



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 ஹ்	சூலை மீ	28 உ
No.	30 Poudouchéry	Mardi	28	Juillet	2026 (6 Sravana 1948)
No.	Puducherry	Tuesday	28th	July	2026

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

பக்கம்	Page	Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள்.. 1318	Sentence arbitral du travail .. 1318	Award of the Labour Court .. 1318
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் .. 1333	Notifications du Gouvernement .. 1333	Government Notifications .. 1333
ஒப்ப அறிவிப்புகள் .. 1340	Avis d'appel d'offres .. 1340	Tender Notices .. 1340
ஆபத்தான நிறுவனங்கள் .. 1340	Etablissements dangereux .. 1340	Dangerous Establishments .. 1340
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் .. 1342	Annonces .. 1342	Announcements .. 1342

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 48/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (T) No. 03/2016, dated 27-03-20256 of the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Larsen and Toubro Private Ltd., Sedarapet, Puducherry and Naam Thamizhar Thozhilalar Nalasangam, over regularization of Tvl. C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and A. Jagadeesan and to pay them wages on par with regular workers have 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.

Friday, the 27th day of March 2026

I.D. (T) No. 03/2020
CNR. No. PYPY06-000003-2020

The President/Secretary,
Naam Thamizhar Thozhilalar Nalasangam,
Mailam Road, Sedarapet,
Puducherry. . . Petitioner

Versus

M/s. Larsen and Toubro Ltd.,
ECC Division, Rep by its Managing Director,
Mailam Road, Sedarapet,
Puducherry – 605 111. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru P.R. Thiruneelankandan and Thiru A. Mithun Chakravarthy, Counsels for the

Petitioner and Thiruvallargal M. Vaikunth, R. Vikneshraj and G. Anand, Counsels for the Respondent, upon perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration 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. 138/AIL/LAB/T/2019, dated 19-12-2019 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioner and the Respondent, *viz.*,

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the union workmen represented by Naam Thamizhar Thozhilalar Nalasangam, Puducherry against the management of M/s. Larsen and Toubro Pvt. Ltd., Sedarapet, Puducherry, over regularization of Tvl. C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and A. Jagadeesan and to pay them wages on par with regular workers 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 averments set forth in the petition is as follows:* (i) That the petitioner union is espousing the cause of its members namely (1) C. Shanmugavel, (2) R. Krishnamoorthy, (3) E. Jagadeesan who are workers in the respondent factory. The said Shanmugavel was appointed in the respondent establishment in the year 1991 and ever since, he had been continuously employed in the respondent factory as driver without any break of service. Despite that the respondent management did not regularize the service of the said worker as permanent workman. Whereas, the respondent closed the provident fund account of the said worker Shanmugavel and issued fresh appointment order on 02-04-2007 as to project the said worker as newly recruited and appointed only on 02-04-2007. Even thereafter the said worker Shanmugavel had been continuously employed in the respondent factory without any break of service. However, the petitioner was not given the wages and other service condition on par with the permanent workers and his service also not regularized. That as far as the petitioner union member Krishnamoorthy is concerned he was appointed on 22-11-1999. Ever since he has been continuously working in the respondent factory. The ESI, EPF contribution were deducted from the salary of the said worker and remitted the same to the authority concerned, but, his service has not been regularized as

permanent employee and he has not been paid wages on par with the permanent employees. That as far as the worker Jagadeesan is concerned he was appointed in the respondent factory in the year 2001 as security. Ever, since he had been continuously working in the respondent establishment without any break of service around 2007 the petitioner was appointed in the dispatch section as dispatcher and working in the respondent establishment as a dispatcher, but, his service was not regularized as permanent employee.

(ii) That the petitioner union workers aggrieved by the exploitation in not regularizing their service, despite the fact they rendered more than 22 to 30 years in the respondent factory and the nature of work which they carried out perennial in nature the said workers had raised an industrial dispute before the Labour Officer Conciliation, Puducherry, but, no amicable settlement was arrived and it was ended in failure report. Thereafter the matter was referred to the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry *vide* Government Order G.O. Rt. No. 138/AIL/LAB/T/2019, Labour Department, dated 18-09-2019. That the petitioner union members are entitled to regularize their service as permanent employee and they are entitled to wages that of the permanent workers of the respondent factory since the petitioner union members are working in the respondent factory for more than 20-30 years of continuous service without any break. That the petitioner union members are directly recruited and appointed by the respondent in its factory and the workers also working under the direct control of the respondent management, that being so the respondent management in order to avoid the regularization of service of the workers and to evade payment of wages to the said workers on par with the permanent workers had employed the petitioner union members under different nomenclature such as casual, contract workers, trainee are illegal. Hence, the petition.

