

Panaji, 8th May, 2014 (Vaisakha 18, 1936)

SERIES II No. 6

# OFFICIAL GAZETTE



# GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

*Note:- There is one Extraordinary issue to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 5 dated 02-05-2014 namely, Extraordinary dated 06-05-2014 from pages 99 to 100 regarding Orders & Notifications from Department of Elections (Goa State Election Commission).*

## GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Agriculture  
Directorate of Agriculture

### Order

No. 8/15/2014-15/D.Agri/21

Read: 1) Order No. 8/9/2012-13/D.Agri/82 dated 28-03-2013.

Government is pleased to grant extension of ad hoc promotion to the following Agriculture Officers, Group 'B' Gazetted Officers of this Directorate for a further period of six months as mentioned against their names on the same terms and conditions as indicated in the above stated Order.

Sr. No.	Name & Designation of the Officers	Period of Extension
1.	Smt. Janice Flossy Gomes	w.e.f. 28-03-2014 to 27-09-2014.
2.	Shri Pramod Joshi	w.e.f. 28-03-2014 to 27-09-2014.
3.	Smt. Vismita Marathe	w.e.f. 28-03-2014 to 27-09-2014.
4.	Shri Prasad Parab	w.e.f. 28-03-2014 to 27-09-2014.
5.	Shri Shivadas Gaonkar	w.e.f. 28-03-2014 to 27-09-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*P. Tufani*, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Agriculture).

Tonca-Caranzalem, 2nd May, 2014.

Department of Civil Supplies and  
Consumer Affairs

### Corrigendum

Ref. No. DCS/ENF/Taluka Matter/14-15/43

Read: Order No. DCS/ENF/Taluka-Matter/2013-14/25 dated 23-4-2013 published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 5 dated 2-5-2013.

In the order read above after the Serial No. 11 the following Sr. No. and words may be added.

12. Dharbandora Jt. Mamlatdar-I  
and the para thereafter shall be omitted.

*Deepali D. Naik*, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs).

Panaji, 30th April, 2014.

## Goa Human Rights Commission

Before the Goa Human Rights Commission

Panaji-Goa

Proceeding No. 95/2013

*Sub:-* Action Taken Report on the recommendation in Proceeding No. 95/2013.

### May it please your Honour

In view of the directions given by the Hon'ble Commission in the above mentioned matter, I am directed to submit the following before the Hon'ble Commission.

The Government vide Notification dated 15-06-2009 has constituted a State Sentence Review Board.

As per guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ramraj v/s State of Chattisgarh* 2010 AIR SCW 23 Penal Code (45 of 1850) Ss. 45,

47-Criminal P.c. (2 of 1974, Ss, 432, 433, 433-A)- Life imprisonment-Implies minimum terms of imprisonment for 14 years -It is not to be interpreted as being imprisonment for whole convicts natural life-Even with remissions earned, sentence of life imprisonment cannot however be reduced to below 14 years.

As per Rule 398 (1) of the Goa Prisons Rules, 2006 the State Sentence Review Board shall meet at least once in six months at the respective prisons on a date to be notified to its members, at least 10 days in advance by its Member Secretary, who shall fix the date in consultation with the Chairman for the premature release of the prisoners.

Under Rule 403 of Goa Prisons Rules, 2006 the State Sentence Review Board has to consider the following facts for reviewing the sentences:

1. Social history of the prisoner.
2. Circumstances of his criminal behaviour.
3. Conduct in the prison.
4. Response to training and treatment.
5. Marked changes in habits.
6. Attitude and character.
7. Degree of criminality.
8. Health & Mental condition.
9. Possibility of his resettlement after release.

Cases of the prisoners are to be considered for premature release who have undergone more than 14 years of actual imprisonment and are hit by Rules 398 (3) of the Goa Prisons Rules, 2006 read with Section 432 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

All cases for review are hit by Section 433-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in view of their being convicted under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

If any case is found favourable, it is placed before the board after due notice. Therefore, the cases of each prisoner are made available to the Chairman and all the members before holding the meeting alongwith the intimation of the meeting.

In terms of Rule 404 (1), Inspector General of Prisons has to forward the recommendations of State Sentence Review Board together with the documents relating to the prisoner recommended for premature release to the Government within 15 days from the date of recommendation of State Sentence Review Board through the I.G. Prisons.

In terms of Rule 404(2) provides that the Government may either accept or reject the recommendations of the State Sentence Review Board on the ground to be stated. In the case where the recommendation has been rejected, the

Government may ask the State Sentence Review Board to reconsider the case. The decision of the Government shall be communicated to the concerned prisoner and in case the Government order to grant remission and his premature release the prisoner shall be released forthwith, with or without conditions.

In the State Sentence Review Board Meeting held on 19-8-2013 about the said prisoners it was decided as below:

As regards prisoner Fati Gaonkar: This murder convict prisoner is 42 years old and has served 28 years, 08 months and 20 days including remission of 04 years and 03 months and 15 days and has been decided that since he was suffering from schizophrenia, was prudent to first observe his behaviour on parole and then consider his case. His brother Digamber Gaonkar and sister Laxmi Kavlekar has expressed their willingness to keep him during parole period.

The I. G. Prisons reported that subsequently his case for release on trial basis had been processed as furlough. When referred to the Government for approval, it was rejected on the ground that Rule 313 (9) does not permit mentally ill prisoners to be released on furlough.

The latest medical reports of Fati Gaonkar stated that he was suffering from somatisation disorder with below average intelligence with psychosis. The Police did not recommend his case. The opinion of the I. G. Prisons was that the prisoner should be released on parole on trial basis under Rule 324 on the ground of "any other sufficient cause". The prisoner would stay at Pilgaon, Bicholim at his sister's place during the parole period.

The Board after deliberation was of the view that parole sanctioning authority is the I.G. Prisons and therefore appropriate decision should be taken by the I.G. Prison. It was decided that after observing the behaviour of prisoner on parole as a test case, his case should be referred back to the Board for consideration. His case was therefore deferred.

