



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

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	2024	சனவரி மீ	23
No.	4 Poudouchéry	Mardi	23	Janvier	2024 (3 Magha 1945)
No.	Puducherry	Tuesday	23rd	January	2024

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

	பக்கம்		Page		Page
மாவட்ட நீதிபதியால் எடுக்கப்படும் .. மேல்நடவடிக்கைகள்	62	Procédure du Magistrat de District ..	62	Proceedings of the District Magistrate	62
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள் ..	76	Sentence arbitral du Travail .. de Tribunal.	76	Award of the Labour Court ..	76
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் ..	85	Notifications du Gouvernement ..	85	Government Notifications ..	85
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் ..	90	Annonces ..	90	Announcements ..	90

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR-CUM-DISTRICT MAGISTRATE

No. 9531/DRDM/C3/PAWN/2023/7045.

Puducherry, dated 13th December 2024.

ORDER

- Present* : E. Vallavan, I.A.S.,
District Collector-cum-District Magistrate.
- Sub.* : DRDM – The Puducherry Pawn Brokers Act, 1966 – Public Auction – Sale of unredeemed and time barred jewels – Permission Order – Issued – Reg.
- Ref.* : 1. Application of Thiru Suresh Kumar, Pawn Banker (L.No. 380), No. 62-A, Thalavaveerasamy Street, Muthialpet, Puducherry.
 2. Consent letter of Thiru B. Karthikeyan, 39A/32, Srinivasan Street, Thirupathiripuliyur, Cuddalore Taluk – Authorized Auctioneer, dated 07-09-2023.
 3. Report of the Deputy Collector (Revenue) North, Puducherry *vide* Letter No. 6005/DC(R)N/A7/PB/2023/3067, dated 06-12-2023.

Whereas, an application, dated 07-09-2023 was received from Thiru Suresh Kumar, Pawn Banker (L.No. 380), No. 62-A, Thalavaveerasamy Street, Muthialpet, Puducherry, a licensed Pawn Broker requesting permission of the District Magistrate to sell unredeemed and time barred articles in public auction;

2. And whereas, the list of unredeemed time barred articles submitted by the Pawn Broker was forwarded to the Deputy Collector (Revenue) North, Puducherry, for causing physical verification of the articles and ascertain that they remain unredeemed after the time allowed for redemption;

3. And whereas, the Deputy Collector (Revenue) North, Puducherry, has furnished the report *vide* reference (3) cited, stating that the Tahsildar, Taluk Office, Puducherry, had conducted physical verification of the articles that are unredeemed and time barred pledged with Thiru Suresh Kumar, Pawn Banker (L.No. 380), No. 62-A, Thalavaveerasamy Street, Muthialpet, Puducherry and reported that the articles mentioned in the application remained unredeemed past the time allowed and the articles are kept in the licensed premises itself except the three items *vide* Catalogue Nos. 217, 326 and 396 of the list, which were redeemed subsequently, after the application of the Pawn Broker cited at reference (1);

4. And whereas, the rule 12 of the Puducherry Pawn Brokers Rules, 1966 prescribes detailed procedure on auctioning of pledges;

5. Now, therefore, Thiru B. Karthikeyan, Thirupathiripuliyur, Authorised Auctioneer, is permitted to conduct within 60 days from the date of receipt of this order, the sale of time barred and unredeemed pledged articles, as shown in the list enclosed and available with the Pawn Broker, Thiru Suresh Kumar, Pawn Banker (L.No. 380), No. 62-A, Thalavaveerasamy Street, Muthialpet, Puducherry, in public auction in the licensed premises of the Pawn Broker at the above address, as per the list approved and sent to the Pawn Broker and the Auctioneer, except the three items *vide* Catalogue Nos. 217, 326 and 396 of the list, which were redeemed. The Pawn Broker and Auctioneer shall observe the above formalities detailed as required under the rules framed under the Puducherry Pawn Brokers Act, 1966, before conducting the sale of time barred and unredeemed pledged articles in the public auction:

Sl.No.	Details of articles	Number of articles (Catalogue)
1	Gold	294
2	Silver	181
3	Others	—
Total		475

E. VALLAVAN, I.A.S.,
District Collector-cum-District Magistrate.

Sl. No.	Catalogue 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
456	456	5/12/19	9719	800	SHANMUGASUNDARAN	SRINIVASAN	MUTHIALPET	ONESILVER SINGLE VILAKU		48.000	2434
457	457	7/12/19	9744	1200	AAKASH	PETER	ARIYANKUPPAM	ONE SILVER ARUNAKAIR		55.000	2789
458	458	7/12/19	9766	1300	MUNIAMMA	LOURDESAMY	MUTHIALPET	ONE SILVER VILAKU ONE SILVER STAND		60.000	3042
459	459	10/12/19	9802	1200	VISHNU	JAYASEETARAM	MUTHIALPET	ONE RING	0.500		1820
460	460	12/12/19	9841	900	SASIKUMAR	KANDASAMY	KOTAKKUPAM	ONE PAIR BANAL, ONE SINGLE GUNDU WITH ARAKU	0.400		1458
461	461	14/12/19	9855	1300	RADHA	KARTHIKEYAN	MUTHIALPET	TWO SILVER TUMBLER		66.000	3346
462	462	16/12/19	9888	4500	KARTHICK	RAMU	MUTHIALPET	ONE PAIR EAR VALAYAM, ONE PAIR DISCO TOPS, ONE PAIR DISCO STONED TOPS	2.000		7280
463	463	16/12/19	9892	1500	BASKAR	ANNAMALAI	MUTHIALPET	ONE PAIR SILVER GOLUSU ONE SILVER HAND CHAIN		59.000	2991
464	464	20/12/19	9958	2000	RAGU	MANI	MUTHIALPET	ONE PAIR SILVER GOLUSU		74.000	3752
465	465	21/12/19	9965	500	PRABHA	KANNAN	MUTHIALPET	ONE SILVER GURUMATH		20.000	1014
466	466	22/12/19	9971	1600	SUSILA	ARUMUGAM	SAMIPILLAI THOTTAM	ONE PAIR SMALL TOPS	0.900		3276
467	467	23/12/19	9990	1000	SITHALAXMI	PANDURANGAN	MUTHIALPET	ONE PAIR SMALL TOPS	0.450		1638
468	468	26/12/19	E 26	800	JAFAR ALI	HAJITH RAHAMAN	KOTAKKUPAM	TWO SILVER GURUMATH		38.000	1927
469	469	26/12/19	E 31	8500	SHANTI	DEENASUNDAR	MUTHIALPET	TWO RINGS	3.900		15288
470	470	28/12/19	E 50	10000	SIVAKUMAR	SIVALINGAM	MUTHIALPET	ONE RING ONE PAIR TOPS	4.000		14560
471	471	30/12/19	E 82	2900	SELVI	SIVAKUMAR	MUTHIALPET	ONE PAIR SILVER GOLUSU		123.000	6236
				40000							72849

CATALOGUE CONSOLIDATION STATEMENT

Sl.No.	Details of Article	No. of Articles	Total Pledge Amount Rs. P.	Approximate Value Rs. P.
1	Gold Jewels	207	1879805	3814508
2	Silver Jewels	181	316315	738328
3	Stainless Vessels			
	TOTAL	478	2196120	4549900

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 114/AIL/Lab./S/2023,
Puducherry, dated 06th December 2023)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 12/2018, dated 17-08-2023 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of dispute between the M/s. Brightenex Private Limited, Thattanchavady, Puducherry and Thiru A. Deiveegan, over non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the Notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/9/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. G.T. AMBIKA, M.L., PGDCLCF.,
Presiding Officer.

Thursday, the 17th day of August, 2023

I.D. (L) No. 12/2018**CNR. No. PYPY06-000111-2018**

A. Deiveegan,
S/o. Anthonisamy,
No. 16-A, Raja Nagar,
Semmandalam,
Cuddalore District,
Tamil Nadu.

. . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Brightenex Private Limited,
No. A-16, Industrial Estate,
Thattanchavady,
Puducherry.

. . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute coming on 19-07-2023 before me for final hearing in the presence of Thiru P. Saravanan, Counsel for the Petitioner, Thiruvalargal Vrintha Mohan, E. V. Chandru @ Chandrasekaran, L.K. Karki and P. Srikandan, Counsels for the respondent and after hearing the both sides 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. 25/AIL/Lab./T/2018, dated 27-02-2018 of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioner and the Respondents, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru A. Deiveegan, s/o. Anthonisamy, No. A-16, Raja Nagar, Semmandalam, Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu against the Management of M/s. Brightenex Private Limited, No. A-16, Industrial Estate, Thattanchavady, Puducherry, over non-employment 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 stated in the claim petition filed by the Petitioner is as follows:*

The Petitioner was working in the Respondent Company as employee from 27-11-1994 onwards to till the date of dismissal from service on 30-05-2017 for about 23 years in the Respondent's Unit of Brightenex Private Limited in Bold and Nuts manufacturing Factory at Puducherry.

(ii) The Petitioner was working as Cell Leader (informally called as Supervisor) in the M/s. Brightenex Private Limited, Thattanchavady, Puducherry, continuously for 23 years with utmost satisfaction of the Management and without giving any room for remarks and while so the Management has transferred the Petitioner to Raw Material Store from the Machine Operator Division and then transferred to Scrap Area in order to reduce his importance in the working sections and without any valid reasons. Due to his family circumstances the Petitioner obeyed the orders of the Management and put his hard work in the said employment.

(iii) The Petitioner workmen is informally called as Supervisor and he was actually working in a position as Cell Leader. The Respondent Management issued the salary slip to the Petitioner with Designation as Cell Leader. Therefore, the Petitioner's employment status and Designation as "Cell Leader" is considered as "Workman" as per Labour Act.