3. *The averments set forth in the counter statement is as follows:* (i) That the respondent company namely Larsen and Turbo Limited, which is Multi National Company (MNC), incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956, which is having factories in all over Territory in India as well other Countries in the world. In the year 2000 it established factory namely Larsen and Turbo Limited, ECC Division Karasur Timber Shop Manufacturer of Timber Beam. That the respondent company is in the business of manufacturing of the transmission line tower component and its factory is situated at Mailam Road, Sedarapet, Puducherry. The factory is duly registered under the provisions of The Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 and Puducherry rules" made thereunder. That the respondent company is engaging several Contractors

for the purpose of carrying out various miscellaneous jobs in the company premises and in turn the contractors were engaging/employing their direct workmen to fulfill their contractual obligations at the premises of the company and the Licensing Authority, Puducherry has also duly issued licenses in favour of several contractors under the provisions of Contract Labour Act, 1970 among them are (1) Selvam, (2) R. Srinivasa Perumal, (3) Radhakrishnan. Therefore, the contract labourers in the petitioner's union was covered under these licences. That the Licensing Officer, Puducherry, had duly issued the licenses to (1) Thiruvallargal A. Selvam, Licence No. 866/LO(E)/CL, (2) R. Srinivasa Perumal, Licence No. 709/CL/LO/F, (3) Radhakrishnan Licence No. 693/CL/ LO/F.

(ii) That the aforesaid (1) Shanmugavel, (2) Krishnamoorthy, (3) Jagadeesan were employed under the Supervision and control of their contractor and thereby the master and servant relationship exist between the aforesaid contractor and the Petitioner. Therefore, the employment with Principal Employer will not arise as such. That the respondent further enquired with the employer of Shanmugavel namely M/s. A. Selvam and understood that due to prolonged absence from the duty with effect from 03-03-2020 the said Shanmughavel was absconding from the services and therefore, Thiru A. Selvam had terminated the services of the present petitioner Mr. C. Shanmugavel and whereas, the said Krishnamoorthy and Jagadeesan are still working under their contractors Srinivasa Perumal and Radhakrishnan. Therefore, there was no employer and employee relationship existed between respondent company and petitioners union members. The respondent company is not a principal employer of the petitioner. So, master and servant relationship existed only between the Licensed Contractors (1) Selvam, (2) R. Srinivasa Perumal and (3) Radhakrishnan and the Petitioners union members. Therefore, the petitioner's union members has to implead Licenced Contractors who is the Principal employer of the petitioners union members, as necessary party in this industrial dispute and should ask for relief only against his principal employer in such raised above industrial dispute conveniently without impleading his principal employer. That however the responsibility of covering all contract employees, including the petitioner, under the provisions of various beneficial legislations such as EPF and MIS Act, 1952, ESI Act, 1947 and *etc.*, lies with the respondent company otherwise the respondent company has to face criminal prosecution. That just because he was covered under EPF and MIS Act, 1952 and ESI Act 1947 by the respondent company it will not confer any right on the contract labourers, including

petitioner, to claim permanent status on par with regular employees those, who were directly appointed by the respondent company after due selection. Hence, the industrial dispute is liable to be dismissed on the sole grounds of non impleading of their respective contractors, who are the principal employer of the petitioners in the industrial dispute.

4. *Points for determination:* (1) Whether the workmen (1) C. Shanmugavel, (2) R. Krishnamoorthy and (3) E. Jagadeesan are workmen of respondent?

(2) Whether the workmen (1) C. Shanmugavel, (2) R. Krishnamoorthy and (3) E. Jagadeesan are contract labourers of respondent?

(3) Whether the relationship of employer and employee exists only between the contractors (1) A. Selvam, (2) R. Srinivasa Perumal and (3) Radhakrishnan and the workmen (1) C. Shanmugavel, (2) R. Krishnamoorthy and (3) E. Jagadeesan?

(4) Whether the denial of regularisation by the respondent is illegal?

(5) Whether the dispute raised by petitioner is justified?

(6) To what other reliefs the petitioner is entitled for?

5. On the side of the petitioner, PW.1 was examined and Exs.P1 to P58 were marked. On the side of Respondent, RW.1 was examined and Exs. R1 to R12 were marked.

6. *On point Nos. 1 to 6:* The contention of the petitioner union is that the petitioner union is a registered trade union espousing the cause of its members namely (1) C. Shanmugavel, (2) R. Krishnamoorthy and (3) E. Jagadeesan who have worked in the respondent factory from the date of their initial appointment. The further contention of the petitioner is that the workman C. Shanmugavel was appointed in the respondent factory in the year 1991 and he had been working as driver without any break of service but, the respondent without regularising the said workman C. Shanmugavel had closed the Provident Fund account and issued fresh appointment on 02-04-2007 as if, he was newly recruited and appointed on 02-04-2007 and though the said workman thereafter was working continuously he was neither regularised nor given wages on par with the permanent workers.

