



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	2026 ஐ	சனவரி மீ	6 ௨
No. } 1	Poudouchéry	Mardi	6	Janvier	2026 (16 Pausa 1947)
No. }	Puducherry	Tuesday	6th	January	2026

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

பக்கம்	Page	Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள் .. 2	Sentence arbitral du Travail .. 2	Award of the Labour Court .. 2
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் .. 9	Notifications du Gouvernement .. 9	Government Notifications .. 9
ஒப்ப அறிவிப்புகள் .. 22	Avis d'appel d'offres .. 22	Tender Notices .. 22
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் .. 22	Annonces .. 22	Announcements .. 22

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 65/LAB/AIL/S/2025,
Puducherry, dated 05th December 2025)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 02/2024, dated 13-05-2025 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of a dispute between M/s. Hindustan Unilever Ltd. (Detergent Division), NH 45A, Vadamangalam, Puducherry-605 102 and Hindustan Unilever Patali Thozhirsangam, over reinstatement of Thiru M. Karthikeyan with back wages, continuity of service and 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 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

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.

Tuesday, the 13th day of May, 2025.

**I.D. (L). No. 02/2024
CNR. No. PYPY06-000009-2024**

The President / Secretary,
Hindustan Unilever Patali Thozhirsangam,
No. 11, Om Ganapathy Nagar,
Achariyapuram, Villianur,
Puducherry-605 110. Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Hindustan Unilever Ltd.,
(Detergent Division),
NH 45A, Vadamangalam,
Puducherry-605 102. Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of petitioner and Thiruvalargal L. Sathish, S. Velmurugan, E. Karthik,

S. Sudarsanan, E. Madhivanan, Ritula Nizam, V. Ravisankar and N. Nandakumar, Counsels for the Respondent and upon hearing 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. 93/Lab./AIL/T/2023, dated 29-11-2023 of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Hindustan Unilever Patali Thozhirsangam, against the Management of M/s. Hindustan Unilever Limited, Detergent Division, Vadamangalam, Puducherry, over reinstatement of Thiru M. Karthikeyan along with back wages, continuity of service and other attendant benefits is justified or not? If justified, give appropriate directions.

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

2. Workman present and gave a letter stating that relating to same issue involved in this case, the workman Karthikeyan has filed petition under section 2A of Industrial Disputes Act and the same is pending before this Court in ID(L) No. 27/2024 and hence, this reference to be closed as the issue involved in ID(L) No. 2/2024 and ID(L) No. 27/2024 are one and the same.

Hence, the letter given by the workman Karthikeyan is recorded and this Court on recording the abovesaid letter is inclined to close this reference.

In the result, this reference is closed.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 13th day of May, 2025.

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

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 66/AIL/Lab./S/2025,
Puducherry, dated 5th December 2025)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (T) No. 01/2016, dated 31-07-2025 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of dispute between M/s. Deepak

Cables (India) Ltd., No.7, Whirlpool Road, Thiruvandar Kovil, Puducherry-605 102 and United Labour Federation, No.149, Thambu Chetty Street, C.J. Complex, IV Floor, Chennai-600 001, over charter of demands 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)

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 31st day of July, 2025

I.D. (T) No. 01/2016
CNR. No. PYPY06-000036-2016

The President,
United Labour Federation,
No.149, Thambu Chetty Street,
C.J. Complex, IV Floor,
Chennai - 600 001.

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Deepak Cables (India) Ltd.,
No.7, Whirlpool Road,
Thiruvandar Kovil,
Puducherry- 605 102.

.. Respondent

This Industrial Dispute coming before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru P. Chandrasekar, Counsel for the Petitioner and Thiru B. Mohandoss, K. Velmurugan, J. Kalirathinam, S. Vijayasanthi, Kanjanamala, R. Anbumathy, A. Asha, Indrajith and T. Vijayasanthi, Counsels for Respondents, upon hearing both sides, after perusing the case records, after having stood over till this day, this Court passed the following:-

AWARD

This Industrial Dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 43/AIL/Lab./T/2016, dated 30-05-2016 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the United Labour Federation against the management of M/s. Deepak Cables (India) Ltd., Thiruvandar Kovil, Puducherry, over charter of demands such as revision of Basic Pay at ₹ 5,000, Annual increment at ₹ 1,000, House Rent Allowance at ₹ 3,000, Conveyance Allowance at ₹ 2,000, Educational Allowance at ₹ 1,000 and other allowances, *etc.*, are justified or not? If justified, what relief the Union workmen are entitled to?