(iv) The alleged statement by the Respondent/Management that the Petitioner was working as Supervisor and therefore, this industrial dispute is not maintainable is invented maliciously to defeat the *bona fide* claim of this innocent Petitioner/Workman.

(v) On one occasion, the barrels containing waste oil and waste solutions were loaded in the lorry under his supervision through Thiru Ayyanar, Forklift Operator to dispatch the same to Viswas Lubes Company on 25-05-2017. When Thiru Arunachalam (Contract Labour) was also there and on completion of the loading work the Petitioner returned back to his place at 10.00 a.m. after an hour, he came to know that Thiruvalargal A.K. Sha and A. Saravanan checked the loaded barrels in the lorry and found 3 numbers of cane containing diesel and the Petitioner rushed immediately to the spot. In the spot enquiry, the Petitioner informed that he does not know how those diesel canes found available in the loaded lorry at the time, Thiru Arunachalam, Contract labour he himself admitted that he handed-over those diesel canes to the load men and also took responsibility for such wrongdoings, but, the Management did not take their statement into account for consideration.

(vi) Thiru A.L. Sha, Managing Director directly conducted the enquiry with the Petitioner and others *viz.*, Thiruvalargal A.K. Sha and A. Saravanan. The Petitioner clearly informed the facts of the incidents to the Managing Director and on completion of the enquiry the Managing Director obtained signature of the Petitioner and 2 others in a Written-Statement and thereafter, he continued his work in the Company as usual. On 30-05-2007 at 3.00 p.m. Tmt. Bhuvanewari, in-charge of H.R. Department has informed that he was terminated from service with effect from 30-05-2017 and instructed to receive the order to this effect and sign in the settlement paper, after getting two months salaries.

(vii) The Petitioner was refused to receive the Termination Order as his Superior Thiru Sivaprakasam was on leave, but, the same was sent by post to his address and the post was received by the Petitioner's family members on 02-06-2017. The Management made a conspiracy with pre-planned idea to expel the Petitioner from the Company. Therefore, the Petitioner has requested the Conciliation Authority to take this case on file and issued necessary instructions to the Management to revoke the Termination Order and to reinstate him into service.

(viii) No reasonable opportunities were given to the Petitioner and even no reasonable time-duration were given to this Petitioner for establishing his

defense and innocent. The proceedings were conducted in a hurried manner and his oral and documentary evidences were not allowed to be submitted in accordance with Labour laws. In order to achieve its illegal-objects for the termination of the Petitioner, "the Respondent's company violated the principles of natural justice, equity, ethics and good conscience and passed a non-speaking order of unlawful termination without wages thrust upon this innocent Petitioner.

(ix) The Petitioner was appointed and designated as Cell Leader in the Respondent Company till the last date of the Respondent's illegal termination and the said work comes under the category of workmen and therefore, the dispute between the Respondent/Management and the victimized Petitioner/Workmen attracted the industrial dispute under the Industrial Disputes Act. Hence, this petition to set-aside the biased Termination Order, dated 30-05-2017 passed against the Petitioner by the Respondent's Company and direct the Respondent Company to reinstate the Petitioner to his employment with all his back wages, promotions and all other Labour and Employment benefits.

3. *The brief averments of the counter filed by the Respondent is as follows:*

The Petitioner was employed as a Supervisor with the Respondent Management and thus is not a "workman" as per the Labour Laws and thus the Petitioner has no *locus standi* to raise the industrial dispute against the Respondent.

(ii) The Petitioner was appointed as "Supervisor Trainee" in the Respondent Management on 27-05-1994 and thereafter, he was confirmed as "Supervisor" by the Respondent Management on 28-05-1996. That on 18-03-2010 he was issued as work responsibility order which included, "Maintaining inward and outward scrap stock register Department wise and type wise separately".

(iii) While this being so, on 25-05-2017, the Petitioner was caught red handed for stealing diesel from the company scrap yard and since the Petitioner had committed the offence of theft the Respondent Management due to sympathy towards the Petitioner who had worked for nearly 23 years has not lodged any Police Complaint against the Petitioner and decided to let the Petitioner by terminating his service.

(iv) Thereafter, the Respondent Management issued a Termination Letter to the Petitioner on 30-05-2017 and as the same was refused the

Respondent Management sent the letter of Termination along with its covering letter, dated 30-05-2017 to the Respondent through registered post with Acknowledgement Card and the same was received by the Petitioner on 02-06-2017.

(v) Thereafter, the Respondent Management received a letter, dated 07-06-2017 from the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Government of Puducherry regarding a representation given by the Petitioner to it on 06-06-2017. The Respondent Management sent a reply to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), through Registered post with AD Card, dated 30-06-2017.

(vi) Thereafter, the Respondent Management has sent a show cause, dated 04-11-2017 to the Petitioner and the same was duly served to the Petitioner through registered post with AD Card on 07-11-2017. subsequently Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate was appointed an Enquiry Officer on for the offences done by the Petitioner.

(vii) The Enquiry Officer had conducted a fair enquiry by following principles of natural justice and had intimated to the Petitioner about the time, date and place of enquiry as 24-10-2018 at 4.30 p.m. at the office of the Advocate through post as early as on 10-10-2018, but, the Petitioner after receiving the notice failed to appear and thus the enquiry was reposted to 30-10-2018 and again the Petitioner failed to appear and explain his case. Therefore, the Enquiry Officer was constrained to set the Petitioner *ex parte* and as the Petitioner has failed to use the opportunity given to him the adverse inference has to be made that the Petitioner is accepting his crime and faults. The Enquiry Officer submitted his Enquiry Report on 12-06-2019.

(viii) Thereafter, the Respondent Management has sent a final show cause notice to the Petitioner on 04-10-2019 and the same was received by the Petitioner *vide* AD Card, dated 06-10-2019. The Respondent Management has followed all the Principles of natural justice and has given ample opportunity to the Petitioner to prove his innocence and as beyond all reasonable doubts the act of theft done by the Petitioner was proved he was rightly terminated from service for his misconduct.

(ix) The Petitioner was removed from the services for the grave misconduct of theft, and further as the same was proved beyond reasonable doubt in an independent and impartial domestic enquiry. Therefore, the dismissal of Petitioner from service is fully justified and warrants non interference of this Court. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the claim petition.

4. *Point for determination:*

1. Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner is maintainable before this Court?

2. Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner over his non-employment is justified or not?

3. If justified, to what relief the Petitioner is entitled to?

5. On the side of Petitioner, the Petitioner himself was examined as PW.1 and Ex.P1 to P11 and through cross-examination of PW.1 Exs. R1 to R8 was marked. On Respondent side Mr. Nagarathinam, Head - H.R of Respondent Management was examined as RW.1 and through him Exs.R9 to R12 were marked. Mr. Saravanan, Senior Executive - Administration - Purchase Department was examined as RW.2. No exhibits were marked through him.

6. *On the points 1 to 3:*

The facts of the case as put forth by the Petitioner is as follows:

That the Petitioner was working in the Respondent company as Cell leader but, informally he was called as "Supervisor" and further the Petitioner was working continuously for 23 years with utmost satisfaction of Respondent Management and while so the Petitioner was transferred to raw material store from the machine operation division and then to scrap area without any valid reasons and to reduce the importance of the Petitioner but, still the Petitioner had obeyed the orders of the Respondent Management considering his family circumstances. The Petitioner further submits that on 25-05-2017 barrels containing waste oil and solutions were loaded in the lorry under the supervision of Petitioner through one Ayyanar Forklift operator and Arunachalam Contract Labour and later upon inspection by A.K. Shah - Finance Manager and Mr. A. Saravanan, Senior Executive it was found that two barrels of fresh diesel was loaded in the vehicle and thereafter, the Petitioner on coming to know about the same had rushed to the spot and during spot enquiry the Petitioner had informed that he does not know as to how the diesel cans were loaded in the lorry but, one Arunachalam Contract labour had admitted that he had handed over those diesel cans to the load men and took the responsibility, but, the Management did not take into consideration of the statement of said Arunachalam. The Petitioner further states that thereafter, A.L. Sha, the Managing Director has directly conducted the enquiry and on 30-05-2017 the incharge of HR. Department had informed that the Petitioner was terminated from the

service with effect from 30-05-2017. It is the prime contention of the Petitioner that the Petitioner having completed 23 years of service in the Respondent Company was planned to be expelled from the Respondent Company and thereby the above case was foisted against the Petitioner and the Petitioner was not given reasonable opportunity to establish his defense and the proceedings were conducted in an hurried manner and therefore, the termination is an illegal one.

7. On the other hand the first contention of the Respondent Management is that the Petitioner was employed as supervisor and therefore, the Petitioner is not a workman and has no *locus standi* to approach this Court. The other contention of the Respondent is that the Petitioner was caught red handed while stealing diesel from the company scrap yard and thereby the Petitioner had committed the offence of theft, but, however the Management out of sympathy upon the Petitioner who had completed 23 years of service in the Respondent Management has not lodged any police complaint against the Petitioner and decided to let the Petitioner by terminating his service by issuing Termination Letter on 30-05-2017. The Respondent further submits that thereafter a letter, dated 07-06-2017 was received from the Labour Department and subsequently the Respondent Management had issued charge-sheet, dated 04-11-2017 and the same was served upon the Petitioner on 07-11-2017 and later had appointed an Enquiry Officer, but, however the Petitioner failed to appear before the Enquiry Officer and explain his case and therefore, the Petitioner was set *ex parte* and Enquiry Report was issued stating the charge was proved and thereafter, final show cause notice was issued to the Petitioner on 04-10-2019, but, the Petitioner even after receipt of the same has not submitted any reply and therefore, the Petitioner was terminated from service since the Petitioner failed to prove his innocence regarding the act of theft done by the Petitioner. The conduct of the Respondent warrants maximum punishment and therefore, he was terminated from service.

