



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

सी.जी.-डी.एल.-सा.-04022026-269795
CG-DL-W-04022026-269795

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 3] नई दिल्ली, जनवरी 25—जनवरी 31, 2026, शनिवार/माघ 5—माघ 11, 1947
No. 3] NEW DELHI, JANUARY 25—JANUARY 31, 2026, SATURDAY/MAGHA 5—MAGHA 11, 1947

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)

परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 16 जनवरी, 2026

का.आ. 84.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन परमाणु ऊर्जा शिक्षण संस्था, मुंबई के निम्नलिखित विद्यालय के 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों के हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लेने पर इन्हें राजभाषा नियम (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग), 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में अधिसूचित करती है:-

1. परमाणु ऊर्जा केंद्रीय विद्यालय, इंदौर

[फा. सं. 11/हिंदी/2025-26/2788-2948]

दीप प्रकाश, वैज्ञानिक सचिव, आईसी एवं प्रमुख आईसीपीडी और अध्यक्ष राजभाषा कार्यान्वयन समिति, पऊवि

DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

New Delhi, the 16th January, 2026

S.O. 84.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies following school of Atomic Energy Education Society, Mumbai, under the administrative control of the Department of Atomic Energy, where more than 80% staff has acquired working knowledge of Hindi :-

1. Atomic energy Central School, Indore

[F. No. 11/Hindi/2025-26/2788-2948]

DEEP PRAKASH, Scientific Secretary, AEC & Head, ICPD & Chairman, OLIC, DAE

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 2026

का.आ. 85.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार आई सी आई सी आई बैंक लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं I दिल्ली के पंचाट (108/2023) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12011/14/2023-आई आर(बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 2026

S.O. 85.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 108/2023) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. I Delhi* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of ICICI Bank Limited and their workmen.

[No. L-12011/14/2023- IR(B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT DELHI - 1,
NEW DELHI.****ID No. 108/2023**

Sh. Rajbir Singh S/o Sh. Babu Ram, Through All India General Mazdoor Trade Union, 170 Bal Mukund Khand, Giri Nagar, Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The Chief Manager, ICICI Bank Limited, 876/2, Main Road, Sant Nagar, Burari, New Delhi-110084.
2. M/s G.I. Group Network Security Technology Private Limited, 581/3, III Floor, Chirag Delhi, New Delhi-110017.

...Management

AWARD

1. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-L-12011/14/2023 (IR(B-I)) dated 06.04.2023 under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Act, for adjudication of a dispute, terms of which are as under:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demands of the All India General Mazdoor Trade Union vide their letter date 27.07.2021 regarding to grant the arrears of overtime wages for the period w.e.f. year, 2016 to year, 2019, amounts in lieu of an-availed yearly leaves and weekly offs for the period w.e.f. year, 2016 to year, 2019, of Sh. Rajbir Singh S/o Sh. Babu Ram is legal proper and justified? If yes, what relief Sh. Rajbir Singh is entitled to and what other directions, if any, are necessary in this matter?”

2. In the reference order, the appropriate Government commanded the parties raising the dispute to file statement of claim, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses with this Tribunal within 15 days of receipt of the reference order and to forward a copy of such statement of claim to the opposite parties involved in the dispute. Despite directions so given, Claimant union opted not to file the claim statement with the Tribunal.

3. On receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as the managements. Neither the postal article sent to the claimant, referred above, was received back nor was it observed by the Tribunal that postal services remained unserved in the period, referred above. Therefore, every presumption lies in favor of the fact that the above notice was served upon the claimant. Despite service of the notice, claimant opted to abstain away from the proceedings. No claim statement was filed on his behalf. Thus, it is clear that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the reference on merits.

4. Since the workman has neither put in his appearance nor he led any evidence so as to prove his cause against the management, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a ‘No Dispute/Claim’ award. Let this award be sent to the appropriate Government, as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for publication.

Date: 29.09.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 2026

का.आ. 86.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार केंद्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं I दिल्ली के पंचाट (80/2024) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2026-आई आर(बी-1)-26]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 2026

S.O. 86.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 80/2024) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. I Delhi* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of CPWD and their workmen.

[No L-12025/01/2026– IR(B-I)-26]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT DELHI - 1,
NEW DELHI.**

ID No. 80/2024

Sh. Surender Majhi S/o Shri Bilas through All India CPWD Karamchari Union, Baba Lal Ji Complex, Shop No. 4, Gurgaon Road, Opp. Bus Stand, Gurgaon.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The Director, CPWD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Executive Engineer, Parliament Division, Y Shape Building, IP Bhawan, New Delhi.

3. Work Cum TLQ (A), Special Director of General Project and Chandigarh CPWD, Kendriya Sadan, Sec-9, Chandigarh.
4. The Assistant Engineer, CPWD 2(T), G.P. O. Complex INA, New Delhi-110023.
5. M/s Hill Top Refrigeration, Govt. Contractor, Regd. Off. 2/103, Subhash Nagar, New Delhi-110027.

...Management

AWARD

1. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-ND-25/III-36/2023-IR dated 12.04.2024 under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Act, for adjudication of a dispute, terms of which are as under:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demands of Shri Surender Majhi S/o Shri Bilas through All India CPWD Karamchari Union for regularization of his services in the establishment of CPWD and payment of salary & other benefits at par with his regular counterparts, is legal and/or justified? If so, what relief the workman concerned is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

2. In the reference order, the appropriate Government commanded the parties raising the dispute to file statement of claim, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses with this Tribunal within 15 days of receipt of the reference order and to forward a copy of such statement of claim to the opposite parties involved in the dispute. Despite directions so given, Claimant union opted not to file the claim statement with the Tribunal.

3. On receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as the managements. Neither the postal article sent to the claimant, referred above, was received back nor was it observed by the Tribunal that postal services remained unserved in the period, referred above. Therefore, every presumption lies in favor of the fact that the above notice was served upon the claimant. But, no claim statement was filed on his behalf. On one occasion, attendance on behalf of the claimant was mark and more time was sought for filing of statement. Thereafter, neither the claimant appeared nor filed statement of claim. Thus, it is clear that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the reference on merits.

4. In these circumstances, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a ‘No Dispute/Claim’ award. Let this award be sent to the appropriate Government, as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for publication.

Date: 26.11.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 2026

का.आ. 87.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार कोटक महिंद्रा बैंक के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं I दिल्ली के पंचाट (158/2023) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2026-आई आर(बी-1)-27]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 2026

S.O. 87.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 158/2023) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. I Delhi* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Kotak Mahindra Bank and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2026- IR(B-I)-27]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT DELHI - 1,
NEW DELHI.

ID No. 158/2023

Sh. Kumar Rajneesh, D-114, Gali No. 13, west Vinod Nagar near 30 futa road, Delhi-110092.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Hauz Qazi, Unit No. 3372-3382, Chawri Bazaar, Delhi-110006.
2. HR Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Unit No. 829, sewa Corporate Park, 14th Floor, MG Road, Revenue State of Sarhau Tehsil, Gurugram-122002.

...Management

AWARD

2. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-96(21)/ID(2A)2023-DYCLC dated 30.06.2023 under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Act, for adjudication of a dispute, terms of which are as under:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of Sh. Kumar Rajneesh, workman for reinstatement by the management of Kotak Mahindra Bank is justified, fair and legal and if yes, then what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. In the reference order, the appropriate Government commanded the parties raising the dispute to file statement of claim, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses with this Tribunal within 15 days of receipt of the reference order and to forward a copy of such statement of claim to the opposite parties involved in the dispute. Despite directions so given, Claimant union opted not to file the claim statement with the Tribunal.

3. On receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as the managements. Neither the postal article sent to the claimant, referred above, was received back nor was it observed by the Tribunal that postal services remained unserved in the period, referred above. Therefore, every presumption lies in favor of the fact that the above notice was served upon the claimant. But, no claim statement was filed on his behalf. On one occasion, attendance on behalf of the claimant was mark and more time was sought for filing of statement. Thereafter, neither the claimant appeared nor filed statement of claim. Thus, it is clear that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the reference on merits.

4. In these circumstances, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a ‘No Dispute/Claim’ award. Let this award be sent to the appropriate Government, as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for publication.

Date: 26.11.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 2026

का.आ. 88.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार केंद्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं I दिल्ली के पंचाट (247/2024) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2026-आई आर(बी-1)-28]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 2026

S.O. 88.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 247/2024) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. I Delhi* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of CPWD and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2026– IR(B-I)-28]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT DELHI - 1,
NEW DELHI.

ID No. 247/2024

Shri Ravi Kumar S/o Sh. Virender Singh, Through General Secretary, Delhi Construction Workers Union, 118/2, Govind Puri, in front of Kotak Mahindra Bank, Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The Executive Engineer, CPWD, U-Divison, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.
2. The Proprietor, M/s Pradeep Kumar, D-169, Vivek Vihar-1, Delhi-110095.

...Management

AWARD

3. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-ND-25/I-29/2024-IR dated 23.08.2024 under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Act, for adjudication of a dispute, terms of which are as under:

SCHEDULE

'1. Whether the Shri Ravi Kumar S/o Shri Virender Singh is covered under the definition of workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?

2.If so, whether the services of Shri Ravi Kumar S/o Sh. Virender Singh, Ex-Electrical Engineer have been terminated illegally and/or unjustifiably by the management of M/s Pradeep Kumar contractor of CPWD, U Division, New Delhi w.e.f. 19.07.2022? If so, then what relief of Shri Ravi Kumar is entitled and what directions are necessary in this respect?'

2. In the reference order, the appropriate Government commanded the parties raising the dispute to file statement of claim, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses with this Tribunal within 15 days of receipt of the reference order and to forward a copy of such statement of claim to the opposite parties involved in the dispute. Despite directions so given, Claimant union opted not to file the claim statement with the Tribunal.

3. On receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as the managements. Neither the postal article sent to the claimant, referred above, was received back nor was it observed by the Tribunal that postal services remained unserved in the period, referred above. Therefore, every presumption lies in favor of the fact that the above notice was served upon the claimant. Despite service of the notice, claimant opted to abstain away from the proceedings. No claim statement was filed on his behalf. Thus, it is clear that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the reference on merits.

4. Since the workman has neither put in his appearance nor he led any evidence so as to prove his cause against the management, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Dispute/Claim' award. Let this award be sent to the appropriate Government, as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for publication.

Date: 19.12.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 2026

का.आ. 89.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **केंद्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग** के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **नं I दिल्ली** के पंचाट (299/2023) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2026-आई आर(बी-1)-29]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 2026

S.O. 89.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 299/2023) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. I Delhi* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **CPWD and their workmen.**

[No L-12025/01/2026– IR(B-I)-29]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT DELHI - 1,
NEW DELHI.**

ID No. 299/2023

Shri Pravin Kumar & 2 ors. Through President, All India CPWD Karamchari Union, Babu Lal Complex, Shop No.4, Opp. Bus Stand, Gurugram.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The Director General, CPWD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Executive Engineer, CPWD, Electrical Division-81, CGO Complex, Lodhi, Delhi-110003.
3. M/s Parmar Electrical, A-112, (New A-162) Padhan Enclave (Behind Bramchari Market), Burari, New Delhi-110084.

...Management

AWARD

4. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-ND-25/I-78/2023-IR dated 01.12.2023 under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Act, for adjudication of a dispute, terms of which are as under:

SCHEDULE

‘Whether the demand of contract workmen Pravin Kumar & 2 ors (details mentioned in Annexure-1) through All India CPWD Karamchari Union, for regularization of their services in the establishment of CPWD, is legal and/or justified? And if so, then what relief the workmen concerned are entitled and what directions are necessary in this respect?’

2. In the reference order, the appropriate Government commanded the parties raising the dispute to file statement of claim, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses with this Tribunal within 15 days of receipt of the reference order and to forward a copy of such statement of claim to the opposite parties involved in the dispute. Despite directions so given, Claimant union opted not to file the claim statement with the Tribunal.

3. On receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as the managements. Neither the postal article sent to the claimant, referred above, was received back nor was it observed by the Tribunal that postal services remained unserved in the period, referred above. Therefore, every presumption lies in favor of the fact that the above notice was served upon the claimant. Despite service of the notice, claimant opted to abstain away from the proceedings. No claim statement was filed on his behalf. Thus, it is clear that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the reference on merits.

4. Since the workman has neither put in his appearance nor he led any evidence so as to prove his cause against the management, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a ‘No Dispute/Claim’ award. Let this award be sent to the appropriate Government, as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for publication.

Date: 12.12.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer