



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	} 11	புதுச்சேரி	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை	2026 லு	மார்ச் மீ	17 உ
No.		Poudouchéry	Mardi	17	Mars	2026 (26 Phalguna 1947)
No.		Puducherry	Tuesday	17th	March	2026

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

	பக்கம்		Page		Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள்..	752	Sentence arbitral du travail de tribunal	.. 752	Award of the Labour Court	.. 752
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள்	.. 772	Notifications du Gouvernement	.. 772	Government Notifications	.. 772
பற்றுக்கை அறிவிப்பு	.. 775	Avis de saisis-arrêt	.. 775	Notice of attachment	.. 775
ஆபத்தான நிறுவனங்கள்	.. 775	Etablissements dangereux	.. 775	Dangerous Establishments	.. 775
சாற்றறிக்கைகள்	.. 777	Annonces	.. 777	Announcements	.. 777

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 10/Lab./AIL/S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 16th February 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (T) No. 03/2024, dated 13-08-2025 of the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry, in respect of the Industrial Dispute between the Management of M/s. Larsen and Turbo Limited, Puducherry (Metal Shop Unit) and L & T Jananayaga Thozhilalargal Sangam (Affiliated to AICCTU), over charter of demands with regard to wage revision, equal pay for equal work, payment of minimum wages, and other allied welfare measures in respect of 259 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).

ANNEXURE

Sl. No.	Name
(1)	(2)
1	R. Kirubakaran
2	D. Vijayakumar
3	H. Mahendhiran
4	P. Vishwanathan
5	V. Subramanian
6	Nagaraj
7	G. Munusamy
8	A. Arun
9	B. Muthukumaran
10	J. Sureshkumar
11	J. Ashok
12	J. Raja

(1)	(2)
13	K. Annamalai
14	V. Manikandan
15	P. Kumar
16	N. Senthamaraikannan
17	E. Vadivel
18	A. Paarthiban
19	R. Govindaraj
20	A. Puroshothaman
21	Kumar. S
22	V. Ramesh Babu
23	P. Senthilmurugan
24	M. Gangasalam
25	V. Kumarakrishnan
26	G. Vijayakumar
27	A. Gnanasamy
28	H. Mahendiran
29	P. Harikrishnan
30	Sridhar. K
31	K. Karna
32	Raja. D
33	Ilyaraja
34	K. Suresh
35	Gopal. G
36	D. Dural
37	K. Mahendiran
38	M. Sekar
39	S. Krishnamoorthy
40	K. Venkatesan
41	N. Arumugam
42	M. Ashokkumar
43	G. Kumar
44	M. Thamaraiselvan
45	V. Balaji
46	A. Jayaraman
47	K. Govindan
48	G. Reuban Franklin
49	V. Kamalnath
50	P. Vijayakumar
51	N. Elumalai
52	K. Murugan

(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
53	P. Ragavan	93	A. Narayanamoorthy
54	V. Elumalai	94	A. Arul
55	D. Senthilkumar	95	A. Arun
56	S. Suthagar	96	P. Kanniyappan
57	S. Sambathkumar	97	D. Iyyappan
58	G. Krishnan	98	K. Thanasilan
59	S. Sakthivel	99	P. Saravanan
60	J. Iyappan	100	P. Selvam
61	R. Elumalai	101	M. Karthikeyan
62	D. Suresh	102	P. Segar
63	P. Elumalai	103	A. Sathish
64	E. Ayyanar	104	T. Thamaraiselvam
65	E. Eazhumalai	105	P. Elumalai
66	K. Raja	106	T. Balaraman
67	A. Veeramani	107	S. Iyyanar
68	D. Raji	108	E. Murugan
69	R. Gnanasekar	109	S. Vijayakumar
70	M. Murugan	110	A. Kalidass
71	N. Rajini	111	J. Muthukumar
72	P. Arumugam	112	E. Supparamany
73	S. Sathiyaraji	113	A. Vinayagamoorthy
74	G. Syedkareem	114	A. Iyyanar
75	E. Jayaprakash	115	K. Raja
76	S. Ramalingam	116	S. Nelagandan
77	M. Venkatesan	117	M. Marimuthu
78	R. Gunasekar	118	K. Ezhumalai
79	S. Sivaraj	119	D. Sakthivel
80	A. Elumalai	120	K. Murugan
81	R. Iyyappan	121	D. Parathsarathy
82	T. Kumar	122	K. Selvakumar
83	G. Anuprasun	123	C. Chandrasekar
84	N. Sathesh	124	E. Ravi
85	D. Saravanan	125	G. Murugan
86	R. Sathiyamoorthy	126	S. Rabnikanth
87	P. Rajesh	127	J. Jeeva
88	L. Selvakumaran	128	S. Senthilmurugan
89	G. Munuswami	129	A. Dharmalingam
90	P. Sakthivel	130	L. Vinoth Kumar
91	B. Asaithambi	131	G. Ramachandra
92	V. Veersamy	132	A. Rajesh

(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
133	P. Settu	173	V. Marimuthu
134	M. Sigamani	174	L. Balamurugan
135	S. Mahendiran	175	B. Kumunda Danakula
136	J. Pushparaj	176	M. Thyaga Rajan
137	J. Purushothamma	177	S. Bhartaharimalick
138	G. Gnanasekar	178	S. Sahadeba Palei
139	K. Ragu	179	B. Rup Kumar Pal
140	N. Murugan	180	S. Saroj Samanta
141	M. Babu	181	G. Tapas Khatua
142	S. Purushothaman	182	J. Niroj Lenka
143	K. Gunasekar	183	D. Raju Kumar
144	R. Veerappan	184	A. Sushanta Danakula
145	P. Manimaran	185	N. Elumalai
146	R. Srithar	186	M. Subramaniyan
147	S. Jothiraman	187	K. Kamalaraj
148	B. Vinayagamoorthi	188	E. Saravanan
149	S. Karthikeyan	189	K. Vijayakumar
150	A. Raman	190	V. Krishnan
151	M. Kothandarama	191	V. Boopalan
152	Christu Rajan	192	M. Kanagaraj
153	V. Vignesh	193	M. Babu
154	A. Kathavarayan	194	Prabakaragaya
155	S. Gnanasekar	195	U. John Stellas
156	J. Ramakrishanan	196	S. Prabu
157	B. Selvam	197	K. Dinesh
158	R. Sundarrajan	198	M. Kumar
159	M. Muthu	199	A. Velmurugan
160	Sudharsanjena	200	G. Kuppusamy
161	R. Veerakumar	201	P. Pabitra Khatua
162	K. Sathish	202	A. Sangar Ram Rout
163	E. Jayaprakash	203	B. Manokar
164	K. Iyyanar	204	S. Laxmanan
165	J. Balaji	205	K. Ravichandran
166	V. Ayyanar	206	P. Arulmurugan
167	E. Boopathi	207	K.S. Murugan
168	P. Sakthivel	208	R. Elumalai
169	M. Sathiyaraj	209	P. Krishnan
170	M. Dhanasekar	210	K. Bakiyaraj
171	K. Arun	211	M. Sathiya Moorthy
172	K. Vijayan	212	S. Velankanni

(1)	(2)
213	B. Asaithambi
214	Muthukrishnan
215	A. Sathiya Moorthy
216	A. Venkatesh
217	S. Dass
218	G. Babu
219	K. Elumalai
220	Goutham Patra
221	B. Balaji
222	N. Elumalai
223	N. Thanikachlam
224	G. Perumal
225	M. Jayaraman
226	P. Sekar
227	P. Iyyappan
228	P. Dharnenthiran
229	P. Balamurugan
230	V. Arumugam
231	K. Arumugam
232	M. Santhoshkumar
233	R. Sivakumar
234	S. Balamurugan
235	S. Balasundar
236	P. Senthilraja
237	P. Sivakumar
238	K. Mohan
239	S. Neelakandan
240	M. Marimuthu
241	A. Surya
242	S. Prabu
243	A. Muthukumaran
244	Buddha Dev Manna
245	A. Dinakaran
246	S. Ayyanar
247	M. Lakshmanan
248	A.K. Masilamani
249	D. Sankar
250	G. Dinakaran
251	R. Sankar
252	S. Veeramanai

(1)	(2)
253	S. Rajasekar
254	R. Saravanan
255	B. Anandhan
256	K. Krishnamoorthy
257	J. Elumalai
258	V. Senthamaraikannan
259	J. Krishnamoorthy

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

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

Wednesday, the 13th day of August 2025.

