Registered with the Registrar
of Newspapers for India
under No. 10410

Registered No. PY/44/2021-23

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 ஞ்	பிப்ரவரி மீ	28 ஏ
No.	9	Poudouchéry	Mardi	28	Février	2023 (9 Phalguna 1944)
No.		Puducherry	Tuesday	28th	February	2023

பொருளடக்கம் SOMMAIRES CONTENTS

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 02/AIL/Lab./T/2022, Puducherry, dated 5th January2023)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 05/2017, dated 26-10-2022 of the Industrial Tribunal-*cum*-Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of dispute between the management of M/s. Pondicherry Engineering College, Pillaichavady, Kalapet, Puducherry and Puducherry State Federation N.R. Congress Thozhilalar Sangam, Puducherry, over non-employment and regularisation of 6 Scavengers (i) Tmt. K. Indirani, (ii) T. Muniammale, (iii) S. Indirani, (iv) E. Jagatha, (v) M. Anjalai and (vi) G. Maragadam.

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 23-5-1991, 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.

Wednesday, the 26th day of October, 2022

I.D. (L) No. 05/2017
CNR. No. PYPY06-000110-2017

The President/Secretary,
Pondicherry State Federation
N.R Congress Thozhilalar Sangam,
No. 61/2, 1st Floor,
Aswini Hospital Opposite,
Vazhudhavur Road, Koundanpalayam,
Puducherry. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Principal,
Pondicherry Engineering College,
Pillaichavady, Kalapet,
Puducherry. . . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute coming on 03-10-2022 before me for final hearing in the presence of Thiruvalargal K. Velmurugn & P. Preethi, Counsels for the Petitioner and Thiru. M. Nakkeeran, Government Pleader, Counsel for the Respondent, Respondent remaining absent set *ex-parte,* upon hearing Petitioner side and perusing the case records, this Court delivered the following:

AWARD

This Industrial Dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 21/AIL/Lab./T/2017, dated 24-02-2017 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.,*

(a) Whether the dispute, raised by Puducherry State Federation N.R. Congress Thozhilalar Sangam, Puducherry, against the management of M/s. Pondicherry Engineering College, Pillaichavady, Kalapet, Puducherry, over non-employment and regularisation of 6 Scavengers (i) K. Indirani, (ii) T. Muniammalle, (iii) S. Indirani, (iv) E. Jagatha, (v) M. Anjalai and (vi) G. Maragadam are justified or not? If justified, what relief they are 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 Union is a registered Trade Union having RTU No. 1803/2013 and is functioning for the welfare and upliftment of the working class in the Puducherry region. As such the Petitioner Union had raised the above industrial dispute on behalf of 6 workmen namely; (i) K. Indirani, (ii) T. Muniammalle, (iii) S. Indirani, (iv) E. Jagatha, (v) M. Anjalai and (vi) G. Maragadam (hereinafter Petitioner workmen) claiming the relief of reinstatement and regularisation. The Respondent management is a prominent Engineering College in the Puducherry region for about 33 years imparting Engineering studies which is well known for its standard and quality. The 2568 students from Puducherry and other States, 2136 students are pursuing B.Tech. and 432 students are pursuing M.Tech. Degree. To cater the above students, the Respondent Management has employed 153 teaching staff, 286 non-teaching staff and 445 office staff including the Petitioner workmen raised the above industrial disputes.

(ii) The Petitioner workmen involved in the above industrial disputes was appointed by the Respondent management on 01-01-2002. After the appointment, all the Petitioner workmen were allotted work to clean the toilets used by the students and staffs, cleaning the roads inside

the Respondent campus, cleaning the hostel rooms, *etc.,* The right from the date of their appointment all the Petitioner workmen had discharged their duties in a sincere and honest manner to the Respondent management without any blackmark whatsoever. The Petitioner workmen used to work all around the day and used to avail leave only on rare occasions and thus, they worked for more than 300 days in every year with the Respondent Management. Though there are regular permanent vacant posts in the Respondent Management so as to absorb the Petitioner workmen, the Respondent Management did not chosen to regularise them for the reasons best known to it.

(iii) Though the Respondent management had utilized the services of the Petitioner workmen for about 15 years, it did not conferred the permanent status upon the Petitioner workmen and also the Respondent has not provided the monetary welfare benefits which is enjoyed by the other permanent workmen.Though the Petitioner workmen have made several requests upon the Respondent management to regularise them, the Respondent management has not acted upon. The Respondent management employed the Petitioner workmen with very minimal wages mentioned below:

Period	Rate of daily wage
01-01-2002 to 31-12-2005	₹ 65
01-01-2006 to 31-12-2009	₹ 80
01-01-2010 to 31-12-2013	₹ 125
01-01-2014 onwards	₹ 200

(iv) The Respondent management *vide* letters, dated 28-09-2015 and 14-10-2015 regularised the services of some 25 workmen who were joined in the service during the year 2010 only. The act of the Respondent management in regularising the 25 workmen who were joined during the year 2010 and neglecting to regularise the 6 Petitioner workmen who joined on 01-01-2002 *i.e.,* having 8 years seniority is arbitrary, illegal and unlawful. The 2 daily rated watchman by name (i) V. Vetriselvam and (ii) N. Ravi who were appointed in 2005 by PCDWDAP Limited, has been regularised from 25-08-2015 *vide* order, dated 10-09-2015 which is also an Government Autonomous Body. They had given representation, dated 25-01-2016 to the Respondent requesting regularisation of their services but, no steps has been taken in furtherance thereof. Similarly, the Petitioner workmen had given representations, dated 15-02-2016 to the Chief Secretary, Secretary to Government (Higher and Technical Education), Chairman of Pondicherry Engineering College and to the Respondent requesting regularisation of their services. The Petitioner painfully submits that none of the said competent authorities took any steps to regularise the 6 Petitioner workmen.

(v) The aggrieved by the act of the Respondent request of management, the Petitioner workmen raised industrial dispute before the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry, *vide* representation, dated 17-03-2016 claiming regularisation of the 6 workmen in the services of the Respondent management. However, on 01-06-2016 during the pendency of the conciliation proceedings, the Respondent management arbitrarily terminated the services of the 6 workmen without following any procedures of law which tantamount to unfair labour practice. The Respondent has not given any single pie to the Petitioner workmen towards compensation and for appreciation of the services rendered by them for all these 15 years. The Respondent management has filed its reply, dated 06-07-2016 to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry, stating false and vexatious reasons. When they informed about the illegal termination to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry, the said authority advised the Respondent management to reinstate the 6 Petitioner workmen in their respective services. However, the Respondent refused to take the advice of the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry and told that only if, the 6 Petitioner workmen unconditionally withdraw the industrial dispute and also waive their rights for regularisation, they will be given employment in the Respondent management. Since, the Respondent management did not chosen for amicable settlement, the above dispute ended in failure and hence, the said industrial disputes was referred to this Court for adjudication.

(vi) The Petitioner submits that the act of the Respondent management is not regularising the 6 Petitioner workmen after utilizing their 15 years of hard work and service is against the principle of estoppels. Similarly, the act of the Respondent management in showing disparity in regularising the services of the workmen joined in service during the year 2010 and neglecting the legitimate request of the Petitioner workmen who were having 8 years seniority is unconstitutional and against the Fundamental right of equality enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The act of the Respondent management, the Petitioner workmen are suffering great hardship and severe mental agony. Till date all the Petitioner workmen are unemployed and they are starving to their day to day needs because of the illegal termination of the Respondent management. Thus, in light of the above propositions of law and also various judicial-pronouncements in this regard the termination of the Petitioner workmen is arbitrary, *null and void,* illegal, invalid, improper and hence, liable to be set aside.

