



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	சூலை மீ	21
No.	Poudouchéry	Mardi	21	Juillet	2026 (30 Asadha 1948)
No.	Puducherry	Tuesday	21st	July	2026

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

பக்கம்	Page	Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள்.. 1282	Sentence arbitral du travail .. 1282	Award of the Labour Court .. 1282
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் .. 1295	Notifications du Gouvernement .. 1295	Government Notifications .. 1295
ஒப்ப அறிவிப்புகள் .. 1297	Avis d' appel d' offres .. 1297	Tender Notices .. 1297
ஆபத்தான நிறுவனங்கள் .. 1303	Etablissements dangereux .. 1303	Dangerous Establishments .. 1303
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் .. 1304	Annonces .. 1304	Announcements .. 1304

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 42/AIL/Lab./S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 07/2020, dated 16-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of a industrial dispute between M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Private Limited, Puducherry and Tmt. S. Vani, over his non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7 Lakh with 24% interest 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 16th day of February 2026.

**I.D. (L) No. 07/2020
CNR. No. PYPY06-000039-2020**

S. Vani,
No. 139, Main Road,
Arumbarthapuram,
Puducherry-605 110. . . Petitioner

Vs.

The Managing Director,
M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Pvt. Ltd.,
R.S. Nos. 141/4 and 142/5, Whirlpool Road,
Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune,
Puducherry-605 102. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiruvalargal S. Nagarajan and A.P. Ilangovan, Counsels for the Petitioner, Thiruvalargal L. Sarathy, R. Murugan and D. Sukumaran, Counsels for the Respondent and after perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, 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. 69/AIL/Lab./T/2020, dated 15-07-2020 of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner Tmt. S. Vani, Arumbarthapuram, Puducherry against the Management of M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Private Limited, Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune, Puducherry over non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7,00,000 with 24% interest 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. Counsel for respondent present. No representation on petitioner side, sufficient time granted. Hence, this case is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this 16th day of February 2026.

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

List of petitioner's witness :

PW.1 — 14-09-2022 Tmt. S. Vani

List of petitioner's exhibits :

Ex.P1 — 21-12-2017 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.

Ex.P2 — 28-12-2017 Photocopy of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

Ex.P3 — 02-01-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.

Ex.P4 — 09-01-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

Ex.P5 — 02-02-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.

Ex.P6 — 02-02-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner intimating job cessation.

- Ex.P7 — 02-02-2018 Photocopy of the Demand Draft No. 078387 (Axis Bank).
- Ex.P8 — 18-05-2018 Original document of the industrial dispute complaint of the Petitioner before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P9 — 10-05-2019 Original document of the reply of Respondent Management before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P10 — 05-08-2019 Photocopy of the re-joinder of the Petitioner before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P11 — 16-03-2020 Failure Report by Labour Officer (Conciliation).
- Ex.P12 — 15-07-2020 Notification of the Labour Department, Government of Puducherry.
- Ex.P13 — 04-12-2017 Photocopy of the 12(3) Settlement.

List of Respondent's witness: 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. 43/AIL/Lab./S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 08/2020, dated 16-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of an industrial dispute between M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Private Limited, Puducherry and Tmt. V. Rajeswari, over his non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7 Lakh with 24 % interest 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 16th day of February 2026.

I.D. (L) No. 08/2020
CNR. No. PYPY06-000040-2020

V. Rajeswari,
No. 10, Madhi Street,
Thirubuvanai Palayam,
Thirubuvanai,
Puducherry-605 107. . . Petitioner

Vs.

The Managing Director,
M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Pvt. Ltd.,
R.S. Nos. 141/4 and 142/5, Whirlpool Road,
Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune,
Puducherry-605 102. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiruvalargal S. Nagarajan and A.P. Ilangoan, Counsels for the Petitioner, Thiruvalargal L. Sarathy, R. Murugan and D. Sukumaran, Counsels for the Respondent and after perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, 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. 70/AIL/Lab./T/2020, dated 15-07-2020 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 Tmt. V. Rajeswari, Thirubuvanai, Puducherry against the Management of M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Pvt. Ltd., Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune, Puducherry over non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7,00,000 with 24% interest 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. Counsel for respondent present. No representation on petitioner side, sufficient time granted. Hence, this case is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this 16th day of February 2026.

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

List of petitioner's witness :

PW.1 — 14-09-2022 Tmt. V. Rajeswari

List of petitioner's exhibits :

Ex.P1 — 21-12-2017 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.

Ex.P2 — 28-12-2017 Original document of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

Ex.P3 — 03-01-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.

Ex.P4 — 09-01-2018 Original document of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner.

Ex.P5 — 01-02-2018 Photocopy of the letter by the Petitioner to the Respondent.

Ex.P6 — 02-02-2018 Original document of the letter by the Respondent to the Petitioner intimating job cessation.

Ex.P7 — 01-02-2018 Photocopy of the Demand Draft No. 078388 (Axis Bank).

Ex.P8 — 10-05-2019 Original document of the reply of Respondent Management before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).