**I.D. (T). No. 03/2024
CNR. No. PYPY06-000026-2024**

The Secretary,
L&T Jananayaga Thozhilalargal Sangam,
(Affiliated to AICCTU),
No. 471, Bharathi Street,
Puducherry-605 001. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Larsen & Turbo Private Limited,
(Metal Shop Unit),
No.103, Mailam to Pondy Main Road,
Sedarapet,
Puducherry-605 111. . . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute came up for hearing, in the presence of Thiruvallargal K. Velmurugan and P. Preethi, Counsels for the petitioner and Thiruvallargal M. Vaikunth, S. Kamalini, D. Pradish Irudayaraj, R. Vikneshraj and N. Prathik, Counsels for the Respondent, upon perusing the records, this Court passed the following:

AWARD

This Industrial Dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 42/Lab./AIL/T/2024, dated 26-03-2024 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,-

(a) Whether any employer – employee relationship exists between the 259 workers (as mentioned in Annexure – A) and the management of M/s. Larsen & Turbo Private Limited, (Metal Shop, TLT Unit and Rolling Mill Unit), Puducherry?

(b) Whether the dispute raised by the Petitioner's Union L&T Jananayaga Thozhilalargal Sangam (Reg. No. 1824/RTU/2017) (Affiliated with AICCTU), over charter of demands with regard to wage revision, equal pay for equal work, payment of minimum wages and other allied welfare measures in respect of 259 workers against the management of M/s. Larsen & Turbo Private Limited (TLT, Metal Shop and Rolling Mill), Puducherry, is legal and justified? If justified, give appropriate directions?

(c) Whether the stand of the management regarding refusal of employment to the alleged 259 workers (TLT – 206, Rolling Mill - 38 and Metal Shop-15) subsequent to charter of demands raised by the Union is legal and justified? If justified, give appropriate directions?

(d) To what relief the 259 workmen represented by the L&T Jananayaga Thozhilalargal Sangam (Reg. No. 1824/RTU/2017) (Affiliated with AICCTU) are entitled to?

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

2. No representation, inspite of several adjournments there is no any representation on the side of Petitioner. As this case is pending without any progress for a long time, this tribunal is inclined to close this reference.

In the result this reference is closed due to non prosecution.

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

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

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 13/AIL/Lab./S/2026,
Puducherry, dated 18th February 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (T) No. 6/2014 and Appeal in SOA.No. 1/2015 of the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry, in respect of a Dispute between the Management of M/s. E.I.D. Parry (India) Limited, Ariyur Sugar Factory, Anna Thozhil Sangam, Anna Thozhil Sanga Peravai against E.I.D. Parry (India) Limited, Ariyur Sugar Factory, over charter of demands has been received.

Now, Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the Notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/9/Lab./L, dated 23-05-1991, 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 12th day of December 2025.

**I.D. (T). No. 06/2014
CNR. No. PYPY06-000014-2014**

and

**Standing Order Appeal No. 01/2015
CNR. No. PYPY06-000021-2015**

I.D. (T). No. 06/2014

1. E.I.D. Parry (India) Ltd.,
Ariyur Sugar Factory Anna
Thozhil Sangam,
represented by its Secretary,
K. Krishnamoorthy.
2. Anna Thozhil Sanga Peravai
represented by its Secretary,
Pappusamy.

. . Petitioners

Vs.

E.I.D Parry (India) Ltd.,
Ariyur Sugar Factory,
Represented by its General Works Manager,
Villianur Commune,
Puducherry-605 110.

. . Respondent

SOA.No. 01/2015

1. Ariyur EID Parry (Ltd.),
Sugar Mill Anna Thozhir Sangam,
Regd.No. 1741/RTU/2013,
Represented by its Secretary
K. Krishnamoorthy,
No. 38, North Street,
Ariyur,
Villianur Commune,
Puducherry-605 102.

2. Anna Thozhirsanga Peravai (ATSP)
represented by its Secretary
A. Pappusamy,
No. 2, Govind Chettiar Thottam,
Vanarapet,
Puducherry-605 001. . . Appellants

Vs.

1. Commissioner of Labour-cum-
Certifying Officer for Union
Territory of Puducherry,
Government of Puducherry,
Labour Department,
Gandhi Nagar,
Vazhudavur Road,
Puducherry-609 009.

2. M/s. EID Parry (India) Limited,
Ariyur Sugar Factory,
represented by its General Manager,
Ariyur,
Kandamangalam Post,
Villianur Commune,
Puducherry-605 102. . . Respondents

These Industrial Dispute and Standing Order Appeal are coming before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru G. Krishnan, Counsel for the Petitioners and M/s. T.S. Gopalan & Co., Thiruvallargal L. Sathish, T. Pravin, S. Velmurugan and V. Veeraragavan, Counsels for the respondent in ID(T).No. 06/2014 and for the second respondent in SOA.No. 01/2015 and Thiru M. Nakkeeran, Government Pleader, Counsel for the first Respondent in SOA.No. 01/2015 upon hearing the both sides and after perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, this Tribunal passed the following:

COMMON AWARD

ID(T).No. 06/2014

1. This Industrial Dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 82/AIL/Lab./J/2014, dated 12-05-2014 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,-

(a) Whether the claim of the E.I.D. Parry (I) Ltd., Ariyur Sugar Mill Anna Thozhir Sangam that the employees of E.I.D Parry (I) Ltd., Ariyur to be retired only at the age of 60 years as per the provisions of Industrial Employment Standing Orders of the company is justified?

(b) If justified, what relief they are entitled to?

(c) Whether the claim of the Union that refusal of employment to their union workmen Thiruvallargal 1. T. Maiyel, 2. R. Jothy, 3. P. Saravanamoorthy and 4. M. Mubarakh by giving retirement at the age of 58 years instead of 60 years which is against the provisions of Standing Orders of the Company is justified?

(d) If justified, what relief they are entitled to?

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

2. This Standing Order Appeal has been filed under Section 6 of the Industrial Employment (Standing Order) Act, 1946 to set aside the impugned order No. 12 of 2014, dated 01-12-2014 in its entirety and direct the first respondent to adjudicate afresh the draft standing orders submitted by the second respondent or to modify/delete in the certified Standing Orders No. 12 of 2014, dated 01-12-2014 as stated in the Annexure of this petition.

3. *The averments set forth by the petitioners in the Claim Statement filed in ID(T).No. 06/2014 :*

That the first petitioner is a registered Trade Union affiliated to the second petitioner which is a federation of trade unions. The first petitioner union is the one and the only union in the respondent factory which manufactures sugar. That the respondent E.I.D. Parry (India) Ltd., became the owner of the Ariyur sugar factory by transfer of undertaking from M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Limited, after the said transfer of undertaking the respondent management collected the particulars of the workmen engaged by the erstwhile management and as per their instructions the workmen had assembled on 01-11-2006 in a place at Moolakulam, Pondicherry which was far away from the factory and the officers of the respondent company who came there have adopted pick and choose policy and offered appointment on probation to many of the workmen engaged by the erstwhile management and the appointees were directed to sign the already prepared appointment orders without disclosing the contents thereof. That the terms and conditions of appointment was in English running and in several pages were neither read over nor explained in Tamil to the appointees and they could not protest against the approach of the management since any such protest would definitely cost them their job itself and the workmen who were not in a bargaining position had no option but to surrender before the might in order to get their livelihood. That the methodology of appointment adopted by the respondent

management was nothing but exploitation of the poor, helpless and hapless workmen who were looking for means of livelihood is humbly submitted that the said appointees have joined services with legitimate expectation. That to their shock and surprise the management by notice, dated 20-11-2013, issued to some of the workmen have informed that they would be superannuated on completion of 58 years on 31-12-2013. The workmen issued with such notice have immediately approached the management and demanded superannuation on completion of 60 years in terms of the certified standing order applicable to them under the erstwhile management but the management took the stand that they have invoked the terms of the appointment order and issued such notice on completion of 58 years.

(ii) That the service conditions for the workmen originally employed by M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Limited, were governed by the certified standing orders of the company wherein the age of superannuation was fixed as 60 years and while offering appointment on probation the respondent management has also informed that the service conditions prevailed under the erstwhile management has not been changed but only through the abovesaid notice, the workmen came to know of the misrepresentation and misleading of the respondent management. That the second petitioner union raised an industrial dispute in this regard by representation, dated 02-12-2013 and the respondent management has deliberately not participated in the conciliation proceedings but, sent a representation dated 07-12-2013 wherein, they claimed, without producing any document, that there was a settlement between the management and another union and enhancing the age of superannuation would be an additional financial burden on the management and due to non-cooperation of the respondent management conciliation ended in failure. That certified standing orders of the erstwhile management till they are amended would only govern the conditions of services of the employees under the respondent company and the standing orders supersede any term and condition of employment, contained in the purported appointment letter and hence, superannuating the workmen at the age of 58 is unsustainable in law. That the appointment orders issued by the respondent management in violation of settled principles of law have no binding effect on the workmen. That the certified Standing order No. 14 of the Pondicherry Co-Operative Sugar Mills Ltd, located in Pondicherry provides superannuation only at the age of 60 years. That the retirement of

the workmen namely, R. Jothi, P. Saravanmoorthy, Mubarak and T. Maiyel under letter, dated 20-11-2013 on the allegation that they have reached superannuation is not valid in law and therefore, their reinstatement in service with full back wages, continuity of service and all other attendant benefits and permit them to continue in employment till they attain the age of 60 years is just and necessary. That this dispute is raised over the retirement age and the respondent management is threatening 18 of its workmen in employment that they would be retired on attaining the age of 58 years which if effected during pendency of dispute is against settled principles of law. Hence the petition.