8. In this case the first contention of the Respondent is that the Petitioner was employed as a "Supervisor" and therefore, the Petitioner does not fall within the ambit of definition of workman and therefore, the Petitioner has no *locus standi* to approach this Court. Whereas, the contention of the Petitioner in the claim statement as well as in his evidence is that he was informally called as supervisor, but, he was working only as a Cell Leader and further the Respondent Management had issued salary slip to the Petitioner with designation as Cell Leader and the said Designation is considered

as workman as per Industrial Disputes Act. The Respondent to substantiate that the Petitioner was employed and working as a supervisor has relied upon Ex.R1 Appointment Letter with service standing orders which has been admitted by the Petitioner in his cross-examination. Whereas, the Petitioner has relied upon Ex.P11 Pay Slip pertaining to the month he was terminated that is Pay Slip for the month of May 2017 wherein the Designation is stated as Cell Leader.

9. The R.W.1 examined on the side of Respondent Management has not denied the designation as stated in Ex.P11 and further during his cross-examination has deposed as follows:

மனுதாரருக்கு வழங்கப்படும் Leave, Permission, Increment ஆகியவற்றுக்கு திரு. சிவபிரகாசம் - Head Incharge என்பவர் தான் Signing Authority என்றால் ஆமாம். மனுதாரர் வேலை செய்யும் போது Scrap, Fork Lift Operation and Maintenance, Diesel Barrel Maintenance ஆகியவற்றுக்கு திரு. சிவப்பிரகாசம் - Head Incharge தான் பொறுப்பு என்றால் ஆமாம். இது சம்மந்தமாக மனுதாரர் தன்னிச்சையாக எந்த முடிவும் எடுக்க முடியாது என்றால் ஆமாம் மனுதாரரை போல DME படித்தவர்களை முதலில் எங்கள் தொழிசலையில் Machine Operator-ராக சில காலம் பணியமர்த்துவோம். அப்போதுதான் அவர்கள் பின்னிட்டு Supervise செய்ய முடியும். மனுதாரரை போல் Diploma படித்தவர்களை Term Employee என்றும் பின்னிட்டு Probation 01, Probation 02, Cell Leader பின்னிட்டு Supervisor-ஆக பதவி உயர்வு அளிக்கப்படும்.

10. Thus, the RW.1 during his cross-examination has deposed that the Head incharge, in respect of the section where the Petitioner works that is Scrap, Fork Lift operation and Maintenance, Diesel Barrel Maintenance is one Thiru Sivaprakasam and further the said Sivaprakasam is the signing Authority to grant, Leave, permission, increment for the Petitioner and further deposed that for the persons like Petitioner who have studied DME would be initially employed as Term employee, then as Probation 01, Probation 02, Cell leader and then would be promoted as Supervisor. Thus as per the evidence of R.W.1 after working as Cell Leader the promotion would be given to the post of Supervisor. Hence, as per the evidence of R.W.1 it could be found that the post of Supervisor is a promotional post which would be given after the post of Cell Leader and further the post of Cell Leader and the post of Supervisor are distinct one. Though as per Ex.R1 Appointment Letter issued on 08-12-1997 it is stated that the Petitioner is appointed as Supervisor Trainee, but, in the last Pay slip of the Petitioner that is for the month of May 2017 the designation is stated as Cell Leader. Hence, from Ex.P11 pay slip for the Month of May 2017 it could be inferred that the Petitioner was working as Cell Leader in the Respondent company. When it is the evidence

of R.W.1 that from the post of Cell Leader the promotion to the post of Supervisor would be given and further the Petitioner posting as per last pay slip that is Ex.P11 the designation of the Petitioner was Cell Leader and further one Sivaprakasam was Head Incharge of the section where the Petitioner worked then it is for the Respondent to prove that the work of the Petitioner was in supervisory category because section 2(s) of Industrial Dispute Act provides for the exceptions to the definition "Workman" in (iii) and (iv) of the said section which states as follows:

"mainly in managerial or administrative capacity" or being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding the prescribed limit(s); and exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature."

11. Thus, as per 2(s) of Industrial Disputes Act, the definition of "workman" means, any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but, does not include any such person who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity or who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature.

12. Therefore, the exception makes explicit that if a workman is not discharging any supervisory function then the exception will not apply. In the present case the Petitioner as per Ex.P11 pay slip for the month of May 2017 is found to be employed as Cell leader and as per the evidence of both sides the Petitioner was in charge of loading and unloading the barrels containing waste oil and waste solution in a lorry through one Ayyanar Forklift operator. Thus, from Ex.P11 Pay Slip and the nature of work done by the Petitioner it is found that the Management has miserably failed to prove that the Petitioner was discharging "managerial/supervisory/administrative" functions. When that being so, this Court from the evidences of both sides holds that the Petitioner falls well within the definition of "Workman" as per section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act and does not fall in any of the exceptions of the said section.

13. The next question that arises for consideration is whether the Petitioner was terminated from the employment after conducting proper enquiry by providing ample opportunity to disprove the charge against him and further by following the principles of natural justice. It is the case of the Respondent that on 25-05-2017 the Petitioner while loading waste oil and solution through Ayyanar Forklift operator and casual labour Arunachalam has attempted to steal diesel from the company through trucks carrying the waste oil and solutions and after the theft was discovered the Petitioner was asked for written explanation, but, the Petitioner was unable to offer any explanation as to how the diesel cans were found in the lorry after the Petitioner had checked and released the lorry and further during the enquiry proceedings the Petitioner has failed to appear and wantonly left *ex parte* and therefore after following all the principles of natural justice the Petitioner was dismissed from the service.

14. Whereas the Petitioner contends that the Petitioner was working continuously for 23 years with utmost satisfaction of Respondent Management and while so the Petitioner was transferred to Raw material store from the machine operation Division and then to scrap area to reduce his importance in the working section but due to family circumstances he obeyed the orders of the Management and while so on 25.05.2017 the waste oil and waste solutions were loaded in the lorry through one Ayyanar Forklift operator and Arunachalam contract labour under his supervision and after completion of the loading work the Petitioner has returned to his place and later after an hour he came to know that A.K. Shah - Finance Manager and Mr. A. Saravanan - Senior Executive have checked the loaded barrels in the lorry and found that two barrels of fresh diesel was loaded in the vehicle and thereafter the Petitioner on coming to know about the same had rushed to the spot and in the spot enquiry the Petitioner informed that he does not know as to how the diesel cans were loaded but one Arunachalam Contract labour had admitted that he had handed over those barrels to the load men and took the responsibility but the Management did not take into consideration of the statement of said Arunachalam. The Petitioner further states that thereafter, A.L. Sha, the Managing Director has directly conducted the enquiry and on 30-05-2017 the incharge of HR department informed that the Petitioner was terminated from service with effect from 30-05-2017. The Petitioner's prime contention is that the Petitioner having completed 23 years of service the Management had planned to expel the Petitioner from the Respondent company and

further the Petitioner was not given reasonable opportunity to establish his defense and innocence all the proceedings were conducted in an hurried manner.

15. Thus, the core point that arises for consideration is whether the principles of natural justice has been followed during the enquiry proceedings and further, whether the Petitioner was given reasonable opportunity to prove his defence before dismissal from employment. On perusal of Ex.R9 the statement of fact stated to have been recorded by A.K. Shah - Finance Manager of Respondent company it is found that the date of occurrence of alleged theft of two Jerry Can containing fresh diesel in the lorry loaded with barrels of waste oil and waste solution for sale and disposal to Visves Lub is on 25-05-2017. Similarly, on perusal of Ex.P2 it is stated that on 30-05-2017 the Management has decided to terminate the Petitioner from service with effect from 30-05-2017. The contention of the Petitioner is that on 25-05-2017 there was spot enquiry by A.K. Shah - Finance Manager and A. Saravanan - Senior Executive and thereafter A.L. Sha Managing Director had conducted the enquiry with the Petitioner and subsequently on 30-05-2017 at 3 p.m. the Petitioner was informed that he was terminated from service with effect from 30-05-2017. Thus, from the above it could be inferred that alleged occurrence of theft is stated to have occurred on 25-05-2017 and later after spot enquiry on 25-05-2017 and after enquiry by the Managing Director the Petitioner on 30-05-2017 was terminated from service with effect from 30-05-2017.

16. Further, from the documents relied by the Petitioner and Respondent it is found that as per Ex.P3 on 06-06-2017 the Petitioner thereafter has approached Labour Officer (Conciliation) and as per Ex.P6 Charge sheet, dated 04-11-2017 was sent to Petitioner and as per Ex.R11 the Respondent Management on 08-10-2018 has appointed Mr. S. Asokumar, Advocate as Enquiry Officer and as per Ex.R8 on 12-06-2019 the Enquiry Officer has prepared his Enquiry Report and as per Ex.R7 series letter, dated 22-10-2019 the Respondent Management based on Enquiry report has upheld the Termination order, dated 30-05-2017 and dismissed the Petitioner from employment. Thus, it is found that initially the Respondent Management without serving charge sheet and without appointing an Enquiry Officer and without conducting due enquiry and without following principles of natural justice and without the Enquiry Report has terminated the Petitioner on 30-05-2017 itself and thereafter the Petitioner is found to have approached Labour Officer (Conciliation) as per Ex.P3 letter, dated 06-06-2017 and thereafter, charge sheet is found to have sent to the Petitioner and Enquiry

Officer was appointed and Enquiry was conducted and subsequently as per Ex.R7 series on 22-10-2019 the Termination order initially done on 30-05-2017 was upheld and the Petitioner was dismissed from the service.

