21/2011 and I.D. No. 10/2020 in which the Petitioner was the party. Pending abovesaid IDs, Management and Labour Union entered into a settlement under section 12(3) on 04-12-2017 in the presence of Labour Commissioner. In view of the settlement, the Respondent Management agreed for compensation of ₹ 3,50,000 for cessation of employment of employees against the effect of illegal closure and the Management was not intended to reopen the factory for work. But, the employees who are willing to continue the service including the Petitioner was paid nothing. The discriminative classification for settlement of compensation among the employees who were on the same position but, refused the compensation among the employees was irrational and illogical.

8. According to the Petitioner, she opted to continue the service with Respondent Management and not in a position to join immediately due to her personal inconvenience. The same was informed to the Management *vide* her letter, dated 21-12-2017 requesting time for joining. The Respondent Management granted only 5 days time for reporting duty *vide* its letter, dated 28-12-2017. Again the Petitioner *vide* her letter, dated 02-01-2018 sought for one month time for joining the duty. The Respondent Management refused the request *vide* letter, dated 09-01-2018 but, given 5 days time for joining duty. Again the Petitioner sought one month time to the Respondent Management *vide* her, letter 02-02-2018. Whereas, the Respondent Management *vide* its letter dated 02-02-2018 had terminated the Petitioner from the employment with the Demand Draft, dated 01-02-2018 for ₹ 40,000 as one time compensation/terminal benefits. The Petitioner has received the same with objection. The above decision of the termination of the Respondent Management is pre-mediated decision and against the 12(3) settlement. The Petitioner had approached the Labour Officer (Conciliation). The Respondent Management filed their objections, dated 10-05-2019. The Labour Officer (Conciliation) submitted the failure report on 16-03-2019.

9. It is submitted by the Petitioner Counsel that ₹ 10,500 was fixed as her wage in *lieu* of the 12(3) settlement dated 04-12-2017 apart from other allowances admissible under the Respondent Management from time to time.

10. Though, the Petitioner has agreed to join the Respondent Management but, she could not make it immediately due to her personal inconvenience. This version of the Petitioner has not been rebutted by the Respondent Management. When Respondent Management had disbursed ₹ 3,50,000 to the employees those who quit the job as per the settlement u/s. 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, in absence of any rebuttal pleadings, evidence and proof, this Court is not in a position to reject the claim of the Petitioner. But, at the same time, this Court is not inclined to order the relief as such claimed by the Petitioner in this claim petition in toto. On considering the facts and circumstances, this Court finds that before the closure, the Petitioner had received ₹ 6,500 as wage after all deductions. Hence, taking into account as per the 12(3) settlement though the Petitioner has agreed to join the Respondent Management but, she could not make it immediately due to her personal inconvenience, it is just and proper that if, ordered the same compensation of ₹ 3,50,000 which was paid by the Respondent Management to the employees those who quit the job, be paid to the Petitioner herein with accrued interest. Since ₹ 40,000 already paid to the Petitioner Workman, the same shall be deducted from the said compensation. Thus, the point for determination is decided accordingly.

11. In the result, the Reference is justified and the Industrial Dispute is partly allowed with the effect that the Respondent Management is hereby directed to pay ₹ 3,10,000 (Rupees Three Lakhs and Ten Thousand only) which was paid by the Respondent Management to the employees those who quit the job, to the Petitioner herein with accrued interest at the rate of 9% from the date of their job cessation *i.e.* 02-02-2018 till the date of this Award and thereafter 6% from the date of the Award till the date of realization. Other Claims claimed by the Petitioner in the claim petition is rejected. No costs.

Dictated to the Stenographer, directly typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 12th day of December, 2022.

**V. SOFANA DEVI,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-  
Labour Court, Puducherry.

*List of petitioner's witness:*

PW1 — 14-09-2022 Tmt. Vani

*List of petitioner's exhibits:*

- Ex.P1 — 21-12-2017 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.
- Ex.P2 — 28-12-2017 Photocopy of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner.
- Ex.P3 — 02-01-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.
- Ex.P4 — 09-01-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner.
- Ex.P5 — 02-02-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.
- Ex.P6 — 02-02-2018 Photocopy of the Letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner intimating job cessation.
- Ex.P7 — 02-02-2018 Photocopy of the Demand Draft No. 078387 (Axis Bank).
- Ex.P8 — 18.05.2018 Original document of the Industrial Dispute complaint of the Petitioner before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P9 — 10-05-2019 Original document of the reply of Respondent Management before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P10 — 05-08-2019 Photocopy of the rejoinder of the Petitioner before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P11 — 16-03-2020 Failure Report by Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P12 — 15-07-2020 Notification of the Labour Department, Government of Puducherry.
- Ex.P13 — 04-12-2017 Photocopy of the 12(3) Settlement.

*List of respondent's witnesses:* Nil

*List of Respondents's Exhibits:* Nil

**V. SOFANA DEVI,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-  
Labour Court, Puducherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY  
**DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND  
ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS (PERSONNEL WING)**  
(G.O. Ms. No. 18, Puducherry, dated 15th March 2023)

NOTIFICATION

The Lieutenant-Governor, Puducherry, is pleased to appoint Thiru Dwij Goel, who has been allotted to the Pondicherry Civil Service by Department of Personnel and Training, Government of India on the basis of the results of Civil Services Examination, 2021, to the Grade-II of Pondicherry Civil Service, with effect from the forenoon of 06-03-2023, subject to the conditions mentioned in the letter of Offer of Appointment, No.A.19011/19/2022/DPAR/SS-I(2) dated, 05-12-2022.

2. The Lieutenant-Governor, Puducherry, is also pleased to order that Thiru Dwij Goel will be a Probationer in the Pondicherry Civil Service (PCS) for a period of two years from the forenoon of 06-03-2023.

3. Thiru Dwij Goel, PCS Probationer, shall take the Oath of Allegiance before the Deputy Secretary to Government (Establishment), Chief Secretariat, Puducherry and furnish Surety Bond in the prescribed proforma within ten days from the date of this Notification.

4. Thiru Dwij Goel, PCS Probationer, is directed to report before the District Collector, Puducherry, for field training in Revenue Department. He shall undergo Foundation Training Course in the Directorate of Training, Union Territory Civil Service (UTCS), Delhi, as and when the next batch commences for a period as may be prescribed by Union Territory Civil Service (UTCS). He shall also pass 'Tamil Course for Non-Tamil PCS Officers' conducted by the Puducherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture, Puducherry.

(By order of the Lieutenant-Governor)

**V. JAISANKAR,**  
Under Secretary to Government.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY  
**LABOUR DEPARTMENT**  
(G.O. Rt. No. 32/Lab./AIL/T/2023,  
Puducherry, dated 17th March 2023)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute has arisen between the management of M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru A. Ayyappan, over his non-employment along with back wages and other attendant benefits, in respect of the matter mentioned in the Annexure to this order;