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

2. The Brief averments set forth in the claim statement filed by the petitioner is as follows:

That the petitioner Union is a Trade Union, registered under the Trade Unions Act representing both organized and unorganized sectors in Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry. The respondent management is a company registered under the companies Act. The respondent management involved in the business of manufacture and sale of ACSR/ Aluminium Conductors and the company started the commercial production in November 2000. That the workers of the respondent management did not have any genuine Trade Union representatives and in absence of the same, the management had been exploiting the workmen in various measures. Then by realizing the necessity of genuine Trade Union functioning, and in order to protect their Trade Union rights, the workmen of the respondent joined as members of the petitioner Union. That the petitioner Union is the only Trade Union in the respondent management and the workers were not paid revised wages for past four years and as the respondent management did not come forward to resolve the dispute for wage revision and fixation of Dearness Allowances *etc.*, by way of bilateral negotiations, the petitioner union was constrained to raise a dispute under section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 before the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry on 08-09-2015. That the respondent management filed their reply stating that on account of unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the employer, the respondent was unable to comply with the demands and so the Conciliation

Officer has issued the Conciliation failure report on 11-02-2016. Pursuant to which the Government issued Government Order referring the said issues for adjudication by this Court.

(ii) That the members of the petitioner Union are employed as operators in the factory of the respondent management at Puducherry. That the members of the petitioner Union have been paid basic wages ranging from ₹ 7,870. Most of the workers are residing in and around Pondicherry and cost of living in that area is extremely high. That the basic wages paid to the workers by the respondent management is inadequate to even meet out the bare minimum necessities of themselves and their families. That no comparable manufacture Aluminium conductor industries are situated in that area. There are other factories in and around Pondicherry where workers are paid much higher wages. That the respondent company is running on a substantial profit and the turnover also is high and hence, considering the same the basic wages to the workers in the respondent factory has to be increased. That the Dearness Allowances should be adequate to compensate workers for the rise in the cost of living, cost of education, cost of transport, cost of fuel, cost of electricity, cost of medical treatment and cost of provisions *etc.*, and should reflect the real rise in cost of living. It is necessary to give annual increment to all the workers every year. That the workers have to work in all the shifts in the respondent factory, the workers have to look for rental premises nearby places to the factory. That the prevailing rate of a residential accommodation is high expensive in and around respondent factory and in order to secure decent accommodation for the workers and their families, the workers would need a minimum of ₹ 3,000 per month as House Rent Allowance. That the workers are not being paid towards conveyance allowance which is difficult to commute to work. That the respondent management has to provide any transport facility to the workers and the workers of the respondent management are not paid the educational allowance to the worker. That the worker has to maintain clean and hygienic health and to get quality washing powder and it requires minimum ₹ 500 per month. That the members of the petitioner Union will share per day wage as death benefit to their family of a workman died during service and double amount of workers contribution from management to be paid to the legal heirs of that deceased workman and thereby demands Funeral help to be paid to parents of workman at ₹ 5,000 and in case death of workman ₹ 10,000. From November to January being rainy season and workers are involved in all shifts, so, demanded for rain coat to each workman per year. That the each worker needs 3 sets of uniform per year

with ₹ 500 as stitching charges in the month of January and 2 sets of small towel per year and three big size Hamam soap, ½ kilo coconut oil, 1 kilo Horlicks to be provided every month. Hence, this claim petition.

3. The brief averments set forth in the Counter Statement filed by the respondent is as follows:

That the respondent company is involved in manufacture and sale of ACSR/Aluminium Conductors and the company started the commercial production in November 2000. The respondent company was performing satisfactory till 2012-13 and the company was paying monetary benefits and salaries in time to the satisfaction of all employees during the period. But, unfortunately the company could not perform well from the Financial year 2013-14 on account of unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the employer and which had resulted in negative performance of the company. It is basic principle of Law that the capacity of industry to pay the monetary benefits is a material criterion in the adjudication process in the matter of demands made by the workers. Similarly, the fault or mistakes committed by the workmen resulting in negative performance of the company cannot be ignored while deciding the validity of the demands made by the workmen. That the quality issues with Power Grid Corporation of India Limited and subsequent poor performance in supplies due to quality issues and financial issues, Power Grid Corporation Limited has blacklisted and banned the respondent company from participating in the tenders for new orders. Due to strained liquidity, the company was finding it difficult to execute supplies in timely manner to clear backlog of orders in hand and the company faced levies and penalties impacting its revenues and cash flows. Thus, the net sales in the company had drastically got reduced over the last 3 years, which has resulted in losses during the previous financial years and losses continued during the financial year 2015-16.

(ii) Irrespective of the financial issues, the company has been paying the salaries (with some delay from last few months) to the employees by arranging the money from bank even though, there was no output from the company because of the said circumstances beyond the control of the company, it has not been able to pay the wages and other statutory payment in time. That the respondent was kind enough to increase the wages of the employees in the year 2012-2013 (w.e.f 01-07-2012) which was valid for 2 years, despite the company's

bad financial situation due to quality issues and expected ban from supplying the materials and participating from the new tenders. That through notice of retrenchment, dated 12-01-2016, retrenchment of 39 workmen done to avoid deterioration of the company. That inability of the respondent management to satisfy the demands made by the petitioner Union was clearly explained through representation, dated 21-12-2015 submitted to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry. That wages due, to the workmen from November 2016 have not been paid by the respondent for want of funds and similarly the statutory dues like ESI & PF Contribution have not been paid from April, 2016 onwards. In such a situation it will against the public interest to ask the respondent to pay more. That if, the demands made by the workmen are satisfied, balance of convenience in the matter of granting relief claimed by the workmen and similar other factors linked with larger interest of the workforce, have to be taken into consideration and if by granting the reliefs claimed by the petitioner, the industry is forced to retrench workmen further or to close the industry. That the satisfaction of the demands made by the petitioner is beyond the capacity of the respondent.

(iii) That as per the sound principles of Labour Law in the matter of fixation of wages, the Industry-cum-Region Principle is recognized one. As the respondent company engaged in the manufacture of ACSR/Aluminium Conductors cannot be compared with industries involved in the manufacture of difference products. That there is no law which mandates an employer to pay a sum of ₹ 5,000 per month as basic wages like the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act. Similarly there is no legal right for the workmen to get a sum of ₹ 1,000 as annual wage increment and there is no obligation on the part of the employer. As it is a collective dispute it is covered by section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. That the petitioner Union should prove its authority to represent the workmen of the respondent. That the name and description of the workmen for whom the claim has been made, has not been disclosed in the claim petition. That the respondent has already retrenched 39 workmen and the petitioner has no authority raise the demand on behalf of retrenched workers, as if, they are still in service. Out of 39 workmen retrenched, 11 of have settled their accounts with the respondent and petitioner Union has no authority to represent them. Hence, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. The brief averments set forth in the Additional Counter Statement filed by the respondent is as follows:

That subsequent to the commencement of the enquiry in the main ID, the creditor State Bank of India, Bangalore filed application before the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench seeking to initiate Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process under the provisions of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016. The Hon'ble Tribunal passed orders, dated 23-08-2018 declaring moratorium prohibiting, among other things, the institution of suits or continuation of pending suits or proceedings against the Corporate Debtor including execution of any judgment, decree or order in any Court of Law, Tribunal, Arbitration Panel or other authority. Subsequently, the Hon'ble Tribunal passed orders on 04-07-2019 appointing Shri Ravindra Beleyur as Liquidator to liquidate the Corporate Debtor namely the respondent company and directed the said liquidator to take speedy steps to conclude the liquidation process. With the directions of the Hon'ble Tribunal, the liquidator has taken possession of the Corporate Office at Bangalore and the factory premises at Puducherry belonging to the respondent company. That the liquidator has sealed the factory premises and all industry operations on the part of the respondent company have come to an end. That the orders passed by the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal and acts of the liquidator have got a bearing on the claim made by the petitioner in the ID and the very maintainability of the claim made by the petitioner is at stake. Therefore, it is prayed for dismissing the claim made by the petitioner on account of the subsequent developments and with directions to work out their remedy by raising their claim before the liquidator appointed by the National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench in its order, dated 23-08-2018 or in the alternative pass order for closing the reference made by the appropriate Government under section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

5. On the side of the petitioner P.W.1 was examined and Exs. P1 to P4 were marked and on the side of respondent no witness was examined and no exhibit was marked.

6. Points for determination:

1. Whether the dispute raised by United Labour Federation against the management of M/s. Deepak Cables (India) Ltd., Thiruvandar Kovil, Puducherry, over charter of demands such as revision of basic pay at ₹ 5,000, Annual increment at ₹ 1,000, House Rent Allowance at ₹ 3,000, Conveyance Allowance at ₹ 2,000, Educational Allowance at ₹ 1,000 and other allowances etc., are justified or not?

