

भारत का राजपत्र
The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 34] नई दिल्ली, अगस्त 14—अगस्त 20, 2016, शनिवार/श्रावण 23—श्रावण 29, 1938
No. 34] NEW DELHI, AUGUST 14—AUGUST 20, 2016, SATURDAY/SRAVANA 23—SRAVANA 29, 1938

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय
(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)
नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1707.—केन्द्र सरकार, दिनांक / / 2014 की गृह (पुलिस) विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. 1/सीबीआई-80-30/2014-एचपी और दिनांक 15.12.2014 के ज्ञापन सं. 1/सीबीआई-80-04/2014 एचपी 10327/पटना द्वारा बिहार राज्य सरकार की सहमति से दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए विभिन्न भारतीय नागरिकों और बाहर रहने वाले एनआरआई के विरुद्ध आईपीसी की धारा 120 बी के साथ पठित धारा 420, 467, 468, 471 और सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी अधिनियम, 2000 की धारा 66 डी के अधीन षड्यंत्र, धोखाधड़ी, जालसाजी के मामले, जिसमें धोखाधड़ी की राशि बिहार के विभिन्न स्थानों पर मनी ग्राम और वेस्टर्न यूनियन के माध्यम से प्राप्त की जा रही, में मामला दर्ज करने और इसका अन्वेषण करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और न्यायाधिकार क्षेत्र का विस्तार एतद्वारा संपूर्ण बिहार राज्य पर करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/80/2014-एवीडी-II]
एल. पी. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS

(Department of Personnel and Training)

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1707.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the

state Government of Bihar vide Home (Police) Deptt. Notification No. 1/CBI-80-03/2014 H.P. dated / /2014 and Memo No. 1/CBI-80-03/2014 H.P. 10327/Patna dated 15.12.2014, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment in the whole of the State of Bihar for registering and investigating a case of conspiracy, cheating and forgery U/s 120-B IPC R/w 420 IPC, 467 IPC, 468 IPC, 471 IPC and Sec. 66D of Information and Technology Act, 2000 committed against various Indian citizens and NRIs staying abroad, in which cheated amounts are being received through Money Gram and Western Union at various places of Bihar.

[F. No. 228/80/2014-AVD-II]

L. P. SHARMA, Under Secy.

उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

(भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो)

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 2016

का.आ. 1708.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (5) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, वे स्वीकृत कर दिए गए हैं :-

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष / माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
1	7209524	01/01/2016	गायत्री स्टील कार्पोरेशन, 395, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट मकरपुरा, वडोदरा-390010	ईरीगेशन इक्यूपमेंट मीडिया फिल्टर	14606	—	—	1998
2	7200032487	01/01/2016	मिलाप ज्वैलर्स 102, 103, सी बी देसाई चैम्बर्स, गुंजन सिनेमा के पास, कोपारली रोड, जी आई डी सी बलसाद -396195	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	—	—	1999
3	7200032891	01/01/2016	जेवरात ज्वैलर्स खोडियार माताजी मंदिर के पास, नवा बाजार, बावला, अहमदाबाद	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	—	—	1999
4	7200032992	01/01/2016	बी एन बी बिटुमन प्रा. लिमिटेड प्लॉट नंबर- 283, नंदेसरी जी आई डी सी एस्टेट अंगध, वडोदरा-391340	बिटुमन इमलशन फार रोड (कैटिआनिक टाईप)	8887	—	—	2004
5	7200033287	01/01/2016	चोकसी हीरालाल मगनलाल ज्वैलर्स प्रा. लिमिटेड, जी एफ/ए/1 राधे शॉपिंग माल, खोखरा सर्कल के सामने, मणीनगर, अहमदाबाद-380008	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	—	—	1999
6	7200032790	04/01/2016	खुशबु प्लाईवुड प्रा. लिमिटेड, 143-ए, धानोत गॉव, छतराल कडी रोड, ता कलोल, धानोत, गांधीनगर- 382729	मेरिन प्लाईवुड	710	—	—	2010

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष / माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
7	7200033085	08/01/2016	पुष्पी पाईप इंडस्ट्रीज एट तथा पोस्ट: होलकिया, बोडेली, ओरसंग नदी के पास, बोडेली, छोटा उदयपुर- 391135	ग्रीकास्ट कांक्रिट पाईप्स (विद तथा विदाउट रेनिफोर्समेंट)	458	—	—	2003
8	7200033186	08/01/2016	एरान पाईप्स प्रा. लिमिटेड ब्लाक नंबर- 187, प्लाट नंबर- 1 से 5, कारज, किम मांडवी रोड, मांडवी, सूरत-394110	अनप्लास्टिसाईज्ड पी वी सी पाईप्स फार पोटेबल वाटर सप्लायस -	4985	—	—	2000
9	7200033388	11/01/2016	इनफिटी एंटरप्राईस प्लाट नंबर- 225, इंडस्ट्रियल एसटेट, गाँव : दंताली, ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382358	अनप्लास्टिसाईज्ड पी वी सी पाईप्स फार पोटेबल वाटर सप्लायस -	4985	—	—	2000
10	7200033489	18/01/2016	सोनी पोपटलाल मोहनलाल 4/5/105, गोविंद चकला, स्टेशन रोड विसनगर 384315	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	—	—	1999
11	7200035089	18/01/2016	बीयररिस्सिट टेक्नोलोजिज प्रा- लिमिटेड, 421-422, जी आई डी सी, पोर रमनगामडी, बडोदरा 391243	कवर्ड इलैक्ट्रोड फार मैनुयल मॅटल आर्क वैल्डिंग आफ कार्बन व कार्बन मैंगेनीज स्टील	814	—	—	2004
12	7200033590	19/01/2016	जिजूवाडिया तथा सन्स जी एफ 6, एफ एफ 106, वीनस अमरडिअस जोधपुर क्रास रोड, सैटेलाईट, अहमदाबाद -380015	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	—	—	1999
13	7200033792	21/01/2016	बलबीर रोलिंग मिल्स प्रा. लिमिटेड, एस नंबर- 38/2 पी, 39/4&5, 4/1 गाँव : मोरैई मोरैई बटार रोड, बलसाद, वापी-396191	स्टील फार जनरल स्टकचरल परपस	2062	—	—	2011
14	7200033893	21/01/2016	सैंटैनरी पालीटेक्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, जी 2 तथा 3, बराज इटीग्रेटेड टैक्सटाईल पार्क लिमिटेड, बारेजा, एन एच नंबर 8, पी ओ बिडाज, खेडा अहमदाबाद -383425	टैक्सटाईलस & हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापीलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	—	—	2014
15	7200033691	22/01/2016	बलबीर रोलिंग मिल्स प्रा. लिमिटेड, एस नंबर-38/2 पी, 39/4 और 5, 4/1 गाँव : मोरैई मोरैई बटार रोड, बलसाद, वापी-396191	हाई स्ट्रेंथ डिफार्मड स्टील बार्स तथा वायर्स फार कांक्रिट रेनिफोर्समेंट	1786	—	—	2008

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष / माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
16	7200033994	27 / 01 / 2016	स्वास्तिक पाईप इंडस्ट्रीज 44 एंड 45, निर्मल इंडस्ट्रियल पार्क, जी आई डी सी, गोजारिया, मेहसाना-382825	अनप्लास्टिसाईज्ड पी वी सी पाईप्स फार पोटेबल वाटर सप्लायस -	4985	—	—	2000
17	7200034087	27 / 01 / 2016	वरुण बिबरेजिस एट पोस्ट : रोला, सर्वे नंबर-222 हाउस नंबर- 483, रोला फतक, एन एच 8, डुंगरी, बलसाद	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेज्ड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	—	—	2004
18	7200034188	28 / 01 / 2016	रानासारिया पालीपैक प्रा. लिमिटेड, 727/सी, गॉव मोती बोयन कलोल खतराज रोड, गांधीनगर, कलोल-382721	टैक्सटाईलस - हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापीलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	—	—	2014
19	7200034289	28 / 01 / 2016	गुजरात राफिया इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, 455, सांतेज बडसर रोड, गॉव सांतेज, ता कलोल गांधीनगर-382721	टैक्सटाईलस - हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापीलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	—	—	2014
20	7200034390	28 / 01 / 2016	उमाश्री टैक्सप्लास्ट प्रा. लिमिटेड, प्लॉट नंबर-728/1] गॉव मोतीबोयन, खतराज-कलोल रोड, ता कलोल, गांधीनगर-382721	टैक्सटाईलस - हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापीलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	—	—	2014
21	7200035594	29 / 01 / 2016	भगवती गोल्ड ज्वैल्स, 201, ओरीयन आरकडे, जाडेश्वर रोड, भारूच-392012	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	—	—	1999

[सं. सी एम डी/13:11]

डॉ. राजीव किशोर झा, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख

MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION**(Department of Consumer Affairs)****(BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS)**New Delhi, the 21st July, 2016

S.O. 1708.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (5) of the regulation 4 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies the grant of licences particulars of which are given in the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name and Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
1	7209524	01/01/2016	GAYATRI STEEL CORPORATION 395, GIDC ESTATE MAKARPURA, VADODARA -390010	Irrigation equipment – media filter	14606	-	-	1998
2	7200032487	01/01/2016	MILAP JEWELLERS 102,103, C B DESAI CHAMBERS, NEAR GUNJAN CINEMA KOPARLI ROAD,GIDC, VALSAD -396195	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
3	7200032891	01/01/2016	ZAVERAT JEWELLERS NEAR KHODIYAR MATAJI TEMPLE NAVA BAZAR, BAVLA AHMEDABAD	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
4	7200032992	01/01/2016	BNB BITUMEN PVT. LTD. PLOT NO.283, NANDESARI GIDC ESTATE, ANGADH, VADODARA-391340	Bitumen emulsion for roads (cationic type)	8887	-	-	2004
5	7200033287	01/01/2016	CHOKSHI HIRALAL MAGANLAL JEWELLERS PVT. LTD. GF/A/1 RADHE SHOPPING MALL, OPP. KHOKHRA CIRCLE, MANINAGAR AHMEDABAD-380008	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
6	7200032790	04/01/2016	KHUSHBOO PLYWOOD PRIVATE LIMITED 143-A, DHANOT VILL, CHHATRAL - KADI ROAD, TA; KALOL, DHANOT GANDHINAGAR-382729	Marine plywood	710	-	-	2010
7	7200033085	08/01/2016	PUSHTI PIPE INDUSTRIES AT & POST: DHOKALIYA, BODELI, NEAR ORSANG RIVER, BODELI CHOTAA UDAIPUR-391135	Precast concrete pipes (with and without reinforcement)	458	-	-	2003
8	7200033186	08/01/2016	ARON PIPES PVT. LTD. BLOCK NO.187, PLOT NO.1 TO 5	Unplasticized pvc pipes for potable water supplies	4985	-	-	2000

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name and Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
			KARAJ, KIM-MANDVI ROAD MANDVI, SURAT-394110					
9	7200033388	11/01/2016	INFINITY ENTERPRISE PLOT NO. 225, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, VILLAGE: DANTALI, TAL: KALOL GANDHINAGAR-382358	Unplasticized pvc pipes for potable water supplies	4985	-	-	2000
10	7200033489	18/01/2016	SONI POPATLAL MOHANLAL 4/5/105, GOVIND CHAKLA STATION ROAD, VISNAGAR-384315	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts-fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
11	7200035089	18/01/2016	WEARRESIST TECHNOLOGIES PVT. LTD, 421-422, GIDC, POR-RAMANGAMDI VADODARA-391243	Covered electrodes for manual metal are welding of carbon and carbon manganese steel	814	-	-	2004
12	7200033590	19/01/2016	ZINZUWADIA AND SONS GF-6, FF-106, VENUS AMADEUS JODHPUR CROSS ROAD SATELLITE, AHMEDABAD- 380015	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
13	7200033792	21/01/2016	BALBIR ROLLING MILLS LTD S.No. 38/2P, 39/1&3 VILLAGE: MORAI, MORAI VATAR ROAD, VALSAD, VAPI 396191	Steel for general structural purposes	2062	-	-	2011
14	7200033893	21/01/2016	CENTENARY POLYTEX PRIVATE LIMITED G-2&3, VRAJ INTEGRATED TEXTILE PARK LIMITED, BAREJA, N H NO. 8,P. O. BIDAJ, KHEDA, AHMEDABAD-383425	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacksfor packaging of 50 kg food grains	14887	-	-	2014
15	7200033691	22/01/2016	BALBIR ROLLING MILLS PVT. LTD.. S.NO.38/2P, 39/4&5, 4/1 VILLAGE: MORAI MORAI- VATAR ROAD, VALSAD VAPI-396191	High strength deformed steel bars and wires for concrete reinforcement	1786	-	-	2008
16	7200033994	27/01/2016	SWASTIK PIPE INDUSTRIES 44-45, NIRMAL INDUSTRIAL PARK, GIDC, GOZARIYA, MEHSANA-382825	Unplasticized pvc pipes for potable water supplies	4985	-	-	2000
17	7200034087	27/01/2016	VARUN BEVERAGES AT POST: ROLA, SURVEY NO. 222 HOUSE NO.483,	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name and Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
			ROLA FATAK, ON NH 8 DUNGRI, VALSAD					
18	7200034188	28/01/2016	RANASARIA POLY PACK PVT. LTD.. 727/C, VILLAGE: MOTI BHOYAN KALOL-KHATRAJ ROAD GANDHINAGAR, KALOL- 382721	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacks for packaging of 50 kg food grains	14887	-	-	2014
19	7200034289	28/01/2016	GUJARAT RAFFIA INDUSTRIES LTD, 455, SANTEJ VADSAR ROAD, Vill: SANTEJ, TALUKA KALOL GANDHINAGAR, KALOL-382721	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacks for packaging of 50 kg food grains	14887	-	-	2014
20	7200034390	28/01/2016	UMASREE TEXPLAST PVT. LTD. Plot NO.728/1, VILLAGE MOTIBHUYAN, KHATRAJ- KALOL ROAD, TAL KALOL, DISTT GANDHINAGAR- 382721	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacks for packaging of 50 kg food grains	14887	-	-	2014
21	7200035594	29/01/2016	BHAGWATI GOLD JEWELLERS 201, ORION ARCADE, ZADESHWAR ROAD, BHARCH, BHARUCH -392012	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999

[No. CMD/13:11]

Dr. RAJIV KISHORE JHA, Scientist 'F' and Head

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 2016

का.आ. 1709.— भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के विनियम (5) के उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि निम्न विवरण वाले लाइसेंसों को उनके आगे दर्शायी गई तारीख से रद्द/स्थगित कर दिया गया है :-

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या सीएम/एल	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	लाइसेंस के अंतर्गत वस्तु/प्रक्रम सम्बंध भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	रद्द करने की तिथि
		कोई नहीं		

[सं. सीएमडी/13:13]

डॉ. राजीव किशोर झा, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख

New Delhi, the 21st July, 2016

S.O. 1709.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of the regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies that the licences particulars of which are given below have been cancelled with effect from the date indicated against each :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No. CM/L	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process with relevant Indian Standards covered by the licence cancelled	Date of Cancellation
		Nil		

[No. CMD/13:13]

Dr. RAJIV KISHORE JHA, Scientist 'F' and Head

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 2016

का.आ. 1710.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (5) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, वे स्वीकृत कर दिए गए हैं : -

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/ माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
1	7200035695	01/02/2016	स्काई विवरेजिस 17, अमर एस्टेट, अनिल स्टार्च रोड, मैमको, अहमदाबाद-380025	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
2	7200034491	01/02/2016	आर आर वी विवरेजिस प्रा. लिमिटेड ब्लॉक नंबर-111, पीपोदरा जी आई डी सी, ता : मंगरोल, सूरत-394110	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
3	7200034592	01/02/2016	जैगरी वायर्स तथा केबलस प्रा. लिमिटेड, प्लॉट नंबर-22, 23, श्रीलक्ष्मी विजय कम्पाउंड, पटेल एस्टेट के सामने, यमुना मिल रोड, बडोदरा-390017	पी वी सी इंसूलेटिड केबल	694	.	.	1990
4	7200034693	02/02/2016	जयेश इलैक्ट्रिकलस लिमिटेड प्लॉट नंबर-47 तथा 48, रमनगामडी, गाँव पोर, बडोदरा- 391243	आउटडोर टाईप श्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफार्मर	1180	1	.	2014
5	7200034794	02/02/2016	सुमेश इंजीनियर्स प्रा. लिमिटेड 504, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, बाघोडिया, बडोदरा-391760	आउटडोर टाईप श्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफार्मर	1180	1	.	2014
6	7200034895	02/02/2016	हवा इंजीनियर्स लिमिटेड प्लॉट नंबर-129, बी/4,	रिसिलियेंट सीटिड कास्ट आयरन एयर रिलिफ वाल्वस	14845	.	.	2000

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/ माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			काशीराम टैक्सटाईल मिल नारोल रोड, अहमदाबाद- 382405	फार वाटर वर्क्स परपस				
7	7200034996	02/02/2016	स्वामैत्री विवरेजिस 8, मारुतिधाम डुपलैक्स, जलाराम सोसाइटी के पास, दाबोई के पीछे, पासालाड भवन, अजवा-वाघोडिया रिंग रोड, वडोदरा	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
8	7200035796	04/02/2016	डिओलेक्स केबल्स प्रा. लिमिटेड प्लॉट नंबर-139, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, गोजारिया- विसनगर रोड गाँव : गोजारिया, मेहसाना 382825	क्रासलिकड पालीथलीन इंसूलेटिड पी वी सी शीथड केबल	7098	1	.	1988
9	7200035897	04/02/2016	डिओलेक्स केबल्स प्रा. लिमिटेड, प्लॉट नंबर-139, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, गोजारिया-विसनगर रोड, गाँव : गोजारिया, मेहसाना 382825	पी वी सी इंसूलेटिड (हैवी ड्यूटी) इलैक्ट्रिक केबल्स	1554	1	.	1988
10	7200035190	04/02/2016	एन जे ए इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लिमिटेड 484, जी आई डी सी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, मंजूसर, वडोदरा 391775	आउटडोर टाईप ग्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफार्मर	1180	1	.	2014
11	7200035291	05/02/2016	आस्टिन पाईप्स प्रा लिमिटेड प्लॉट नंबर 46-48, ब्लाक नंबर 219, महेली कंपाउंड, कारंज, सूरत, मांडवी 394110	अनप्लास्टिसाईड पी वी सी पाईपस फार पोटेबल वाटर सप्लाईस	4985	.	.	2000
12	7200035392	05/02/2016	बराज प्लास्टिक इंडस्ट्रीज 20, 21, 41, 42, 43, अमरनाथ एस्टेट, बंसीधर रोलिंग मिल के सामने, नारोल, अहमदाबाद 382405	फिटिंग फार रिजिड नान मैटैलिक कांड्यूटस	3419	.	.	1988
13	7200035493	05/02/2016	जैम्स इंजिनियरिंग यूनिट-2, ब्री/144, मारुति इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट,	सबमर्सिबल पम्पसेट	8034	.	.	2002

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/ माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			फायर स्टेशन के सामने, फुट मार्केट के पास, नरोडा रोड, अहमदाबाद 380025					
14	7200036293	05/02/2016	प्रियंका ज्वैलर्स 66 राजश्री नगर को ओप हाउसिंग सोसाइटी लिमिटेड छापरा, नवसारी 396445	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
15	7200036394	05/02/2016	श्री नारायण ज्वैलर्स गालागोटाडिया नी पोल, 3490/93/94 चोकसी बाजार, उमरेठ, आनंद 388220	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
16	7200035998	08/02/2016	नारायण वाटर तथा बिबरेजिस 208, गोपालचरण इंडस्ट्रियल हब, कुंजाड बाकरोल, अहमदाबाद इंदौर, 200 फीट रोड, ओडव रिंग रोड से कनभा हाइवे के पास, बाकरोल बजरंग, दसक्रोई, अहमदाबाद 382430	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
17	7200036091	10/02/2016	सेईक्स 1801/9, 4 फेस, श्री साई ग्लास कंपाउंड, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, विठ्ठल उद्योगनगर, आनंद 388121	एक्सप्लोसिव एटमासफियर्स पार्ट 1 इक्यूपमेंट प्रोटैक्शन बाय फ्लेमप्रुफ एनक्लोसरर्स "डी"	आई एस/आई ई सी 60079	11	.	2006
18	7200036192	10/02/2016	हच इंडिया प्रा. लिमिटेड प्लॉट नंबर-3ए तथा 3 बी, बारडोली रोड, गाँव टांटी, थायिया, तह: पालसाना, सूरत	स्टील ट्यूब्स फार मेकैनिकल तथा जनरल इंजिनियरिंग परपस	3601	.	.	2006
19	7200036495	11/02/2016	भूमि प्रीकास्ट आर्टिकलस एट- दतरपुरा, केनाल रोड, निरमा के पास, पी ओ लामडापुरा, सावली, बडोदरा 391775	प्रीकास्ट कांक्रिट मेनहोल कवर तथा फ्रेम	12592	.	.	2002
20	7200036596	11/02/2016	अलफा ट्रांसफार्मर्स लिमिटेड 1046-1048 जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, वाघोडिया बडोदरा 391760	आउटडोर टाईप श्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफार्मर	1180	1	.	2014
21	7200036697	11/02/2016	पोलीकैब वायर्स प्रा. लिमिटेड,	क्रास लिंकड पालीथलीन	7098	3	.	1993

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/ माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			67-72 नुरपुरा, ता हलोल, डिस्ट्रिक्ट पंचमहल हलोल 389350	इसूलेटिड थर्मोप्लास्टिक शीथड केबल्स				
22	7200036798	12/02/2016	कुल विंगस 161-2-3 रामदेव एस्टेट, शाहवाडी बस स्टॉप के पास (स्टैंड), नारोल, अहमदाबाद 382405	सैल्फ कंटेंट ड्रिंकिंग वाटर कुलर्स	1475	1	.	2001
23	7200036903	12/02/2016	ए वी बिबरेजिस 26- राजक मास्टरनी चाली, नवरंग फ्लैट के सामने, भीड़ भंजन हनुमान मंदिर के सामने, बापूनगर, अहमदाबाद	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
24	7200037093	15/02/2016	अंतरनाड ज्वैलर्स 4/3/26, धोबीवाड, वी पी रोड, बलसाद 396001	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
25	7200037194	15/02/2016	अंजली ज्वैलर्स दुकान नंबर-5, सरदार मैमोरियम मार्केट, आजाद चौक, बलसाद 396001	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
26	7200036899	15/02/2016	गुजरात राफिया इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, 455, सांतेज बडसर रोड, सांतेज, ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721	टैक्सटाईल - हाई डेंसिटी पालीथलीन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पेकेजिंग 10 किलो, 15 किलो, 20 किलो, 25 किलो तथा 30 किलो फुडग्रेनस	16208	.	.	2015
27	7200038705	16/02/2016	यूनिक इलैक्ट्रोडस प्लॉट नंबर-1/बी, ओकट्राय नाका के पास, मोडासा रोड, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, कापडवंज, खेडा 387620	कर्वड इलैक्ट्रोड फार मैनुयल मेटल आर्क वैलडिंग आफ कार्बन तथा कार्बन मैग्नेनीस स्टील	814	.	.	2004
28	7200037295	17/02/2016	देविका आर्ट ज्वैलरी 9/13/67, सोनी बाडो, कृष्णा सिनेमा के पास, दादूपंथ नी खाडकी के सामने, पाटन 384265	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
29	7200037396	17/02/2016	राधा कृष्णा ज्वैलर्स 6 पाटीदारिन काम्पलैक्स,	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता	1417	.	.	1999

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/ माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			3174, सरदार अस्पताल के सामने, बारडोली, सूरत 394601	एवं मुहरांकन				
30	7200037699	18/02/2016	कृपाली ज्वैलर्स फतेहपुरा चार रस्ता, महादेव मंदिर के पास, फतेहपुरा, बडोदरा 390006	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
31	7200037497	19/02/2016	गोपाला पालीप्लास्ट लिमिटेड प्लाट नंबर-485, सांतेज वडसर रोड, सांतेज ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721	टैक्सटाईल्स - हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	.	.	2014
32	7200037598	19/02/2016	झी जे बिबरेजिस सर्वे नंबर- 37/3, प्लाट नंबर 2 अरिहंत दाल मैल के सामने, दाहोद, देलसर 389151	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
33	7200037703	22/02/2016	मैटल फास इंस 79-बी, नर्मदा उद्योगनगर, भोलव, होटल रंग इन के पीछे, भारूच 392015	ड्रमस लार्ज, फिक्स एंडस- पार्ट 2 : ग्रेड बी ड्रमस	1783	2	.	2014
34	7200038604	22/02/2016	मैटल फास इंस 79-बी, नर्मदा उद्योगनगर, भोलव, होटल रंग इन के पीछे, भारूच 392015	ड्रमस लार्ज, फिक्स एंडस- पार्ट 1: ग्रेड ए ड्रमस	1783	1	.	2014
35	7200038196	22/02/2016	वैभववी इंडस्ट्रीज 58-59, एट पार्वता, गाँव पार्वता, उमरेठ, आनंद 388220	बुडन फलश डोर शटर (सालिड कोर टाईप)	2202	1	.	1999
36	7200038095	23/02/2016	वैभववी इंडस्ट्रीज 58-59, एट पार्वता, गाँव पार्वता, उमरेठ, आनंद 388220	ब्लाक बोर्ड	1659	.	.	2004
37	7200037804	24/02/2016	हाई टैक पार्सिप्स लिमिटेड ई-6, जी आई डी सी, फेस-II, रोड एफ, सानंद, अहमदाबाद 382170	स्टील ट्यूबस फार स्टक्चरल परपस	1161	.	.	2014
38	7200038297	24/02/2016	मारुतिकृपा ज्वैलर्स 4412, पाडव, दाहोद 389151	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
39	7200038398	25/02/2016	शुभमटैक्स ओ पैक प्रा. लिमिटेड, प्लाट नंबर-554, वडसर खतराज रोड, गाँव : वडसर, ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721	टैक्सटाईल्स - हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	.	.	2014
40	7200038499	25/02/2016	एम एम टी पालीपैक्स प्रा. लिमिटेड	टैक्सटाईल्स - हाई डेंसिटी	14887	.	.	2014

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/ माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			ब्लाक नंबर-1644/4, गाँव मोती बोयन ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721	पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन				
41	7200039505	25/02/2016	कैमेट कैमिकलस प्रा. लिमिटेड प्लाट नंबर- 6230/6231/6215, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, भारूच, अंकलेश्वर 393002	पैसटिसाईड डैल्टामैथरिन डब्ल्यू पी	13457	.	.	1992
42	7200037905	25/02/2016	वैभववी इंडस्ट्रीज 58-59, एट पार्वता, गाँव पार्वता, उमरेठ, आनंद 388220	प्लाईवुड फार जनरल परपस	303	.	.	1989
43	7200038806	25/02/2016	जय भुवनेश्वरी ज्वैलर्स पहली मंजिल, 37, 38, सिद्धेश्वरी सोसाइटी, दाभोली चार रस्ता, वेड रोड, सूरत 395004	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
44	7200038907	25/02/2016	सोनी योगेशभाई चंपकलाल हाउस नंबर 2710, भिलाडवाला बैंक के सामने पारसी स्ट्रीट, किलापारडी, वलसाद 396125	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
45	7200038503	26/02/2016	मयूर बोवनस प्रा. लिमिटेड ब्लाक नंबर-1485, गाँव मोती बोयन, अरविंद इंटरनेशनल के सामने, खतराज कलोल रोड, ता कलोल (उत्तर गुजरात), गांधीनगर 382721	टैक्सटाईलस - हार्ड डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलोग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	.	.	2014
46	7200039808	29/02/2016	रत्नाकर गोल्ड 45, साकडी शेरी नाका, मानेक चौक, अहमदाबाद 380001	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
47	7200039097	29/02/2016	प्रायोशा इलैक्ट्रिकलस 11 बी तथा 33 रवि इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, गुजरात बाटलिंग रोड, मनीयार टेलर के सामने, रखियाल, अहमदाबाद 380023	इंडक्शन मोटर्स -एनर्जी एफिशेंट श्री फेस, सकवीरल केज	12615	.	.	2011
48	7200039198	29/02/2016	प्रायोशा इलैक्ट्रिकलस 11 बी तथा 33 रवि इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, गुजरात बाटलिंग रोड, मनीयार टेलर के सामने, रखियाल, अहमदाबाद 380023	सिंगल फेस स्माल ए सी तथा यूनिवर्सल इलैक्ट्रिक मोटर्स	996	.	.	2009

[सं. सीएमडी/13 : 11]

डॉ. राजीव किशोर झा, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख

New Delhi, the 21st July, 2016

S.O. 1710.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (5) of the regulation 4 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies the grant of licences particulars of which are given in the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name & Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
1	7200035695	01/02/2016	SKY BEVERAGES 17, AMAR ESTATE, ANIL STARCH ROAD MEMCO, AHMEDABAD 380025	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
2	7200034491	01/02/2016	R.R.B. BEVERAGES PVT. LTD. BLOCK NO.111, PIPODARA GIDC, TALUKA: MANGROL, SURAT 394110	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
3	7200034592	01/02/2016	JAGGERY WIRES AND CABLES PVT. LTD. PLOT No. 22, 23, SHRILAXMI VIJAY COMPOUND, OPP. PATEL ESTATE, YAMUNA MILL ROAD, VADODARA 390017	Pvc Insulated Cables	694	-	-	1990
4	7200034693	02/02/2016	JAYESH ELECLTRICALS LTD PLOT NO.47 & 48, RAMANGAMDI VILLAGE: POR, VADODARA 391243	Outdoor type three-phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
5	7200034794	02/02/2016	SUMESH ENGINEERS PVT. LTD. 504, GIDC ESTATE, WGHODIA VADODARA 391760	Outdoor type three-phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
6	7200034895	02/02/2016	HAWA ENGINEERS LTD PLOT NO.129, B/4, KASHIRAM TEXTILE MILL NAROL ROAD, AHMEDABAD 382405	Resilient seated cast iron air relief valves for water works purposes	14845	-	-	2000
7	7200034996	02/02/2016	SWAMAITRI BEVERAGES 8, MARUTIDHAM DUPLEX NEAR JALARAM SOCIETY, BEHIND DABHOI PASALAD BHAVAN, AJWA-WAGHODIA RING ROAD, VADODARA `	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name & Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
8	7200035796	04/02/2016	DEOLAX CABLES PVT. LTD. PLOT NO.139, GIDC ESTATE GOZARIA-VISNAGAR ROAD VILLAGE:GOZARIA, MEHSANA 382825	Crosslinked polyethylene insulated PVC sheathed cables	7098	1	-	1988
9	7200035897	04/02/2016	DEOLAX CABLES PVT. LTD. PLOT NO.139, GIDC ESTATE GOZARIA-VISNAGAR ROAD VILLAGE:GOZARIA, MEHSANA 382825	PVC Insulated (Heavy Duty) Electric Cables	1554	1	-	1988
10	7200035190	04/02/2016	NJA INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD. 484, GIDC INDUSTRIAL ESTATE MANJUSAR, VADODARA 391775	Outdoor type three-phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
11	7200035291	05/02/2016	AUSTIN PIPES PVT. LTD. PLOT NO.46-48,BLOCK NO.219, SAHELI COMPOUND,KARANJ, SURAT, MANDVI 394110	Unplasticized PVC pipes for potable water supplies	4985	-	-	2000
12	7200035392	05/02/2016	VRAJ PLASTIC INDUSTRIES 20,21,41,42,43, AMARNATH ESTATE OPP BANSIDHAR ROLLING MILL,NAROL AHMEDABAD 382405	Fittings for rigid non-metallic conduits	3419	-	-	1988
13	7200035493	05/02/2016	JEMS ENGINEERING UNIT-2, B-144, MARUTI INDUSTRIAL ESTATE OPP. FIRE STATION,NEAR FRUIT MARKET, NARODA ROAD, AHMEDABAD 380025	Submersible pumpsets	8034	-	-	2002
14	7200036293	05/02/2016	PRIYANKA JEWELLERS 66 RAJESHRI NAGAR CO. OP. HOUSING SOCIETY LTD. CHHAPRA NAVASARI 396445	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
15	7200036394	05/02/2016	SHREE NARAYAN JEWELLERS GALAGOTADIYA NI POLE, 3490/93/94 CHOKSI BAZAR, UMERTH ANAND 388220	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
16	7200035998	08/02/2016	NARAYAN WATER & BEVERAGES 208, GOPALCHARAN INDUSTRIAL HUB, KUNJAD-BAKROL, AHMEDABAD-INDORE 200 FEET ROAD, NEAR ODHAV RING	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name & Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
			ROAD TO KANBHA HIGHWAY, BAKROL BUJRANG, DASKROI, AHMEDABAD 382430					
17	7200036091	10/02/2016	SAIEX 1801/9, 4TH PHASE, SHREE SAI GLASS COMPOUND, GIDC ESTATE VITHAL UDYOGNAGAR ANAND 388121	Explosive atmospheres part 11 equipment protection by intrinsic safety "i"	IS/IEC 60079	11	-	2006
18	7200036192	10/02/2016	HUTCH INDIA PVT. LTD. PLOT NO.3A AND 3B, BARDOLI ROAD VILAGE: TANTI, THAIYA TEH: PALSANA, SURAT	Steel tubes for mechanical and general engineering purposes	3601	-	-	2006
19	7200036495	11/02/2016	BHOOMI PRECAST ARTICLES AT. DATARPURA, CANAL ROAD NEAR NIRMA, P O LAMDAPURA SAVLI, VADODARA 391775	Precast concrete manhole cover and frame -	12592	-	-	2002
20	7200036596	11/02/2016	ALFA TRANSFORMERS LTD 1046-1048 GIDC ESTATE, WAGHODIA VADODARA 391760	Outdoor type three- phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
21	7200036697	11/02/2016	POLYCAB WIRES PVT. LTD. 67-72 NURPURA, TALUKA- HALOL, DIST PANCHMAHALHALOL 389350	Cross-linked polyethylene insulated thermoplastic sheathed cables	7098	3	-	1993
22	7200036798	12/02/2016	COOL WINGS 161-2-3 RAMDEV ESTATE MEAR SHAHWADI BUS STOP (STAND) NAROL, AHMEDABAD 382405	Self-contained drinking water coolers	1475	1	-	2001
23	7200036903	12/02/2016	A B BEVERAGES 26. RAJAK MASTERNI CHALI OPP. NAVRANG FLAT, OPP. BHID BHANJAN HANUMAN MANDIR, BAPUNAGAR AHMEDABAD 380024	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
24	7200037093	15/02/2016	ANTARNAD JEWELLERS 4/3/26, DHOBIVAD, V P ROAD VALSAD 396001	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
25	7200037194	15/02/2016	ANJALI JEWELLERS DUKAN NO.5, SARDAR MEMORIUM MARKET AZAD CHOWK, VALSAD 396001	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
26	7200036899	15/02/2016	GUJARAT RAFFIA INDUSTRIES LTD,	Textiles - high density polyethylene (hdpe)/	16208	-	-	2015

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name & Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
			455, SANTEJ VADSAR ROAD, SANTEJ, TALUKA KALOL GANDHINAGAR 382721	polypropylene (pp) woven sacks for packaging 10 kg, 15 kg, 20 kg, 25 kg and 30 kg foodgrains -				
27	7200038705	16/02/2016	UNIQUE ELECTRODES PLOT NO.1/B, NEAR OCTROI NAKA, MODASA ROAD, GIDC ESTATE KAPADWANJ, KHEDA 387620	Covered electrodes for manual metal arc welding of carbon and carbon manganese steel	814	-	-	2004
28	7200037295	17/02/2016	DEVIKA ART JEWELLERY 9/13/67, SONI WADO, NEAR KRISHNA CINEMA OPP DADUPANTH NI KHADKI, PATAN, PATAN 384265	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
29	7200037396	17/02/2016	RADHA KRISHNA JEWELLERS 6 PATIDARIN COMPLEX 3174, OPP: SARDAR HOSPITAL BARDOLI, SURAT-394601	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
30	7200037699	18/02/2016	KRUPALI JEWELLERS FATEHPURA CHAR RASTA, NEAR MAHADEV TEMPLE FATEHPURA, VADODARA 390006	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
31	7200037497	19/02/2016	GOPALA POLYPLAST LTD PLOT NO.485, SANTEJ-VADSAR ROAD SANTEJ, TAL: KALOL, GANDHINAGAR SANTEJ 382721	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacksfor packaging of 50 kg food grains —	14887	-	-	2014
32	7200037598	19/02/2016	G J BEVERAGES SURVEY NO. 37/3, PLOT NO.2 OPP ARIHANT DAL MELL DAHOD, DELSAR 389151	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
33	7200037703	22/02/2016	METAL FASS INC 79-B, NARMADA UDYOG NAGAR, BHOLAV, BEHIND HOTEL RANG INN, BHARUCH 392015	Drums, large, fixed ends, part 2 grade b drums	1783	2	-	2014
34	7200038604	22/02/2016	METAL FASS INC 79-B, NARMADA UDYOG NAGAR, BHOLAV, BEHIND HOTEL RANG INN, BHARUCH 392015	Drums, large, fixed ends part 1 grade a drums	1783	1	-	2014

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name & Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
35	7200038196	22/02/2016	VAIBHAVI INDUSTRIES 58-59, AT: PARVATA, VILL: PARVTA UMRETH, ANAND 388220	Wooden flush door shutters (solid core type)	2202	1	-	1999
36	7200038095	23/02/2016	VAIBHAVI INDUSTRIES 58-59, AT: PARVATA, VILL: PARVTA UMRETH, ANAND 388220	Block boards	1659	-	-	2004
37	7200037804	24/02/2016	HI TECH PIPES LIMITED E-6, GIDC, PHASE-II, ROAD-F SANAND, AHMEDABAD 382170	Steel tubes for structural purposes	1161	-	-	2014
38	7200038297	24/02/2016	MARUTIKRUPA JEWELLERS 4412, PADAV DAHOD 389151	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
39	7200038398	25/02/2016	SHUBHAM TEX O PACK PVT. LTD. PLOT NO.554, VADSAR- KHATRAJ ROAD, VILL:VADSAR,TALUKA- KALOL, GANDHINAGAR 382721	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacks for packaging of 50 kg food grains —	14887	-	-	2014
40	7200038499	25/02/2016	MMT POLYPACKS PVT. LTD. BLOCK No. 1644/4, VILL MOTI BHOYAN TAL KALOL, GANDHINAGAR 382721	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacksfor packaging of 50 kg food grains —	14887	-	-	2014
41	7200039505	25/02/2016	CHEMET CHEMICALS PVT. LTD. PLOT NO.6230/6231/6215, GIDC ESTATE, BHARUCH, ANKLESHWAR 393002	Pesticide - deltamethrin wp	13457	-	-	1992
42	7200037905	25/02/2016	VAIBHAVI INDUSTRIES 58-59, AT: PARVATA, VILL: PARVTA UMRETH, ANAND 388220	Plywood for general purposes	303	-	-	1989
43	7200038806	25/02/2016	JAY BHUVNESHWARI JEWELLERS IST FLOOR, 37, 38 , SIDDHESHWARI SOC., DABHOLI CHAR RASTA, VED ROAD SURAT 395004	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
44	7200038907	25/02/2016	SONI YOGESHBHAI CHAMPAKLAL HOUSE NO 2710, OPP: BHILADWALA BANK PARSI STREET, KILAPARDI, VALSAD 396125	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
45	7200038503	26/02/2016	MAYUR WOVENS PVT. LTD. BLOCK NO.1485, VILLAGE: MOTI BHOYAN,	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) /	14887	-	-	2014

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name & Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
			OPP.ARVIND INTERNATIONAL, KHATREJ- KALOL ROAD, TAL: KALOL(N.G) GANDHINAGAR 382721	polypropylene (pp) woven sacksfor packaging of 50 kg food grains —				
46	7200039808	29/02/2016	RATNAKAR GOLD 45,SAKADI SHERI NAKA MANEK CHOWK, AHMEDABAD 380001	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
47	7200039097	29/02/2016	PRAYOSHA ELECTRICALS 11 B & 33 RAVI INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, GUJARAT BOTTLING ROAD, OPP MANIYAR TAILOR, RAKHIAL, AHMEDABAD 380023	Induction motors - energy efficient, three- phase, squirrel cage -	12615	-	-	2011
48	7200039198	29/02/2016	PRAYOSHA ELECTRICALS 11 B & 33 RAVI INDUSTRIAL ESTATE GUJARAT BOTTLING ROAD, OPP MANIYAR TAILOR, RAKHIAL, AHMEDABAD 380023	Single-phase small ac and universal electric motors	996	-	-	2009

[No. CMD/13 : 11]

Dr. RAJIV KISHORE JHA, Scientist 'F' and Head

नई दिल्ली 21 जुलाई, 2016

का.आ. 1711.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के विनियम (5) के उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि निम्न विवरण वाले लाइसेंसों को उनके आगे दर्शायी गई तारीख से रद्द/स्थगित कर दिया गया है:—

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस सीएम/एल—	संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	लाइसेंस के अंतर्गत वस्तु/प्रक्रम सम्बंध भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	रद्द करने की तिथि
			कोई नहीं		

[सं. सीएमडी/13:13]

डॉ. राजीव किशोर झा, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख

New Delhi, the 21st July, 2016

S.O. 1711.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of the regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies that the licences particulars of which are given below have been cancelled with effect from the date indicated against each:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No. CM/L-	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process with relevant Indian Standards covered by the licence cancelled	Date of Cancellation
---------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---	----------------------

		NIL		
--	--	-----	--	--

[No. CMD/13:13]

Dr. RAJIV KISHORE JHA, Scientist 'F' and Head

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 2016

का. आ. 1712.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (5) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, वे स्वीकृत कर दिए गए हैं :-

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
1	7200039299	01/03/2016	गुरुकृपा वायर नैटिंग इंडस्ट्रीज 17/18, जी आई डी सी एसटेड, नडियाड कैमवे रोड, आनंद, पेटलाड 388450	वैलडिड स्टील वायर फैब्रिक फार जनरल यूस	4948	.	.	2002
2	7200039303	03/03/2016	वैस्ट्रन इलेक्ट्रोड्रांस प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, 11, सिरामिक कंपाउंड, सांकारडा, बडोदरा 391350	आउटडोर टाईप श्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफार्मर	1180	1	.	2014
3	7200039404	04/03/2016	सत्वा ईरीटैक 64, नागेश्वर एसटेड, जवाहर नगर के सामने भागीरथ एसटेड के पास, अमराईवाडी, अहमदाबाद 380026	फर्टिलाइजर तथा कैमिकल इंजेक्टर सिस्टम	14483	1	.	1997
4	7200039606	04/03/2016	साई आशीष वाटर सपलायर, शॉप नंबर 2 और 3, हरिहर अपार्टमेंट, पारस सोसाइटी के सामने, वाघोडिया के पीछे, आ टी ओ, बडोदरा 390019	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
5	7200039707	04/03/2016	कुबेर जवैलर्स 235/1, पारावाडी बाजार, मेन रोड, कलोल पंचमहल 389330	स्वर्ण तथा स्वर्ण धातुओं के आभूषणों शिल्पकारी शुद्धता एवं मुहरांकन	1417	.	.	1999
6	7200039909	10/03/2016	योको स्टोन काटिनेंटल लिमिटेड, सर्वे नंबर 785 पी, कोठ, बागोदरा तारापुर रोड, आरनेज गाँव के पास, अहमदाबाद	आटोमोटिव विहीकल- ट्यूबस फार न्यूमैटिक टायर	13098	.	.	2012
7	7200040082	10/03/2016	मार्डन लैमिनेटर्स लिमिटेड ब्लाक नंबर 273, हाजीपुर गाँव ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721	टैक्सटाईलस - हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलाग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	.	.	2014
8	7200040486	10/03/2016	अहमदाबाद स्ट्राईपस प्रा. लिमिटेड	स्टील पाईपस फार वाटर तथा सिवेज	3589	.	.	2001

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			(टयूब डिविजन) प्लॉट नंबर .49, पैकी -4-5-6-7, ओलम्पिक लैमिनेटड के पास, गाँव कारोली, ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721					
9	7200040587	10/03/2016	अहमदाबाद स्ट्राईपस प्रा. लिमिटेड (टयूब डिविजन) प्लॉट नंबर - 49, पैकी -4-5-6-7, ओलम्पिक लैमिनेटड के पास, गाँव कारोली, ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721	स्टील टयूबस फार मकैनिकल तथा जनरल इंजिनियरिंग परपस	3601	.	.	2006
10	7200040183	11/03/2016	यूनिवर्सल बिबरेजिस टैनामेंट नंबर.17-बी-91-5687-1- 001, 5687 जे पी नगर स्कूल के सामने, अंकुर सोसाइटी के पास सूरत	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
11	7200040284	11/03/2016	एस के पी ट्रांसफार्मर्स प्लॉट नंबर 519 अंकुर आयल मिल के सामने गाँव रकनपुर, ता कलोल, गांधीनगर 382721	आउटडोर टाईप ग्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफार्मर	1180	1	.	2014
12	7200040385	11/03/2016	प्लैटिनम टाईअप प्रा. लिमिटेड ब्लाक नंबर 214, सोखली गाँव, ता विरमगाम अहमदाबाद 382150	टैक्सटाईलस – हाई डेंसिटी पॉलीथलीन (एच डी पी ई) /पालीप्रापलिन (पी पी) बोवन सैक फार पैकेजिंग आफ 50 किलाग्राम फुडग्रेन	14887	.	.	2014
13	7200041892	11/03/2016	स्पैन इंटरमिडियेट प्रा. लिमिटेड प्लॉट नंबर 1735, तीसरा फेस, जी आई डी सी, बापी, बलसाद 396195	सोलवेंट सिमेंट फार यूस विद अनप्लास्टिसाईजड पालीविनाईल क्लोराइड प्लास्टिक पाईप तथा फिटिंग	14182	.	.	1994
14	7200040688	17/03/2016	वीर प्लास्टिक्स प्रा. लिमिटेड ब्लाक नंबर - 327, सांतेज वडसर रोड, सांतेज ता कलोल गांधीनगर	टैक्सटाईल तारपोलिन मेड फ्राम हाई डेंसिटी पालीथलीन बोवन फैब्रिक	7903	.	.	2011
15	7200040789	17/03/2016	रोयल पोली प्लास्ट ब्लाक नंबर 830 प्लॉट नंबर 11, गाँव धुंधर गाँव	हाई डेंसिटी पालीथलीन पाईपस फार पोटेबल वाटर सम्लाईस	4984	.	.	1995

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			साबरकांठा, हिममतनगर 383001					
16	7200040890	17/03/2016	श्रीजी आईस तथा मिनरल आर ओ वाटर एट जेतपुर, पी ओ दूधिया ता लिमखेडा दाहोद 389146	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
17	7200040991	17/03/2016	एनबी ई मोटर्स प्रा. लिमिटेड 1-7, तिरुपति एसटेट बांबे हाउसिंग के सामने, मिलन सिनेमा रोड, सरसपुर, अहमदाबाद	एक्सप्लोसिव एटमासफियर्स पार्ट 1 इक्यूपमेंट प्रोटैक्शन बाय फलेमप्रुफ एनकलोसरर्स " डी "	आई एस/आई ई सी 60079	1	.	2007
18	7200041084	17/03/2016	डी आई पम्पस 76, तिरुपति एसटेट, अंबर सिनेमा के पीछे, मनसा की मस्जिद के पास बापूनगर अहमदाबाद 380024	सबमर्सिबल पम्पसेट	8034	.	.	2002
19	7200041185	17/03/2016	लिब्रो इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लिमिटेड 332,333,334, शिव भक्ति इंड, पालसाना सूरत गुजरात 394305	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
20	7200041286	18/03/2016	श्री गण गणपतये विवरेजिस सर्वे नंबर 16, टैनामेंट नंबर 27ए - 11-0471-0-001, प्लॉट नंबर -13 ग्राउंड फ्लोर + पहली मंजिल, आशियाड सोसाइटी, यू एम रोड, उधना गॉव सूरत 394210	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
21	7200041387	21/03/2016	श्री साई विवरेजिस सर्वे नंबर - 7, प्लॉट नंबर - 1, पैकी 54 से 57, (ग्राउंड फ्लोर) हरिपार्थ प्लाजा, फाटकवाडी टंकी, वेद रोड, सूरत 395004	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
22	7200041488	21/03/2016	आदर्श प्लांट प्राटैक्ट लिमिटेड 604, जी आई डी सी, आनंद, विठ्ठल उद्योगनगर 388121	सालिड बाओ मास चूल्हा	13152	1	.	1991
23	7200041589	21/03/2016	डॉके टेक्नोलॉजिस्ट्री प्रा. लिमिटेड 244/8, जी आई डी सी इंडस्ट्रियल एसटेट वाघोडिया, वडोदरा 391760	आउटडोर टाईप श्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफारमर	1180	1	.	2014
24	7200041690	21/03/2016	डॉके इलैक्ट्रिकलस लिमिटेड 776-778, जी आई डी सी	आउटडोर टाईप श्री फेस डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ट्रांसफारमर	1180	1	.	2014

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने की तिथि वर्ष/ माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	भा मा संख्या	भाग	अनु	वर्ष
			इंडस्ट्रियल एसटेट बाघोडिया, बडोदरा 391760					
25	7200041791	23/03/2016	कृष्णा इंजिनियर्स 10, आशुतोष एसटेट, जाक (देहगाम) गांधीनगर 382305	सबमर्सिबल पम्पसेट	8034	.	.	2002
26	7200041993	23/03/2016	वनस बिबरेजिस प्लॉट नंबर - 22-23, खेडियार एसटेट, हंसापुर बस स्टैंड के सामने, दूधसागर डेरी के पास, उंझा रोड, पाटन 394265	पैकेजबंद पेयजल (अदर दैन पैकेजड नेचुरल मिनरल वाटर)	14543	.	.	2004
27	7200042086	29/03/2016	ट्रांसपैक सिलॉक्स इंडस्ट्री प्रा. लिमिटेड कलाली रोड, एटलाडरा, बडोदरा 390012	सोडियम फारमलडीहाइड सल्फाक्सिलेट	4505	.	.	2015
28	7200042187	30/03/2016	वैलड्रीप पोलीप्लास्ट, शैड नंबर 61, अभिषेक एसटेट, अरिहंत एसटेट के सामने, गिरनार स्कूटर कंपाउंड, ओढव, अहमदाबाद 382415	ईरीगेशन इक्यूपमेंट – रोटेटिंग स्प्रिंकलर	12232	1	.	1996
29	7200042591	30/03/2016	अहमदाबाद स्ट्राईपस प्रा. लिमिटेड (टयूब डिविजन) प्लॉट नंबर .62, खातरेज चौकडी के पास, कलोल, सानंद हाइवे, खातरेज, कलोल 382721	कोल्ड रोलड लो कार्बन स्टील शीट्स तथा स्ट्राईपस	513	.	.	2008
30	7200042692	30/03/2016	अहमदाबाद स्ट्राईपस प्रा. लिमिटेड (टयूब डिविजन) प्लॉट नंबर - 62, खातरेज चौकडी के पास, कलोल, सानंद हाइवे, खातरेज, कलोल 382721	हॉट रोलड कार्बन स्टील शीट्स तथा स्ट्राईपस	1079	.	.	2009

[सं. सी एम डी/13:11]

डॉ. राजीव किशोर झा, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख

New Delhi, the 21st July, 2016

S.O. 1712.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (5) of the regulation 4 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies the grant of licences particulars of which are given in the following Schedule:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name and Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
1	7200039299	01/03/2016	GURUKRUPA WIRE NETTING INDUSTRIES 17/18, GIDC ESTATE, NADIAD CAMBAY ROAD, ANAND, PETLAD 388450	Welded steel wire fabric for general use	4948	-	-	2002
2	7200039303	03/03/2016	WESTERN ELECTROTRANS PRIVATE LIMITED 11, CERAMIC COMPOUND, SANKARDA VADODARA 391350	Outdoor type three-phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
3	7200039404	04/03/2016	SATVA IRRITECH 64, NAGESHWAR ESTATE, OPP. JAWAHAR NAGAR, NEAR BHAGIRATH ESTATE, AMRAIWADI, AHMEDABAD 380026	Fertilizer and chemical injector system	14483	1	-	1997
4	7200039606	04/03/2016	SAI ASHISH WATER SUPPLIERS SHOP NO.2 & 3, HARIHAR APARTMENT OPP. PARAS SOCIETY, BEHIND WAGHODIA R.T.O., VADODARA 390019	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
5	7200039707	04/03/2016	KUBER JEWELLERS 235/1, PARAVADI BAZAR, MAIN ROAD, KALOL PANCHMAHAL 389330	Gold and gold alloys, jewellery/artefacts - fineness and marking -	1417	-	-	1999
6	7200039909	10/03/2016	YOKOSTONE CONTINENTAL LIMITED SURVEY NO. 785P, KOTH, BAGODRA TARAPUR ROAD, NEAR ARNEJ VILLAGE, AHMEDABAD	Automotive vehicles - tubes for pneumatic tyres -	13098	-	-	2012
7	7200040082	10/03/2016	MODERN LAMINATORS LTD BLOCK NO.273, HAJIPUR VILLAGE TA KALOL,	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacks for	14887	-	-	2014

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name and Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
			GANDHINAGAR 382721	packaging of 50 kg food grains —				
8	7200040486	10/03/2016	AHMEDABAD STRIPS PVT. LTD. (TUBE DIV) PLOT NO.49, PAIKI-4-5-6-7, NEAR OLYMPIC LAMINTES, VILLAGE: KAROLI TALUKA: KALOL, GANDHINAGAR 382721	Steel pipes for water and sewage	3589	-	-	2001
9	7200040587	10/03/2016	AHMEDABAD STRIPS PVT. LTD. (TUBE DIV) PLOT NO.49, PAIKI-4-5-6-7,NEAR OLYMPIC LAMINTES, VILLAGE: KAROLI TALUKA: KALOL, GANDHINAGAR 382721	Steel tubes for mechanical and general engineering purposes	3601	-	-	2006
10	7200040183	11/03/2016	UNIVERSAL BEVERAGES TENEMENT NO.17-B-91- 5687-1-001, 5687 J P NAGAR OPP. SCHOOL NEAR ANKUR SOCIETY VILLAGE: SURAT	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
11	7200040284	11/03/2016	SKP TRANSFORMERS PLOT No.519 OPP.ANKUR OIL MILL AT.VILLAGE: RAKANPUR TAL: KALOL Gandhinagar RAKANPUR Gujarat 382721	Outdoor type three- phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
12	7200040385	11/03/2016	PLATINIUM TIE-UP PVT. LTD. BLOCK NO.214, SOKHLI VILLAGE TA: VIRAMGAM Ahmedabad Gujarat 382150	Textiles — high density polyethylene (hdpe) / polypropylene (pp) woven sacksfor packaging of 50 kg food grains	14887	-	-	2014
13	7200041892	11/03/2016	SPAN INTERMEDIATES PVT. LTD. PLOT NO. 1735, IIIRD PHASE, GIDC, VAPI VALSAD 396195	Solvent cement for use with unplasticized polyvinylchloride plastic pipe and fittings	14182	-	-	1994
14	7200040688	17/03/2016	VEER PLASTICS PVT. LTD. BLOCK NO.327, SANTEJ VADSAR ROAD SANTEJ, TAL KALOL DISTT GANDHINAGAR	Textiles-tarpaulins made from high density polyethylene woven fabric	7903	-	-	2011
15	7200040789	17/03/2016	ROYAL POLY PLAST BLOCK NO. 830 PLOT NO 11, AT VILLAGE DHUNDHAR SABARKANTHA HIMATNAGAR Gujarat	High density polyethylene pipes for potable water supplies	4984	-	-	1995

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name and Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
			383001					
16	7200040890	17/03/2016	SHREEJI ICE & MINERAL RO WATER AT: JETPUR P O DUDHIYA TAL: LIMKHEDA DAHOD Gujarat 389146	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
17	7200040991	17/03/2016	NBE MOTORS PVT. LTD. 1-7, TIRUPATI ESTATE OPP.BOMBAY HOUSING, MILAN CINEMA ROAD, SARASPUR, Ahmedabad	Explosive atmospheres part 1 equipment protection by flameproof enclosures "d	IS/IEC 60079	1	-	2007
18	7200041084	17/03/2016	D I PUMPS 76, TIRUPATI ESTATE BEHIND AMBER CINEMA NR MANSA NI MASJID BAPUNAGAR Ahmedabad Gujarat 380024	Submersible pumpsets	8034	-	-	2002
19	7200041185	17/03/2016	LIBERO INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD. 332,333,334, SHIV BHAKTI IND PALSANA Surat Gujarat 394305	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
20	7200041286	18/03/2016	SHREE GAN GANPATAYE BEVERAGES SURVEY NO.16, TENEMENT NO.27A-11-0471-0-001, PLOT NO.13 GROUND FLOOR + FIRST FLOOR ASHIYAD SOCIETY U M ROAD UDHANA VILLAGE: SURAT CITY Surat Gujarat 394210	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
21	7200041387	21/03/2016	SHREE SAI BEVERAGES SURVEY NO.7, PLOT NO.1, PAIKY 54 TO 57, (GROUND FLOOR) HARIPARTH PLAZA, FATAKDWADI TUNKI, VED ROAD, Surat Gujarat 395004	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
22	7200041488	21/03/2016	ADARSH PLANT PROTECT LIMITED 604, GIDC ESTATE ANAND VITHAL UDYOGNAGAR Gujarat 388121	Solid bio-mass chulha	13152	1	-	1991
23	7200041589	21/03/2016	DANKE TECHNOELECTRO PVT. LTD. 244/8, GIDC INDL ESTATE WAGHODIA VADODARA Gujarat 391760	Outdoor type three-phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
24	7200041690	21/03/2016	DANKE ELECTRICALS LTD 776-778, GIDC INDL ESTATE WAGHODIA VADODARA Gujarat 391760	Outdoor type three-phase distribution transformers	1180	1	-	2014
25	7200041791	23/03/2016	KRISHNA ENGINEERS 10, ASHUTOSH ESTATE ZAK(DEHGAM) GANDHINAGAR ZAK Gujarat 382305	Submersible pumpsets	8034	-	-	2002

Sl. No.	Licences No.	Grant Date	Name and Address of the party	Title of the Standard	IS No.	Part	Sec	Year
26	7200041993	23/03/2016	BANAS BEVERAGES PLOT NO.22-23, KHODIYAR ESTATE, OPP.HUNSAPUR BUS STAND, NEAR DUDHSAGAR DAIRY UNJHA ROAD PATAN Gujarat 394265	Packaged drinking water (other than packaged natural mineral water)	14543	-	-	2004
27	7200042086	29/03/2016	TRANSPEK SILOX INDUSTRY PVT. LTD. KALALI ROAD, ATLADARA VADODARA Gujarat 390012	Sodium formaldehyde sulphonylate	4505	-	-	2015
28	7200042187	30/03/2016	WELLDRIIP POLYPLAST SHED NO.61, ABHISHEK ESTATE, OPP. ARIHANT ESTATE, GIRNAR SCOOTER COMPOUND, ODHAV AHMEDABAD GUJARAT 382415	Irrigation equipment - rotating sprinkler	12232	1	-	1996
29	7200042591	30/03/2016	AHMEDABAD STRIPS P LTD PLOT NO.62, NEAR KHATREJ CHOKADI KALOL, SANAND HIGHWAY KHATREJ-KALOL KHATRAJ Gujarat 382721	Cold-rolled low carbon steel sheets and strips	513	-	-	2008
30	7200042692	30/03/2016	AHMEDABAD STRIPS P LTD PLOT NO.62, NEAR KHATREJ CHOKADI KALOL, SANAND HIGHWAY KHATREJ-KALOL KHATRAJ Gujarat 382721	Hot rolled carbon steel sheets and strips	1079	-	-	2009

[No. CMD/13:11]

Dr. RAJIV KISHORE JHA, Scientist 'F' and Head

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 2016

का.आ. 1713.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के विनियम (5) के उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि निम्न विवरण वाले लाइसेंसों को उनके आगे दर्शायी गई तारीख से रद्द / स्थगित कर दिया गया है :

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	लाइसेंस के अंतर्गत वस्तु / प्रक्रम सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	रद्द करने की तिथि
	सीएम/एल-	कोई नहीं		

[सं. सी एम डी/13:13]

डॉ. राजीव किशोर झा, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख

New Delhi, the 21st July, 2016

S.O. 1713.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of the regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies that the licences particulars of which are given below have been cancelled with effect from the date indicated against each:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No. CM/L-	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process with relevant Indian Standards covered by the licence cancelled	Date of Cancellation
		NIL		

[No. CMD/13:13]

Dr. RAJIV KISHORE JHA, Scientist 'F' and Head

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1714.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स सोनार स्टोन क्वारी के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 60/2012) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/29/2010-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1714.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 60/2012) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Sonar Stone Quarry and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-29012/29/2010-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD****Present :**

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 14th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 60/2012

Shri Mafatlal Ambalal Patel,
Owner, M/s Sonar Stone Quarry,
Surat Songadh Highway, Songadh, Distt. Tapi

...First Party

V/s

Shri Bhangiyabhai Bilabhai Gamit,
Nishal Falia, Vill. Kumkuwa,
PO Kumkuwa, Tal. Songadh, Distt.- Tapi

...Second Party

For the First Party : None

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-29012/29/2010-IR (M) dated 24.01.2012 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of M/S Sonar Stone Quarry, Tapi, in terminating the services of the workman Shri Bhangiyabhai Bilabhai Gamit, Watchman w.e.f. 15.11.2009 without notice & retrenchment compensation and also not reinstating him to the service with full back wages and other benefits, is legal, proper and just? What relief the workman is entitled to?”

1. The reference dates back to 24.01.2012. Both the parties were served to registered post on 10.05.2012 but since then the second party has been absent and did not respond to the notice sent to him and has also not file the statement of claim. Thus, it appears that the second party has not been intending to prosecute the case.

2. Thus, the case is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1715.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ओ. एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड एवं अन्य के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 130/2012) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/40/2012-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1715.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 130/2012) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. ONGC Ltd. And Others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-30011/40/2012-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 13th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 130/2012

1. The Asset Manager,
ONGC Ltd., Hazira, Surat.
2. M/s Demi Engineering,
C/o Asset Manager, ONGC Ltd., Hazira,
Surat

...First Party

V/s

The Secretary,
Surat Jilla Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh,
B/206, Capital Complex, Beside Pratik Row House,
Hany Park Road, Adajan, Surat

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri K.V. Gadhia Associates

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-30011/40/2012-IR (M) dated 30.08.2012 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the Union for regularization of services of S/Shri (1) Patel Anil M. (2) Patel Mahendra B. (3) Patel Harshad N. (4) Patel Vinay S. (5) Patel Bharat C. (6) Patel Manish C. (7) N. Madhukumar (8) Patel Rajnish V. (9) Rathod Chhиту K. (10) Ramesh Prasad (11) Vinod Prasad (12) Patel Rajesh V. & (13) Rathod Nathu in the establishment of ONGC Ltd. is legal and justified? What relief the workmen are entitled to?”

1. The reference dates back to 30.08.2012. Both the parties were served by registered post. Advocate Shri K.V. Gadhia Associates has been representing the first party but despite sending notices twice to the second party, the second party did not appear and also fail to submit the statement of claim even after a lapse of 4 years. Thus, it appears that second party has no willingness to prosecute the case.

2. Thus, the case is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1716.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स लाईफ इंश्योरेंस कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 161/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-17012/13/2006-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1716.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 161/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. LIC of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-17012/13/2006-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD**

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 19th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 161/2006

The Senior Divisional Manager,
LIC of India,
Nadia Divisional Office, Post Box No. 57,
Nadiad (Gujarat) – 387001

...First Party

V/s

The General Secretary,
General Workmen's Union,
Sinduri Mata Devasthan, ST Nagar Road,
Godhra (Gujarat) – 389001

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri Ambalal F. Patel
 For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-17012/13/2006-IR (M) dated 23.08.2006 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of LIC of India by terminating the services of Shri Rambhai Prembhai Bhamanla, Development Officer, w.e.f. 01.03.2002 is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to and to what extent?”

1. The reference dates back to 23.08.2006. Both the parties are served with registered post. Second party submitted the statement of claim Ext. 5 on 19.04.2007. The first party submitted the written statement Ext. 12 on 29.04.2009. Since then the second party has been absent and has failed to lead his evidence. Thus, it appears that the second party is not intending to prosecute the case.
2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in default of the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1717.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ओ. एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड एवं अन्य के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 25/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/3/2016-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1717.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 25/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. ONGC Ltd. and Others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-30025/3/2016-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
 Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
 Ahmedabad,
 Dated 12th July, 2016

Complaint : (CGITA) No. 25/2004

Shri Pasabhai Nathabhai Senva,
 C/o Gujarat Petroleum Employees Union,
 Ahmedabad (Gujarat)

... Complainant

V/s

1. ONGC Ltd.,
 Sabarmati, Ahmedabad.

2. Parishram Labour Co-operative society Ltd.,
Shahibagh, Ahmedabad

...Respondent

For the Complainant : Shri A.L. Saiyad

For the Respondent : Shri C.S. Naidu

This is a complaint under Section 33 (a) of Industrial Dispute Acts, moved by the complainant on 13.10.2000. After service, opposition party ONGC filed the written statement Ext. 19 on 01.04.2003 and opposite party no. 2 Parishram Labour Co-operative Society despite service did not file the written statement. The case was proceeded ex parte against opposite party no. 2 but the complainant has been absent since last several dates and has also failed to lead evidence. Thus, it appears that the complainant has no inclination to prosecute the case.

Thus, the case is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the complainant.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1718.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स एम. एम.टी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध निर्यातकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 1177/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/3/2001-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1718.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1177/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. MMTC Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-29011/3/2001-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 13th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 1177/2004

1. The Chairman-cum-Managing Director,
M/s MMTC Ltd. Core I, Scope Complex,
7, Institutional Area, Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110003.
2. The General Manager(P),
M/s MMTC Ltd. Core I, Scope Complex,
7, Institutional Area, Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110003.
3. The Senior Manager,
M/s MMTC Ltd., D-12, Sector NU – 10/B,
Shaktinagar, Gandhidham,
(Kutch) – 370201.

...First Party

V/s

The Regional Secretary,
MMTC Workers Association, Ganesh Building, Ward 12-C,
Plot No. – 592, Gandhidham (Kutch)

...Second Party

For the First Party : Mr. Amarnath M. Bhatt

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-29011/3/2001-IR (M) dated 10.05.2001 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the MMTC Workers Association Gandhidham for transfer of 9 workers as per the list enclosed from Gandhidham to MICA Unit, Chandwara/ Giridih (Bihar) as there is no work available of Mica or related to it at Gandhidham (Gujarat), is just, valid and legal? If so, to what benefits the workmen are entitled for and what directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 10.05.2001. The first party submitted the vakalatpatra Ext. 6 and 12 on 18.06.2009 and 11.06.2012 respectively. The second party submitted the statement of claim on 06.06.2001 and first party submitted the written statement Ext. 4 on 16.09.2002. But since then second party has not been present and has also not lead his evidence despite giving dozens of opportunities even in his absence. Thus, in the said circumstances, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the reference as not pressed and in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1719.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ओ. एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड एवं अन्य के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 1303/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/65/2000-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1719.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1303/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. ONGC Ltd. and Others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-30012/65/2000-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD**

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 18th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 1303/2004

1. The Group General Manager (P),
ONGC Ltd.,
Hazira Project, P.O. Bhatpore,
Surat (Gujarat) – 394518.
2. M/s Sagar Construction,
Near Tapi Bridge, Tax Plaza, Kagdaila ONGC Road,
Surat (Gujarat) – 394518

...First Party

V/s

Shri Naresh V. Patel,
At.Bhatpur,
Taluka Choryasi, Surat (Gujarat)

...Second Party

For the First Party : None

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-30012/65/2000-IR (M) dated 05.07.2000 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the contract between the management of ONGC Ltd., Surat and the Contractor M/s Sagar Construction in respect of the contractual workman Shri Naresh V. Patel is sham & bogus contract?

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri Naresh V. Patel for treating/declaring him as direct and regular/permanent employee of ONGC Ltd or from the date of notification issued by Government of India, prohibiting his alleged employment/work through the contract system is legal and justified? If so, to what relief Shri Naresh V. Patel is entitled and from which date and what other directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 05.07.2000. Both the parties submitted their statement of claim Ext. 4 and written statement Ext. 8 respectively. Reference was listed for evidence of the second party but on 30.06.2016, only workman involved in the reference Shri Naresh V. Patel, moved an application Ext. 22 for withdrawal from the reference. Therefore, on 30.06.2016 the name of the aforesaid workman was deleted from the reference. He was the only workman involved in the reference. Therefore, no further action was required in the reference.

2. Hence, the reference is finally disposed of as withdrawn.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1720.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ओ. एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड एवं अन्य के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 1315/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/74/2000-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1720.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1315/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. ONGC Ltd. and Others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-30012/74/2000-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD****Present :**

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 18th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 1315/2004

1. The Group General Manager (P),
ONGC Ltd.,
Hazira Project, P.O. Bhatpore,
Surat (Gujarat) – 394518.
2. M/s Sagar Construction,
Near Tapi Bridge, Tax Plaza, Kagdaila ONGC Road,
Surat (Gujarat) – 394518

...First Party

V/s

Shri Bharat N. Patel,
At.Bhatpur,
Taluka Choryasi, Surat (Gujarat)

...Second Party

For the First Party : None

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-30012/74/2000-IR (M) dated 05.07.2000 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the contract between the management of ONGC Ltd., Surat and the Contractor M/s Sagar Construction in respect of the contractual workman Shri Bharat N. Patel is sham & bogus contract?

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri Bharat N. Patel for treating/declaring him as direct and regular/permanent employee of ONGC Ltd or from the date of notification issued by Government of India, prohibiting his alleged employment/work through the contract system is legal and justified? If so, to what relief Shri Bharat N. Patel is entitled and from which date and what other directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 05.07.2000. Both the parties submitted their statement of claim Ext. 5 and written statement Ext. 9 on 24.10.2000 and 10.04.2001 respectively.
2. On 18.07.2016, after a passing of 15 years, second party did not lead evidence and withdrew himself from the reference. Therefore, his name was deleted from the reference as the first party did not oppose the deletion of the name of the second party from the reference.
3. Thus, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the reference as not presses.
4. Thus, the reference is dismissed as not pressed.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1721.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ओ. एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड एवं अन्य के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 1316/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/67/2000-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1721.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1316/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. ONGC Ltd. and Others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-30012/67/2000-IR (M)]
SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXUE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 18th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 1316/2004

1. The Group General Manager (P),
ONGC Ltd.,
Hazira Project, P.O. Bhatpore,
Surat (Gujarat) – 394518.
 2. M/s. Sagar Construction,
Near Tapi Bridge, Tax Plaza, Kagdaila ONGC Road,
Surat (Gujarat) – 394518
- ...First Party

V/s

Shri Hasmukh M. Patel,
At. Bhatpur,
Taluka Choryasi, Surat (Gujarat)

...Second Party

For the First Party : None

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-30012/67/2000-IR (M) dated 05.07.2000 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the contract between the management of ONGC Ltd., Surat and the Contractor M/s. Sagar Construction in respect of the contractual workman Shri Hasmukh M. Patel is sham & bogus contract?

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri Hasmukh M. Patel for treating/declaring him as direct and regular/permanent employee of ONGC Ltd. or from the date of notification issued by Government of India, prohibiting his alleged employment/work through the contract system is legal and justified? If so, to what relief Shri Hasmukh M. Patel is entitled and from which date and what other directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 05.07.2000. Both the parties submitted their statement of claim Ext. 4 and written statement Ext. 10 on 24.10.2000 and 10.04.2001 respectively.
2. On 18.07.2016, after a passing of 15 years, second party did not lead evidence and withdrew himself from the reference. Therefore, his name was deleted from the reference as the first party did not oppose the deletion of the name of the second party from the reference.
3. Thus, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the reference as not presses.
4. Thus, the reference is dismissed as not pressed.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1722.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स ओ. एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड एवं अन्य के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 1350/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/2/2001-आईआर (एम)]

समीर कुमार दास, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2016

S.O. 1722.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1350/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. ONGC Ltd. and Others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 08.08.2016.

[No. L-30011/2/2001-IR (M)]

SAMIR KUMAR DAS, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD****Present :**

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,
Dated 12th July, 2016

Reference : (CGITA) No. 1350/2004

1. The Group General Manager (P),
ONGC Ltd., Hazira Project,
P.O. – Bhatpore,
Surat (Gujarat) – 394518.
2. The Ahmedabad Electricity Co. Ltd.,
Power Service Div., ONGC Ltd.,
Hazira Project, Surat (Gujarat) – 394510.
3. M/s. AJK Associates,
B/4, Kailash Apartment Opp, Dr.Sumit Shah,
Old Sharda Mandir, Eillsbridge, Ahmedabad,
Gujarat – 380006.
4. M/s. Industrial & Engineering Corp. Ltd.,
22, Dhara Centre, Vijay Char Rasta, Navrangpura,
Ahmedabad (Gujarat) – 380009

...First Part

V/s

The General Secretary,
Gujarat Working Class Union,
A – 772, Anand Ganga Kasak,
Bharuch (East), Gujarat

...Second Party

For the First Party : None

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-30011/2/2001-IR (M) dated 16.01.2001 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the Union to absorb/regularise the services of 9 contractual workmen (list enclosed) as permanent and direct employees of ONGC Ltd., Hazira Surat with time scale of pay of their category of work equivalent to their similar placed regular employees of ONGC Ltd., by declaring the Contract as ‘sham contract’ is fair and justified? If so, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to, and from which date, and what other directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 16.01.2001. The second party submitted the statement of claim Ext. 3 on 12.02.2001. The first party no. 4 M/s. Industrial & Engineering Corp. Ltd. submitted the written statement Ext. 30 on 19.04.2002 and first party no. 1 ONGC Ltd., submitted the written statement Ext. 15 on 10.09.2001. First party no. 2 and 3 did not prefer to file written statement. Second party has been absent since last several dates and has not been leading evidence. Thus, it appears that the second party has no inclination to prosecute the case.

2. Thus, the case is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1723.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सेंट्रल बोर्ड ऑफ सेकेंडरी एजुकेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट (आईडी सं. 3/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/115/97-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1723.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. No. 3/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Central Board of Secondary Education and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/115/97-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 27th July, 2016

Present : K.P. PRASANNA KUMARI, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 3/2007

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(14 of 1947), between the Management of Central Board of Secondary Education and their workman)

BETWEEN :

Sri K. Soundararajan : 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

The Joint Secretary : 2nd Party/Respondent
Central Board of Secondary Education
Plot No. 1630-A, “J” Block, Anna Nagar
Chennai-600040

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner of Union : M/s. Balan Haridas, Advocates

For the 2nd Party/Respondent : Sri G. Nagaraj, Advocate

REVISED AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour & Employment vide its Order No. L-42012/115/97-IR (DU) dated 08.01.2007 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is :

“Whether the action of the management of Central Board of Secondary Education, Chennai in terminating the services of their workman Sri K. Soundararajan w.e.f. 30.01.1995 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. On receipt of Industrial Dispute this Tribunal numbered it as ID 3/2007 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their counsel and filed claim and counter statement respectively.

3. The averments in the Claim Statement filed by the petitioner in brief are as below:

The petitioner joined the service of the Respondent as Peon at Nungambakkam on 05.08.1991. The petitioner was discharging his duties diligently and to the satisfaction of his superiors. The petitioner was transferred in the year 1994. He was paid a monthly salary of Rs. 1,333/-. The petitioner was working continuously without any break. He has completed more than 240 days of work in a calendar year. The petitioner was terminated from service by the Respondent by order dated 31.01.1995. the petitioner has raised Industrial Dispute on account of his termination. The Labour Commissioner had sent failure report as the conciliation ended in failure. However, the Ministry refused to refer the matter for adjudication. So the petitioner approached the High Court of Madras and the matter was referred to this Tribunal as decided by the Adalat held by the High Court. The termination of the service of the petitioner is illegal and is in violation of Section-25(F) of the ID Act. The petitioner was without any employment after termination. An award may be passed directing the Respondent to reinstate the petitioner in service with continuity of service and other attendant benefits.

4. The Respondent has filed Counter Statement contending as below:

The petition is not maintainable in law or sustainable on facts. The Respondent being an educational examining body the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act are not applicable to the same. The petitioner is not a workman as contemplated in the Industrial Disputes Act. It is incorrect to state that the petitioner had joined the service of the Respondent on 05.08.1991 in the Office at Nungambakkam. So also it is incorrect to state that the petitioner was transferred to Anna Nagar subsequently. In the Claim Statement itself the petitioner had admitted that he was working as casual labourer in the Office of the Respondent. The Office of the Respondent at Nungambakkam was shifted to Anna Nagar after a building was constructed for the purpose. So there was no question of transfer of the petitioner from Nungambakkam to Anna Nagar. It is incorrect to state that the petitioner was getting salary of Rs. 1,333/- per month and he had worked continuously for more than 240 days in a calendar year. The petitioner was employed on daily wage basis as and when exigency arose. He had worked with the Respondent from 05.08.1991 to 30.12.1991, from 01.01.1992 to 30.06.1992, 16.08.1992 to 30.11.1992, 01.01.1993 to 31.03.1993, 01.05.1993 to 13.06.1993, 01.08.1993 to 31.12.1993 01.01.1994 to 31.01.1994, 01.03.1994 to 15.04.1994 and from 01.05.1994 to 30.06.1994. the service of the petitioner having been utilized on daily wage basis there was no employer-employee relationship between the petitioner and the Respondent and there was no question of assigning any reason for termination or pay any compensation to the petitioner. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

5. The evidence in the case consists of oral evidence of WW1 and MW1 and documents marked as Ext. W1 to Ext. W11 and Ext. M1 to Ext. M6.

6. My predecessor has passed an award in the matter on 27.04.2011 directing the Respondent to reinstate the petitioner in service with continuity of service and other benefits but without backwages. The Respondent has filed Writ Petition No. 17419/2011 challenging this order and the Hon'ble High Court has found that the award is devoid of reasons, set aside the award and has remanded the matter to this Tribunal for fresh consideration in accordance with law. Thus the revised award is being passed.

7. **The points for consideration are:**

- (i) Whether the action of the Respondent in terminating the service of the petitioner is legal and justified?
- (ii) What, if any is the relief to which the petitioner is entitled?

The Points

8. The petitioner has claimed in the Claim Statement that he has joined the service of the Respondent on 05.08.1991. According to him he was continuously working with the Respondent and has even been transferred in the year 1994. He is said to have been terminated by the Respondent on 31.01.1995. It is alleged by him that his termination is in violation of Section-25(F) of the ID Act. He seeks an order of reinstatement in the service of the Respondent.

9. The Respondent has admitted in the Counter Statement that the petitioner had worked with it, but only as a casual labourer. There was no transfer for the petitioner at all. The Office which was at Nungambakkam has been shifted to Anna Nagar after a new building has been constructed for the Respondent. The Respondent has given in the Counter Statement the period during which the petitioner has been employed as a casual labourer. According to the Respondent, it being only a body which was conducting examinations the petitioner was employed on daily wage basis only when exigency arose. There was no need to comply with Section-25(F) of the ID Act for this reason when the petitioner was stopped from work, it is stated.

10. The Respondent has advanced a technical contention in the Counter Statement that it being the educational examining body conducting examinations for the schools affiliated with the Board for All India Secondary School Examination and All India Senior School Certificate Examination, the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act are not applicable to it and the petitioner will not come under the definition of workman as contemplated in the Industrial Disputes Act. However, the Respondent has not established that the Industrial Disputes Act is not applicable to it. Even by the admission of the Respondent that the petitioner was working as a casual labourer, the petitioner will come under the definition of "workman" as any work of manual, skilled, un-skilled, technical operational or Clerical would come under the definition of workman for the purpose of Industrial Disputes Act.

11. What exactly was the period during which the petitioner had worked in the Respondent establishment? The Respondent had given the list of period during which the petitioner had been working with it. This is seen stated in the Counter Statement which was filed before the Labour Commissioner and marked as Ext. W6 also. These periods alongwith the number of days that the petitioner had worked during each period are given probably with the intention of showing that the petitioner had not worked for more than 240 days in a calendar year, though even as admitted by the Respondent the petitioner was in the establishment from 05.08.1991 to 30.06.1994 intermittently.

12. A perusal of the documents on the side of the petitioner and that of the Respondent alongwith evidence on either side would show that enlistment of the period given in the Counter Statement is not fully correct. The case of the petitioner is that he started to work in the establishment on 05.08.1991. It is admitted in the Counter Statement itself that the petitioner started to work on 05.08.1991. The last date of employment shown in the Counter Statement is 30.06.1994. However, Ext. M6 would show that he was employed even thereafter. This states that the service of the petitioner is being terminated on 26.07.1994. As could be seen he has been working with the Respondent thereafter also as wage for the month of September 1994 also is seen paid to him on 30.09.1994. The petitioner has produced Exts.W1 to W4, different orders by which he was temporarily appointed as casual labour with the Respondent on contract basis for different periods not ranging more than 30 days. Exts.M1 to M6 are different orders of the Respondent by which the temporary appointment of the petitioner was terminated.

13. All the documents pertaining to the appointment and termination of the petitioner are not available. The documents pertaining to the appointment, if any, after 30.09.1994 are not produced at all. So there is no documentary evidence available to prove the case of the petitioner that the last date on which he was terminated from service is 30.01.1995. However, when the facts and circumstances are taken into account the case of the petitioner that he had worked in the establishment till 30.01.1995 is to be accepted. Ext. W11 produced by the petitioner persuades one to make such a conclusion. Ext. W11 is the copy of the Attendance Register for the period from September 1991 to June 1993. MW1 examined on the side of the Respondent has admitted during his cross-examination that this is the copy of the Register maintained at the Office of the Respondent. The case of MW1 is that the Attendance Register was maintained only for the purpose of calculation of wages and proof of attendance. One aspect that could be noticed from Ext. W11 is that this disproves the case of the Respondent that the petitioner was working only intermittently and that also during exigencies. On going through the enlistment of the period worked by the petitioner in the Counter Statement it could be seen that there are several gaps in the period of work. However, on going through Ext. W11 it could be seen that there was no such gap at all. The petitioner seems to have been working continuously from September 1991 till June 1993, as could be seen from this document. On most of the months the petitioner has been working throughout on all the days of the month, even on holidays which would show that there was no gap in work though several appointment orders were served on him. As seen from Ext. W1 itself the appointment on contract basis is for a period of 30 days from 01.09.1992. Immediately after expiry of this period on 30.09.1992 i.e. on 01.10.1992 another order appointing him for another 30 days is served on him. Ext. W3 states that the period of appointment is extended by another 30 days. So it is very much clear from the appointment orders, termination orders, Ext. W11 and also the admission of MW1 that the petitioner was working throughout with the Respondent, without any break even

though termination orders were being given to him periodically. There is no gap of even one day for appointment after a particular termination. When the fact that the petitioner was working continuously, as seen from Ext. W11, is taken into account there could be no doubt that the petitioner must have been working in this manner until 31.01.1995 on which date he is said to have been terminated. MW1 had admitted during his cross-examination that though the Respondent is intended for the work in connection with the two examinations referred to in the Counter Statement it was doing other works also. They were publishing text books and selling books to students. They were conducting orientation program for the Teachers. He has also admitted that they were working throughout the year. So it was not an engagement of the petitioner for intermittent period only but continuous.

14. The argument on behalf of the Respondent seems to be that the petitioner was being engaged for a specified period only on contract basis and once this period expired he was being terminated and so his engagement could not be treated to be a continuous one. This argument could not be accepted. Apparently, termination orders were intended only as a ploy. In such case, the engagement is to be treated as continuous itself.

15. In the present case the claim of the is for reinstatement on the ground that he was sent away without complying with the provisions of Section-25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no case for the Respondent that Section-25(F) was complied with. The case was that there was no necessity for the same for the reason that the petitioner was being engaged on contract basis only for specified periods. However, I have already found that the engagement was continuous in nature. Therefore, the petitioner will come within the purview of Section-25(F) of the Act.

16. The counsel for the petitioner has referred to the decision in RAJ KUMAR VS. DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION AND OTHERS reported in 2016 6 SCC 541 to fortify his argument that the petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service. In the above case, the Driver of Public School has been retrenched from service on the ground that his services were no longer required by the School. The Apex Court has found that notice was not given under Section-25(F)(c) of the Act. The Apex Court has further found that no evidence was available to show that the retrenchment of the workman has become necessary as he had become surplus. Accordingly, the Apex Court has directed that the workman should be reinstated in service with full backwages. However, the facts of the case is different from the present one in the sense that the workman was a permanent employee of the School and had put up service for several years in the School.

17. In the present case, the petitioner was being engaged as a casual labour. The total period during which he had worked in the Respondent establishment is three years and a few months. Even in such case a reinstatement could not be said to be improper in the absence of compliance with Section-25(F) of the Act. However, even if the petitioner is now reinstated in service, his period of employment and that also as a casual employee would be just for a few months if his age is taken into account. Proof of exact age of the petitioner is not available. However, as seen from his deposition which was recorded in March 2009 he was then 52 years. So he would attain the age of 60 years within a few months. The Apex Court has stated in several many cases that reinstatement is not a must in all cases of termination without complying with Section-25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act. In fit cases, where the circumstances permit, even compensation will be sufficient relief. In the circumstances I find that it is a fit case where compensation rather than reinstatement is the proper relief. Considering the facts I fix the compensation payable to the petitioner as Rs. 2.00 lakhs.

18. For the above reasons, the Respondent is directed to pay Rs. 2.00 lakhs as compensation to the petitioner, within a month of publication of the Award. If payment is not made within the time it would carry interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of the order.

The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 27th July, 2016)

K.P. PRASANNA KUMARI, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:

For the 1 st Party/Petitioner	:	WW1, Sri K. Soundararajan
For the 2 nd Party/Respondent	:	MW1, Sri R. Venkatesh

Documents Marked:

On the Petitioner's side

Ext. No.	Date	Description
Ext. W1	30.09.1992	Appointment Order
Ext. W2	01.10.1992	Appointment Order
Ext. W3	30.10.1992	Appointment Order
Ext. W4	30.11.1992	Appointment Order
Ext. W5	12.09.1996	Lodge of Complaint before Regional Labour Commissioner (C) against termination
Ext. W6	21.03.1997	The Management's Counter
Ext. W7	21.03.1997	Reply filed by the petitioner
Ext. W8	26.08.1997	Conciliation failure report
Ext. W9	Nil	Copy of the Writ Petition No. 3870/2000 with affidavit
Ext. W10	09.12.2006	recommendation of High Court through Lok Adalat directing the Ministry of Labour to refer the matter to this Tribunal
Ext. W11	1991-1992	Attendance Register

On the Management's side

Ext. No.	Date	Description
Ext. M1	16.08.1992	Copy of the appointment order appointing the petitioner on daily wages for a period of 15 days w.,e.f. 16.08.1992
Ext. M2	28.08.1992	Copy of the termination order dated 28.08.1992 which shows that his services were terminated on 31.08.1992 on completion of 15 days
Ext. M3	30.09.1992	Copy of the termination order which shows that his services were terminated
Ext. M4	09.12.1992	Copy of the termination order which shows that his services were terminated
Ext. M5	29.10.1993	Copy of the termination order which shows that his services terminated
Ext. M6	26.07.1994	Copy of the termination order which shows that his services were terminated.

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1724.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर ग्राउंडनट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट [सदर्भ आईडी सं. (सीजीआईटीए) 03/2009] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/65/2008-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1724.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [I.D. Reference No. (CGITA) 03/2009] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Groundnut and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42011/65/2008-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT cum Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,

Dated 29th July, 2016

Reference: (CGITA) No. 03/2009

The Director,
National Research Centre for Groundnut,
Post Box No. 5, Ivenagar Road,
Junagadh (Gujarat) – 362001

...First Party

V/s

The President,
Saurashtra Employees Union,
City Shops 3rd Floor, Opp. Jagnath Police Chowky,
Dr. Yagnik Road, Rajkot

...Second Party

For the First Party : None

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-42011/65/2008-IR (DU) dated 19.03.2009 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of National Research Centre for Groundnut, Junagadh in terminating the services of their workman Shri Sureshbhai Ratilal Vachhani w.e.f. 01.07.2002 is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

1. The reference dates back to 19.03.2009. Both the parties were served by registered post. On 13.01.2010, acknowledgements of service were also received. Second party workman vide application Ext. 5 sought time on 14.10.2010 but till date he has refrained to submit statement of claim. More than 6 years have passed and second party appears to have been sleeping on the matter. Thus, it appears that the second party workman is not willing to prosecute the case.
2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1725.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्पोर्ट्स अथॉरिटी ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट [सदर्भ आईडी सं. (सीजीआईटीए) 227/2004] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/30/99-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1725.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [I.D. Reference No. (CGITA) 227/2004] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Sport Authority of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42011/30/99-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
 Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
 Ahmedabad,

Dated 26th July, 2016

Reference: (CGITA) No. 227/2004

The Director,
 Sports Authority of India,
 Sector – 15, Gandhinagar – 382010

...First Party

V/s

The General Secretary,
 Gujarat Rajya Ardhsarkari Audhyogik Karmachari Sangh,
 4, Alap Flats, Damubhai Colony, Opp. Anjali Cinema,
 Vasna Road, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) – 380001

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri D.C. Gandhi

For the Second Party : Shri R.C. Pathak

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-42011/30/99-IR (DU) dated 13/16.09.1999 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether demand of the union Gujarat Rajya Ardhsarkari Audhyogik Karmachari Sangh is justified in demanding absorption of all the security guards (as per annexure) as regular employees of Sports Authority of India and to grant all the consequential benefits from the date of their appointment? If so, what relief these workmen are entitled to? And whether action of the management is justified in terminating the services of these employees by changing the contractor during pendency of conciliation proceedings? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?”

1. The reference dates back to 13/16.09.1999. The second party submitted the statement of claim Ext. 5 on 31.01.2000 and first party submitted the written statement Ext. 14 on 20.08.2001 along with the documents list enclosed Ext. 15.
2. The record reveals that the second party moved a special civil application 95/98 in the Gujarat High Court wherein on 29.01.1998 the honourable high court directed the second party to move to Central Administrative Tribunal for alternative statutory remedy.
3. Since 20.08.2001, the second party has been absent and has also not led his evidence. Record also does not reveal as to whether the second party moved the Central Administrative Tribunal as per the direction of the Gujarat High Court. Thus, it appears that the second party has no willingness to prosecute the case.
4. Thus, the reference is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1726.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार काकरापार एटॉमिक पावर स्टेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट [सदर आईडी सं. (सीजीआईटीए) 163/2012] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/70/2012-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1726.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [I.D. Reference No. (CGITA) 163/2012] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Kakrapar Atomic Power Station and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42011/70/2012-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD****Present :**

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT cum Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,

Dated 20th July, 2016**Reference: (CGITA) No. 163/2012**

The Station Director,
Kakrapar Atomic Power Station,
PO Anumala, Tal. Vyara, Tapi – 394651

...First Party

V/s

The General Secretary,
Kakrapar Anumathak Karmachari Sangathan,
KAPP Township, Post Anumala,
Tapi – 394651

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri K.V. Gadhia

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-42011/70/2012-IR (DU) dated 22.11.2012 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the union for allowing all the workmen to use the Mobile Phones in the Plant Area of Kakrapar Atomic Power Station, Tapi or reimbursement of Rs.350/- per month for compensating the injustice is legal, proper and just? If so, what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

1. The reference dates back to 22.11.2012. Both the parties were served by registered post. First party submitted the vakalatpatra Ext. 3 of his advocates Shri K.V. Gadhia Associates but second party neither submitted the vakalatpatra nor the statement of claim despite an expiry of 4 years. Therefore, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the reference is default of the second party.

2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in default of the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1727.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम डिपार्टमेंट, जामनगर के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार

औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट [सदर्भ आईडी सं. (सीजीआईटीए) 1093/2004] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/53/97-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1727.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [I.D. Reference No. (CGITA) 1093/2004] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Telecom Department, Jamnagar and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-40012/53/97-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,

Dated 29th July, 2016

Reference: (CGITA) No. 1093/2004

1. The Telecom Distt. Engineer,
Telecom Deptt., Jamnagar - 361001.
2. The Asstt. Engineer,
Microwave Maintenance, Khambalia – 361305.
3. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Rajkot – 380001.
4. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Ahmedabad – 380001

...First Party

V/s

Shri Meraman Arsi Modhvia,
C/o Sh. G.S. Uppal, Plot No. 381,
Ward No. 2-B, Adipur,
Kutch (Gujarat)

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri N.K. Trivedi

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-40012/53/97-IR (DU) dated 01/16.04.1998 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Telecom Distt. Engineer, Jamnagar/Asstt. Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Khambalia/Divisional Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Ahmedabad/Rajkot, in not taking on duties/discontinuance/terminating the services of Shri Meraman Arsi Modhvia w.e.f. 02.01.1989 just, valid and legal? If not to what benefits the workman is entitled for and what directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 01/16.04.1998. Second party submitted the statement of claim Ext. 2 on 01.09.1999 and first party submitted the written statement Ext. 7 on 25.06.2001. First party substituted his advocates on 24.07.2003 then 20.12.2004 and then 13.01.2011. First party has also filed his affidavit Ext. 13 emphasising the concealment of facts in the statement of claim by the second party but second party since then did not respond to the application of the first party and also did not prefer to lead evidence despite giving last opportunity on 28.03.2016. The advocate for the first party appeared on most of the dates of hearing. Thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case, second party appears to have been sleeping over the matter since long time and unwilling to prosecute the case. Thus, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the case in default of the second party.

2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1728.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम डिपार्टमेंट, जामनगर के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट [सदर्थ आईडी सं. (सीजीआईटीए) 1094/2004] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/50/97-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1728.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [I.D. Reference No. (CGITA) 1094/2004] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Telecom Department, Jamnagar and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-40012/50/97-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,

Dated 29th July, 2016

Reference: (CGITA) No. 1094/2004

1. The Telecom Distt. Engineer,
Telecom Deptt., Jamnagar - 361001.
2. The Asstt. Engineer,
Microwave Maintenance, Khambalia – 361305.
3. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Rajkot – 380001.
4. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Ahmedabad – 380001

...First Party

V/s

Shri Ramdas Premdas Kapdi,
C/o Sh. G.S. Uppal, Plot No. 381,
Ward No. 2-B, Adipur,
Kutch (Gujarat)

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri N.K. Trivedi

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-40012/50/97-IR (DU) dated 01/16.04.1998 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Telecom Distt. Engineer, Jamnagar/Asstt. Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Khambhalia/Divisional Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Ahmedabad/Rajkot, in not taking on duties/discontinuance/terminating the services of Shri Ramdas Premdas Kapdi w.e.f. 02.01.1989 just, valid and legal? If not to what benefits the workman is entitled for and what directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 01/16.04.1998. Second party submitted the statement of claim Ext. 2 on 01.09.1999 and first party submitted the written statement Ext. 7 on 25.06.2001. First party substituted his advocates on 24.07.2003 then 20.12.2004 and then 13.01.2011. First party has also filed his affidavit Ext. 16 emphasising the concealment of facts in the statement of claim by the second party but second party since then did not respond to the application of the first party and also did not prefer to lead evidence despite giving last opportunity on 28.03.2016. The advocate for the first party appeared on most of the dates of hearing. Thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case, second party appears to have been sleeping over the matter since long time and unwilling to prosecute the case. Thus, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the case in default of the second party.

2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1729.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम डिपार्टमेंट, जामनगर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट [सदर्थ आईडी सं. (सीजीआईटीए) 1096/2004] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/51/97-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1729.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [I.D. Reference No. (CGITA) 1096/2004] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Telecom Department, Jamnagar and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-40012/51/97-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD**

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT cum Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,

Dated 29th July, 2016

Reference: (CGITA) No. 1096/2004

1. The Telecom Distt. Engineer,
Telecom Deptt., Jamnagar - 361001.
2. The Asstt. Engineer,
Microwave Maintenance, Khambalia – 361305.
3. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Rajkot – 380001.
4. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Ahmedabad – 380001

...First Party

V/s

Shri Dipak Kumar Dayalal Raval,
C/o Sh. G.S. Uppal, Plot No. 381,
Ward No. 2-B, Adipur,
Kutch (Gujarat)

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri N.K. Trivedi

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-40012/51/97-IR (DU) dated 16.04.1998 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Telecom Distt. Engineer, Jamnagar/Asstt. Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Khambalia/Divisional Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Ahmedabad/Rajkot, in not taking on duties/discontinuance/terminating the services of Shri Dipak Kumar Dayalal Raval w.e.f. 02.01.1989 just, valid and legal? If not to what benefits the workman is entitled for and what directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 16.04.1998. Second party submitted the statement of claim Ext. 3 on 01.09.1999 and first party submitted the written statement Ext. 7 on 25.06.2001. First party substituted his advocates on 24.07.2003 then 24.12.2009 then 13.01.2011 and then 28.03.2016. First party has also filed his affidavit Ext. 13 emphasising the concealment of facts in the statement of claim by the second party but second party since then did not respond to the application of the first party and also did not prefer to lead evidence despite giving last opportunity on 28.03.2016. The advocate for the first party appeared on most of the dates of hearing. Thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case, second party appears to have been sleeping over the matter since long time and unwilling to prosecute the case. Thus, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the case in default of the second party.
2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1730.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम डिपार्टमेंट, जामनगर के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचात [सदर्भ आईडी सं. (सीजीआईटीए) 1097/2004] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/46/97-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1730.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [I.D. Reference No. (CGITA) 1097/2004] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Telecom Department, Jamnagar and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-40012/46/97-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present :

Pramod Kumar Chaturvedi,
Presiding Officer, CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Ahmedabad,

Dated 29th July, 2016

Reference: (CGITA) No. 1097/2004

1. The Telecom Distt. Engineer,
Telecom Deptt., Jamnagar - 361001.
2. The Asstt. Engineer,
Microwave Maintenance, Khambalia – 361305.
3. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Rajkot – 380001.
4. The Divisional Engineer,
Telecom Microwave Maintenance, K.R. Telephone Exchange,
Ahmedabad – 380001

...First Party

V/s

Shri Atul Kumar Babulal Pandya,
C/o Sh. G.S. Uppal, Plot No. 381,
Ward No. 2-B, Adipur,
Kutch (Gujarat)

...Second Party

For the First Party : Shri N.K. Trivedi

For the Second Party : None

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-40012/46/97-IR (DU) dated 16.04.1998 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Telecom Distt. Engineer, Jamnagar/Asstt. Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Khambalia/Divisional Engineer, Microwave Maintenance, Ahmedabad/Rajkot, in not taking on duties/discontinuance/terminating the services of Shri Atul Kumar Babulal Pandya w.e.f. 02.01.1989 just, valid and legal? If not to what benefits the workman is entitled for and what directions are necessary in the matter?”

1. The reference dates back to 16.04.1998. Second party submitted the statement of claim Ext. 3 on 01.09.1999 and first party submitted the written statement Ext. 7 on 25.06.2001. First party substituted his advocates on 24.07.2003 then 20.12.2004 then 24.12.2009 then 13.01.2011 and then 28.03.2016. First party has also filed his affidavit Ext. 13 emphasising the concealment of facts in the statement of claim by the second party but second party since then did not respond to the application of the first party and also did not prefer to lead evidence despite giving last

opportunity on 28.03.2016. The advocate for the first party appeared on most of the dates of hearing. Thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case, second party appears to have been sleeping over the matter since long time and unwilling to prosecute the case. Thus, the tribunal has no option but to dismiss the case in default of the second party.

2. Thus, the reference is dismissed in non-prosecution of the case by the second party.

P. K. CHATURVEDI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1731.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रांट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी 2/42 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/40/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1731.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGITA 2/42 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/40/2014-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/42 of 2014

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF

(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND

THEIR WORKMAN

Smt. Gangabai B. Kale
A/P. Bale
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra 413 001.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. S.P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMAN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/40/2014-IR (DU), dated 21.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Smt. Gangabai B. Kale for asking regularisation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Acknowledgement of notice served on the second party Workman is at Ex-5. On the first date of hearing, First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Second party/ workman remained absent though served with notice. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed her statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1732.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रान्ट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी 2/46 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/45/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1732.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGIT- 2/46 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/45/2014-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI****PRESENT :**

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/46 of 2014**EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF****(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE**

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND

THEIR WORKMAN

Shri Dharma Ram Rathod
Basaveshwar Nagar
Post Degaon
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra 413 002

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. S. P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMAN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/45/2014-IR (DU), dated 22.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri Dharam Raj Rathod for asking regulation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Acknowledgement of notice served on the second party Workman is at Ex-5. On the first date of hearing, First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Second party workman remained absent though served with notice. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed his statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1733.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रांट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी-2/63 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/62/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1733.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGIT-2/63 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/62/2014-IR (DU)]
P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI****PRESENT :**

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/63 of 2014**EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF****(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE**

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND**THEIR WORKMAN**

Shri Baban J. Jadhav
R/o. Kedgaon
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra 413 002

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. S. P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMAN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/62/2014-IR (DU), dated 23.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri Baban J. Jadhav for asking regulation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Acknowledgement of notice served on the second party Workman is at Ex-5. On the first date of hearing, First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Second party workman remained absent though served with notice. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed his statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1734.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रांट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में

केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी-2/68 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/67/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1734.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGIT-2/68 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/67/2014-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/68 of 2014

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF

(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND

THEIR WORKMAN

Smt. Bhamabai B. Landge
A/o. Kedgaon
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra 413 002

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. S. P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMAN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/67/2014-IR (DU), dated 24.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Smt. Bhamabai B. Landge for asking regulation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Acknowledgement of notice served on the second party Workman is at Ex-5. First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Second party workman remained absent though served with notice. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed her statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1735.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रांट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी 2/74 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/73/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1735.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGITA 2/74 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/73/2014-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/74 of 2014

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF

(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND

THEIR WORKMAN

Smt. Nanda Kisan Dhawane
Shivajinagar, Bale
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra 413 001

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. S. P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMAN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/73/2014-IR (DU), dated 25.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Smt. Nanda Kisan Dhawane for asking regulation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Order of Reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Acknowledgement of notice served on the second party Workman is at Ex-5. First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Second party workman remained absent though served with notice. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed her statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1736.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रांट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी 2/76 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/75/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1736.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGITA 2/76 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/75/2014-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI****PRESENT :**

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/76 of 2014**EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF****(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE**

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND

THEIR WORKMAN

Shri Bhikaji Saimbhaji Waghmare
R/o Kondi
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra 413 001

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. S. P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMAN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/75/2014-IR (DU), dated 25.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri Bhikaji Saimbhaji Waghmare for asking regulation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Reference, notices were served on the parties. On the first date of hearing, second party/ Workman filed Vakalatnama of Shri V.R. Deshpande and sought adjournment for filing Statement of Claim. First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed his statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1737.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रान्ट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्थ सं. सीजीआईटी 2/78 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/77/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1737.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGITA 2/78 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/77/2014-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI****PRESENT :**

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/78 of 2014**EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF****(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE**

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND**THEIR WORKMAN**

Smt. Janabai Navnath Survase
R/o House No. 184
Khadak Galli, Bale
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra State

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. S. P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMAN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/77/2014-IR (DU), dated 25.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Smt. Janabai Navnath Survase for asking regulation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Acknowledgement of notice served on the second party Workman is at Ex-5. First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Second party workman remained absent though served with notice. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed her statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1738.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल रिसर्च सेंटर फॉर पोमीग्रांट एंड अदर्स के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में

केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, मुंबई के पंचाट (सदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी 2/80 ऑफ 2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/79/2014-आईआर (डीयू)]

पी. के. वेणुगोपाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2016

S.O. 1738.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I.D. Reference No. CGITA 2/80 of 2014) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the National Research Centre for Pomegranate & others and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10.08.2016.

[No. L-42012/79/2014-IR (DU)]

P. K. VENUGOPAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI

PRESENT : M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/80 of 2014

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF

(1) NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTRE FOR POMEGRANATE

The Director
National Research Centre for Pomegranate
Near Solapur University
Solapur (MS).

(2) M/s. SWADESHI SECURITIES

M/s. Swadeshi Securities
96, Salgar Vasti
Dongaon Road
Solapur (MS).

AND

THEIR WORKMAN

Smt. Vithabai S. Waghmode
Jai Malhar Nagar, Bale
Tal. North Solapur
Maharashtra-413 001

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER	:	Mr. S. P. Chinchwadkar, Advocate
FOR THE WORKMAN	:	No appearance

Mumbai, dated the 13th July, 2016

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-42012/79/2014-IR (DU), dated 25.07.2014 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the demand of the workman Smt. Vithabai S. Waghmode for asking regulation as an employee of National Research Centre for Pomegranate, Solapur is legal and justified? If yes to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the Reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Acknowledgement of notice served on the second party Workman is at Ex-5. First party/ management filed Vakalatnama of Shri S.P. Chinchwadkar. Second party workman remained absent though served with notice. Thereafter the matter was adjourned on several occasions for filing Statement of Claim by workman. Neither Second party/ workman appeared before this Tribunal nor filed her statement of claim. Without Statement of claim, the Reference cannot be decided on merits and the same deserves to be dismissed. Thus I pass the following order:

ORDER

Reference stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

Date: 13.07.2016

M. V. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer/Judge

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1739.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार केनरा बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में प्रिंसिपल श्रम न्यायालय, बेंगलुरु के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 47/2014) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/37/2010-आईआर (बी-II)]

रवि कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2016

S.O. 1739.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 47/2014) of the Principal Labour Court, Bengaluru as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Canara Bank and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 11.08.2016.

[No. L-12012/37/2010-IR (B-II)]

RAVI KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, PRINCIPAL LABOUR COURT, BENGALURU; AT; BENGALURU

DATED:- THIS THE 18TH DAY OF JUNE, 2016

I/c. PRESIDING OFFICER
N. S. MAMADAPUR LLM
DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE

REFERENCE. NO:- 47 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

Sri K.Nagaraj D.
No.75, Mathrashree Nilaya,
2nd cross, Jnanajyothi Nagara,
Jnanabharathi post,
Bangalore-560 056

...FIRST PARTY
(BY SRI C.R. PATIL, ADVOCATE)

VERSUS

1. The Chairman,
M/s. Canara Bank,
Head Office J.C.Road,
Bangalore-560 002.
2. The Deputy General Manager,
Canara Bank, D.A.Cell,
Circle Office, IMA House,
Baillappanavaranaagara,
Hubli-29

...SECOND PARTY
(BY SRI T.P. MUTHANNA, ADVOCATE)

AWARD

Initially the matter was referred by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, Bangalore on 20.09.2010 by framing the Schedule as under and directed the CGIT to dispose of the matter within three months:

1. Whether the punishment of dismissal imposed to Shri K.Nagaraj by the management of M/s. Canara Bank is just and proportionate to the misconduct proved in the enquiry? If not, to what relief the applicant is entitled for?

Subsequently on 01.03.2012 forwarded a corrigendum by making partial modification in the schedule as under:

“Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank in imposing the punishment of “Dismissal without notice” upon Shri K.Nagaraj, Ex-Clerk vide Order dated 21/05/2008 is legal & justified? What relief is the concerned workman entitled to?”

Thereafter as per the order dtd. : 26.09.2014 the Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-Section (1) and sub-Section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 referred the matter to this Court to adjudicate the matter and to pass award in respect of the following Schedule:

“Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank in imposing the punishment of “Dismissal without notice” upon Shri K.Nagaraj, Ex-Clerk vide Order dated 21/05/2008 is legal & justified? What relief is the concerned workman entitled to?”

02. Sum and substance of the contention of the claim statement filed by the first party are that: The first party having joined the second party No.1 Bank as clerk w.e.f, 30.05.1977 his services came to be confirmed after completion of probationary period. He served the bank in different branches as clerk. He rendered 33 years of service to the entire satisfaction of his official superiors and maintained unblemished service records regarding which he has been issued with number of appreciations in respect of mobilisation of deposits, recovery, obtaining AOD's and image building activities of the Bank. When he was working at Kannur Branch, he was transferred and posted to work at Hiriya Branch, Chithradurga District w.e.f., April, 2004. Disciplinary proceedings were initiated against him on the basis of the unsigned charge sheet dtd. : 23.5.2007 by appointing the Enquiry Officer. The enquiry so conducted on the basis of the unsigned charge sheet is totally without authority and as such, enquiry findings holding the charges proved are also without authority and illegal. So also the order of termination dtd. : 02.06.2008.

03. Further during the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer did not afford opportunity to the delinquent official to appear before him and by placing him ex-parte, in his absence, proceeded with the case one sided and passed the order which is illegal and without following the principles of natural justice. His request to appoint another Enquiry Officer for conducting the enquiry has been turned down.

04. In the earlier charge dtd. :17.12.1988 in respect of a cheque he was exonerated from the alleged charges. The said fact was not considered in the enquiry conducted against him in the subsequent enquiry. All the allegations made against him in the unsigned charge sheet were not proved by producing relevant documents and by examining the material witnesses, which was also informed vide appeal submitted to the appellate authority by the first party and the appellate authority also did not consider the said fact and without verifying the file and records confirmed the enquiry findings and dismissed the appeal. In spite of the directions by the disciplinary authority to allow the first party to attend pre promotion training for the purpose of promotion and to appear for the promotion examination dtd. : 10.02.2007, the branch manager refused permission to him to join the duty after completion of the training which amounts of miscarriage of justice. The order of dismissal is illegal as the same is passed in contravention of Section 33(2)(b) of I.D.Act. As he has crossed the age of super annuation on 08.07.2010, he is entitled for all the consequential monetary benefits instead of reinstatement and also entitle for full back wages w.e.f., 02.06.2008 to 08.07.2010 and thereafter full pension with allowances along with interest till the date of payment.

05. Subsequently the first party also filed additional claim statement wherein he has taken contentions regarding conducting the domestic enquiry by the disciplinary authority without following the procedure and without complying the conditions stipulated and also with regard to the irregularities occurred during the enquiry in respect of each allegation i.e., 5 charges and prayed to hold that the second party bank is not justified in dismissing the first party from service.

06. Further he has also filed statement of rejoinder to the counter statement of the second party wherein he has denied the contentions of the second party bank with regard to bringing to the notice of the second party bank in respect of unsigned charge sheet, affording sufficient opportunity to him to participate in the enquiry, appointing the Enquiry Officer and submitted that in spite of number of representations for full salary after completion of one year of the suspension period went in vain and the enquiry is not completed in time despite providing time Schedule and delay in

disposal of disciplinary case is a matter of serious concern and justice delayed is justice denied. Further on 19.07.2013 the first party filed the amended claim statement wherein the above said facts are reiterated.

07. On service of notice, the second party appeared before the Court and filed the counter statement contending that K.Nagaraj working as clerk at Hiriya Branch since 08.08.2004 has committed several misconducts for which he was issued with the charge sheet Ref. No. HUBCO:DAC-48:CHW:02:2007 dtd. : 23.5.2007 and he was kept under suspension on the allegation that when he was working at Hiriya Branch intentionally has issued no due confirmation from Canara Bank Hiriya Branch to Vijaya Bank in respect of one Mr.Narasimhaiah of Alur village a customer of the second party bank, a complaint received from one Mr.Murugesh, H.S.Venkatesh SB account holders of Hiriya Branch that the first party has taken a loan from them by giving cheques to them, but failed to refund the said amount, a cheque for Rs.15,000/- drawn on SBI Davanagere discounted by the first party under ECDB 50.2006 was returned for the reasons insufficient funds and cheques issued by him were dishonoured for want of sufficient funds in his account and in spite of instructions to surrender all the unused cheque leaves and the Can Card, he failed to return the same, the slogans and statements made in the Ugadi greetings in his personal name using Bank's logo do not form the official/accepted propriety of the Banks, the proceeds of cheque bearing No.73879 dtd. : 3.5.2005 drawn by Jala Samnaya Yojanadhikarigala Sangha, Chithradurga was credited twice to two different accounts due to the involvement of the first party by colluding with Smt. Mallika, student trainee. In respect of the said acts domestic enquiry was conducted according to the regulations of the Bank by affording all the reasonable opportunities to the first party to defend himself and the Enquiry Officer submitted his findings dtd. : 26.02.2008 and thereafter, the same was brought to the notice of the first party and after considering the submissions made by him, evidence on record, circumstances in the case and gravity of the misconduct, the punishment of dismissal without notice was imposed on 21.5.2008. Against the said punishment order, he preferred an appeal before the appellate authority which in turn after considering the documents on record, found no reasons to interfere either with the order of dismissal or with the findings of the Enquiry Officer. There is no illegality in the enquiry proceedings. The misconduct committed by the first party is grave. Further by denying the entire pleadings of the claim statement contended that the same are nothing but a clear after thought.

08. Further with regard to the contentions raised by the first party in his additional claim statement, denied the same and further in respect of the amended counter statement contended that while working as clerk at Hiriya branch of the bank he has committed several misconducts for which he was issued with a charge sheet and during the enquiry, the same were came to be proved and accordingly, he was terminated from service. Further this Court as per the orders dtd. : 21.09.2012 has decided the preliminary issue with regard to domestic enquiry conducted against the first party as fair and proper. Hence, the first party is not entitled for any relief sought for and accordingly prayed to dismiss the case with exemplary costs.

09. The issue referred by the Central Government is as under:

“Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank in imposing the punishment of “Dismissal without notice” upon Shri K.Nagaraj, Ex-Clerk vide Order dated 21/05/2008 is legal & justified? What relief is the concerned workman entitled to?”

10. To prove the preliminary issue the first party got himself examined as WW.1 and got marked Ext. W1 to W33 and closed his side. The second party bank examined its Sr. Manager as M.W.1 and got marked Ext. M1 to M108 and closed his side and the CGIT., by its order dtd. : 21.09.2012 recorded its findings on preliminary issue i.e., fairness of the domestic enquiry held against the first party as fair and proper.

11. The first party in order to prove the victimisation got examined himself as WW.1 and got marked Ext. W34 to W46 and closed his side. The second party bank got examined one Chandrashekhar Adiga as M.W.2 on victimisation and got marked Ext. M109 to 110 and closed his side.

12. Heard the arguments.

13. My findings to the above points as stated in the reference order are as under:

REFERENCE NO.1: In the AFFIRMATIVE for the following :

REASONS

14. **REFERENCE POINT NO.1:** Before considering the reference referred by the Government of India and also before considering the facts of this case to give findings on the reference point, it is necessary to mention herein the reasons for transferring this dispute from the Central Government Industrial Dispute Tribunal, Bengaluru to this Court.

15. The first party was working in Canara Bank, thereafter Canara Bank issued charge sheet on 23.5.2007 alleging some serious misconducts mentioned in the charge sheet, departmental enquiry is held and thereafter based on departmental enquiry report, he was dismissed from service. He has raised industrial dispute and the matter was

referred to the CGIT., Bengaluru for adjudication on 20.09.2010. The CGIT has framed preliminary issue in regard to fairness of the domestic enquiry and after recording the evidence and after hearing both sides, passed the order dtd. : 21.09.2012 and held that the domestic enquiry conducted by the second party against the first party is fair and proper. Thereafter the first party has filed application for interim relief and the same was rejected by the CGIT., Bengaluru. He has approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka wherein also his writ petition was dismissed. In the meanwhile, the first party has approached the Government of India by submitting the representation that the Presiding Officer of CGIT., is biased against him. Thereafter concerned Ministry, after taking the remarks from the Presiding Officer of CGIT., Bengaluru referred this Industrial Dispute to this Court.

16. Now this Court has to give its finding on the reference made by the Government of India ie., “Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank in imposing the punishment of “Dismissal without notice” upon Shri K.Nagaraj, Ex-Clerk vide Order dated 21/05/2008 is legal & justified? What relief is the concerned workman entitled to?”

17. Besides this the first party has also raised specific plea that the order of his dismissal passed by the second party management is in contravention of the provisions of Sec.33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. He has also raised another dispute that subsistence allowance is not paid to him.

18. With regard to dismissal order passed by second party management without notice to the first party K.Nagaraj, I have examined the records produced by the second party management. After conclusion of the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer has submitted his report dtd. : 26.2.2008 to the management. The report of Enquiry Officer is marked as Ext. M-99. Records further reveal that as per Ext. M100 the management vide its letter dtd. : 29.02. 2008 has forwarded the enquiry report to the first party Nagaraj wherein the Nagaraj has endorsed his acknowledgement mentioning as “Received by registered A.D., through Hiriur Branch on 6.3.2008.”. Ext. M101 is the letter submitted by the first party K.Nagaraj on 23.3.2008 with reference to the findings given by the Enquiry Officer. Again the second party management issued a letter as per Ext. M102. It is a letter dtd. : 22.4.2008 wherein the second party management has specifically stated that they have received the submissions made by the first party Nagaraj on the findings of the Enquiry Officer.

19. Further the management has analysed all the relevant records, submissions made by the first party and also the findings given by the Enquiry Officer and in the said letter it is specifically mentioned that considering the facts and circumstances of the case and gravity of the misconduct, they have decided to impose punishment of “Dismissal without Notice” as envisaged under Chapter XI Regulation 4 clause (a) of the Canara Bank Service Code. Before this personal hearing was accorded to him on 03.05.2008 at Canara Bank, Circle Office, I.M.A. House, B.N.nagara, Hubli-29 at 11.00 am., Ext. M-103 demonstrates that as per notice issued for personal hearing, the proceedings of the personal hearing took place on 03.05.2008 in the date, time and place mentioned in Ext. M102. The first party K.Nagaraj appeared on 3.5.2008 before the disciplinary authority and answered that he received the letter issued by the Bank on 22.4.2008 and an opportunity of being heard was given to him on the punishment and he has categorically stated that he is submitting the letter dtd. : 3.5.2008 and requested to consider the same. Ext. M103 is the personal hearing proceedings took place before the disciplinary authority at Hubli. Ext. M104 is the written letter submitted by the first party and again he has raised the contention that the charge-sheet was not signed by any officer or competent authority and the enquiry conducted against him is illegal and the Enquiry Officer was biased against him from the beginning. Therefore, he has requested once again to reconsider the proposed punishment by reviewing the entire case and exonerate him from the allegations.

20. In Canara Bank disciplinary action against award staff is initiated as per the provisions of Canara Bank Service Code. Chapter XI of Canara Bank Services Code deals with initiation of disciplinary proceedings against award staff and procedure thereon. Chapter XI Rule 3 describes the acts and omissions on the part of an employee coming under the definition of “gross misconduct”. Further Chapter XI Rule 4(a) of Canara Bank Services Code provides for “dismissal without notice” for an employee found guilty of gross misconduct. The charge proved against the present first party comes under the definition of “gross misconduct”. The dismissal order also discloses that dismissal without notice is for gross misconduct. Ext. M-105 is the proceedings of the Deputy General Manager in regard to dismissal without notice. In the proceedings the disciplinary authority has considered the representation made by the first party and also considered the gravity of the misconduct for imposition of punishment of dismissal without notice and came to the conclusion that the dismissal without notice is just and proper. Accordingly the dismissal order is passed on 21.5.2008. So, on perusal of all the records, I am of the view that there is no error committed by the second party management in dismissing the first party without notice. The second party management has referred the provisions under which the order of dismissal without notice was passed. They have invoked the provisions of Chapter XI Regulation 4 Clause (a) of Canara Bank Service Code. By giving cogent reasons and considering the gravity of misconduct the order was passed. Further the suspension period was treated as one spent on duty. Therefore, I am of the definite view that the dismissal order passed by the management without notice is in accordance with law.

21. The first party has raised specific plea that the second party management has not complied the provisions of Sec.33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Sec.33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act refers only when if during the pendency of any such proceedings in respect of any industrial dispute, the employer may, in accordance with the standing orders applicable to a workman cannot pass a dismissal or discharge order for any misconduct not connected with the dispute. The law mandates that if any order has to be passed for dismissal of a workman during the pendency of any such proceedings, the workman shall be discharged or dismissed only by paying wage for one month and an application has to be made by the employer to the authority before which, the proceedings is pending, for approval of the action taken by the employer. The first party has to prove that at the time of passing of the dismissal order dtd. : 21.5.2008, proceedings were pending before any competent authority with reference to Industrial dispute.

22. It is the case of the first party that the management did not obtain permission to get the approval order of dismissal from the competent authority as provided under Sec.33(2)(b) of the Industrial Dispute Act. In this regard he relied on Ext. W44 wherein the Deputy General Manager Canara Bank, Circle Office, Hubli in his reply submitted to the Asst. Labour Commissioner, Hubli dtd. : 16.7.2008 has admitted and mentioned about the dispute raised by the first party on 14.3.2008 on the file of the Addl.Labour Commissioner, Hubli.

23. Further he has also relied on the provisions of Sec.20(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act and contended that the proceedings come to effect from the date of receipt of representation by the competent authority. On perusal of Sec.20(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act it refers to the commencement and conclusion of the proceedings. Sec.20(1) specifies that a conciliation proceeding shall be deemed to have commenced on the date on which, the notice of strike or lockout U/Sec.22 is received by the conciliation officer or on the date of the order referring the dispute to a Board as the case may be. In the present case the first party has not raised any dispute with regard to strike or lockout. He himself has admitted that he had made representation before the conciliation officer for non-payment of full salary w.e.f., 16.12.2007. He had submitted his representation on 14.3.2008. Hence, he pleads that Sec.33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act is applicable. But on perusal of all the records, records reveal that the termination order is passed by the second party management on 21.5.2008. Records further reveal that notice from the Asst.Labour Commissioner(Central), No.362A/362B/6, (Lejoy Dental Clinic Compound, Jusugal Road, Keshwapur, Hubli-20, bearing No. 50(4) 2008-A/H dtd. : 3.6.2008 calling for payments on representation submitted by the first party was received by the second party on 9.6.2008 to submit their comments on or before 20.6.2008. So as on the date of dismissal order dtd. : 21.05.2008 the second party management was not having the knowledge about the representation made by the first party dtd. : 14.3.2008. There was no impediment for the first party to submit his representation to the second party management stating that he has already raised a dispute regarding non-payment of full salary before the Asst.Labour Commissioner by filing representation dtd. : 14.3.2008. This Court has already observed that before passing the dismissal order without notice, personal hearing was given to the first party. Ext. - clearly demonstrates that the first party appeared before the disciplinary authority on 3.5.2008 and an opportunity of personal hearing was given to him. On that day he had submitted the written representation to the second party management which is marked as Ext. M104. On perusal of the contents of Ext. M104 the written statement made by the first party dtd. : 3.5.2008 no where he has mentioned that he had made representation to the Asst. Labour Commissioner on 14.3.2008 by raising an industrial dispute for non-payment of full salary and conciliation proceedings are pending. The conduct of the first party clearly demonstrates that he is not fair in regard to submission of his representation before the Asst. labour Commissioner dtd. : 14.3.2008 which was not brought to the notice of the second party management neither at the time of personal hearing nor after furnishing the findings of the Enquiry Officer. So the contentions raised by the first party in regard to contravention of Sec.33(2)(b) of Industrial Disputes Act 1947 is not sustainable.

24. Further records clearly indicate that the first party has filed an interim application for grant of interim relief before the CGIT., pending adjudication of dispute, which was rejected. Against the said rejection order the first party has filed W.P.No.50093/2013 (L-TER) before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka after hearing the parties dismissed the writ petition on the ground that the first party has filed the application in CR.No.38/2010 for interim relief which was rejected on the ground that the reference was received on 27.9.2010 on which date, the first party has attained the superannuation and therefore, the interim relief cannot be granted. Against the said order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the first party has not approached the higher courts either by way of writ appeal or in the form of SLP., So, the plea raised by the first party regarding non-payment of full salary etc., cannot be considered.

25. I have examined the decisions relied by the learned advocate for the first party and also his written argument with reference to the contravention of the provisions of Sec.33(2)(b) of Industrial Disputes Act 1947. The proposition of law laid down in these decisions cannot be disputed. At the same time, the law mandates that Sec.33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes is applicable only when any proceedings are pending before the competent authority. Admittedly the first party has failed to prove that as on the date of dismissal order, there were any proceedings before the competent authority and ignoring the same, dismissal order is passed. Accordingly I give my findings on Reference point no.1 in the AFFIRMATIVE and In view of the forgoing reasons, legal propositions and discussions made above; I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The Reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act is rejected.

Send copy of this Award to the Government for publication.

The Government is directed to publish the award in such manner, as it thinks fit within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the same.

The award shall become enforceable on the expiry of 30 days from the date of its publication Under Section 17 of the I.D. Act. 1947.

The Government is directed to intimate the publication of award to all the parties to the case by registered post acknowledgement due, without fail.

(Dictated to the Judgment Writer, computerised by her, corrected and then signed by me on this the 18th DAY OF JUNE, 2016).

N. S. MAMADAPUR, District Judge I/C Presiding Officer

ANNEXURE**WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR I PARTY:**

WW1: K.Nagaraja (on Domestic Enquiry) 19.8.2011/9.9.2011/ 27.9.2011.

WW1: K.Nagaraja (On victimization) 1.10.2012/4.6.2013/29.1.2014

DOCUMENTS GOT MARKED FOR I PARTY :

Ext. W.1 : Suspension order dtd. : 4.11.2006

Ext. W.2 : Xerox copy of Enquiry proceedings dtd. : 07.1.2007

Ext. W.3 : Xerox copy of enquiry proceedings dtd. : 31.07.2007

Ext. W.4 : Certified copy of telegram receipt

Ext. W.5 : Certified copy of telegram receipt

Ext. W.6 : Certified copy of the delivery of telegram dtd. : 17.4.2007

Ext. W.7 : Xerox copy of hand book on disciplinary matters

Ext. W.8 : Representation by B.M.Madhava dtd. : 8.8.2007

Ext. W.9 : Representation by first party dtd. : 9.8.2007

Ext. W.10 : Letter by 2nd party dtd. : 21.08.2007

Ext. W.11 : Enquiry proceedings dtd. : 21.8.2007

Ext. W.12 : Enquiry proceedings dtd. : 9.10.2007

Ext. W.13 : Representation dtd. : 10.10.2007 with courier receipt

Ext. W.14 : Letter dtd. : 16.11.2007 by Enquiry Officer to first party .

Ext. W.15 : Representation by first party dtd. : 30.11.2007

Ext. W.16 : Letter dtd. : 24.12.2007 by Enquiry Officer.

Ext. W.17 : Letter by second party dtd. : 21.11.2006 to first party and letter of first party .

Ext. W.18 : Letter dtd. : 24.4.2006 by manager of second party to Senior Manager

Ext. W.19 : Representation by first party dtd. : 15.2.2007

Ext. W.20 : Representation by first party dtd. : 30.5.2006

Ext. W.21 : Proceedings of deputy general manager dtd. : 21.5.2008 with enclosures

Ext. W.22 : Proceedings of deputy general manager dtd. : 24.4.2009 and order of appellate authority.

Ext. W.23 : Memo dtd. : 10.12.2010 by first party in C.R.38/2010

Ext. W.24 : Certified copy of deposition of M.W.1 dtd. : 9.6.2011 in C.R.No.28/2010

Ext. W.25	:	Certified copy of deposition of M.W.1 dtd. : 11.4.2011 in C.R.No.20/2009
Ext. W.26	:	Statement given by M.W.1 dtd. : 30-.5.2006
Ext. W.27	:	Charge sheet dtd. : 23.5.2007
Ext. W.28	:	RPAD postal receipt
Ext. W.29	:	Certified copy of telegram dtd. : 19.8.2007
Ext. W.30	:	Delivery of telegram letter issued by telegraph office
Ext. W.31	:	Telephone bill/receipt
Ext. W.32	:	Letter by second party to first party dtd. : 21.8.2007
Ext. W.33	:	Letter by Enquiry Officer dtd. : 24.12.2007
Ext. W.34	:	Representation given by first party dtd. :2.1.2008 along with courier receipt
Ext. W.35	:	Representation given by first party dtd. :19.1.2008 along with courier receipt
Ext. W.36	:	Representation given by first party dtd. :05.02.2008 along with courier receipt
Ext. W.37	:	Representation given by first party dtd. :23.2.2008 along with courier receipt
Ext. W.38	:	Two representations given by I party dtd. : 08.03.2008 along with courier receipts
Ext. W.39	:	Representation given by first party dtd. : 24.4.2008
Ext. W.40	:	Representation given by first party dtd. :13/5/08 along with courier receipt
Ext. W.41	:	Representation given by first party dtd. :26.5.2008 along with courier receipt
Ext. W.42	:	Third party letter dtd. : 22./01.2008 along with circular
Ext. W.43	:	Representation by first party dtd. :14.03.2008 along with acknowledgement
Ext. W.44	:	Third party statement of reply A.L.C., Hubli, dtd. : 1.7.2008
Ext. W.45	:	Third party letter dtd. : 2.6.2008 along with order of dismissal of first party .
Ext. W.46	:	Notice given by A.L.C., to the third party dtd. : 3.6.2008.

WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR II Party:

M.W.1: R.Guruprasad (On domestic enquiry) 16.05.2011/9.6.11

M.W.2: Chandrashekhhar Adiga (On victimization) 17.11.2015.

DOCUMENTS GOT MARKED FOR II PARTY

Ext. M.1	:	Suspension order Dtd. 4/11/2006
Ext. M.2	:	Charge sheet dtd. 23/05/2007
Ext. M.3	:	Appointment order of Enquiry Officer & Presenting Officer Dtd. 15/06/2007
Ext. M.4	:	Enquiry Notice Dtd. 25/06/2007
Ext. M.5	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 07/07/2007
Ext. M.6	:	Enquiry Notice Dtd. 10/07/2007
Ext. M.7	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 31/07/2007
Ext. M.8	:	Letter Dtd. 31/07/2007 by Enquiry Officer
Ext. M.9	:	Enquiry Notice Dtd. 1/08/2007
Ext. M.10	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 21/08/2007
Ext. M.11	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 22/08/2007
Ext. M.12	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 23/08/2007
Ext. M.13	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 08/10/2007
Ext. M.14	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 09/10/2007

Ext. M.15	:	Enquiry Notice Dtd. 16/11/2007
Ext. M.16	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 12/01/2008
Ext. M.17	:	Enquiry proceedings Dtd. 14/01/2008
Ext. M.18	:	Statement by Mallik Dtd. 16/05/2006
Ext. M.19	:	Statement by Mallik Dtd. 30/05/2006
Ext. M.20	:	Joint Statement by V.R Murthy & S.P. Mishra Dtd. 29/05/06
Ext. M.21	:	Statement by Eranna Dtd. 5/06/2006
Ext. M.22	:	Statement by G.B. Nagaraju Dtd. 18/07/2006
Ext. M.23	:	Investigation Report Dtd. 1/06/2006
Ext. M.24	:	Supplemental investigation report
Ext. M.25	:	Debit slip dtd. 16/05/2005
Ext. M.26	:	Debit slip dtd. 16/05/2005
Ext. M.27	:	Cheque No 920681 dtd. 12/05/2005
Ext. M.28	:	Cheque No 920682 dtd. 17/05/2005
Ext. M.29	:	Cheque No 920684 dtd. 9/06/2005
Ext. M.30	:	Cheque no 920683 dtd. 27/05/2005
Ext. M.31	:	Bank Statement from 14/09/04 to 29/04/06 of Mallik
Ext. M.32	:	Supplemental inspection report dtd. 18/07/2006
Ext. M.33	:	O S C register page No 192
Ext. M.34	:	Bank statement of Muneer Ahmed
Ext. M.35	:	Statement dtd. 8/05/2006 by K.S Muralidhar
Ext. M.36	:	Statement dtd. 31/05/2006 by S.Chandra Mohan
Ext. M.37	:	Statement dtd. 8/05/2006 by T. Ramachandrappa
Ext. M.38	:	Statement dtd. 16/05/2006 by Muneer Ahmed
Ext. M.39	:	Mandatory report dtd. 17/05/2005
Ext. M.40	:	Payment details dtd. 6/06/2006
Ext. M.41	:	Attendance sheet for the month of May 2005
Ext. M.42	:	Statement dtd. 05/06/2006 by K.Nagaraju
Ext. M.43	:	Statement by Muneer Ahmed
Ext. M.44	:	Statement by Umesh
Ext. M.45	:	Statement by T.N Veeresh
Ext. M.46	:	Complaint by K. Murugesd dtd. 11/05/2006
Ext. M.47	:	Cheque No 393374 Dtd. 3/03/2006
Ext. M.48	:	Statement by Suresh.S. Shahapur dtd. 18/07/2006
Ext. M.49	:	Bank letter dtd. 18/04/2006
Ext. M.50	:	Vijaya Bank letter dtd. 18/04/2006
Ext. M.51	:	Reply letter dtd. 20/04/2006 to Vijaya Bank
Ext. M.52	:	No due Certificate Issued to Narashimhiah
Ext. M.53	:	Bank letter dtd. 30/05/2006
Ext. M.54	:	Letter dtd. 25/06/2006 by K.Nagaraja

Ext. M.55	:	Bangalore Circle office letter dtd. 23/05/2006
Ext. M.56	:	Letter dtd. 17/06/2006
Ext. M.57	:	Letter dtd. 9/05/2006
Ext. M.58	:	Letter dtd. 14/04/2006
Ext. M.59	:	Letter dtd. 27/04/2006
Ext. M.60	:	Letter dtd. 18/07/2006 by K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.61	:	Letter dtd. 09/06/2006 by Nagaraja
Ext. M.62	:	Letter dtd. 3/06/2006
Ext. M.63	:	Letter dtd. 24/04/2006
Ext. M.64	:	Letter dtd. 26/04/2006
Ext. M.65	:	Letter dtd. 26/04/2006 to K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.66	:	Letter dtd. 11/08/2006
Ext. M.67	:	Letter dtd. 8/08/2006
Ext. M.68	:	Greetings by K.Nagaraja dtd. 30/03/2006
Ext. M.69	:	Greetings by K.Nagaraja dtd. 7/09/2005
Ext. M.70	:	Greetings by K.Nagaraja dtd. 19/11/2004
Ext. M.71	:	Greetings by K.Nagaraja dtd. 1/01/2005
Ext. M.72	:	Greetings by K.Nagaraja dtd. 26/01/2005
Ext. M.73	:	Greetings by K.Nagaraja dtd. 01/11/2005
Ext. M.74	:	Greetings by K.Nagaraja dtd. 3/10/2005
Ext. M.75	:	Letter dtd. 21/04/2006 by K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.76	:	Letter dtd. 29/05/2006 by K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.77	:	IBAR Quarry dtd. 24/04/2006
Ext. M.78	:	Letter dtd. 28/04/2006
Ext. M.79	:	Cheque refused register page No 22
Ext. M.80	:	R.C Book of K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.81	:	Investigation report dtd. 7/06/2006
Ext. M.82	:	Attendance sheet for the month of Dec 2005
Ext. M.83	:	Statement of loan of M Narasimhiah No. 1703
Ext. M.84	:	Statement of loan of M Narasimhiah No 1575
Ext. M.85	:	Statement of loan of M Narasimhiah No 2183
Ext. M.86	:	Statement dtd. 30/05/2006 of K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.87	:	Statement by K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.88	:	Bank statement of Nagaraja A/C No. 22163
Ext. M.89	:	Bank statement of K.Nagaraja A/C No. 2236
Ext. M.90	:	Letter dtd. 27/04/2006 to K.Ramakrishna
Ext. M.91	:	Vijaya bank letter dtd. 12/01/2006
Ext. M.92	:	Letter dtd. 15/02/84
Ext. M.93	:	Letter dtd. 22/02/83
Ext. M.94	:	Cheque Book issue register page No. 164

Ext. M.95	:	S.B A/C opening form of M.Muneer Ahmed
Ext. M.96	:	Attendance register extract for the month of Sep 2004
Ext. M.97	:	Brief submitted by Presenting Officer dtd. 24/01/2008
Ext. M.98	:	Written arguments filed by defence
Ext. M.99	:	Enquiry report and findings dtd. 26/02/2008
Ext. M.100	:	Letter dtd. 29/02/2008 along with enclosure to K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.101	:	Letter dtd. 23/03/2008 by K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.102	:	Letter dtd. 22/04/2008 about personal hearing
Ext. M.103	:	Personal hearing proceedings
Ext. M.104	:	Written submission dtd. 3/05/2008 by K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.105	:	Proceedings dtd. 21/05/2008 along with orders passed by Disciplinary Authority
Ext. M.106	:	Memorandum of appeal dtd. 13/06/2008
Ext. M.107	:	Letter dtd. 28/02/2009 to K.Nagaraja
Ext. M.108	:	Letter dtd. 7/05/2009 along with order passed by Appellate Authority
Ext. M.109	:	Letter dtd. 3/06/2008 by Asst. Labour Commissioner, Hubli
Ext. M.110	:	Letter dtd. 28/07/2008 by Asst. Labour Commissioner, Hubli.

नई दिल्ली, 12 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1740.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार यूको बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, राउरकेला के पंचाट [संदर्भ सं. 34/97(सी)] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/22/94-आईआर (बी-II)]

रवि कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th August, 2016

S.O. 1740.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award [Ref. No. 34/97(C)] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Rourkela as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of UCO Bank and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 12.08.2016.

[No. L-12012/22/94-IR (B-II)]

RAVI KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE COURT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER : INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL ROURKELA

Industrial Dispute Case No.34 /97 (C)

Dated, the 18th December 2013

Present:

Sri S.K. Mohanty, Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Rourkela.

Between:

The Branch Manager,
UCO Bank, Godvaga Branch
At: Goadvaga, Sambalpou

...Ist Party

And

Sri Manabhajan Bhoi,
At/PO : Goadvaga,
Dist: Sambalpur

...IInd party

Appearances :

For the Ist party : Sri P.S. Naik, Advocate

Sri S.S. Jena, Advocate

For the IInd party : Sri G. Pujhari , Advocate

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub Section (1) of Sub Section (2A) of Section 10 of the I.D. act, 1947 have referred the following disputes for adjudication vide no. L-12012/22/94-IR (B-II) dt.9.5.94 :

“Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank, Goadvaga District : Sambalpur in terminating the services of Sri Manabhajan Bhoi , Sub Staff with effect from 19.8.92 and not giving him the one –time opportunity for absorption in terms of the Approach Paper circulated by the Ministry of Finance in 1990 is justified ? If not, what relief is the said workman entitled to?”

2. The case of the 2nd party workman is that he was appointed as an employee in Goadvaga branch of the UCO bank with effect from 26.3.88 on daily wage basis and was working continuously from 26.3.88 to 19.8.92 when he was refused employment. During his service period, he was doing the job of Daftari, cash Peon and other job assigned to him from time to time and the job performed by him were similar with that of jobs performed by permanent employee of the bank of his grade . His further case is that when the head office of UCO bank issued circular dt.19.10.89 to treat all the daily rated workers who have completed 240 days of continuous service as regular employees of the bank, he had submitted necessary application for his regularisation. But the branch Manager with ulterior motive had refused to accept the same and without assigning any reason the Branch Manager had refused employment to him illegally with effect from 19.8.92. So the workman had raised the industrial dispute which was taken up for consideration and the same having ended in failure the dispute has been referred to this Tribunal by Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour for adjudication with the aforesaid terms of the dispute. According to the workman since he has completed more than 240 days of continuous service in the bank, the refusal of his employment with effect from 19.8.92 amounts to retrenchment. So he has prayed for his reinstatement with full back wages.

3. On the other hand the management of the bank in its written statement have submitted that there are 20 nationalised banks in the country with its branches. Some irregularities had crept up in the matter of engagement of sub staff for which the trade union representing the workman of UCO bank and the management of the bank have prompted a settlement on 12.10.89 for regularization of such casual/daily wage employee. There were several eligibility criteria prescribed for such regularisation in the said settlement. According to the management as the workman was engaged as a water boy to supply water to the staff and customers of the bank on daily wage basis, he did not fulfill the eligibility criteria for absorption in the bank. Further the main duty of the workman was to supply drinking water to the staff and customers of the bank during summer season and he has never worked as a subordinate staff in the said branch of the UCO bank nor he has performed any of the duties required to be done by subordinate staff. Moreover as per the norms of the settlement it has been specifically agreed that those who have been engaged as water boys on daily wage would not be eligible for being considered for absorption under settlement. Therefore he claim of the 2nd party workman is not legal and justified and hence the reference may kindly be answered in their favour.

4. On the above pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed:

I: Whether the reference is bad in law?

II: Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank, Goadbhaga, Dist: Sambalpur in terminating the services of Sri Manabhajan Bhoi, Sub staff w.e.f 19.8.92 and not giving him one –time opportunity for absorption in erms of the Approach Paper circulated by the Ministry of Finance in 1990 is justified ?

III: To what relief, if any, the 2nd party workman is entitled?

5. In order to prove their case, the management has examined two witnesses in their favour as against one for the 2nd party workman. Besides oral evidence the management has exhibited three documents as against 8 documents from the side of the workman to substantiate its case.

6. Issue no. II:- In this issue the Tribunal has to decide whether the action of the management of UCO bank in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 19.8.92 and not giving him one-time opportunity for absorption in terms of the Approach Paper circulated by Ministry of Finance in 1990 is justified or not?

7. It is the specific case of the 2nd party workman is that on 26.3.88 he started service as a peon in Goadbaga branch of UCO Bank and continued to work till 19.8.92 with break of two days after completing 89 days of work each time and he has been improperly debarred from being empanelled for absorption in the bank permanently. But the management has vehemently objected the assertion of the workman through M.W.1 and have stated that the 2nd party workman was engaged in the bank as a water boy only to supply water to the staff and customers in the summer season and he was engaged as a casual worker. M.W.2 has also lent corroboration to the aforesaid statement of M.W.1 by stating that the workman was engaged as a water boy. But to substantiate his claim that he was working throughout the year on all the bank working days on daily wage basis and was doing multifarious works like cleaning the bank premises, supply snacks, giving bank intimation to the customers and also maintaining the balance register in the bank. At times, during his evidence the workman has proved the balance register dt. 31.5.88, 21.11.88, 30.11.88 and 31.12.91 maintained by him in his hand which have been marked as Ext. B, C and D. The workman has further stated that he was receiving his wages in direct cash and at times his wages were being deposited in his bank account. The said statement of the workman has also been admitted by M.W.1. The evidence of the workman also reveals that on 6.3.92 he was sent to Sambalpur by the bank on official duty for which he was paid T.A of Rs.25/- vide Ext. F and on 9.4.92 he had done extra work in the bank for which he has been paid Rs.20/- vide Ext. G. Similarly on 16.8.91 he was sent to Brajrajnagar on official duty for carrying cash for which he was paid Rs.25/- as T.A vide Ext. E/26. He was also paid bonus every year and Ext. E/56 is the bonus for the year 1991-92. As such the balance register marked Exts. B, C & D clearly shows that the 2nd party workman was working in the bank from 1988 as claimed by him and from Ext. F, G, E/26 and E/56 it is crystal clear that he was not a seasonal worker engaged only for summer season and negates the claim of the managements that he was engaged as a water boy. Also maintenance of Ext. B, C & D by the workman, is going to Sambalpur & Brajrajnagar on official duty shows that he was engaged in the bank for doing multifarious works. But from the above documentary evidence it cannot be inferred that the workman was working throughout the year on bank working days on daily wages basis as a sub staff of the bank because the workman being examined as W.W.1 in his cross examination dt. 10.12.13 has fairly admitted that he was initially appointed as water boy, only to supply water and in the year 1988 he has worked for 76 days, in 1989 has worked for 85 days, in 1990 he has worked for 85 days, in 1991 he has worked for 205 days and in 1992 he has worked for 173 days. As such from 1988 till 1992 the workman has never worked for 240 days continuously in a year and his statement that he was engaged in 1988 and was working throughout the year on bank working days on daily wage basis is found to be false. Of course Ext. A, B, C, D, F & G show that at times he was engaged in other bank work, but that was unofficial because the workman (W.W.1) has fairly admitted in cross examination on 10.12.13 that the Bank Manager had not given him any official order to handle with financial transaction and to maintain cash book etc. The cross examination of the workman (W.W.1) on 1.6.99 also reveals that before his initial engagement he was not called for any interview nor his name was sponsored by the Employment Exchange. The bank had only called him and asked him to work. His cross examination also reveals that he was not given any order in writing to proceed to Sambalpur for official work. He has also admitted that one Pitchu Barua was working as cash peon in the bank and on 16.8.91 the said Barua was present in his duty and he was taken by the bank clerk to Sambalpur only to load and unload the cash box. The workman has also admitted in cross examination that there was one sweeper attached to the bank and one Daftari was also engaged in the bank while he was working in the bank. So when a sweeper was engaged to sweep and clean the bank premises, it is hard to believe that the workman was engaged for the said purpose. Likewise when there was a permanent Daftari it cannot be believed that the workman was being engaged as a daftari by the management. The cross examination of the workman (W.W.1) on 10.12.13 also discloses that as per his admit card, Ext. H his date of birth is 7.2.1971 and he had not completed 18 years of age when he was initially appointed in the bank. He has also admitted that after the disposal of the present I.D. case by this Tribunal in the year 1989 he had made an application to the bank in the year 2000 for his appointment. But the bank had intimated him that as he had not completed 18 years of age at the time of initial appointment, his service cannot be regularised. This witness also admits that he knew that in the year 1989 there was a bank circular for regularisation of the services of the temporary bank employees basing on the agreement between the management of the bank and the trade union vide Ext. 3 and he had not fulfilled all the criterias fixed in the agreement executed between the management of the bank and the trade union for which the bank had denied service to him. From the discussion made above it can be safely concluded that the 2nd party workman Manabhanjan Bhoi was not a sub staff of the bank and even if he is held to be a sub staff he is not entitled for absorption in terms of Approach Paper circulated by Ministry of Finance in the year 1990. In view of his own admission that he had not completed 18 years of age when he was appointed and he was not called for any interview nor his name was sponsored by Employment Exchange and he had not fulfilled all the criterias fixed in the agreement

executed between the management of bank and the trade union. As such this Tribunal is of the view that the action of the management of UCO Bank, Goadbaga, District: Sambalpur in terminating the services of Sri Manabhanjan Bhoi with effect from 19.8.92 and not giving him one-time opportunity for absorption in terms of the Approach Paper circulated by Ministry of Finance in the year 1990 is justified and this Issue is answered accordingly.

8. Issue Nos. I & II:- Since neither side have raised any objection before the Tribunal that the reference is bad in law it is held that the reference is not bad in law. In view of the findings of this Tribunal given vide Issue No. II the 2nd party workman is not entitled for any relief as claimed by him. Accordingly the reference is answered.

Dictated & corrected by me.

S. K. MOHANTY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1741.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार डब्ल्यूसीएल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 94/08) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/21/2008-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

राजेन्द्र सिंह, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th August, 2016

S.O. 1741.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 94/08) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Western Coalfields Limited and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 12.08.2016.

[No. L-22012/21/2008-IR (CM-II)]

RAJENDER SINGH, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/94/08

Shri Moh. Naseem Siddiqui,
Zonal Mahamantri,
C.Mewa, Zonal Vekoli Shakha,
Ward No.10, Gudhi, Post Palachaurai,
Chhindwara

...Workman/Union

Versus

Chief General Manager,
Western Coalfields Limited,
Kanhana Area,
PO Dungaria,
Chhindwara

...Management

A W A R D

Passed on this 17th day of June, 2016

1. As per letter dated 30-6-08 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section -10 of I.D.Act, 1947 as per Notification No.L-22012/21/2008-IR(CM-II). The dispute under reference relates to:

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. WCL in denying employment to Kumari Manisha D/o Late Shri Ramlal on compassionate basis is legal and justified? To what relief is the dependent of the deceased workman entitled?”

2. After receiving reference, notices were issued to the parties. Ist party submitted statement of claim through Zonal Secretary of the Union. Case of Ist party is that Union is a registered trade Union having its registration No. 2055/77. The dispute is raised under authority given by Kumari Manisha. That her father Ramlal was in employment of 2nd party management. He died on 16-9-96. In harness. As per service rules, the dependent of employee is entitled for

compassionate appointment to come over the sudden crisis. That after death of Shri Ramlal, Smt. Jugnibai widow of Ramlal submitted an application for appointment on compassionate ground for her daughter submitting that her daughter was dependent. Her application was turned down on the pretext that no rule provide compassionate appointment to a female member. Information was given vide letter dated 27-10-97. The widow of deceased Ramlal informed management that her son was not capable of discharging duties as he is remaining sick and he died on 8-6-02. Thereafter again claimant Manisha submitted application on 16-3-04 requesting that she may be allowed appointment on compassionate ground in place of her deceased father. That both of her brother has died and there was no make member in the family. She received reply dated 12-5-05 that since the matter was referred to Competent Authority who had not agreed to consider her case for giving her compassionate appointment as it is a belated case. Again she was informed by letter dated 28-8-06 by Assistant Chief Personal Manager, Bakoli that as desired by her, a certificate was sent to her regarding rejection of her application for compassionate appointment. Union submits action of management is unjustifiable as dependents of the family of deceased employee Ramlal are thrown into hell for struggle and after rejection of compassionate appointment to Ku. Manisha she is struggling for daily bread with her handicapped mother and other young family members. After death of Ramlal, she is dependent family member being unmarried daughter. On such ground, Istparty submits that claimant Manisha is entitled to get appointment immediately after death of her father.

3. 2nd party filed Written Statement opposing claim of Ist party workman. 2nd party also submits that Late Ramlal was working as Mechanical Fitter at Rakhikol colliery of WCL, he died on 16-9-97. That service conditions of coal mines are covered by NCWA executed from time to time. The provision of employment to dependent came into effect w.e.f. 1-1-79 during implementation of NCWA II. Said provision had been carried out through with modifications as and when required. That the NCWA VI deals with employment/monetary compensation to female dependent under clause 9.5.0. reproduced below-

“ In case of death either in mine accident or for any other reason or medical unfitness under clause 9.4.0, if no employment has been offered and the male dependent of the concerned worker is 12 years and above in age, he will be kept on a live roster and would be provided employment commensurate with is skill and qualifications when he attain the age of 18 years. During the period the male dependent is on live roster, the female dependent will be paid monetary compensation as per rates at para (i) and (ii) above. This will be effective from 1-1-2000.”

4. 2nd party further submits that as per official record as well as declaration given by the widow of deceased workman the family particulars are Smt. Jugna-widow 40 years, Sunil Kumar-son 24 years, Anil Kumar son 21 years, Ku.Bhagwati daughter- 25 years, Ku. Manisha daughter- 20 years. That the widow of deceased did not apply for employment, she submitted application in favour of her daughter Ku.Manisha for employment alongwith certain documents including affidavit stating that her son Anil residing separately with his family, no objection from other legal heirs were not filed by her alongwith application. Said application was submitted in 1999. Application was forwarded to Competent Authority by Area concerned. The Competent Authority vide order dated 24-7-06 regret to provide employment to the dependent on the ground that the claimant has approached belatedly. The widow submitted an application that she doesnot want to recommend for employment to any of her son/ daughter including Ku. Manisha and she wanted the monetary benefit available under the said scheme for herself. Said application was forwarded to the Competent Authority on 13-5-2000.

5. After the statement of claim is filed by Ist party, additional Written Statement is filed by 2nd party at Page 14. The management without prejudice to its contentions in earlier exparte Written Statement submits that Late Ramlal was not member of Union on such ground, Union has no locus-standi to raise the dispute. That management had informed claimant that when male members are alive, dependent female cannot be provided employment. The family particulars of the deceased shows that there were male dependents, hence the claim made by the claimant was not tenable. That the widow mother has specifically told the management that she is not prepared for recommend for providing employment to her children, she claimed financial compensation under the scheme. That the widow of Late Ramlal is entitled for the monetary benefits as per prevailing scheme. That claimant Manisha is not entitled for compassionate appointment. On such ground, 2nd party prays that reference be answered in its favour.

6. Considering pleadings on record, the points which arise for my consideration and determination are as under. My findings are recorded against each of them for the reasons as below:-

(i) Whether the action of the management of M/s. WCL in denying employment to Kumari Manisha D/o Late ShriRamlal on compassionate basis is legal and justified?	In Negative
(ii) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"	As per final order.

REASONS

7. Point No.1- the terms of reference pertains to legality of denial of compassionate appointment to claimant Manisha D/o Deceased employee Ramlal. The copy of Memo of Agreement Exhibit M-1 is produced. Clause 9.5.0 provides-

- (I) In case of death due to mine accident, the female dependant would have the option to either accept the monetary compensation of Rs.4000 per month or employment irrespective of her age.
- (II) In case of death/ total permanent disablement due to cause other than mine accident, medical unfitness under Clause 9.4.0, if the female dependent is below the age of 45 years she will have the option either to accept the monetary compensation of Rs.3000 per month or employment.

In case the female dependent is above 45 years of age she will be entitled only to monetary compensation and not to employment.

Keeping above aspect in view, the evidence adduced by parties and documents needs to be considered.

8. Claimant Manisha filed affidavit of her evidence stating that her father Ramlal died on 16-9-96. Her mother submitted application for compassionate appointment on 17-10-97. Said application was rejected on the ground that female member was not entitled for compassionate appointment. As per rule, only male dependents were entitled to compassionate appointment. Her mother had informed management that her son was not able to work. Thereafter her son died on 8-6-02. Again claimant Manisha submitted application for compassionate appointment on 16-3-04 on the ground that there was no male dependent in the family, her brothers were dead. She received reply to said application on 12-5-05 and letter dated 28-8-06 that her claim for compassionate appointment could not be allowed for the ground of delay. Ist party workman has produced documents Exhibit W-1 to W-10. In her cross-examination, claimant Manisha says W-9 & 10 were written by ShriShashiShekhar clerk who was working outside the office of management. Those applications were written as per their say. In 1997, the applications were submitted. She was of 18 years of age. Applications W-9,10 were given in dispatch section. She admits that if application is given in dispatch section, receipt is given imposing office seal. When her father died, age of her mother was more than 45 years. Her elder brother died before death of her father. Her brother Anil Kumar was of 25-26 years age at the time of death of her father. Shri Anil Kumar died in the year 1000-01. Her sister Bhagwati is married and she resides at different place. After letter given by management she submitted no objection of other LR's of deceased. She denies that she not submitted NOC of other dependents.

9. Evidence of management's witness Shri Milind Ganveer is n the point that as per family particulars of deceased workman, he left dependents Smt. Jugna-widow 40 years, Sunil Kumar-son 24 years, Anil Kumar son 21 years, Ku.Bhagwati daughter- 25 years, Ku Manisha daughter- 20 years. That application for compassionate appointment was forwarded to Competent Authority concerned area vide letter dated 24-7-06. That widow of deceased workman did not want to recommend employment of her daughter Manisha. The area concerned forwarded the application to Competent Authority on 13-5-2010. That the widow wanted monetary benefits. Management's witness in his further evidence says that the application is submitted by widow Jugnabai. At that time, he was working as Personal Manager. Application is admitted in evidence at Exhibit M-17. Management's witness also admitted his signature on Exhibit M-18. In his cross-examination, management's witness says that employee Ramlal died on 16-9-97, Jugnabai submitted application for compassionate appointment for her daughter Manisha on 17-10-97. He denies that after death of Ramlal only Jugnabai and Manisha were his dependents. Service record of Ramlal is produced. He claims ignorance that Anil Kumar S/o Ramlal died. He admits that compassionate appointment to Manisha was rejected on the ground of delay. As per Exhibit M-17, monetary benefits are not paid, the matter is still pending.

10. Smt. Jugnabai in her evidence says her husband was working as Fitter. She did not remember date of his death. That she had no issues, she was residing alone. Her son Sunil and Anil died. Manisha is her daughter but she resides separately. She claims to be dependent of her husband Ramlal. That she is not willing to give any benefit to other persons accrued to be as widow of Ramlal. She desires to take those benefits in her lifetime. That she is not recommending compassionate appointment for her daughter. In her cross, Jugna says Manisha is her daughter but residing separately. She has married at Rakhikol. She had not performed her marriage, she did not see Manisha residing with her husband. In cross-examination by Advocate A.K.Shashi by management JugnaBai says that claimant is her daughter since past 6 years, she is residing separate from her. The claimant herself married without her knowledge. Claimant has 3 sons, claimant had not married with her consent. She is not consent for compassionate appointment to claimant Manisha.

11. The documentary evidence on record needs to be considered. Exhibit M-1 is copy of application dated 6-9-99 submitted by Manisha for compassionate appointment, Exhibit M-2 is copy of application dated 6-9-99 submitted by widow Jugnabai not to give compassionate appointment to her son Anil Kumar, he was residing separately and she has

no relation with him. Exhibit M-3 is copy of proposal for compassionate appointment after death of Ramlal, his widow Jugnabai, son Sunil, Anil daughters Bhagwati and Manisha are shown as dependents. Exhibit M-4 is copy of marksheet of claimant of Manisha of SSC. Exhibit M-5 is certificate about death of Ramlal on 16-9-97. M-6 is copy of affidavit submitted by Jugnabai recommending compassionate appointment for claimant Manisha and denying compassionate appointment to her son Anil. Said affidavit is of dated 3-11-97. Age of Manisha is shown 21 years. Manisha has stated that if her mother is not specified with her, she was ready to pay half of her salary to her mother. M-8 is service excerpt of Late Ramlal, his dependents are shown at reverse page. M-9 is Medical Certificate issued by Dr.G.C.Chourasia about birth of Manisha, M-10 is caste certificate of Ramlal, M-11 is copy of marksheet of Manisha. M-12 is death certificate of Ramlal, died on 16-9-97. M-13 is copy of Identity card of Manisha, M-14 is letter dated 26-5-05 informing that management not agreed to consider case for compassionate appointment of claimant Manisha.

12. The documents produced by workman Exhibit W-1 is death certificate of Ramlal, W-2 is service excerpt of Ramlal identical set of documents are produced by management. Exhibit W-10 is application submitted by Jugna Bai that her sons Anil was not fit for service, she used to quarrel in drunken condition she recommended compassionate appointment to Manisha. W-3 is letter informing Jugnabai that when male dependents are alive, it is not possible to allow compassionate appointment to female dependents. W-4 is death certificate of Anil, W-5 is letter dated 12-5-05 informing decision of management that compassionate appointment to Manisha could not be allowed.

13. The substance of the documents on record are clear that though application was submitted by Manisha and widow in 1999 management informed in 2005-06 that compassionate appointment could not be allowed to Manisha as the application was belated. What management had done during 99 to 2006 is not clear from the evidence adduced by the management. The claimant Manisha could not be blamed for delay when she submitted application in 1999. As per document Exhibit W-3, Jugnabai was informed when there were male dependants, it was not possible to allow compassionate appointment to female dependents.

14. Memorandum of agreement M-1 Para 9.5 is clear that when female dependent is below age of 45 years, she has option to accept monetary compensation Rs.3000 per month or employment. In documents on record at the time of death of Ramlal, age of Jugnabai was 40 years. During all those years, neither she was paid monetary compensation nor any decision was taken on application of Manisha from 99 to 2005 and lastly her claim was rejected for delay. Manisha could not be blamed for it. Considering reasons discussed above, the action of the management is not proper and legal. Accordingly I record my finding in Point No.1 in Negative.

15. Point No.2- despite of Para 9.5.0 (I) & (II) the female dependents i.e. widow was entitled for monetary benefits, management has not taken decision in that regard for last 19 years. The document Exhibit W-7 shows that the officials of the management tried to pursue that Jugnabai widow of deceased employee may accept monetary benefits. The application Exhibit M-17 was submitted by Jugnabai on 19-5-08 for claiming monetary compensation if it is not possible to provide compassionate employment to Manisha after death of her husband. Management has not taken decision till date in the matter. Considering the circumstances discussed above, the claim for compassionate appointment of Manisha is justified with the condition that amount Rs.4000 per month from her salary be paid to widow Jugna Bai till her death. Accordingly I record my finding in Point No.2.

16. In the result, award is passed as under:-

- (1) The action of the management is not proper and legal.
- (2) 2nd party management is directed to provide compassionate appointment to the claimant Manisha subject to the condition that Rs.4000/- per month from her salary be paid to Smt. Jugna, widow of deceased workman.

R. B. PATLE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1742.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार डब्ल्यूसीएल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 77/02) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/13/2000-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

राजेन्द्र सिंह, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th August, 2016

S.O. 1742.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 77/02) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Western Coalfields Limited, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 12.08.2016.

[No. L-22012/13/2000-IR (CM-II)]

RAJENDER SINGH, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/77/02

Shri Keshavrao,
C/o Shri Kisanaji Kabarkar,
R/o Vill. Koliya,
PO Hatnapur, Tehsil Multai,
Betul

...Workman

Versus

General Manager,
Western Coalfield Limited,
P.O Pathakhhera,
Betul

...Management

AWARD

Passed on this 27th day of June 2016

1. As per letter dated 20-5-02 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section -10 of I.D.Act, 1947 as per Notification No.L-22012/13/2000-IR(CM-II). The dispute under reference relates to:

“Whether the action of the management of M/S Western Coalfields Ltd. Pathakhhera Area, Distt. Betul in terminating the services of ShriKeshavraow.e.f. 1-4-96 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receiving reference, notices were issued to the parties. Ist party workman submitted statement of claim at Page 2/1 to 2/7. Case of Ist party workman is that he was appointed on post of loader on 12-5-97 in same. He worked as loader till 7-8-75, thereafter he was disengaged. Letter was issued by Attendance Clerk Shri A.R. Raipure on the basis of said letter, he was appointed in other mine. He worked as loader. That Labour Officer Mr. Suryavanshi wrongly recorded his name Krishna S/o Isna at the time of 2nd appointment. In Satpura mine at the time of his first appointment, his name was recorded as Keshav Rao S/o Kisna. He also submitted application in writing for correction of his name. again he submitted application on 29-3-76 to Welfare Officer, 3-4 Nuclear Mines. His name was not corrected as per his request and applications in writing. Ist party workman consider that in case of his death, his LRs may face difficulties. He had approached the Officer. He was directed to file affidavit in name of Keshavrao was known as Krishna. On advice of the Officer, he submitted affidavit on 1-4-81. From 29-10-75 to 3-8-82, he worked as general loader, from 6-8-82 to 20-7-83, he was performing timering work. From 21-7-83 to 5-4-84, he was doing deplaring work. From 6-6-84 to 5-12-84, he was doing work of shot firing, from 6-12-84 to 31-5-88 general work. He worked for 12 years 6 months and 28 days in Pathakhhera mines. ShriP.K.Chatterjee had signed the record and MTK Balwant counter signed. On 12-12-91, he passed exam of Sirdar.

3. He was granted permission for said exam in name of Keshav Rao. On 24-2-93, he passed TVC exam. In the year 1993, Labour Officer again asked him to submit affidavit from Notary. Thereafter workman submitted notarized affidavit on 7-12-93. On 4-1-94, Suptd of Mine No.2 issued office order about his promotion as Mining Sirdar. On 24-1-94, his promotion was cancelled. On 4-1-94, he was promoted as Mining Sirdar and his promotion was cancelled on 24-1-94 without explaining any reasons to him. Any showcause notice was not issued. The Officer of the department directed him to again file affidavit about correction of his name. he submitted affidavit of correction of his name on 12-4-94. He was complied with the directions of the Officers. He has not committed any kind of misconduct. For mistakes committed by the Officers of the department, any cumulative act against him is not legal. Ist party further submits that chargesheet was issued to him on 3-2-94 calling his explanation. Without correcting his name as per his request, the workman was dismissed from service. workman feeling aggrieved filed proceeding before Labour Court,

Betul and dispute was also raised before RLC, Bhopal. The staff in Pathakhera deliberately shown negligence. His request for correction of name was not considered as Keshav Rao S/o Kisna instead of Krishna S/o Isna. Though the negligence was of the staff working in the mine, he was dismissed from service illegally.

4. 2nd party filed Written Statement at Page 4/1 to 4/10 opposing claim of workman. 2nd party submits that one Krishna S/o Isna resident of Kolia, Tehsil Multai, Distt. Betul was appointed as Loader from 29-10-75. Appointment order was issued in his name. however workman reported to duty and resumed duty in name of Krishna S/o Isna. Subsequently management came to know that name of workman is Keshav Rao S/o Kisna and not Krishna S/o Isna. Workman committed fraud, therefore chargesheet was issued to him on 3-2-94 for the charges workman obtained employment giving his false name and education. Chargesheet was replied by workman. His reply was found unsatisfactory. Shri D.C. Jha was appointed as Enquiry Officer. Shri A.K. Singore was appointed as Management Representative. Enquiry was conducted against workman on various dates. Management as well as workman has laid oral and documentary evidence. Enquiry Officer submitted his report holding workman guilty of the charges against him. Considering the findings of Enquiry Officer, Competent Authority imposed punishment of dismissal. Workman was dismissed from service as per order dated 31-3-96.

5. 2nd party reiterates that workman Keshav Rao S/o Kisna reported on duty in name of Krishna S/o Kisna. No appointment order was issued in name of Keshav Rao to workman. All adverse contentions of workman are denied. It is reiterated that management's witnesses were examined. Workman was granted opportunity to cross examine. The findings of Enquiry Officer are based on evidence. For proved misconduct, workman is not entitled to any relief.

6. Vide order dated 1-5-2013, enquiry conducted against workman is found vitiated. Management of 2nd party was allowed to prove misconduct against workman.

7. Considering pleadings on record and findings on enquiry, the points which arise for my consideration and determination are as under. My findings are recorded against each of them for the reasons as below:-

(i) Whether the 2 nd party management proves misconduct/ charges alleged against workman?	In Negative
(ii) Whether the action of the management of M/S Western Coalfields Ltd. Pathakhera Area, Distt. Betul in terminating the services of Shri Keshav Rao w.e.f. 1-4-96 is legal and justified?	In Negative
(ii) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"	As per final order.

REASONS

8. Point No.1- Enquiry conducted against workman is found vitiated as per order dated 1-5-2013, management was granted permission to prove misconduct/ charges against workman.

9. The charges alleged against workman pertains to obtaining employment giving his false name of himself, his father and false information of his education. After enquiry was held vitiated, management was granted permission to prove misconduct, management filed affidavit of witness Shri Rasid Ahmed, Shri B.K. Mishra. However both witnesses of the management failed to appear for their cross-examination. It was therefore observed that evidence of both witnesses shall not be considered. Management did not adduce evidence of any other witness as such management has absolutely failed to adduce evidence to prove charges adduced against workman. Workman filed affidavit of his evidence. Workman states in his affidavit that he was appointed on 12-5-75 as labour and worked till 7-8-75. He was appointed in other mine, his name was wrongly written as Krishna S/ Kisna by Labour Officer, he was terminated on 31-3-96. After his dismissal from service, he is not working anywhere. He is having financial problems. His relative and friends bear expenses of his family. Said affidavit was not pressed by workman. As such both parties have not adduced evidence w.r.t. charges alleged against workman. For above reasons, I record my finding in Point No.1 in Negative.

10. Point No.2- In view of my finding in Point No.1 charges against workman are not proved, punishment of dismissal against workman cannot be sustained. Learned counsel for 2nd party Shri A.K. Shashi emphasized that name of workman was Keshav Rao, S/o Isna joined duty in the mine in the name of Krishna S/o Isna and secured employment in wrong name and though the charges are not proved against workman, any relief should not be granted to the workman. Above argument is opposed by learned counsel for workman Shri Himanshu Srivastav. The pleading between parties disclosed that workman repeatedly approached management for correction of his name from Keshav Rao S/o Isna to Krishna, S/O Isna. Management has not adduced any evidence whether any person by name Krishna

S/o Isna was really existing and workman had dishonestly secured employment why the correction in name requested by workman was not accepted. Even the documents about education submitted by workman were accepted or not? In absence of such evidence and when charges are not proved, the dismissal of workman from service cannot be sustained. Workman deserves to be reinstated in service, the punishment of dismissal is not justified. For above reasons, I record my finding in point No.2.

11. In the result, award is passed as under:-

- (1) The action of the management is not proper and legal.
- (2) 2nd party is directed to reinstate workman with continuity of service with full back wages.

Amount of back wages shall be paid to workman within 30 days from the date of notification of award. In case of default, amount shall carry 9 % interest per annum from the date of award till its realization.

R. B. PATLE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 अगस्त, 2016

का.आ. 1743.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एसईसीएल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 30/1997) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12.08.2016 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/458/1994-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

राजेन्द्र सिंह, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th August, 2016

S.O. 1743.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 30/1997) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of South Eastern Coalfields Limited and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 12.08.2016.

[No. L-22012/458/1994-IR (CM-II)]

RAJENDER SINGH, Section Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/30/97

General Secretary,
National Colliery Workers Federation (NLO),
J & K Area,
Post Kotma Colliery,
Distt.Shahdol (MP)

Workman/Union

Versus

Sub Area Manager,
Kurja UG Project, SECL,
Post Bijuri,
Distt.Shahdol.

Management

AWARD

Passed on this 30th day of June 2016

1. As per letter dated 7-2-97 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section -10 of I.D.Act, 1947 as per Notification No.L-22012/458/94/IR (C-II). The dispute under reference relates to:

“Whether the action of the management of Kurja U/G Project of Hadeo Area of SECL in not regularizing the services of workers employed at Kurja Project is just and legal? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?”

2. After receiving reference, notices were issued to the parties. Ist party Union submitted statement of claim. Case of Ist party Union is that Union is registered under Trade Union Act. It has large membership in colliery of SECL in MP, CG including Kurja Project. That service conditions of SECL are governed by NCWA, Mines Act, Coal Mines Regulations etc. That Government of India issuing notification prohibited the contract labour in the underground mines. The workers whose names have been referred to this Tribunal have worked in the prohibited category directly under the SECL. Therefore they are entitled for benefit of regularization. It is further submitted that workers shown in the list referred to this Tribunal for adjudication were initially appointed in the post of Category I Mazdoorw.e.f. 26-5-90 to Sept.90 in the prohibited category jobs like stone drift, stone cutting and earth removing, earth cutting, loading and unloading and transportation of coal in the underground mines of Kurja Project. The workers were initially appointed directly by the 2nd party during May 90 to Sept.90. they were ordered to perform duty of Category-I Mazdoor in the field of mining operation of Kurja Mines of Hasdeo Area. The workers continued to work till December 1992. Management of SECL used to supervise their work. Their attendance was marked in Form C Register. All workers were directly working under the control and supervision of the management of Kurja Project. Management used to pay wages directly. Workers were also given other benefits like payment of bonus Act, Category I wages under NCWA and other benefits. Even coal mine provident fund contribution was deducted from the salaries of the workers and was deposited with the Coal Mine Provident Fund Authority. Contribution was deducted from their salaries of the workers and was deposited with the Coal Mine Provident Fund Authority.

3. Ist party further submits that tools like Ganty, phawda, drill rod, drill machine, haulage machine and other required equipments for the purpose of coal raising were provided by the management. It is submitted that in December 1992, management adopted unfair labor practice and with a view to victimize the workers, changed their service conditions without issuing any notice under Section-9 of ID Act, 1947. The workers were directed to perform duties under various contractor. Despite of it, overall supervision and control was of management of SECL because the nature of job was not changed. Union further submits that during 1991 to 1994, workers were working in Kurja Project underground Mines. Due to their service, coal production reached to the maximum. During May 1990 to Sept-90, there was direct employer employee relationship between worker and the management. After serving more than 5 years instead of absorbing or regularizing employees, they were stopped from duties. It is alleged that workman were depriving their benefits for regularization is unfair labor practice under Item 10, Schedule V. workmen are illegally stopped from performing their duties in violation of provisions of ID Act. On such ground, Union prays that denial of regularization of services of all those workers is illegal and workmen be allowed regularization.

4. 2nd party has filed Written Statement opposing claim of Union. 2nd party submits that term of reference is highly prejudicial to its reference. The reference is vague. The particulars of claimants for identification are not given. The period of engagement, nature of employment, particulars of ages are not disclosed. That claimants are not covered as workman under Section 2(s) of ID Act. Personal identification of claimant's employment are not produced. Government has committed error in terming the claimants as workman. Claimants were not in employment of the management. There is no question of their regularization in service. employment of claimant is highly disputed question. It should not have been decided by the Government, the reference is misconceived and liable to be rejected.

5. It is submitted that person seeking employment in coal industry needs to go through the procedure prescribed for appointment. When person appointed following such procedure would be considered for absorption. That management used to engage contractors following the rules. The contractor used to engage labour for execution of work awarded to him. Management has no control or supervision of labours engaged by the contractor. The appointments and termination of services of labours engaged by the contractor, management has no concern. Similarly liability to pay remuneration to labours engaged by contractor is of the contractor himself.

6. All material contentions of Istparty Union in statement of claim have been denied. It is denied that claimants were appointed as Cat-I Mazdoor during the period 26-5-90 to Sept.90 in prohibited category for work of stone drifting, stone cutting etc. The recovery of CMPF contribution from wages paid to claimants have been denied. Claimants were not engaged. There is no question of stopping them from duties. It is further submitted unless particulars of contract, the period of contract are disclosed, management is unable to offer its comments. On such ground, 2nd party prays for rejection of claim under reference.

7. Considering pleadings on record, the points which arise for my consideration and determination are as under. My findings are recorded against each of them for the reasons as below:-

(i) Whether the action of the management of Kurja U/G Project of Hadeo Area of SECL in not regularizing the services of workers employed at Kurja Project is just and legal?	In Affirmative
(ii) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"	Workmen are not entitled to any relief.

REASONS

8. Point No.1- The term of reference pertains to denial of regularization to the claimants workman by management of SECL. 2nd party management had denied claimants were appointed at any time for the prohibited category of work in underground mine. Identical affidavit of evidence are filed by Shri Ashraf S/o Shri Muhammad Gafur, Shri Rahim S/o Late Shri Abdul Karim, Shri Sameed S/o Shri Shabbar Miyar. All the witnesses of Ist party Union have stated in their affidavit that they were working in underground mines during the period May 1990 to December 1992. That they were engaged as Category I Mazdoor around May 1990, they continued to work underground mine. The instructions required for the work were supplied by the management. The instructions for work were given to them by overman, their attendance was maintained by Shri Ramkaran Singh and Ramphal Sharma were in charge. CMPF contribution was deducted from their wages, they worked more than 240 days during each of the calendar year. They were stopped from work from November 1994. If they would have been regularized by management, they would not have stopped from work by the contractor.

9. Shri Ashraf in his cross-examination says he was engaged by management on 18-5-90, 250 persons were engaged along with him. He was unable to tell name of Officer engaging him. He had not submitted application for job he was interviewed. He was unable to tell the date of interview. 10 persons were interviewed with him. Appointment letter was not given to him. He did not recollect whether his name was sent through Employment Exchange. He did not recollect Kurja underground mines comes under which area. In his further cross-examination, witness says foreman Ramlal was giving instruction for work. He was unable to tell whether Ramlal is still in employment of 2nd party. Wages were paid by the officer, he was unable to tell name of the Officer. The payment was made after end of the month. His signatures used to be obtained on register. He was unable to tell his working days in the year 1990. His attendance was maintained by clerk Shri Ramkaran Singh. He was unable to tell what kind of vocational training was given to him. He had requested for regularization in 1993-94 but request was not made in writing. Shri Abdul Karim in his cross examination says appointment letter was not given to him. He did not give clear reply to the question whether appointments in 2nd party used to be made as per rules. That he disengaged in the year 1994. Shri Sameed in his cross-examination says appointment letter was not given to him, he did not reply to the question whether he had received any letter about his termination in the year 1992. The evidence of all the witnesses is clear that they were stopped from work in the year 1994. Any of them are not in employment of the management.

10. Evidence of management's witness Shri M.V. Lakra and Shri Biresh Shukla is by way of denial of the engagement and employment of the claimants. Despite 2nd party has raised contentions in Written Statement that particulars of claimants are not given, list is not submitted, list of claimants on whose behalf the reference has been raised by Union is not received along with order of reference. As such who are claimants seeking regularization of their services is not clear. On whose behalf, Union is prosecuting the dispute under reference, therefore could not be known. The document Exhibit W-1 pertains to the training given by management to 5 employees name of Rahim is at Sl.No.1.

11. Learned counsel for Ist party Shri Shailendra Pandey submitted copy of standing orders of SECL.

Para 3.5 pertains to A permanent workman is one who is employed on a job of permanent nature for a period of at least 6 months or who has satisfactorily put in 6 months continuous service in a permanent post as a probationer.

When list of workers is not received along with order of reference, union without taking care of it has proceeded in the matter. The claim of Union therefore cannot be accepted.

12. Incidentally I may refer to ratio cited by Shri A. K. Shashi for management on bunch of cases.

In case between Oshiar Prasad and others versus employers in relation to the management of Sudamdih Coal Washery of BCCL, Dhanbad, Jharkhand reported in 2015-I-LLJ-513(SC). Their Lordship held-Appellant not in service of either contractor or/ and BCCL on date of making reference in question. No industrial dispute that existed or apprehended in relation to appellant's absorption in services of BCCL on date of making reference.

Since the appellant's services discontinued or and retrenched long back, question of absorption or regularization did not arise."

In present case, the pleading and evidence of 1st party and its witnesses are clear that the claimants were stopped from duty in November 1994. The dispute has been referred as per order dated 7-2-97, any of the claimants were not in working with 2nd party at the time of raising dispute. Therefore claim for regularization of the Union cannot be established.

13. Other citation in the bunch are not relevant to the controversy in present reference, therefore I am not inclined to discuss those citations for reasons as claimants were not in employment since November 1994. The claim for regularization by Union cannot be accepted. Besides it, list of claimants is not received along with order therefore also the claim cannot be accepted. For above reasons, I record my finding in Point No.1 in Affirmative.

14. In the result, award is passed as under:-

- (1) The action of the management is proper and legal.
- (2) Workmen are not entitled to any relief.

R. B. PATLE, Presiding Officer