As regards to Caitan Paul Antao: This murder convict is 60 years old and has served 28 years, 11 months and 3 days including remission of 5 years, 5 months and 12 days. In the previous Board meeting held on 26-10-2012 his case was deferred with a view of having his full rehabilitation programme, as well as written undertaking from NGO on record.

The latest medical report of Caitan Paul Antao stated that the prisoner was not showing any

psychotic disorder. The District Magistrate, Probation Officer and Police had not recommended his case. The opinion of the I.G. Prison is that since the prisoner is of 60 years of age and is having only a sister whose family does not want him, the possibility of accommodating him in one of the Old Age Homes of Provedoria may first be explored prior to considering his case for pre-mature release.

The Board after deliberation directed I.G. Prison to probe the issue regarding his rehabilitation. A report of the inquiry is to be placed before the Board in its next meeting. Till then the case of Caitan Paul Antao is deferred.

As regards to prisoner Domingo Costa: The said prisoner has already been premature released vide Government order No. 9/17/94-HD(G)/PF dated 22-07-2013.

As regards to the above two prisoners, the Advisory Board will be having their meeting in a due course of time for recommendation the review of sentence.

*Neetal P. Amonkar*, Under Secretary (Home).

-----  
**Proceeding No. 95/2013**  
**Daily Proceeding Sheet**

04-10-2013 Sr. No. 4  
Respondent No. 3 is present.

Adv. V. Sardessai is present for the Respondents.

From the reply filed by the Respondents No. 3, it is apparent that three prisoners have already completed 20 years of imprisonment and the Respondent No. 3 has forwarded a proposal to the State Advisory Board recommending for premature release of those prisoners.

In the facts and circumstances of this case, we feel it appropriate to recommend to the State Government to consider the question of releasing of these prisoners as early as possible preferably by the end of December, 2013 and submit action taken report.

Adjourned for report by the State Government.

Sd/- (Justice P. K. Misra) Chairperson Goa Human Rights Commission	Sd/- (A. D. Salkar) Member Goa Human Rights Commission	Sd/- (J. A. Keny) Member Goa Human Rights Commission
---	---	---

**Department of Information and Publicity**

-----  
**Order**

No. DI/INF/ESG/IFFI/10/128

Read: 1) Order No. DI/INF/ESG/IFFI/10/769 dated 25-5-2012.  
2) Order No. DI/INF/ESG/IFFI/10/770 dated 25-5-2012.

In partial modification of the above read orders and in pursuance of Rule 5 of the Rules of Entertainment Society of Goa, Government of Goa is pleased to nominate Shir Damodar alias Damu Gajanand Naik, Gogal, Margao as Member of the General Body of the Society with immediate effect.

Further, Shri Damodar alias Damu Gajanand Naik is appointed as the Vice-Chairman of the General Body and also as the Chairman of the Governing Body of Entertainment Society of Goa with immediate effect.

This issues with the approval of the Chairman ESG/Hon'ble Chief Minister vide U.O. Ref. 1611/F dated 24-4-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*S. V. Naik*, Director & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Information & Publicity).

Panaji, 24th April, 2014.

-----  
**Order**

No. DI/INF/ESG/IFFI/10/129

In pursuance of Rule 5 of the Rules of Entertainment Society of Goa, Old GMC Complex, Panaji-Goa, Government of Goa is pleased to reconstitute a General Body of the Society as follows, with immediate effect:

Chief Minister of the State (Ex Officio Chairman)	Shri Manohar Parrikar, Chief Minister.
Vice-Chairman	Shri Damodar alias Damu Gajanand Naik, Chairman, Ravindra Bhavan, Margao.
Member Secretary	Chief Executive Officer, ESG.
12 representatives from Government Departments including two from Departments of Government of India	1. Chief Secretary. 2. Finance Secretary. 3. Secretary (Information & Publicity). 4. Director, Art & Culture.

- 03 persons from other similar Societies or autonomous bodies
5. Director, Information & Publicity.
  6. Councillor, CCP.
  7. Chairman, KTCL.
  8. Chairman, GTDC.
  9. MLA, Thivim.
  10. MLA, Calangute.
  11. GOI nominee.
  12. GOI nominee.

- 03 persons having proven track record in the field of films
1. Shri Sushant Khedekar, Vice-Chairman, Kala Academy.
  2. Shri Augie D'Mello, Film Fraternity of Goa.
  3. Shri Soiru V. Varde, Artist.

- 03 eminent persons in the field of entertainment
1. Shri Ramdas Futane, Eminent film maker and Member, Film Censor Board.
  2. Ms. Sharon Mazzarelo, Film Producer and Actress.
  3. Shri Sharmad Raiturcar, Film Cameraman.

- 05 persons who in the view of the Government is worthy of helping Society to realize its objectives
1. Shri Francisco Martins, Ace Showman and event manager.
  2. Shri Shiva Baba Naik, Leading Film Organizer.
  3. Shri Nanda Honawarkar, Vasco-Goa.
  1. Ms. Ranjana Salgaonkar.
  2. Shri Sunil Ajgaokar.
  3. Shri Teotonio D'Costa.
  4. Shri Dharmanand Vernekar.
  5. Shri Sandip Kundaikar.

In addition to the above composition, the following shall be appointed as Special Invitees on the General Body:

1. All Ministers in the Government of Goa.
2. Shri Glen Ticlo Sousa, MLA, Aldona.
3. Shri Lavoo Mamlatdar, MLA, Ponda.
4. Shri Benjamin Silva, MLA, Velim.
5. Shri Caitan D'Silva, MLA, Benaulim.
6. Shri Subash Phaldessai, MLA, Sanguem.

The tenure of the General Body shall be for a period of three years. The Chairman, Member Secretary and Members will be eligible for re-appointment. However, the Government shall have the authority to terminate the membership

of any member including the Member Secretary at any time.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

S. V. Naik, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Information and Publicity).

Panaji, 24th April, 2014.