2. If justified, to what relief the Union workmen are entitled to?

7. *On points 1 & 2:*

The contention of the petitioner Union is that the workers of the respondent management were not paid revised wages for the past four years and the members of the petitioner Union have been paid basic wages ranging from ₹ 7870 and the said basic wages paid were inadequate to meet the costs of bare minimum necessities and whereas, in other factories in and around at Puducherry are paying higher wages than the basic wages paid by the respondent company and further, the Dearness Allowance are not adequate to meet out the rise in the cost of living and therefore, considering the contentions raised by the petitioner Union, the basic wages for the workers of respondent company has to be increased by another ₹ 5,000 and to enhance the house rent allowance from ₹ 3000 and conveyance allowance at ₹ 2000 and educational allowance at ₹ 1000 and washing allowance of ₹ 500 and to provide death benefits to the family members and legal heirs of the deceased workman and to provide funeral help in case of death of the workman and in case of death of the parents of the workman and to provide rain coat, uniform, stitching charge, coconut oil, horlicks, towel and soap allowances with effect from 01-01-2015.

8. The respondent in the counter contended that the subject matter of the dispute pertains to terms and conditions of employment of workmen of the respondent company and therefore, it is a collective dispute covered under section 2(k) of Industrial Disputes Act and hence, in such case, the petitioner Union has to prove its authority to represent the workmen of the respondent company. The respondent further contended that the respondent company was running in huge financial loss and apart from that due to quality issues with Power Grid Corporation of India Limited and subsequent poor performances in supplies due to quality issues, the Power Grid Corporation of India Limited had blacklisted and banned the respondent company from participating in the tenders for new orders and thereby there was no any orders from any vendors and the company net sales has drastically gone down resulting in huge loss from the financial year 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016 and from the year 2013 onwards there was no production and further when the respondent company had approached its lead lender State Bank of India for restructuring of its debt under the CDR mechanism the Bank accounts of respondent company was attached by the Income-tax Department and the company was

struggling to make payments to various Government Departments and everything went beyond the control of the respondent company and the company was struggling to disburse the wages in time and yet in the midst of all problems the company has increased wages in the year 2012-2013 with effect from 01-07-2012 and thereby in the said circumstances the respondent management has explained through representation, dated 21-12-2015 its inability to meet out the demands raised by its employees.

9. In this case, on the side of petitioner, the P.W.1 was examined in chief and was cross-examined in part and later was posted for further cross-examination of P.W.1 by respondent on various hearing dates and while so, the learned Counsel for respondent on 29-10-2019 has filed additional written statement stating that after commencement of enquiry in this case, the creditor State Bank of India, Bangalore had filed application before the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench seeking to initiate corporate insolvency Resolution Process under the provisions of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code 2016 and subsequently on 04-07-2019 Shri Ravindra Beleyur was appointed as Liquidator to liquidate the Corporate Debtor namely the respondent company and the said Liquidator was directed to take speedy steps to conclude the liquidation process and thereupon the liquidator has taken possession of the Corporate office at Bangalore and factory premises at Puducherry and sealed the factory premises. The learned Counsel for respondent thereafter has represented that in view of subsequent events took place as stated in the additional counter it is not possible for the learned Counsel for respondent to further cross-examine the P.W.1. Hence, this Tribunal has recorded the same and thereby has closed the evidence of P.W.1 and evidence on the side of the petitioner and later as the respondent did not choose to adduce any oral or documentary evidence this Tribunal has closed the evidence on the side of the respondent.

10. Thus, in the said back drops, this Tribunal has taken up this case for disposal. The first contention of the respondent is that the subject matter of dispute pertains to terms and conditions of employment of workmen of the respondent company and therefore, it is a collective dispute covered under section 2(k) of Industrial disputes Act and hence, in such case the petitioner Union has to prove that it has authority to represent the workmen of the respondent company. This Tribunal finds that as per section 36 of Industrial Disputes Act 1947, a workman who is a party to the dispute can be represented in any proceeding under the

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by any member of the executive or office bearer of any Trade Union. The petitioner Union has produced Ex. P1 which states that the petitioner Union is raising dispute regarding the charter of demands on behalf of members of the Trade Union functioning in the respondent company and further, the P.W.1 examined on the side of petitioner Union has categorically deposed during his chief examination that he has been authorised to depose evidence on behalf of the petitioner Union. To disprove the same no oral or documentary evidence has been adduced by the respondent and thereby the said contention of the respondent is found to be evasive one.

11. The next contention is that the Liquidator representing the respondent company has filed documents to substantiate that the respondent company is undergoing liquidation process as per the provisions of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code 2016 and also filed memo stating that as per the order of Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench on 04-07-2019, the Liquidator namely Shri Ravindra Beleyur was appointed to liquidate the Corporate Debtor namely the respondent company and further, the Liquidator has been directed to take speedy steps to conclude the liquidation process. This Tribunal on perusal of records finds that in this case the liquidation process pertaining to the respondent company has been commenced by way of order of Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench, dated 23-08-2018. Whereas this reference is made to this Tribunal from the Labour Department on 30-05-2016. Hence, this Tribunal without bearing to the proceedings of Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench is constrained to determine the merits of the claim made by the petitioner Union in the claim statement.