4. *The averments set forth in the Counter Statement filed by the respondent in ID(T).No.06/2014 is as follows:*

That in 1960s, one M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd (NHSM) put up a Sugar Factory at Ariyur Village in Puducherry and the company had availed credit facilities from Indian Bank, Puducherry offering its assets as collateral security, for the loan advanced to the Company. That the Company had fallen into arrears in the matter of repayment of loan to M/s. Indian Bank, as a result the Indian Bank invoked section 13(6) of SARFAESI Act for sale of all the assets. That the respondent was one of the bidders to buy only the assets lying in the premises of the factory, for a consideration of ₹ 50.20 Crores. The sale was confirmed by the High Court of Madras and the authorized Officer of the Bank issued a Certificate of Sale in favour of the respondent and the same was also registered on 23rd August 2006. That even before the auction and issue of the Certificate of Sale, there were numerous litigation at different levels among various parties including New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., Indian Bank, the Employees of the New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd. and this respondent. That in the course of such litigation, it has been held that the workmen of New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd. would only be entitled to arrears of wages and compensation provided for the transfer of undertaking affected by operation of law from their previous employer. That on the basis of the said declaration, from and out of the amounts deposited with the Labour Commissioner and other amounts, the final dues of the workmen of NHSM including their terminal benefits were settled, and as such the employment of the workmen with NHSM had ceased and come to an end and all the workmen had also received the entire arrears including their terminal benefits through the orders of the Courts from the Commissioner of Labour, Puducherry.

(ii) That from 2006 onwards, the respondent was making preparations to commence the operations of the Mill. The erstwhile employees of NHSM, who applied for employment, among others, were called for interview and those who got selected in the interview were offered fresh employment, setting out new terms and conditions of service available in the employment of the respondent Company. That the respondent is having 4 Sugar Mills in Tamil Nadu, apart from the one at Puducherry, 2 Sugar Factories in Karnataka and one Sugar Factory in Andhra Pradesh. The service conditions like leave benefits, age of retirement on superannuation, relieving them at the end of the Calendar Year when the workmen reaches the age of superannuation, the service *ex gratia*, long service mementos, *etc.*, have always been uniform in all the mills, though, there may be marginal difference in the matter of basic wages and other allowances. The age of retirement in all the Sugar Mills is 58 years and the concerned workmen who have reached the age of superannuation will also retire only at the end of the Calendar Year *i.e.*, on 31st December. This was the terms incorporated in the letter of appointment issued to the erstwhile employees of NHSM, who had taken up employment with the respondent factory at Puducherry. That between 2006 and 2013, 67 employees in the Puducherry Mill of the respondent Company also retired on reaching 58 years, the age of superannuation in December of the respective calendar year. That apart from the age of superannuation being 58 years, other service conditions set out in the offer of employment were also accepted by both the parties in the respondent Mills at Puducherry and acted upon during the last more than seven years. That there is no scope to alter the service conditions of the employees of Puducherry Mills alone, and it is not permissible for the petitioners in this context to refer to what used to be the age of superannuation in the closed Factory of NHSM, where the petitioners were employed prior to cessation of their employment and made a demand on that basis of the said term. That the issue referred for adjudication is: "whether the demand made by reference to the age of retirement provided for in the Certified Standing Orders of the NHSM is justified" which is totally irrelevant.

(iii) That the service conditions obtaining in the respondent Company were far better than what the workmen were enjoying in the NHSM. In any event, the erstwhile employees of NHSM in the service of the respondent have taken up the employment accepting the terms and conditions of employment

clearly set out in the offer of employment, including their age of superannuation to be 58 years and it is not permissible for them to seek change in the service condition pertaining to superannuation alone, *viz.*, for enhancement of the age of superannuation from 58 years to 60 years. That there is no warrant for the assumption of the petitioner that the standing orders having been certified for the New Horizon Sugar Mills at Ariyur Village in Puducherry, they should be continued after the said Establishment got vested with the respondent Company. The Industrial undertaking of M/s. NHSM got extinguished with the auction sale of the assets, moreover, the respondent had acquired only the assets of the NHSM in the auction sale and not the employees. Even the employees in non-workmen category of the NHSM were also recruited only as fresh employees by the respondent after the assets were purchased from the NHSM. In any event, the workmen of NHSM have fully settled all their legal dues including their terminal benefits through the order of the Courts from and out of the sale proceeds and the same was also directly settled by the Commissioner of Labour, Puducherry as per the orders of the Court and thereby the entire employment of the workmen of NHSM has come to an end both factually and legally. Hence, the present demand as it stand is liable to be rejected and the same is also beyond the scope of the Industrial Disputes Act. That the 4 workmen M/s. T.Maiyel, R.Jothy, P.Saravanamoorthy and M.Mubarakh were entitled to the benefits of the age of 60 years as provided in the Certified Standing Orders of the New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd. is not tenable for more reasons than one. The age of retirement at 58 was accepted and acted upon by 67 workmen between 2006 and 2013. That there was no continuity of employment (from NHSM) in the service of the respondent so as to make the Certified Standing Orders of NHSM being made binding on the respondent. That after the commencement of the sugar manufacturing by the respondent in 2008, the workmen of the factory formed a Union to represent their workmen in the name and style of "Ariyur Sarkarai Alai EID Parry Thozhilalar nala sangam", which has also registered on 06-02-2012. The said union has got the followup of a vast majority of workmen in the respondent factory and it also signed numerous settlements which has also been accepted by all workmen without demur. That having accepted the liberal terms and conditions of employment with the respondent establishment for more than 7 years, now it is not permissible for them to say that they were not aware of the terms and conditions of the

offer of employment, or that they had not read the terms and conditions. That it is not a case of transfer of employment between the two private parties. That the Certifying Officer under the Industrial Standing Orders Act of the Union territory of Pondicherry had directed the respondent to submit the Draft Standing Orders, and pursuant to the direction, the respondent already submitted the Draft Standing Orders for approval.

5. *The averments set forth in the Appeal in SOA.No. 1/2015 is as follows:*

That the first Appellant Trade Union was registered under the Trade Unions Act with Regn. No. 1741/RTU/2013 and affiliated with the second Appellant. The second Respondent is a factory within the meaning of Section 2(m) of the Factories Act and thus, an establishment under section 2(e) of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act 1946. The Second Respondent submitted a draft standing orders containing 55 clauses under section 3 of the Act to the first Respondent for certification of the same but copy of the draft standing order was not furnished to the first Appellant 14 Common Order I.D.(T).No. 06/2014 and SOA.No. 01/2015 Union for giving their remarks/objections on the draft standing orders in spite of letter, dated 07.04.2014 and reminder, dated 25-04-2014 submitted by the first Appellant Union for serving a copy on then. That the Second Respondent, Certifying Officer, has certified against settled principles of law and in violation of the provisions of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act 1946. That the Certifying Officer has failed to take into consideration of the pendency of the industrial dispute in I.D. (T) No. 6 of 2014 on the file of this Tribunal, Pondicherry, referred over the dispute of retirement age of the workmen of the second respondent company and incorporated a clause pertaining to the retirement in the certified standing orders. That the Certifying Officer has failed to send a copy of the draft standing orders to the second Appellant in the manner prescribed together with a notice calling for objections. That the appellants were not heard before certification and thereby the Certifying Officer deliberately violated the provisions of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act which mandates providing opportunity to the Union/workmen of being heard and then to decide whether or not any modification of or addition to the draft standing orders was necessary to render them certifiable under the Act. Hence this appeal.

