



புதுச்சேரி மாநில அரசிதழ்

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

அதிகாரம் பெற்ற வெளியீடு

Publiée par Autorité

Published by Authority

எண்	} 5	புதுச்சேரி	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை	2023 ல்	சனவரி மீ	31 ௨
No.		Poudouchéry	Mardi	31	Janvier	2023 (11 Magha 1944)
No.		Puducherry	Tuesday	31st	January	2023

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

	பக்கம்		Page		Page
மாவட்ட நீதிபதியால் எடுக்கப்படும் .. மேல்நடவடிக்கைகள்	86	Procédure du Magistrate de District ..	86	Proceedings of the District Magistrate	86
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள் ..	96	Sentence arbitral du Travail ..	96	Award of the Labour Court ..	96
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் ..	101	Notifications du Gouvernement ..	101	Government Notifications ..	101
ஏல அறிவிப்பு ..	104	Vente publique ..	104	Auction notice ..	104
ஆபத்தான நிறுவனங்கள் ..	105	Etablissements dangereux ..	105	Dangerous Establishments ..	105
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் ..	106	Annonces ..	106	Announcements ..	106

CATALOGUE CONSOLIDATION STATEMENT

Sl.No.	Details of Articles	No of Articles	Total Pledge Amount Rs. P.	Approximate Value Rs. P.
1	Gold Jewels	217	4381050	5054720
2	Silver Jewels	58	99175	136843
3	Brasses Vessels	0	0	0
	TOTAL	275	4480225	5191563

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 175/AIL/Lab./T/2022,
Puducherry, dated 15th December 2022)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (T) No. 16/2018, dated 15-09-2022 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of dispute between the management of M/s. Strides Shasun Pharmaceuticals Limited, Puducherry and Shasun Chemical Staff Union, Ariyankuppam, Puducherry, over inclusion of apprentice period for counting the terminal benefits of Thiru. John Arthur.

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.

Thursday, the 15th day of September, 2022

I.D. (T) No. 16/2018
C.N.R. No. PYPY06-000070-2018

The President,
Shasun Chemical Staff Union,
No. 20, Cuddalore Road,
Ariyankuppam,
Puducherry-605 007.

Vs.

.. Petitioner

The General Manager,
M/s. Strides Shasun Pharmaceuticals Limited,
R.S.No. 33 & 34, Mathur Road,
Periyakalpet,
Puducherry-605 014. . . Respondent

This Industrial dispute coming on 06-09-2022 before me for final hearing in the presence of Tvl. S. Kalimuthu @ Lenin Durai, Counsel for the Petitioner and Tvl. L. Sathish, S. Velmurugan, E. Karthik and S. Sudarasanan, Counsel for the Respondent, upon hearing both sides, perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivered the following:

AWARD

This Industrial Dispute has been referred by the Government as per the G.O. Rt.No.118/AIL/LAB/T/2018, dated 31-07-2018 for adjudicating whether the industrial dispute raised by Shasun Chemical Staff Union, Ariyankuppam, Puducherry, against the Management of M/s. Strides Shasun Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Puducherry, over inclusion of apprentice period for counting the terminal benefits of Thiru. John Arthur 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 averments made in the claim Statement of the Petitioner are as follows:*

The petitioner Mr. Y. John Arthur had worked in the respondent company from 07-09-1991 to 11-02-2014 for 23 years 1 month and 4 days till his superannuation. The respondent company had given him the gratuity amount by calculating the service period of the petitioner as 20 years only, not for 23 years. For which the reason stated by the respondent company is that the petitioner employee had worked from 07-01-1991 to 30-09-1993 only as apprentice *i.e.*, 2 years 8 months and 23 days for the such apprentice

period the gratuity amount cannot be paid and thus, such period of his apprenticeship had not been included while calculating the gratuity. This calculation excluding the apprenticeship period amounts to an adverse impact on the calculation of petitioner/ employee's pension benefits, gratuity and other benefits. The refusal to include the apprentice period for the purpose of calculating the gratuity of the respondent company amounts to violation of Industrial Disputes Act. Under section 2 (s) of Industrial Disputes Act, apprentice also included under the category of workman. Hence, the respondent company is liable to pay ₹ 26,040 to the petitioner employee towards the gratuity for the period 07-01-1991 to 30-09-1993. Hence, the petition.

3. *The brief averments of the counter filed by the respondent are as follows:*

(i) Petitioner has raised a dispute against a company which does not exist. There was and is no company by name Strides Shasun Pharmaceuticals Limited and hence, no claim can be raised against such no-existent company.

(ii) The very cause title of the reference and claim petition is defective. One M/s. Shasun Pharmaceuticals Limited, was engaged in the business of manufacturing tablets and pharmaceutical products. The said company was merged with M/s. Strides Arcolab Limited by way of a scheme of Amalgamation by the order of Hon'ble High Court in company petition No.149/2015, dated 16-06-2015. The Amalgamated company was then named as M/s. Strides Shasun Limited and registered with Registrar of company *vide* certificate of incorporation, dated 18-11-2015. Again it was changed to M/s. Strides Pharma Science Limited and approved by Registrar of company *vide* certificate of incorporation dated 18-07-2018. Hence, the nomenclature of the respondent in the cause title of the petition is erroneous and needs to be amended.

(iii) The present ID is raised by petitioner's Union on behalf of one Mr. John Arthur seeking payment of gratuity from 07-01-1991 to 30-09-1993, *i.e.*, for 2 years 8 months and 23 days as apprentice in the erstwhile company of the respondent is not maintainable and liable to be rejected on following grounds:-

(a) All issues pertaining to payment of gratuity can be decided only by the special authority constituted under section 3 of Payment of Gratuity Act. Therefore, this Court has no inherent jurisdiction to decide this petition.

(b) Petitioner already filed a petition before Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity, Puducherry in PG.No.41/2017 raising the dispute of miscalculation. Having approach the competent authority for Payment of Gratuity, petitioner cannot approach this court also for computation of gratuity, whether for the same period or for some other period.

(c) Section 2(s) of Industrial Disputes Act, even an apprentice is worker. Even assuming petitioner was an apprentice from 07-01-1991, to the Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity in PG. No. 41/2017, the petition for computation of gratuity is still not entertainable. Petitioner cannot invoke section 2(s) of Industrial Disputes Act for making a claim of gratuity when section 2 (e) of Payment of Gratuity Act, which is a special Statute governing payment of gratuity defines the terms worker/employee.

(d) As per section 2(e) of Payment of Gratuity Act, for computing payment of gratuity, apprentice are excluded from definition of term worker/employee and apprentice is not eligible for gratuity and period served by the worker/employee as apprentice cannot be calculated for payment of gratuity.

(iv) Petitioner has no locus to raise the present ID and the Government of Puducherry ought not to have referred the dispute to this Court.

(v) Petitioner was employed and got superannuated on 10-02-2014 and he was paid gratuity by the erstwhile management to the tune of ₹ 1,73,608. It is absolutely false to claim the petitioner ever worked as on apprentice and hence, the petitioner has to prove the same. The petitioner has not claimed that he was worked as apprentice before the Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity in PG.No.41/2017, which confirms that claims are absolutely bogus. Hence, the claim of the petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. *The Points for consideration are:*

(1) Whether the Petitioner is entitled for inclusion of apprentice period for counting the terminal benefits of Thiru. John Arthur and whether he is entitled for ₹ 26,040 towards gratuity amount for the apprentice period from the respondent company as prayed in the claim ?

(2) To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

5. *On Points :*

On the Petitioner side, Mr. Y. John Arthur / the Petitioner himself was examined as PW1 and Exs. P1 and P2 were marked. On the respondent side,

Mr. Balamurugan, Assistant Manager, HR of the respondent company was examined as RW1 and Ex. R1 to Ex.R7 were marked.

6. *On the Points:*

Three points of defence that have been raised on the side of the respondent company are:-

(i) Petitioner has raised a dispute against a company which does not exist. The very cause title of the reference and claim petition is defective. The nomenclature of the respondent in the cause title of the petition is erroneous.