17. However, it is the contention of the Respondent Management that after the Petitioner was served with charge sheet, dated 04-11-2017 the Petitioner inspite of receipt of notice of hearing from the Enquiry Officer has failed to appear for the Enquiry and wantonly left the enquiry *ex parte* and therefore after following all the principles of natural justice and after giving sufficient opportunity to the Petitioner to prove his innocence regarding it came to be concluded that the act of theft was proved beyond all reasonable doubts and thereby the Petitioner was terminated from service for his grave misconduct. The Petitioner also during his cross examination admitted that he was served with Ex.P9 notice of hearing from the Enquiry Officer and further inspite of receipt of Ex.P9 he had not appeared before Enquiry Officer. Thus from the evidence of Petitioner it is found that the Petitioner inspite of knowing about the enquiry proceedings has failed to appear before Enquiry Officer and left the enquiry proceedings *ex parte* and thereafter Enquiry Officer has prepared the Enquiry Report Ex.R8 on 12-06-2019 and again the Petitioner was called upon to give his written explanation to the Enquiry Report as per Ex.R6 series letter, dated 04-10-2019, but, again the Petitioner has not responded and therefore as per Ex.R7 series letter, dated 22-10-2019 the termination of Petitioner on 30-05-2017 was upheld and the Petitioner was dismissed from his employment.

18. This Court on perusal of above Ex.P9 notice of hearing for the enquiry sent by the Enquiry Officer and Ex.R6 series letter sent by the Respondent Management to the Petitioner, finds that no doubt the Petitioner was aware of Enquiry proceedings and Enquiry Report but still the Petitioner has failed to appear before Enquiry Officer and give written explanation for the Enquiry Report and thereby the Petitioner is found to have left the enquiry proceedings *ex parte* and thereby, the contention of the Respondent at the outset that during the enquiry proceedings the Petitioner was given opportunity to disprove the case against him and further, all principles of natural justice was followed during the enquiry proceedings and also while passing orders based on Enquiry Report is found to be acceptable one. However, at this juncture it becomes necessary to consider whether the procedure adopted by the Respondent from the beginning till the passing of dismissal order was proper and without any bias and further free and fair opportunity was given to the Petitioner to dispel the charge against him.

19. On perusal of Ex.P2 it is found that the Respondent Management initially has terminated the Petitioner from service with effect from 30-05-2017 without conducting due enquiry. The reason stated by the Respondent is that as per the provisions of the Industrial Employment (SO) Central Rules 1946 under section 14(2) of Schedule 1 based on the grievous misconduct the Petitioner can be terminated from service without notice, this Court on perusal of Ex.R1 Appointment letter with Service Standing Orders finds that it is stated that for theft, fraud or dishonesty in conjunction with the employer's business or property the Sanction Category is 5 and as per Sanction Category 5 for first offence the punishment is Termination. Thus, as per the Service Standing Orders of Respondent Management the punishment prescribed for theft for the very first time itself is termination but however in the standing order there is no any statement that the punishment of termination can be provided without affording opportunity to the employee. Thus, even for providing the punishment of termination it is mandatory for the Respondent Management to follow the principles of natural justice by affording opportunity to the Petitioner to disprove the charge during the enquiry proceedings. In this case the Enquiry Officer to conduct enquiry as against the Petitioner was appointed as per Ex.R11 on 08-10-2018 and thereafter, enquiry is found to have commenced and the Enquiry Report Ex.R8 is found to have been prepared on 12-06-2019.

20. Thus, from the above discussions it is found that the Petitioner is found to have been punished initially without any due enquiry as early as on 30-05-2017 by terminating him from the service and thereafter in the said continuous status of termination the Enquiry is found to have been commenced by appointing Enquiry Officer on 08-10-2018 and thereafter the Enquiry Report is found to have been emerged on 12-06-2019. Therefore, in the said context this Court finds that the very fairness of the enquiry itself is doubtful because when the Petitioner was already punished by the Respondent Management as early as on 30-05-2017 and further when the said termination continued to be in force than in such case the contention of the Respondent that fair enquiry by following principles of natural justice was held is found to be unacceptable one. This Court opines that principles of natural justice requires that the Petitioner must be given all opportunity to establish his innocence and must also be placed in a situation which does not give any room for fear and must also give hope that there would be a fair enquiry. However in this case all procedures with regard to appointment of Enquiry Officer and further the enquiry proceedings is found to have been conducted later point of time that is more particularly after the

Petitioner was punished by terminating him from the employment. Therefore, in the said context though the Petitioner has not explained during his cross-examination the reason for his non-appearance before the Enquiry Officer, but, still from the beginning the procedure adopted by the Respondent during the enquiry proceedings is found to be one sided since, the Petitioner was already punished by way of termination and further in the said status of termination the Petitioner was compelled to attend the enquiry for the name sake so as to make it appear that all due procedures were followed by the Respondent Management so as to justify; and confirm the earlier punishment of termination which was imposed prior to the Enquiry and Enquiry Report.

21. Furthermore even after Enquiry Report, dated 12-06-2019 the Respondent while passing orders as per Ex.R7 series letter, dated 22-10-2019 based on Enquiry Report is found to have again upheld the Termination order passed on 30-05-2017 that is the punishment given prior to the enquiry. Thus, this Court finds that the Respondent Management has not passed any final order independently based on the Enquiry Report, but, on the other hand has attempted to justify and legalise the punishment which was given to the Petitioner prior to enquiry. Thus, viewed in any angle this Court finds that the Enquiry Officer has not conducted the enquiry in a fair manner by following the principles of natural justice. Therefore, this Court finds that the enquiry conducted by the Respondent Management through the Enquiry Officer is not a valid one and thereby the termination of the Petitioner by the Respondent based on the Enquiry Report is found to be unsustainable and illegal one. In view of above discussions it is held that Industrial dispute raised by the Petitioner as against the Respondent Management over his non-employment is justified and as such this Court holds that the Petitioner is entitled for reinstatement as claimed by him.

22. Now coming to the other aspects of back wages and other attendant benefits is concerned, this Court finds that in this case the Respondent has not proved that the Petitioner was gainfully employed any where else and earning income. However it is found that the Petitioner was sustaining his day to day life even this situation and the same could not be done without any income. Hence, this Court on considering the circumstances, deems fit that the Petitioner is entitled for 30% back wages with continuity of service and other attendant benefits. Thus, the points are answered accordingly.

In the result this petition is allowed by holding that the Industrial Dispute raised by the Petitioner as against the Respondent Management over his

non-employment is justified and the Respondent Management is directed to reinstate the Petitioner into service within two months from the date of this award and further directed to pay 30% of back wages from the date of termination till the date of reinstatement with continuity of service and other attendant benefits. There is no order as to costs.

Dictated to the Stenographer, directly typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 17th day of August, 2023.

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

List of petitioner's witness:

PW.1 — 26-02-2020 Thiru Deiveegam

List of petitioner's exhibits :

Ex.P1 — 30-05-2017 Photocopy of the letter issued by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

Ex.P2 — 30-05-2017 Photocopy of the letter issued by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

Ex.P3 — 06-06-2017 Photocopy of the letter Submitted by the Petitioner before the Conciliation Officer.

Ex.P4 — 30-06-2017 Photocopy of the reply letter submitted by the Respondent before the Conciliation Officer.

Ex.P5 — 05-07-2017 Photocopy of the notice issued by the Conciliation Officer regarding enquiry to the Petitioner and the Respondent.

Ex.P6 — 04-11-2017 Photocopy of the Charge Sheet issued by the Respondent to the Petitioner through RPAD.

Ex.P7 — 29-01-2018 Photocopy of the Failure report given by the Conciliation Officer.

Ex.P8 — 27-02-2018 Photocopy of the Notification issued by the Government of Puducherry.

- Ex.P9 — 10-01-2018 Photocopy of the Enquiry notice issued by the Enquiry Officer by name Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate to the Petitioner.
- Ex.P10 — 24-10-2018 Photocopy of the Enquiry notice issued by the Enquiry Officer by name Mr. Ashok Kumar.
- Ex.P11 — — Photocopy of the Pay slip of the Petitioner for the Month of May 2017.

List of Respondent's witness:

- RW1 — 14-10-2022 Thiru Nagarathinam, Head - HR of the Respondent Management.
- RW2 — 02-03-2023 Thiru Saravanan, Sr. Executive Officer (Purchase) of the Respondent Management.

List of Respondent's Exhibits:

- Ex.R1 — 08-12-1997 Appointment Letter with Service Standing Order issued by the Respondent Management to the Petitioner.
- Ex.R2 — 18-03-2010 Office copy of the Petitioner's Work responsibility.
- Ex.R3 — 30-05-2017 Termination order issued by Respondent Management to the Petitioner.
- Ex.R4 — 30-05-2017 Respondent Management sent the Termination letter to the Petitioner' residential address through Registered post with AD Card.
- Ex.R5 — 04-11-2017 Respondent Management sent a Charge Sheet to the Petitioner' residential address through Registered post with AD Card.
- Ex.R6 — 04-10-2019 Respondent Management sent a show cause notice to the Petitioner' residential address through Registered post with AD Card.
- Ex.R7 — 22-10-2019 Respondent Management sent a Final notice to the Petitioner' residential address through Registered post with AD Card.

- Ex.R8 — 12-06-2019 Photocopy of the Enquiry Report submitted by the Enquiry Officer Mr. Ashok Kumar.
- Ex.R9 — 25-05-2017 Spot Inspection Report signed by the Employee and Inspection Officer.
- Ex.R10 — 30-06-2017 Letter addressed to Labour Officer (Conciliation) by the Management regarding dispute raised by Deiveegam.
- Ex.R11 — 08-10-2018 Letter of the Management appointing Enquiry Officer along with acknowledgment of receipt by an Advocate.
- Ex.R12 — 24-08-2022 Authorization letter for deposing evidence in ID(L). 12/2018.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT
(G.O. Rt. No. 115/AIL/Lab./S/2023,
Puducherry, dated 06th December 2023)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 05/2019, dated 21-08-2023 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of Dispute between the M/s. Larsen and Toubro Private Limited, Sedarapet, Puducherry and Thiru K. Kamalakannan, Puducherry, over reinstatement with back wages 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 23-5-1991, 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. G.T. AMBIKA, M.L., PGDCLCF.,
Presiding Officer.

Monday, the 21st day of August, 2023.

**I.D. (L). No. 05/2019
CNR. No. PYPY06-000005/2019**

K. Kamalakannan,
Mahalakshmi Nagar,
Vinothkumar Complex,
Thiruchitrabalam Kootroad,
Vanur Taluk, Villupuram District. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Larsen and Toubro Private Limited,
Sedarapet, Puducherry. . . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute coming on 21-08-2023 before me for final hearing in the presence of Thiruvalargal K. Velmurugan and P. Preethi, Counsel for the Petitioner and Thiruvalargal B. Mohandoss, K. Velmurugan, J. Kalirathinam, S. Vijayasanthi, Kanjanamala, R. Anbumathy, A. Asha and Indrajith, Counsels for the Respondent, and after perusing the case records, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

This Industrial Dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 10/AIL/Lab./T/2019, dated 28-01-2019 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 K. Kamalakannan, Puducherry, against the Management of M/s. Larsen and Toubro Private Limited, Sedarapet, Puducherry, over reinstatement with back wages 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. Today when the case came up for hearing, no representation on Petitioner's side in spite of posting for steps for amendment as no further adjournments. Further more, the Petitioner is not present for several hearing dates.

Hence, this reference is closed for non prosecution.

Written and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 21st day of August, 2023.

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

புதுச்சேரி அரசு

துணை மாவட்ட ஆட்சியர் (வருவாய்) அலுவலகம், காரைக்கால்

No. 7924/DCR/KKL/LGR/MVP/C3/2022-23.

அறிவிக்கை

[புதுச்சேரி நில மானிய விதி 1975, விதி 60(iii)-ன் கீழ்]

புதுச்சேரி அரசால் தங்களுக்கு ஒப்படை செய்யப்பட்ட கீழ்க்காணும் நிலவிவரங்களுடைய இடத்தில் தாங்கள் வீடு கட்டாமலோ அல்லது குடியிருக்காமலோ இருப்பதன் மூலம் தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட நில ஒப்படை ஆணையில் காணப்படும் நிபந்தனை (2)-ஐ தாங்கள் கடைபிடிக்காததை அறியவும்.

வரிசை எண்	ஒப்படை பெற்றவரின் பெயர் மற்றும் முகவரி	நகர/மறு அளவை எண்	நிலத்தின் பரப்பளவு	நில ஒப்படை ஆணை எண்
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
			ஹெ. ஆ. சா.	
28. காரைக்கால் வருவாய் கிராமம்				
1	தீருமதி ஜீனத்து. க/பெ. தாவுது.	F/1/205	0 00 54	265/94

ஆதலால், இவ்வறிவிப்பு கிடைக்கப்பெற்ற 15 நாட்களுக்குள் தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட இடத்தினை ஏன் அரசே திரும்ப எடுத்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடாது என்பதற்கான காரணங்களை இவ்வலுவலகத்திற்குத் தெரிவிக்கும்படி கேட்டுக்கொள்ளப்படுகிறது. இது தொடர்பாக தாங்கள் கருத்து ஏதேனும் தெரிவிக்க விரும்பினால் மேற்குறிப்பிட்ட காலக்கெடுவிற்குள் கீழ்க்கையொப்பமிட்டுள்ள அதிகாரியிடம் முறையிடலாம்.

குறிப்பிட்ட காலக்கெடுவிற்குள் தாங்கள் நேரிலோ அல்லது கடிதம் வாயிலாகவோ தங்களது கருத்தைத் தெரிவிக்காவிடில், தங்களிடம் கருத்துக்கூற ஏதும் இல்லை எனக் கருதப்பட்டு இதற்கு மேல் எந்த அறிவிப்புமின்றி தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட நில ஒப்படை ஆணை ரத்து செய்யப்படும்.

காரைக்கால், 2023 *வருபு* டிசம்பர் மீ 18 *உ.*

ஞா. ஜான்சன்,
துணை ஆட்சியர் (வருவாய்).

புதுச்சேரி அரசு

துணை மாவட்ட ஆட்சியர் (வருவாய்) அலுவலகம், காரைக்கால்

எண் 3820/மாசாஆ/காரை/சீ3/2023.

அறிவிக்கை

[புதுச்சேரி நில மானிய விதி 1975, விதி 60(iii)-ன் கீழ்]

புதுச்சேரி அரசால் தங்களுக்கு ஒப்படை செய்யப்பட்ட கீழ்க்காணும் நிலவிவரங்களுடைய இடத்தில் தாங்கள் வீடு கட்டாமலோ அல்லது குடியிருக்காமலோ இருப்பதன் மூலம் தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட நில ஒப்படை ஆணையில் காணப்படும் நிபந்தனை (2)-ஐ தாங்கள் கடைபிடிக்காததை அறியவும்.

வரிசை எண்	ஒப்படை பெற்றவரின் பெயர் மற்றும் முகவரி	நகர/மறு அளவை எண்	நிலத்தின் பரப்பளவு	நில ஒப்படை ஆணை எண்
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

ஹெ. ஆ. சா.

25. கோவில்பத்து வருவாய் கிராமம்

1	திரு. முகமது யூசுப், த/பெ. மெய்தீன் ஷா; திருமதி ஆயிஷா பீவி, க/பெ. முகமது யூசுப்.	D/1/135	0 00 72	729/2000
---	---	---------	---------	----------

ஆதலால், இவ்வறிவிப்பு கிடைக்கப்பெற்ற 15 நாட்களுக்குள் தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட இடத்தினை ஏன் அரசே திரும்ப எடுத்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடாது என்பதற்கான காரணங்களை இவ்வலுவலகத்திற்குத் தெரிவிக்கும்படி கேட்டுக்கொள்ளப்படுகிறது. இது தொடர்பாக தாங்கள் கருத்து ஏதேனும் தெரிவிக்க விரும்பினால் மேற்குறிப்பிட்ட காலக்கெடுவிற்குள் கீழ்க்கையொப்பமிட்டுள்ள அதிகாரியிடம் முறையிடலாம்.

குறிப்பிட்ட காலக்கெடுவிற்குள் தாங்கள் நேரிலோ அல்லது கடிதம் வாயிலாகவோ தங்களது கருத்தைத் தெரிவிக்காவிடில், தங்களிடம் கருத்துக்கூற ஏதும் இல்லை எனக் கருதப்பட்டு இதற்கு மேல் எந்த அறிவிப்புமின்றி தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட நில ஒப்படை ஆணை ரத்து செய்யப்படும்.

காரைக்கால், 2023 டிசம்பர் மீ 18 வ.

ஞா. ஜான்சன்.

துணை ஆட்சியர் (வருவாய்).

புதுச்சேரி அரசு

துணை மாவட்ட ஆட்சியர் (வருவாய்) அலுவலகம், காரைக்கால்

எண் 8820,4624/மாசாஆ/காரை/சீ3/2023.

அறிவிக்கை

[புதுச்சேரி நில மானிய விதி 1975, விதி 60(iii)-ன் கீழ்]

புதுச்சேரி அரசால் தங்களுக்கு ஒப்படை செய்யப்பட்ட கீழ்க்காணும் நிலவிவரங்களுடைய இடத்தில் தாங்கள் வீடு கட்டாமலோ அல்லது குடியிருக்காமலோ இருப்பதன் மூலம் தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட நில ஒப்படை ஆணையில் காணப்படும் நிபந்தனை (2)-ஐ தாங்கள் கடைபிடிக்காததை அறியவும்.

வரிசை எண்	ஒப்படை பெற்றவரின் பெயர் மற்றும் முகவரி	நகர/மறு அளவை எண்	நிலத்தின் பரப்பளவு	நில ஒப்படை ஆணை எண்
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

ஹெ. ஆ. சா.

28. காரைக்கால் வருவாய் கிராமம்

1	திரு. ஆரோக்கியநாதன், த/பெ. முருகேசன்; திருமதி ஜோஸ்பின் தனசெல்வி, க/பெ. ஆரோக்கியநாதன்.	F/37/251	0 00 35	140/07-08
---	--	----------	---------	-----------

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
			ஹெ. ஆ. சா.	
28. காரைக்கால் வருவாய் கிராமம்				
2	திரு. லோகராஜன், த/பெ. சுப்பிரமணியன்; திருமதி உஷா ராணி, க/பெ. லோகராஜன்.	F/3/211	0 00 58	81/98

ஆதலால், இவ்வறிவிப்பு கிடைக்கப்பெற்ற 15 நாட்களுக்குள் தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட இடத்தினை ஏன் அரசே திரும்ப எடுத்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடாது என்பதற்கான காரணங்களை இவ்வலுவலகத்திற்குத் தெரிவிக்கும்படி கேட்டுக்கொள்ளப்படுகிறது. இது தொடர்பாக தாங்கள் கருத்து ஏதேனும் தெரிவிக்க விரும்பினால் மேற்குறிப்பிட்ட காலக்கெடுவிற்குள் கீழ்க்கையொப்பமிட்டுள்ள அதிகாரியிடம் முறையிடலாம்.

குறிப்பிட்ட காலக்கெடுவிற்குள் தாங்கள் நேரிலோ அல்லது கடிதம் வாயிலாகவோ தங்களது கருத்தைத் தெரிவிக்காவிடில், தங்களிடம் கருத்துக்கூற ஏதும் இல்லை எனக் கருதப்பட்டு இதற்கு மேல் எந்த அறிவிப்புமின்றி தங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட நில ஒப்படை ஆணை ரத்து செய்யப்படும்.

காரைக்கால், 2023 டிசம்பர் மீ 21 வ.

ஞா. ஜான்சன்,
துணை ஆட்சியர் (வருவாய்).

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Ms. No. 55/FD/F2/A2/2023-24,
Puducherry, dated 26th December 2023)

NOTIFICATION

On attaining the age of superannuation, Thiru M.J. Udhaya Bhaskaran, Junior Accounts Officer, Office of the Executive Engineer, Special Buildings Division-I, Public Works Department, Puducherry, is admitted into retirement on the afternoon of 31-12-2023.

(By order)

RATNAGHOSH KISHOR CHAURE,
Deputy Secretary to Government (Finance).

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
HEALTH SECRETARIAT

(G.O. Ms. No. 64, Puducherry, dated 27th December 2023)

NOTIFICATION

The Notice of voluntary retirement given by Dr. M. Narayanan, Specialist (Senior Administrative Grade), Rajiv Gandhi Government Women and Children Hospital, Puducherry under "rule 43 (1) of Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 2021" is accepted.

2. Accordingly, he is admitted into voluntary retirement with effect from the afternoon of 05-03-2024.

(By order of the Lieutenant-Governor)

K. CANDANE @ SIVARADJANE,
Under Secretary to Government (Health).

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS (PERSONNEL WING)

[G.O. Ms. No. 88/DP&AR-SS.II(1),
Puducherry, dated 27th December 2023]

NOTIFICATION

On attaining the age of superannuation, the following Senior Private Secretary and Superintendents, shall retire from service with effect from the afternoon of 31-12-2023.

Sl. No.	Name of the Official, Designation and Department/Office in which working
(1)	(2)

Tmt./Selvi/Thiru:

- 1 Sarojini Kundora, Senior Private Secretary, Chief Secretariat, Puducherry.
- 2 R. Calavanane, Superintendent, Chief Secretariat, Puducherry.
- 3 P. Sivaganesh, Superintendent, Chief Secretariat, Puducherry.

(By order)

M. KANNAN,
Under Secretary to Government.

**தொழிலாளர் இழப்பீட்டுக் கூடுதல்
ஆணையர் நீதிமன்றம்
(தொழிலாளர் இழப்பீட்டு சட்டம், 1923 கீழ்)**

தொழிலாளர் அதிகாரி அலுவலகம், காரைக்கால்

W.C. எண் 1/2018.

அறிவிக்கை

ஸ்ரீராம் இன்சூரன்ஸ் கம்பெனி லிமிடெட், எண் 27, 100 அடி ரோடு, சுந்தரராஜ நகர், முதலியார்பேட்டை, புதுச்சேரி, 1923-ஆம் ஆண்டு தொழிலாளர் இழப்பீட்டுச் சட்டத்தின் பிரிவு 8(1)-ன் கீழ் ₹ 12,00,000 (ரூபாய் பனிரெண்டு இலட்சம் மட்டும்) தொகையினை வைப்பீட்டு செய்துள்ளார் என்பதாலும்;

2. இந்த தொகையானது 10-01-2018 அன்று திரு. மு. செல்வம் மற்றும் திரு. ம. பழனி, முதல் மற்றும் இரண்டாம் எதிர்மனுதாரரிடம் காலஞ்சென்ற திரு. சௌ. அறிவழகன், த/பெ. சௌந்தரராஜன் அவர்கள் எலக்ட்ரிசியன் பணியில் ஈடுபட்டிருந்தபோது மரண விபத்திற்கு உள்ளானதால் அவரது வாரிசுதாரர்களுக்கு நஷ்ட ஈடாக கொடுக்கப்பட வேண்டியுள்ளது என்பதாலும்;

3. காரைக்கால் மாவட்டம், திருநள்ளார், கருக்கங்குடி - இளையங்குடி கிராமம், எண் 49, கீழ்க்கு தெருவில், வசிக்கும் திருமதி அ. ஜெயகுமாரி, திரு அ. சௌந்தரராஜன், திருமதி சௌ. சரோஜா மற்றும் (மைனர்) அ. அஜய், (மைனர்) அ. வர்ஷினி என்பவர்கள் காலஞ்சென்ற திரு. சௌ. அறிவழகன் ஆதரவில் வாழ்ந்தவர் தான் என்பதைச் சான்றுரைத்துள்ளார் என்பதாலும்;

4. எனவே, தற்போது மேற்சொன்ன இழப்பீட்டுத் தொகையினை மேற்படி காலஞ்சென்ற எலக்ட்ரிசியன் திரு. சௌ. அறிவழகன் அவர்களின் ஆதரவில் வாழ்ந்து வந்தவர்களுக்கு திருமதி அ. ஜெயகுமாரி, திரு அ. சௌந்தரராஜன், திருமதி சௌ. சரோஜா மற்றும் (மைனர்) அ. அஜய், (மைனர்) அ. வர்ஷினி ஆகியோருக்கு பங்கீட்டு அளிக்க கருதப்பட்டுள்ளது என, பொதுமக்களின் தகவலுக்காக அறிவிக்கை செய்யப்படுகிறது. இவ்வறிவிக்கையில், காலஞ்சென்ற எலக்ட்ரிசியன் சௌ. அறிவழகன் அவர்களின் ஆதரவில் வாழ்ந்து வந்தவர் என உரிமைக் கோரிக்கை எழுப்பும் எவரொருவரும் இந்த அறிவிக்கையானது அலுவல்முறை அரசிதழில் வெளியிடப்பட்ட தேதியிலிருந்து ஒருமாத கால அளவிற்குள் தொடர்புடைய ஆவணங்கள் அனைத்துடன் ஒரு விண்ணப்பம் மூலம் இந்த நீதிமன்றத்தில் உரிமைக் கோரிக்கையை முன்னிடலாம். உரிய தேதிக்குப் பிறகு பெறப்படலாகிற உரிமைக் கோரிக்கைகள் கருதப்படமாட்டாது.

காரைக்கால், நாள் 2023 வர்பு. டிசம்பர் 27 உ.

வெ. ரவி.

தொழிலாளர் அதிகாரி மற்றும்
தொழிலாளர் இழப்பீட்டு கூடுதல் ஆணையர்.

**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL
COMMISSIONER
(Under the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923)
OFFICE OF THE LABOUR OFFICER
KARAIKAL**

W.C. No. 1/2018.

Karaikal, dated 27th December 2023.

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Management, M/s. Sriram General Insurance Co. Limited, has deposited a sum of ₹ 12,00,000 (Rupees twelve lakhs only) under section 8(1) of the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923.

2. Whereas, the said amount payable to the dependents of Thiru S. Arivazhagan (*late*), s/o. A. Soundararajan, who met with fatal accident on 10-01-2018 arising out of and in the course of employment as an Electrician working under 1st respondent, while working on erection of new electrical post in Karaikal region. When he and his co-employee (Balasubramanian) were working to fix the new cement pole, the crane operator, the 2nd respondent without exercising care and caution made the old pole to touch the electrical line without any protection. Consequently, passing of electric shock both were thrown away and Arivazhagan had died.

3. And whereas, Tmt. A. Jeyakumari, w/o. S. Arivazhagan (*late*), residing at No. 49, East Street, Ilayangudi, Karukangudi, Thirunallar-609 607, Karaikal District, appeared before this Court and deposed an oath that she is only dependent at the time of the death of the employee Thiru S. Arivazhagan (*late*).

4. Now, therefore, it is notified for the information of the public that it is proposed to disburse the said compensation amount to the aforesaid dependents. Tmt. A. Jeyakumari, Thiru A. Soundararajan, Tmt. S. Saroja and (minor) A. Ajay, (minor) A. Varshini. As such whoever claims to be the dependents of the deceased workmen Thiru S. Arivazhagan at the time of his death, may claim by an application in this Court within a period of one month from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette with all relevant documents, claim received after the date will not be considered.

V. Ravi,

Labour Officer-cum-Additional Commissioner
for Employees' Compensation.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POWER) DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Ms. No. 52, Puducherry, dated 02nd January 2024)

NOTIFICATION

In partial modification of the G.O. Ms. No. 35, 04-11-2022 of the Industrial Development (Power) Department, Puducherry and in pursuance of Article 80 of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Puducherry Power Corporation Limited, Karaikal, the Lieutenant-Governor, Puducherry, is pleased to appoint the following Officers as Directors in the Board of Directors of the Puducherry Power Corporation Limited.

Sl. No.	Name of the Officers appointed in the Board of Directors of the Corporation	Outgoing Directors
(1)	(2)	(3)
1	Shri Ashish Madhaorao More, I.A.S., Commissioner-cum-Secretary (Finance & Industries).	Shri P. Jawahar, I.A.S.
2	Shri Rajeev Kumar Mittal, Director, TE & TD Division, Central Electricity Authority, New Delhi.	Shri. OM Kant Shukla, Director, TE & TD Division, Central Electricity Authority, New Delhi.

(By order of the Lieutenant-Governor)

S. MURUGESAN,
Under Secretary to Government (Power).

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
DIRECTORATE OF SCHOOL EDUCATION
(SECRETARIAT WING)

(G.O. Ms. No. 58, Puducherry, dated 03rd January 2024)

NOTIFICATION

On attaining the age of superannuation, the following Vice-Principals are admitted into retirement with effect from the afternoon of 31-01-2024.

Sl. No.	Name of the Vice-Principals	Name of the Institution
(1)	(2)	(3)
Thiru/Tmt.:		
1	P. Purushothaman	Jawaharlal Nehru Government Girls' Higher Secondary School, Mahe.
2	G. Latha	Maraimalai Adigal Government Higher Secondary School, Embalam, Puducherry.