6. *The counter averments set forth by the first respondent in SOA.No.1/2015 is as follows:*

That the show cause notice was issued to the Management of M/s. EID Parry (India) Limited, Puducherry for non-submission of draft Standing Orders vide No. 8161/AIL/Lab./S/2013, dated 26-12-2013. In response to the notice, the Management had submitted a letter, dated 02-01-2013 stating that originally they had purchased only the Sugar Mills assets of M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd. (NHRML), Ariyur, Puducherry through a public action held by M/s. Indian Bank on 23-03-2005 under the SARFAESI Act. The sale was confirmed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and the Authorized Officer of the Bank issued a Certificate of Sale in favour of the Respondent and the same was also registered on 23rd August 2006. The Management of M/s. EID Parry (India) Limited had commenced the sugar manufacturing facility at Ariyur from the year 2006 onwards on a fresh licence and employed workmen on fresh terms and also requested to grant 45 days time for submission of the draft Standing Orders. The Management had submitted a letter, dated 07-03-2014 and stated that discussions were held between the Management of M/s. EID Parry (India) Limited and the Union Representatives of Ariyur Sarkarai Alai EID Parry Thozhilalar Nala Sangam regarding Certification of the Draft Standing Orders on various dates and 16 Common Order I.D.(T).No. 06/2014 and SOA.No. 01/2015 finally both the parties mutually agreed to accept and adopt the draft Standing Orders for the establishment by arriving at a Memorandum of Understanding.

(ii) That the copy of the draft Standing Orders together with a Notice in Form II, dated 17-03-2014 has been forwarded to the Union Representatives of Ariyur Sarkarai Alai EID Parry Thozhilalar Nala Sangam and Ariyur EID Parry (LTD) Sugar Mill Anna Thozhir Sangam (ATSP) to furnish their objections if any within 15 days. The Secretary of Ariyur Sarkarai Alai EID Parry Thozhilalar Sangam has submitted a letter, dated 12-06-2016 stating that they have no objection with regard to the draft Standing Orders submitted by the Management for due Certification. That the Appellant Union, Ariyur EID Parry (LTD) Sugar Mill Anna Thozhir Sangam (ATSP) had submitted a letter, dated 13-05-2014 along with the objections in respect of the draft Standing Orders filed by the Management of M/s. EID Parry (India) Limited, Puducherry and stated that most of the clauses incorporated by the Management are objectionable without raising any specific modifications/additions/alterations to be made in the

draft Standing Orders and the Union Representatives were suggested to re-submit their objections in clear form. That the Appellant Union, Ariyur EID Parry (LTD) Sugar Mill Anna Thozhir Sangam had submitted a letter, dated 22-05-2014 requesting to grant 10 days time to furnish their objections in respect of the draft Standing Orders and the union had not submitted any valid objections in respect of the draft Standing Orders inspite of sufficient time granted to them. After a lapse of two months, the Union had filed a letter, dated 08-08-2014 stating that the certified Standing Orders applicable to the workmen employed by M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills, the erstwhile management is still in force and by transfer of understanding the present management of M/s. EID Parry (India) Limited has no legal right to seek for fresh certification of the Standing Orders. The Union had further stated that under the guise of fresh certification of Standing Orders, the present management is attempting to fix the age of superannuation as 58 years instead of 60 years as fixed in the existing standing orders and insisted to withhold the proceedings until the disposal of the Industrial Dispute pending before this Tribunal.

(iii) That on careful perusal of the draft Standing Orders submitted by the management of M/s. EID Parry (India) Limited, Puducherry, it was found that all the clause incorporated in the draft Standing Orders were in conformity with the provisions of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 and Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Central Rules, 1946 and the same was certified *vide* Standing Order No. 12/2014, dated 01-12-2014. Hence the memorandum of appeal is liable to be dismissed.

7. *The counter averments set forth by the second respondent in SOA.No.1/2015 is as follows:*

That ever since the Ariyur Sugar Factory came under the control of EID Parry (India) Limited in the year 2006, the workmen were represented by Ariyur Sarkarai Alai Thozhilalar Nala Sangam. The said Union has also been recognized by the Second Respondent. On 17-02-2010 the workmen belonging to the Union concluded a settlement with the Second Respondent fixing the wages, allowances and other service conditions for the period 01-01-2010 to 31-12-2013. That on 03-11-2014, the said Union submitted a charter of demands and on 26-02-2015, a settlement was signed on wages, allowances, *etc.* for the period 01-10-2014 to 30-09-2018. The increase in wages under this settlement was agreed between the Second Respondent and the said union and the same has been accepted by all the workmen. All the

terms of employment of the Second Respondent were uniformly applicable to all the Sugar Factories under the control of EID Parry (India) Limited including the age of superannuation, *i.e.*, on attaining the age of 58 years. Clause 11 provided that "All other terms and conditions of employment like leave, age of superannuation of 58 years, welfare benefits, applicability of the company certified Standing Orders and all other terms and conditions of service shall continue to remain unaltered unless and until specifically modified or changed in future". Besides the Ariyur Sugar Factory, the Second Respondent is having 4 Sugar Factories in Tamil Nadu, 3 Sugar Factories in Karnataka, 2 Sugar Factories in Andhra Pradesh and in all the factories, certain conditions of employment are uniform such as leave benefits, *ex gratia* payment at the time of retirement and age of retirement and in order to maintain the parity of service conditions, this clause 11 was incorporated and similar clause can also be found in factories where there are settlement. That the first Appellant Union raised the issue of age of retirement in the year 2013. On 26-12-2013, the Commissioner of Labour, Puducherry who is also the Certifying Officer under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act issued a show cause notice to various large Industrial establishments calling upon them to show cause why action shall not be taken against them if, they do not make an application for certification of Standing Orders. In response to the said show cause notice, on 07-03-2014, the Second Respondent submitted a draft Standing Orders which *inter alia* contained the provision that the age of retirement is 58 years. That before submitting the draft Standing Orders for certification, the provisions to be incorporated in the draft Standing Orders were discussed with the majority recognized Union, namely the Ariyur Sarkarai Alai EID Parry Thozhilalar Nala Sangam and a broad understanding was reached. That the Certifying Officer sent the draft Standing Orders to the first Appellant Union. By letter, dated 22-05-2014, the first Appellant Union sought time to submit their objections to the draft on or before 5th June 2014. That the Appellant addressed a letter to the Certifying Officer requesting that the Certification of the Standing Orders should be kept in abeyance till the issue raised by it by way of a dispute was decided which was pending in I.D. No. 06/2014 on the file of this Tribunal and the Certifying Officer after perusal of records had ignored the said letter. As an Authority under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, he was obliged to hear the parties and satisfy himself that it is conforming to the Model Standing Orders and

certifying the draft Standing Orders with or without modification to the draft submitted by the establishments. There was a personal hearing fixed on 26-06-2014 to which the first Appellant as well as the Ariyur Sarkarai Alai EID Parry Thozhilalar Nala Sangam was invited. However, the first Appellant Union did not attend the hearing. That in the aforesaid context on 17-11-2014, the Certifying Officer directed the Second Respondent to carry out certain modifications in the draft submitted by it. Those modifications were incorporated and a revised draft was submitted on 19-11-2014. On 03-12-2014, the Certifying Authority passed orders certifying the Standing Orders for the Second Respondent establishment to take effect from 01-12-2014. At present the Second Respondent establishment is having a complement of 90 workmen and barring 3 workmen who claimed to belong to the first Appellant Union, all other workmen including the President of Appellant Union have accepted the settlement, dated 26-02-2015 and received the benefits of the settlement as well as the wage increase. That by doing so, they accepted the position that the age of retirement will be 58 years. That the impugned order of certification of Standing Orders, dated 03-12-2014 is liable to be upheld and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

8. *Points for determination:*

1. Whether the claim of the petitioners union that the employees of respondent factory are to be retired only at the age of 60 years as per the provisions of Industrial Employment standing orders of the company is justified?

2. Whether the petitioners union are entitled for the relief of reinstatement of the workmen mentioned in the claim statement who have retired on attaining the age of 58 years with back wages, continuity of service with all other attendant benefits and to permit to continue their employment till they attain the age of 60 years?

3. Whether the petitioners union are entitled for the relief to set aside the certification order of standing order No.12 of 2014 in its entirety and direct the first respondent to adjudicate afresh the draft standing order submitted by the second respondent?

4. Whether the petitioner are entitled for an order of modification/deletion in the certified standing order No.12 of 2014?

5. To what other reliefs?

9. In ID(T).No.6/2014 on the side of petitioners PW1 was examined and Exs. P1 to P5 were marked, PW2 was examined and Exs.P6 to P10 were marked. On the side

of respondent, RW1 was examined, Exs. R1 to R28 were marked and Exs.R29 to 88 were marked on consent and later arguments were submitted by both parties.

10. In SOA.No.1/2015, no oral or documentary evidence was adduced on both sides and later arguments were submitted by both parties.