(vii) Hence, the Petitioner prays to reinstate the 6 Petitioner workmen in their original employment with full back wages, continuity in service and all other attendant benefits from 01-06-2016 onwards till date of reinstatement; to direct the Respondent management to regularise the

services of the 6 Petitioner workmen with retrospective effect and to give them the back wages, continuity of services and all attendant benefits thereof; to award compensation of ₹10,00,000 for the mental agony, hardship suffered by the Petitioner due to the illegal termination by the Respondent with interest at 18% from the date of petition till date of realisation.

3. Brief averments made in the counter:

The Respondent is not the person to be used or to take decisions relating to creation of posts and to regulate recruitments. The Pondicherry Engineering College established and maintained and its administration and management are being carried on by the Engineering College (Pondicherry) Society (Registered No. 40/84), registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as the Society). The said Society and its Institutions are managed by a Governing Body.

(ii) Rule 3 of the Rules and Regulations of the Engineering College (hereinafter referred to as the Rules) prescribe the Authorities of the Society. Rule 3 stated that-

"3. Authorities of Society:- The following shall be the authorities of the Society, namely:-

(a) The General Body;

(b) The Governing Body and the Executive Committee; and

(c) Such other Committees as have been appointed under these present and other authorities as may be appointed by the General Body from time to time specifying their duties, powers and functions".

(iii) The composition of the Governing Body is called the Board of Governors, Engineering College (Pondicherry) Society (hereinafter referred to as the Board) and rule 11 (2) (n) of the rules empowers the Board only to create posts and to regulate recruitment of staff of the Society and its Institutions. A Standing Committee, "Staff (Non-Teaching) Selection Committee" has also been constituted by the Board for the purpose of selection of non-teaching staff. Rule 11 (2) (u) prescribed that the Board shall be the person to sue and defend all legal proceedings on behalf of the Society.

(iv) As prescribed by the rules, the Society only can be deemed to be the employer as the definition clause, 2(g), of the Service Bye-laws defines that "Employee" means a person in the service of the Society in any post.

(v) Therefore, the Pondicherry Engineering College, an Institution established and maintained by the Society, cannot be deemed to be the employer for the purpose of deciding the industrial dispute referred to this Court. The Institution, as such, has not power to decide upon the creation or regularisation of posts. Therefore, the present reference of the alleged dispute, without making the Society as a party through its proper representative, is not maintainable.

(vi) It is denied that the 6 persons claiming regularisation by the Petitioner were appointed by the Respondent management on 01-01-2002 or on any other date as claimed by the Petitioner. The said 6 persons were engaged by a labour contractor between 2000 and 2004 for road cleaning works and subsequently, on their offer, they were engaged for daily worker at the rate of ₹ 85 per day to do cleaning work for three days in a week, for a maximum number of 13 days in a month and were paid through hand receipts/vouchers. From March 2006 till November 2009, there was a break in service and in the same month itself they were again engaged for the same number of days at the same rate of work till June 2010. Subsequently the rate were raised to ₹ 125 per day and number of days were increased to 22 days till August 2012. From September 2012 the rates were raised to ₹ 200 per day. However, it is denied that there are regular, permanent vacant posts to absorb the said 6 persons. Till date there are no sanctioned posts as against their engagement to consider regularisation.

(vii) The creation and sanctioning of posts are issues and policy matters within the purview and powers of the Society and the Respondent herein has no power to create posts or to regularise the 6 persons claiming through the Petitioner. The said persons cannot be said or deemed to be holders of a post, since; a regular appointment could be made only by making appointment consistent with the requirements of the Society and by the Society only.

(viii) The Petitioner Union's claim for regularisation of its members merely because they have been engaged for a considerable period of time cannot be granted in light of several decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which had consistently held that casual employment terminates when the same is discontinued, and merely because a temporary or casual worker has been engaged beyond the period of his employment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent, if, the original appointment was not in terms of the process envisaged by the relevant rules.

(ix) The Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to hold that "The employees before us were engaged on daily payment in the Department concerned on a rate that was made known to them. There is no case that the wage agreed upon was not being paid. Those who are

working on daily payment formed a class by themselves, they cannot claim that they are discriminated as against those who have been regularly recruited on the basis of the relevant rules. No right can be founded on an employment on daily wages to claim that such employee should be treated on a par with a regularly recruited candidate, and made permanent in employment, even assuming that the principle could be invoked for claiming equal wages for equal work. There is no fundamental right in those who have been employed on daily wages or temporarily or on contractual basis, to claim that they have a right to be absorbed in service. As has been held by this Court, they cannot be said to be holders of a post, since, a regular appointment could be made only by making appointments consistent with the requirements of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. The right to be treated equally with the other employees employed on daily wages, cannot be extended to a claim for equal treatment with those who were regularly employed. That would be treating unequals. It cannot also be relied on to claim a right to be absorbed in service even though they have never been selected in terms of the relevant Recruitment Rules".

(x) The Respondent denies the averment that all the six persons claiming regularisation belong to Scheduled Castes. To the best of the knowledge and information of the Respondent three of them only are from Scheduled Castes and one from MBC and the remaining two are from Scheduled Castes from Tamil Nadu. Even assuming that posts are created as against the engagement of the 6 persons the Recruitment Rules cannot be framed in a manner to accommodate them with reference to age and minimum educational qualifications.

(xi) The demand for regularisation is not sustainable for the following reasons: (a) No appointment order was issued as against any existing post specifying the terms and conditions of service, (b) The six persons were engaged by the Estate Officer when contingency required, (c) There are no regular posts to accommodate the said six persons, (d) They have no educational qualification to accommodate them in any Group 'C' post. Engagement in Group 'D' posts are against the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission and involve policy decisions. (e) The existing ratio of non-teaching staff as against the teaching staff is being questioned by the AICTE, (f) As the Institution is owned by the Society and funded by the Government of Puducherry, independent decisions cannot be taken by the Institution in matters having financial implications and the Government itself had to be made a party to the proceedings under the circumstances, (g) There exists a ban on direct recruitment in Government of Puducherry *vide* G.O. No. G. 24011/1/2017-18/Fl(B), dated 2nd January 2018 issued by, Finance Department, Government of Puducherry highlighting the Economy measures and rationalisation of expenditure to face the emerging financial challenges.

(xii) The Petitioner cannot seek relief citing appointments not related or equated to the six persons whose cause is espoused by the Petitioner.

(xiii) It is denied that the six persons represented by the Petitioner were illegally terminated. Their services, were no longer required by the Society and therefore, their engagement was discontinued which cannot be deemed to be termination. There was no discharge or dismissal consequent to any misconduct and assuming that it was discharge it was a simple discharge only requiring no redressal. It is denied that the Respondent has done anything which can be termed arbitrary, illegal or improper to treat the disengagement of the six persons as *null and void.*

(xiv) There was no original employment to grant the relief of reinstatement as prayed for by the Petitioner. As already submitted the question of regularisation does not arise in the case of the six persons represented by the Petitioner Union. The Respondent is not liable to pay any compensation and much less the sum of ₹ 10,00,000 or any part of it as claimed by the Petitioner and as the dispute is not adversarial there can be no costs also.

(xv) The Petitioner's claim, has no merit and the dispute itself has been raised speculatively aiming for unjust enrichment which is evident from the claim of ₹ l0,00,000. As already submitted, the reference of the dispute against the Respondent herein is improper and no enforceable Award can be passed as against the Respondent herein. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the petition.