12. Admittedly the above industrial dispute has been raised by the petitioner Union over charter of demands raised by the workers of the respondent company. The petitioner Union by way of charter of demands are seeking for increase in basic wages and increase in house rent allowance at ₹ 3,000 and transport allowance at ₹ 2,000, educational allowance of ₹ 1,000, washing allowance of ₹ 500 and demand of death benefits to the legal heirs of deceased workman, funeral help, rain coat, uniform and stitching charges, coconut oil, horlicks, towel and soap allowances from the period from 1-1-2015.

13. It is the specific contention of respondent that the Net sales of the respondent company has drastically gone down resulting in huge loss from the

financial year 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016 and from the year 2013 onwards there is no production and everything went beyond the control of the respondent company and company was struggling to disburse the wages in time and yet in the midst of all problems the company has increased wages in the year 2012-2013 with effect from 01-07-2012.

14. This Tribunal on perusal of cross-examination of P.W.1 finds that the P.W.1 during his cross-examination has deposed as follows:

2013-14 கம்பெனி நஷ்டத்தில் இயங்கி வருகிறது என்றும் 2015-ல் முழுவதுமாக மூடப்பட்டது என்றால் சரிதான்.

Thus, it is found that the P.W.1 himself has admitted that the respondent company was in loss from 2013 onwards. Further, it is an admitted fact that the respondent company has been taken and sealed by the Liquidator appointed by the Hon'ble Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench and the company is in liquidation process under the provisions of Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code 2016. Hence, this Tribunal considering the above facts and further considering the facts set out in the counter statement filed by the respondent company finds that when the respondent company was admittedly running in loss from 2013 onwards and was struggling to make payment of wages in time to its workmen cannot be expected to burden more beyond its financial capability by implementing the charter of demands raised by the workmen of the respondent company more particularly when the respondent company is under liquidation process. Hence, this Tribunal finds that the dispute raised by the petitioner Union is not justified and this Tribunal is inclined to dismiss the claim petition.

In the, result the claim petition and the industrial dispute raised by the petitioner Union is dismissed. There is no order as to costs.

Partly typed by the Stenographer, partly typed by me in my laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 31st day of July, 2025.

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

List of petitioner's witness:

PW.1 — 09-04-2018 Thiru D. Prakash

List of petitioner's side exhibits:

- Ex.P1 — 08-09-2015 Photocopy of the Charter Demands raised by the Petitioner before the Conciliation Officer (Pg. 1-7).
- Ex. P2 — 11-02-2016 Photocopy of the Conciliation Failure Report (Pg. 8-14).
- Ex. P3 — 30-05-2016 Photocopy of the Government of Puducherry Labour Department Reference (Pg. 15-16).
- Ex. P4— 09-07-2017 Photocopy of the Resolution of the Petitioner Union (Pg. 17-18).

*List of respondent's witnesses: Nil**List of respondent's exhibits : Nil*

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 67/AIL/Lab./S/2025,
Puducherry, dated 05th December 2025)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 16/2024, dated 17-06-2025 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of dispute between the M/s. Chandraprabhu Enterprises Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru. M. Dhinakaran @ Babu, Puducherry, over his non-employment 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 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

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.

Tuesday, the 17th day of June, 2025.

I.D. (T). No. 16/2024
CNR. No. PYPY06-000032-2024

Thiru M. Dinakaran @ Babu,
S/o. R. Mannangatti,
No. 48, Hospital Street,
Ramanathapuram,
Puducherry. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Chandraprabhu Enterprises Pvt. Ltd.,
B- 143, 19th Cross,
Mettupalayam Industrial Estate,
Mettupalayam,
Puducherry- 605 009 . . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute came up for hearing, both the Petitioner and Respondent being remained absent set *ex parte*, upon perusing the records, this Court passed the following;

AWARD

This Industrial Dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 07/Lab./AIL/S/2024, dated 10-01-2024 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 Thiru M. Dinakaran @ Babu against the management of M/s. Chandraprabhu Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Puducherry, over reinstatement along with other attendant benefits is justified or not? If justified, give appropriate directions.

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

2. Notice served to respondent. No representation on respondent side, vakalath not filed, respondent called absent set *ex parte* on 07-01-2025.

3. No representation on petitioner side inspite of posting this case as finally. Petitioner called absent.

In the result, this industrial dispute is dismissed for non- prosecution.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 17th day of June, 2025.

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