Ex.P9 — 05-08-2019 Original document of the re-joinder of the Petitioner before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).

Ex.P10 — 16-03-2020 Photocopy of the Failure Report by Labour Officer (Conciliation).

Ex.P11 — 15-07-2020 Photocopy of the Notification of the Labour Department, Government of Puducherry.

Ex.P12 — 04-12-2017 Photocopy of the 12(3) Settlement.

List of Respondent's witness: 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. 44/AIL/Lab./S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 09/2020, dated 16-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of an industrial dispute between M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Private Limited, Puducherry and Tmt. K. Hemamalini, over his non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7 Lakh with 24 % interest 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 16th day of February 2026.

**I.D. (L) No. 09/2020
CNR. No. PYPY06-000041-2020**

K. Hemamalini,
No. 7, Third Cross Street,
First Main Road, Villianur,
Puducherry-605 110.

. . Petitioner

Vs.

The Managing Director,
M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Pvt. Ltd.,
R.S. Nos. 141/4 and 142/5, Whirlpool Road,
Thiruvandarkoil, Mannadipet Commune,
Puducherry-605 102. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiruvallargal S. Nagarajan and A.P. Ilangovan, Counsels for the Petitioner, Thiruvallargal L. Sarathy, R. Murugan and D. Sukumaran, Counsels for the Respondent, and after perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, 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. 78/AIL/Lab./T/2020, dated 15-07-2020 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner Tmt. K. Hemamalini, Villianur, Puducherry against the Management of M/s. DXN Manufacturing (India) Pvt. Ltd., Thiruvandar Koil, Mannadipet Commune, Puducherry over non-employment and compensation of ₹ 7,00,000/- with 24% interest 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. Counsel for respondent present. No representation on petitioner side, sufficient time granted. Hence, this case is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 16th day of February 2026.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 45/AIL/Lab./S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 14/2023, dated 18-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of an industrial dispute between M/s. Shree Mother Plast Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru. R. Sudhakar, over his non-employment along with 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 18th day of February 2026.

I.D. (L) No. 14/2023
CNR. No. PYPY06-000053-2023

R. Sudhakar,
S/o. Ramamurthy,
No. 15, Pudhu Nagar,
Thirubuvana, . . . Petitioner
Puducherry-605 107.

Vs.

The Managing Director,
M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Pvt. Ltd.,
A-43 to A-48, PIPDIC Electronic Park,
Thirubhuvanai, . . . Respondent
Puducherry.

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru S. Asokumar, Counsel for the Petitioner, Thiru S. Balaji, Counsel for the Respondent and after perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, 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. 39/Lab./AIL/T/2023 dated 21-03-2023 of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner Thiru. R. Sudhakar represented by Shree Mother Plast Employees Union against the management of M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Private Limited,

Puducherry over his non-employment along with other attendant benefits is justified or not? If justified, to give appropriate direction.

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

2. Petitioner not present. No representation inspite of adjourning this case for enquiry on various hearing dates. Case is pending for enquiry from 23-01-2025 without any progress. Hence, on recording the same this case is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 18th day of February 2026.

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

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 46/AIL/Lab./S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 11/2023, dated 18-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of a industrial dispute between M/s. Shree Mother Plast Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru R. Sakthivel, over his non-employment along with 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 18th day of February 2026.

**I.D. (L). No. 11/2023
CNR. No. PYPY06-000051-2023**

R. Sakthivel,
S/o. Rahakodi,
No. 76, Main Road,
Kalthietherthalkuppam,
Madagadipet Post,
Puducherry-605 107.

. . Petitioner

Vs.

The Managing Director,
M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Pvt. Ltd.,
A-43 to A-48, PIPDIC Electronic Park,
Thirubhuvanai,
Puducherry.

. . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru S. Asokumar, Counsel for the Petitioner, Thiru S. Balaji, Counsel for the Respondent and after perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, 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. 34/Lab./AIL/T/2023, dated 17-03-2023 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner Thiru R. Sakthivel represented by Shree Mother Plast Employees Union against the management of M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Private Limited, Puducherry over his non-employment along with other attendant benefits is justified or not? If justified, to give appropriate direction.

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

2. Petitioner not present. No representation inspite of adjourning this case for enquiry on various hearing dates. Case is pending for enquiry from 23-01-2025 without any progress. Hence, on recording the same this case is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 18th day of February 2026.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 47/AIL/Lab./S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (T) No. 12/2022, dated 16-03-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of an industrial dispute between M/s. Chemin C and I Private Limited, Puducherry and Chemin C and I Thozhilalar Nala Sangam over transfer of Thiru M. Manikandan and non-employment of Thiruvalargal C. Suresh and G. Selvam 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 16th day of March 2026.

I.D. (L). No. 12/2022
CNR. No. PYPY06-000051-2022

The President / Secretary
Chemin C and I Thozhilalar Nala Sangam,
No. 9, First Street,
Ariyur Pet and Post,
Villianur Commune,
Puducherry-605 102. . . Petitioner

Vs.