5. Points for consideration:

Whether the Puducherry State Federation N.R. Congress Thozhilalar Sangam, Puducherry is entitled for non-employment and regularisation of 6 scavengers (i) K. Indirani, (ii) T. Muniammalle, (iii) S. Indirani, (iv) E. Jagatha, (v) M. Anjalai and (vi) G. Maragadam?

6. On point:

PW1 Mr. Mohandas examined Ex. Pl to Ex. Pll marked. Since Respondent did not come forward to cross-examine PW1, the Respondent was set *ex parte* on 24-02-2022.

7. On the Point:

The relief sought in the claim petition is to reinstate the six Petitioner-workmen in their original employment with full back wages, continuity of service and other attendant benefits from 01-06-2016 onwards till the date of reinstatement; to regularise the services of the said six Petitioner workmen with retrospective effect and to give them the back wages, continuity of services and all attendant benefits; to award ₹ 10,00,000 with interest @ 18% from the date of petition till the date of realisation as compensation for the mental agony, hardship suffered by the Petitioners due to illegal termination.

8. As per the claim Statement, the Petitioner workmen were appointed by Respondent management on 01-01-2002 for doing the work of cleaning the toilets, roads inside the Respondent campus, hostel rooms *etc*., The Petitioner workmen had discharged their duties to the satisfaction of the Respondent management without any black marks. Petitioner workmen worked for more than 300 days in every year. Though there are regular permanent vacant post in the Respondent management to observe the Petitioner workmen, the Respondent management did not chosen to regularise them. But, the Respondent management *vide* letters, dated 28-09-2015 and 14-10-2015 regularised the services of some 25 workmen who joined during 2010 and Respondent management neglected to regularise the six Petitioner workmen, which is illegal and unlawful.

9. Despite the representations given by the Petitioner workmen requesting regularisation of their services, there were no responses. Aggrieved by that, Petitioner workmen raised industrial dispute before Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry *vide* representation dated 07-03-2016. Pending Conciliation proceedings the Respondent management arbitrarily terminated the services of the six Petitioner-workmen on 01-06-2016 without following any procedures which amounts unfair labour practices. When the illegal termination was informed to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry, he advised the Respondent management to reinstate the six Petitioner-workmen. For which the Respondent management informed the Conciliation Authority that if, the six Petitioner workmen unconditionally withdraw the ID and they waive their rights for regularisation only, they will be given employment in the Respondent management. Hence, it was referred to this Court.

10. On the side of the Petitioner workmen, representation given to Labour Officer (Conciliation), dated 17-03-2016 with the prayer to regularise the six Petitioner workmen retrospectively from 31-12-2006 with financial benefits *etc.,* filed and marked as Ex. Pl. The reply to Ex. Pl submitted by the Respondent management, dated 06-07-2016 to the Labour Officer (Conciliation) filed and marked as Ex. P2. On perusal of Ex. P2, I could able to find that the Respondent management has listed out the reasons for not accepting the workmen's claim for regularisation. The counter reply given by the Petitioner Union on Ex. P2 to the Labour Officer (Conciliation) on 24-08-2016 was filed and marked as Ex. P3. The Petitioner Union has elaborately given its reply that the reasons mentioned by the management in Ex.P2 for not giving regularisation as improper and false. Further, in Ex. P3 Petitioner Union has stated at page 3 of Ex.P3 that during the hearing before Labour Officer (Conciliation) held on 23-05-2016, both the Petitioner Union and the Respondent management were present and participated in the Conciliation talks. In that meeting, the representatives of management had stated that since the Principal of the College was out of station, the reply regarding the claim for regularisation of the said six Petitioner workmen will be duly given after getting instructions from the Principal and thereby requested to adjourn the matter to 20-06-2016. That being so, meanwhile all of a sudden the six Petitioner workmen were terminated on 01-06-2016 illegally. The learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner would also argue that when the Conciliation proceedings were pending before Labour Officer (Conciliation), having participated and sought time for filing their reply, the Management in the mean time before giving a reply, had terminated all the six Petitioner workmen for whom the Conciliation proceedings were pending.

11. Ex. P4 is the Failure report of the Labour Officer (Conciliation), dated 06-01-2014. On perusal of Ex. P4 also, I could find that the six Petitioner workmen were terminated pending Conciliation proceedings. The said fact has been stated by the Labour Officer, (Conciliation) in his Failure report. Ex. P4 at page 6 unnumbered 1st and 2nd para. Further, at page 30 of the Ex. P4 it is mentioned that,

"During the course of Conciliation proceedings held on various dates, the management prays further time for discussion with higher officials and to report.

Further course of proceedings on 01-09-2016, on 16-09-2016 and 26-09-2016, the Management also stated that as the direction regarding continuous service of 6 workers working as daily rated workers pending before the Law Department for vetting and also prays short time to report to the Conciliation Authority.

During the course of Conciliation proceedings held on 03-10-2016, workers/Petitioner insisted that to take immediate action in this regard. The management stated that as the matter is pending for the direction before the Law Department, they are unable to reply before the Conciliation Authority regarding the continuous service of the 6 workers. The Union not accepted the above statement of the management and also stated that the management follow the delay tactics and hence, insist to failure this issue and to take further steps for adjudication. As an amicable settlement could not be reached before this forum, the matter is ended in failure".

12. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted the two case laws during his arguments to substantiate his contention which are as follows:

(i) CDJ 2018 SC-463– the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India-in Chennai Port Trust *Vs.* The Chennai Post Trust Industrial Employees Canteen Workers Welfare Association and Others held on dated 27-04-2018 that,

"15-(a) The canteen has been there since the inception of the appellant's factory, (b) The workmen have been employed for long years and despite a change of contractors, the workers have continued to be employed in the canteen, (d) The wages of the canteen workers have to be reimbursed by the appellant, (e) The supervision and control on the canteen is exercised by the appellant through its authorised officer, as can be seen from the various clauses of the contract between the appellant and the contractor, (f) The contractor is nothing but an agent or a manager of the appellant, who works completely under the supervision, control and directions of the appellant, (g) The workmen have the protection of continuous employment in the establishment.

(ii) The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India- in Civil Appeal No.4443 of 2021, held that, *"the point that arises for consideration in these appeals is whether the daily wagers/Respondents are entitled for regularisation of their services.*

By an order, dated 17-10-2011, persons similarly situated to the Respondents were absorbed by being given the benefit of regularisation. The Division Bench of the High Court has taken note of the discriminatory approach of the University in conferring the benefit of regularisation to some and not to all those daily wagers who are eligible. There is no error in the Judgment of the High Court which warrants interference by this Court. Eligible daily wagers in accordance with the schemes have been eagerly awaiting regularisation as per the judgment of this Court in Gujarat Agricultural University's Case (Supra). The right of the Respondents for regularisation has been correctly recognised by the High Court."

13. In addition to the above referred documents, the Petitioner Union has also filed and relied Ex. P5- photocopy of the extract of attendance of Petitioner workmen for the period 01-04-2016 to 30-04-2016; Ex.P6-Photocopy of the attendance of Petitioner workmen for the month of April, 2016; Ex.P7-photocopy of the appointment letter of Mr. Anbarasan as helper on contract basis in the Respondent establishment; Ex.P8-photocopy of office order issued by the Respondent regularising Mr. Anbarasan; Ex.P9- photocopy of the memorandum issued by the Respondent regarding regularisation of consolidated staffs; Ex.Pl0-photocopy of the RTI Application submitted by the Petitioner to the Respondent; Ex.Pl1-RTI reply given by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

14. Though the Respondent management filed their counter refuting the claims of the Petitioner, they did not come forward to cross-examine the Petitioner witness PW1. .Respondent remained absent and set *ex parte* on 24-02-2022. From the exhibits *i.e.,* P1 to P11 and as discussed above, I hold that Petitioner Union has categorically proved its case by way of adducing oral evidence and by marking documentary evidences. The case of the Petitioner Union has not been rebutted by the Management Company and it remained absent. Therefore, from all angles this Court decides the point for determination in favour of the Petitioner Union to the effect that Respondent management is directed to reinstatement the six Petitioner workmen and thus, the industrial dispute referred is justified.

15. In the result, the Reference is justified. The industrial dispute raised by the Petitioner Union is partly allowed to the effect that the Respondent management is hereby directed to reinstate the six Petitioner-workmen in their original employment with full back wages, continuity of service and other attendant benefits from 01-06-2016 onwards till the date of reinstatement; to regularise the services of the said six Petitioner workmen with retrospective effect and to give them the back wages, continuity of services and all attendant benefits. No costs.

Dictated to the Stenographer, directly typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this 26th day of October, 2022.

V. Sofana Devi,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-*cum*
Labour Court,
Puducherry.

List of petitioner's witness:

PW.1 —20-08-2019 Mohandas

List of petitioner's exhibits:

Ex.P1 — 17-01-2016—Photocopy of the representation given by the Petitioner to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.

Ex.P2 — 06-07-2016—Photocopy of the reply submitted by the Respondent to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.

Ex.P3 — 24-08-2016—Photocopy of the representation given by the Petitioner to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.

Ex.P4 — 06-07-2017—Photocopy of the failure report submitted by the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.

Ex.P5 — April 16—Photocopy of the extract of attendance of the Petitioner workmen for the period 01.04.2016 to 30-04-2016.

Ex.P6 — April 16—Photocopy of the attendance of the Petitioner workmen for the month of April, 2016.

Ex.P7 — 12-08-2010—Photocopy of the Appointment Letter of Mr. Anbarasan as helper on contract basis in the Respondent establishment.

Ex.P8 — 14-10-2015—Photocopy of office order issued by the Respondent regularising Mr. Anbarasan.

Ex.P9 — 28-09-2015—Photocopy of the memorandum issued by the Respondent regarding regularisation of consolidated staffs.

Ex.P10 — 06-12-2017—Photocopy of the RTI Application submitted by the Petitioner to the Respondent.

Ex.P11 — 21-01-2018—RTI reply given by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

List of respondent's witnesses: *Nil*

List of respondent's exhibits : *Nil*

V. Sofana Devi,
Presiding Officer (FAC),
Industrial Tribunal-*cum*-
Labour Court, Puducherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

CHIEF SECRETARIAT (FISHERIES)

(*G.O. Ms. No. 6/Fy.,*
Puducherry, dated 06th February 2023)

NOTIFICATION

Tmt. J. Mary Santhi, Deputy Director of Fisheries (Inland), Department of Fisheries and Fishermen Welfare, Puducherry, is admitted into retirement with effect from the afternoon of 28-02-2023 on attaining the age of superannuation.

(By order)

S. Murugesan,
Under Secretary to Government,
(Fisheries).

புதுச்சேரி அரசு

இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் மற்றும் வக்ஃபு துறை

(அரசு ஆணை பலவகை எண் 56/இசநி./கோ.4/2023,
புதுச்சேரி, நாள் 2023 ஹேவி பிப்ரவரி மீ 10 வ)

ஆணை

புதுச்சேரி மாநிலம், புதுச்சேரி வட்டாரம், காந்தி வீதி, ஸ்ரீ வேதபுரீஸ்வரர், ஸ்ரீ வரதராஜப்பெருமாள் தேவஸ்தானத்திற்கு, அலவலக குறிப்பாணை எண் 5248/இசநி./கோ.5/2004/520, நாள் 13-12-2021-ன் மூலம் நியமனம் செய்யப்பட்ட திரு. B. சரவணன், உதவியாளர், தலைமைச் செயலகம் அவர்கள் மேற்கண்ட தேவஸ்தானத்தை நிர்வகிக்கும்படி பணிக்கப்பட்டார். அவரின் பணிக்காலம் ஓராண்டு முடிவடைந்த நிலையில், மேற்படி தேவஸ்தானத்தை செம்மையாக நிர்வகிக்கும் பொருட்டு வேறு ஓர் புதிய நிர்வாக அதிகாரியை நியமிக்க வேண்டியது அவசியமானதாகக் கருதப்படுகிறது.

2. எனவே, 1972-ஆம் ஆண்டு, புதுச்சேரி இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் சட்டம் 9(1)-ஆம் பிரிவின்கீழ் வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ள அதிகாரங்களைச் செலுத்தி, புதுச்சேரி, திருவள்ளுவர் அரசு பெண்கள் மேல்நிலைப்பள்ளியில் விரிவுரையாளராக பணிபுரியும் திரு. கி. ஸ்ரீநிவாசன், த/பெ. கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி என்பவரை, புதுச்சேரி, காந்தி வீதி, ஸ்ரீ வேதபுரீஸ்வரர், ஸ்ரீ வரதராஜப் பெருமாள் தேவஸ்தானத்திற்கு, நிர்வாக அதிகாரியாக அரசால் இதன் மூலம் நியமனம் செய்யப்படுகிறார்.

3. திரு. கி. ஸ்ரீநிவாசன் அவர்கள், புதுச்சேரி, இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் சட்டம், 1972-ன்படி, புதுச்சேரி, காந்தி வீதி, ஸ்ரீ வேதபுரீஸ்வரர், ஸ்ரீ வரதராஜப்பெருமாள் தேவஸ்தானத்தின் கௌரவ நிர்வாக அதிகாரிக்கு உண்டான பொறுப்புக்களை உடனடியாக பேற்றுக்கொண்டு, அரசுத் துறையில் தான் வகிக்கும்

பதவிக்குக் கூடுதலாகவும், 1972-ஆம் ஆண்டு, புதுச்சேரி, இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் சட்டம் மற்றும் அதன்கீழ் உருவாக்கப்பட்டுள்ள விதிகளுக்கு இணங்கவும், தேவஸ்தானத்தின் நிர்வாகத்தைக் கவனித்து வரவேண்டும்.

(துணைநிலை ஆளுநரின் ஆணைப்படி)

அ. சிவசங்கரன்,
அரசு சார்புச் செயலர் (கோயில்கள்).

புதுச்சேரி அரசு

இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் மற்றும் வக்ஃபு துறை

(அரசு ஆணை பலவகை எண் 57/இசநி./கோ.3/2023, புதுச்சேரி, நாள் 2023 ஹ்ப பிப்ரவரி மீ 10 வ)

ஆணை

புதுச்சேரி மாநிலம், புதுச்சேரி வட்டாரம், உழவர்கரை கொம்யூன், முத்திரையர்பாளையம், அருள்மிகு ஸ்ரீ செங்கழுநீரம்மன் தேவஸ்தானத்திற்கு, அரசு ஆணை பலவகை எண் 17/இசநி./கோ. 3/2017, நாள் 26-07-2017-ன் மூலம் ஓர் அறங்காவலர் வாரியம் அமைக்கப்பட்டது. இவ்வறங்காவலர் வாரியத்தின் பதவிக்காலம் முடிவடைந்துவிட்டது.