11. For the sake of convenience this Tribunal has taken up the cases in ID(T).No. 6/2014 and SOA.No.1/2015 together for simultaneous disposal. The term petitioners union wherever used would mean the petitioners in ID(T).No. 6/2014 and Appellants in SOA.No. 1/2015 and similarly, the term respondent wherever used would mean the respondent in ID(T).No. 6/2014 and second respondent in SOA.No. 1/2015 and the term first respondent wherever used would mean the first respondent in SOA.No. 1/2015. 12. The contention of the petitioners union is that the first petitioner trade union is affiliated to second petitioner Trade Union and the first petitioner trade union is the only Trade Union functioning in the respondent factory. The further contention of the petitioners union is that the respondent factory EID Parry India Ltd., became the owner of Ariyur Sugar Factory by transfer of undertaking from M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., and thereafter the EID Parry India Ltd., Ariyur Sugar Factory had collected the particulars of the workmen engaged by M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., and instructed those workmen to assemble on 01.11.2006 at Moolakulam, Pondicherry and later the officers of respondent factory adopted pick and choose policy and offered appointment to the workmen who were engaged by the erstwhile management and also directed to sign the already prepared appointment orders without disclosing the contents of the terms and conditions which were in English and were running to several pages. The petitioners union further contended that the said workmen were unable to raise any objection with regard to the approach of the management as they feared that any such protest would end up in losing their opportunity of getting the job but however, they were under legitimate expectation that the terms and conditions of the newly, undertaking factory would no way be lesser than the terms and conditions followed by erstwhile management and while so to their shock and surprise the management had issued notice, dated 20-11-2013 to some of the workmen that they would be superannuated on completion of 58 years on 31-12-2013. It is the further contention of the petitioners union that on receipt of such notice the workmen approached the management and had demanded for superannuation at the age of 60 years in terms of certified standing order applicable to them under the erstwhile management but, the management denied to accept the same and informed that the notices were issued in terms of appointment

order issued to the workmen and therefore, an industrial dispute was raised but, the management did not participate in conciliation proceedings and issued a representation, dated 07-12-2013 stating that there was a settlement between the management and another union that enhancing the age of superannuation would cause additional financial burden to the management but infact, till the certified standing orders of erstwhile management is amended the same would continue to govern the service conditions of the employees of respondent factory and thereby superannuating the workmen at the age of 58 is unsustainable in law and further the Hon'ble Supreme Court in various reported judgment has held that the life expectation has increased and thereby fixing the age of retirement at 60 years would be fair and proper and similarly in the other Sugar Mills located in Pondicherry, the certified standing orders provides for retirement at the age of 60 years and therefore, it is just and necessary to fix the age of retirement for the employees of respondent factory at the age of 60 years and to reinstate those workmen who were ordered to retire on attaining 58 years with full back wages, continuity of service and all other attendant benefits.

13. The learned Counsel for petitioners union has relied upon the following citations :

1. AIR 1984 SUPREME COURT 356

Workmen Of The Bharat Petroleum ... vs Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. And ... on 6 October, 1983.

Industrial Disputes Act - Industrial dispute regarding raising of retirement age - Different factors for determining retirement age - 26 Common Order I.D.(T).No.06/2014 and SOA.No. 01/2015 Trend in a particular area - Most important factor - Trend need not be static - Modern conditions and general trend in favour of raising retirement age - Trend in Bombay region in flavour of raising retirement age. For applying industry-cum-regional formula - If no comparable industries in the region - Regional aspect to be given precedence.

In applying the region-cum-industry formula the emphasis to be placed on region or industry depends upon varying factors. Where there are no comparable industries in the region, the regional aspect of the region-cum-industry formula must be given precedence.

2. AIR 1966 SUPREME COURT 732

M/S. British Paints (India) Ltd vs Its Workmen on 4 November, 1965.

Considering that there has been a general improvement in the standard of health in this country and also considering that longevity has increased, fixation of age of retirement at 60 years - appears to us to be quite reasonable in the present circumstances. Age of retirement at 55 years was fixed in the last century in - Government service and had become the pattern for fixing the age of retirement everywhere. But, time in our opinion has now come considering the improvement in the standard of health and increase in longevity in this country during the last fifty years that the age of retirement should be fixed at a higher level, and we consider that generally speaking in the present circumstances fixing the age, of retirement at 60 years would be fair and proper, unless there are special circumstances justifying fixation of a lower age of retirement.

3. CDJ 2024 Kar HC 1148

Central Silk Board by its Member-Secretary, Bengaluru Versus The Central Silk Board Employees Union (R) by its Secretary, Bengaluru & Another.

Further, the CGIT was correct in applying the principle of "Region-cum-Industry" as similar organizations under other Ministries had already enhanced the retirement age to 60 years. The demand for retirement age enhancement was justified based on the increased lifespan and parity with other organizations like the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) and National Seeds Corporation Limited.

14. *Per contra*, the respondent management contends that M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., was started in the year 1960 by availing credit facilities from Indian Bank, Puducherry and later as the said company defaulted in making repayment the said Bank had initiated proceedings under section 13(6) of SARFAESI Act and thereby the assets of M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., was sold in auction and the present respondent factory became a successful bidder to buy the assets sold in auction and subsequently, the sale was also confirmed and thereafter the present respondent factory settled the final dues to the workmen of M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., and thereby the employment of workmen with M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., was ceased and later on the respondent factory began to commence the operations of the Mill and in the said process the erstwhile employees of M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., had applied for

employment along with others and those who got selected in the interview were offered fresh employment setting out new terms and conditions of service and the age of retirement was fixed as 58 years which was similar to the service conditions fixed in the other three Sugar Factories of respondent factory. The respondent further contended that in between 2006 to 2013 nearly 67 employees were superannuated on reaching the age of 58 years and as such there is no any scope to alter the service conditions of the employees at Puducherry mill alone since the workmen have taken up the employment by accepting the terms and conditions of employment set out in the offer of employment and further more the petitioners union are not entitled to seek for change in the service conditions by enhancing the age of superannuation from 58 to 60 years by contending that the standing orders of erstwhile management that is M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., should be followed by the present factory since M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., got extinguished by auction sale of assets to the present respondent factory and the employees of erstwhile management were settled all dues and terminal benefits and thereafter the employees had been newly recruited to the present respondent factory. The further contention of the respondent is that as per the direction of certifying officer under Industrial Standing Orders Act of Union territory of Pondicherry, the respondent had already prepared a draft standing orders and the same is pending for approval and therefore, the workmen of the petitioners union having accepted the service conditions of employment is not entitled to claim for enhancement of age of superannuation.

15. *The learned Counsel for respondent management has relied upon the following citations:*

1. 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 692 : 2023 INSC 733

CENTRAL COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH IN
AYURVEDIC SCIENCES & ANR.

Versus

BIKARTAN DAS & ORS.

Service Law - Retirement age cannot be increased based on superannuation age in another similar post. The age of superannuation age in another similar post. The age of superannuation for employees is determined solely by statutory rules.

Service Law - Retirement age of an employee cannot be increased on the ground of devotion to the job.

2. CDJ 2025 SC 969

Kashmiri Lal Sharma Versus Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd. & Another.

Otherwise also, an employee has no fundamental right as regards the age at which he would retire. Moreover, termination of service of an employee on account of reaching the age of superannuation in accordance with law or rules regulating the conditions of service does not amount to his removal from service within the meaning of Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India. [Bishnu Narain Mishra vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others, AIR 1965 SC 1567 : 1964 SCC Online SC 72] In K. Nagaraj and Others vs. State of Andhra Pradesh and another, (1985) 1 SCC 523, three-Judge Bench of this Court upheld reduction of the age of retirement from 58 years to 55 years. While doing so, this Court observed that "it is not possible to lay down an inflexible rule that 58 years is a reasonable age for retirement and 55 is not. If, the policy adopted for the time being by the Government or the Legislature is shown to violate recognized norms of employment planning, it would be possible to say that the policy is irrational since, in that event, it would not bear reasonable nexus with the object which it seeks to achieve.

16. This Tribunal from the submissions of both parties and on perusal of records finds that one M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., which is an erstwhile company is found to have availed credit facilities from the Indian Bank and thereafter has committed default in making repayment and therefore, the said Indian Bank has initiated proceedings as against M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., under the SARFAESI Act, 2002 and brought the assets of the said company in auction sale and subsequently the respondent factory that is EID Parry (India) Ltd., had emerged to be a successful bidder and became owner of M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., by way of transfer of undertakings and thereafter the EID Parry (India) Ltd., is found to have provided employment to some of the workmen of erstwhile company and while providing employment in the appointment letters the respondent management had fixed the age of superannuation as 58 years instead of 60 years which was the prevailing service condition of the erstwhile company that is M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd.,

17. According to petitioners union it is contended that the Appointment letters were in English and running into several pages and the respondent management neither read over nor explained the terms in Tamil and the members of the petitioners were in fear that they may lose their chance of getting job in case of raising protest and thereby they were constrained to append their signature in the Appointment orders and

declaration Form and that apart they were in the hope that their service conditions would be no way less favourable than the service conditions prevailed in the erstwhile company but, however to their shock and dismay they came to know about the terms of service conditions stipulated in the appointment letters only when few workmen had received notice, dated 20-11-2013 stating that they would be superannuated on reaching the age of 58 years on 31-12-2013.

