



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	} 12	புதுச்சேரி	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை	2026 லு	மார்ச் மீ	24 உ
No.		Poudouchéry	Mardi	24	Mars	2026 (3 Chaitra 1948)
No.		Puducherry	Tuesday	24th	March	2026

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

	பக்கம்		Page		Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள்..	788	Sentence arbitral du travail de tribunal	.. 788	Award of the Labour Court	.. 788
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள்	.. 793	Notifications du Gouvernement	.. 793	Government Notifications	.. 793
ஆபத்தான நிறுவனங்கள்	.. 887	Etablissements dangereux	.. 887	Dangerous Establishments	.. 887
சாற்றறிக்கைகள்	.. 889	Annonces	.. 889	Announcements	.. 889

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 14/AIL/Lab./S/2026,  
Puducherry, dated 20th February 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 04/2020, dated 22-09-2025 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of the industrial dispute between M/s. T.T.K. Healthcare Limited, Puducherry and T.T.K. Healthcare Employees Union (INTUC), Puducherry, over alteration of service conditions on work/time study has been received;

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

(By order)

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

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

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

*Monday, the 22nd day of September 2025.*

**I.D. (L) No. 04/2020**  
**CNR. No. PYPY06-000029-2020**

The Secretary,  
T.T.K. Healthcare Employees Union (INTUC),  
No. 50, Vellalar Street,  
Puducherry-605 001. . . Petitioner

*Versus*

The Managing Director,  
T.T.K. Healthcare Limited  
No. 12, TTN Complex,  
K.P. Natham Road,  
Thiruvandarkoil,  
Puducherry-605 102. . . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute coming before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru R. T. Shankar, P. Suresh and B. Balamurugan, Counsels for the Petitioner and M/s. Ravi Law Chambers, S. Indumathi Ravi, R. Sanjeev, R. Shravan, K. Gowtham and R. Thilagavathi, Counsels

for the Respondent upon hearing both sides and 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. 63/AIL/Lab./T/2020, dated 04-06-2020 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,-

(a) Whether the industrial dispute raised by the union workmen represented by T.T.K. Healthcare Employees Union (INTUC), Puducherry, against the management of M/s. T.T.K. Healthcare Limited, Thiruvandarkoil, Puducherry over alteration of service conditions on work/time study is justified or not? If justified, what relief the union workmen are entitled to?

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

2. *The brief averments set forth in the Claim Statement filed by the petitioner is as follows:*

That the respondent management M/s. T.T.K. Healthcare Limited involved in the manufacturing of condoms. That the respondent management had been exploiting the workmen in various measures thereby they did not come forward to increase the wages to the employees from 2013 and the wage revision is pending before this Court and while so the respondent management decided unilaterally and pressurizing the workers by imposing for higher production beyond their capacity and also threatening the workers/office bearers of the union, who were raising question against the management about assigning over burden work. Hence, the petitioner union had requested the conciliation authority to redress the grievances of the workers and to set-right the service conditions in the Electronic Testing and Foiling units. During the conciliation proceedings, the petitioner union had insisted the management to settle the issue at the earliest. But, the management did not accept the mechanism of Time study. Hence, the matter was ended in failure on 09-12-2019. That the respondent management Department Head had pressurized the workers for higher production, threatening the workers by fixing higher benchmark in production, cheating the workers in the wake of loss of time during power failure and insisting the workers to sign in the 18(1) agreement in favour of management.

(ii) That the respondent management fixed 13710 pieces as benchmark in production in the ET Department in the agreement reached before 10 years and the same is continued hitherto. The said benchmark in production was fixed at that time after considering factors of age/health condition of the workers and the working atmosphere, but the said production could not be given at present, as loss of time occurred due to various changes made in the ET Department, in machineries, in standard of machines, replacement in spare parts in machines. That the management is engaging more and more contract workers thereby heavy congestion was caused which made the workers health ill and mental illness. That the petitioner union requested the respondent management to do the time study for the production target and the time can be assessed depending upon the running speed and running time of machine, after that the target from 60% to 100% of the production but, the management did not come forward to assess time consumption and to prove time-loss purportedly caused by the workers. Hence the petition.

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

That the respondent management entered into a settlement with the union on 20-09-2010 that the workmen employed in Electronic Testing and foiling was to get a sum of ₹ 52 as incentive per day provided they achieve production of 13,710 pieces per day in Electronic Testing department. The benchmark of 13,710 pieces was being maintained right from 2010. However on expiry of the abovesaid settlement the United Labour Federation Union, the only union prevailing at that time raised a demand for revision of wages and other benefits. Since, the demands were practically not viable, the respondent management could not come to a consensus and therefore, the said union raised a demand before the Labour Officer (Conciliation). Since no settlement could be arrived before the Labour Officer (Conciliation), the dispute was referred for adjudication before this Court. When the Industrial Dispute I.D.(T) 13/2014 was pending before this Court, the Settlement 18(1) arrived at on 27-07-2019 envisages revision of wages and other benefits conspicuously with a special mention of production incentive to the employees employed in the electronic testing department. According to which the status quo anti of the quantum production 13,710 pieces per day was continued to be accepted with an increase of incentive amount from ₹ 52 to ₹ 84.

However a dissented group of workers who were all members of the United Labour Front, and also were being a necessary party in ID(T) 13/2014 formed a separate union and disputed the settlement entered with their parent union viz., United Labour Federation and impleaded as a party in the industrial dispute pending before this Industrial Tribunal. When the dispute was pending, a number of workers belonging to the breakaway group of petitioner union came forward voluntarily to include them as a party in the 18(1) settlement, dated 27-07-2019. They opted to accept the terms of settlement and received increased wages and other benefits. As for as the Respondent management is concerned the matter regarding production incentive in respect of the workman employed in Electronic testing department was fully settled as the bench mark of 13,710 pieces per day as per the settlement entered in the year 2010 with the union. The accepted quantum was continued to be followed right from 2010 and there is no increase in number of pieces. That even the settlement, dated 27-07-2019 maintains the same quantum of 13,710 pieces per day though there is an increase of incentive benefits from ₹ 52 to ₹ 84. The members of the petitioner union who were a party in the earlier settlement, dated 20-09-2010 continued to accept the bench mark of 13,710 pieces and enjoyed the benefits of production incentive. However after splitting themselves and forming a new union they started acting against the interest of the management and were in the habit of raising fresh demands day after day. There is no reason behind the demands and it is only a protest due to their inter union rivalries. The practice that was prevailing for the past 12 years being disputed only after developing rival group. And therefore there is no necessity for any ratio deciding at this stage for any time study for electronic testing. That the norms fixed for over a decade is followed and there was no material changes in respect of the machines or manpower and also there is no change in the standard operating procedure laid down for over 12 years. That act per se tantamount to violation of the terms of settlement entered therewith. Moreover out of 222 workers 155 workers have already accepted the terms of settlement which specifically envisages a reference for incentive to the workers employed in the electronic testing department. When the abovesaid settlement is in operation the petitioner union does not have any legal right to raise fresh demands for any work study. Hence, the claim petition is liable to dismissed as devoid of merits.

4. *Points for determination :*

1. Whether the industrial dispute raised by the union workmen represented by TTK Healthcare Employees Union (INTUC), Puducherry, against the management of M/s. TTK Healthcare Limited, Thiruvandarkoil, Puducherry over alteration of service conditions on work/time study is justified or not?

2. To what other reliefs?

5. During the course of enquiry, on the side of petitioner, PW.1 was examined and Exs. P1 to P2 were marked. On the side of respondent, RW.1 was examined and Exs. R1 to R11 were marked.

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

In this case, it is the contention of the petitioner union that the respondent management has fixed production of 13,710 pieces as bench mark in the Electronic Testing department and the said bench mark in production was fixed after considering various factors such as age, health conditions of the workers and working condition of the workers in the machine and replacement of spare parts in the machines. It is the further case of the petitioner that in spite of agitations raised by the workers, the respondent management failed to redress the grievances of the workers and set right the service conditions based on time study and therefore the present industrial dispute was raised to direct the respondent management to do the time study with the office bearers of petitioner union and to fix production target slabs from 60 % to 100%.

7. Whereas the contention of the respondent in the counter is that the respondent management had entered into a settlement with the union on 20-09-2010 and as per the said settlement the workmen employed in Electronic testing and foiling will get a sum of ₹ 52 as incentive per day provided the worker achieves production of 13,710 pieces per day and this bench mark was maintained from the year 2010 and later on expiry of abovesaid settlement the management could not come to a consensus with a demands of the union, therefore an industrial dispute was raised by the petitioner union and the same was taken up before this Court as ID(T).No. 13/2014 and further during the pendency of abovesaid case a settlement under section 18(1) of Industrial Dispute Act was arrived on 27-07-2019 and as per the said settlement the incentive was increased from ₹ 52 to ₹ 84 on achieving the production of 13,710 pieces per day and therefore, the present industrial dispute raised by the petitioner union is devoid of merits and liable to be dismissed.

8. This Court from the contentions of both parties finds that in this case the dispute is with regard to fixation of production of 13,710 pieces per day as benchmark to get the incentive of ₹ 52 per day and further by way of this dispute the petitioner union is seeking to do time study with the office bearers of the petitioner union and fix the production target slabs from 60% to 100%. The contention of the respondent is that as per settlement under section 18(1) of Industrial Dispute Act arrived on 27-07-2019, the incentive amount for the production of 13,710 pieces per day was increased from ₹ 52 to ₹ 84 and therefore, there is no necessity to do time study as contended by the petitioner union.