2. மேலும், தேவஸ்தானத்தை செம்மையாக நிர்வகிக்கும் பொருட்டு வேறு ஓர் புதிய அறங்காவலர் வாரியம் அமைத்து நிர்வகிப்பது இன்றியமையாதது என்று அரசால் கருதப்படுகிறது.

3. எனவே, 1972-ஆம் ஆண்டு, புதுச்சேரி இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் சட்டம் 4(1)-ஆம் பிரிவின் கீழ் வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ள அதிகாரங்களைச் செலுத்தி, புதுச்சேரி மாநிலம், புதுச்சேரி வட்டாரம், உழவர்கரை கொம்யூன், முத்திரையர்பாளையம், அருள்மிகு ஸ்ரீ செங்கழுநீரம்மன் தேவஸ்தானத்திற்கு, பின்வரும் ஐந்து நபர்களைக் கொண்ட ஓர் புதிய அறங்காவலர் வாரியத்தை அரசு உடனடியாக அமைக்கிறது:-

திருவாளர்கள்:

(1) ரா. ராதாகிருஷ்ணன், . . தலைவர்
த/பெ. ராஜமாணிக்கம்,
எண் 56, பஜனை மடம் வீதி,
கோவிந்தன்பேட்டை,
முத்திரையர்பாளையம்,
புதுச்சேரி.

(2) க. மஞ்சினி, . . துணைத் தலைவர்
த/பெ. கண்ணியப்பன்,
எண் 27, மாரியம்மன் கோயில் வீதி,
முத்திரையர்பாளையம்,
புதுச்சேரி.

(3) க. குமாரவேலு, . . செயலாளர்
த/பெ. கணபதி,
எண் 11 , கோவிந்தன் கோயில் வீதி,
கோவிந்தன்பேட்டை,
முத்திரையர்பாளையம்,
புதுச்சேரி.

(4) விஜயராகவன், . . பொருளாளர்
த/பெ. கிருஷ்ணன்,
எண் 4/5, ஜீவா வீதி (விரிவு) கிழக்கு,
முத்திரையர்பாளையம்,
புதுச்சேரி.

(5) திருமதி. கா. சரஸ்வதி, . . உறுப்பினர்
க/பெ. கார்த்திகேயன்,
எண் 10, ஜீவா வீதி (விரிவு) கிழக்கு,
முத்திரையர்பாளையம்,
புதுச்சேரி.

4. புதிய அறங்காவலர் வாரியம் தேவஸ்தானத்தின் பொறுப்புகளை அதன் அசையும், அசையாச் சொத்துக்கள் மற்றும் இதர ஆவணங்களுடன் முந்தைய அறங்காவலர் வாரியத்திடமிருந்து உடனடியாக பெற்றுக் கொள்ளுமாறு அறிவுறுத்தப்படுகிறது.

5. 1972-ஆம் ஆண்டு, புதுச்சேரி, இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் சட்டம் மற்றும் அதன்கீழ் இயற்றப்பட்ட விதிகளுக்குட்பட்டு, அறங்காவலர் வாரியத்தினர் திருக்கோயிலை நிர்வகிக்கக் கடமைப்பட்டது ஆகும். மேலும், நிர்வாகத்தினர் கடைபிடிக்க வேண்டிய சில முக்கிய பணிகள் கீழே கொடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ளன.

(i) கோயிலுக்குச் சொந்தமான காலி மனைகள், கோயிலை சுற்றியுள்ள இடங்கள் மற்றும் கோயில் குளங்களை தூர்வாருதல்/சுத்தம் செய்தல் இவைகளை உள்ளடக்கிய ஒரு ஆண்டறிக்கையினை சமர்ப்பித்தல் வேண்டும்.

(ii) நன்கொடையாளர்களால் மேற்கொள்ளப்படும் பணிகளை நிறைவேற்ற முழு மூச்சுடன் ஈடுபடுதல் வேண்டும்.

(iii) ஒவ்வொரு வருடத்திற்குமான உத்தேச வரவு, செலவு கணக்குகள் மார்ச் மாத காலத்திற்குள் சமர்ப்பித்தல் வேண்டும்.

(iv) கோயில் வரவு, செலவு கணக்குகளை முறையாக பராமரித்தல் மற்றும் அக்கணக்கினை ஆண்டுக்கு ஒருமுறை கணக்கு மற்றும் கருவூலகத் துறை மூலம் தணிக்கை செய்தலை உறுதி செய்யவேண்டும்.

(v) அறங்காவலர் வாரியத்தினர் கடமைகளையும், பொறுப்புகளையும் இந்து சமய ஆலய விதிகள், 1975-ன் பிரிவு 5-இன் படி செவ்வனே நிறைவேற்றுதல் வேண்டும்.

6. அறங்காவலர் வாரியத்தின் பதவிக்காலம் இவ்வரசாணை பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்ட தேதியிலிருந்து மூன்று ஆண்டுகள் ஆகும். இதற்கிடையில் அரசு வாரியத்தை நீக்கினால் தவிர அல்லது தகுதி இழக்கச் செய்தால் தவிர அல்லது வாரிய உறுப்பினர்கள் தங்களது பதவிகளை இராஜினாமா செய்யுங்கால் அவர்களின் இராஜினாமாவை அரசு ஏற்றுக்கொண்டால் தவிர, புதிய வாரியம்/வாரிய உறுப்பினர்கள் பதவியில் இருப்பதாகக் கருதப்படும்.

(துணைநிலை ஆளுநரின் ஆணைப்படி)

அ. சிவசங்கரன்,
அரசு சார்புச் செயலர் (கோயில்கள்).

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT

(G.O. Ms. No. 2/2023, Puducherry, dated 17th February 2023)

NOTIFICATION

In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 7 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transperancy in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, the Government of Puducherry hereby constitutes an independent multi-disciplinary "Expert Group" with the following Members to evaluate the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) report submitted by the Social Impact Assessment Team in connection with acquisition of lands at 25-Kovilpathu Revenue Village, Karaikal District, for the public purpose *viz.,* "Construction of GAIL Office Building-*cum*-Regional Gas Management Centre (RGMC) Control Room for GAIL, Karaikal". The Expert Group shall make its recommendations within a period of two months from the date of its constitution:-

Sl. No.	Name and designation	Department/ Organisation
(1)	(2)	(3)
	Thiruvalargal:	
1	Dr. Prof. S. Sundaravarathan, M.Sc. (Agri), Ph.D., (Microbiology), (To function as the Chairperson for the Expert Group).	Registrar, National Institute of Technology, Karaikal.
2	Dr. V. Arulmurugan, Assistant Professor.	Department of Commerce, School of Management, Pondicherry University, Karaikal Campus, Karaikal.
3	S. Subash, Commissioner in-charge.	Karaikal Municipality, Karaikal.
4	R. Arunasalam, Commissioner.	Thirunallar Commune Panchayat, Thirunallar, Karaikal.
5	R. Manivannan, Coordinator.	AVVAI NGO, No. 8, Puthupalayam Street, Polagam, T.R. Pattinam, Karaikal.
6	K. Maheswari, Coordinator.	Karaikal Rehabilitation Centre, Valluvar Street, Thalatheru, Karaikal.
7	C. Mayavel, Member-Secretary.	Town and Country Planning Department, Karaikal.

(By order of the Lieutenant-Governor)

Dr. **T. ARUN,** I.A.S.,
Secretary to Government (Revenue).