The Managing Director,
M/s. Chemin C and I Pvt., Ltd.,
C-102-106, 110-114,
17th Cross, PIPDIC Industrial Estate,
Mettupalayam,
Puducherry. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming before me for hearing in the presence of Thiruvalargal R.T. Shankar, P. Suresh and B. Balamurugan, Counsels for the Petitioner and

Thiru R. Chandrasekaran, Counsel for the Respondent, upon hearing both sides and perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, 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. 84/Lab./AIL/T/2022, dated 31-05-2022 of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the petitioners Union Chemin C and I Thozhilalar Nala Sangam against the Management of M/s. Chemin C and I (P) Ltd., Puducherry, over transfer of Thiru M. Manikandan to Jharkhand or Andharapradesh is justified or not? If justified, to give appropriate direction.

(b) Whether the dispute raised by the petitioners Union Chemin C and I Thozhilalar Nala Sangam against the Management of M/s. Chemin C and I (P) Ltd., Puducherry over termination of Thiruvalargal C. Suresh and G. Selvam by way of victimization is legal and justified? If justified, to give appropriate direction to what remedies to be entitled in this dispute.

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

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

That the petitioner's Union is the only Union functioning in the respondent company and has been registered under the Trade Unions Act, 1926 represented by its General Secretary, Authorized Signatory of the Petitioner Union. That, the Respondent Management M/s. CHEMIN C and I, company Registered under the Companies Act and providing most comprehensive range of instrumentation products and services, Pre-engineered, Pre-fabricated building solutions with all modern facilities for Design, Engineering and Manufacturing in the Union territory of Puducherry with qualified and experienced Human Resources. That Human Resource of more than 2000 C and I Professionals recruited directly and indirectly working at various Project sites spread over India and abroad, and CHEMIN C and I Family is having a total of 400 Engineers with operation people. That the respondent Company M/s. CHEMIN C and I is headquartered in Puducherry and deploys around two thousand employees in manufacturing and other

services throughout India. That the members / employees of the Petitioner Union had been serving at the respondent management at the utmost satisfaction of the respondent management and there is no remark at all as against the members of the petitioner Union so far and all the employees are performed all works assigned to them more than 8 hours without any safety, health, statutory leave or welfare; and also the employees are getting very low salary. That due to escalating the price of living cost/ living index; the financial position and buying capacity of the employees comes down toward the employees were demanded wage increase/revision from the respondent management but, they are not ready to increase the wages. That therefore, all the employees are formed one Trade Union in the year of 2021 namely Chemin C and I Thozhilalar Nala Sangam, and the same was duly registered before the Government of Puducherry *vide* Registration No. 1884/RTU/2021 for their collective bargaining. That all the employees of the respondent management are joined as a member of the said Trade Union and the said Union is only one and majority Union and therefore, the respondent management is heated as against the Office Bearers of the Trade Union as well as its active members.

(ii) That in these circumstances the respondent management had started all sorts of unfair Labour Practice against the Trade Union to deprive the workmen from their legitimate right created under the Labour Laws as a result, the respondent management has committed and adopted the unfair labour practices against the Office Bearers as well as active members of the said Trade Union. That the petitioner Union raised various industrial disputes as against the respondent management and the same was pending before the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry. That during the pendency of the conciliation proceedings the respondent management issued a transfer order, dated 11-11-2021 to Thiru M. Manikandan (ID 2514) to report for duty at Jharkhand and issued a Suspension Order, dated 11-03-2021 to the Union Office Bearers namely 1. C. Suresh and 2. G. Selvam for the baseless, invented and fabricated charges, which was framed by the respondent management to victimize the said Suresh and Selvam for their active Union activities. That the respondent management appointed Mr. Mohan Ilayaraja (Advocate) for conducting a domestic enquiry, and he was acted upon the tunes of the respondent management and conducted the domestic enquiry in a biased manner for fulfilling the formalities and he has submitted his report without

considering the employees statements and cross-examination points. That the Office Bearer of the petitioner Union Namely Thiruvallargal C. Suresh, welding leader and G. Selvam Sr.Fitter-*cum*-Welder were submitted their representation, dated 15-12-2021 before the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry stating that during the pendency of Conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer, the respondent management had terminated the services of Thiruvallargal C. Suresh and G. Selvam *vide* letter, dated 22-11-2021 without getting prior approval from the concerned authority and without following the principles of natural justice and prior intimation whatsoever. That C. Suresh acting as Joint Treasurer and G. Selvam acting as Vice-President of the said Union have been treated as protected workmen as per letter, dated 16-04-2021 sent by the Petitioner Union to the respondent management, hence, the said activities of the management amount to violation of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, *i.e.*, conditions of service, *etc.*, to remain unchanged under certain circumstances during pendency of Conciliation proceedings therefore, the petitioners Union requested the conciliation authority to instruct the management to revoke the transfer of Thiru. Manikandan and to post him at Puducherry and to reinstate the workmen Thiruvallargal C. Suresh and G. Selvam with all other attendants benefits while the transfer is *mala fide* and also the termination of them is unlawful one and contravention of section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act. That with regard to termination of Thiruvallargal C. Suresh and G. Selvam the respondent management did not consider the plea of the petitioners and there is no possibility to revoke the termination order in respect of Thiruvallargal C. Suresh and G. Selvam and hence, the matter was ended in failure on 14-02-2022 accordingly the dispute may be referred for further adjudication to get the relief and actual remedies only before the Court of Law. That the Labour Officer submitted their failure report to the Government of Puducherry and the Government of Puducherry referred this industrial dispute to this Labour Court *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 84/Lab./AIL/T/2022, Puducherry, dated 31 May 2022 for proper adjudication. That the petitioner Union communicated to the respondent company *vide* it's letter, dated 19-04-2021 the names of five Office Bearers of the Trade Union who were employed in the respondent company's and who should be recognised as protected workmen under section 33 (3) read with rule 66. That the protected workmen list was received by the respondent company on 19-04-2021, and within the prescribed period of 15 days from the receipt of that letter the