(1)	(2)	(3)
3	Thiru N.M. Saminathan	Kannagi Government Girls' Higher Secondary School, Villianur, Puducherry.

(By order)

F.P. VERBINA JAYARAJ,
Under Secretary to Government (School Education).

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
CHIEF SECRETARIAT
(HIGHER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION)
(G.O. Ms. No. 01, Puducherry, dated 05th January 2024)

NOTIFICATION

On attaining the age of superannuation Dr. R. Parivallal, Assistant Professor in Psychology, Tagore Government Arts and Science College, Puducherry, shall retire on the afternoon of 31-01-2024.

(By order)

V. SOUMYA,
Under Secretary to Government
(Higher and Technical Education).

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COLLECTOR
(REVENUE)-NORTH-CUM-LICENSING AUTHORITY**

No. 8397DCRN/Rev./A7/2023/55.

Puducherry, dated 08th January 2024.

ORDER

Whereas, Thiru Deepak Fashliwal, s/o. Kaluram Jain, now residing at No. 40, Ground Floor, 7th Cross Extension, Rainbow Nagar, Puducherry, was issued with Pawn Broker Licence bearing No. 724 on 25th July 2023 to carry on the business at No. 13, Velrampet Main Road, Netha Nagar, Mudaliarpeta, Puducherry under the provision of Pondicherry Pawn Brokers Act, 1966;

And whereas, the applicant has now requested this authority to cancel the Pawn Broker licence issued to him since he is willing to settle down in his native place. Further, he has also stated that he did not conduct any business under Pawn Brokers Act, from the date of issue of Licence to him. In this regard, the Tahsildar, Puducherry Taluk, conducted a field inspection and verified the Account Book, Pawn tickets, Safety Locker of the pawn broker, etc.

And whereas, upon conduct of the enquiry the Tahsildar, Puducherry Taluk, has reported that the said Licence Holder has not conducted any pawn business since issue of Licence to him.

Therefore, I M. Kandasamy, Deputy Collector (Revenue)-North-cum-Licensing Authority, Puducherry, under the Puducherry Pawn Brokers Act, 1966 in exercise of the provisions of section 14-A(1)(b) of the Puducherry Pawn Brokers Act, 1966, for the reasons mentioned above, hereby cancel the Pawn Broker licence issued to Thiru Deepak Fashliwal, s/o. Kaluram Jain bearing Licence No. 724.

M. KANDASAMY,
Deputy Collector (Revenue) North.

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
CHIEF SECRETARIAT (WORKS)**

(G.O. Ms. No. 02, Puducherry, dated 12th January 2024)

NOTIFICATION

On attaining the age of superannuation, Thiru R. Manickavasagam, Assistant Engineer, who was holding the post of Executive Engineer, SBD-II, Public Works Department, Puducherry, on CDC basis, is admitted into retirement on the afternoon of 31-12-2023.

(By order)

P. EJOUMALE,
Under Secretary to Government (Works).

AFFIDAVIT

I, M. Shantha, wife of Moorthy, residing at No. 22, Velan Nagar, Velrampet, Mudaliarpeta, Puducherry-605 004, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows:

That my name has been entered as 'Perera Sainte Anne' in my Birth Certificate *vide* Registration No. PM/P/1962/000062, issued by Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Perera Sainte Anne' in my Marriage Certificate *vide* Registration No. 7/OMC/1990, issued by Oulgaret Municipality, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Saintanne' in my son Pragadeesh's Birth Certificate *vide* Registration No. O/1995/1786, issued by Oulgaret Municipality, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Saintanne' in my daughter Dharshini's Birth Certificate *vide* Registration No. OM/0/1993/000451, issued by Oulgaret Municipality, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'M Shantha' in my Aadhaar Card *vide* No. XXXX XXXX 5054, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Shantha' in my PAN Card *vide* No. LTDPS5916A, issued by Income-tax Department, Government of India.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Shantha' in my Elector's Photo Identity Card *vide* No. IBI0206235, issued by Election Commission of India.

I state that my name has been entered as 'சாந்தா' in the Family Ration Card *vide* No. 118692, issued by the Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry.

Hence, I declare that all the abovesaid names *viz.*, 'Perera Sainte Anne', 'Saintanne', 'M Shantha', 'Shantha' and 'சாந்தா' are referring one and the same person, *i.e.*, myself only.

I declare that what are all stated above is true and there is no suppression or misrepresentation of the facts.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 02nd day of January 2024.

562607

M. SHANTHA.

AFFIDAVIT

I, M.Lourduraj, son of K.Munisamy, aged 36 years, residing at No. 31, Vaithilinga Chetty Street, Mudaliarpet, Puducherry-605 004, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm and state on oath as follows:

That I am the deponent herein and made this affidavit on behalf of myself.

I state that my name is entered as 'M Lourduraj' in my Aadhaar Card, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India bearing No. XXXX XXXX 5862.

I state that my name is entered as 'Lourduraj' in my Electoral Identity Card, issued by Election Commission of India bearing Card No. IBI0010090.

I state that my name is entered as 'Lourduraj' in my Birth Certificate, issued by Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry bearing Registration No. M/1987/02816, dated 19-05-1987.

I state that my name is entered as 'Lourduraj' in my PAN Card, issued by Income-tax Department, Government of India bearing No. AIAPL2413J.

I state that my name is entered as 'Lourduraj' in my Driving Licence, issued by the Transport Department bearing No. PY01 20120009133.

I state that my name is entered as 'ஹார்து ராஜ்' in the Family Ration Card, issued by the Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry, bearing No. 102617.

I submit that the names described in the above records as 'M Lourduraj', 'Lourduraj' and 'ஹார்து ராஜ்' are referring one and the same person *i.e.*, myself only.

I wish to change my name as 'Vinoth Raj' according to Numerology.

Finally, I declare that my correct name is 'Vinoth Raj'.

The above statements in the abovesaid paragraphs are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 03rd day of January 2024.

562608

M. LOURDURAJ.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Antoine Govindou @ Babuantoine @ Babu @ Antoine, son of Govindarassou Govindou, Hindu, aged about 51 years, presently residing at No. 10, 2nd Cross Street, Raja Nagar, Orleanpet, Puducherry-605 013, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm, and state on oath as follows:

1. That I am the deponent herein and I am well aware of the facts and circumstances of my declaration.

2. That my name is 'Antoine Govindou', 'Babu @ Antoine' @ 'Babu Antoine'.

3. I state that I was born on 18-01-1972 and my birth was duly registered before the Oulgaret Municipality, Puducherry *vide* Registration No. OM/0/1972/000070, dated 21-01-1972.

4. I state that my name 'Antoine Govindou' has been mentioned in my Biith Certificate, issued by Oulgaret Municipality, Puducherry.

5. I state that my name 'Babuantoine' has been mentioned in my Driving Licence issued by the Transport Department, Government of Puducherry.

6. I state that my name 'Babu @ Antoine' has been mentioned in Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Principal District Munsif at Puducherry *vide* O.S.No. 323/2007, dated 20-07-2007.

7. I state that my name 'Babu @ Antoine' has been mentioned in the Decree passed by the Hon'ble Principal District Munsif at Puducherry *vide* in O.S.No. 323/2007, dated 20-07-2007.

8. I state that due to difference in the names found in the above documents, confusions prevail over while approaching various Authorities. 'Antoine Govindou', 'Babu @ Antoine' and 'Babuantoine' are referring one and the same person *i.e.*, myself only.

That the content of the above declaration is true to the best of my knowledge, belief and information and nothing material has been concealed therein.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 22nd day of December 2023.

562609

G. ANTOINE GOVINDOU.

AFFIDAVIT

I, P Nadesan *alias* Babou, son of Patchaippan, aged 53 years and residing at No. 29, Third Cross Street, Brindavanam, Puducherry-605 013, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows:

1. I state that my name has been entered as 'P Nadesan *alias* Babou' in my Aadhaar Card under No. XXXX XXXX 3634, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India.

2. I state that my name has been entered as 'பு நேசன் எ பாயு' in the Family Ration Card under No. 485313, issued by the Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry.

3. I state that my name has been entered as 'Nadesan @ Babou' in my Electoral Identity Card under No. PY/01/007/030674, issued by Election Commission of India.

4. I state that my name has been entered as 'Nadesan *alias* Babou' in my daughter's Aadhaar Card under No. XXXX XXXX 7617, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India.

5. I state that my name has been entered as 'Natesan @ Babu' in my daughter's Birth Certificate *vide* Registration No. M/2009/00703, dated 19-01-2009, issued by Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry.

6. I declare that all the abovesaid names *viz.*, 'P Nadesan *alias* Babou', 'ப ந டே சன் @ பாபு', 'Nadesan @ Babou' and 'Natesan @ Babu' are referring one and the same person *i.e.*, myself only.

7. That I hereby declare that I shall at all times hereafter in all records, deeds and writings and in all proceedings, dealings and transactions, private as well as upon all occasions whatsoever use and sign the name of 'P Nadesan *alias* Babou' as my name in place and in substitution of my former name.

8. I declare that what are all stated above is true and there is no suppression or misrepresentation of the above facts.

Solemnly and sincerely affirmed, and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 04th day of January 2024

562610

P. ந டே சன் @ பாபு.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Jancy Rani S, wife of George Augustin Raj, aged 36 years and residing at No. 9, Vaigai Street, Vallalar Nagar, Nainarmandabam, Puducherry-605 004, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm, and state on oath as follows:

That I am the deponent herein and I am well aware of the facts of my deposition.

I state that my daughter's name is mentioned as 'J.G. Mithulya Marie' in her Birth Certificate *vide* Registration No. P/2020/00070, dated 21-01-2020, issued by Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry.

I state that my daughter's name is mentioned as 'G.J. Mithulya (மித்துல்யா)' in her Astrological Report, issued by Sri Agathiyar Jothida Nilayam, Puducherry-605 004.

