



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	} 9	புதுச்சேரி	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை	2025 லு	மார்ச் 4	4
No.		Poudouchéry	Mardi	4	Mars	2025 (13 Phalguna 1946)
No.		Puducherry	Tuesday	4th	March	2025

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

	பக்கம்		Page		Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள் ..	118	Sentence arbitral du Travail ..	118	Award of the Labour Court ..	118
		de Tribunal.			
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் ..	124	Notifications du Gouvernement ..	124	Government Notifications ..	124
ஒப்ப அறிவிப்புகள் ..	125	Avis d'appel d'offres ..	125	Tender Notices ..	125
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் ..	126	Annonces ..	126	Announcements ..	126

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 12/AIL/Lab./S/2025,
Puducherry, dated 17th February 2025)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (T) No. 02/2024, dated 12-08-2024, of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of the dispute between the M/s. Larsen and Toubro Private Limited, (Metal Shop Unit), Puducherry and L&T Jananayaga Thozhilalargal Sangam over payment of Bonus @ 20% and *Ex gratia* @ 20% for the year 2021-22 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)

S. SANDIRAKUMARAN,
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 12th day of August, 2024

I.D(T). No. 02/2024
C.N.R. No. PYPY06-000015-2024

The Secretary,
L&T Jananayaga Thozhilalargal Sangam,
(Affiliated to AICCTU),
Puducherry. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Larsen and Toubro Private Limited,
(Metal Shop Unit),
Puducherry. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute came upon this day for hearing, the petitioner being remained absent and in the presence of Thiru B. Mohandoss, Counsel for the respondent, upon perusing the records, this Court passed the following:

ORDER

1. This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 106/AIL/Lab./T/2023, dated 05-12-2023, of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,-

(i) Whether the industrial dispute raised by the petitioners Union L & T Jananayaga Thozhilalargal Sangam (Affiliated with AICCTU), Puducherry, against the Management of M/s. Larsen and Toubro Private Limited, (Metal Shop Unit), over payment of maximum bonus @ 20% and *Ex gratia* amount @ 20% to the workers Thiruvalargal A. Dinakaran and 14 others (as mentioned in the annexure) for the year 2021-22 is legal and justified? If justified, to give appropriate direction?

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

2. Today, the case came up for hearing. No representation on petitioner side. The petitioner has not chosen to appear inspite of receipt of notice from this Court. Further, inspite of adjourning this case for appearance of petitioner, still the petitioner has neither appeared nor chosen to represent this case through a counsel. Hence, the same is recorded.

In the result this reference is closed for non-prosecution.

Written and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 12th day of August, 2024.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 13/AIL/Lab./S/2025,
Puducherry, dated 17th February 2025)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (T) No. 44/2022, dated 08-08-2024, of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of dispute between the M/s. Vinayaga Mission's Medical College and Hospital, Kottucherry Post, Karaikal and the Vinayaga Mission Thozhilalar Munnetra Sangam, over Promotion of Thiru R.Pandian and 3 others 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)

S. SANDIRAKUMARAN,
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 08th day of August, 2024

I.D(T). No. 44/2022
CNR.No. PYPY06-000092-2022

The President/Secretary,
Vinayaga Mission
Thozhilalar Munnetra Sangam,
No. 30, Kamaraj Nagar,
Karaikal - 609 602.

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Management,
M/s. Vinayaga Mission's
Medical College and Hospital,
Keezhakasakudimedu, Kottucherry (PO),
Karaikal- 609 609.

.. Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on 02-08-2024 before me for final hearing in the presence petitioner union members appeared in person and Tvl. R. Ilancheliyan, Counsel for the respondent, upon hearing both sides, upon perusing the case records, after having stood, over for consideration till this day, this Court passed the following:

AWARD

1. This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 144/AIL/Lab./T/2022, dated 01-09-2022, of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Union Vinayaga Missions Thozhilalar Munnetra Sangam, Karaikal against the management of M/s. Vinayaka Missions's Medical College and Hospital,

Karaikal, over promotion of 4 workers namely, 1. Thiru R. Panidan 2. Tmt. P. Indrani 3. A. Vanitha and 4. Sarathirajan are justified? If justified, to what relief the workmen represented by the Union are entitled to?

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

2. This case taken up before camp Court. Representative of petitioners and Counsel for respondent are present. Memo filed by petitioners Union stating that the petitioners workmen intends to have negotiation talks through their Union with the management and therefore, the petitioners want to withdraw the case. Perused memo filed by petitioner's union and the same is recorded.