7. The further contention of the petitioner is that the workman R. Krishnamoorthy was appointed on 22-11-1999 and though ESI and EPF were deducted from

his salary and was working continuously but, he was neither regularised nor given wages on par with the permanent workers. It is the further contention of the petitioner that another workman Jagadeesan had joined in the respondent factory in the year 2001 and had been working continuously without any breakage and later worked as dispatcher in despatch section but, his service was not regularised and thus it is the specific contention of the petitioner that though the abovesaid workmen had worked in the respondent factory for 22 to 30 years and did perennial nature of work their service were not regularised.

8. *Per contra*, it is the contention of the respondent that the present industrial dispute has been raised by the petitioner by suppressing material facts and infact the respondent company is engaged in the business of manufacturing of the transmission line components and the factory is situated at Mailam Road, Sedarapet, Tower Puducherry and the respondent the factory was registered under the provisions of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 and Puducherry Rules and thereby the respondent company had been engaging several contractors for the purpose of carrying out various miscellaneous jobs in the company premises and inturn the contractors were engaging workmen for the purpose of fulfilling the contractual obligations at the premises of the respondent factory and hence, those workmen were under the supervision and control of abovesaid contractors and were receiving salary from the said contractors and therefore, there was no any master and servant relationship between the workmen and the respondent factory. The yet another contention of the respondent is that to avoid criminal prosecution and to cover all the permanent workmen and contract labourers of the respondent factory under beneficial legislation such as EPF and ESI Act, the respondent was deducting EPF and ESI contribution from the wages as principal employer but, the same does not confer any right upon the contract labourers to claim permanent status on par with regular employees.

9. Thus from the contentions raised by the petitioner and respondent this Tribunal finds it is the specific case of the petitioner that the workmen C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and E. Jagadeesan were appointed in the respondent factory on 02-04-2007, 22-11-1999 and 2001 respectively and then onwards were working without any breakage of service but, the respondent has not regularised their service and whereas, the contention of the respondent is that the said workmen are contract labourers under contractors A. Selvam, R. Srinivasa Perumal and Radhakrishnan and therefore, there does not exist any employer and employee relationship between the respondent and the abovesaid workmen.

10. The P.W.1 who is the Secretary of the petitioner union has deposed that he has not produced any appointment order pertaining to the workmen namely C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and E. Jagadeesan but, has produced ESI and PF documents to substantiate the same. When the respondent is found to have admitted the fact that the workmen C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and E. Jagadeesan were working in the respondent factory but, nevertheless has not specifically stated the period from when the abovesaid workmen were working in the respondent factory. The R.W.1 during his cross-examination has deposed that in Ex.P18 ESI Corporation Identity Card, the date of entry of Shanmugavel is mentioned as 02-04-2007 and further admitted that Ex.P.20 pertains to the ESI contribution of Shanmugavel from the period from 2009 to 2019 and in Ex.P26 series it is mentioned that Shanmugavel is a driver. Thus from the above discussed exhibits and from the evidence of R.W1, this Tribunal finds the fact that the Shanmugavel was working in the respondent factory from 02-04-2007 stands proved.

11. Similarly, the R.W.1 during his cross-examination has deposed that in Ex.P31 ESI Corporation Identity Card the date of entry of Krishnamoorthy is mentioned as 22-11-1999 and further admitted that Ex.P.42 is issued by respondent factory. On perusal of Ex.P42 it is found that it is PF part withdrawal Form and in the said Form at the place of Employer's signature the Seal of L&T is affixed and has been signed by A. Nepoliyan, Assistant Manager – Industrial Relations. Similarly on perusal of Ex.P48 it is found to be the PF statement of Krishnamoorthy for the period from 2009 to 2019 and in Ex.P48 the Establishment ID name is mentioned as Larsen-Toubro Ltd., and Likewise Ex.P51 is the PF statement of Jagadeesan for the period from 2009 to 2019 and in Ex.P51 the Establishment industrial dispute name is mentioned as Larsen-Toubro Ltd. Thus from the above discussions, exhibits and evidence of RW.1 this Tribunal finds the fact that the workmen C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and E. Jagadeesan were working in the respondent factory from 02-04-2007, 22-11-1999 and 2001 respectively as contended by the petitioner stands proved.

12. When the petitioner has proved that the workmen C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and E. Jagadeesan were working in the respondent factory from 02-04-2007, 22-11-1999 and 2001 respectively then it is for the respondent to prove its contention as contended in the counter that the said three workmen were only a contract labourers employed by the licensed contractor of respondent factory. The specific contention of the respondent is that the respondent as

a principal employer was deducting ESI and EPF contributions from the wages payable to the abovesaid workmen but, the respondent to substantiate the same has not produced any documents to show that the respondent as a principal employer was deducting ESI and EPF contributions from the wages of workmen and thereafter along with employers share the same was remitted to the authority concerned and subsequently the amount remitted was deducted in the invoice of the said contractors. Likewise the respondent has not produced either the respondent Factory's ESI and EPF code or alleged licensed contractors ESI and EPF code to substantiate that the contribution amount deducted was remitted in the alleged contractors ESI and EPF code.