9. The learned Counsel for petitioner today contented that the incentive amount for production of bench mark of 13,710 pieces has been increased by respondent management as per settlement under section 18(1) of Industrial Dispute Act arrived on 27-07-2019 and further the petitioner union has raised an industrial dispute over charter of demands including the incentive and the same is pending before this Honourable Court in ID(T).No. 13/2014 and in the said case the fairness and justness of settlement under section 18(1) of Industrial Dispute Act, dated 27-07-2019 has been challenged and is yet to be decided and therefore, in such case the present case pertaining to the incentive is not required since the case in ID(T).No. 13/2014 with comprehensive relief is pending for determination.

10. This Court on considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for petitioner and on considering that the relief claimed in ID(T).No. 13/2014 which is pending before this Court, finds that the present petition does not deserve any consideration and thereby this petition deserves to be dismissed. Thus, the points are answered accordingly.

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

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 22nd day of September, 2025.

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

*List of petitioner's witness:*

PW.1 — 28-10-2022 Thiru Mohan

*List of petitioner's side exhibits :*

Ex.P1 — 02-05-2020 Photo copy of the Failure Report.

Ex.P2 — 04-06-2020 Photo copy of the Notification.

*List of Respondent's witness:*

RW.1 — 23-11-2023 Thiru M. Chellai Karthikeyan

*List of Respondent's side Exhibits:*

Ex.R1 — 27-08-2019 Photocopy of the Industrial Dispute raised by the Union.

Ex.R2 — 20-09-2010 Photocopy of the Settlement.

Ex.R3 — 27-07-2019 Photocopy of the Settlement.

Ex.R4 — 29-08-2019 Photocopy of the Rejoinder given by the Petitioner Union. Photocopy of the Notice sent by the Labour Officer (Conciliation).

Ex.R5 — 09-12-2019 Photocopy of the Reply Series letter given by the Respondent to the Labour Officer (Conciliation).

Ex.R6 — 15-10-2019 Photocopy of the Reply letter given by the Respondent.

Ex.R7 — 08-11-2019 Photocopy of the Rejoinder given by the Petitioner Union.

Ex.R8 — 12-09-2019 Photocopy of the Reply letter given by the Respondent to the Labour Officer (Conciliation).

Ex.R9 — — Photocopy of the 25-06-2023 to 24-07-2023 period Operator's Output details.

Ex.R10 — — Photocopy of the 25-07-2023 to 24-08-2023 period Operator's Output details.

Ex.R11 — — Photocopy of the 25-08-2023 to 24-09-2023 period Operator's Output details.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

**LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 15/AIL/Lab./S/2026,  
Puducherry, dated 20th February 2026)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No. 13/2019, dated 08-10-2025 of the Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of a industrial dispute between M/s. Chambre De Commerce, Puducherry and Thiru C. Govindasamy, 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 08th day of October 2025.*

**I.D. (L). No. 13/2019  
CNR. No. PYPY06-000019-2019**

Thiru C. Govindasamy,  
No. 50, I Floor, 1st Cross Street Extension,  
Krishnan Nagar,  
Puducherry-605 003. . . Petitioner

*Versus*

The Managing Director,  
M/s. Chambre De Commerce,  
No. 1, Rue Suffren,  
Puducherry-605 001. . . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute coming before me for hearing in the presence of Thiruvallargal B. Mohandoss, K. Velmurugan. J. Kalirathinam, S. Vijayasanthi, Kanjanamala, R. Anbumathy, A. Asha and Indrajith, Counsels for the Petitioner and Thiruvallargal L. Sathish, S. Ulaganthan, T. Pravin, S. Velmurugan, V. Veeraranagan and E. Karthik, Counsels for the Respondent having agreed to settle the matter before mediation and thereby the case being settled under Joint compromise memo filed by the parties, an Award is passed accordingly:

#### AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 24/AIL/Lab./T/2019, dated 11-02-2019 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,-

(a) Whether the industrial dispute raised by the petitioner Thiru C. Govindasamy, Puducherry against the management of M/s. Chambre De Commerce, No.1, Rue Suffren, Puducherry, over non-employment is justified or not? If justified, what relief the petitioner is entitled to?

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

2. *The brief averments set forth in the Claim Statement filed by the petitioner is as follows:*

That the petitioner joined the service of the respondent organisation as clerk on 05-06-1998. During his service in the respondent organisation he discharged his duties in a very sincere and honest manner and without any black mark. But, the respondent management sent show cause notice, dated 07-03-2016 alleging charges of misconduct against the petitioner and he was called upon to submit his explanation within 48 hours of receipt of the same. By the show cause notice the petitioner was suspended with immediate effect, pending further course of action. The petitioner sent reply, dated 17-03-2016 denying the charges of misconduct. He also raised objection questions on the basis and the rules under which disciplinary proceeding were initiated against him. Moreover, he sought clarification as to how he was suspended by the respondent at the time of issuing show-cause notice itself and when enquiry was not at all commenced or

pending on the charges. However, the respondent did not give the necessary clarification and did not comply with his request and proceeded further. That the respondent issued charge memorandum, dated 27-04-2016 framing 5 charges of misconduct against the petitioner. As per the 1st charge the petitioner was accused of going to the open terrace without getting permission of the officers of the Chamber of Commerce and threatened to commit suicide on 07-03-2016 against Law, demanding enhancement of wages. The 2nd charge was to the effect that the petitioner caused damage to the status and reputation of the Chamber of Commerce by making false statement to the common public, press persons and police officials, that he was not granted sufficient pay hike, while threatening to commit suicide. Showing a few secret files belonging to the Chamber of Commerce to press persons and Police Officers without the permission of the employer and making false statements about the same to the above persons is the 3rd charge. Moreover, he was alleged to have expressed the opinion that the Chamber of Commerce was wrongly registered as commercial Society, while being an employee of the respondent organization. The 4th charge found fault with the petitioner for calling the press people to the building belonging to the Chamber of Commerce without the permission of the executive officers of the respondent Society. The allegation that the petitioner uttered abusive and defamatory words against the executives of the Chamber of Commerce while he was talking to the press persons found place in charge No.5. The charge memorandum also stated that if the false charges are proved against the petitioner, it will bring the respondent Society and its executives in disrepute in the minds of the public.

(ii) The petitioner submitted detailed explanation, dated 30-04-2016 denying the charges framed against him by the respondent management. But, without considering the objections and requests made by the petitioner, the respondent proceeded with the enquiry proceedings in a mechanical manner. On 04-07-2016 the petitioner presented a petition to the Learned Enquiry Officer seeking permission to engage an advocate to act as his defence assistant in the enquiry proceedings. However through orders, dated 04-07-2016 the Enquiry Officer rejected the request made by the petitioner. That the respondent

examined its Presenting Officer Mr. Devakumar as its 1st witness and through him marked exhibits 1 to 9 which is against law and principles of natural justice. The respondent management as well as the Enquiry Officer refused to rectify the above defects in spite of repeated representations made by the petitioner through letter, dated 21-07-2016 as well as the advocate notice, dated 26-07-2016. That the learned Enquiry Officer submitted his report, dated 31-05-2017, holding the petitioner guilty of charges 1, 2 and 4 and not guilty of charge No. 5 and guilty of charge No.3 only in part. The respondent sent 2nd show cause notice, dated 12-06-2017 enclosing copy of enquiry report and seeking explanation of the petitioner as to why the disciplinary proceedings should not be proceed against him further. The petitioner submitted his explanation, dated 20-06-2017 pointing out the defective disciplinary proceedings and non-maintainability of the same in law. He also requested the respondent to wind up the enquiry proceedings and to reinstate him in his original employment with back wages and all other benefits. However the respondent dismissed the petitioner from service with effect from 29-06-2017. Aggrieved by the order of termination of his services by the respondent, the petitioner raised an industrial dispute before the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry through representation, dated 23-06-2018 seeking intervention through conciliation proceedings. The respondent submitted letter, dated 16-07-2018 raising preliminary objections. The petitioner submitted re-jointer, dated 23-11-2018 to the Conciliation Officer,

pointing out his objections for the preliminary objection raised by the respondent. This made the respondent to submit letter, dated 29-08-2018 to the Learned Conciliation Officer, reiterating that the case pertaining to the petitioner disclose absolutely no industrial dispute capable of being conciliated. The conciliation proceedings ended in failure through report of the Conciliation Officer, dated 31-12-2018. Hence the petition.

3. Notice served to respondent. Counter not filed.

4. *Point for determination:*

Whether the Petitioner is entitled for the relief as prayed in the petition?

5. *On Point:*

Case settled before mediation. Joint compromise memo filed by both parties before mediation. Joint compromise memo and settlement agreement is recorded.

In the result this case is disposed in terms of Joint compromise memo filed by both parties before mediation. The Joint compromise memo and settlement agreement shall form part and parcel of the Award.

Written and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 08th day of October, 2025.

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

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY  
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

*No. 14/JUD/JM-II/KKL/2026.*

*Karaikal, dated 29th January 2026.*

NOTIFICATION

It is hereby notified that the case records mentioned in the Annexure will be destroyed after one month from the date of publication of this notification. Hence, parties to those cases, who are willing to get any of the documents or certified copies thereof, may approach the Court within one month from the date of this publication.

**A. ABDHUL KANI,**  
Judicial Magistrate – II, Karaikal (FAC).