18. Whereas, the contention of the respondent is that the age of superannuation had been explicitly mentioned in the offer of appointment and the members of the petitioners union have accepted the said terms and conditions by affixing their signatures in the declaration Forms as well as in the duplicate copy of Appointment letters and further from the year of appointment that is from 2006 onwards to till the raising of the present industrial dispute that is in the year 2014, the members of the petitioners union at no point of time have raised any objections stating that they were not permitted to know the terms of service conditions that was fixed at the time of appointment and that apart from the year 2006 to 2013 nearly 67 employees have retired on reaching the superannuation age of 58 years but the members of the petitioners union did not raise any protest with regard to retirement of 67 employees who had retired on reaching the superannuation age of 58 years and hence, in the said context the petitioners union are estopped from contending that they were not aware of the terms and conditions stipulated in the offer of appointment letter.

19. This Tribunal on perusal of Appointment letters issued to the workmen by the respondent management finds that in clause 9 the age of superannuation is fixed as 58 years and further the concerned workman to whom the employment was provided is found to have appended his signature in the duplicate copy of appointment letter and also has signed in the declaration Forms annexed along with the appointment letters. Further on perusal of declaration Forms it is stated that the person who had affixed signature in it had carefully studied and understood the terms and conditions of service contained in the appointment letter and Annexure I and II, which have been explained in Tamil and further accept and undertake to abide by the said terms and conditions.

20. Furthermore, it is an admitted fact that the employment was provided by the respondent management in the year 2006 and thereafter onwards the members of the petitioners union were working in the respondent factory till 2013 and 2014 and further it is admitted by the PW1 during his cross-examination that 67 employees have retired for the period from 2007 to 2012. This Tribunal on perusal of Ex.R26 finds that the

respondent has produced the list of 67 employees who had retired from service for the period from 2006 to 2013. Therefore, from the evidence of PW1 and Ex.R26 it is found that from the year 2006 onwards the workmen had been retiring at the age of 58 years and hence, in such context, the contention of the members of the petitioners union that they were not aware of the terms and conditions of service more particularly the age of superannuation which had been fixed at 58 years till the raising of present industrial dispute in the year 2014 is found to be totally unacceptable and unbelievable one. Similarly, had it been true that the members of the petitioners union were not informed about the terms and conditions stipulated in the appointment letters which were in English and running to several pages and further the respondent management did not read over or explain the its contents in Tamil then in such case, the members of the petitioners union had an opportunity of knowing the age of retirement which had been fixed as 58 years from the workmen who were retiring from 2006 onwards as per the particulars furnished in Ex.R26 but, the members of the petitioners union is found to have not raised any such objections or initiate any legal proceedings protesting the fixation of retirement age as 58 years till the raising of present dispute in the year 2014. Hence, viewed in any angle the contention of the members of the petitioners union that they were not aware of the terms and conditions of service more particularly the age of superannuation fixed at 58 years till the raising of present industrial dispute in the year 2014 is found to be fallacious and evasive one.

21. Regarding the other contention of the petitioners union that there is no any certified standing order for the respondent factory and therefore, till the certified standing order of the erstwhile management is amended the same would continue to govern the service conditions of the employees of respondent factory and therefore, standing order of erstwhile management will supersede the terms of service conditions stated in the appointment letters are concerned, this Tribunal on perusal of Exs.R7, R9 and R10 finds that after the respondent factory became the successful bidder in the auction sale of assets of erstwhile company namely, M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., there were many legal proceedings initiated by erstwhile company namely M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., and by the respondent factory with regard to the issues as to who had to settle the dues and retrenchment compensation to the workmen of erstwhile company and also period up to which retrenchment compensation had to be disbursed.

22. Likewise on perusal of Ex.R10 it is found that some of the trade unions is found to have filed Writ Petitions in W.P.No. 24834/2005 and W.P.No. 36900/2005

to direct the Indian Bank to deposit amount out of the sale proceeds for disbursement of dues to the workers and as per Ex.R9 the commissioner of Labour, Labour Department has issued order to the erstwhile company and to the respondent factory and to the Trade Unions stating that as per the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court, dated 11-12-2009 it has been proposed to proceed with the disbursement of all dues to the workers of M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., subject to their eligibility and admissibility of such claims.

23. Further, on perusal of Ex.R10 it is found that the Hon'ble Division Bench of Madras High Court has ordered the date from which the benefits under section 25FF of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as well as the other benefits to be reckoned for the workers. The PW1 during his cross-examination has deposed that the erstwhile company before getting employment in the respondent factory has paid ₹ 3,76,000 to PW1 and the said amount includes the terminal benefits and likewise had paid to other workmen also. Thus, on careful perusal of Exs.R7, R9, R10 and from the evidence of PW1 it could be inferred that the workmen of erstwhile company namely M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., is found to have been paid retrenchment compensation and other dues as contemplated under section 25FF of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. For better appreciation section 25 FF of ID Act is extracted hereunder:

25FF. Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.— Where the ownership or management of an undertaking is transferred, whether by agreement or by operation of law, from the employer in relation to that undertaking to a new employer, every workman who has been in continuous service for not less than one year in that undertaking immediately before such transfer shall be entitled to notice and compensation in accordance with the provisions of section 25F, as if, the workman had been retrenched:

Provided that nothing in this section shall apply to a workman in any case where there has been a change of employers by reason of the transfer, if—

(a) the service of the workman has not been interrupted by such transfer;

(b) the terms and conditions of service applicable to the workman after such transfer are not in any way less favourable to the workman than those applicable to him immediately before the transfer; and

(c) the new employer is, under the terms of such transfer or otherwise, legally liable to pay to the workman, in the event of his retrenchment,

compensation on the basis that his service has been continuous and has not been interrupted by the transfer.

24. Therefore, as per section under section 25FF of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, every workman who has been in continuous service for not less than one year in an undertaking immediately before the transfer of ownership or management of an undertaking by agreement or operation of law shall be entitled for notice and compensation in accordance with the provisions of section under section 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In this case, by way of auction sale of assets the erstwhile company namely M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., has been extinguished and so also the workmen of erstwhile company had been paid retrenchment compensation as per section 25FF of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. When the retrenchment compensation has been paid to the workers of erstwhile company namely M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Ltd., then in such context the service of the workmen in the erstwhile company has been interrupted by transfer of undertaking and thereby the terms of service conditions of erstwhile company also comes to standstill. Hence, the contention of the petitioners that standing orders of erstwhile company will continue and has to be followed by the respondent management even after the transfer of undertakings is found to be unsustainable and untenable one.

25. In this case, admittedly the respondent factory as per Ex.R12 letter, dated 02-01-2014 has sought time for submission of draft standing orders and further stated that till then it will follow the model standing orders. It is also admitted by both parties that after transfer of undertaking there was no any standing order framed for the respondent company. Hence, in the absence of any standing orders of its own, the model standing orders would be applicable to the respondent factory. Schedule I-B of Industrial Employment (standing orders) Central Rules, 1946 stipulates Model standing orders on Additional items applicable to all industries and as per the said model standing orders in the clause for age of retirement it is stated that the age of retirement or superannuation of a workman shall be as may be agreed upon between the employer and the workman under an agreement or as specified in a settlement or award which is binding on both the workman and the employer and where there is no such agreed age, retirement or superannuation shall be on completion of 58 years of age by the workman. In this case, there is no any agreement or settlement or award between the employer and workman with regard to fixation of age of retirement, hence in such context the age of retirement or superannuation shall be 58 years as mentioned in the

model standing orders. Thus, even as per the model standing orders the age of superannuation would be 58 years.

26. As per Ex.R28 the certified standing orders of the respondent factory is stated to be come into force with effect from 01-12-2014. Hence prior to 01-12-2014 the terms of service conditions mentioned in the appointment letters and the age of retirement mentioned in the model standing order would be applicable and thereby the age of retirement or superannuation would be 58 years and therefore, the retirement of workmen of respondent factory occurred till 30-11-2014 on attaining the age of 58 years is found to be legally valid and does not require any interference of this Tribunal.