13. That apart this Tribunal finds that when the plea of contract labour is raised then the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 comes into play and it is for the respondent to prove that the establishment was registered as per section 7 of Contract Labour (Regulation And Abolition) Act, 1970 and further the alleged contractors were issued licence by the Licensing Officer as per section 13 of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 and further there was a contract entered between the licensed contractors and the respondent factory agreeing to deploy contract labourers to the respondent factory.

14. In this case, though the respondent in the counter has stated that the Licensing Officer, Puducherry has issued licence to the contractors A. Selvam, R. Srinivasa Perumal and Radhakrishnan but, the respondent has not produced any licence that stands in favour of said A. Selvam, R. Srinivasa Perumal and Radhakrishnan. Furthermore, the R.W.1 during his cross-examination has deposed and admitted that the respondent factory has not produced any contract entered between the respondent factory and the alleged contractors A. Selvam, R. Srinivasa Perumal and Radhakrishnan. Likewise the respondent has not produced any contract extension document entered between the respondent and the contractors and similarly has not produced any documents to substantiate that there was money transaction between the respondent factory and the contractors to substantiate the payments made for deploying contract labourers.

15. This Tribunal finds that when the respondent company contends that the workmen are contract labourers of its licensed contractors then it is for the respondent factory to prove the same by production of licence issued by the Licensing Officer in favour of said

licensed contractors and also by production of contract entered between the contractors namely A. Selvam, R. Srinivasa Perumal and Radhakrishnan and respondent factory with regard to the deployment of contract workmen by the contractors to the respondent factory but, in this case none of the said documents has been produced by the respondent. Moreover, the respondent has also not produced any document to prove the transaction that had taken place between licenced contractors and respondent factory towards the settlement of wages to the contract labours deployed by the contractors. Thus this Tribunal finds that the respondent has miserably failed to prove that A. Selvam, R. Srinivasa Perumal and Radhakrishnan are the contractors of respondent factory and the workmen namely C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and E. Jagadeesan were under direct supervision and control of the said contractors and further deployed the said workmen to the respondent factory.

16. Furthermore, it is the specific contention of the petitioner that the workmen were engaged in work of perennial in nature but, to negate the same no documents has been produced by the respondent and further the R.W.1 during his cross admitted that in Ex.P26 series it is mentioned that Shanmugavel is a driver and therefore the nature of work carried by the workmen being perennial nature as contended by the petitioner this Tribunal finds that as per Contract Labour (Regulation And Abolition Act), 1970 it prevents the principal employer from engaging a contract labour to do the core activity of the establishment. Hence, in the said discussions, this Tribunal holds that the abovesaid three workmen has to be treated as workmen directly employed by the principal employer of the establishment that is by the respondent factory and in such context there exists master and servant relationship between the abovesaid workmen and the respondent.

17. The other contention of the petitioner is that the said three workmen were engaged in regular work and were discharging their service on par to that of permanent workers but, despite the same they were not regularised. This Tribunal finds that if, a workman works for 240 days in preceding twelve calendar months then he must be said to be in continuous service as per section 25B of Industrial Disputes Act. No doubt the Hon'ble Apex Court in *catena* of decisions has held that it is for the workman to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in a calendar year and mere filing of affidavit by the workman to that effect is not sufficient and further the burden cannot be initially cast upon the employer. This Tribunal on perusal of case records finds that the respondent has not specifically

disputed that the abovesaid workmen have completed 240 days in a calendar year and the said fact and evidence of the petitioner to that effect also has not been controverted by the respondent by producing any rebuttal evidence. This Tribunal on perusal of records and evidence of PW.1 and RW.1 finds that the workmen have worked for years together without breakage of service and thereby based on doctrine of legitimate expectation and taking into consideration of the fact that they had worked for 240 days in a calendar year it should be deemed that they are in continuous service. Hence, this Tribunal finds that the workmen are entitled for the relief of regularisation of service.

18. As a last attempt the respondent has produced documents to substantiate that the respondent company has been closed in the year 2023. On perusal of Ex.R1 it is found that in Ex.R1 the respondent has stated that the operations in the factory had come to a standstill since 21-07-2022 and communication to all authorities had been issued on 06-04-2023. whereas, in this case on the side of respondent the RW.1 was examined in chief on 28-10-2022 and thereafter was cross-examined in part on 14-12-2022 and 03-03-2023 but, during the said examination the RW.1 neither disclosed nor deposed regarding the closure of the company but, has choosen to disclose about the closure only on 22-07-2025 before this Tribunal by way of adducing additional chief examination.

19. Further more, the RW.1 during his cross-examination has deposed that regarding the closure issue a separate Industrial Dispute case in I.D. (T). No. 6/2024 has been raised and pending. Hence, in the said circumstances this Tribunal finds that the validity of closure cannot be determined in this case. Even other wise on perusal of exhibits relied by the respondent this Tribunal finds that those documents does not transpire anything as to whether the closure was accepted by the authorities concerned and done according to the procedure contemplated under Industrial Disputes Act but, on the other hand it is found that they are communication letters sent by the respondent and thereby it is only a self-serving documents and does not deserve any consideration to accept the factum of closure as contended by the respondent.

20. Lastly from the evidence of RW.1 it is found that the RW.1 has deposed that the workmen involved in this case at present are not working in the respondent factory. This Tribunal finds that when the abovesaid workmen were made to work for many years and were not absorbed as permanent employee and when an industrial dispute raised for regularisation is pending

then the respondent or anybody claiming through them cannot discontinue the service of the said workmen without taking prior permission under section 33(1) (a) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the same amounts to unfair labour practice.

21. Thus, this Tribunal in view of above discussions, holds that the industrial dispute raised by the petitioner as against the respondent management is justified and the petitioner is entitled for the relief as claimed in the claim petition.

In the result, this petition is allowed by holding that the industrial dispute raised by the petitioner as against the respondent is justified and the respondent is directed to regularise the service of workmen namely C. Shanmugavel, R. Krishnamoorthy and E. Jagadeesan and pay wages on par with the regular workers and pay its arrears within two months from the date of this Award. There is no order as to costs.

Partly typed by Stenographer and partly typed by me in my laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 27th day of March 2026.

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

List of petitioner's witness :

PW.1 — 26-08-2022 Thiru D. Ramesh

List of petitioner's side exhibits :

Ex. P1 — 06-09-2018 Photocopy of the Petitioner Union Members dispute raised before the LOC (Pg. Nos. 1 and 2).

Ex. P2 — 19-09-2018 Photocopy of the LOC Enquiry notice (Pg. No. 3)

Ex. P3 — 11-10-2018 Photocopy of the Petitioner Union Member Letter to LOC (Pg. No. 4).

Ex. P4 — 21-01-2019 Photocopy of the Workers representation to Labour Secretary (Pg. Nos. 5 and 6).

Ex. P5 — 21-01-2019 Photocopy of the Workers representation to Inspector of Factory (Pg. Nos. 7 and 8).

Ex. P6 — 21-01-2019 Photocopy of the Workers representation to Commissioner of Labour (Pg. Nos. 9 and 10).

Ex. P7 — 14-02-2019 Photocopy of the Inspector of Factory Letter (Pg. No. 11).

Ex. P8 — 08-03-2019 Photocopy of the Respondent Reply Statement before LOC (Pg. Nos. 12 to 16).

Ex. P9 — 18-09-2019 Photocopy of the Failure Report issued by the LOC (Pg. Nos. 17 to 20).

Ex. P10 — 19-11-2019 Photocopy of the Petitioner Union Members Letter to LOC (Pg. Nos. 21 and 22).

Ex. P11 — 19-11-2019 Photocopy of the Petitioner Union Members Letter to Commissioner of Labour (Pg. Nos. 23 and 24).

Ex. P12 — 19-11-2019 Photocopy of the Petitioner Union Members Letter to Labour Secretary (Pg. Nos. 25 and 26).

Ex. P13 — 25-11-2019 Photocopy of the Form F submitted by the Petitioner Union before the LOC (Pg. No. 27).

Ex. P14 — 19-12-2019 Photocopy of the Government Notification referring the Petitioner Union dispute for Adjudication (Pg. Nos. 28 and 29).

Ex. P15 — 31-12-2019 Photocopy of the Government Gazette (Government Reference) G.O. Rt. No. 138, dated 19-12-2019 referring the dispute to Honble Court (Pg. Nos. 30 and 31).

Ex. P16 — 04/2014 Series to 06/2016 Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's Register (Pg. Nos. 32 to 58).

Ex. P17 — — Photo copy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's Bus Log Book (Pg. Nos. 59 to 66).

Ex. P18 — — Photo copy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's ESI Card (Pg. Nos. 67 to 69).

Ex. P19 — 04/2018 to 12/2019 Photo copy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's ESI Contribution Statement (Pg. Nos. 70 to 73).

Ex. P20 — 31-03-2019	Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's EPF Contribution Statement (Pg. Nos. 74 to 78).	Ex. P34 — —	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Photo with his Charge (Pg. No. 96).
Ex. P21 — 17-04-2018	Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's Bank Account Statement (Pg. No. 79).	Ex. P35 — 01-07-2002 Series and (2) 21-11-2002	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's signed with Delivery Challan (Pg. Nos. 97 and 98).
Ex. P22 — —	Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's Family Card with sign in Company – IR (Pg. No. 80).	Ex. P36 — — (6)	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Loading Input (Pgs. No. 99 to 104).
Ex. P23 — — (6)	Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's PF Contribution Slip (1996-2008) (Pg. Nos. 81 and 82).	Ex. P37 — 10-04-2006	Photocopy of the Evaluation report of R. Krishnamoorthy's (Pg. No. 105).
Ex. P24 — —	Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's Face Reading (Pg. No. 83).	Ex. P38 — — (3)	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Tour Slip (Pg. Nos. 106 and 107).
Ex. P25 — —	Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's ESI Form regulation (Pg. No. 84).	Ex. P39 — 02/2011 Series to (26) 02/2013	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Salary Register (Pg. Nos. 108 to 133).
Ex. P26 — — (4)	Photocopy of the Worker C. Shanmugavel's Shift Schedule (Pg. Nos. 85 to 88).	Ex. P40 — —	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's ESI Digital Card (Pg. No. 134).
Ex. P27 11-11-2000	Photocopy of the Factory Personal Manager Letter to the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy (Pg. No. 89).	Ex. P41 — 11-01-2017	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Face Reading (Pg. No. 135).
Ex. P28 18-12-2001	Photocopy of the Letter from Factory Personal Manager to the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy (Pg. No. 90).	Ex. P42 — 25-05-2017	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's PF Loan Application Form-19 (Pg. No. 136).
Ex. P29 — —	Photocopy of the ESI Leave, Confirmation Letter with sign (Worker R. Krishnamoorthy) Form-10 (Pg. No. 91).	Ex. P43 — 23-04-2018 Series and (3) 06-12-2019	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's dispatch loading advice (Pgs. No. 137 to 139).
Ex. P30 — 1999 - 2000	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's PF Slip (Pg. No. 92).	Ex. P44 — 11-07-2019	Photocopy of the Panel Verification report of R. Krishnamoorthy's (Pg. No. 140).
Ex. P31 — 06-04-2006	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's ESI Card (Pg. No. 93).	Ex. P45 — 25-01-2020	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's ESI, Form-10 (Pg. No. 141).
Ex. P32 — 16-11-2002	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Meals Coupon (Pg. No. 94).	Ex. P46 — 16-07-2020	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Permission Slip (Pg. No. 142).
Ex. P33 — 24-08-2002	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's Permission Slip (Pgs. No. 95).	Ex. P47 — 10/2017 to 09/2019	Photocopy of the Worker R. Krishnamoorthy's ESI Statement (Pg. Nos. 143 to 146).

Ex. P48 — —	Photocopy of the Worker R.Krishnamoorthy's PF Statement (Pg. Nos. 147 to 151).	Ex. R3 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Registering Officer.
Ex. P49 — 04/2018 to 09/2019	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's ESI Statement (Pg. Nos. 152 to 154).	Ex. R4 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to Labour Officer (Enforcement).
Ex. P50 — 2018	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's ESI Leave Confirmation Letter (Pg. No. 155).	Ex. R5 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Employment Officer.
Ex. P51 — —	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's PF Contribution Statement (Pg. Nos. 156 to 160).	Ex. R6 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Apprentice Advisor.
Ex. P52 — — Series (2)	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's PF Slip (Pg. No. 161).	Ex. R7 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Member-Secretary, Puducherry Pollution Control Committee.
Ex. P53 — —	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's ESI Card (Pg. No. 162).	Ex. R8 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Commissioner, Villianur Commune Panchayat.
Ex. P54 — 18-04-2016	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's Meals Coupon (Pg. No. 163).	Ex. R9 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Station House Officer, Sedarapet Police Station.
Ex. P55 — —	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's attendance of the Face Reading (Pg. Nos. 164).	Ex. R10 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Director, Directorate of Industries and Commerce.
Ex. P56 — —	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's attendance of the face reading (Pg. No. 165).	Ex. R11 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Director (ESIC).
Ex. P57 — 10/2009 to 03/2021	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's ESI Statement (Pg. No. 166).	Ex. R12 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Regional PF Commissioner.
Ex. P58 — —	Photocopy of the Worker Jagadeesan's L&T Factory in work authorized signature Department of HOD (Pg. No. 167).		
<i>List of respondent's witness :</i>			
RW.1 — 28-10-2022	Thiru Kannan		
<i>List of respondent's exhibits :</i>			
Ex. R1 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the Closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Inspector of Factories.		
Ex. R2 — 03-08-2023	Photocopy of the closure of Factory at Puducherry Letter sent to the Medical Inspector of Factories.		

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 49/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 31/2022, dated 07-03-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Leo Fasteners, Puducherry and Thiru K. Sabarinathan, over his non-employment with 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 23-05-1991, 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.

Friday, the 07th day of March 2026

I.D. (L) No. 31/2022
CNR. No. PYPY06-000095-2022

Thiru K. Sabarinathan,
S/o. Kandasamy,
No. 15, 2nd Cross Street,
Thamizhannai Nagar,
Pakkamudayanpet, Lawspet,
Puducherry-605 008. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Leo Fasteners,
No. A-27/A, Industrial Estate,
Thattanchavady,
Puducherry. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru L. Vinoba, Counsel for the Petitioner, Thiru K. Parthiban, 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. 150/LAB/AIL/T/2022, dated 06-09-2022 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 K. Sabarinathan against the management of M/s. Leo Fasteners, Thattanchavady, Puducherry, over his non-employment with continuity of service and other attendant benefits is justified or not? If justified, what relief he is entitled to?

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

2. Respondent present PW.1 not present, no representation on petitioner side in spite of several adjournments. Hence, this petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. There is no order as to costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 07th day of March 2026.

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

List of petitioner's witness :

PW.1 — 18-12-2023 Thiru K. Sabarinathan

List of petitioner's side exhibits : Nil

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. 50/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 09/2023, dated 18-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru A. Ayyappan, over non-employment along with 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. 09/2023
CNR. No. PYPY06-000049-2023

Thiru A. Ayyappan,
S/o. Allimuthu,
No. 9, North Street, Madagadipet Post,
Puducherry-605 107. . . Petitioner

Versus

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. 32/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 A. Ayyappan represented by Shree Mother Plast Employees Union against the Management of M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Pvt. Ltd., 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. 51/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 12/2023, dated 18-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru L. Gasperraj, over non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the Notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/9/Lab./L, dated 23-05-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

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. 12/2023
CNR. No. PYPY06-000052-2023

Thiru L. Gasperraj,
S/o. Lourdusamy,
No. 89, 2nd Cross Street,
V.V. Nagar, Kalitheerthalkuppam,
Madagadipet Post,
Puducherry-605 107. . . Petitioner

Versus

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. 37/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 L. Gasperraj Kalitheerthalkuppam, Puducherry against the management of M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Private Limited, Thirubuvanai, Puducherry, over non-employment is justified or not? If justified, to 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. 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. 52/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)*

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 15/2023, dated 18-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Shree Mother Plast Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru R. Irusappan, over his non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the Notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/9/Lab./L, dated 23-05-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

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. 15/2023
CNR. No. PYPY06-000054-2023**

Thiru R. Irusappan,
S/o. Raja,
No.15, Vaikaal Street,
Kalitheerthalkuppam,
Madagadipet Post,
Puducherry-605 107.

.. Petitioner

Versus

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. 40/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 Thiru R. Irusappan represented by Shree Mother Plast Employees Union against the management of M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Pvt. Ltd., Puducherry, over non-employment is justified or not? if justified, to give appropriate directions?

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

2. Petitioner not present. No representation in spite of adjourning this case for enquiry on various hearing dates. Case is pending for enquiry from 28-03-2025 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. 53/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)*

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 44/2017, dated 20-02-2026 of the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Sri Manakular Motors, Puducherry and Manakular Motors Thozhilalar Sangam, over non-employment of 61 workers 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.

Friday, the 18th day of February 2026

**I.D. (L) No. 44/2017
CNR. No. PYPY06-000073-2017**

The Secretary,
Manakular Motors Thozhilalar Sangam,
No. 49, Rodier Mill Street,
Puducherry-605 004.

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Sri Manakular Motors,
R.S. No. 31/3, Olandai Keerapalayam,
100 Feet Raod, Mudaliarpot,
Puducherry-605 004.

.. Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru D. Ilamparuthi, Counsel for the Petitioner, Thiru K. Sreenath, 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. 125/AIL/LAB/T/2017, dated 09-08-2017 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Manakular Motors Thozhilalar Sangam, Mudaliarpur, Puducherry against the management of M/s. Sri Manakular Motors, Mudaliarpur, Puducherry, over non-employment of 61 workers namely, (1) R. Gopathi, (2) R. Santhosh, (3) G. Selvakumar, (4) A. Nataraj, (5) N. Kambadasan, (6) D. Patchaiyappan, (7) P. Prasad, (8) R. Muthukumaran, (9) S. Narasimman, (10) N. Ganapathy, (11) T. Sivaperumal, (12) C. Vengadesan, (13) R. Iyyappan, (14) R. Varadarajan, (15) R. Arokiadass, (16) M. Krisidiyan Mayee, (17) P. Saravanan, (18) K. Karthikeyan, (19) R. Arumugam (20) V. Veeramuthu, (21) R. Ganesh, (22) S. Karthikeyan, (23) S. Manikandan, (24) G. Srinivasan, (25) N. Senthilkumar, (26) M. Sathish, (27) R. Umapathy, (28) M. Balamurugan, (29) G. Kandan, (30) E. Anandan, (31) S. Karunakaran, (32) A. Ramkumar, (33) A. Arivu, (34) E. Rajkumar, (35) R. Vadivel, (36) L. Veerabalan, (37) Anandakumar, (38) M. Dheenadayalan, (39) S. Vernkatesan, (40) K. Vallavan, (41) G. Pradeeswaran, (42) S. Balasundaram, (43) K. Kannadasan, (44) R. Vijayavelu, (45) S. Kamalakannan, (46) T. Parthiban, (47) S. Nagaraj, (48) K. Ramesh, (49) R. Tamizhselvan, (50) M. Sakthivel, (51) M. Vadivel, (52) T. Moova, (53) J. Kabeerkhan, (54) M. Murugan, (55) S. Raja, (56) P. Puganthi, (57) R. Sankar, (58) V. Venkatachalam, (59) G. Ganesan, (60) S. Kandasamy and (61) A. Saravanan is justified or not? If justified, what relief they are entitled to?

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

2. Petitioner called absent, Counsel for respondent present. No representation on petitioner side though posted as finally.

Hence, this petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 20th day of February 2026

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 54/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 10/2023, dated 18-02-2026 of the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru D. Abimannan, over 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. 15/2023
CNR. No. PYPY06-000054-2023

Thiru D. Abimannan,
S/o. Deivanayagam,
No. 52, Mariamman Koil Street,
Kaliitheerthalkuppam,
Madagadipet Post,
Puducherry-605 107.

.. Petitioner

Versus

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. 33/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 Thiru D. Abimannan represented by Shree Mother Plast Employees Union against the management of M/s. Shree Mother Plast India Pvt. Ltd., Puducherry, over non-employment is justified or not? if justified, to give appropriate directions?

(b) To compute the relief 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 28-03-2025 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. 55/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 30th June 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (T) No. 08/2023, dated 16-02-2026 of the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Superfil Products Private Ltd., Puducherry and Superfil Products Workers Union over leave entitlement have 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. 08/2023
CNR. No. PYPY06-000039-2023

The Secretary,
Superfil Products Workers Union,
No. 37, Bahour Road,
Uruvaiyar, Mangalam Post,
Villianur Commune,
Puducherry-605 110. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Superfil Products Pvt. Ltd.,
Puducherry. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Tvl. K. Velmurugan and P. Preethi, Counsels for the Petitioner, Tvl. G. Krishnan, 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. 24/LAB/AIL/T/2023, dated 23-02-2023 of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Superfil Products Workers Union against the Management of M/s. Superfil Products (P) Ltd., Uruvaiyar, Mangalam Road,

Puducherry, over leave entitlement to Tvl. (1) K. Muthusamy, (2) M. Umapathy, (3) C. Murugan and (4) S. Anjapuli for a period of 2 days during May 2020 and 2 days during June 2020 is justified or not?

(b) If Justified, to what relief, the workers represented by the union are entitled to?

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

2. Counsel for respondent present. PW.1 not present. No representation on petitioner side, sufficient time granted, inspite of adjournments PW.1 has not choosen to appear for cross-examination. 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. 56/AIL/LAB/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 04th July 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D. (L) No. 36/2010, dated 27-02-2026 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of industrial dispute between the M/s. Atmarati Architects, Puducherry and Thiru S. Krishnamoorthy over his non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the Notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/9/Lab./L, dated 23-05-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

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.

Friday, the 16th day of February 2026

I.D. (L) No. 36/2010
CNR. No. PYPY06-000007-2010

S. Krishnamoorthy,
No. 65, Mariamman Koil Street,
Alankuppam, Auroville Post,
Puducherry.

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Chief Executive,
M/s. Atmarati Architects,
No. 33, Dumoy Street,
Puducherry.

.. Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Petitioner appeared in person and no representation on respondent side, after hearing petitioner side and upon 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. 220/AIL/LAB/J/2010, dated 11-11-2010 of the Labour Department, Puducherry, to resolve the following dispute between the Petitioners and the Respondent, *viz.*

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru S. Krishnamoorthy against the management of M/s. Atmarati Architects Puducherry, over non-employment is justified or not?

(b) If justified, what relief the petitioner is entitled to?

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

2. Petitioner present. Respondent absent. Petitioner represented that he is not interested to conduct this case anymore and further represented to pass any further orders. Hence, the same is hereby recorded.

In the result, this industrial dispute is dismissed for non-prosecution. There is no order as to costs.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 27th day of February 2026.

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