I state that both the abovesaid of my daughter names *viz.*, 'J.G. Mithulya Marie' and 'G.J. Mithulya (மித்துல்யா)' are denoting one and the same person that is referring my daughter only.

I state that hereafter, she always writing and signing her name as 'G.J. Mithulya (மித்துல்யா)' on all records, papers and all affairs of my daughter's life.

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

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

562611

JANCY RANI S.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Krishnakumary, wife of P.K. Rajendran, Hindu, aged about 60 years and residing at Plot No. 30-C, Velrampet Main Road, Velrampet, Mudaliarpot Post, Puducherry-605 004, do hereby swear and state on oath as follows :

That I am the deponent herein and aware of the facts and contents as the recitals found in this affidavit.

I state that my name has been mentioned as 'G. Kirouchenacoumary' in my Secondary School Leaving Certificate, dated 07-06-1978 bearing Serial No. 044340, issued by The Headmistress, Immaculate Heart of Mary's Girls' High School, Puducherry.

I state that due to inadvertence, my name has been mistakenly mentioned as 'கிருஷ்ணகுமாரி' in the Family Ration Card, dated 05-07-2005, bearing No. 119891, issued by the Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry and followed that my name has been mentioned as 'Krishnakumary' in my Elector's Photo Identity Card, dated 14-10-2020 bearing No. IBI0135525, issued by Election Commission of India.

I state that my name has been mentioned as 'R Krishnakumary' in my Aadhaar Card, dated 27-03-2021 bearing No. XXXX XXXX 9108, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India.

I state that my name has been mentioned as 'Krishna Kumary. R' in my Scool Identity Card, issued by the Principal, Wiseman Higher Secondary School, Velrampet, Mudaliarpot, Puducherry and also in the Pay Slip, my name has been mentioned as 'R. Krishnakumary'.

Hence, I hereby declare that my names *viz.*, 'G. Kirouchenacoumary', 'கிருஷ்ணகுமாரி', 'R. Krishnakumary', 'R Krishnakumary' and 'Krishna Kumary. R' are referring one and the same person *i.e.*, myself only.

I state that what are all sworn in this affidavit by me is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, belief and information, and nothing material facts have been concealed and suppressed thereon.

Solemnly and sincerely affirmed, and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 19th day of December 2023.

562612

R. KRISHNAKUMARY.

AFFIDAVIT

I, R. Heerachandran, son of Ramadasse, aged 34 years and residing at No. 96, 3rd Cross Street, Sabthagiri Nagar, Karuvadikuppam, Lawspet Post, Puducherry-605 008, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows:

1. I state that my name has been entered as 'Heerachandran' in my Birth Certificate under Registration No. PM/M/1989/8999, issued by Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry.

2. I state that my name has been entered as 'Heerachandran R' in my S.S.L.C. Mark Sheet, under Certificate No. SEC. 5813007 issued by the Secretary, State Board of School Examinations, Tamil Nadu.

3. I state that my name has been entered as 'Heerachandran R' in my School Transfer Certificate under Admission No. 12663, issued by the Headmistress, Thamizh Thendral Thiru.Vi. Ka. Government High School, Puducherry.

4. I state that my name has been entered as 'Heerachandran' in my Elector's Photo Identity Card under No. ATT0012658, issued by Election Commission of India.

5. I state that my name has been entered as 'R. Heerachandran' in my Aadhaar Card No. xxxx xxxx 9310, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India.

6. I state that my name has been entered as 'Heerachandran' in my PAN Card No. AOVPH9664N, issued by the Income-tax Department, Government of India.

7. I state that my name has been entered as 'Heerachandran' in my Indian Passport No. J3724362, issued by Regional Passport Office, Chennai.

8. I state that my name has been entered as 'R Heerachandran' in my Bank Passbook, issued by Indian Bank, Lawspet Branch, Puducherry.

9. I state that my name has been entered as 'Heerachandran' in my Certificate for Conversion of Religion from Hindu to Muslim *vide* Ref. F.No.36/Town Kazi/2022, issued by Government Town Kazi, Puducherry after my religion conversion, I have been changed my name as 'Abubackar' from my original name 'Heerachandran' in the said Certificate.

10. I state that my name has been entered as 'Abubackar' in my Marriage Certificate under S.M. No. 138/2017, issued by the Sub-Registrar, Oulgaret, Puducherry.

11. I state that my name has been entered as 'அபுபக்கர்' in our Family Ration Card No. 458243, issued by the Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry and again due to religion conversion, I have changed my name from 'ஹீராசந்திரன்' to 'அபுபக்கர்' *vide* Ref. No. DCS/PR/02/00062927, dated 14-09-2017.

12. I declare that all the abovesaid names *viz.*, 'Heerachandran', 'R Heerachandran', 'Abubackar' and 'அபுபக்கர்' are referring one and same person, that is me only. I state that henceforth, I shall be known and identified only by the name 'Heerachandran *alias* Abubackar' 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, and nothing material facts have been concealed thereon.

Solemnly and sincerely affirmed, and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 03rd day of January 2024.

562613

R. HEERACHANDRAN.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Mourthy, son of Muthu, residing at No. 22, Velan Nagar, Velrampet, Mudaliarpet, Puducherry-605 004, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows :

That my name has been entered as 'Mourty' in my Birth Certificate *vide* Registration No. P/1964/00817, issued by Pondicherry Municipality, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Moorty' in my Elector's Photo Identity Card *vide* No. IBI0201426, issued by Election Commission of India.

I state that my name has been entered as 'M Mourthy' in my Aadhaar Card *vide* No. XXXX XXXX 9856, issued by Unique Identification Authority of India.

I state that my name has been entered as 'M Mourthy' in my PAN Card *vide* No. AGOPM3991J, issued by Income-tax Department, Government of India.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Mourty' in my Marriage Certificate *vide* Registration No. 7/OMC/1990, issued by Oulgaret Municipality, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Mourthy M' in my Driving Licence *vide* No. PY01 19940002092, issued by the Transport Department, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'M. Mourthy' in my Transfer Certificate *vide* Admission No. 588, issued by Calve College Government Higher Secondary School, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'Mourthy M' in my Passbook of State Bank of India *vide* Account No. XXXXXXXX1491.

I state that my name has been entered as 'முர்த்தி' in my Family Ration Card *vide* No. 118692, issued by Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Puducherry.

I state that my name has been entered as 'M. Murthy' in my Appointment Order *vide* No. 1-14/ED/EEIII/Estt/A3/88, dated 26-12-1988.

Hence, I declare that all the abovesaid names *viz.*, 'Mourty', 'Moorty', 'M Mourthy', 'Mourthy M', 'M. Murthy' and 'மூர்த்தி' are denoting one and the same person *i.e.*, myself only.

I declare that what are all stated above is true and there is no suppression or misrepresentation of the facts.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Puducherry, on this 05th day of January 2024.

562614

M. MOURTHY.

—————
AFFIDAVIT

I, Noel Stanley Udhayakumar, son of Siriapushpam Henry Theodore, Indian inhabitant, aged 58 years and residing at the house bearing Door No. 66, 2nd Cross Street, Priyadharshini Nagar, Gorimedu, Puducherry-605 006, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm, to whomsoever it may concern as follows;

That I am the deponent herein. I state that in my Certificate of Birth under Registration No. K/1965/00017, my name has been mentioned as 'Noel Stanley Udhayakumar'.

In my Secondary School Cumulative Record Book under Serial No. 13007, my name has been mentioned as 'Stanley.H.T'.

In the Degree of Master of Commerce in Banking and Insurance Management Certificate under Register No. 103D0435P03138, my name has been mentioned as 'Stanley Theodore H'.

In my Electoral Identity Card under No. JTP0561118, my name has been mentioned as 'Stanley Theodore (ஸ்டேன்லி தியோடர்)'.

In the PAN Card under No. CXBPS8408L, my name has been mentioned as 'Stanley Theodore'.

In my Aadhaar Card under No. XXXX XXXX 0866, my name has been mentioned as 'Noel Stanley Udhayakumar (நோயல் ஸ்டான்லி உதயகுமார்)'

In my Marriage Register Book, my name has been mentioned as 'Stanley'.

In the particulars of members, in my Family Ration Card under No. 159895, my name has been mentioned 'நோயல் ஸ்டான்லி உதயகுமார்'.

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

I state that hereafter, I shall be known and identified by the name as 'Noel Stanley Udhayakumar (நோயல் ஸ்டான்லி உதயகுமார்)' 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 09th day of January 2024.

562618

NOEL STANLEY UDHAYAKUMAR.

—————
AFFIDAVIT

I, Kaliammal, daughter of Munusamy, Indian, aged 22 years residing at No. 42, Savadi Street, Melasubrayapuram, Thirunallar, Thirunallar Commune, Karaikal District, do hereby solemnly and sincerely affirm, and state on oath as follows :

1. I submit that I am a deponent herein and I am residing in the above-mentioned address. I am the holder of my Aadhaar Card *vide* No. XXXX XXXX 6645 for the proof of the same.

2. I submit that I was born on 30-03-1999 and my birth has been registered with the Karaikal Municipality, Karaikal.

3. On faith of Islamic religion, I have converted myself to Islamic religion on 22-12-2023.

4. I hereby relinquish my birth name 'Kaliammal' and hereafter, I shall be known, called, identified and referred only as 'Nasriya (நஸ்ரியா)'.

5. Therefore, I do hereby declare that all the abovesaid facts are true to the best of my knowledge, belief and faith.

Solemnly affirmed and signed before the Notary Public at Karaikal, on this 28th day of December 2023.

Ack No. 026

KALIAMMAL.

No legal responsibility is accepted for the publication of advertisement regarding change of names and other private notifications in the Gazette. Persons notifying the same will remain solely responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentations, *etc.*