27. Next issue that arises for consideration is whether the certification of standing order No. 12 of 2014 of respondent factory is liable to be set aside or modified. In this case, if the certification of standing order No. 12 of 2014 of the respondent factory is set aside or modified then the same will have impact upon the workmen of respondent factory who had retired from the day the standing orders came into force that is 01-12-2014 because in clause 44 of the certified standing order 12 of 2014 the respondent management has fixed the age of retirement on attaining the age of superannuation as 58 years and whereas, the petitioners are seeking for modification by fixing the age of superannuation as 60 years instead of 58 years and thereby the workmen who had retired from 01-12-2014 onwards on reaching the age of 58 years would be entitled for the monetary benefits for the difference period of two years, *i.e.*, from 58 years to 60 years.

28. This Tribunal on perusal of case records finds that as per Ex.R69 cancellation of licence and deregistration issued by the office of the Chief Inspector of factories and boilers, dated 10-12-2018 it is stated that based on closure report the licence issued to the respondent factory stands cancelled and factory registration also stands deregistered. Thus, from 10-12-2018 it is found that the respondent factory licence has been cancelled and therefore, till 09-12-2018 the workmen who have retired from service on attaining age of 58 years would be entitled for the monetary benefits for two years in case, the certification of standing order No. 12 of 2014 of respondent factory is set aside or modified.

29. It is the specific contention of the petitioners that pending ID (T).No. 6/2014 the certifying officer had certified the standing order No. 12 of 2014 which contained a clause pertaining to the age of retirement and further the certifying officer has certified the said standing order as against the provisions of Industrial

Employment (Standing orders) Act, 1946 without proper appreciation and without hearing the petitioners. Though the respondent factory is stated to be closed and further licence issued to the respondent factory has been cancelled as per Ex.R69 cancellation of licence and deregistration issued by the office of the Chief Inspector of factories and boilers, dated 10-12-2018, this Tribunal for limited purpose proceeds to determine validity of certification of standing order No. 12 of 2014 of the respondent factory since the same will have impact on the monetary benefits for which the members of the petitioners union would be entitled in case, they succeed in their case.

30. As per section 5(1) of Industrial Employment (Standing orders) Act, 1946, the certifying officer on receipt of the draft standing order shall forward a copy thereof to the trade union together with a notice in the prescribed form requiring objections if any and subsequently after giving the employer and the trade union an opportunity of being heard shall decide whether or not any modification or addition to the draft is necessary so as to render the standing orders certifiable and thereafter has to pass an order in writing accordingly.

31. Therefore, as per section 5(1) of Industrial Employment (Standing orders) Act, 1946, the certifying officer has to send a copy of the draft standing orders to the trade union requiring objections if any and thereafter has to provide an opportunity of being heard to the employer as well as to the Trade Union and then only has to certify the standing orders. In this case, it is the contention of the petitioners union that they were not given opportunity of being heard and the certifying officer has passed an order of certification mechanically. This Tribunal on perusal of case records finds that the Labour Officer (WB) has issued a notice on 17-03-2014 to the president of Ariyur Sarkarai Alai, EID Parry Thozhilalar Nala Sangam and to the first petitioner union under section 5 of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 along with a copy of draft standing order calling for objections if any for the draft standing order and thereafter on 13-05-2014 the first petitioner union is found to have submitted its objections and on 08-08-2014, the second petitioner union is found to have issued letter to the certifying officer stating that the industrial dispute raised by the petitioners union over the age of superannuation of the workmen is pending before the Labour Court and thereby the matter regarding age of superannuation is in sub-judice and hence, to wait till the disposal of industrial dispute raised by the petitioners union.

32. The records further reveals that after considering the objections and stand taken by the petitioners union the certifying officer is found to have proceeded to go

ahead with the process of certification and thereafter on 01-12-2014 certification order has been issued. Hence in the said context the contention of the petitioners union that they were not given opportunity of being heard and the certifying Officer has passed an order of certification mechanically is found to be absurd. The contention of the petitioners union that in the Sugar Mills situated in the nearby locality of respondent factory has a certified standing orders which provides for superannuation at the age of 60 years and therefore, the same has to be followed by the respondent factory is concerned, this Tribunal finds that the issue of fixation of age of superannuation is purely a policy matter that lies within the domain of the employer and the workman does not have any vested right to seek for extension of the age of retirement since it has significant financial implications upon the employer in case of enhancing the age of superannuation and therefore, it is for the employer to decide what will be age of superannuation according to their financial strategy.

33. Further, Schedule I-B of Industrial Employment (standing orders) Central Rules, 1946 stipulates Model standing orders on Additional items applicable to all industries and as per the said model standing orders, the age of retirement on superannuation is fixed as 58 years. Thus, the fixation of age of superannuation at 58 years is not found to be in contravention to the Model standing orders contained in Schedule I-B of Industrial Employment (standing orders) Central Rules, 1946. Hence, from the above submissions and discussions it is clear that the first respondent has certified the standing order in accordance with the provisions envisaged in the Industrial Employment Standing Orders Act, 1946. Therefore, it will bind the employer and the employee. The citations relied by the petitioners union is found to be not applicable to the present case in hand. Thus, this Tribunal on taking into consideration of all above submissions and discussions finds that the industrial dispute raised by the petitioners union is not justified and hence, the industrial dispute as well as the appeal preferred by the appellants are liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the claim petition filed in ID (T). No. 6/2014 and Appeal in SOA.No. 1/2015 are dismissed. There is no order as to costs.

Partly typed by the Stenographer, partly typed by me in my laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 12th day of December 2025.

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

List of petitioner's witnesses:

- PW1 — 02-12-2014 Thiru K. Krishnamoorthy
PW2 — 29-01-2015 Thiru A. Pappusamy

List of petitioner's side exhibits :

- Ex.P1 — 02-05-1990 Photocopy of the appointment order issued by M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Limited.
Ex.P2 — 01-11-1993 Photocopy of the Letter of retirement on superannuation issued M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Limited.
Ex.P3 — 23-07-2003 Photocopy of the letter of retirement on superannuation issued M/s. New Horizon Sugar Mills Limited.
Ex.P4 — 01-11-2006 Photocopy of the appointment letter issued by the respondent company to K. Jayabalan.
Ex.P5 — 25-09-1987 Photocopy of the Certified Standing Orders of the Pondicherry Co-op. Sugar Mills Ltd., Lingareddipalayam.
Ex.P6 — 30-12-1991 Photocopy of the certification order issued by Joint Commissioner of Labour/ Certifying Officer, Madurai.
Ex.P7 — 19-09-2014 Photocopy of the Superannuation order issued by Sri Bharathi Mills, Pondicherry.
Ex.P8 — — Photocopy of the certified Standing Orders of Swadeshi Cotton Mills Ltd., Pondicherry.
Ex.P9 — 18-11-1987 Photocopy of the certified Standing Orders of the Pondicherry Co-operative Spinning Mills Ltd., Thirubuvanai, Pondicherry.
Ex.P10 — 11-08-2005 Photocopy of the Certified Standing Orders of the Hindustan Lever Ltd., Detergent Division, Vadamangalam, Pondicherry.

- Ex.P11 — 30-12-1991 Photocopy of the certification orders issued by Joint Commissioner of Labour/Certifying Officer, Madras. (Pages 1 to 12).
- Ex.P12 — 07-12-2004 Photocopy of the Superannuation order issued by New Horizons Sugar Mills Ltd., (Page 13).
- Ex.P13 — 26-02-2015 Photocopy of the letter to the Labour Officer (Conciliation) with Charter of demands (Pages 14 to 24).
- Ex.P14 — 02-03-2015 Photocopy of the notice of Enquiry sent by Labour Officer (Conciliation) (Page 25).
- Ex.P15 — 02-03-2015 Photocopy of the representation made to the Labour Officer (Conciliation) (Pages 26 to 31).
- Ex.P16 — 05-03-2015 Photocopy of the notice of Enquiry sent by Labour Officer (Conciliation) (Page 32).
- Ex.P17 — 04-03-2015 Photocopy of the representation made to the management by 55 workmen (Pages 33 to 38).
- Ex.P18 — 17-03-2015 Photocopy of the letter submitted to the Labour Officer (Conciliation) by union (Pages 39 to 40).
- Ex.P19 — 28-04-2015 Photocopy of the reply given by Legislative Assembly Secretariat, Puducherry (Pages 41 to 43).
- Ex.P20 — 03-03-2015 Photocopy of the Original Affidavit sworn by workmen before Notary Public (Pages 44 to 131).
- Ex.P21 — 10-08-2018 Photocopy of the letter submitted to the Labour Officer (Conciliation) by union.
- Ex.P22 — 13-09-2019 Photocopy of the notice of Enquiry sent by Labour Officer (Conciliation).