In the result, this reference is closed in terms of memo filed by petitioner's Union. The memo shall form part parcel of this Award. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 08th day of August, 2024.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 14/AIL/Lab./S/2025,
Puducherry, dated 17th February 2025)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 29/2019, dated 28-08-2024 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of dispute between the M/s. Hotel Vijendira, Puducherry and Thiru Raghuvaran and 2 others, Puducherry, over reinstatement with continuity of service and other attendant benefits 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)

S. SANDIRAKUMARAN,
Under Secretary to Government (Labour).

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

Present : Tmt. G.T. AMBIKA, M.L., PGDCLCF.,
Presiding Officer.

Wednesday, the 28th day of August, 2024

**I.D. (L) No. 29/2019
CNR. No. PYPY06-000054-2019**

1. Raghuvaran
2. Manohar
3. Mohamad Rafik . . . Petitioners

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Hotel Vijendra,
No. 108, Kamarajar Salai,
Puducherry. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Tvl. R.T. Shankar, Counsel appearing for petitioner and Tvl. M.V. Vaithilingam, Counsel for the respondent and upon hearing the Learned Counsel for petitioner and respondent and on perusing the entire records of the case, having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivered the following:

AWARD

This Petition filed under section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Amended Act, 2010 (24 of 2010) Act 1947 to pass an Award to direct the respondent to reinstate the petitioners with full back wages, continuity of Service and all other attendance benefits and for the costs.

2. The averments set forth in the claim petition is as follows :

The respondent is running a Hotel Business in which more than 25 employees are working, however, no employees were confirmed/permanent employees, for the reasons best known to them. This industrial dispute arose between the abovesaid 3 petitioners and one Mr. Sathishkumar totally 4 employees and the respondent Management of M/s. Hotel Vijendra. The petitioner's raised industrial dispute before the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry on 25-07-2018 for their illegal termination. Within the period of 45 days there is no amicable settlement arrived before the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry and therefore, the petitioners are constrained to file this petition before this Court for adjudication.

(ii) The petitioners joined with the respondent company on various dates and they continued their work with the respondent factory very honestly and to the entire satisfaction of the respondent management without any remarks or blemish at all. The petition mentioned employees had worked for more than 5 years with lesser wages and the respondent management engaged the petition mentioned employees to do the perennial nature of work in full time that is 12 hours in a day and all working days in a month and the petitioners has been directly working in the front office management and room service thereby the respondent management extended the benefits of ESI to the petitioners but, not provided EPF Scheme, and the petitioner workmen were having requisite experience and qualification and they have been working for a long period that is from 2012 with the respondent management.

(iii) The petitioners have been working for a long period as a permanent worker with the respondent management and they have worked more than 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months. Hence, the petitioners are deemed to be permanent workmen as per Labour Laws; however, the respondent management had not absorbed and regularized the petitioners for the reasons best known to them.

(iv) The petitioners worked more than 5 years with the respondent management for the same nature of work and similar number of hours like permanent employees, therefore, the petitioners are entitled for regularisation as per Labour Laws and therefore, the petitioners had forced the respondent management to absorb and confirm their employment. But, the respondent management denied it and therefore the petitioners are made and effort to form a Trade Union for their legitimate right. While, this is the situation to the shock and surprise of the petitioners, the respondent management not permitted them to do their normal work and stopped them at the main entrance on 12-07-2018 by the Vijayarav with an ulterior motive without issuing any termination order or statutory notice and he had pasted a notice in their notice-board stating that the petitioners are not permitted to enter the Hotel.

(v) The respondent management without regularizing the petitioner orally terminated and threw out the petitioners as against the Labour Laws. The Act committed by the respondent management is a violation of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act and against the Principles of Natural

justice and all the statutory provisions are clearly willfully violated by the respondent management being subjected to exploitation everyday with respondent to the petitioners pay and service conditions. The respondent management denied the employment to the petitioners for their permanent status and is absolutely illegal and against the law and therefore the respondent is liable to reinstate the petitioners with full back wages and continuity of service. Hence the petition.

3. *The averments set forth in the counter filed by the Respondent is as follows :*

The respondent submits that the second petitioner Manoharan joined his work as Front Office Assistant on 18-03-2017 and colluded with the first petitioner and he himself relieved from his job along with first petitioner on 12-07-2018. Therefore, the petitioners allegation that the petition mentioned employees had worked for more than 5 years with lesser wages and the respondent management engaged the petition mentioned employees to do the perennial nature of work in full time, *i.e.*, 12 hours in a day and all working days in a month and the petitioner has been directly working in the front office management and room service thereby the respondent management extended the benefit of ESI to the petitioners but not provided EPF Scheme are totally false. The first petitioner has worked for only for two years three month and second petitioner worked only less than two years and the third petitioner worked only less than three years and they not worked continuously without break. The EPF scheme not covered for the reason that unless more than 20 employees engaged the EPF scheme will not apply. The petitioner worked 240 days within 12 calendar months is totally false, therefore, the petitioner cannot be deemed to be permanent workman and therefore, the petitioners are not entitled for regularisation as per Labour Laws.

(ii) The petitioners were not terminated from service as alleged by them. Only the first petitioner has been sent without service on 12-07-2018, since, he was in drunken mood and not able to work therefore, there is no any termination from service. The respondent came to know the first petitioner running a lodge under lessee and earned more than ₹ 50,000 per month. Even during his employment he is having travel business and thereby evaded to come to the respondent hotel for doing his job. The second petitioner doing business with his uncle by having heavy vehicle lorry and earning ₹ 30,000 per month. The third petitioner consumed alcohol and

abused one Anand and beaten him which is exhibited in the CCTV footage. The allegation that the respondent management orally terminated the petitioner which is violation of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act and against the Principal of Natural Justice and willfully violated all the statutory provisions are totally false imaginary and invented for the purpose of filing this vexatious petition.

(iii) The respondent management utilized the petitioners like a slave for a long time and exploited the tender age and not considered the welfare and all other benefits and also refused their permanent status and liable to reinstate with full back wages and continuity of service is all false. Since the petitioner requested the D' Nagar Police Station on 18-07-2018 to settle the dues as one time settlement of their wages for which the D' Nagar Police concerned Station House Officer requested the respondent to settle the dues and on the same day the respondent settled all the dues in front of Station House Officer D' Nagar and obtained the signature for full and final settlement, therefore, the question of reinstate with full back wages continuity of service and all other attendance benefits are not entitled, hence, prays for dismissal of the claim petition.

4. *Points for determination :*

1. Whether the petitioners were illegally terminated by the respondent?
2. Whether the respondent has settled all the dues to the petitioners?
3. Whether the petitioners were gainfully employed elsewhere?
4. Whether the dispute raised by the petitioners over their non-employment is justified?
5. Whether the petitioners are entitled for the reliefs as claimed in the claim petition?

5. Mr. Raghuvaram was examined on the side of petitioner as P.W.1 and through chief examination of P.W.1, Exs.P1 to P3 were marked and through cross-examination of P.W.1, Exs.R1 to R3 were marked. On the Respondent side Mr. T.S. Vijaya Rao was examined as R.W.1 and through chief examination of R.W.1, Exs. R4 and R5 were marked.

6. *On points 1 to 5 :* The contention of the petitioners is that the respondent/management is running a hotel business with more than 25 employees but none of the employees were confirmed permanent status and the petitioners herein had been working as a permanent workers in the respondent hotel for more than 240 days within a calendar period of 12 months

and requested the respondent to regularize their service but the respondent refused to confirm their employment and hence, the petitioners have attempted to form a Trade Union to claim their legitimate right and while so, the respondent management on 12-07-2018 stopped the petitioners at main entrance and thereby, without issuing any termination order the respondent have terminated the petitioners which is in violation to section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act and hence, the present industrial dispute has been raised by the petitioner for reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service.

7. On the other hand, the contention of the respondent is that at no point of time the respondent had employed more than 11 workers and thereby the EPF Scheme was not applicable to the respondent hotel but however the respondent had extended the ESI benefits to the workers. The further contention of the respondent is that the first petitioner was employed as Front Office Assistant from 01-04-2016 with a monthly salary of ₹ 8,820 and while so, on 11-07-2018 the first petitioner had come to the respondent hotel in an inebriated condition during night shift and did not work properly and thereby complaints were received from the customers and nearby tenants and therefore, the respondent came to the hotel and enquired the first petitioner about his illegal activities for which the first petitioner had abused and threatened the respondent and the neighboring tenants and took along with him the second and third petitioner and also threatened another room boy by name Sathish Kumar and later all of them went away from the hotel by themselves without informing the respondent and but thereafter the said Sathish Kumar alone had joined to the work on 10-11-2018.

8. The further contention of the respondent is that the second petitioner had joined in the respondent hotel as Front Office Assistant on 18-03-2017 and he had colluded with the first petitioner and left the job on his own along with the first petitioner on 12-07-2018 and similarly the third petitioner also went away with the first petitioner on 11-07-2018 and did not join for the work from 12-07-2018 onwards. It is further contention of respondent that in a earlier occasion on 11-09-2017 the third petitioner after consuming alcohol had abused and beaten one of the worker by name Anand who was working at Front Office and for which the same is available in CCTV footage. The respondent vehemently contended that the first petitioner had worked only for two years and three months and the second petitioner had worked for less than two years and the 3rd petitioner had worked for less than three years and all the three petitioners have abandoned the job by themselves from 12-07-2018 onwards.

9. In this case the fact of employment of the petitioners in the respondent hotel stands admitted by the respondent but the respondent denies the fact that the petitioners were illegally terminated by the respondent. It is the specific contention of the respondent that the petitioners themselves got relieved from the work from 12-07-2018 onwards and they are gainfully employed elsewhere. Whereas, the contention of the petitioners is that when the petitioners have demanded to regularise their services, the respondent prevented them from entering into the hotel on 12-07-2018 and thereby they were not provided any work from 12-07-2018 onwards. However, during the cross-examination of RW.1 the learned Counsel for the petitioners has suggested to the RW.1 that since the petitioners have demanded to issue ESI Card, the respondent management became antagonized and thereby had terminated the petitioners. Thus, the reason for termination as stated by the petitioners in the claim statement as well as during cross-examination of RW.1 is found to be on different aspects. However in this case it has to be determined whether the petitioners were illegally terminated as contended by the petitioners.

10. It is the contention of the petitioners that they had been in service for more than five years. The respondent in the counter has stated that the first petitioner had worked in the respondent Hotel for two years and three months and the second petitioner for less than two years and third petitioner for less than three years. The RW.1 during his cross-examination has deposed that the first petitioner was working in the respondent management as Front Office Assistant from 01-04-2016 onwards and second petitioner was working as Front Office Assistant from 18-03-2017 onwards and third petitioner was working as Room boy from 01-06-2012 and later he stopped to work and again joined in the respondent Hotel as room boy from 2017 onwards. Thus, in this case the petitioners were found to have worked for more than 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months. Further, the nature of work as admitted by the respondent is also found to be of perennial in nature. Therefore, in such case the petitioners were not only entitled for regularisation but, also their service could be terminated only after following the procedures enumerated under Industrial Disputes Act.

11. Hence, in the aforesaid circumstances even in case of any misconduct on the part of the petitioners the same has to be dealt by the respondent only as per the procedures stipulated under Industrial Disputes Act. In this case it is the contention of the respondents that the first petitioner came to the hotel to attend for

his work on 11-07-2018 in an inebriated condition and when this was questioned by the respondent, the first petitioner abused and threatened the respondent and neighbour tenants with dire consequences and took away with him the second and third petitioners and thereafter onwards the petitioners have not reported for work. It is an admitted fact by the respondent that either for the alleged misconduct of the petitioners the respondent management had initiated any disciplinary proceedings or has issued any show cause notice to the petitioners for their long or unauthorized absence and therefore in such context the respondent is found to have not taken any action as per the procedure contemplated under Industrial Disputes Act.

12. Similarly in respect of the incident alleged to have occurred on 11-07-2018 it is found that the respondent has not lodged any Police complaint either as against the first petitioner or as against the second and third petitioners and likewise for the incident dated 11-09-2017 as narrated in the counter it is found that no Police complaint has been lodged by the respondent but on the other hand the RW1 during his cross-examination has deposed that the respondent had enquired and reprimanded the concerned petitioners orally. However, the respondent through RW1 has produced Ex.R1/copy of the FIR to substantiate that a case has been lodged as against first petitioner but, on perusal of Ex.R1 it is found that it is a case lodged by one Kuppan against the first petitioner for some occurrences took place in front of Eswaran Koil, Oulgaret, Puducherry. Therefore, the Ex.R1 is found to be a copy of FIR in respect of some occurrence not related to the respondent management. Similarly, when the respondent contended that the respondent has CCTV footage for the occurrence, dated 11-09-2017 as stated in the counter it is found that the respondent has not produced any such footage to substantiate such allegations. Nevertheless, even in case of such allegations also the respondent can take action only as per procedures established by law.

13. When the respondent specifically contends that the respondent at no point of time had terminated the work of the petitioners and it was the petitioners who have abandoned their job but, at the same time the respondent contends that the petitioners have received one time settlement at D' Nagar Police Station on 18-07-2018 and produced Ex.R2 to substantiate that the petitioners have received final settlement from the respondent. Therefore, when the alleged occurrence as per the respondent is stated to have occurred on 11-07-2018 then contention of the respondent that the

petitioners were settled by way of one time settlement at D' Nagar Police Station on 18-07-2018 is nothing but an illegal attempt of termination or retrenchment which is totally against the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act. Further, from the above it could be inferred that the statement of respondent that the respondent never terminated the petitioners and it was the petitioners who have abandoned their job is totally a futile attempt made by the respondent for the purpose of this case.

14. Apart from that on perusal of Ex.R2 it is stated as pay register for July 2018 and in which the pay details for the month of July 2018 is stated and therefore, the same cannot be taken as full and final settlement done by the respondent and further, it is against the procedures contemplated under Industrial Disputes Act. Hence, in the said context, this Court finds that no importance can be attached to Ex.R2. Therefore, this Court from the above submissions and discussions finds that non-employment contended by the petitioners is nothing but an illegal termination done by the respondent without following any due procedures as contemplated under the Industrial Disputes Act. Thus, this Court from the above discussions finds that the industrial dispute raised by the petitioners are justified.

15. Regarding the claim of back wages is concerned, it is the contention of the respondent that the petitioners are gainfully engaged in a business and in other establishments but to substantiate the same and therefore, this Court finds that the respondent has failed to prove that the petitioners were gainfully employed elsewhere. However, this Court finds that all along the petitioners were able to sustain their life and the same cannot be done without any earnings. Hence, this Court on considering the same finds that the petitioners could be given 30% of back wages.

In the result this petition is allowed and the Respondent is directed to reinstate the petitioners 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, transcribed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 28th day of August, 2024.

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

List of petitioner's witness :

PW.1 — 15-02-2022 Thiru. Raguvaran

List of petitioner's side exhibits :

Ex.P1 — 25-07-2018 Photocopy of the Dispute raised by the petitioner No. 1 before the Labour Officer – Conciliation.

Ex.P2 — 25-07-2018 Photocopy of the Dispute raised by the petitioner No. 2 before the Labour Officer – Conciliation.

Ex.P3 — 25-07-2018 Photocopy of the Dispute raised by the petitioner No. 3 before the Labour Officer – Conciliation.

List of respondent's witness :

RW.1 — 19-10-2022 Thiru. T.S. Vijaya Rao

List of respondent's side exhibits :

Ex.R1 — 15-04-2018 Photocopy of the FIR No. 40/2018 under sections 294(b), 323, 324 r/w 34 IPC of the Reddiarpalayam Police Station on the complaint of one Kupan.

Ex.R2 — 18-07-2018 Signature of the first petitioner marked in the Pay register for July, 2018.

Ex.R3 — July, 2018 Photocopy of the attendance of the petitioners.

Ex.R4 — 2003 Photocopy of the Acknowledgement of Registration of Firms as No. 255/003 of the respondent.

Ex.R5 — 18-07-2018 Photocopy of the full final settlement of wages and relieving their services, copy of all the petitioner before the Station House Officer D' Nagar, entire documents.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

**DIRECTORATE OF INDUSTRIES AND COMMERCE
(SECRETARIAT WING)**

(G.O. Ms. No. 7/Ind.&Com./T3/2024-25/178,
Puducherry, dated 18th February 2025)

NOTIFICATION

The Pondicherry Industrial Promotion Development and Investment Corporation Limited (PIPDIC), a Government of Puducherry undertaking has requested for transfer of Government land at Sedarapet/Karasur Villages as described in the Annexure measuring an extent of 303 HA-14A-02CA belonging to the Directorate of Industries and Commerce, Puducherry, for Comprehensive Industrial Development at Sedarapet/Karasur Villages in the Union territory of Puducherry.

2. The Director, Directorate of Industries and Commerce, Puducherry, has furnished necessary particulars of land detailed in Annexure attached to the Government Order which was acquired for setting up of Special Economic Zone.

3. It was decided by the Council of Ministers, Puducherry, to transfer the land to PIPDIC, Puducherry for Comprehensive Industrial Development at Sedarapet/Karasur Villages to an extent of 303 HA-14A-02CA.

4. The Government of Puducherry, has approved the proposal for transfer of the said land to the PIPDIC, Puducherry subject to the following conditions, namely:-

(i) The proposed land should be used only for Comprehensive Industrial development.

(ii) PIPDIC shall not use the land for any purpose other than for industrial development.

(iii) The land records shall be mutated in the name of PIPDIC.

(iv) PIPDIC shall issue Share Certificates for ₹ 70.18 crores to the Government of Puducherry.

(v) Transparent mechanism as per Rules/Guidelines shall be followed for the allotment of the land.

(vi) PIPDIC shall get approval of the Government through Industries and Commerce Department in the finalization of Master Plan as well as allotment in respect of the Sedarapet-Karasur Industrial Estate.

(vii) Steering Committee chaired by Chief Secretary shall be formed to oversee the process of allotment of plots.

5. In exercise of the powers conferred under the rules 309 and 310 of the General Financial Rules, 2017, approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, Puducherry, is