-----

**Order**

No. DI/INF/ESG/IFFI/10/130

In pursuance of Rule 6 of the Rules of Entertainment Society of Goa, Old GMC Complex, Panaji-Goa, Government of Goa is pleased to reconstitute a Governing Body of the Society as follows, with immediate effect:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Chairman of the Governing Body (Ex Officio Chairman)           | Shri Damodar alias Damu Gajanand Naik, Chairman of Ravindra Bhavan, Margao. |
| Member Secretary of General Body (Ex Officio Member Secretary) | Chief Executive Officer, Member Secretary, General Body.                    |

- 05 official members from amongst official members of the General Body
1. Chief Secretary.
  2. Finance Secretary.
  3. Secretary (Information & Publicity).
  4. Director, Art & Culture.
  5. Director, Information & Publicity.

- 04 non-official members from amongst the non-official members of the General Body
1. Shri Ramdas Futane.
  2. Shri Sharmad Raiturcar.
  3. Shri Shiva Baba Naik.
  4. Ms. Ranjana Salgaonkar.

- 05 Special invitees
1. Shri Soiru V. Varde.
  2. Shri Francisco Martins.
  3. Ms. Sharon Mazarello.
  4. Shri Sandip Kundaikar.
  5. General Manager, ESG.
  6. Ms. Vaidehi Naik, Councillor (CCP) shall be a Special Invitee as per order dated 22-10-2008.

The tenure of the Governing Body shall be for a period of three years. The Chairman, Member Secretary and Members will be eligible for re-appointment. However, the Government shall have the authority to terminate the membership

of any member including the Member Secretary at any time.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

S. V. Naik, Director & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Information and Publicity).

Panaji, 24th April, 2014.

◆◆◆  
Department of Home

Home—General Division

—  
Order

No. 24/11/2011-HD(G)/1620

Read: Order No. 24/11/2012-HD(G)/2835 dated 16-08-2013.

Government is pleased to extend the ad hoc promotion of the following Public Prosecutors, Group 'A' Gazetted for a period of six months w.e.f. 01-03-2014 to 31-08-2014 or till the posts are filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

Sr. No.	Name of the Public Prosecutor
1.	Smt. Asha Arsekar.
2.	Smt. Sunita Nagvenkar.

This issues with the concurrence of Goa Public Service Commission, vide their letter No. COM/II/11/58(1)/2011/133 dated 25-04-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Neetal P. Amonkar, Under Secretary (Home).

Porvorim, 29th April, 2014.

◆◆◆  
Department of Labour

--  
Notification

No. 28/1/2014-Lab/153

The following award passed by the Labour Court-II at Panaji-Goa on 04-12-2013 in reference No. LC-II/IT/09/12 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).  
Porvorim, 24th February, 2014.

IN THE LABOUR COURT-II  
GOVERNMENT OF GOA  
AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble  
Presiding Officer)

Case No. Ref. LC-II/IT/09/12

Smt. Vaishali Harikant,  
Government Staff Quarters-D2-B,  
Near Microwave Tower,  
Altinho, Panaji-Goa. ... Workman/Party-I  
V/s

M/s Kendriya Bhandar,  
New Shopping Centre,  
Central Government Staff Quarters,  
Sector VII, Antop Hill,  
Mumbai. ... Employer/ Party-II

Workman/Party-I represented by Shri P. Gaonkar.

Employer/Party-II represented by Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar.

Panaji, Dated: 4-12-2013

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) the Government of Goa, by Order dated 31-10-2012, bearing No. 28/38/2012-LAB/603 referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa. The Hon'ble Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court I in turn assigned the present reference for its adjudication to this Labour Court II vide her order dated 08-11-2012.

*"(1) Whether the action of the Management of M/s Kendriya Bhandar, Panaji, in terminating the services of their workperson Smt. Vaishali Harikant, with effect from 11-09-2011, is legal and justified?"*

*(2) If not, what relief, the workman is entitled to?"*

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC- II/IT/09/12 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Parties put in their appearance. The Workman/Party I (for short 'Workman'), filed her Statement of Claim on 22-01-2013 at Exhibit 4. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workman are that the Employer/Party-II (for short "Employer") is a Multi State Co-operative Society under the aegis of Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and



Pension, Government of India having their Head Office at Pushpa Bhavan, Madengin Road, New Delhi. She stated that the Employer Society used to cater to the household needs of Central and State Government staff by providing them daily household items like grocery etc.

3. She stated that she was employed as a casual worker as a Government Billing Clerk from 1-11-2002 till 11-9-2011 in the said bhandar on daily wages of Rs. 81/-. She stated that in the year 2006, all the daily wage employees were made to accept VRS scheme and she was orally given the charge as in-charge of Goa region. She stated that though she was promoted as in-charge of Goa region, she was doing all the clerical duties such as billing, selling of items at the stores and also officiating as in-charge on the advice of the Regional Manager. She submitted that she was primarily performing the duties of clerical in nature such as packing the materials required for self store, billing the counter sales, manual billing of Government bills, depositing of cash and cheques in the banks, visiting Government departments for supplying orders as per the instructions of Divisional Manager, visiting the departments for big orders, collection of cash, signing cheques along with Regional Manager after 2006 onwards and dealing for supply with local suppliers. She stated that as per the office order dated 07-01-2010, she was instructed to handover the temporary charge of in-charge of Goa branch to Shri Jayant Deshmukh, Jr. Salesman and in-charge of Goa branch. She stated that she was reporting to Shri Jayant Deshmukh and was assisting him to carry out the affairs of Goa branch. She stated that she was promised that her services could be regularized soon. She stated that on 05-09-2010, a super market was open by the Employer at residential area at Altinho. She stated that the Regional Manager of the Employer, Shri Manoj Gupta demanded Rs. 6,00,000/- for regularizing her services. She stated that instead of confirming her services, the Regional Manager Mr. Manoj Gupta started harassing her in different ways and used to threaten that her services would be terminated on any pretext. She stated that after putting in for about nine years sincere service, the Employer instead of confirming her in services, issued a termination letter dated 12-09-2011 to her. She stated that on 05-01-2011 she had sent a detailed letter informing the top management about the maltreatment meted out to her at the work place. She submitted that as the Employer did not respond to her representation dated 05-01-2011, she raised an industrial dispute before the Labour Commissioner, Panaji-Goa on

16-09-2011 which ended in failure due to non co-operative and adamant stand of the Employer.