respondent company calm and quiet after sending the letter, dated 27-04-2021 to the petitioner Union. That the respondent management failed to recognise the list of the five workmen submitted by the petitioner Trade Union therefore, as per the proviso of the Industrial Disputes Act, the list mentioned employees are deemed to be a protected workman including the terminated employees namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam. That as per the said provision of section 33-A provides that during the pendency of an industrial dispute before the Tribunal for adjudication, the management shall not take any action without the prior permission of the Tribunal in which the case is pending and if any, action is taken without the permission of the Tribunal, then it amounts to violation of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. That for the violation committed by the respondent management right from its initial stage of the charge to till dismissal, charge as against this petitioner members / workers is illegal and unlawful one. Hence, the petition is to declare that the dismissal order, dated 22-11-2021 passed by the Respondent management is Illegal and unenforceable one in accordance with the provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and to direct the respondent management to reinstate the dismissed employees namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam into their service with full back wages, continuity of service and all other attendant benefits.

3. *The averments set forth in the counter statement is as follows:*

That the respondent company is engaged in the manufacture of control panels and specialized / custom built and tailor made instrumentation and electrical power plants and employs around 455 employees all over India. That the respondent is investing huge money every year in its operation to maintain the standards in the field of production and bestows its concentration in the welfare of the employees. That their company has started its production since 1981 and petitioner Union was formed only in the year 2021 and it is still a minority Union having very minimal membership and in any event its membership is less than the mandatory 10% representation of the workforce as required under the Trade Union Act. Therefore, the respondent had not recognized the petitioner Union. That the petitioner union had not furnished so far the list of its members to the respondent or even listed them along with this claim petition. That the petitioner, a minority Union with its members of lesser strength, than the required numbers as mandated by law, has no *locus standi* / right to raise an industrial dispute of general nature

which has the effect of covering all workers of the establishment. That the petitioner Union is having only 10 to 12 members and it has not been recognized by the management till date. That the petitioner by hook or crook and by way of suppressing actual fact was able to get a RTU Number, which is under challenge, for which a separate action is being initiated by way of filing suit challenging the Registration of the petitioner Union is under process. That in the given fact and circumstances the petitioner Union is deemed to be an Union not registered under statutory requirement, do not have the *locus standi* to raise a dispute and therefore, the claim petition of the petitioner is liable to be dismissed on this score alone.

(ii) That the petitioner has not come to this Court with clean hands and suppressed the material facts in the matter of termination of the services of Thiruvallargal G. Selvam and C. Suresh for the reasons that they have, while in service of the respondent company, parallelly employed themselves in another company namely M/s. India General Engineering with effect from 09-07-2019 and thereby committed violation of the appropriate rules envisaged in the standing orders prescribed for the respondent company. That the said workmen were issued with suspension order on 11-02-2021 and thereafter after conducting proper domestic enquiry, as provided under law, both C.Suresh and G. Selvam were terminated from service, with effect from 22-11-2021. That the so called petitioner Union was not existed at the time of deduction of commission of misconduct and issuance of the suspension Order, i.e., on 09-07-2019 and 11-02-2021 respectively. That the enquiry for misconduct, was initiated as early as on 11-02-2021, by issuing suspension order to the said workmen. That the transfer order issued to Thiru M. Manikandan is purely in exigency of service and therefore this is no merits in this petition and this petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. *Points for determination:*

1. Whether the industrial dispute raised by the petitioner Union is maintainable?

2. Whether the workmen Thiruvallargal M. Manikandan, C. Suresh and G. Selvam were protected workmen as envisaged under section 33 (3) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Rule 61 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957?

3. Whether the workmen C. Suresh and G. Selvam were simultaneously employed in another company while in employment of respondent company?

4. Whether the domestic enquiry was conducted in negation of principles of natural justice?

5. Whether the findings arrived by the Enquiry Officer was perverse?

6. Whether the dispute raised by the petitioner Union over non-employment of workmen C.Suresh and G.Selvam is justified?

7. Whether the petitioner Union is entitled for the reliefs as claimed in the claim petition?

5. On the side of Petitioner, PW.1 was examined and Exs.P1 to P25 were marked. On the side of Respondent, RW.1 was examined and Ex.R1 was marked. Written arguments was filed by the Petitioner and Oral arguments was submitted by the respondent.

6. *On point No. 's 1 and 2:*

The contention of the petitioner Union is that the respondent company is a company registered under the Companies Act and has human resource of more than 2000 C and I professionals recruited directly and indirectly and working at various project sites spread over India and abroad, and though the employees of the respondent company were working to the utmost satisfaction of the respondent management but, they were paid very low salary and therefore, all the employees of together formed a Trade Union for collective bargaining and the petitioner Union is the only Trade Union functioning in the respondent company and they had raised various industrial disputes and therefore, the respondent management got antagonized and engaged in unfair labour practice by transferring one of the Office Bearer by name Manikandan to Jharkhand as per transfer order, dated 11-11-2021 and also issued suspension order, dated 11-03-2021 to the Office Bearers namely C.Suresh and G.Selvam when Conciliation proceedings were pending and later conducted domestic enquiry by appointing an Advocate by name Mohan Ilayaraja who had acted as per the tunes of the respondent management and he without conducting fair and proper enquiry has submitted an Enquiry Report in a biased manner and without proper reasoning and based upon which the respondent had terminated the said Office Bearers namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam even though they were protected workmen and thereby the same amounts to violation under section 33(3) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

7. Whereas, the contention of the respondent is that the petitioner Union has only 10 to 12 members when the respondent company is said to have 2000 employees and therefore the respondent management has not

recognised the petitioner Union till date since it did not have minimum of 10% of membership out of 2000 total employees and therefore, the petitioner Union has no *local standi* to raise the dispute on behalf of the workmen and further as the petitioner Union has not been recognised by the respondent management the question of protection as protected workmen does not arise. The further contention of the respondent is that the transfer order issued to Thiru M.Manikandan was purely based on administrative exigencies of service and as far as the workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam is concerned while they were in service of the respondent company they had taken parallel employment in an another company by name M/s. India General Engineering with effect from 09-07-2019 and therefore, the respondent company had issued suspension order on 11-03-2021 and later after proper domestic enquiry had terminated the said workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam from service with effect from 22-11-2021 and further, in fact on the date of suspension of said workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam the petitioner Union was not in existence and hence, the said workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam cannot be contended that they were illegally dismissed from service.

8. This Court on perusal of cross-examination of RW.1 finds that the RW.1 during his cross-examination has deposed that in the Pondicherry unit there were 17 permanent employees and 3 casual labours and for the 17 workers at Pondicherry there was only one Union. Thus, this Court on perusal of evidence of RW.1 finds that in the company of respondent at Pondicherry there were only 17 permanent employees and therefore the contention of the respondent that the petitioner Union did not have minimum of 10% of total employees for recognition of Union is found to be untenable one. Furthermore on perusal of Ex.P1 it is found that the petitioner Union is a registered one and certificate of registration of Trade Union has been issued on 23-03-2021. According to section 2(qq) of Industrial Disputes Act "Trade Union" means a trade union registered under the Trade Unions Act 1926. Admittedly in this case the petitioner Union has been registered as per Ex.P1 and hence, in view of above discussions this Court holds that the dispute espoused by the petitioner Union is found to be competent and maintainable one.

9. The other contention of the respondent is that based on the exigency of service and necessity the workmen Manikandan had been transferred and it was only a routine transfer. This Court on perusal of claim statement filed by the petitioner Union finds that the petitioner Union has sought to declare the dismissal order passed against the workmen namely C. Suresh and

G. Selvam as illegal and for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits but whereas no relief has been claimed as against the abovesaid Manikandan. Similarly the PW.1 also during his cross-examination has deposed that in this claim petition no relief has been sought in favour of the workman namely Thiru Manikandan. That apart to prove that the transfer was *mala fide* it is found that the said Manikandan after the reference was made to this Court by the Labour Officer (Conciliation) has neither approached this Court challenging the transfer order nor has let in any oral or documentary evidence to prove that the transfer order was passed with *mala fide* intent. Hence, in the said context this Court finds that the contention of the respondent that the transfer of one Manikandan was passed due to administrative exigencies is found to be acceptable one and even otherwise it is found that the petitioner Union has continued this reference by way of filing claim statement only for the workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam who were said to have been dismissed from service.

10. Now coming to the dispute raised by the workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam, it is the prime contention of the petitioner Union that the petitioner Union was formed to protect and restore the rights of the workmen in the respondent company but, the respondent management to oppress the functioning of the Trade Union has started to victimize the Office Bearers of the petitioner Union by engaging in unfair labour practices. The petitioner's further contention is that the workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam comes within the ambit of protected workmen as envisaged under section 33 (3) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Rule 61 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 for the reason that the petitioner Union as per Ex.P1 was registered on 23-03-2021 and as per Ex.P12 the list, dated 16-04-2021 containing the details of the protected Workmen which includes the names of workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam was furnished to the respondent but the respondent ignoring the said list has passed termination order as per Ex.P10 on 22-11-2021 and thereby has violated the mandatory provision of section 33 (3) (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Per contra, the contention of the respondent is that the petitioner Union was not recognised by the respondent management at any point of time for the reason that in the petitioner Union there were only 10 to 12 Members which is less than 10% of total number of 2000 employees as admitted by the petitioner and thereby the petitioner Union has no *locus standi* to raise dispute before this Court and further, the workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam cannot claim any shield under the garb of protected workmen.

11. This Court on perusal of Ex.P1 Certificate of Registration of Trade Union finds that in the said certificate it has been stated that the sangam has been registered on 12-03-2021 but, whereas as per Exs.P3 and P4 the suspension orders passed by the respondent is found to have been issued on 11-03-2021. Therefore, this Court finds that on the date of issuance of suspension orders the workmen cannot raise the plea that they were protected workmen because the suspension orders are found to have been issued on 11-03-2021 and whereas the petitioner Union as per Ex.P1 has been registered only on 12-03-2021. However the termination order is concerned the same is, dated 22-11-2021. Thus, the termination order is found to have been issued after the registration of petitioner Union and after the list containing the names of protected workmen was furnished to the respondent management.

12. Before proceeding further, at this juncture this Court extracts hereunder the provisions contained under section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Rule 61 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 for better appreciation:

Section 33. Conditions of service, etc., to remain unchanged under certain circumstances during pendency of proceedings.— (1) During the pendency of any conciliation proceeding before a Conciliation Officer or a Board or of any proceeding before an arbitrator or a Labour Court or Tribunal or National Tribunal in respect of an industrial dispute, no employer shall-

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (2), no employer shall, during the pendency of any such proceeding in respect of an industrial dispute, take any action against any protected workman concerned in such dispute—

(a) by altering, to the prejudice of such protected workman, the conditions of service applicable to him immediately before the commencement of such proceedings; or

(b) by discharging or punishing, whether by dismissal or otherwise, such protected workman, save with the express permission in writing of the authority before which the proceeding is pending.

Explanation.— For the purposes of this sub-section, a “protected workman”, in relation to an establishment, means a workman who, being a member of the executive or other Office Bearer of a registered Trade Union connected with the establishment, is recognised as such in accordance with rules made in this behalf.

(4) In every establishment, the number of workmen to be recognised as protected workmen for the purposes of sub-section (3) shall be one per cent of the total number of workmen employed therein subject to a minimum number of five protected workmen and a maximum number of one hundred protected workmen and for the aforesaid purpose, the appropriate Government may make rules providing for the distribution of such protected workmen among various Trade Unions, if any, connected with the establishment and the manner in which the workmen may be chosen and recognised as protected workmen.

(5) Where an employer makes an application to a Conciliation Officer, Board, an arbitrator, a labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal under the proviso to sub-section (2) for approval of the action taken by him, the authority concerned shall, without delay, hear such application and pass, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of such application, such order in relation thereto as it deems fit.

Rule 61. Protected workmen.— (1) Every registered Trade Union connected with an industrial establishment, to which the Act applies, shall communicate to the employer before the 30th April every year, the names and addresses of such of the officers of the Union who are employed in that establishment and who, in the opinion of the Union, should be recognised as “protected workmen”. Any change in the incumbency of any such officer shall be communicated to the employer by the Union within fifteen days of such change.

(2) The employer shall, subject to section 33, sub-section (4), recognise such workmen to be “protected workmen” for the purposes of sub-section (3) of the said section and communicate to the Union, in writing, within fifteen days of the receipt of the names and addresses under sub-rule (1), the list of workmen recognised as protected workmen for the period of twelve months from the date of such communication.

(3) Where the total number of names received by the employer under sub-rule (1) exceeds the maximum number of protected workmen, admissible for the establishment, under section 33, sub-section (4), the employer shall recognise as protected workmen only such maximum number of workmen:

Provided that, where there is more than one registered Trade Union in the establishment, the maximum number shall be so distributed by the

employer among the Unions that the numbers of recognised protected workmen in individual Unions bear roughly the same proportion to one another as the membership figures of the Unions. The employer shall in that case intimate in writing to the President or the Secretary of the Union the number of protected workmen allotted to it:

Provided further that where the number of protected workmen allotted to a Union under this sub-rule, falls short of the number of officers of the union seeking protection, the Union shall be entitled to select the officers to be recognised as protected workmen. Such selection shall be made by the union and communicated to the employer within five days of the receipt of the employer's letter.

(4) When a dispute arises between an employer and any registered Trade Union in any matter connected with the recognition of ‘protected workmen’ under this rule, the dispute shall be referred to any Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) or the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) concerned, whose decision thereon shall be the final.

13. Keeping in view of the abovesaid facts and provision of law, this Court has to examine whether the workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam are protected workman within the meaning of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Rule 61 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and whether the said workmen are entitled to enjoy the benefit of the protection under section 33(3)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The learned Counsel for respondent contended that mere communication of the names of the Office Bearers of the union as protected workmen to the employer in compliance with Rule 61 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 is not sufficient because there must be some positive action on the part of the employer in respect of grant of recognition that those employees recommended by the Union are accepted as protected workmen and in this case the respondent management had replied by way of Ex.P15 letter, dated 27-04-2021 stating that the respondent would consider the request of the petitioner Union only after receipt of proper communication from the Labour Department but, thereafter no such communication was received from the Labour Department and henceforth, the abovesaid workmen are precluded from claiming that they are protected workmen for want of recognition as protected workmen.

14. Refuting the contentions of respondent, it is contended by the learned Counsel for petitioner that the respondent after receipt of list of protected

workmen has not raised any objection, but, on the other hand has issued only Ex.P15 stating that the respondent would consider the request of the petitioner Union only after receipt of proper communication from the Labour Department and thereafter the respondent has remained silent regarding grant of recognition to the list of protected workmen within the requisite time period and therefore the conduct of the respondent would imply automatic recognition as 'protected workmen'.

15. The learned Counsel for petitioner further contended that the employer cannot at his sweet will choose to deprive the concerned workmen of their statutory protection and respondent company could refuse to accord recognition to the workmen as 'protected workman' only on the ground that by granting such recognition total number of 'protected workmen' in the establishment would exceed the prescribed number of protected workmen admissible for the said establishment under section 33(4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

16. This Court on perusal of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 finds that Rule 61 (1) empowers the registered Trade Union to select the Office Bearers who should be recognised as protected workmen and the names and addresses of such officers of the Union who are employed in the establishment should be communicated to the employer by the concerned Union before 30th April of every year and Rule 61(2) casts an obligation on the employer to recognise such workmen to be protected workmen subject to condition as mentioned in section 33 (4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, Rule 61(2) does not empower the employer unfettered power regarding selection and recognition of protected workmen and if the concerned Trade Union complies with the provisions of sub-rule (1) of Rule 61 then, under sub-rule (2) of Rule 61 the employer is duty bound to recognise the workmen whose names have been forwarded by the concerned Union under sub-rule (1) to be protected workmen unless the total number of such Office Bearers forwarded by the concerned Union exceeds the maximum number of protected workmen admissible for the establishment under section 33(4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

17. Therefore the only limited statutory right which the employer has is that if the recognition as protected workmen sought is in excess of the maximum number as contemplated under Rule 61 (3) Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, then the employer shall recognise only the maximum of such protected number of workmen

as provided under section 33(4) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In this case recognition was sought as per the cut off date fixed under Rule 61(1) of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 that is on 16-04-2021 the list of protected workmen which contained the name of five persons who were admittedly Office Bearers was sent to respondent management and further the said number did not exceed the statutory maximum provided under section 33 (4) of Industrial Disputes Act 1947 and hence, the respondent in this case had mandatory obligation to recognise the five Office Bearers whom the Union had selected and was bound to communicate recognition of these officers as protected workmen within 15 days period from the date of the receipt of Ex.P12 but, the respondent management remained silent by sending Ex.P15 stating that the respondent would consider the request of the petitioner Union only after receipt of proper communication from the Labour Department which is unsustainable. Hence, for the aforementioned reasons, this Court holds that the workmen C. Suresh and G. Selvam are found to be protected workmen and as such they are entitled for the benefit of statutory protection as contemplated under section 33 (3) (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947.

18. *On Point No's 3 to 7:*

In this case according to respondent the reason for suspension and subsequently dismissal of two workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam is that while they were in employment in the respondent company they had taken parallel employment with another company by name M/s. India General Engineering. This Court on perusal of Exs.P7 and P8 Enquiry Reports finds that in the domestic enquiry proceedings it is the specific contention of the respondent management before the Enquiry Officer that the two workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam have refused to do overtime work and to work on holidays for the reason that they had taken parallel employment in an another company by name M/s. India General Engineering which is carried by one of the supervisor of respondent company by name L.Venkatesaperumal.

19. The enquiry proceedings further reveals that during enquiry the respondent management representative had requested the Enquiry Officer to exempt the management from examining the said L. Venkatesaperumal for the reason that the said L. Venkatesaperumal had refused to adduce any evidence before the Enquiry Officer and thereafter the Enquiry Officer considering the representation of the

respondent management representative has removed the name of L.Venkatesaperumal from the management witnesses list.

20. Similarly on perusal of Enquiry Report it is found that except the oral evidence of witnesses examined on the side of respondent management there is no any documentary evidences produced to substantiate that the two workmen namely C.Suresh and G.Selvam while employed in respondent company was simultaneously working in an another company by name M/s. India General Engineering when it is the specific case of respondent that L.Venkatesaperumal is a supervisor working in the respondent company. Furthermore even before this Court the respondent has not produced any single documents, viz., like attendance register, salary slip, ESI or PF pertaining to M/s. India General Engineering to prove that the two workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam were working in M/s. India General Engineering for the period while they were working in the respondent company.

21. This Court finds that when the allegation raised by the respondent is of serious nature then in such case the respondent is expected to prove the same by producing proper documentary evidence but, in this case except the oral evidence of the management witness there is nothing on record to prove that the two workmen namely C.Suresh and G.Selvam were working in M/s. India General Engineering for the period while they were working in the respondent company. Thus, this Court holds that the findings given by the Enquiry Officer is totally perverse one. Furthermore as held in *supra* the two workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam are found to be protected workmen. Therefore, viewed in any angle the termination order passed as against two workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam are found to be unsustainable one. Thus, the industrial dispute raised by the petitioners are found to be justifiable one.

22. Regarding the claim of back wages is concerned the respondent failed to prove that the two workmen were gainfully employed elsewhere. Furthermore the two workmen were forbidden from performing their duties for no fault on their part but, on account of arbitrary action on the part of respondent from terminating their service and in such context this Court holds that the workmen would be entitled for full back wages.

In the result, this petition is allowed, the dismissal order, dated 22-11-2021 passed by the respondent management as against the two workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam is set aside and the respondent

management is directed to reinstate the two workmen namely C. Suresh and G. Selvam into their service within two months from the date of this Award with full back wages, continuity of service and all attendant benefits. There is no order as to cost.

Partly typed by the stenographer, partly typed by me in my laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 16th day of March 2026.

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

List of Petitioner's Witness :

PW.1 — 07-12-2022 Thiru G. Selvam

List of petitioner's exhibits :

- | | | |
|--------|--------------|---|
| Ex.P1 | — 23-03-2021 | Photocopy of the Trade Union Registration Certificate. |
| Ex.P2 | — 11-11-2021 | Photocopy of the Transfer order issued by the respondent management to Manikandan. |
| Ex.P3 | — 11-03-2021 | Photocopy of the suspension order issued by respondent management to Suresh. |
| Ex.P4 | — 11-03-2021 | Photocopy of the suspension order issued by respondent management to Selvam. |
| Ex.P5 | — 12-04-2021 | Photocopy of the Domestic Enquiry Officer appointment letter sent by the respondent management to Suresh. |
| Ex.P6 | — 12-04-2021 | Photocopy of the Domestic Enquiry Officer appointment letter sent by the respondent management to Selvam. |
| Ex.P7 | — 09-10-2021 | Photocopy of the Domestic Enquiry findings of the enquiry to Suresh. |
| Ex.P8 | — 09-10-2021 | Photocopy of the Domestic Enquiry findings of the enquiry to Selvam. |
| Ex.P9 | — 15-12-2021 | Photocopy of the Letter submitted by Suresh to the Labour Office Conciliation. |
| Ex.P10 | — 22-11-2021 | Photocopy of the Notice of Dismissal order issued by respondent management to Suresh. |

Ex.P11 — 22-11-2021	Photocopy of the Notice of Dismissal order issued by respondent management to Selvam.	Ex.P20 — 03-03-2022	Photocopy of the Notice issued by the Hon'ble Labour Court.
Ex.P12 — 16-04-2021	Photocopy of the Submission of list of protected workmen issued by the petitioner Union to the respondent management and Post acknowledgement.	Ex. P21 — 11-10-2021	Photocopy of the Notice of enquiry / Conciliation issued by the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry.
Ex.P13 — 11-03-2022	Photocopy of the Failure Report submitted by the Labour Officer.	Ex.P22 — 30-09-2021	Photocopy of the reply furnished by the Respondent Management to the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry.
Ex.P14 — 31-05-2022	Photocopy of the Reference issued by the Government of Puducherry.	Ex.P23 — 27-01-2022	Photocopy of the Failure report submitted by the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry.
Ex.P15 — 27-04-2021	Photocopy of the Reply letter sent by the respondent management to the Petitioner Union.	Ex.P24 — 25-02-2022	Photocopy of the Reference issued by the Government of Puducherry.
Ex.P16 — 11-10-2021	Photocopy of the Notice of enquiry / Conciliation issued by the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry.	Ex.P25 — 22-03-2022	Photocopy of the Notice issued by the Hon'ble Labour Court.
Ex.P17 — 30-09-2021	Photocopy of the reply furnished by the Respondent Management to the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry.	<i>List of Respondent's Witness:</i>	
Ex.P18 — 24-01-2022	Photocopy of the Failure report submitted by the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry.	RW.1 — 17-08-2023	Thiru R. Suresh
Ex.P19 — 25-02-2022	Photocopy of the Reference issued by the Government of Puducherry.	<i>List of Respondent's exhibits:</i>	
		Ex.R1 — —	Original document of the Authorization letter appointing R.Suresh to represent the case.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER, KARAIKAL

No. 2731/CEO/KKL/E3(Exam.)/2026/869.

Karaikal, dated 30th June 2026.

NOTIFICATION

It is hereby informed that the following candidate has lost his original S.S.L.C. Mark Certificate beyond the scope of recovery and necessary steps have been taken to issue duplicate certificate. If, any one finds the original mark certificate, it / they may be sent to the Secretary, State Board of School Examinations (Sec.), College Road, Chennai-600 006 for cancellation, as it / they is / are no longer valid.