———

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS (PERSONNEL WING)

(*G.O. Ms. No. 10, Puducherry, dated 17th February 2023*)

NOTIFICATION

On attaining the age of superannuation, Thiru V. Mokankumar, Pondicherry Civil Service (CDC) Officer, presently working as Block Development Officer (Villianur Block), Puducherry, shall retire from service on the afternoon of 28-02-2023.

(By order)

V. JAISANKAR,
Under Secretary to Government.

உழவர்கரை நகராட்சி, புதுச்சேரி

கோப்பு எண் 51-17/உ.பொ.II/இ.பொ(3)/உ.ந./2022-23.

இறுதி அறிவிப்பு

[1973-ஆம் ஆண்டின் புதுச்சேரி நகராட்சிகள் சட்டத்தின் பிரிவு எண் 256 (1)-ன் படி]

இதனால் அறிவிப்பது யாதெனில், கீழ்க்கண்ட அட்டவணையில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ள பொது வீதிகளாக இல்லாமல் இருந்து வரும் வீதிகள் பொது வீதிகளாக அறிவிக்கப்படவுள்ளது எனவும், அது குறித்து ஆட்சேபனை ஏதேனும் இருப்பின், அது குறித்தான அறிவிப்பு வெளியிடப்பட்ட 30 நாட்களுக்குள் தெரிவிக்குமாறு, கடந்த 13-10-2022 அன்று "தினத்தந்தி" தமிழ் நாளேட்டில் வெளியிடப்பட்டது.

மேற்கூறிய 30 தினங்களுக்குள் இரண்டு ஆட்சேபனைகள் மட்டும் பெறப்பட்டது. இவைகளை பரிசீலனை செய்த பிறகு, இந்நகராட்சியானது கீழ்க்கண்ட அட்டவணையில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ள வீதிகளை பொது வீதிகளாக இன்று முதல் அறிவிக்கப்படுகிறது.

வரிசை எண்	வருவாய் கிராமம்/ உட்கிராமம்	உரிமையாளர்களின் பெயர் (ஆவணப்படி)	மறு அளவை எண்	பட்டா எண்	அளவு			குறிப்பு (திசைகள்)
					நீளம்	அகலம்	பரப்பளவு	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					மீ.	மீ.	ச.மீ.	
	20. காலாப்பட்டு வருவாய் கிராமம்							
	மூகாம்பிகை நகர், பெரிய காலாப்பட்டு							
		திரு./திருமதி/செல்வி :						
1	பிரதானசாலை	1. வேணு நாயுடு, த/பெ. செங்கல்வராய நாயுடு; 2. N. கிரஹலெட்சுமி, க/பெ. பாண்டியன்.	188/1	572	18.00 கிழக்கு 16.20 மேற்கு	6.10 வடக்கு 6.10 தெற்கு	105	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.
		1. ராமானுஜ நாயுடு, த/பெ. கிருஷ்ணசாமி நாயுடு.	84/16	515	58.20 கிழக்கு 58.00 மேற்கு	6.10 வடக்கு 6.10 தெற்கு	354	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.
2	குறுக்குத் தெரு	1. தெய்வசிகாமணி (மைனர்), கார்டியன்/பெ. மங்கலட்சுமி (தாயார்).	84/8	285	56.30 வடக்கு	6.10 கிழக்கு	343	கிழக்கு-மேற்கு சாலை.
		1. பாலகிருஷ்ண கவுண்டர், த/பெ. மஞ்சினி கவுண்டர்.	84/9	334	56.20 தெற்கு	6.10 மேற்கு		
	ஜெயபால் நகர், பெரியக்காலாப்பட்டு							
1	பிரதான சாலை	1. கந்தசாமி, த/பெ. மஞ்சினி கவுண்டர்; 2. பாலமுருகன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 3. விஸ்வநாத கவுண்டர், த/பெ. கந்தசாமி; 4. ரவிச்சந்திரன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 5. சிவஞானம், த/பெ. சாம்பசிவ கவுண்டர்.	85/1E	555	80.00 வடக்கு 79.50 தெற்கு	6.10 கிழக்கு 6.10 மேற்கு	486	கிழக்கு-மேற்கு சாலை.
		1. கோவிந்தன், த/பெ. சீனுவாச கவுண்டர்; 2. ரவிச்சந்திரன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 3. பெருமாள், த/பெ. நாராயணசாமி; 4. பாலமுருகன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 5. ராகவன், த/பெ. முனிய கவுண்டர்; 6. நாராயணசாமி, த/பெ. லட்சுமண கவுண்டர்; 7. லட்சுமணன், த/பெ. அரிகிருஷ்ண கவுண்டர்.	85/4	398	18.30 மேற்கு 18.30 கிழக்கு	6.10 வடக்கு 6.10 தெற்கு	112	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					மீ.	மீ.	ச.மீ.	
20. காலாப்பட்டு வருவாய் கிராமம்								
ஜெயபால் நகர், பெரியக்காலாப்பட்டு								
		திரு./திருமதி/செல்வி :						
		1. கோவிந்தன், த/பெ. சீனுவாச கவுண்டர்; 2. ரவிச்சந்திரன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 3. பெருமாள், த/பெ. நாராயணசாமி; 4. பாலமுருகன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 5. ராகவன், த/பெ. முனிய கவுண்டர்; 6. நாராயணசாமி, த/பெ. லட்சுமண கவுண்டர்; 7. லட்சுமணன், த/பெ. அரிக்கிருஷ்ண கவுண்டர்.	85/4	398	135.30 வடக்கு 135.20 தெற்கு	6.10 கிழக்கு 6.10 மேற்கு	825	கிழக்கு-மேற்கு சாலை.
		1. பாலமுருகன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 2. பெருமாள், த/பெ. நாராயணசாமி கவுண்டர்; 3. ரவிச்சந்திரன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை.	85/7	637				
2	இணைப்பு சாலை	1. கந்தசாமி, த/பெ. மஞ்சினி கவுண்டர்; 2. பாலமுருகன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 3. விஸ்வநாத கவுண்டர், த/பெ. கந்தசாமி; 4. ரவிச்சந்திரன், த/பெ. ஏழுமலை; 5. சிவஞானம், த/பெ. சாம்பசிவ கவுண்டர்.	85/1E	555	65.00 கிழக்கு 65.20 மேற்கு	6.10 வடக்கு 6.10 தெற்கு	397	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.
		1. கோபாலு கவுண்டர், த/பெ. ரத்தின கவுண்டர்; 2. சிங்காரவேலு, த/பெ. மாணிக்க கவுண்டர்; 3. ஜெயலெட்சுமி, க/பெ. முனிசாமி கவுண்டர்.	85/2	346				
		1. பாவாடை கவுண்டர், த/பெ. சின்ன குழந்தை; 1. நடசே செட்டியார், த/பெ. பொன்னுசாமி செட்டியார்	84/17A 84/19	333 299	72.40 வடக்கு 73.70 தெற்கு	6.10 கிழக்கு 5.90 மேற்கு	438	கிழக்கு-மேற்கு சாலை.
அம்மன் நகர், கணபதிசெட்டிக்குளம்								
1	பிரதான சாலை	1. கோவிந்தசாமி செட்டியார், த/பெ. செல்லப்பெருமாள்; 2. கண்ணு கிராமணி, த/பெ. சின்னதம்பி கிராமணி.	136/6A/1	451	145.00 கிழக்கு 144.30 மேற்கு	5.80 வடக்கு 5.50 தெற்கு	817	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					மீ.	மீ.	ச.மீ.	
		திரு./திருமதி/செல்வி :						
		1. ஏழுமலை, த/பெ. முருகேசன்.	119/2	49	24.60 கிழக்கு 24.50 மேற்கு	5.50 வடக்கு 5.50 தெற்கு	135	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.
2	முதல் குறுக்குத் தெரு	1. வெங்கடேசன், த/பெ. பார்த்தசாரதி; 2. பாலகிருஷ்ணன், த/பெ. பார்த்தசாரதி.	119/3	695	34.80 வடக்கு 34.70 தெற்கு	5.50 கிழக்கு 5.50 மேற்கு	191	கிழக்கு-மேற்கு சாலை.
3	இரண்டாவது குறுக்குத் தெரு	1. வெங்கடேசன், த/பெ. பார்த்தசாரதி; 2. பாலகிருஷ்ணன், த/பெ. பார்த்தசாரதி.	119/3	695	19.80 கிழக்கு 19.80 மேற்கு	6.10 வடக்கு 6.10 தெற்கு	120.78	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.
					26.10	5.60	146.16	வடக்கு-தெற்கு சாலை.

இவ்வர் நகர், 2023 (ரூப பிப்ரவரி மீ 21 வ.

A. சுரேஷ்ராஜ்,
ஆணையர்.

PUDUCHERRY AGRO SERVICE AND INDUSTRIES CORPORATION LIMITED (PASIC)

(A GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY UNDERTAKING)

Ref. No. 6-315/PASIC/Estt./P.F/05-06

Puducherry, the 30th January 2023.

NOTICE

Under rule 16(1) of Pasic Staff Service Rules, 1988

It has been reported by the undersigned that Thiru C. Gnanendra Raj Sharma, (Employee Code No. 2269). Watchman (unauthorised absence from duty) has not joined duty, after expiry of leave on 01-07-2016 and thus, he failed to maintain integrity and devotion to duty in violation of rule 3 of PASIC (Conduct) Rules, 1988.

As his residential address is not available for communication, final notice could not be sent to him.

The undersigned feels that the Corporation cannot run smoothly with such employee as the same would be detrimental to the interest and functioning of the Corporation.

Therefore, in pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 16 of PASIC Staff Service Rules, 1988, the undersigned hereby giving notice to Thiru Gnanendra Raj Sharma, (Code No. 2269), Watchman (unauthorized absence from duty) that his services shall stand terminated with effect from the date of his unauthorized absence from duty *vize* namely 01-07-2016.

K. SIVASHANMUGAM,
Managing Director.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Latha @ Gnanalatha, wife of Tamilmaran, residing at No. 47 and 48, 7th Main Road, Mahaveer Nagar, Karuvadikuppam, Puducherry-605 008, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm on oath and as follows:

That I state my name has been mentioned as 'Gnanalatha' in my Elector's Photo Identity Card No. IPD0142497, issued by the Election Commission of India, Aadhaar Card No. XXXX XXXX 6090, issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India, PAN Card No. AKFPG4890B, issued by the Income-tax Department, Government of India.

I state that my name has been mentioned as 'Latha @ Gnanalatha' in the Certificate of Identity C.M.P.No. 310/2016, dated 08-12-2016, issued by the Judicial Department, Government of Puducherry.

I state that I am also called and known in my residence by the home-calling name as 'லதா' and the same has been mentioned in my Family Ration Card No. 126626.

I hereby declare that my all the abovesaid names *viz.,* 'லதா' and ' Gnanalatha' and 'Latha @ Gnanalatha' are referring one and the same person that is myself only.

I state that I shall use to write and sign my name as 'Latha @ Gnanalatha' in all records, deeds and writings and in all proceedings, dealings and transactions, and hereinafter, I shall also use the same name for all transactions whatsoever.

The above deposition is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and nothing material has been concealed thereon.

Solemnly and sincerely affirmed, and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 09th day of February 2023.

562229 **GNANALATHA.**

———

AFFIDAVIT

I, Gokulji, presently third gender, previously son of Chandrasekaran, and Abaranji, present by residing at the house situated at Kamaraj Street, Abishegapakkam, Puducherry-605 007, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm to whomsoever it may concern as follows:

That I am the deponent herein. I state that I was born as a male, as such in my Birth Certificate under Registration No. M/2000/07092, my name has been mentioned as 'Gokulji'.

In my Secondary School Leaving Certificate under SL.SEC 5299255 and in my School Transfer Certificate under Admission No. 6055, my name has been mentioned as 'Gokulji.C'.

In my Elector's Photo Identity Card No. SQY0111906, my name has been mentioned as 'Gokulji (கோகுல்ஜி)'.

In my Family Ration Card under No. 463577, my name has been mentioned as 'கோகுல்ஜி'.

Further, I state that later I have transformed into third gender through proper surgery and became a transgender, as such in the Sex Reassignment Surgery (male to female) Certificate, issued by the Mahatma Gandhi Medical College and Research Institute, Puducherry dated 06-03-2021, my male name has been mentioned as 'Gokulji' and female name has been mentioned as 'Megathi Ammu'.

In my Aadhaar Card under No. XXXX XXXX 2184, my name has been mentioned as 'C. Megathi (ச. மெகத்தி)'.

In my PAN Card under No. HANPM4438J, my name has been mentioned as 'C. Megathi'.

Therefore, I do hereby declare that all the abovesaid names are referred, identified and relate to one and the same person that is me, the deponent herein. I state that henceforth, I shall be known and identified only by the name 'C. Megathi (ச. மெகத்தி)' for all purposes.

I state that what are all stated in the above paragraphs is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, belief and information.

Solemnly and sincerely affirmed, and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 17th day of February 2023.

562241 **C. GOKULJI.**

———

AFFIDAVIT

I, Marie Angesundari Selvanadin @ Marie Ange Sundari Selvanadin @ Marie Ange Selvanadin, (Aadhaar No. XXXX XXXX 9691) (DoB: 08-12-1978), daughter of Marie Joseph Selvanadin, residing at No. 14, Labour Donnais Street, Puducherry-605 001, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm and state on oath as follows:

That I am the deponent herein and as such I am well acquainted with the facts of the affidavit deposed hereunder.

I state that in my Aadhaar Card, dated 13-01-2012, bearing No. XXXX XXXX 9691, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India, my name has been entered as 'Marie Angesundari Selvanadin'.

Further, I state that in my Elector's Photo Identity Card, dated 06-04-2016, bearing No. JMF0072470, issued by Electoral Registration Officer, Rajbhavan Assembly Constituency and in my PAN Card, bearing No. CXIPS9826H, issued by Income-tax Department, my name has been entered as 'Marie Ange Sundari Selvanadin'.

Further, I state that in my School Bio-data, issued by Vice-Principal, Jeevanandam Government Higher Secondary School, Karamanikuppam, Puducherry, my name has been entered as ' Marie Ange Selvanadin'.

Further, I state that in my Family Ration Card, bearing No. 142527, issued by Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry, my name has been entered as 'மரி ஆஞ்சசுந்தரி செல்வநாதன்'.

Further, I declare that the aforesaid names 'Marie Angesundari Selvanadin, Marie Ange Sundari Selvanadin, Marie Ange Selvanadin' and 'மரி ஆஞ்சசுந்தரி செல்வநாதன்', are referred one and the same person that is myself only.

Further, I state that henceforth, I will be known and called as 'Marie Ange Selvanadin' as I am adopting the name entered in my School Bio-data.

I submit that the above contents are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, belief and information, and nothing has been concealed thereas.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 14th day of February 2023.

562242 **Marie Ange Selvanadin.**

———

AFFIDAVIT

I, K. Pajanivelou *alias* Pannirselvam, son of Krishnaraj, Christian, aged about 56 years, residing at No.6, Thillai Maistry Street, Puducherry, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm and state on oath as follows:

That my original name is 'K. Pajanivelou *alias* Pannirselvam' and the same is evidenced in my Birth Certificate issued by the Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry *vide* Registration No. PM/P/1967/2390, dated 20-06-1967.

I state that in my Aadhaar Card, my name is mentioned as 'K. Palanivelu *alias* Panneerselvam', issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India *vide* No. XXXX XXXX 0950, dated 23-04-2016, and the same name is evidenced in my daughter's Aadhaar Card issued by the Unique Identification Authority of India *vide* No. XXXX XXXX 6757, dated 27-11-2011.

I state that in the Family Ration Card, my name is mentioned as 'K Palanivelu *alias* Panneerselvam' [கி. பழனிவேலு (எ) பன்னீர்செல்வம்] and the same name is evidenced in my Family Ration Card issued by the Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry, *vide* No. 009084, dated 11-09-2020.

I state that in my daughter's Birth Certificate, my name is mentioned as 'K. Pazhanivel' issued by the Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry *vide* Registration No. PM/M/2007/1007, dated 19-07-2007.

Hence, I declare that all the abovesaid names *viz.,* 'K. Pajanivelou *alias* Pannirselvam', 'K. Palanivelu *alias* Panneerselvam', 'K Palanivelu *alias* Panneerselvam' [கி. பழனிவேலு (எ) பன்னீர்செல்வம்] and 'K. Pazhanivel' are denoting one and the same person, referring myself only.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 09th day of December 2022.

562243 **K. Pajanivelou alias Pannirselvam.**

———

AFFIDAVIT

I, Rosaline Maraia Rajakumari, daughter of Muthukumar @ Kumaresan, Hindu, aged about 23 years and residing at 454C, Anna Salai, Puducherry-605 001, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows:

That I was born on 21-07-2000 and my name is entered as 'Rosaline Maraia Rajakumari', the same is evidenced in my Birth Certificate, issued by the Registrar of Births and Deaths, Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry *vide* Registration No. PM/N/2000/000041.

Further, I state that in my Educational Certificates, in my Family Ration Card and in my Aadhaar Card, my name is entered as 'Rosaline Maraia Rajakumari'. Furthermore, I submit that since my name is too long, so, from today onwards, I propose to shortening my name and intent to change as 'Rosaline'.

Hence, I do hereby renounce/relinquish and abandon the use of my former name 'Rosaline Maraia Rajakumari' and in place thereof, I do hereby assume from this date the name 'Rosaline' and so that hereafter, I shall be called, known and distinguished not by my former name, but, assumed name of 'Rosaline' from 17-02-2023 onwards for the purpose of rectifying my name into my Family Ration Card and other official records.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 17th day of February 2023.

562244 **M. Rosaline Maraie Rajakumari.**

———

உறுதிமொழிப் பத்திரம்

2023-ஆம் ஆண்டு பிப்ரவரி மாதம் 20-ஆம் தேதி (20-02-2023) புதுச்சேரி 605 501, மண்ணாடிப்பட்டு கொம்யூன், திருக்கனூர், காந்தி நகர், மூன்றாவது குறுக்குத் தெரு, நெ.24 என்ற முகவரியில் வசிக்கும் அப்துல் ரசாக் அவர்களின் குமாரர் சபரிலா (Sabarla) ஆகிய நான் எழுதிக்கொடுக்கும் உறுதிமொழிப் பத்திரம் யாதெனில்,

எனது பெயர், மண்ணாடிப்பட்டு கொம்யூன் பஞ்சாயத்து பிறந்த பதிவு எண் 23/1977-ல் 'Sabarla' என்றும், எனது ஆதார் அடையாள அட்டை எண் XXXX XXXX 2113-ல் 'Sabeer' என்றும், எனது வாக்காளர் புகைப்பட அடையாள அட்டை எண். XDQ0123448-ல் 'Sabeer' என்றும், எனது

வருமான வரி (PAN Card) No. EFZPS9880A-ல் 'Sabeer' என்றும், எனது City Union Bank புதுச்சேரி, வங்கி கணக்கு எண் XXXXXXXXXX8530-ல் 'Sabeer.A' என்றும், எனது 5-ஆம் வகுப்பு படிப்பு படித்ததற்கான சான்றிதழ் எண். 1110-ல் 'அ.சபரிலா' என்றும் மற்றும் எனது குடும்ப உணவுப் பங்கீட்டு அட்டை எண் 193013-ல் 'சபீர்' என்றும் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது. மேற்கண்ட பெயர்கள் அனைத்தும் என்னுடைய பெயர்கள்தான், வெவ்வேறு நபர்களுடைய பெயர்கள் இல்லை என்று இதன்மூலம் உறுதியளிக்கின்றேன். இனிவரும் காலங்களில் நான் 'Sabeer (சபீர்)' என்றே அழைக்கப்படுவேன்.

மேற்படி, நான் அளித்த உறுதிமொழி சம்பந்தமாக பிற்காலத்தல் ஏதேனும் சிக்கல்கள் ஏற்பட்டால் எனது சொந்த செலவில் தீர்த்துக்கொள்வேன் என்றும், அரசு எடுக்கும் அனைத்து சட்டதிட்டங்களுக்கும் கட்டுப்படுவேன் என்றும் இதன்மூலம் உறுதியளிக்கின்றேன்.

புதுச்சேரி சான்றுரைஞர் முன்னிலையில் 2023-ஆம் ஆண்டு பிப்ரவரி மாதம் 20-ஆம் தேதி கையொப்பமிடப்பட்டது.

562245 **A. Sabarla.**

———

AFFIDAVIT

I, Muruganayagi, daughter of Palanisamy and wife of Ramachandiran, Indian inhabitant, aged 59 years and residing at the house situated at Main Road, 18th Cross, Krishna Nagar, Lawspet, Puducherry-605 008, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm, to whomsoever it may concern as follows:

That I am the deponent herein. I state that in my Record Sheet under Admission No. 345, my name has been mentioned as 'P. முருகநாயகி'.

In my Marriage Certificate under Serial Number of the Marriage 348 of the year 2013, my name has been mentioned as 'Muruganayaki'.

In my Elector's Photo Identity Card under No. IPD0098012 and in my Aadhaar Card issued by Unique Identification Authority of India under No. XXXX XXXX 8062, my name has been mentioned as 'Muruganayagi (முருகநாயகி)'.

In the Memorandum, issued by Mahatma Gandhi Postgraduate Institute and Dental Sciences, Puducherry under No. I-327/MGDCH/Estt./A1/97-98/1970 and in my Service Certificate under No. I-443/MGPGIDS/Estt-3/2022-23/195, my name has been mentioned as 'P.Muruganayaki'.

In the Identity Card, issued by Mahatma Gandhi Postgraduate Institute of Dental Sciences, Puducherry under Emp. ID.No. DC0250, my name has been mentioned as 'P.Muruganayagi'.

In the Family Ration Card, issued by Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry under No. 029806, my name has been mentioned as 'முருகநாயகி'.

Therefore, I do hereby declare that all the abovesaid names are referred, identified and relate to one and the same person, that is me, the deponent herein.

I state that hereinafter, I shall be known and identified only by the name with initial and spelling as 'R.Muruganayagi, (ரா.முருகநாயகி)' for all purposes.

I state that what are all stated in the above paragraphs is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, belief and information.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 23rd day of February 2023.

562251 **R. முருகநாயகி.**