(ii) All issues pertaining to payment of gratuity can be decided only by the special authority constituted under section 3 of Payment of Gratuity Act. Therefore, this Court has no inherent jurisdiction to decide this petition. Petitioner already filed a petition before Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity, Puducherry in PG.No.41/2017 raising the dispute of miscalculation. Having approach the competent authority for Payment of Gratuity, petitioner cannot approach this Court also for computation of gratuity, whether for the same period or for some other period. The petitioner has not claimed that he was worked as apprentice before the Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity in PG.No.41/2017, which confirms that claims are absolutely bogus. Hence, the claim of the petition is liable to be dismissed.

(iii) Petitioner cannot invoke section 2(s) of Industrial Disputes Act for making a claim of gratuity when section 2 (e) of Payment of Gratuity Act, which is a special Statute governing payment of gratuity defines the terms worker/employee. As per section 2(e) of Payment of Gratuity Act, for computing payment of gratuity, apprentice are excluded from definition of term worker/employee and apprentice is not eligible for gratuity and period served by the worker / employee as apprentice cannot be calculated for payment of gratuity.

7. As far as the first defence is concerned, the ID raised as against the General Manager, M/s. Strides Shasun Pharmaceuticals Limited, Puducherry. According to the respondent company, one M/s. Shasun Pharmaceuticals Limited, was engaged in the business of manufacturing tablets and pharmaceutical products. The said company was merged with M/s. Strides Arcolab Limited by way of a scheme of Amalgamation by the order of Hon'ble High Court in company petition No.149/2015, dated 16-06-2015. The Amalgamated company was then named as M/s. Strides Shasun Limited and registered with Registrar of company *vide*

certificate of incorporation, dated 18-11-2015. Again it was changed to M/s. Strides Pharma Science Limited and approved by Registrar of company *vide* certificate of incorporation, dated 18-07-2018.

8. In support of his above contentions, the learned Counsel for the respondent referred his documents marked as EX.R4 to EX.R7 in order to substantiate the above defence. From these Exhibits, I shall see that since 18-07-2018, the company name is M/s. Strides Pharma Science Limited. This ID has been raised in the year 2018 under the reference, dated 30-07-2018 as against the General Manager, M/s. Strides Shasun Pharmaceuticals Limited, Puducherry, even much before that the said company was merged with M/s. Strides Arcolab Limited by way of a scheme of Amalgamation and the order of Hon'ble High Court in company petition No.149/2015, dated 16-06-2015 (EX.R4). The Amalgamated company was then named as M/s. Strides Shasun Limited and registered with Registrar of company *vide* certificate of incorporation, dated 18-11-2015. Again it was changed to M/s. Strides Pharma Science Limited and approved by Registrar of company *vide* certificate of incorporation, dated 18-07-2018. The above objection raised by the Respondent Management that despite the wrong in describing the cause title was indicated in the counter statement of the Respondent Management, the petitioner has not come forward to amend the nomenclature of the company in its Claim Petition as M/s. Strides Pharma Science Limited is sustainable.

9. According to the second and third defence are concerned, when the Petitioner already could file a petition before Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity, Puducherry in PG. No.41/2017 raising the dispute of miscalculation what prevented him to raise this present issue of claiming gratuity for the apprenticeship period in the same proceedings or before the same forum. Photocopy of the petition filed by Mr. John Arthur in PG.41/2017 before Controlling Authority under payment of Gratuity is marked as EX.R2, on respondent company side. It has not been denied by the petitioner at any occasions before this Court. To the contrary, he admitted while he was cross examined by the respondent Counsel that, he filed PG.41/2017 before Controlling Authority under payment of Gratuity for correct calculation of Gratuity. For the better appreciation, the relevant portion of PW1 oral evidence during his cross-examination is reproduced hereunder :

நான் தாக்கல் செய்துள்ள மதசாஆ.2-ஆன 07-01-1911 தேதியிட்ட Shasun drugs நிறுவன Appointment order for the post of Apprentice training என்ற உத்தரவில் 3-வது Clause-ல் எனக்கு மாதம் தோறும் ₹ 250 என்னுடைய apprentice காலக்கட்டத்திற்கு

stipend-ஆக வழங்கப்படும் என்றும் வேறு இதர Allowance-களோ, bonus அல்லது இதர மற்ற நிரந்தர தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு வழங்கக்கூடிய பண பலன்களோ வழங்கிட இயலாது என்று விரிவாக குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். மேற்படி நிரந்தரனைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொண்டதான், மேற்படி Shasun நிறுவனத்தில் apprentice training-ஆக சேர்ந்தேன் என்றால் சரிதான். மேற்படி மதசாஆ.2-டுடன், நான் மேற்படி நிறுவனத்தில் நிரந்தர தொழிலாளியாக செய்யப்பட்ட பின்னர், பிப்ரவரி 2014-ம் ஆண்டுக்குரிய மாதச் சம்பள பட்டியல் விபரத்தை இணைத்துள்ளேன் என்று சொன்னால் சரிதான். அந்த பட்டியலில் நான் பணியில் சேர்ந்த நாள் 01-10-1993 என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். நான் பணியில் இருந்த காலக்கட்டத்தில், என்னுடைய பணியில் சேர்ந்த தேதி 01-10-1993 என குறிப்பிடப்பட்டிருப்பது தவறு என ஆட்சேபித்து, எழுத்துமூலமான மனு ஏதேனும் கொடுத்தேனா என்றால் கிடையாது. எனக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட Bonus, EPF பிடித்தம் மற்றும் இதர சலுகைகள் 01-10-1993 தேதியை மையமாக வைத்து கணக்கிடப்பட்டு வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். Payment of Gratuity Authority-யிடம் எனக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட gratuity குறைத்து வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ளதாக கூறி ஒரு மனுவை தாக்கல் செய்து அது PG.No.41/2017 என்ற எண்ணில் நிறுவனத்தில் உள்ளது என்று சொன்னால் எனக்கு அந்த வழக்கின் stage பற்றி தெரியவில்லை. அந்த மனுவில் எனக்கு apprentice காலத்திற்குரிய gratuity வழங்கவில்லை என்று கேட்டுள்ளேனா என்றால் எனக்கு தெரியவில்லை. அந்த வழக்கு முதலில் தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்ட வழக்கு என்றும், அதன் பின்னரே இந்த தொழிற்நாவா எழுப்பப்பட்டது என்று சொன்னால் எனக்கு அது பற்றிய விபரத்தெரியவில்லை, Gratuity சம்மந்தமாக இரண்டு வெவ்வேறு இடங்களில் முறையீடு/மனு தாக்கல் செய்ய எனக்கு அருகதையில்லை என்றால் எனக்கு தெரியவில்லை. Gratuity சட்டத்தில் எவ்வாறு gratuity வழங்கப்பட வேண்டும் என அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் விபரங்கள் குறித்து எனக்கு தெரியாது. Payment of Gratuity Act-படி apprentice training காலக்கட்டத்திற்கு gratuity வழங்கிட இயலாது என்று சொன்னால் எனக்கு அது பற்றி தெரியாது.

10. It is argued by the learned Counsel for the respondent that having approach the competent authority for Payment of Gratuity, petitioner cannot approach this Court again for computation of gratuity, whether for the same period or for some other period. Further, he would contend that the petitioner has not claimed that he was worked as apprentice before the Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity in PG. No. 41/2017. Thus, he concluded his argument on this point that party can choose either of the forms but, not the two forums for the same relief and relied on a case-law on this aspect. In a case reported in CDJ 2014 SC 1238:

It is held in Page 4, Para 13 that: “..... in Chetak Construction Limited, vs. Om Prakash and others, 1998(3) R.C.R. (Civil) 644: (1998) 4 SCC 577, wherein, this Court has observed that a litigant cannot be permitted ‘choice’ of the ‘forum’ and every attempt at ‘forum-shopping’ must be crushed with a heavy hand. In Tamil Nadu Mercantile Bank shareholders Welfare

Association vs. S.C. Sekar and others, (2009)2 SCC 784, it has been observed that the Superior Courts of this Country must discourage forum-shopping”.

11. Further, the learned Counsel for the respondent would stress upon that all issues pertaining to payment of gratuity can be decided only by the special authority constituted under section 3 of Payment of Gratuity Act. Therefore, this Court has no inherent jurisdiction to decide this petition. He would also argue that the petitioner cannot invoke section 2(s) of Industrial Disputes Act for making a claim of gratuity when section 2 (e) of Payment of Gratuity Act, which is a special statute governing payment of gratuity defines the terms worker / employee.

12. Section 2(e) of Payment of Gratuity Act ‘employee’ means any person (other than an apprentice) employed on wages, in any establishment, factory, mine, oilfield, plantation, port, railway company or shop, to do any skilled, semi-skilled, or unskilled, manual, supervisory, technical or clerical work, whether the terms of such employment are express or implied, and whether or not such person is employed in a managerial or administrative capacity, but, does not include any such person who holds a post under the Central Government or a State Government and is governed by any other Act or by any rules providing for payment of gratuity. As per section 2(e) of Payment of Gratuity Act, for computing payment of gratuity, apprentice are excluded from definition of term worker/employee and apprentice is not eligible for gratuity and period served by the worker/employee as apprentice cannot be calculated for payment of gratuity. He also relied upon the following case-laws on this aspect.

(i) In a case reported in CDJ 2006 APHC 683 :

It is held in Page 5 that, “the payment of Gratuity Act is a self contained Code. It provides for deciding the liability of an employer, to pay gratuity, and the manner of calculation thereof. Section 8 of the Act prescribes the procedure for recovery of amount payable as gratuity”. It reads as under:

A Section 8 : Recovery of Gratuity :- If, the amount of gratuity payable under this Act is not paid by the employer, within the prescribed time, to the person entitled thereto, the controlling authority shall, on an application made to it in this behalf by the aggrieved person, issue a certificate for that amount to the Collector who shall recover the same, together with compound interest thereon (at such rate as the Central Government may, by notification, specify) from the date of expiry of the prescribed time, as arrears of land revenue and pay the same to the person entitled thereto.

Provided that the controlling authority shall, before issuing a certificate under this section, give the employer a reasonable opportunity of showing cause against the issue of such certificate.

Provided further that the amount of interest payable under this section shall, in no case exceed the amount of gratuity payable under this Act.

This provision does not admit of, any doubt that the only method to recover the amount of gratuity is, to approach the controlling authority, section 14 of that Act gives an overriding effect upon the provisions contained in any other enactment. In *State of Punjab vs. Labour Court, Jalandhar AIR 1979 SC 1981* the recovered by initiating proceedings under section 33 C (2) of the Act.

(ii) In a case reported in CDJ 1979 SC 037:

It is held in Page 3 that, “..... The third contention raised by the appellant is that the employee respondents were not entitled to apply under section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for payment of the gratuity, and should have, if at all, applied under the provisions of the Payment of Gratuity Act. It is urged that the Payment of Gratuity Act is a self-contained code incorporating all the essential provisions relating to payment of gratuity which can be claimed under that Act, and its provisions impliedly exclude recourse to any other statute for that purpose. The contention has force and must be accepted”.

(iii) In a Order passed in W.P. (MD) No. 3490/2019:

It is held in Page 3 - Para 4 that : “This Court is of the considered view that for the facts and circumstances of the instant case, a period of two years from 27-11-1983, *i.e.*, up to 26-11-1985 will have to be treated as an apprentice period for which, the third respondent is not entitled for any gratuity amount in terms of section 2(e) of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972. Accordingly, the proportionate gratuity amount for the apprentice period from 27-11-1983 to 26-11-1985 will have to be reduced from and out of the gratuity amount awarded by the second respondent in its order, dated 09-11-2017 in P.G.No.68/2016. In so far as, the other findings of the Authorities below are concerned, this Court does not find any infirmity in the same and are hereby confirmed”.

13. From the above, it is made clear that under the provisions of Payment of Gratuity Act, there is an express exclusion that employee means any person other

than an apprentice. Payment of Gratuity Act is a special enactment provides for a scheme for the payment of gratuity to employees engaged in factories, mines, oilfields, plantations, ports, railway companies, shops or other establishments and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto. The Petitioner has also approached the Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity in PG.No.41/2017 for alleged miscalculation of his gratuity for the period of his regular employment, *i.e.*, 01-10-1993 to till his superannuation, dated 10-02-2014. No reason stated by the petitioner about why he did not seek for the payment of gratuity amount for his apprentice period before the Controlling Authority, Payment of Gratuity in PG.No. 41/2017. From the documents produced by the petitioner himself such as Photocopy of the appointment order for the post of Apprentice Trainee issued by M/s. Shasun Drugs, Puducherry and photocopy of salary slip of the petitioner for the month of February 2014 (EX.P2), Photocopy of the petition filed by Mr. John Arthur in PG.41/2017 before Controlling Authority under payment of Gratuity (EXR2) and from oral admissions of the petitioner as PW1 before this Court, it is clearly proved that he was joined the company Shasun Drugs on 07-01-1991 as an apprentice *vide* appointment order EX.P2 and his date of joining as regular employee was only on 01-10-1993 and same has been reflected in his salary slip for the month of February 2014, marked along with his Apprentice Appointment Order EX.P2. Therefore, he was joined and worked only as Apprentice from 07-01-1991 to 30-09-1993 for 2 years 8 months 23 days. Under the Payment of Gratuity Act, apprentice is excluded for payment of gratuity. Further, when there is a special enactment under which an authority is appointed for deciding the issue on gratuity and anything incidental thereto and the petitioner having approached same authority for alleged miscalculation, but, not made any claim regarding the gratuity for his apprentice period before such authority which has been specially empowered to decide the issue under the special statute, is highly fatal to his claim. Without making such claim before the said authority and subsequently claiming the same before this Labour Court is not maintainable.

14. From the above discussions and findings, the point for consideration is decided as against the Petitioner employee and consequently he is not entitled for any relief as sought for in the claim petition.

In the result, the reference is unjustified and the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief. The industrial dispute as raised by the Petitioner is dismissed. There is no order as to costs.

Dictated to the Stenographer, directly typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 15th day of September, 2022.

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

List of petitioner witness:

PW1 — 13-02-2020 Mr. John Arthur

List of petitioner side exhibits:

Ex.P1 — 13-02-2020 Form - F issued in favour of representative by name Mr. Durai Arumugam.

Ex.P2 — 07-01-1991 Photocopy of the appointment order for the post of Apprentice Trainee issued by M/s. Shasun Drugs, Puducherry and photocopy of salary slip of the petitioner for the month of February 2014.

List of respondent's witness:

Rw1 — 06-09-2021 Mr. Balamurugan

List of respondent side exhibits:

Ex.R1 — 21-08-2021 Letter of Authorization authorizing Mr. Balamurugan to depose evidence in the present ID on behalf of respondent company.

Ex.R2 — — Photocopy of the petition filed by Mr. John Arthur in PG.41/2017 before Controlling Authority under payment of Gratuity.

Ex.R3 — — Photocopy of the counter statement filed by the respondent in PG.41/2017.

Ex.R4 — 16-06-2015 Photocopy of the Orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in company petition No.149/2015.

Ex.R5 — 18-11-2015 Photocopy of the certificate of Incorporation of M/s. Strides Shasun Limited issued by Registrar of Companies, Puducherry.

Ex.R6 — 18-07-2018 Photocopy of the name of M/s. Strides Shasun Limited was changed to M/s. Strides Pharma Science Limited and it was approved by Registrar of Companies *vide* certificate of Incorporation.

Ex.R7 — 25-03-2017 Photocopy of the Certificate of Incorporation of M/s. Strides Pharma Science Limited to Solara Active Pharma Science Limited.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR (SECONDARY EDUCATION), KARAIKAL

No. 0601/DDSE/KKL/E3(Exam)/2022/528.

Karaikal, dated 06th January 2023.

NOTIFICATION

It is hereby notified that the following candidates have lost their original Higher Secondary Course (I-Year and II-Year)/S.S.L.C. Examination Mark Certificates beyond the scope of recovery, the necessary steps have been taken to issue duplicate certificates. If, anyone finds the original Mark Certificate(s), it/they may be sent to the Secretary, State Board of School Examinations (Sec.), College Road, Chennai – 600 006 for cancellation, as it is/they are no longer valid.