4. She submitted that she has completed more than 240 days of service in these nine years consistently and no procedure was followed under Section 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947, while terminating her services. She submitted that no enquiry was conducted before termination of her services. She submitted that her services have been arbitrarily dispensed with without following the basic rules of natural justice. She stated that she is unemployed and did not succeed in getting any employment since the termination of her services. She therefore prayed that her services be legalized and she may be restored with back wages from the date of termination of her services.

5. The Employer controverted the aforesaid claim of the workman by filing their written statement on 05-03-2013. The Employer by way of preliminary objections submitted that the present reference of the Party I is bad-in-law and not maintainable. The Employer submitted that it is a multi-state co-operative society under the aegis of Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension, Government of India and as such it is an undertaking of the Central Government, this court has therefore no jurisdiction to entertain the present reference. The Employer submitted that the Party I was employed with them on contract basis and as such she is not a 'workman' as defined u/s 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Employer submitted that the Party I has not given any justification for the demands/claims raised by her. The Employer further submitted that the present dispute of the Party I is not an 'industrial dispute' as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

6. The Employer stated that it had initially engaged the Party I as a casual employee as and when required in the past. The Employer stated that on 28-12-2006, the Party I was conveyed to be appointed as in-charge of Goa branch of its bhandar on a consolidated fixed monthly payment of Rs.5,000/- on a purely contractual agreement and was not an employment contract in any manner. The Employer stated that the Party I was officiating as in-charge and was reporting to the Regional Manager. The Employer denied that the Party I was employed as its casual worker as a Government billing clerk from 01-11-2002 till 11-09-2011 on daily wages of Rs. 81/-. The Employer denied that the Party I was primarily performing the duties of clerical in nature. The Employer stated that the Party I was doing all the duties which include signing of cheques

along with Regional Manager and also taking all policy decision on behalf of them to operate the said bhandar. The Employer stated that it had no intention of whatsoever nature of offering any employment and establishing an employer-employee relationship with the Party I during her entire tenure in terms of the contract dated 28-12-2006 with them. The Employer stated that the terms of contract were clearly understood by the Party I while accepting the same and the same remained unchanged till her termination contract on 05-09-2011. The Employer admitted that as per their office order dated 07-01-2010, the Party I was requested to handover the temporary charge of in-charge of Goa branch to Shri. Jayant Deshmukh, Jr. Salesman.

7. The Employer stated that during the term of contract of the Party I, some verbal complaints were received at its Mumbai office from their suppliers and the customers and other parties commercially related to them. The Employer stated that consequently the Party I was given to understand about her performance as a contractor and consistent negative feedbacks or complaints received about her from various agencies and parties about her operational methodology and this compel them to consider the termination of her contract. The Employer stated that it had incurred huge losses for couple of years as the Party I has grossly failed in performing the duties entrusted to her as a contractor and this has finally compelled its competent authorities to terminate her contract with effect from 05-09-2011. The Employer stated that as per the terms of contract, the Party I was offered one month salary in lieu of notice period which she had refused to accept. The Employer stated that the Party I was directed to discontinue the temporary appointments of driver-cum-clerk respectively immediately vide Memorandum dated 20-07-2009, however she did the same with effect from 01-09-2009. The said act on her part amounts to insubordination which has caused loss to them. The Employer stated that the Party I was instructed to handover all the office equipments, documents, stationary and records etc., and also the key of the office. The Employer stated that the Party I was possessing the keys and was operating the store without permission and doing business in their name. The Employer stated that as the Party I was in possession of keys of their store premises, they decided to break open the lock of the premises by conducting proper panchnama. The Employer stated that because of the aforesaid act, the Party I lodged a false complaint before the Panaji Police

Station by making false allegations against their Regional Manager. The Employer stated that they have never appointed the Party I as its employee as per the order of appointment dated 28-12-2012. The Employer denied the overall case of the Party I as pleaded in her claim statement. The Employer submitted that the Party I is not entitled to any relief and prayed for dismissal of the present reference.

8. Thereafter, the Party I filed her Re-joinder on 15-04-2013 at Exb.8. The Workman, by way of her Re-joinder confirms and reiterates all her submissions, averments and statements made in her Claim Statement to be correct and true and denies all the statements, averments and submissions made by the Employer in its Written Statement which are contrary to her Statement and averments made in her Claim Statement.

9. On the basis of the pleadings filed by the respective parties, this Court framed the following issues on 30-4-2013 at Exb. 9.

1. Whether the Workman/Party I proves that she is a "workman" as defined u/s. 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
2. Whether the Workman/Party I proves that the action of the Employer in terminating her services w. e. f. 11-09-2011 is illegal & unjustified?
3. Whether the Employer/Party II proves that the present dispute raised by the Party I is not an "industrial dispute" as defined u/s 2 (k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
4. Whether the Employer/Party II proves that the present reference issued by the Government is bad-in-law and not maintainable in view of the reasons stated in para a, b and d of the written statement by way of preliminary objections?
5. Whether the Employer/Party II proves that it has appointed the Party I purely on contractual agreement?
6. Whether the Employer/Party II proves that the termination of contract of the Party I by them with effect from 5-9-2011 on account of her alleged misconduct?
7. Whether the Party I is entitled for any relief?
8. What order? What Award?

10. Thereafter, both the parties produced their documents along with list of documents respectively. The Party I also filed her affidavit-in-evidence on 17-9-2013 and the case was adjourned

for further examination-in-chief of the Party I to 03-10-2013. On 03-10-2013, Ld. Rep. Shri P. Gaonkar appearing for the Party I as well as Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar appearing for the Employer remained present before me and orally submitted that the matter is likely to be settled amicably between the parties and seek time to settle the matter amicably. Accordingly, Party I along with her representative Shri P. Gaonkar as well as Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar appearing for the Employer remained present on 06-11-2013 and filed an application for award in terms of settlement at Exb.14. In the said application for award, the parties have come to an amicable settlement on two terms namely one the Party I, in view of the offer of appointment dated 30-10-2013 does not wish to pursue the present reference and another the Party I states that her entire claim in the present reference in view of the above appointment letter is conclusively settled.

I have carefully perused the said terms of settlements at Exb. 14 and I am of the opinion that the said terms of settlement are beneficial to both the parties. It also helps in keeping peaceful harmonious industrial relations between the parties and hence I pass the following order:

## ORDER

1. That in view of the amicable settlement between the Parties hereto, the dispute as to "Whether the action of the Management of M/s Kendriya Bhandar, Panaji, in terminating the services of their workperson Smt. Vaishali Harikant, with effect from 11-09-2011, is legal and justified?" does not survive.

2. The Party I is not entitled to any relief.
3. No order as to costs.
4. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-  
(Suresh N. Narulkar)  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II.

-----  
Notification

No. 28/1/2013-Lab/666

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 29-08-2013 in reference No. IT/24/07 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of  
Goa.

*Meena Priolkar*, Under Secretary (Labour).  
Porvorim, 27th September, 2013.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND  
LABOUR COURT  
GOVERNMENT OF GOA  
AT PANAJI

(Before Ms. Bimba K. Thaly, Presiding  
Officer)

REF. No. IT/24/07

Smt. Swati Kerkar  
President of Dupont Sportswear  
Employees 'Union', ...  
C/o Dupont Sportswear Pvt. Ltd.,  
D-2, Bicholim Industrial Estate,  
Bicholim Goa. ... Workman/Party I

V/s

The Manager,  
M/s. Dupont Sportswear Pvt. Ltd.,  
D-2, Bicholim Industrial Estate,  
Bicholim, Goa. ... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I represented by Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat.

Employer/Party II represented by Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar.

## AWARD

(Passed on this 29th day of August, 2013)

By order dated 14-05-07, bearing No. 28/7/2007-LAB/485, the Government of Goa in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 1 of Section 10 of The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short The Act) has referred the following dispute for adjudication.

"(1). Whether the action of the management of M/s. Dupont Sportswear Private Limited, Bicholim Industrial Estate, in closing down their factory with effect from 19-09-2002, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the Workmen are entitled?"

2. Upon receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. IT/24/07 and registered AD notices were issued to both the parties and upon service, Party I filed the claim statement at Exb. 6 and Party II filed the written statement at Exb. 11. Party I then filed the rejoinder at Exb. 12.

3. In the claim statement it is in short the case of Party I that it is an Union of Workpersons of the Party II registered under the Trade Unions Act, 1926 and has been espousing the cause of the Workpersons of the Party II. It is stated that Party II was employing more than 100 permanent Workpersons at its factory since the inception of the factory. It is stated that on and from 19-9-2002 Party II closed the factory without any reasons and



terminated the services of all the Workpersons w.e.f. 19-9-2002. It is stated that at the time of closure Party II was employing more than 125 permanent Workmen and prior to the closure i.e. 19-9-2002 for preceding 12 months of closure, Party II was employing more than 100 Workpersons at its factory and thus Party II establishment was covered under Chapter V-B of the said Act. It is stated that Party II has closed down its undertaking illegally, without permission of the appropriate Government, u/s 25-O of the Act without giving any reason for such closure. It is stated that Party I raised the dispute before the Addl. Labour Commissioner, Panaji by letter dated 7-11-02 but no settlement was arrived at Party I has therefore prayed to hold that the action of Party II in closing down the undertaking w.e.f. 19-9-02 is illegal, unjust, bad in law being in contravention of Section 25(O) of chapter V-B of the Act and that the Workmen are entitled for reinstatement in service with full back wages and continuity in service and all other benefits.

4. In the written statement Party II has denied the case set up by Party I and has stated that the President of the Union has no locus standi to file the claim statement on behalf of the other employees; that the order of reference does not refer to the substantive issue and therefore this Tribunal cannot decide whether the closure has been declared and if so whether it is legal or illegal. It is stated that the company was franchisee of V.F. Corporation owner of Wrangler Brand American based company and it licensed the manufacturing and marketing the Wrangler branded garments such a jeans, trousers, shirts etc. since 1987-88. It is stated that after September, 2000 owing to deep recession in the market condition the company has not been getting enough orders from the merchants, manufacturers and due to which it was in difficult financial situation. It is stated that the company has been making losses for last few years and hence was referred to the Board of Industrial Financing and Restructuring (BIFR) u/s 15-I of Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985 but the reference was rejected on the technical grounds however the order is challenged before the authority for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction and the appeal is pending for final disposal. It is stated that Sec. 22(1) provides for suspension of legal proceedings, contracts etc. with respect to Sick Industrial Company and Section 32 of the Act states that provisions of SICA overrides the provisions of other law except Foreign Action Regulation Act, 1973 and hence the present proceedings need to be kept in abeyance. It is stated that Party II

establishment was not covered under Chapter V-B of the Act. It is stated that Party II Company never closed its factory of their own but the closure was due to the circumstances prevailing at that particular time. Thus, Party II has prayed to reject the reference.

5. In the rejoinder Party I has denied the case pleaded by Party II and has asserted their case projected in the claim statement.

6. On the basis of the averments of the respective parties, issues were framed on 5-2-08 (Exb. 13).

7. In support of its case Party I examined Mrs. Swati Kerkar, the President of Dupont Sportswear Limited Employees Union as witness No. 1 and closed the case. On the other hand Party II examined Shri Purushottam Badetia, the authorized representative of Party II as witness No. 1 and Shri Ashok Kumar Jalan as witness No. 2 and closed the case.

8. Heard Ld. Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat for Party I and Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar for Party II.

9. I have gone through the records of the case and have duly considered the arguments advanced. I am reproducing the issues along with their findings and reasons thereof.

Sr. No.	Issues	Findings
1.	Whether the Party I proves that the Party II was employing more than 100 Workmen preceding 12 months of closure of the factory?	In the negative.
2.	Whether the Party I proves that the Party II was covered under Chapter V-B of the I.D. Act?	In the negative.
3.	Whether the Party I proves that the Party II had closed down the undertaking illegally without permission of the appropriate Government in contravention of Section 25-O of Chapter V-B of the Act?	In the negative.
4.	Whether the Party I proves that the Workmen of the Party II are entitled for reinstatement in service with full back wages, continuity in service and other benefits?	In the negative.
5.	Whether the Party II proves that the reference is not maintainable and bad in law?	In the negative.

## REASONS

10. *Issue Nos. 1 and 2:* Both these issues are answered together for the sake of convenience, being interconnected. This is because fate of issue No. 2 would depend upon the outcome of issue No. 1 and therefore answering both these issues together would avoid repetition of facts.

11. It is the categorical case of Party I in the claim statement that at the time of closure of the factory, Party II was employing more than 125 permanent Workmen at its factory and prior to the closure i.e. 19-9-02 for preceding 12 months of closure, Party II was employing more than 100 Workpersons at its factory. The above pleading in the claim statement has been reiterated by Mrs. Swati Kerkar, witness for Party I in her affidavit in evidence. This witness has produced the returns submitted by the employer to the Provident Fund Authority at Exb. 17. Perusal of these returns indicate that the same are for the period pertaining to April, 2000 to March, 2001 and April, 2001 to March, 2002. In her cross examination the suggestion put to her that at the time of closure Party II did not employ more than 125 permanent Workmen and that it had not employed more than 100 Workmen in preceding 12 months, has been denied by this witness.

12. Shri Purushottam Badetia witness No. 1 for Party II has stated in his affidavit in evidence that Party II did not employ more than 100 Workmen preceding 12 months of the alleged closure of the factory. In his cross examination Shri Badetia has stated that he does not remember the number of workers working at the Bicholim unit of Party II during the period from March, 2002 to September, 2002 but has stated that in the month of September, 2002, the number of workers working at the Bicholim unit of Party II was less than 100. To the suggestion that during the period from April, 2000 to March, 2001, there were 198 workers working with the Bicholim unit of Party II and during the period from April, 2001 to September, 2002 there were 157 workers working with the Bicholim unit of Party II, this witness has stated that he does not remember.

13. Shri Ashok Kumar Jalan witness No. 2 for Party II has corroborated the statements made by Shri Badetia in his chief examination on the subject of number of workers working in the Bicholim unit of Party II, however in his cross examination upon being asked to produce the copies of return of PF and ESI of Party II for the period from March, 2002 to September, 2002 this witness has stated that the same were lying in the factory which has been taken over by EDC. Upon being shown the

documents at Exb. 17, this witness has identified the signature of one Mr. M. W. Dharwadkar, the personal officer of Party II, on the same and thus has admitted there were 198 workers in the factory during the period 2000-2001 and 157 workers in the factory during the period from 1-4-01 to 1-3-2002. In his further cross examination this witness was asked about the registers maintained by Party II under the factories rules but he expressed inability to produce the same as Party II factory was taken over by EDC. He has denied the suggestion that all these registers were shifted from the factory premises by the company before the factory was taken over by EDC or that all these registers are in his possession till date, in Bombay. He has also denied the suggestion that he does not want to produce the registers because if produced they would show that there were 151 workers working in the factory in September, 2002. This witness has however made it clear that he does not have records to show that there were less than 100 workers in the factory in September, 2002.

14. In his arguments Ld adv. for Party I by referring to Exb. 17 submitted that there were 198 workers in the factory during the period from 2000-2001 and 157 workers during the period from 2001 to 2002. He stated that the above document was obtained from Provident Fund Office and in case Party II had to establish otherwise they should have produced the relevant document to prove the same. By referring to the statements brought on record in the cross examination of Shri Badetia Ld adv. for Party I submitted that the average number of workers working in the factory of Party II was more than 100 workers during the period of twelve months preceding the closure of the factory w.e.f. 19-9-2002. Ld. Adv. for Party I relied on the judgment in the case of ***Oswal Agro Furene Ltd., & Anr. vs Oswal Agro Furane Workers Union & ors. 2005 I CLR 816*** in which it is observed that for the establishment which attracts provisions of Chapter VB of the Act obtaining prior permission from Government as required under Section 250 of the Act is imperative.

15. On the other hand Ld Adv. for Party II stated that the closure of the factory w.e.f. 19-9-02 was due to the circumstances prevailing at the relevant time. He stated that the documents at Exb. 17 colly do not give any specific indication that there were more than 100 workers working in the factory during the period of 12 months preceding 19-9-02. He then by referring to the statement made by Shri Ashok Kumar Jalan which is that the copies of return of PF and ESI for the period from March, 2002 to September, 2002 were lying in the factory

which has been taken over by EDC, stated that Party II was not in a position to produce the same due to aforesaid reason. He also stated that evidence on record suggest that Party I has not disputed the fact of taking over of the factory of Party II by EDC. Thus, according to him the burden was on Party I to prove that Party II establishment was covered under Chapter V-B of the I.D. Act, by producing the required documents.

16. It may be mentioned here that Chapter V-B of the Act pertains to "Special Provisions relating to lay-off, retrenchment and closure in certain establishments". It encompasses within its ambit provisions from Section 25-K to Section 25-S. It deserves to be noted that Section 25-K speaks about applicability of Chapter V-B to the industrial establishments (not being an establishment of seasonal character or in which work is performed only intermittently) in which not less than one hundred Workmen were employed on an average per working day for the preceding twelve months. Section 25-O speaks about the procedure for closing down an undertaking. It states about the duties of the employer and the procedure to be followed by him when he intends to close down an undertaking of an industrial establishment to which chapter V-B applies. Thus, only in case Party I succeeds in establishing the applicability of Section 25-K of the Act of Party II establishment, compliance of the provision of Section 25-O of the Act, by Party II, would be required.

17. Undoubtedly, Exb. 17 shows the number of the workers working with Party II during the period from April, 2000 to March, 2001 which was 198 and from April, 2001 to March, 2002 which was 157. For the applicability of Section 25-K an industrial establishment should have not less than one hundred Workmen employed on an average working per day for the preceding twelve months. For determining the question as to whether Chapter V-B applies to a particular industrial establishment on a particular day, it is not sufficient that on the particular day or for some days, one hundred or more Workmen were employed in it. But will have to be shown that such number of Workmen were employed in the establishment on an average calculated for the twelve months preceding that day on the basis of each working day. In the instant case the date preceding twelve months from 19-09-2002 (on which Party II closed the factory) is 19-09-01. Thus, Party I is required to establish that Party II had employed not less than one hundred Workmen on an average per working day during the period from 19-09-01 to 19-09-02. Undisputedly, Exb. 17 pertains to the period from April, 2000 to

March, 2002. Thus, there is no record of the Workmen employed by the Party II during the period from April, 02 to 19-09-02. The number of Workmen employed on an average per working day preceding twelve months from 19-09-02 could have been found out only in case there was evidence to indicate the number of workers employed by Party II on each of the days from April, 02 to 19-09-02 or the total number of Workmen employed by Party II during the period from April 02 to 19-09-02. In the absence of above details, it is rather hard for this Court to find out the number of Workmen employed by Party II on an average per working day during the preceding twelve months from 19-09-02.

18. I have already pointed out supra that Mr. Badetia in his cross-examination has stated that he does not remember the number of workers working at the Bicholim unit of Party II during the period from March, 2002 to September, 2002. He however has categorically stated that in the month of September, 2002 the number of such workers was less than hundred. Even for that matter, I have pointed out supra that in his cross-examination Mr. Ashok Kumar Jalan has also stated that he cannot produce the copies of returns of PF and ESI for the period from March, 2002 to September, 2002 as they were lying in the factory which has been taken over by EDC. It may be mentioned here that the fact of factory having been taken over by EDC is not in dispute. No other exercise has been done by Party I to get on record any other documentary evidence indicating the number of Workmen employed by Party II during the period from April, 2002 to 19-09-02. pointed out above and wherein it has come on record through the witnesses of the Party II that in the month of September, 2002, there were less than hundred workers, one is at loss to understand as to what could be the number of workers employed by Party II for each of the months from April, 02 to August, 2002.

19. It may be mentioned here that in the cross examination of Shri Badetia, it is suggested that from April, 2000 to March, 2001 and from April 2001 to September, 2002, there were 198 and 157 workers respectively, working with the Bicholim unit of Party II and Mr. Badetia has answered that he does not know. In this context it is the submission of Ld. Advocate for Party I that the average number of workers working with Party II during the period from April, 2001 to September, 2002, would therefore be not less than 100 per working day preceding twelve months from 19-09-02 or otherwise Shri Badetia would have stated otherwise. I do not find any force in these submissions of Ld. Advocate for



Party I for the reasons that it is not the case of Party I in the claim statement that there were 157 workers working in the Bicholim unit of Party II during the period from April, 2001 to September 2002. Thus, the suggestion put to the above effect is without any legal force. That apart, as pointed out by me supra, no documentary evidence to show the number of workers working with Party II during the period from April, 2002 to 19-09-20 is on record. In such situation, taking an average of number of workers employed with Party II, on the basis of suggestions put to Shri Badetia, to arrive at the conclusion that there were not less than 100 workers employed on an average per working day preceding twelve months from 19-09-02, would be highly improper and inappropriate. Consequently, the observations in the judgment in the case of Oswal Agro (supra) cannot be made applicable to the set of facts in the present case.

20. In the light of above discussion, I am of the considered opinion that Party I has failed to prove that Party II was employing not less than one hundred Workmen on an average per working day for the preceding twelve months of the closure of the factory and it therefore follows that Party I has also failed to prove that Party II was covered under Chapter V-B of the I.D. Act. Hence my findings.

21. *Issue No. 3:* The limited aspect which the Party I is required to prove vide this issue is that Party II had closed down the undertaking illegally without permission of the Appropriate Government in contravention of Section 25-O of Chapter V-B of the Act. Having come to the conclusion that Party II was not covered under chapter V-B of the Act, it was not required of Party II to follow procedure as required u/s 25-O of the Act. Hence, my findings.

22. *Issue No. 4:* Reading of the claim statement as well as the evidence of Mrs. Swati Kerkar in entirety gives a clear indication that reinstatement of the Workmen in service with full back wages and continuity in service is prayed as according to Party I the action of Party II in closing down the undertaking w.e.f. 19-09-02 is illegal, unjustified, bad-in-law and in contravention of Section 25-O of Chapter V-B of the Act. Discussion supra makes it clear that Party I has failed to prove issue Nos. 1, 2 and 3 and therefore finding on issue No. 4 which would be a consequence of the findings on issue Nos. 1, 2 and 3 also deserve to be given in the negative. Hence my findings.

23. *Issue No. 5:* In their written statement Party II has raised the preliminary objections such as that the President of the union has no locus standi to file the claim statement on behalf of the other

employees and that the order of reference does not refer to the substantive issue as to whether closure has been declare and if so whether it is legal or illegal and therefore this Tribunal cannot decide the above aspect of the matter and has only to adjudicate upon the question if the action of Party II in closing their factory w.e.f. 19-09-02 is legal and justified. It is on account of above pleadings of the Party II, issue No. 5 came to be framed.

24. It may be mentioned here that Mrs. Swati Kerkar has in her affidavit in evidence addressed herself as the President of Party I Union and has stated Party I Union is registered under The Trade Union's Act, 1926. Though in her cross examination her above statements are denied but as rightly pointed out by Ld. Advocate for Party I the pleadings to the above effect made in Paras 2, 3 and 4 of the claim statement are admitted vide para 7 in the written statement. Thus no issue as such arises on the above subject matter.

25. Coming to the other objection of the Party II, on the subject of terms of reference, there is otherwise no dispute that the factory of Party II was closed down with effect from 19-9-02. It is apparent from the terms of reference that this Court is required to adjudicate on the legality and justification of the action of Party II in closing down their factory with effect from 19-9-02. Reliance is placed on the judgment in the case of **pottery Mazdor Panchayat v/s The Perfect Pottery Co. Ltd., and another 1999 SCC (3) 762**, in which the reference was limited to the narrow question whether the closure was proper and justified and it was held that the Tribunal by the very terms of the references, had no jurisdiction to go behind the fact of closure and enquire into the question whether the business was infact closed down by the management. Reference also deserves to be made to the judgment in the case of **Bhogpur Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd. v/s Harmesh Kumar 2006 (111) FLR 1202** the observations in which indicate that the Labour judgment in the case of **Bhogpur Co-operative Sugar-Mills Ltd. v/s Harmesh Kumar 2006 (111) FLR 1202** the observations in which indicate that the Labour Court derives its jurisdiction from the terms of reference. Thus, in the light of above settled position of law it would not be proper and justified for this Court to go into the reason for closure of the establishment.

26. Ld. Advocate for Party II argued that the case of Party II falls under proviso to Section 25-FFF of the Act as according to him the undertaking has been closed down on account of unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the employer.



It may be mentioned here that reading of the written statement in totality and more particularly paras 3 and 4 of the same, makes it clear beyond doubt that according to Party II, after September, 2000 due to deep recession they had not been getting enough orders from its merchants, manufacturers to break even its expenditures and because of this the company was in difficult financial situation. It is also clear from the pleadings in above paras that on account of the losses suffered by the company it was referred to BIFR. Thus, the pleadings in Para 11 of the written statement wherein it is stated that Party II company never closed its factory of their own but the closure of the factory was due to the circumstances prevailing at that particular time, has to be read in the light of contents of para 3 and 4 the written statement. When so read, it gives a clear indication that Party II undertaking was closed down due to financial difficulties which reason in term of "Explanation" to proviso to Section 25-FFF cannot come under "unavoidable circumstances" and therefore I find no force in the submissions of Ld. Advocate for Party II that the case of Party II falls within the purview of proviso to Section 25-FFF of the Act. Consequently, the evidence brought on record in the cross examination of Shri Ashok Kumar Jalan by making reference to para 11 of the written statement that the "Circumstances prevailing at that particular time" which effected the closure of the factory were that the workers had stopped coming to the factory, is of no significance. Nevertheless, considering the terms of reference forwarded to this Court for adjudication which is only to find out as to whether the action of Party II in closing down their factory w.e.f. 19-09-02 is legal and justified and the consequential relief arising out of the same, it is not required for me to go into the aspect of applicability or non-applicability of the Section 25-FFF of the Act while adjudicating the above issue. However, since the terms of reference are very clear indicating that this Court is required to adjudicate only on the legality and justification of the action of Party II in closing down their establishment in my considered opinion, Party II has failed to prove that the present reference is not maintainable and hence my findings.

27. In the result and in view of discussion supra, I pass the following.

ORDER

1. It is hereby held that the action of the management of M/s. Dupont Sportswear Private Limited, Bicholim Industrial Estate, in

closing down their factory with effect from 19-09-2002, is legal and justified.

2. Party I Workmen are therefore not entitled to any relief.
3. No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-  
(B. K. Thaly),  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-  
-cum-Labour-Court.

Department of Law & Judiciary  
Law (Establishment) Division

Notification

No. 14-3-2008-LD-Estt.(CBI)/985

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Central Act 49 of 1988) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby appoints Shri P. V. Sawaikar, District Judge-I and Additional Sessions Judge, Panaji, as Special Judge for the whole of the State of Goa, for exclusive trial of corruption cases investigated by the Central Bureau of Investigation and/or Anti-Corruption Branch at Panaji, in the State of Goa, under the said Act.

This issues in supersession of the Government Notification No. 13-4-2011/LD(Estt) 1883 dated 29-10-2013, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 32, dated 7-11-2013.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vasanti H. Parvatkar, Under Secretary  
(Establishment).

Porvorim, 2nd May, 2014.

Department of Urban Development  
Municipal Administration

Order

No. 1/2/2014-DUD/PG/183

Whereas, vide Order No. 14/236/DMA/2007-08/LA.Funds/2123 dated 30-11-2007 grant amounting to ₹ 1,30,20,000/- (Rupees one crore thirty

lakh twenty thousand only) was sanctioned and paid to Curchorem-Cacora Municipal Council for acquisition of land in Survey No. 164/8 (Part), 165/1 (Part) 167 & 168 (Part) (Kharangateghat) of Cacora Village of Quepem Taluka.

And Whereas, the said land was acquired for "Garbage disposal", by the said Council.

And whereas, in terms of condition No. 4 of the aforesaid Order read with Section 86(2)(j) of the Goa Municipalities Act, 1968, the acquired land is vested with the Government.

And whereas, the Government in order to improve the garbage disposal system has proposed setting up of a Solid Waste Management Facility with the intention of solving the Solid Waste Management disposal problems.

Now therefore, in terms of the provisions of Section 304 read with Section 86(2)(j) of the Goa Municipalities Act, 1968 and condition No. 4 of the sanction Order, the Government hereby resumes possession of the said land vested in it for its management towards setting up of technologically advanced 'Solid Waste Management System' in public interest.

*Elvis P. Gomes*, Director & ex officio Additional Secretary (Urban Development).

Panaji, 22nd April, 2014.

## Department of Transport

Directorate of Transport

### Order

Ref. No. D.Tpt/EST/285-II (Part)/2014/1537

- Read: 1) Order No. D.Tpt/EST/285-II (PF)/2011/3836 dated 15-09-2011.  
 2) Order No. D.Tpt/EST/285-II (PF)/2012/997 dated 15-03-2012.  
 3) Order No. D.Tpt/EST/285-II (PF)/2012/3821 dated 31-10-2012.  
 4) Order No. D.Tpt/EST/285-II (Part)/2014/612 dated 18-02-2014.  
 5) Order No. D.Tpt/EST/285-II (Part)/2014/621 dated 18-02-2014.

Ex post facto approval of the Government is conveyed for the extension of the ad hoc promotion in respect of Shri Vinod Arlekar for the period from 01-07-2013 to 17-02-2014.

This is issued with the approval of the Government and the concurrence of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide letter No. COM/II/11/49(1)/2011/149 dated 28-04-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Arun L. Desai*, Director & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Transport).

Panaji, 29th April, 2014.

[www.goaprintingpress.gov.in](http://www.goaprintingpress.gov.in)

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,  
 Government Printing Press,  
 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 14.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA-50/350-5/2014.