List of Respondent's witness:

- RW1 — 23-02-2015 Thiru. S. Swaminathan

List of Respondent's side Exhibits:

- Ex.R1 — — Photocopy of the undertaking signed by Thiru Krishnamoorthy.
- Ex.R2 — — Photocopy of Probationary appointment letter of Thiru Krishnamoorthy.
- Ex.R3 — 15-02-2005 Photocopy of the Auction notice.
- Ex.R4 — 24-08-2006 Photocopy of the Sale of Immovable Property Certificate.
- Ex.R5 — 29-01-2009 Photocopy of the Patta Copy in the name of the Respondent.
- Ex.R6 — 01-11-2006 Photocopy of the Copy of Appointment order (Sample).
- Ex.R7 — 31-08-2009 Photocopy of the Order of Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 6381 and 6382 of 2009.
- Ex.R8 — 11-12-2009 Photocopy of the Order of Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 6381 and 6382 of 2009.
- Ex.R9 — 18-03-2010 Photocopy of the Order of Commissioner of Labour.
- Ex.R10 — 29-06-2010 Photocopy of the Order of High Court of Madras in W.P.No. 11881/2010.
- Ex.R11 — 26-12-2013 Photocopy of the Show Cause notice issued to Respondent by Deputy Commissioner of Labour.
- Ex.R12 — 02-01-2014 Photocopy of the reply to show cause notice by the respondent to the Deputy Commissioner of Labour.
- Ex.R13 — — Photocopy of the draft Standing Orders submitted by the Respondent.
- Ex.R14 — 07-03-2014 Photocopy of the letter addressed to the Certifying Officer by the Respondents along with draft Standing Order.

Ex.R15	— 22-05-2014	Photocopy of the letter from the petitioners to the Certifying Officer.	Ex.R27	— —	Photocopy of the order of appointment orders issued to Mr. K. Krishnamoorthy (PW1).
Ex.R16	— 04-12-2013	Photocopy of the Notice of enquiry/Conciliation by the Labour Officer (Conciliation) to the Respondent.	Ex. R28	— —	Photocopy of the certified Standing Order issued to the respondent factory.
Ex.R17	— 17-12-2013	Photocopy of the reply by respondent to the Labour Officer (Conciliation).	Ex.R29	— 01-11-2006	Photocopy of the series appointment order issued by the respondent to its workers.
Ex.R18	— 24-12-2013	Photocopy of the letter from the respondent to the Commissioner of Labour.	Ex.R30	— —	Photocopy of the notices issued by the respondent to workmen who retired between 2006 - 2013.
Ex.R19	— —	Photocopy of the Certified Standing Orders of Nellikuppam Sugar Factory.	Ex.R31	— —	Photocopy of the appointment order (Sample).
Ex.R20	— —	Photocopy of the Certified Standing Orders of Ennore Factory.	Ex.R32	— 17-02-2010	Photocopy of the Settlement.
Ex.R21	— 17-10-2006	Photocopy of the Fresh Factory Licence of Ariyur Sugar Factory in the name of the respondent.	Ex.R33	— 03-11-2014	Photocopy of the Charter of demands submitted by the union.
Ex.R22	— 26-12-2006	Photocopy of the communication from PF Authority issuing Fresh Registration number in the name of respondent.	Ex.R34	— 26-02-2015	Photocopy of the settlement.
Ex.R23	— 17-10-2007	Photocopy of the Copy of communication from PF authority issuing fresh sub-code allotment in the name of respondent.	Ex.R35	— —	Photocopy of the Individual letters of undertaking given by 86 workmen.
Ex.R24	— —	Photocopy of the VAT Registration certificate issued in respect of the Ariyur factory for 2007 and 2014.	Ex.R36	— 01-12-2014	Photocopy of the certified standing order.
Ex.R25	— 17-02-2010	Photocopy of the Settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act.	Ex.R37	— 07-10-2016	Photocopy of the proceedings held on 07-10-2016.
Ex.R26	— —	Photocopy of the details of workmen who retired between 2006 and 2013.	Ex.R38	— 28-10-2016	Photocopy of the Order issued by Labour Department, Puducherry.
			Ex.R39	— 01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru P. Udayasaravanan found in the Probationary Appointment letter.
			Ex.R40	— —	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru P. Udayasaravanan found in the Annexure-6.
			Ex.R41	— —	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru V. Dharmalingam found in the Probationary Appointment letter.
			Ex.R42	— 01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru. K Kumar found in the Probationary Appointment letter.

Ex.R43	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru K. Kumar found in the Annexure- 6.	Ex.R57	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru K. Kumar found in the Annexure-6.
Ex.R44	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru V. Ganesamoorthy found in the Probationary Appointment letter.	Ex.R58	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru G. Gunasekaran found in the Probationary Appointment letter.
Ex.R45	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru V. Ganesamoorthy found in the Annexure-6.	Ex.R59	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru G. Gunasekaran found in the Annexure 6.
Ex.R46	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru N. Ganesan found in the Probationary Appointment letter.	Ex.R60	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru M. Sivaraman found in the Probationary Appointment letter.
Ex.R47	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru N. Ganesan found in the Annexure-6.	Ex.R61	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru M. Sivaraman found in the Annexure-6.
Ex.R48	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru R. Kaliyamurthy found in the Probationary Appointment letter.	Ex.R62	—	18-08-2018	Photocopy of the retrenchment orders issued to the 8 workmen (Pages 1 to 24).
Ex.R49	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru R. Kaliyamurthy found in the Annexure-6.	Ex.R63	—	31-08-2018	Photocopy of the proceedings held on 31-08-2018 by the Commissioner of Labour, Puducherry (Pages 25 to 27).
Ex.R50	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru R. Kuppusamy found in the Probationary Appointment letter.	Ex.R64	—	03-09-2018	Photocopy of the letter by Mr. K. Krishnamurthy - Page 28.
Ex.R51	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru R. Kuppusamy found in the Annexure-6.	Ex.R65	—	04-09-2018	Photocopy of the letter by Mr. K. Kumar - Page 29.
Ex.R52	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru V. Jayaraman found in the Probationary Appointment letter.	Ex.R66	—	04-09-2018	Photocopy of the settlement signed between Mr. K. Kumar and the Management (Pages 30 to 32).
Ex.R53	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru V. Jayaraman found in the Annexure-6.	Ex.R67	—	05-09-2018	Photocopy of the settlement signed between Mr. K. Krishnamurthy and the Management (Pages 33 to 35).
Ex.R54	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru K. Kaliyamurthy found in the Probationary Appointment letter.	Ex.R68	—	10-10-2018	Photocopy of the Management to the Commisioner of Labour, Puducherry - Page 36.
Ex.R55	—	—	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru K. Kaliyamurthy found in the Annexure-6.	Ex.R69	—	10-12-2018	Photocopy of the Factory Licence - cancellation and surrender certificate - Page 37.
Ex.R56	—	01-11-2006	Photocopy of the Signature of Thiru K. Kumar found in the Probationary Appointment letter.				

Ex.R70 — 10-12-2018	Photocopy of the cancellation of License and de Registration issued by the Chief Inspector of Factories.	Ex. R81 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Medical Inspector of Factories.
Ex.R71 — 26-08-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Villianur Commune Panchayat Office.	Ex.R82 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Labour Officer (Enforcement).
Ex.R72 — 26-08-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Villianur Police Station.	Ex.R83 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Labour Officer (Conciliation).
Ex.R73 — 26-08-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Puducherry Pollution Control Committee.	Ex.R84 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Inspector of Factories.
Ex.R74 — 26-08-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Regional PF Commissioner.	Ex. R85 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Chief Secretary.
Ex.R75 — 26-08-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Registering Officer under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970.	Ex.R86 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Inspector of Police, Villianur.
Ex.R76 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Employment Officer.	Ex.R87 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to District Collector.
Ex.R77 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Directorate of Industries and Commerce.	Ex.R88 — 11-10-2019	Photocopy of the Acknowledgment Slip issued by Department of Revenue and Disaster Management.
Ex.R78 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Apprentice Advisor, Puducherry.		
Ex.R79 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Station Fire Officer.		
Ex.R80 — 30-09-2019	Photocopy of the Closure Notice of Puducherry factory to Boiler Inspector.		

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
HEALTH SECRETARIAT

(G.O. Ms. No. 04, Puducherry, dated 27th February 2026)

NOTIFICATION

On attaining the age of superannuation, the following Assistant Nursing Superintendents of Indira Gandhi Government General Hospital and Postgraduate Institute, Puducherry, are admitted into retirement from service with effect from the dates noted against each: