



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

सी.जी.-डी.एल.-सा.-21092026-276351
CG-DL-W-21092026-276351

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 32]	नई दिल्ली, अगस्त 16—अगस्त 22, 2026, शनिवार/ श्रावण 25—श्रावण 31, 1948
No. 32]	NEW DELHI, AUGUST 16— AUGUST 22, 2026, SATURDAY/ SHRAVAN 25— SHRAVAN 31, 1948

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)

वित्त मंत्रालय
(वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1774.— राष्ट्रीय आवास बैंक अधिनियम, 1987 (1987 का 53) की धारा (6) की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ड) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, श्री अमित शुक्ला के स्थान पर श्री पीयूष श्रीवास्तव, वरिष्ठ आर्थिक सलाहकार (ग्रामीण आवासन), ग्रामीण विकास मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली को तत्काल प्रभाव से और अगले आदेशों तक राष्ट्रीय आवास बैंक के निदेशक मंडल में निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती हैं।

[फा. सं. एफटी-1/12/2022-आईएफ-II]

कुमार शैलेन्द्र, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Financial Services)

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1774.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the National Housing Bank Act, 1987 (53 of 1987), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Piyush Srivastava, Senior Economic Advisor (Rural Housing), Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi as a Director on the Board of Directors of National Housing Bank, with immediate effect and until further orders, vice Shri Amit Shukla.

[F. No. FT-1/12/2022-IF-II]

KUMAR SHAILENDRA, Under Secy.

(राजस्व विभाग)

(हिन्दी-2)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1775.— केन्द्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में राजस्व विभाग के केन्द्रीय अप्रत्यक्ष कर एवं सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड के अधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक अधिकारियों एवं कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है:

क्रम सं.	कार्यालय का नाम
1.	राष्ट्रीय सीमा शुल्क, अप्रत्यक्ष कर और नार्कोटिक्स अकादमी, आंचलिक प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, दिल्ली।
2.	माल एवं सेवा कर प्रधान आयुक्त का कार्यालय, सिकंदराबाद आयुक्तालय, जीएसटी भवन, बशीरबाग, हैदराबाद।
3.	आयुक्त सीमा शुल्क, लेखा परीक्षा का कार्यालय, नवीन सीमा शुल्क भवन, नई दिल्ली।

[फा. सं. ई-11017/3/2017- हिन्दी-2-अधिसूचना]

प्रीति सेलारे, उप निदेशक (रा.भा.)

(Department of Revenue)

(Hindi-2)

New Delhi, the 18th August, 2026

S.O. 1775.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official Purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976 Central Government, hereby, notifies the following offices under Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs, Department of Revenue where more than 80% staff have acquired the working knowledge of official language Hindi:

S.No.	Name of the Office
1.	National Academy of Customs, Indirect Tax and Narcotics, Zonal Training Institute, Delhi.
2.	Office of the Principal Commissioner of Goods and Service Tax, Secunderabad Commissionerate, GST Bhavan, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.
3.	Office of the Commissioner of Customs Audit, New Customs House, New Delhi.

[F. No. E-11017/3/2017- Hindi-2-Notification]

PREETI SELLARE, Dy. Director (OL)

विदेश मन्त्रालय
(सी.पी.वी. प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 7 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1776.— राजनयिक और कौंसुलीय अधिकारी (शपथ एवं फीस) के अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में वैधानिक आदेश।

एतद् द्वारा, केंद्र सरकार भारत के प्रधान कौंसलावास दुबई में श्री आशीष शर्मा, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी को दिनांक अगस्त 07, 2026 से सहायक कौंसुलर अधिकारी के तौर पर कौंसुलर सेवाओं के निर्वहन के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फा. सं. टी.4330/01/2026(14)]

तरुण कुमार, अवर सचिव (सीपीवी-II)

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
(CPV Division)

New Delhi, the 7th August, 2026

S.O. 1776.—Statutory Order in pursuance of the clause (a) of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1048), the Central Government hereby appoints Mr. Ashish Sharma, Assistant Section Officer as Assistant Consular Officer in the Consulate General of India, Dubai, to perform the consular services as Assistant Consular Officer with effect from August 07, 2026.

[F. No. T.4330/01/2026(14)]

TARUN KUMAR, Under Secy.(CPV-II)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय
(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 2026

का.आ. 1777.— केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय नागरिक सुरक्षा संहिता, 2023 (2023 का 46) की धारा 18 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री एस.वी.राजू, भारत के एडिशनल सॉलिसिटर जनरल, को विशेष न्यायाधीश के न्यायालय सहित विचारण न्यायालय और कर्नाटक राज्य के उच्च न्यायालय के समक्ष, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामला संख्या आरसी 17(एस)/2019-सीबीआई/एसीबी/ बीएलआर (धारवाड हत्या मामला – विशेष मामला सं. 565/21 और 1856/21) के अभियोजन का और तत्समय प्रवृत्त विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में, ऐसे मामलों से उद्भूत, किसी अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों का संचालन करने हेतु, पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से या मामले का निपटान होने तक या अगले आदेशों तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/02/2021-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS
(Department of Personnel and Training)

New Delhi, the 20th August, 2026

S.O. 1777.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 18 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (46 of 2023), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. V Raju, Additional Solicitor General of India as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting prosecution of case number RC 17(S)/2019/-CBI/ACB/BLR (Dharwad Murder case-Special case numbers 565/21 and 1856/21) instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) before the trial court including court of Special Judge and High Court in the State of Karnataka, and any appeal, revision or other matters arising out of such cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by law for the time being in force, from the date of assumption of charge or until disposal of the case or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/02/2021-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 मार्च, 2026

का.आ. 1778.— केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 की केन्द्रीय अधिनियम सं. XXV) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पंजाब राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना ज्ञापन सं.: गृह-एचएम-40विविध/25/2024-4एच4/II/1312772/2026, दिनांक 09.02.2026, गृह विभाग (गृह-4 शाखा) के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से भारतीय दंड संहिता की धाराएं 120-बी सपठित धारा 465 और भ्रष्टाचार निरोधक अधिनियम, 1988 (वर्ष 2018 में यथा संशोधित) की धारा 7 एवं 7ए के तहत दंडनीय अपराधों और उस के मूल अपराधों के लिए 1. श्री सुरेंद्र कुमार, लेखाकार, आंतरिक लेखा-परीक्षा दल (आईएपी), गृह मंत्रालय, सीमा सुरक्षा बल, जालंधर, पंजाब फ्रंटियर, निवासी, ग्राम पंचायत कार्यालय-कालवां, तहसील-आनंदपुर साहिब, जिला-रोपड़, पंजाब-140117, 2. श्री पूर्ण चंद किशन, प्रधान आरक्षक/जीडी, सीमा सुरक्षा बल (सं. 904012167) तत्कालीन 132 बटालियन, सीमा सुरक्षा बल, (अब सेवा मुख्यालय, सीमा सुरक्षा बल, कोरापुट), 3. श्री जितेन्द्र कुमार, आरक्षक (सं. 124523212), 136 बटालियन, सीमा सुरक्षा बल, 4. श्री बलराम यादव, आरक्षक (सं. 133201923), 136 बटालियन, सीमा सुरक्षा बल, 5. श्री मनोज कुमार, आरक्षक (सं. 042547316), 136 बटालियन, सीमा सुरक्षा बल, 6. श्री अमनदीप सिंह, गैर सरकारी व्यक्ति और 7. श्रीमती मीना कुमारी, सुरेंद्र कुमार की पत्नी के विरुद्ध दिनांक 13.02.2026 को दर्ज किए गए आरसी 0052026ए0003 में पंजीकरण एवं अन्वेषण हेतु दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार (कार्योत्तर प्रभाव से दिनांक 13.02.2026 से) पंजाब राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/26/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd March, 2026

S.O. 1778.—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 (Central Act no. XXV of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Punjab, issued vide Notification Memo No.: HOME-HM-40MISC/25/2024-4H4/II/1312772/2026, Dated 09.02.2026, Department of Home Affairs (Home-4 Branch), hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment in the State of Punjab (ex post facto w.e.f. 13.02.2026) for registration and investigation in RC0052026A0003 registered on 13.02.2026 against 1. Sh. Surendar Kumar, Accountant, Internal Audit Party (IAP), MHA, BSF, Jalandhar Punjab Frontier, R/o VPO Kalwan, Tehsil, Anandpur Sahib, Distt-Ropar, Punjab-140117, 2. Sh. Purna Chand Kisan, HC/GD, BSF (No. 904012167) then 132 Bn BSF (now SHQ BSF Koraput), 3. Sh. Jitender Kumar, Constable (No. 124523212), 136 Bn BSF, 4. Sh. Balram Yadav, Constable (No. 133201923), 136 Bn BSF, 5. Sh. Manoj Kumar, Constable (No. 042547316), 136 Bn BSF, 6. Sh. Amandeep Singh, Private Person and 7. Smt. Meena Kumari, Wife of Surender Kumar for the offences punishable under sections 120-B r/w 465 of IPC and Sections 7 & 7A of PC Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018) and substantive offences thereof.

[F. No. 228/26/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 मार्च, 2026

का.आ. 1779.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तेलंगाना राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. जी.ओ.एमएस.सं.134, दिनांक 10.12.2025, गृह (विशेष) विभाग एवं संशोधित अधिसूचना सं. जी.ओ.एमएस.सं.30, दिनांक 10.03.2026, गृह (विशेष) विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से थाना नामतः सेंट्रल क्राइम स्टेशन, हैदराबाद, तेलंगाना में भारतीय न्याय संहिता, 2023 की धारा 316(2), 316(5), 318(4) सपठित धारा 61(2) के तहत दिनांक 19.10.2024 को दर्ज मामला एफआईआर संख्या 213/2024, जिसे सीबीआई को विधिवत हस्तांतरित की जा रही है, के आरोपों के साथ-साथ भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 के अध्याय-III के तहत अपराधों के जांच/अन्वेषण करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार तेलंगाना राज्य में करती है ताकि केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो (सीबीआई) माननीय लोकपाल के आदेशों का अनुपालन कर सके।

[फा. सं. 228/29/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd March, 2026

S.O. 1779.—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 (Central Act No.25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Telangana, issued vide Notification No. G.O.Ms.No.134, Dated 10.12.2025, Home (Special) Department and Amendment Notification No. G.O.Ms.No.30, Dated 10.03.2026, Home (Special) Department, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment in Telangana for conducting Enquiry / Investigation into the allegations, duly transferring the case registered in FIR No.213/2024 dated 19.10.2024 under section 316(2), 316(5), 318(4) read with 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station namely, Central Crime Station, Hyderabad, Telangana and also for the offences under Chapter-III of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 so as to enable the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) to comply with the orders of the Hon'ble Lokpal.

[F. No. 228/29/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 2026

का.आ. 1780.—केंद्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तमिलनाडु राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. जी.ओ.(2डी).सं.94 दिनांक : 03.03.2026, गृह (नागरिकता) विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से आईडीबीआई बैंक लिमिटेड के साथ 11.97 करोड़ रुपये की धोखाधड़ी करने हेतु (i) अपने प्रमोटेर्स/निदेशकों के माध्यम से मेसर्स श्री लक्ष्मी सरस्वती स्पिनटेक्स लिमिटेड, (ii) श्री बी.शरत चन्द्र, (iii) श्री सी.एस. आदित्य प्रवीण, (iv) श्री एस.नवीन चन्द्र एवं आईडीबीआई बैंक लिमिटेड के अज्ञात लोक सेवकों के विरुद्ध भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम XLV) की धारा 120-बी सपठित धारा 420 एवं भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (1988 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम 49) की धारा 13(2) सपठित धारा 13(1)(डी) और भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (2018 के अधिनियम 16 द्वारा यथासंशोधित) की धारा 13(2) सपठित 13(1)(ए) के तहत दंडनीय अभिकथित अपराधों एवं उसके मूल अपराधों का अन्वेषण करने हेतु एफआईआर दर्ज करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार समस्त तमिलनाडु राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/28/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th March, 2026

S.O. 1780.—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 (Central Act 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Tamil Nadu, issued vide Notification No. G.O.(2D).No.94 Dated: 03.03.2026, Home (Citizenship) Department, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment in the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu to register a FIR for investigation of offences as alleged against (i) M/s. Sri Lakshmi Saraswathi Spintex Ltd. through its Promoters/Directors, (ii) Shri B. Sarath Chandra, (iii) Shri C.S. Aditya Praveen, (iv) Shri S. Naveen Chandra and unknown public servants of the IDBI Bank Ltd. for cheating the IDBI Bank Ltd. to the tune of Rs.11.97 crores for the offences punishable under section 120-B read with section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act XLV of 1860) and under section 13(2) read with section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Central Act 49 of 1988) and under section 13(2) read with section 13(1)(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (As amended vide Act 16 of 2018) and substantive offences thereof.

[F. No. 228/28/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 मार्च, 2026

का.आ. 1781.—केंद्रीय सरकार, एतद् द्वारा, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केंद्रीय अधिनियम 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तमिलनाडु राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. जी.ओ. (2डी) सं.86 दिनांक : 24.02.2026, गृह (पुलिस-XIV) विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से श्री एम. धर्मराज, पुत्र मरुदामुथु, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क /वस्तु एवं सेवा कर निरीक्षक (सेवानिवृत्त), भारत सरकार, उनकी पत्नी श्रीमती वाणी उर्फ कलैवाणी एवं उनका पुत्र डी. प्रभु दौस के विरुद्ध भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 की धारा 13(2) सपठित धारा 13(1)(ड) तथा भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (2018 में यथा संशोधित) की धारा 13(2) सपठित धारा 13(1)(ख), भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 109, भारतीय न्याय संहिता, 2023 की समकक्ष धारा 49 के अंतर्गत दंडनीय आय से अधिक संपत्ति 1.42 करोड़ रुपये रखने के आरोप में एवं इस मामले से संबंधित उसी संव्यवहार में अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न किसी अन्य कारित अपराध के अन्वेषण हेतु नियमित मामले का पंजीकरण करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण तमिलनाडु राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/30/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th March, 2026

S.O. 1781.—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 (Central Act 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Tamil Nadu, issued vide Notification No.G.O. (2D) No.86, Dated:24.02.2026, Home (Police-XIV) Department, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment in the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu for registration of a regular case to conduct investigation against Shri M. Dharmaraj, S/o Maruthamuthu, Inspector of Central Excise/Goods and Services Tax (Retd.), Government of India, his wife Smt. Vani @ Kalaivani and his son D. Prabhu Doss for the allegation of possession of disproportionate assets to the tune of Rs.1.42 crores punishable under sections 13(2) read with 13(1)(e) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 & 13(2) read with 13(1)(b) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018), section 109 of Indian Penal Code, corresponding section 49 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and any other offence committed in the course of same transaction or arising out of the same facts, in regard to this case.

[F. No. 228/30/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 2 अप्रैल, 2026

का.आ. 1782.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, शाखा प्रमुख, सीबीआई, एसीबी, धनबाद के दिनांक 23.02.2026 के पत्र संख्या 97/सीओ-4/2026-डी द्वारा किए गए अनुरोध पर झारखंड राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना ज्ञापन सं.-10/सी.बी.आई.-407/2026-1398/रांची, दिनांक 27.02.26, गृह, कारागार और आपदा प्रबंधन विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से श्री संजीव कुमार, वरिष्ठ डीईई(जी), पूर्व मध्य रेलवे, डीआरएम कार्यालय, धनबाद के विरुद्ध भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (संशोधन अधिनियम, 2018) की धारा 7 के तहत दंडनीय अपराधों के लिए दिनांक 06.03.2026 को पंजीकृत आरसी 02(ए)/2026-डी में, साथ ही इस मामले के अन्वेषण के दौरान प्रकाश में आए किसी अन्य अपराधों सहित ऐसे एक या उससे अधिक अपराधों से जुड़े या उससे संबद्ध किसी दुष्प्रयास, दुष्प्रेरणा और षड्यंत्र एवं/अथवा उसी संव्यवहार में किए गए या उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न किसी अन्य अपराध(धों) के लिए पंजीकरण और अन्वेषण करने हेतु दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार (कार्योत्तर प्रभाव से, दिनांक 06.03.2026 से) समस्त झारखंड राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/31/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 2nd April, 2026

S.O. 1782.—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 (25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Jharkhand, issued vide Notification Memo No.-10/C.B.I.-407/2026-1398/Ranchi, Dated 27.02.26, Home, Prisons and Disaster Management Department upon request made via letter number 97/CO-4/2026-D, dated 23.02.2026 of Head of Branch, CBI, ACB, Dhanbad, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction to the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment in the whole state of Jharkhand (ex post facto w.e.f 06.03.2026) for registration and investigation in RC 02(A)/2026-D registered on 06.03.2026 against Shri Sanjeev Kumar, Sr. DEE(G), East Central Railway, DRM Office, Dhanbad for the offences punishable under section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Amendment Act, 2018) and any other offence that may come to light during investigation of this case, including any attempt, abetment and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with one or more such offences and/or any other offence(s) committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[F. No. 228/31/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secretary

नई दिल्ली, 7 अप्रैल, 2026

का.आ. 1783.— केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, शाखा प्रमुख, सीबीआई, एसीबी, धनबाद के दिनांक 27.02.2026 के पत्र संख्या 102/सीओ-5/2026-डी द्वारा किए गए अनुरोध पर झारखंड राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना ज्ञापन सं.-10/सी.बी.आई.- 409/2026-1530/रांची, दिनांक 10.03.26, गृह, कारागार और आपदा प्रबंधन विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से, श्री रवींद्र कुमार, जे. ई. इलेक्ट्रिकल, भोजुडीह, बोकारो, आद्रा मंडल, दक्षिण-पूर्व रेलवे के विरुद्ध भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (संशोधित अधिनियम, 2018) की धारा 7 के तहत दंडनीय अपराधों के लिए दिनांक 16.03.2026 को पंजीकृत आरसी 03(ए)/2026-डी में, साथ ही इस मामले के अन्वेषण के दौरान प्रकाश में आए किन्हीं अन्य अपराध एवं ऐसे एक या उससे अधिक अपराधों से जुड़े या उससे संबद्ध किसी दुष्प्रयास, दुष्प्रेरणा और षड्यंत्र एवं उसी संव्यवहार में किए गए या उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न किन्हीं अन्य अपराध(धों) के पंजीकरण एवं अन्वेषण करने हेतु दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार (कार्योत्तर प्रभाव से, दिनांक 16.03.2026 से) समस्त झारखंड राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/35/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th April, 2026

S.O. 1783.—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 (25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Jharkhand, issued vide Notification Memo No.-10/C.B.I.-409/2026-1530/Ranchi, Dated 10.03.26, Home, Prisons and Disaster Management Department upon request made via letter number 102/CO-5/2026-D, dated 27/02/2026 of Head of Branch, CBI, ACB, Dhanbad, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction to the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment in the whole state of Jharkhand (ex post facto w.e.f. 16.03.2026) for registration and investigation in RC 03(A)/2026-D registered on 16.03.2026 against Shri Ravindra Kumar, J.E Electrical, Bhojudih, Bokaro, Adra Division, SE Railway for the offences punishable under section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Amendment Act, 2018) and any other offence that may come to light during investigation of this case, including any attempt, abetment and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with one or more such offences and for any other offence(s) committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[F. No. 228/35/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 अप्रैल, 2026

का.आ. 1784.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 की अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. 61/16/2026-2VII, चंडीगढ़, दिनांक 25.03.2026, सतर्कता विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से, अभिकथित रूप से सुनियोजित तरीके से धोखाधड़ी पूर्ण बैंकिंग संचालन और काल्पनिक लेन-देन द्वारा सरकारी धन को स्वास्तिक देश प्रोजेक्ट, एसआरआर प्लानिंग गुरुज प्रा. लि., कैप को फिनटेक सर्विसेज, आर.एस. ट्रेडर्स, और अन्य संबद्ध फर्मों/व्यक्तियों सहित शेल संस्थाओं के खातों में स्थानांतरित कर सरकारी धन के दुरुपयोग और व्यापक स्तर पर, संगठित और बहुस्तरीय धोखाधड़ी करने, जिसके परिणाम स्वरूप सरकारी खजाने को लगभग 550 करोड़ रुपए से भी अधिक की भारी हानि पहुँची, से जुड़े गंभीर आरोपों के संबंध में एसबी और एसीबी, पंचकुला थाना में भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (2018 में यथासंशोधित) की धारा 13(2) सपठित धारा 13(1)(ए) और भारतीय न्याय संहिता, 2023 की धाराएँ 316(5), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) और 61(2) के तहत दर्ज मामला एफआईआर सं. 04, दिनांक 23.02.2026 में अन्वेषण करने के प्रयोजन से दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार समस्त हरियाणा राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/33/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th April, 2026

S.O. 1784.—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 Haryana, issued vide Notification No.61/16/2026-2VII, Chandigarh, Dated 25.03.2026, Vigilance Department, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Haryana for the purpose of investigation into a case FIR No. 04 dated 23.02.2026 registered at Police Station, SV&ACB, Panchkula under Section 13(2) read with 13(1)(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018) and Sections 316(5), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 involving serious allegations of misappropriation of Government funds and a large-scale, organized, and multi-layered fraud pertaining to fraudulent banking operations and fictitious transactions allegedly undertaken in a systematic manner to siphon off Government funds into the accounts of shell entities, including Swastik Desh Project, SRR Planning Gurus Pvt. Ltd., Cap Co Fintech Services, R.S. Traders, and other associated firms/individuals, resulting in a substantial loss to the public exchequer, estimated to exceed ₹ 550 crores.

[F. No. 228/33/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 अप्रैल, 2026

का.आ. 1785.— केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम XXV) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, शाखा प्रमुख, सीबीआई, एसीबी, रांची के दिनांक 26.02.2026 के पत्र संख्या 102/आर द्वारा किए गए अनुरोध पर झारखंड राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना ज्ञापन सं.-10/सी.बी.आई.-408/2026-1535, रांची, दिनांक 10.03.26, गृह, कारागार और आपदा प्रबंधन विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से, श्री हिमांशु शेखर, मुख्य वाणिज्यिक निरीक्षक, दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे, रांची मंडल, भारतीय रेलवे, रेल मंत्रालय के विरुद्ध भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम-1988 (2018 में यथा संशोधित) की धारा 7 के तहत अपराध कारित करने के लिए दिनांक 25.03.2026 को पंजीकृत आरसी0242026ए0005 में, साथ ही इस मामले के अन्वेषण के दौरान प्रकाश में आए किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों एवं ऐसे एक या उससे अधिक अपराधों से जुड़े या उससे संबद्ध किसी दुष्प्रयास, दुष्प्रेरणा और षड्यंत्र एवं/अथवा उसी संव्यवहार में किए गए या उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न किसी अन्य अपराध(धों) के पंजीकरण और अन्वेषण करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार (कार्योत्तर प्रभाव से, दिनांक 25.03.2026 से) झारखंड राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/37/2026-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th April, 2026

S.O. 1785.—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 (Central Act XXV of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Jharkhand, issued vide Notification Memo No.-10/C.B.I.-408/2026-1535, Ranchi, Dated 10.03.26, Home, Prisons and Disaster Management Department upon request made vide letter number 102/R, dated 26.02.2026 of Head of Branch, CBI, ACB, Ranchi, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of all the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment in the State of Jharkhand (ex post facto w.e.f. 25.03.2026) for registration and investigation in RC0242026A0005 registered on 25.03.2026 against Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, Chief Commercial Inspector, S.E. Rly., Ranchi Division, Indian Railways, Ministry of Railways for committing offence u/s 7 of PC Act-1988 (As amended in 2018) and any other offences that may come to light during investigation of this case including any attempt, abetment and conspiracy in relation or in connection with one or more such offences and/or any other offence(s) committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[F. No. 228/37/2026-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

सूक्ष्म, लघु और मध्यम उद्यम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1786.— केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के सूक्ष्म, लघु और मध्यम उद्यम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का.आ. 1008, तारीख 6 नवम्बर 2020, जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग -2, खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) में तारीख 14 नवम्बर, 2020 को प्रकाशित हुई थी, को उन बातों के सिवाय अधिक्रांत करते हुए, जिन्हें ऐसे अधिक्रमण से पूर्व किया गया है या करने का लोप किया गया है, नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को जो केन्द्रीय सरकार में राजपत्रित अधिकारी की श्रेणी के समतुल्य पद का अधिकारी है, को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए संपदा अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है तथा यह और निदेश देती है कि उक्त अधिकारी प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थान के संबंध में अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन या द्वारा संपदा अधिकारी पर अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा:-

सारणी	
अधिकारी का पदनाम	सरकारी स्थानों और अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमा के प्रवर्ग
(1)	(2)
श्री अरुण कुमार सिंह, ज्येष्ठ महाप्रबंधक,	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड के राष्ट्रीय राजधानी राज्यक्षेत्र दिल्ली और उपाबंध में यथाउल्लिखित अन्य

राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, नई दिल्ली।	स्थानों जहां इसमें जोनल कार्यालय, शाखा और उप-शाखा कार्यालय और तकनीकी सेवा केंद्र स्थित हैं, में अपने स्वामित्व वाले या समय-समय पर पट्टे पर लिया गया परिसर।
--	--

उपाबंध

क्र.सं.	कार्यालय	पता
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	कॉर्पोरेट कार्यालय	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड (भारत सरकार का उद्यम) एनएसआईसी भवन, ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-110 020 फ़ोन: 011-26926275, 26926370 टोल फ्री नंबर- 1800111955 ईमेल: info@nsic.co.in वेबसाइट: www.nsic.co.in
2.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय दिल्ली	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय दिल्ली, तकनीकी सेवा केंद्र परिसर, ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली- 110020 फ़ोन - 011 - 40584930 ईमेल - zodelhi@nsic.co.in
3.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी बिजनेस पार्क, ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली - 110020 फ़ोन - 011 - 26926275
4.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- नोएडा III-बी/118, सेक्टर - 18 शॉपिंग कॉम्प्लेक्स, नोएडा (उत्तर प्रदेश)- 201301 फ़ोन - 0120 - 4595000 से 4595045, 2511798 ईमेल - bonoida@nsic.co.in
5.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- देहरादून तीसरी और चौथी मंजिल, मेफेयर बिजनेस पार्क, होटल ग्लोरी के पास, माजरा, सहारनपुर रोड, देहरादून, पिनकोड - 248001 फ़ोन - 0135 - 2520501 ईमेल - bodehradun@nsic.co.in
6.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- आगरा 307/टी-6, तीसरा तल, मारुति प्लाजा, (संजय टॉकीज के पीछे), संजय प्लेस, आगरा, उत्तर प्रदेश, पिनकोड - 282002 फ़ोन - 0562 - 2527862, 2525567 ईमेल - boagra@nsic.co.in
7.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - आगरा

		इकाई संख्या-202, दूसरा तल, सेक्टर-12 ए, पदम बिजनेस पार्क, आवास विकास, सिकंदरा योजना, आगरा, उत्तर प्रदेश पिनकोड – 282007 फ़ोन - 0562 - 2603131 ईमेल - nsshoagra@nsic.co.in
8.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- कानपुर 112/1, बेनाझाबर रोड, कानपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश पिनकोड – 208002 फ़ोन - 0512 - 2535049, 2556379 ईमेल - bokan@nsic.co.in
9.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- गोरखपुर उप शाखा, डीआईसी परिसर, गोरखपुर इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, गोरखपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, पिनकोड – 273015 मोबाइल- 7524043999 ईमेल - sogorakhpur@nsic.co.in
10.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- वाराणसी एनएसआईसी लिमिटेड, मानसरोवर कॉम्प्लेक्स, सी-30/35-बी, दूसरा तल, मलदहिया, वाराणसी, उत्तर प्रदेश, पिनकोड – 221001 फ़ोन - 542 - 2370223 ईमेल - bovaranasi@nsic.co.in
11.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय-लखनऊ /एसबीओ/एसजेडओ, 503, श्री राम टावर, 5वीं मंजिल, 13, अशोक मार्ग, लखनऊ, उत्तर प्रदेश, पिनकोड – 226001 फ़ोन - 0522 - 2288803 ईमेल - nssholucknow@nsic.co.in
12.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- दिल्ली एनटीएससी कॉम्प्लेक्स, ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, गोविंदपुरी मेट्रो स्टेशन के पास, नई दिल्ली-110020 फ़ोन - 011 - 26382568-69, 41002319 ईमेल - delhinsic@nsic.co.in
13.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- फरीदाबाद 107 निसान हट एनएच-5 रेलवे रोड फरीदाबाद, पिनकोड - 121001 फ़ोन - 0129 - 2985910/2985912/2985911 ईमेल - bofaridabad@nsic.co.in
14.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- गुरुग्राम, प्लॉट संख्या 69, पहला तल, आईडीसी, सेक्टर-16, एमजी रोड, गुरुग्राम पिनकोड – 122001

		फ़ोन - 0124 - 2308913 ईमेल - bogur@nsic.co.in
15.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- सेन्ट्रल दिल्ली नारायणा सीबी-326, दूसरा तल, रिंग रोड, नारायणा, नई दिल्ली पिनकोड - 110028 फ़ोन - 011 - 64611484, 25775787 ईमेल - bonaraina@nsic.co.in
16.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- नैनी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, उद्योग नगर, नैनी, प्रयागराज, पिनकोड - 211009 फ़ोन - 0532 - 2697218/2697050, 2695847 ईमेल - boallahabad@nsic.co.in
17.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- अलीगढ़ एनएसआईसी तकनीकी सेवा केन्द्र, ए-1 इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, अलीगढ़, उत्तर प्रदेश पिनकोड - 202001 फ़ोन - 9810038916 ईमेल - soaligarh@nsic.co.in
18.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय लुधियाना	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड , क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय- लुधियाना गुरु गोबिंद सिंह टावर, ढोलेवाल चौक के पास जीटी रोड- लुधियाना, पिनकोड - 141003 फ़ोन - 0161 - 2541946, 2530940, 2546523 ईमेल - zoludh@nsic.co.in
19.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- चंडीगढ़ ग्राउंड फ्लोर, बीएसएनएल एडमिन बिल्डिंग सेक्टर-34-ए, पिकेडिली सिनेमा के सामने, चंडीगढ़ (यूटी), पिनकोड - 160022 फ़ोन - 0172 - 2610537, 2971759 ईमेल - bochd@nsic.co.in
20.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- लुधियाना गुरु गोबिंद सिंह टावर, ढोलेवाल चौक के पास, जीटी रोड, लुधियाना, पिनकोड - 141003 फ़ोन - 0161 - 2541946/2530940/2546523 ईमेल - boludh@nsic.co.in
21.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय, लुधियाना पहला तल, फ्रंटियर टॉवर, जीटी रोड, मिलर गंज (फायर ब्रिगेड कार्यालय के पास), लुधियाना , पिनकोड - 141003 फ़ोन - 0161 - 4100939 ईमेल - nssholudh@nsic.co.in

22.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- जालंधर दूसरा तल, एससीओ-21, पुडा कॉम्प्लेक्स, लाडोवाली रोड, जालंधर - 144001 फ़ोन - 0181 - 2292242, 2295533, 6570257 ईमेल - bojal@nsic.co.in
23.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय कोलकाता	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-कोलकाता प्लॉट संख्या 7/7 और 7/8, ब्लॉक -सीपी, साल्ट लेक, सेक्टर -V, कोलकाता (पश्चिमी बंगाल), पिनकोड - 700091 फ़ोन - 033 - 23672001, 29861253 ईमेल - zokolkata@nsic.co.in
24.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- पटना फ्लैट संख्या 403, चौथा तल , श्याम किशोरी होम्स, राजस्थान रेस्टोरेंट के पीछे, डाक बंगला चौराहा, फ्रेजर रोड, पटना, पिनकोड - 800001 फ़ोन - 0612 - 2354222, 3212403 ईमेल - bopatna@nsic.co.in
25.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय, बोध गया मगध यूनिवर्सिटी कैम्पस, बोध गया, जिला- गया जी, बिहार, पिनकोड - 824234 मोबाइल - 9760100565 ईमेल - nsshobodhgaya@nsic.co.in
26.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- कोलकाता 20-बी, अब्दुल हामिद स्ट्रीट, (7वीं मंजिल), कोलकाता, पिनकोड - 700069 फ़ोन - 033 - 033-2213-7084/2248-8288 ईमेल - bocal@nsic.co.in
27.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - कोलकाता प्लॉट संख्या 7/7 और 7/8, ब्लॉक-सीपी, साल्ट लेक, सेक्टर -V, कोलकाता (पश्चिमी बंगाल), पिनकोड - 700091 फ़ोन - 033 - 23672001, 29861253 ईमेल - nsshokol@nsic.co.in
28.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- साल्ट लेक प्लॉट नंबर - 7/7 और 7/8, ब्लॉक - सीपी, सेक्टर - V, साल्ट लेक, कोलकाता, पिनकोड - 700091 फ़ोन - 033 - 23671471 / 23670155 / 23672416 ईमेल - bosaltlake@nsic.co.in
29.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय भुवनेश्वर	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय भुवनेश्वर 304-बी, तीसरा तल, एनएसआईसी-आईएमडीसी धर्मपद भवन, आईडीसीओ प्लॉट संख्या 6 ब्लॉक-डी, मंचेश्वर इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट,

		भुवनेश्वर, पिनकोड – 751010 फ़ोन - 0674 - 2548875 / 6510189 ईमेल - zobhubaneswar@nsic.co.in
30.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय-भुवनेश्वर मॉड्यूल संख्या 204, दूसरा तल, एनएसआईसी-आईएमडीसी धर्मपद भवन, आईडीसीओ प्लॉट संख्या 6 ब्लॉक-डी, मंचेश्वर इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, भुवनेश्वर, पिनकोड – 751010 फ़ोन - 0674 - 2583182 / 2580780 ईमेल - bobhubaneswar@nsic.co.in
31.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एसी-एसटी हब कार्यालय, भुवनेश्वर 304-बी, तीसरा तल, एनएसआईसी-आईएमडीसी धर्मपद भवन, आईडीसीओ प्लॉट संख्या 6 ब्लॉक-डी, मंचेश्वर इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, भुवनेश्वर, पिनकोड – 751010 फ़ोन - 0674 - 0674-2580630 ईमेल - nsshobhub@nsic.co.in
32.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- राउरकेला प्लॉट नंबर क्यूक्यूक्यू-6, सिविल टाउनशिप, राउरकेला, पिनकोड – 769012 फ़ोन - 0661 - 2664459 ईमेल - rourkela@nsic.co.in
33.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- जमशेदपुर फ्लैट संख्या ए-2/1, दूसरा तल, निरोड अपार्टमेंट, एल-रोड, पीओ और पीएस बिष्टुपुर, जमशेदपुर, पिनकोड – 831001 फ़ोन - 0657 - 2320068 ईमेल - bojms@nsic.co.in
34.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- बोकारो, पिन कोड- 827012 मोबाइल - 9431923065 ईमेल - bojms@nsic.co.in
35.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय/ राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - रांची उद्योग भवन, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र कोकर, रांची पिनकोड – 834001 फ़ोन - 0651 - 2543921 ईमेल - nsshoranchi@nsic.co.in
36.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय गुवाहाटी	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-गुवाहाटी बाई लेन संख्या 3, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट बामुनीमैदान, गुवाहाटी, पिनकोड – 781021 फ़ोन - 0361 - 2960635 ईमेल - zoguawahati@nsic.co.in

37.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- गुवाहाटी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, तीसरी बाई लेन, बामुनीमैदान, गुवाहाटी, पिनकोड – 781021 फ़ोन - 0361 - 2960631 ईमेल - bogwh@nsic.co.in
38.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय, गुवाहाटी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, बाई लेन सं. 3, बामुनीमैदान, गुवाहाटी, पिनकोड – 781021 फ़ोन - 0361 - 2558947 ईमेल - nsshogwh@nsic.co.in
39.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड उप शाखा कार्यालय- अगरतला आईटीआई रोड, युवा संस्था क्लब के पास, शिक्षा निकेतन स्कूल रोड की ओर, इंद्रानगर, अगरतला, त्रिपुरा, पिनकोड – 799006 फ़ोन - 0381 - 2911763, 9411630450 ईमेल - bogwh@nsic.co.in
40.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- इंफाल उरीपोक अचोम लेइकाई, इंफाल (मणिपुर), पिनकोड – 795001 फ़ोन - 0385 - 2414270, 9401726718 ईमेल - bogwh@nsic.co.in
41.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- दीमापुर आवर्स बिल्डिंग, दूसरा तल, नंबर-411, डी.सी. कोर्ट जंक्शन, दीमापुर, पिनकोड – 797112 मोबाइल—9905082471 ईमेल - bogwh@nsic.co.in
42.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय मुंबई	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-मुंबई कार्यालय संख्या 505, पांचवीं मंजिल, मित्तल कमर्शियल बिल्डिंग, विंग – बी, गांव मरोल, एम.वी. रोड के पास, अंधेरी (पूर्व), मुंबई, पिनकोड – 400059 फ़ोन - 022 - 28500377 ईमेल - zomumbai@nsic.co.in
43.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- मुंबई पी/104, खैराने एमआईडीसी, टीटीसी औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, कोपरखैराने, नवी मुंबई, पिनकोड – 400710 फ़ोन - 022 – 23740268, 23740272, 23740116 ईमेल - bomum@nsic.co.in
44.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- अंधेरी मुंबई 5सी2, 5वीं मंजिल ए-विंग, गुंडेचा ओन्क्लेव, खेरानी रोड, साकीनाका, अंधेरी (पूर्व), मुंबई, पिनकोड-400072

		फ़ोन - 022 - 2850 9915 / 16 ईमेल - boandheri@nsic.co.in
45.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- नागपुर नई सचिवालय बिल्डिंग, पहली मंज़िल, ईस्ट विंग, बीसीए स्टेडियम के सामने, सेंट उर्सुला स्कूल के पास, सिविल लाइंस, नागपुर, पिनकोड – 440001 फ़ोन - 0712 - 2543254, 2552023 ईमेल - bonagpur@nsic.co.in
46.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- छत्रपति संभाजीनगर पहला तल, मॉड्यूल हाउस, मेस बंगले के सामने महावीर चौक, छत्रपति संभाजीनगर, पिनकोड – 431005 फ़ोन - 0240 - 2954395 ईमेल - boaurangabad@nsic.co.in
47.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- नासिक गल्ला नंबर 13, तीसरी मंज़िल उद्योग भवन, एमआईडीसी, सतपुर, नासिक, पिनकोड – 422007 फ़ोन - 0253 - 2365059 ईमेल - bonasik@nsic.co.in
48.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- पुणे 211/212, दूसरा तल, टाइम्स स्क्वायर बिल्डिंग, पुणे-सतारा रोड, साई बाबा मंदिर के पास, पुणे, पिनकोड – 411037 फ़ोन - 020 - 24273800/24274800/48620207 ईमेल - bopune@nsic.co.in
49.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - पुणे 213, दूसरा तल, पुणे - सतारा रोड, साई बाबा मंदिर के पास, स्वर्गेट, पुणे, पिनकोड – 411037 फ़ोन - 020 - 48620209 ईमेल - nssshopune@nsic.co.in
50.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - सिंधुदुर्ग प्लॉट संख्या -16, नवनगर विकास प्राधिकरण, सिंधुदुर्गनगरी के पास, ओरोस जिला, लैंडमार्क बैंक ऑफ महाराष्ट्र के पास, सिंधुदुर्ग, महाराष्ट्र, पिनकोड - 416812 मोबाइल - 9673511536 ईमेल - nsshosindhudurg@nsic.co.in
51.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - मुंबई कार्यालय सं. 505, 5वीं मंज़िल, बी-विंग, मित्तल कमर्शियल बिल्डिंग, गांव मरोल, एम.वी. रोड, मरोल नाका, अंधेरी (पूर्व), मुंबई - 400 059 फ़ोन - 022 - 49710065 / 23728902 ईमेल - nsshomum@nsic.co.in

52.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय-गोवा उप शाखा प्लॉट संख्या एससी - 1/47, वर्ना इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, वर्ना, साउथ गोवा, गोवा, पिनकोड - 403001 फ़ोन - 0832 - 2220540 ईमेल - bogoa@nsic.co.in
53.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय अहमदाबाद	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-अहमदाबाद 202, 203, समृद्धि बिल्डिंग, गुजरात हाई कोर्ट के सामने, अहमदाबाद, पिनकोड - 380014 फ़ोन - 079 - 27543228/27544893/27544254 ईमेल - zoahmedabad@nsic.co.in
54.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय-अहमदाबाद 202-203, समृद्धि बिल्डिंग, साकार-III के सामने, इनकम टैक्स सर्कल के पास, आश्रम रोड, अहमदाबाद, पिनकोड - 380014 फ़ोन - 079 - 27543228/27544893/27544254 ईमेल - boamd@nsic.co.in
55.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय-जयपुर एनएफ/0/2, नेहरू प्लेस, टोंक रोड, जयपुर पिनकोड - 302015 फ़ोन - 0141-2740191/2742991/2742372/2744899 ईमेल - bojai@nsic.co.in
56.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- कोटा एसएसआई एसोसिएशन, पुरुषार्थ भवन, आईपीआईए, रोड सं. 5, कोटा, पिनकोड - 324005 फ़ोन - 744 - 2426104 ईमेल - sokota@nsic.co.in
57.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- जयपुर वीकेआईए 513, अलंकार प्लाजा, सेंट्रल स्पाइन, सेक्टर-02, विद्याधर नगर, जयपुर, पिनकोड - 302039 फ़ोन - 0141 - 2231594, 2231573 ईमेल - bovkijaipur@nsic.co.in
58.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय रायपुर	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-रायपुर 204, दूसरा तल, ब्लॉक-ए, क्रिस्टल आर्केड, लोधीपारा चौक के पास, शंकर नगर, रायपुर- 492007 फ़ोन - 0771 - 4035388, 4006070 ईमेल - zoraipur@nsic.co.in
59.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- इंदौर राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, 10, पोलोग्राउंड इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, इंदौर, पिनकोड - 452015 फ़ोन - 0731 - 2424408 - 2424409 - 2422248 ईमेल - boindore@nsic.co.in

60.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- भोपाल 110, मालवीय नगर, पहला तल, भोपाल पिनकोड – 462003 फ़ोन - 0755- 4295152, 0755-2992944 ईमेल - bobpl@nsic.co.in
61.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- रायपुर 204, दूसरा तल, ब्लॉक-ए, क्रिस्टल आर्केड, लोधीपारा चौक के पास, शंकर नगर, रायपुर, पिनकोड – 492007 फ़ोन - 0771 - 4035388, 4006070 ईमेल - boraiipur@nsic.co.in
62.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय/उप शाखा कार्यालय - सूरत 306, तीसरा तल, राजहंस बिल्डिंग, जे.के टॉवर के सामने, रिंग रोड, सूरत, पिनकोड – 395002 फ़ोन - 0261 - 2345733, 4029735 ईमेल - nsshosurat@nsic.co.in
63.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय बेंगलुरु	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय बेंगलोर संख्या 25, पहली मेन रोड, केएसएसआईडीसी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, छठवां ब्लॉक राजाजी नगर, बेंगलुरु, पिनकोड – 560010 फ़ोन - 080 - 23109059, 23307791, 23147858 ईमेल – zobengaluru@nsic.co.in
64.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- बेलगाम प्लॉट संख्या 60, अनुजय बिल्डिंग, पांचवां क्रॉस, सुभाष-चंद्र नगर, बेलगाम फाउंड्री क्लस्टर के सामने, उत्सव होटल के पास, उद्यमबाग, बेलगाम-कर्नाटक, पिनकोड – 590006 फ़ोन - 0831 - 2449922 ईमेल - belgaum@nsic.co.in
65.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - बेंगलोर सं. 6 और 7, आईएसआईसीओएस बिल्डिंग, कॉर्ड रोड के पश्चिम में, राजाजी नगर, औद्योगिक नगर, बेंगलुरु, पिनकोड – 560044 फ़ोन - 080 - 23147791 / 29777790 ईमेल - nsshoban@nsic.co.in
66.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय -बेंगलोर संख्या 25, पहली मेन रोड, केएसएसआईडीसी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, छठवां ब्लॉक राजाजीनगर, बेंगलुरु, पिनकोड – 560010 फ़ोन - 080 - 23109059, 23307791, 23147858 ईमेल - boban@nsic.co.in
67.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय -पीन्या

		सी-424, पीन्या इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, पहला स्टेज, पीन्या पुलिस स्टेशन के पीछे, बेंगलुरु, पिनकोड – 560058 फोन - 080 - 28374676, 28394576, 28372977 ईमेल - bopeenya@nsic.co.in
68.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय हैदराबाद	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-हैदराबाद 201, 203, श्री दत्तासाई कॉम्प्लेक्स, आरटीसी क्रॉस रोड्स, हैदराबाद, पिनकोड – 500020 फोन - 040-27622515 / 040-27615761 ईमेल - zohyderabad@nsic.co.in
69.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- हैदराबाद 203 और 303, श्री दत्तासाई कॉम्प्लेक्स, आरटीसी क्रॉस रोड्स, हैदराबाद, पिनकोड – 500020 फोन - 040-27615764 / 27615761 / 27622097. ईमेल - bohyd@nsic.co.in
70.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- विजयवाड़ा डी. सं. 59 ए-8/8- 6बी/1, तृतीय तल, मेन रोड, गुरुनानक कॉलोनी, विजयवाड़ा, पिनकोड – 520008 फोन - 0866 - 2541055 ईमेल - bovijayawada@nsic.co.in
71.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- विशाखापत्तनम डी. सं. 32-6-1/13/49, फ्लैट सं. 107, प्रथम तल, लैंडमार्क एमबीआर, शीला नगर, विशाखापत्तनम, पिनकोड – 530012 फोन - 0891 - 2758554 ईमेल - visakhapatnam@nsic.co.in
72.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- बालानगर 6-3-144, 144/1, तीसरा तल, जहाँआरा करीम कॉम्प्लेक्स, बालानगर, हैदराबाद, पिनकोड – 500037 फोन - 040 - 23324769 ईमेल - bobalanagar@nsic.co.in
73.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - हैदराबाद एनएसआईसी तकनीकी सेवा केंद्र इलेक्ट्रॉनिक कॉम्प्लेक्स कमलानगर, हैदराबाद, पिनकोड – 500062 फोन - 040 - 29559801 ईमेल - nsshohyd@nsic.co.in
74.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय टीएससी-हैदराबाद एनएसआईसी तकनीकी सेवा केंद्र, कमलानगर, ईसीआईएल पोस्ट, हैदराबाद, पिनकोड – 500062 फोन - 040 – 27121422 2712 6646 ईमेल - botschyd@nsic.co.in

75.	क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय चेन्नई	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-चेन्नई मॉड्यूल सं. 201, एनएसआईसी – सॉफ्टवेयर टेक्नोलॉजी बिजनेस पार्क, गुडंडी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, एक्कट्टुथंगल, चेन्नई – 600 032, पिनकोड-600006 फ़ोन - 044 - 2829 1943, 2829 4541 ईमेल - zochennai@nsic.co.in
76.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- चेन्नई मॉड्यूल 205, एनएसआईसी सॉफ्टवेयर टेक्नोलॉजी पार्क बिल्डिंग, गुडंडी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, एक्कट्टुथंगल, चेन्नई, पिनकोड – 600032 फ़ोन - 044 - 28293347/28294541 ईमेल - bochen@nsic.co.in
77.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, राष्ट्रीय एससी-एसटी हब कार्यालय - चेन्नई एमएसएमई-डीआई परिसर, सं. 65/1, जीएसटी रोड, गुडंडी, चेन्नई, तमिलनाडु, पिनकोड – 600032 फ़ोन - 044 - 48631200 ईमेल - nsshochen@nsic.co.in
78.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- अंबतूर 309 सिडको-एमा टावर्स, फर्स्ट मेन रोड, अंबतूर इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, चेन्नई, पिनकोड – 600058 फ़ोन - 044 - 26243984, 28291292 ईमेल - boambattur@nsic.co.in
79.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- पुदुचेरी प्रशासनिक भवन, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, थट्टांचावडी, पुदुचेरी - 605 009 फ़ोन - 0413 - 2248970, 2248940 ईमेल - boapon@nsic.co.in
80.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- मदुरई 74, एडीआर टॉवर प्रथम तल, कलावसल, थेनी मेन रोड, मदुरई, पिनकोड - 625016, फ़ोन - 0452-2609992, 2609993, 4984191 ईमेल - bomadu@nsic.co.in
81.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- कोयंबटूर 1055/10, गौथम सेंटर, अवनाशी रोड, कोयंबटूर पिनकोड – 641018, फ़ोन - 0422 - 2244618, 2247757 ईमेल - bocomb@nsic.co.in
82.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, शाखा कार्यालय- कोचीन एनएसआईसी लिमिटेड, एस-67, जीसीडीए कमर्शियल

		कॉम्प्लेक्स, मरीन ड्राइव, शनमुघम रोड, कोच्चि पिनकोड - 682031, फोन - 0484-2381850/2368149/2986107/2351440 ईमेल - bococh@nsic.co.in
83.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, उप शाखा कार्यालय- त्रिशूर (अय्यनथोल पोस्ट ऑफिस के सामने) अय्यनथोल, त्रिशूर पिनकोड - 680003 मोबाइल- 9895571743 ईमेल - in.co.nsic@sbothrissur
84.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम प्रौद्योगिकी केंद्र	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड प्रशिक्षण केंद्र, मंडी # 210/12, राम नगर (पुलघराट), मंडी, जिला मंडी (हिमाचल प्रदेश), पिनकोड - 175001 मोबाइल- 9816071471 ईमेल- lokeshbhatia@nsic.co.in
85.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड आजीविका व्यवसाय इनक्यूबेटर- देवरिया , कौशल चंद्र टॉवर, प्रथम और द्वितीय तल, 319/1, रिलायंस स्मार्ट प्वाइंट के ऊपर, सीसी रोड, देवरिया, उत्तर प्रदेश, पिनकोड - 274001 मोबाइल- 8009477301 ईमेल- ibideoria@nsic.co.in
86.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी- प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र और एलबीआई - बोधगया मगध विश्वविद्यालय परिसर, पीजी हिंदी विभाग के पास, बोधगया, बिहार-824234 मोबाइल- 8697887899 ईमेल - nsshobodhgaya@nsic.co.in
87.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-नीमका सेक्टर-71, तिगांव रोड, नीमका, फरीदाबाद, हरियाणा, पिनकोड - 121004 फ़ोन - 0129 - 2401101 ईमेल - ntscneemka@nsic.co.in
88.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एसटीवीपी-चेन्नई बी-24, गुड्डी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, एक्कादुथंगल, चेन्नई, पिनकोड - 600032 फ़ोन - 044 - 22250444, 22250445 ईमेल - stpchennai@nsic.co.in
89.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-ओखला ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली , पिनकोड - 110020 फ़ोन - 011 - 26826801, 26826847, 26826846 ईमेल - ntscok@nsic.co.in

90.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-चेन्नई सेक्टर बी-24, गुडंडी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट एक्कादुथंगल पीओ, चेन्नई, पिनकोड – 600032 फ़ोन - 044 - 22252335/6/7 ईमेल - ntscche@nsic.co.in
91.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-हावड़ा जापानी गेट, बालिटिकुरी, हावड़ा, पिनकोड – 711113 फ़ोन - 033 - 26530304/26532962/26534280 ईमेल - ntschow@nsic.co.in
92.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-राजकोट भावनगर रोड, अजी औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, राजकोट, पिनकोड – 360003 फ़ोन - 0281 - 2387396/97/98 ईमेल - ntscraj@nsic.co.in
93.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-हैदराबाद कमलानगर, ईसीआईएल पोस्ट, हैदराबाद, पिनकोड – 500062 फ़ोन - 40 - 27121422, 27126646, 27134025, 27124597 ईमेल - ntschy@nsic.co.in
94.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-अलीगढ़ ए-1 इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट अलीगढ़, पिनकोड – 202001 फ़ोन - 0571 - 2403552 ईमेल - ntsecalig@nsic.co.in
95.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-राजपुरा डी-82/83, फोकल प्वाइंट, राजपुरा पिनकोड – 140401, फ़ोन - 01762 - 232669 ईमेल - ntsec.rjp@nsic.co.in
96.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड एनएसआईसी प्रौद्योगिकी सेवा केंद्र-डिंडीगुल शेड 27,29 और 30 सिडको इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, डिंडीगुल तमिलनाडु, पिनकोड – 624003 फ़ोन - 0451 - 2911165 ईमेल - ntscdindigul@nsic.co.in
97.	राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड ईएमडीबीपी हैदराबाद मॉड्यूल नं. 207, कमलानगर, ईसीआईएल पोस्ट, हैदराबाद, पिनकोड – 500062 फ़ोन - 040 - 27141422, 27125802 ईमेल - emdbphyd@nsic.co.in

98.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड आजीविका व्यवसाय इनक्यूबेटर (एलबीआई) - काशीपुर बी-1, बी-5, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, बाजपुर रोड, काशीपुर, जिला - उधम सिंह नगर, पिनकोड - 244713 फोन - 5947 - 262453 ईमेल - tickashipur@nsic.co.in
99.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड विधि एवं वसूली प्रकोष्ठ-कोलकाता, कमरा सं. 2/1, द्वितीय तल, हुडको टॉवर, न्यू मार्केट, 15एन, नेल्ली सेनगुप्ता सेरिनी, लिंडसे स्ट्रीट कोलकाता 700087 फोन - 033 - 22522232 ईमेल - lrcellkol@nsic.co.in
100.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड आईएमडीसी भुवनेश्वर आईडीसीओ प्लॉट सं. 6, ब्लॉक डी, मचेस्वर इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, भुवनेश्वर, पिनकोड - 751010 फोन - 0674 - 2548875 ईमेल - imdcbbsr@nsic.co.in
101.		राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड आजीविका व्यवसाय इनक्यूबेटर - नैनी, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, उद्योग नगर, नैनी, प्रयागराज, पिनकोड- 211009 फोन - 0532- 2697218, 2697050 ईमेल - lbinaini@nsic.co.in
राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड (NSIC) के स्वामित्व वाली अन्य ज़मीन/बिल्डिंग		
102.	भूमि/भवन का विवरण	पुडुचेरी, प्लॉट सं. ए-19, पीआईपीडीआईसी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, सेदारपेट, पुडुचेरी
103.		प्लॉट सं. बी-38 डी, सेक्टर-57, नोएडा
104.	आवासीय क्वार्टर	फ्लैट सं. 101, प्रथम तल, बी-विंग, सांताक्रूज़, चेंबूर लिंक रोड, एमआईजी बिल्डिंग, न्यू तिलक नगर, चेंबूर, मुंबई -400089
105.		फ्लैट सं. 102, प्रथम तल, बी-विंग, सांताक्रूज़, चेंबूर लिंक रोड, एमआईजी बिल्डिंग, न्यू तिलक नगर, चेंबूर, मुंबई -400089
106.		फ्लैट सं. 103, प्रथम तल, बी-विंग, सांताक्रूज़, चेंबूर लिंक रोड, एमआईजी बिल्डिंग, न्यू तिलक नगर, चेंबूर, मुंबई -400089
107.		फ्लैट सं. 104, प्रथम तल, बी-विंग, सांताक्रूज़, चेंबूर लिंक रोड, एमआईजी बिल्डिंग, न्यू तिलक नगर, चेंबूर, मुंबई -400089
108.		फ्लैट सं. 1203, बारहवां तल, ए-विंग, सांताक्रूज़ चेंबूर लिंक रोड, न्यू तिलक नगर, चेंबूर, मुंबई-400089
109.		फ्लैट सं. 1204, बारहवां तल, ए-विंग, सांताक्रूज़ चेंबूर लिंक रोड, न्यू तिलक नगर, चेंबूर, मुंबई-400089
110.		फ्लैट सं. 602, छटा तल, बिल्डिंग सं. 12, श्री गणेश सीएचएस, शास्त्री नगर, गोरेगांव (पश्चिम), मुंबई 400104
111.		फ्लैट सं. 604, छटा तल, बी-विंग, बिल्डिंग सं. 6, वसुंधरा सीएचएस, शास्त्री नगर, गोरेगांव (पश्चिम), मुंबई-400104

112.		फ्लैट सं. 1250, बारहवां तल, आजाद नगर पूर्णिमा सीएचएस , डी -64, आजाद नगर - 2, वीरा देसाई रोड, अंधेरी (पश्चिम), मुंबई-400053
113.		फ्लैट सं. 1254, बारहवां तल, आजाद नगर पूर्णिमा सीएचएस , डी -64, आजाद नगर - 2, वीरा देसाई रोड, अंधेरी (पश्चिम), मुंबई-400053
114.		फ्लैट सं. सी-75, चौथी मंज़िल, श्री सुंदर अपार्टमेंट, डायमंड गार्डन के सामने, चेंबूर, मुंबई-400071
115.		फ्लैट सं. 113/3920, प्रथम तल, ओल्ड तिलक नगर, चेंबूर, मुंबई- 400084
116.		फ्लैट सं. ए.एफ -8, दुर्गावाडी को-ऑपरेटिव हाउसिंग सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, तालेगाओ, गोवा
117.		फ्लैट सं. डीपी42, दुर्गावाडी को-ऑपरेटिव हाउसिंग सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, तालेगाओ, गोवा
118.		फ्लैट सं. 186-एन-एचआईजी 'सी', तृतीय तल, ब्लॉक सं. 3, यहालंका , न्यू टाउन, छठवां फेज, बेंगलुरु
119.		फ्लैट सं. 199-एन-एचआईजी 'सी', यहालंका न्यू टाउन, पांचवां फेज, बेंगलुरु
120.		फ्लैट सं. पी-384, जलवायु विहार, फेज-4, सेक्टर-21, नोएडा
121.		फ्लैट सं. पी-476, जलवायु विहार, फेज-4, सेक्टर-21, नोएडा
122.		फ्लैट सं. पी-299, जलवायु विहार, फेज-4, सेक्टर-21, नोएडा
123.		फ्लैट सं. क्यू-517, जलवायु विहार, फेज-4, सेक्टर-21, नोएडा
124.		फ्लैट सं. 45, ब्लॉक सं. 03, एफ.एफ, राधिका थिएटर के सामने, कुशाईगुडा, हैदराबाद
125.		फ्लैट सं. 36, ब्लॉक सं. 03, जी.एफ, राधिका थिएटर के सामने, कुशाईगुडा, हैदराबाद
126.		फ्लैट सं. 44, ब्लॉक सं. 03, एफ.एफ, राधिका थिएटर के सामने, कुशाईगुडा, हैदराबाद
127.		काशीपुर, फ्लैट सं. बी-5, नारायण कुंज कॉलोनी, काशीपुर
128.		काशीपुर, फ्लैट सं. बी-6, नारायण कुंज कॉलोनी, काशीपुर
129.		जयपुर, फ्लैट सं. सी-54 (जी-159) जवाहर नगर, जयपुर
130.		जयपुर, फ्लैट सं. 34/37, जी.एफ, प्रताप नगर, सांगानेर जयपुर
131.		जयपुर, फ्लैट सं. 34/39 एफ.एफ, प्रताप नगर, सांगानेर, जयपुर
132.		फ्लैट सं. बी-4/31, गोयल इंटरसिटी, अहमदाबाद
133.		मकान सं. 102/844 निर्मल अपार्टमेंट्स न्यू नांगल सराय, अहमदाबाद
134.		मकान सं. 113/976 निर्मल अपार्टमेंट्स न्यू नांगल सराय, अहमदाबाद
135.		फ्लैट सं. 10, प्रथम तल, ब्लॉक सं. 469, नादव्वक्करी गांव, एगमोर , नुंगमवक्कम तालुक, चेन्नई
136.		फ्लैट सं. 8, प्रथम तल, ब्लॉक-ए, भाई रणधीर सिंह नगर, लुधियाना
137.	ऑफिस स्पेस	मेसर्स सिद्धि एस्टेट ओनर्स एसोसिएशन, गुजरात हाई कोर्ट के सामने, अहमदाबाद इकाई सं. जी. 01 इकाई सं. जी. 10 इकाई सं. जी. 11

		इकाई सं. जी. 07 इकाई सं. जी. 08 इकाई सं. जी. 09
138.		सीआईबी/159, पीओआर- रामांगमडी , इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट वडोदरा
139.		शेड सं. 101, सीडको इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, मालुमिचमपट्टी, कायेम्बूर
140.		शेड सं. सी-20, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, थट्टांचावडी, पुडुचेरी
141.		दुकान सं. 3 और 4, ग्राउंड फ्लोर, इकाई सं. बी-21, 14379, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह टॉवर, ढोलेवाल, जी.टी रोड, लुधियाना
142.		142, 143 ब्लॉक- सी, एफ.एफ. मौर्या लौक काम्पलेक्स, पटना
143.		स्पेस सं. 02-01, 02-08, 02-27, 02-28, 02-29 (5 सं.), न्यू मार्केट, कोलकता

[फा. सं. के-01/4/2020-एसएमई]

अंकित कुमार अग्रवाल, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES

New Delhi, the 4th August, 2026

S.O. 1786.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises vide number S.O. 1008, dated the 6th November, 2020, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 14th November, 2020, except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being an officer equivalent to the rank of the Gazetted Officer of the Central Government to be estate officer for the purpose of the said Act and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on estate officer by or under the said Act within the local limits of jurisdiction in respect of public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table below:-

Table	
Designation of officer	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Shri Arun Kumar Singh, Senior General Manager, The National Small Industries Corporation Limited, New Delhi.	Premise owned or taken on lease from time to time by the National Small Industries Corporation Limited in the National Capital territory of Delhi and in other places where its Zonal Offices, Branch and Sub-Branch Offices, Technical Service Centres are situated as mentioned in Annexure.

Annexure

S. No	Offices	Address
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	CORPORATE OFFICE	National Small Industries Corporation Limited (A Government of India Enterprise) NSIC Bhawan, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi - 110 020 Tel: 011-26926275, 26926370, Toll free No. 1800111955 Email: info@nsic.co.in Website: www.nsic.co.in
2.	ZONAL OFFICE DELHI	National Small Industries Corporation Limited Zonal Office, Delhi Technical Services Centre Campus, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi - 110020.

		Ph - 011 - 40584930 Email - zodelhi@nsic.co.in
3.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Business Park, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi - 110020 Ph - 011 - 26926275
4.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- NOIDA III-B/118, Sector - 18 Shopping Complex, Noida (Uttar Pradesh)-201301 Ph - 0120 - 4595000 to 4595045, 2511798 Email - bonoida@nsic.co.in
5.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Dehradun 3rd & 4th Floor, Mayfare Business Park, Near Hotel Glory, Majra, Saharanpur Road, Dehradun. Pincode - 248001 Ph - 0135 - 2520501 Email - bodehradun@nsic.co.in
6.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Agra 307/T-6, 3rd Floor, Maruti Plaza, (Behind Sanjay Talkies), Sanjay Plaza, Agra, Uttar Pradesh. Pincode - 282002 Ph - 0562 - 2527862, 2525567 Email - boagra@nsic.co.in
7.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office-Agra Unit No.-202, Second Floor, Sector-12A, Padam Business Park, Awas Vikas, Sikandra Yojana, Agra, Uttar Pradesh. Pincode - 282007 Ph - 0562 - 2603131 Email - nsshoagra@nsic.co.in
8.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Kanpur 112/1, Benajhabar Road, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh. Pincode - 208002 Ph - 0512 - 2535049, 2556379 Email - kan@nsic.co.inbo
9.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office- Gorakhpur Sub Branch, DIC Campus, Gorakhpur Industrial Estate, Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh, Pincode - 273015 Mob- 7524043999 Email: sogorakhpur@nsic.co.in
10.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office- Varanasi NSIC Ltd., Mansarovar Complex, C-30/35-B, 2nd Floor, Maldhaiya, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh. Pincode - 221001 Ph - 542 - 2370223 Email - bovaranasi@nsic.co.in
11.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office- Lucknow/SBO/SZO, 503, Sri Ram Tower, 5th Floor, 13, Ashok Marg, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, Pincode - 226001 Ph - 0522 - 2288803 Email - nssholucknow@nsic.co.in
12.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Delhi. NTSC Complex, Okhla Industrial Estate, Near Govindpuri Metro Station, New Delhi-110020 Ph - 011 - 26382568-69, 41002319

		Email - delhinsic@nsic.co.in
13.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Faridabad 107 Nissan Hut NH-5 Railway Road Faridabad, Pincode – 121001 Ph - 0129 - 2985910/2985912/2985911 Email: bofaridabad@nsic.co.in
14.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Gurugram Plot No 69, 1st Floor, IDC, Sector-16, MG Road, Gurugram Pincode – 122001 Ph - 0124 - 2308913 Email - bogur@nsic.co.in
15.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Central Delhi Naraina CB-326, Second Floor, Ring Road, Naraina, New Delhi, Pincode – 110028 Ph - 011 - 64611484, 25775787 Email - bonaraina@nsic.co.in
16.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Naini Industrial Estate, Udyog Nagar, Naini, Prayagraj, Pincode – 211009 Ph - 0532 - 2697218/2697050, 2695847 Email: boallahabad@nsic.co.in
17.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited Sub Branch Office-Aligarh NSIC Technical Services Centre, A-1 Industrial Estate Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, Pincode – 202001 Mob- 9810038916 Email – soaligarh@nsic.co.in
18.	ZONAL OFFICE LUDHIANA	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office- Ludhiana, Guru Gobind Singh Tower, Near Dholewal Chowk G T Road- Ludhiana, Pincode – 141003 Ph - 0161 - 2541946,2530940, 2546523 Email: zoludh@nsic.co.in
19.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Chandigarh Ground Floor, BSNL Admin Building Sector-34-A, Opp-Piccadilly Cinema, Chandigarh (UT), Pincode – 160022 Ph - 0172 - 2610537, 2971759 Email: bochd@nsic.co.in
20.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Ludhiana Guru Gobind Singh Tower, Nr. Dholewal Chowk,Gt Road, Ludhiana, Pincode – 141003 Ph - 0161 - 2541946/2530940/2546523 Email: boludh@nsic.co.in
21.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office- Ludhiana 1st Floor, Frontier Tower, G.T.Road, Miller Ganj (Near Fire Brigade Office), Ludhiana, Pincode – 141003 Ph - 0161 – 4100939 Email: nssholudh@nsic.co.in
22.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Jalandhar 2nd Floor, SCO-21, Puda Complex, Ladowali Road, Jalandhar - 144001. Ph - 0181 - 2292242, 2295533, 6570257 Email: bojal@nsic.co.in

23.	ZONAL OFFICE KOLKATA	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office- Kolkata Plot No. 7/7 & 7/8, Block –CP, Salt Lake, Sector –V, Kolkata (West Bengal) Pincode – 700091 Ph - 033 - 23672001, 29861253 Email – zokolkata@nsic.co.in
24.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Patna Flat No. 403, 4th Floor, Shyam Kishorei Homes, Behind Of Rajasthan Restaurant, Dak Bungalow Chauraha, Frezer Road, Patna, Pincode – 800001 Ph - 0612 - 2354222, 3212403 Email: bopatna@nsic.co.in
25.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited National SC-ST Hub Office, Bodh Gaya Magadh University Campus, Bodh Gaya , Distt. Gaya Ji , Bihar, Pincode – 824234 Mob - 9760100565 Email - nsshobodhgaya@nsic.co.in
26.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Kolkata 20-B, Abdul Hamid Street, (7th Floor) , Kolkata, Pincode – 700069 Ph - 033-2213-7084/2248-8288 Email: bocal@nsic.co.in
27.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office, Kolkata Plot No. 7/7 & 7/8, Block –CP, Salt Lake, Sector –V, Kolkata (West Bengal)Pincode – 700091 Ph - 033 - 23672001, 29861253 Email: nsshokol@nsic.co.in
28.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Salt Lake Plot No- 7/7 & 7/8, Block - CP, Sector - V, Salt Lake, Kolkata, Pincode – 700091 Ph - 033 - 23671471 / 23670155 / 23672416 Email: bosaltlake@nsic.co.in
29.	ZONAL OFFICE BHUBANESWAR	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office- Bhubaneswar 304-B, 3rd Floor, NSIC-IMDC Dharampad Bhavan, IDCO Plot No. 6 Block-D, Mancheswar Industrial Estate, Bhubaneswar, Pincode – 751010 Ph - 0674 - 2548875 / 6510189 Email: zobhubaneswar@nsic.co.in
30.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Bhubaneswar Module No.204, 2nd Floor, NSIC-IMDC, Dharmpad Bhawan, IDCO Plot No.6, Block-D, Mancheswar Industrial Estate, Bhubaneswar- 751010 Ph - 0674 - 2583182, 2580780 Email - bobhubaneswar@nsic.co.in
31.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office, Bhubaneswar 304-B, 3rd Floor, NSIC-IMDC Dharampad Bhavan, IDCO Plot No. 6 Block-D, Mancheswar Industrial Estate, Bhubaneswar, Pincode – 751010 Ph - 0674-2580630 Email - nsshobhub@nsic.co.in
32.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Rourkela Plot No. QQQ-6, Civil Township, Rourkela,

		Pincode – 769012 Ph - 0661 - 2664459 Email - rourkela@nsic.co.in
33.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Jamshedpur Flat No.A-2/1, 2nd Floor, Nirode Apartment, L-Road, P.O. & P.S. Bistupur, Jamshedpur, Pincode – 831001 Ph - 0657 - 2320068 Email - bojms@nsic.co.in
34.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office, Bokaro, Pincode: 827012 Mob - 9431923065 Email - o.inbojms@nsic.c
35.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office/ National SC-ST Hub Office- Ranchi Udyog Bhawan, Industrial Area Kokar, Ranchi Pincode – 834001 Ph - 0651 - 2543921 Email - c.co.innsshoranchi@nsi
36.	ZONAL OFFICE GUWAHATI	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office-Guwahati Bye Lane No.3, Industrial Estate Bamunimaidan, Guwahati Pincode – 781021 Ph - 0361 - 2960635 Email - ati@nsic.co.inzoguwah
37.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Guwahati Industrial Estate, 3rd Bye Lane, Bamunimaidan, Guwahati, Pincode – 781021 Ph - 0361 - 2960631 Email - bogwh@nsic.co.in
38.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office, Guwahati Industrial Estate, Bye Lane No.3 , Bamunimaidan, Guwahati Pincode – 781021 Ph - 0361 - 2558947 Email - nsshogwh@nsic.co.in
39.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited Sub Branch Office-Agartala ITI Road, Near Yuba Sangstha Club, Towards Shiksha Niketan School Road, Indranagar, Agartala, Tripura Pincode – 799006 Ph - 0381 - 2911763, 9411630450 Email - bogwh@nsic.co.in
40.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office- Imphal Uripok Achom Leikai, Imphal (Manipur) Pincode – 795001 Ph - 0385 - 2414270, 9401726718 Email - bogwh@nsic.co.in
41.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office- Dimapur Ours Building, 2nd Floor, No-411,D.C.Court Junction, Dimapur, Pincode – 797112 Mob—9905082471 Email - bogwh@nsic.co.in
42.	ZONAL OFFICE MUMBAI	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office-Mumbai Office No. 505, Fifth Floor, Mittal Commercial Building, Wing – B, Village Marol, Off M.V. Road, Andheri (E), Mumbai, Pincode – 400059 Ph - 022 - 28500377 Email - zomumbai@nsic.co.in

43.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Mumbai "P/104, Khairane MIDC, TTC Industrial Area, Koparkhairane, Navi Mumbai, Pincode – 400710 Ph - 022 - 23740268 23740272, 23740116 Email - bomum@nsic.co.in
44.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Andheri Mumbai 5C2, 5th Floor A-Wing, Gundecha Onclave, Kherani Road, Sakinaka, Andheri (East), Mumbai, Pincode – 400072 Ph - 022 - 2850 9915 / 16 Email - boandheri@nsic.co.in
45.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Nagpur New Secretariat Building, 1st Floor, East Wing, Opp. VCA Stadium, Beside St. Ursula School, Civil Lines, Nagpur Pincode – 440001 Ph - 0712 - 2543254, 2552023 Email - bonagpur@nsic.co.in
46.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Chh. Sambhajinagar First Floor, Module House, Opp Mes Bunglow Mahavir Chowk, Chh. Sambhajinagar, Pincode – 431005 Ph - 0240 - 2954395 Email - boaurangabad@nsic.co.in
47.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Nashik Gaalla No 13 , 3rd Floor Udyog Bhawan , MIDC , Satpur, Nasik, Pincode – 422007 Ph - 0253 - 2365059 Email - bonasik@nsic.co.in
48.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Pune 211/212, 2nd Floor, Times Square Building, Pune-Satara Road, Near Saibaba Mandir,Pune, Pincode – 411037 Ph - 020 - 24273800/24274800/48620207 Email - bopune@nsic.co.in
49.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office- Pune 213, 2nd Floor, Pune - Satara Road, Near Sai Baba Temple, Swargate, Pune, Pincode – 411037 Ph - 020 - 48620209 Email - nssshopune@nsic.co.in
50.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office- Sindhudurg Plot No.-16, Navanagar Vikas Pradhikaran Beside Sindhudurgnagari, Oros District, Landmark Near Bank of Maharashtra, Sindhudurg, Maharashtra, Pincode – 416812 Mob - 9673511536 Email - sic.co.innsshosindhudurg@n
51.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office- Mumbai Office No. 505, 5th Floor, B -Wing, Mittal Commercial Building, Village Marol, M.V. Road, Marol Naka, Andheri (East), Mumbai – 400 059. Ph - 022 - 49710065 / 23728902 Email - nsshomum@nsic.co.in
52.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office-Goa Sub Branch Plot No. SC - 1/47, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, South Goa, Goa, Pincode – 403001 Ph - 0832 - 2220540

		Email - bogoa@nsic.co.in
53.	ZONAL OFFICE AHMEDABAD	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office-Ahmedabad 202, 203, Samruddhi Building Opp. Gujarat High Court, Ahmedabad, Pincode – 380014 Ph - 079 - 27543228/27544893/27544254 Email: zoahmedabad@nsic.co.in
54.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office-Ahmedabad 202-203, Samruddhi Bldg, Opp. Sakar-III, Near Income Tax Circle, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad, Pincode – 380014 Ph - 079 - 27543228/27544893/27544254 Email - boamd@nsic.co.in
55.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office-Jaipur NF/0/2, Nehru Place, Tonk Road, Jaipur, Pincode – 302015 Ph - 0141 - 2740191/2742991/2742372/2744899 Email - bojai@nsic.co.in
56.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office- Kota SSI Association, Purushartha Bhawan, IPIA, Road No. 5, Kota, Pincode – 324005 Ph - 744 - 2426104 Email: sokota@nsic.co.in
57.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Jaipur VKI 513, Alankar Plaza, Central Spine, Sector-02, Vidhyadhar Nagar, Jaipur, Pincode – 302039 Ph - 0141 - 2231594, 2231573 Email - bovkijaipur@nsic.co.in
58.	ZONAL OFFICE RAIPUR	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office-Raipur 204, IInd Floor, Block-A, Crystal Arcade, Near Lodhipara Chowk, Shankar Nagar, Raipur - 492007 Ph - 0771 - 4035388, 4006070 Email - zoraipur@nsic.co.in
59.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Indore NSIC Ltd., 10, Pologround Industrial Estate, Indore Pincode – 452015 Ph - 0731 - 2424408 - 2424409 – 2422248 Email - boindore@nsic.co.in
60.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Bhopal 110, Malviya Nagar, Ist Floor, Bhopal, Pincode – 462003 Ph - 0755- 4295152, 0755-2992944 Email - bobpl@nsic.co.in
61.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Raipur 204, IInd Floor, Block-A, Crystal Arcade, Near Lodhipara Chowk, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Pincode – 492007 Ph - 0771 - 4035388, 4006070 Email - boraipur@nsic.co.in
62.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office /Sub Branch Office-Surat 306,3rd Floor , Rajhans Building, Opposite J.K Tower, Ring Road, Surat Pincode – 395002, Ph - 0261 - 2345733, 4029735 Email - nsshosurat@nsic.co.in
63.	ZONAL OFFICE BENGALURU	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office - Bengaluru No. 25, Ist Main Road, KSSIDC Industrial Estate, 6th Block Rajajinagar,

		Bengaluru, Pincode – 560010 Ph - 080 - 23109059, 23307791, 23147858 Email – zobengaluru@nsic.co.in
64.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Belgaum Plot No. 60, Anujay Building, 5th Cross, Subhash-Chandra Nagar, Opp. Belgaum Foundry Cluster, Near Utsav Hotel, Udyambag, Belgaum- Karnataka, Pincode – 590006 Ph - 0831 - 2449922 Email - belgaum@nsic.co.in
65.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office - Bengaluru No.6&7, ISICOS Building West Of Chord Road Rajaji Nagar, Industrial Town, Bengaluru, Pincode – 560044 Ph - 080 - 23147791 / 29777790 Email - nsshoban@nsic.co.in
66.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office - Bengaluru No. 25, Ist Main Road, KSSIDC Industrial Estate, 6th Block Rajajinagar, Bengaluru Pincode – 560010 Ph - 080 - 23109059, 23307791, 23147858 Email - boban@nsic.co.in
67.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office -Peenya C-424, Peenya Industrial Estate, 1st Stage, Behind Peenya Police Station, Bengaluru, Pincode – 560058 Ph - 080 - 28374676, 28394576, 28372977 Email - bopeenya@nsic.co.in
68.	ZONAL OFFICE HYDERABAD	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office-Hyderabad 201, 203, Sri Dattasai Complex, RTC Cross Roads, Hyderabad, Pincode – 500020 Ph - 040-27622515 / 040-27615761 Email - zohyderabad@nsic.co.in
69.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Hyderabad 203 & 303, Sri Dattasai Complex, RTC Cross Roads, Hyderabad, Pincode – 500020 Ph - 040-27615764 / 27615761 / 27622097. Email - bohyd@nsic.co.in
70.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Vijayawada D.No.59A-8/8-6B/1, 3rd Floor, Main Road, Gurunanak Colony, Vijayawada, Pincode – 520008 Ph - 0866 - 2541055 Email - bovijayawada@nsic.co.in
71.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Visakhapatnam D.No 32-6-1/13/49, Flat No 107, First Floor, MBR Landmark, Sheela Nagar, Visakhapatnam, Pincode – 530012 Ph - 0891 - 2758554 Email - visakhapatnam@nsic.co.in
72.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Balanagar 6-3-144, 144/1, 3rd Floor, Jahanara Kareem Complex, Balanagar, Hyderabad, Pincode – 500037 Ph - 040 - 23324769 Email - bobalanagar@nsic.co.in
73.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office - Hyderabad NSIC Technical Services Centre Electronic Complex Kamalanagar, Hyderabad, Pincode – 500062

		Ph - 040 - 29559801 Email - nsshohyd@nsic.co.in
74.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited Branch Office TSC-Hyderabad, NSIC Technical Services Centre, Kamalanagar, ECIL Post, Hyderabad, Pincode – 500062 Ph - 040 - 27121422, 27126646, Email - botschyd@nsic.co.in
75.	ZONAL OFFICE CHENNAI	National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Zonal Office-Chennai Module No. 201, NSIC – Software Technology Business Park, Guindy Industrial Estate, Ekkattuthangal, Chennai – 600 032, Pincode – 600006 Ph - 044 - 2829 1943 ,2829 4541 Email - zochennai@nsic.co.in
76.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Chennai Module 205, NSIC Software Technology Park Building, Guindy Industrial Estate, Ekkattuthangal, Chennai Pincode – 600032 Ph - 044 - 28293347/28294541 Email - bochen@nsic.co.in
77.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, National SC-ST Hub Office- Chennai MSME-DI Campus, No.65/1, GST Road, Guindy, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, Pincode – 600032 Ph - 044 - 48631200 Email - nsshochen@nsic.co.in
78.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Ambattur 309 SIDCO-AIEMA Towers, 1st Main Road, Ambattur Industrial Estate, Chennai, Pincode – 600058 Ph - 044 - 26243984, 28291292 Email - boambattur@nsic.co.in
79.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Puducherry Administrative Building, Industrial Estate, Thattachavady, Puducherry - 605 009, Ph - 0413 - 2248970, 2248940 Email - boapon@nsic.co.in
80.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Madurai 74, ADR Tower 1st Floor, Kalavasal, Theni Main Road, Madurai, Pincode – 625016, Ph - 0452-2609992, 2609993, 4984191. Email - bomadu@nsic.co.in
81.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Coimbatore 1055/10, Gowtham Centre, Avanashi Road, Coimbatore Pincode – 641018, Ph - 0422 - 2244618, 2247757 Email - bocomb@nsic.co.in
82.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Branch Office- Cochin NSIC Ltd, S-67, GCDA Commercial Complex, Marine Drive,Shanmugham Road, Kochi, Pincode – 682031, Ph - 0484 - 2381850/2368149/2986107/2351440 Email - bococh@nsic.co.in
83.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Sub Branch Office - Thrissur (Opposite to Ayyanthole Post Office) Ayyanthole Thrissur, Pincode– 680003

		Mob- 9895571743 Email – sbothrissur@nsic.co.in
84.	National Small Industries Corporation Technical Centres	National Small Industries Corporation Limited Training Centre, Mandi # 210/12, Ram Nagar(Pulgharat), Mandi, Distt. Mandi (HP), Pincode – 175001 Mob- 9816071471 Email: lokeshbhatia@nsic.co.in
85.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited Livelihood Business Incubator- Deoria, Kaushal Chandra Tower, 1st And Second Floor, 319/1, Above Reliance Smart Point, CC Road, Deoria, Uttar Pradesh, Pincode–274001 Mob- 8009477301 Email: lbideoria@nsic.co.in
86.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC- Technical Services Centre & LBI- Bodh Gaya Magadh University Campus, Near PG Hindi Department Bodh Gaya Bihar -824234 Mob- 8697887899 Email - ntscbodhgaya@nsic.co.in
87.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Neemka Sec-71, Tigaon Road, Neemka, Faridabad , Haryana, Pincode – 121004 Ph - 0129 - 2401101 Email - ntscneemka@nsic.co.in
88.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited STBP- Chennai B-24, Guindy Industrial Estate, Ekkaduthangal, Chennai Pincode – 600032 Ph - 044 - 22250444, 22250445 Email - stpchennai@nsic.co.in
89.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Okhla Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi, Pincode – 110020 Ph - 011 - 26826801, 26826847, 26826846 Email - ntscok@nsic.co.in
90.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Chennai Sector B-24, Guindy Industrial Estate Ekkaduthangal PO, Chennai, Pincode - 600032 Ph - 044 - 22252335/6/7 Email - ntscche@nsic.co.in
91.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Howrah Japanigate, Balitikuri, Howrah, Pincode – 711113 Ph - 033 - 26530304/26532962/26534280 Email - ntschow@nsic.co.in
92.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Rajkot Bhavnagar Road, Aji Industrial Area, Rajkot, Pincode – 360003 Ph - 0281 - 2387396/97/98 Email - ntscraj@nsic.co.in
93.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Hyderabad Kamalanagar, ECIL Post, Hyderabad, Pincode – 500062 Ph - 40 - 27121422, 27126646, 27134025, 27124597 Email - ntschy@nsic.co.in
94.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Aligarh A-1 Industrial Estate Aligarh, Pincode – 202001

		Ph - 0571 - 2403552 Email: ntsecalg@nsic.co.in
95.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Rajpura D-82/83, Focal Point, Rajpura Pincode – 140401, Ph - 01762 - 232669 Email: ntsec.rjp@nsic.co.in
96.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited NSIC Technical Services Centre-Dindigul Shed 27,29 & 30 SIDCO Industrial Estate, Dindigul Tamil Nadu, Pincode – 624003 Ph - 0451 - 2911165 Email: ntscdindigul@nsic.co.in
97.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited EMDBP Hyderabad Module No. 207, Kamalanagar, ECIL Post, Hyderabad, Pincode – 500062 Ph - 040 - 27141422, 27125802 Email: emdbphyd@nsic.co.in
98.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited Livelihood Business Incubator -Kashipur B-1, B-5, Industrial Area,Bazpur Road, Kashipur, District – Udham Singh Nagar, Pincode – 244713 Ph - 5947 - 262453 Email: tickashipur@nsic.co.in
99.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited Law & Recovery Cell-Kolkata, Room No.2/1, 2nd Floor, HUDCO Tower, New Market, 15n, Nelli Sengupta Serini, Lindsay Street Kolkata 700087 Ph - 033 - 22522232 Email - lrcellkol@nsic.co.in
100.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited IMDC Bhubaneswar IDCO Plot No.6, Block D, Macheswar Industrial Estate, Bhubaneswar, Pincode – 751010 Ph - 0674 - 2548875 Email - imdcbbbsr@nsic.co.in
101.		National Small Industries Corporation Limited Livelihood Business Incubator -Naini, Industrial Estate, Udyog Nagar, Naini, Prayagraj Pincode – 211009, Ph - 0532 - 2697218, 2697050 Email – lbainaini@nsic.co.in
	OTHERS LANDS / BUILDINGS OWNED BY NATIONAL SMALL INDUSTRIES CORPORATION LIMITED	
102.	LAND/BUILDING DETAILS	Puducherry, Plot No. A-19, PIPDIC Industrial Estate, Sedarapet, Puducherry
103.		Plot No. B-38D, Sector-57, Noida
104.	RESIDENTIAL QUARTERS	Flat No. 101, 1st Floor, B-Wing, Santacruz, Chembur Link Road, MIG Building, New Tilak Nagar, Chembur, Mumbai -400089.
105.		Flat No. 102, 1st Floor, B-Wing, Santacruz Chembur Link Road, MIG Building, New Tilak Nagar, Chembur, Mumbai - 400089.
106.		Flat No.103, 1st Floor, B-Wing, Santacruz Chembur Link Road, MIG Building, New Tilak Nagar, Chembur, Mumbai -400089.
107.		Flat No.104, 1st Floor, B-Wing, Santacruz Chembur Link Road, MIG Building, New Tilak Nagar, Chembur, Mumbai -400089.
108.		Flat No.1203, 12th Floor, A-Wing, Santacruz Chembur Link Road, New Tilak Nagar, Chembur, Mumbai-400089
109.		Flat No. 1204, 12th Floor, A-Wing, Santacruz Chembur Link Road, New Tilak Nagar, Chembur, Mumbai-400089

110.		Flat No. 602, 6th Floor, Bldg. No. 12, Shri Ganesh CHS, Shastri Nagar, Goregaon (W), Mumbai 400104
111.		Flat No. 604, 6th Floor, B-Wing, Bldg. No. 6, Vasundhara CHS, Shastri Nagar, Goregaon (W), Mumbai-400104
112.		Flat No. 1250, 12th Floor, Azad Nagar Poornima CHS, D-64, Azad Nagar- 2, Veera Desai Road, Andheri (W), Mumbai-400053.
113.		Flat No. 1254, 12th Floor, Azad Nagar Poornima CHS, D-64, Azad Nagar-2, Veera Desai Road, Andheri (W), Mumbai- 400053.
114.		Flat No. C-75,4th Floor, Shri Sunder Apartment, Opp. Diamond Garden, Chembur, Mumbai-400071
115.		Flat No., 113/3920, 1st Floor, Old Tilak Nagar, Chembur, Mumbai-400084.
116.		Flat No; A.F-8, Durgawadi Co-Operative Housing Society Ltd. Taleigao,Goa
117.		Flat No. D.P.42, Durgawadi Co-Operative Housing Society Ltd., Taleigao, Goa
118.		Flat No.186-N-HIG 'C', 3rd Floor, Block No. 3, Yahalanka, New Town, VIth Phase, Bengaluru
119.		Flat No.199-N-HIG 'C', Yahalanka New Town, Vth Phase, Bengaluru
120.		Flat No. P-384, Jalvayu Vihar, Phase-IV, Sector-21, Noida
121.		Flat No. P-476, Jalvayu Vihar, Phase-IV, Sector-21, Noida
122.		Flat No. P-299, Jalvayu Vihar, Phase-IV, Sector-21, Noida
123.		Flat No. Q-517, Jalvayu Vihar, Phase-IV, Sector-21, Noida
124.		Flat No. 45, Block No. 03, F.F, Opp. Radhika Theater, Kusaiguda, Hyderabad.
125.		Flat No. 36, Block No. 03, G.F, Opp. Radhika Theater, Kusaiguda, Hyderabad.
126.		Flat No. 44, Block No. 03, F.F, Opp. Radhika Theater, Kusaiguda, Hyderabad.
127.		Kashipur, Flat No. B-5, Narain Kunj Colony, Kashipur.
128.		Kashipur, Flat No. B-6, Narain Kunj Colony, Kashipur.
129.		Jaipur, Flat No. C-54 (G-159) Jawahar Nagar, Jaipur.
130.		Jaipur, Flat No. 34/37 G.F, Pratap Nagar, Sanganer Jaipur
131.		Jaipur, Flat No. 34/39 F.F, Pratap Nagar, Sanganer, Jaipur
132.		Flat No. B-4/31, Goyal Intercity, Ahmedabad
133.		House No. 102/844, Nirmal Apartments New Nangal Sarai, Ahmedabad
134.		House No. 113/976, Nirmal Apartments New Nangal Sarai, Ahmedabad
135.		Flat No. 10, First Floor, Block No. 469, Nadvvkkari Village, Egmore, Nungambakkam Taluk, Chennai
136.		Flat No. 8, First Floor, Block-A, Bhai Randhir Singh Nagar, Ludhiana
137.	OFFICE SPACE	M/s Siddhi Estate Owners Association, Opp. Gujarat High Court Ahmedabad
		Unit No. G. 01
		Unit No. G. 10
		Unit No. G. 11
		Unit No. G. 07
		Unit No. G. 08
		Unit No. G. 09
138.		-CIB/159, PORRamangamdi, Industrial Estate, Vadodra
139.		Shed No.101, SIDCO Industrial Estate, Malumichampatti, Coimbatore
140.		Shed No. C-20, Industrial Estate, Thattanchavady, Puducherry
141.		Shop No. 3 & 4, Ground Floor, Unit No. B-21, 14379, Guru Gobind Singh Tower, Dholewal,G.T Road Ludhiana
142.		142,143, Block-C,F.F, Morya Lok Complex, Patna
143.		Space No. 02-01, 02-08,02-27,02-28,02-29 (5 Nos.), New Market, Kolkata

[F. No. K-01/4/2020-SME]

ANKIT KUMAR AGRAWAL, Director

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1787.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **सेंट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **श्री गोविन्द अंकुश शिंदे** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में श्रम न्यायालय **अहमदनगर** के पंचाट (13/2017) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01/2026-आई आर (बी- II)-76]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1787.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (**Ref. 13/2017**) of the **Labour Court, Ahmednagar** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Central Bank of India** and **Shri Govind Ankush Shinde**.

[No. L-39025/01/2026-IR(B-II)-76]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDNAGAR**

(Before Shri Sharad G.Deshpande Presiding Officer, Labour Court ,Ahmednagar)

Exh. O- 7

Reference (IDA) No. 13/2017
(CNR No. MHLC160002682017)

1. Regional Manager,
Central Bank of India,
Regional Office, Aurangabad 5/5/72,
New Usmanpura, Aurangabad, 431005

2. Branch Manager,
Central Bank of India,
Branch Mandavgan, Po.: Mandavgan,
Tal.: Shrigonda, Dist.: Ahmednagar.

2A. Regional Manager,
Central Bank of India,
Plot No. 56,M.I.D.C.,
Sahyadri Chauk, Nagapur,
Ahmednagar.

... **First Party**

Vs.

Govind Ankush Shinde
Age: 40 Years, Occ.: Nil,
At Po.: Mandavgan, Tal.: Shrigonda,
Dist.: Ahmednagar

... **Second Party**

CORAM: Shri Sharad G. Deshpande, Judge, First Labour Court A.nagar.

Advocates : T.T. Kakad Advocate for First Party.

Shri K.Y. Modgekar for Second Party.

AWARD
(Date: 25-07-2024)

1. This Reference IDA Application filed by Second Party Govind Ankush Shinde against First Party Central Bank of India, branch Mandavgan District Ahmednagar where he was acting as Sweeper. However, on 1.4.2017 he was removed from service on the basis of oral order. Being aggrieved by said order he has filed this said reference IDA application for reinstatement alongwith all benefits. Brief facts of the Application are as under-

2. The second party Govind Ankush Shinde (Labour) is Sweeper towards the first party Central Bank of India (Bank) at branch Mandavgan since 2008. Initially his salary was Rs. 100/- only. Neither any appointment letter, nor any salary slip given to him. He has given unblemished and continuous service since 2008 to 2017 near about 9 years. On 1.4.2017 he was dismissed from service by oral order. Therefore, he raised said issue before Labour Commissioner at Pune. However, there was no settlement and therefore such reference. He was many times requested for his reinstatement however Bank pay no heed. In between, in the year 2013 there was process started for recruitment, he has also taken part in the said recruitment however no appointment was given to him. Further Bank did not comply the Section 25-F, G, H. Actually he was given 240 days service and his post was permanent. Though recruitment process was held however no appointment was given to him. His last salary was Rs. 130/- per day. He was dismissed from services against principles of natural justice without any permission.

3. On the contrary, other workers namely Keru Suryabhan Borude, Dikshant Ghogare, Vinod Ghaytadak, Abasaheb Kale was kept on establishment. The second party was removed from service without any valid reason and legal way. Therefore oral order dated 1-4-2017 needs to be vacated and it prayed that the second party should appoint alongwith salary and all benefits. Hence, this application.

4. In pursuance of notice first party Nos. 1 & 2 Central Bank appeared and filed their detail written statement at Exh. C-6.

5. In between the address of the bank was changed and necessary amendment was taken on record. A pursis has filed to read the original Say of Bank. Pursis was at Exh. C-22.

6. Bank has filed detail Say at Exh C-6 and denied all the averments in application. According to the first party application is not legal and maintainable as per law. The second party has never locus-standi to file such application. The application was filed beyond prescribed period of limitation. It was specifically denied that the bank has given oral order on 1.4.2017 regarding dismissal of the said second party. The last salary of Rs. 130/- per day was denied by the bank. It is clarified by bank that no any appointment was given to the second party. Actually the appointment of the employee, dismissal, promotions these rights were not vested with the bank. It was vested towards Zonal officer. All appointments were fulfilled by after giving public notice in news paper. There was no any rule to give permanency to the workers who have completed 60 or 45 days. There was no any classification as temporary or permanent Sweeper in bank. The second party ought to appoint as per rules and conditions given to him in advertisement. No condition under sec. 25 F, G and H and rule 80, 81 were applicable to bank. It was also denied that, his service was unblemished. Actually he has filed matter towards Labour Officer without any valid reason. He never given continuous service to the bank, nor bank dismissal him. Actually his work was temporary and he has given per day salary. Whenever work was available bank used to call him, he never worked as permanent or temporary worker towards bank. Therefore no question arises regarding any notice pay or compensation. As he was not in service towards bank no question arise to prepare any seniority list, no any particular work allotted to him. Now a days there was no work available which was suitable to him. Already he was going towards another bank regarding his work. He has filed this application only to harass the bank. Lastly, they prayed for rejection of this application with cost.

7. On the basis of application and W.S. filed on record my learned predecessor has framed issues at Exh. O-6, to which I have recorded my findings thereon with the reasons mentioned below-

Sr. No.	ISSUES	FINDINGS
1	Does the second party prove that the first party has illegally and improperly terminated his services by oral order dated 1.4.2017, violating the statutory provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?	Negative
2	Does the Second Party prove that, he is entitled for the relief of reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages w.e.f. 1.4.2017 ?	Does not survive
3	What Award	As per final order

REASONS**8. Issue No.1:**

To substantiate his claim, second party has given oral and documentary evidence at Exh. U-16. He has filed School leaving certificate, caste certificate, permanency orders from Bank at Exh. U-10, He also filed S.S.C. mark-sheet, Order dated 3.12.2011 at Exh. U-12, Also filed some correspondence towards association and Zonal office, a letter for collecting information, notification of recruitment, and public advertisement placed on record at Exh. U-15. He also filed order of regional office, order from Central Sweepers and regarding their recruitment. He also filed order to give permanency those work who have completed 45 days continuous service, also filed orders of Zonal Office Ahmednagar regarding recruitment and orders of W.P. No. 3781/ 2014 of Hon'ble High Court Guwahati and also copy of judgments in W.P. No. 365 & 374/2014, he also filed copy of W.P. No. 8275/ 2018 and also copy of Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 2760-2761/ 2023 regarding Madhyapradesh Central Bank, order of Hon'ble High Court dated 16.3.2022, He also filed a letter of Bankers Committee dated 10.2.2022, also filed letters sent by bankers Committee to Central office dated 28-6-2021, and letter given by second party dated 5.7.2021, and also some correspondence dated 2.8.2021 and 5.11.2022, He also filed agreement regarding temporary workers, letter dated 14-8-2012 given by Bank to other branches, also a letter dated 31-7-2023 given by association to bank regarding compliance of said agreement, copy of letter issued by first party dated 26-12-2023, orders in W.P.No. 379/ 2024, and W.P. No. 14519/2012 of Hon'ble High Court Jabalpur, Madhyapradesh, some paper cutting of daily Yashbharati, cutting of recruitment in Loksatta newspaper, application of second party dated 4-1-2024, news regarding cancellation of recruitment dated 13-1-2024, letter from association dated 10.1.2024 and some receipts placed on record.

9. To substantiate their claim, the second party examined himself at Exh. U-16 and reiterated the contention in the application. I have refrain myself to mention the same. He has filed evidence closed pursis at Exh. U-16. Per contra, bank has examined one Shri Makarand Kasabe at Eh. C-12 and one another witness namely Sonali Jadhav at Exh. C-16 and filed evidence closed pursis at Exh. C-21.

10. According to the second party, he has given unblemished and continuous service for 9 years and therefore, he has eligible as permanent employee of bank. However, bank did not given permanency to him. On the contrary, on 1.4.2017 he has been dismissed from service. Actually there is some procedure ought to be adopted by bank regarding permanency. According to this second party the employees who has completed 60 days and now in 45 days these employees are eligible for permanency and therefore to prove the said fact burden shifts on the shoulder of the second party himself, but he did not succeed the same. He has to prove the some one has given permanency by adopting this procedure. According to him, on 1.4.2017 he removed from service and it was oral termination. I have minutely gone through with all documents filed on record. However no any sufficient evidence placed on record by the second party except some answers regarding vouchers. Learned Advocate Kakad turned my attention to cross examination. Actually Central Bank is Nationalized bank and such bank having no powers to dismiss to any one by oral termination. Furthermore, the recruitment process has to adopt by bank. Though the second party submitted that he has Sweeper since 28.12.2008 however no any documentary evidence placed on record. Per contra, he has admitted at Exh. U-16 that the appointment of any employee has to fill up only by due procedure by public advertisement in news paper. However, in the year 2008 no any advertisement had been published by bank. Also no any written or oral examination was held. There was no any agreement between him and bank regarding his service. Also no appointment letter given by bank. He has also admitted that bank has not given any particular work to him. Further Kakad Advocate turned my attention that he has no authority to sign any register of the bank. Also he has no any authority to record any entries in register and therefore, no any cogent evidence placed on record by the second party.

11. To substantiate their claim, he mentioned that on 1.4.2017 he was removed from service. His service was clean and unblemished. However no any appointment letter or salary slip given to him. Also compensation of sec. 25-F, 25-G, and 25-H not given to him. Advocate Kakad has taken cross of the second party and turned my attention that in the year 2008 no any advertisement given by the bank and no any written and oral examination taken by bank. Neither any appointment letter, nor salary slip given to him. He has no authority to sign any register. No signature taken on attendance register. The voluminous documents placed on record regarding recruitment process in the year 2013 at Exh. U-27 but thereafter said recruitment process was cancelled. The copy of order in W.P. No. 379/ 2024 and W.P. No. 14519/ 2015 order of Hon'ble Jabalpur High Court placed on record. However these matters are not connected with the matter in hand. The recruitment notification No. 2425 was also placed on record at Exh. U-33. Copy of order in W.P. No. 3781/ 2014 dated 14-3-2016 of Hon'ble Apex Court placed on record. I have minutely gone through with all these documents. However, did not find any relevancy of these matters regarding matter in hand in my opinion, any recruitment process must be clean, transparent and definite no may one can allow to appoint above process.

12. When any one make prayer of permanency he has to prove his entry was valid one and burden shifts on his shoulder. Learned Advocate Shri Modgekar submitted that no seniority list was published. He also mentioned some names like Keru Suryabhan Borude, Dikshant Ghogare, Vinod Ghaytadak, Abasaheb Kale etc. they were in service but such argument though attractive but not digestible. He has to make their own case on own footing. The judgment of Court were not depend on qualitative but depend on quantity therefore I do not wish to comment in case of

other workers.

13. Learned Advocate Shri Modgekar turned my attention to the recruitment process in 2013 and stay orders passed in W.P. No. 365 and 374/2014. The advertisement was published in English and sweeper does not understand the same. It should be vernacular local language but thereafter whole process was cancelled. The reference should not be taken from said matter. At Exh. U-23 there are some letters regarding recruitment process of Sweepers. Also copy of orders of other Hon'ble High Courts, Guwahati and Nagpur bench. The copy of W.P. No. 356/ 2016, W.P. No. 8275/ 2018 was placed on record. I have minutely gone through with orders of Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 8275/ 2018 Sandip Prahalat Engole & others. However, in this matter there was memorandum of settlement and if any recruitment was started than these sweepers has to be considered on priority basis. In case in hand no specific order given by any Hon'ble High Court. In W.P. No. 17273/ 2016 Pradipkumar Shuklya Vs. Central Bank of India recruitment process was suspended. In short, there was many case filed by Sweepers against Central bank and facts are different. In my opinion, the second party has to prove their case by filing some probable evidence however in this matter no any documentary evidence given by the second party. Per contra, Central bank examined on Makarand Kasabe at Exh. C-12 and Sonali Jadhav at Exh. C-16. In cross examination very much reliance given on the vouchers. Actually these are witnesses of bank and in my opinion only vouchers of the documents could not decide merit in their prayer and therefore we could not rely on oral testimony of these bank officers. The signatures of the employee is to give on bank vouchers. Another employee Sunil Gatane was appointed said period. The date and time was mentioned on vouchers regarding payment. They tried to come on record except these evidence no other evidence available with second party. Shri Makarand Kasabe already deposed that he could not assign the salary of Shri Shinde.

14. In cross examination of Sonali Jadhav very much relied on voucher. The expenses of daily wages worker used to shown in daily wages account. However, the reasons of the expenses not mentioned on voucher. No any documents available with bank regarding daily wages worker. In my opinion, for appointment of any employee there should be first creation of post and thereafter advertisement must be published in news paper. In present matter he was appointed in 2008 and having salary of Rs.100/- per day and he has working 45 days did not prove by him and no any documents placed on record regarding the same. Though whole case depend upon other employee who were in service and vouchers available towards bank and therefore, I do not think that he was eligible for reinstatement in service only on some admissions given in cross examination.

15. Learned Advocate Kakad placed reliance on **Secretary State of Karnataka and Ors. Vs. Umadevi (AIR 2006 SC 1806 (SC)** wherein it is held that-

"Constitution of India] Art 16, Art 162, Art 226, Art 14, Art 39(d) Public employment Appointment dehors due process of selection envisaged by constitutional scheme- Confers no right on appointee- Regularisation of daily wages, temporary/ contractual employees appointed in violation of constitutional scheme- Right of Court/ executive would not extend to directing regularisation to be treated as permanence in service- Fact that employee has continued for long, irrespective- That apart, principle of equal pay for equal work cannot also be applied for giving relief of permanency- Doctrine of legitimate expectation cannot be invoked by such employees merely because in past State had regularised similarly placed on record.

It has also to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent, merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by the relevant rules. It is not open to the court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right. High Courts acting under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, should not ordinarily issue directions for absorption, regularization, or permanent continuance unless the recruitment itself was made regularly and in terms of the constitutional scheme. Merely because, an employee had continued under cover of an order of Court, which we have described as 'litigious employment' in the earlier part of the judgment, he would not be entitled to any right to be absorbed or made permanent in the service. In fact, in such cases, the High Court may not be justified in issuing interim directions, since, after all, if ultimately the employee approaching it is found entitled to relief, it may be possible for it to mould the relief in such a manner that ultimately no prejudice will be caused to him, whereas an interim direction to continue his employment would hold up the regular procedure for selection or impose on the State the burden of paying an employee who is really not required. The courts must be careful in ensuring that they do not interfere unduly with the economic arrangement of its affairs by the State or its instrumentalities or lend themselves the instruments to facilitate the bypassing of the constitutional and statutory mandates.

In my opinion in this case, criteria mentioned regarding promotion on temporary employee and daily wages. When there was any appointment in Nationalized bank there must be apply principle of equity. There should not be any violation of these principle of equity in between daily wages, contract labour and seasonal workers. "Same workers same pay" ^leku dke leku osru* these principle is not apply here and therefore, others State apply these rules must be apply case in hand. These principle is not sustained. In case in hand Shri Modgekar submitted that same

other workers are in service and such rule must be apply to case in hand however Rule of equality in public employment is basic feature of our Constitution and therefore this court having no right to give appointment of a particular employee and violate these fundamental principle. The same fact mentioned in case of Umadevi that the workers who are doing job on basis of honorarium should not be permanent.

16. The Learned Advocate Shri Modgekar relied on **Chief Conservator of Forests, Pune and another Vs. Janabai Sonaba Sarpale (2019 (I) Bom.L.C. 18)** wherein it is held that-

"Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act, 1971, Section 30, Sch-IV, Items 6,9- Regularisation- power of Industrial Court- Plea raised that in view of Uma Devi's case- Industrial Court has no power to regularise- Held, once a case of unfair labour practice is established, Industrial Court has power to regularise services."

The case of Umadevi is not applicable here. However, in this above case the Court has declared unfair labour practice but case in hand facts are different one.

17. The Advocate Shri Modgekar also relied upon the following judgments-

1. **H.D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and others (S.C. Labour Judgments 1984 to 1987 p 610)**, wherein it is held that-

"Industrial Disputes Act, 1947-Sections 2(oo), 25-B- "Retrenchment" meaning of- Dailyrated worker- His name struck off rolls on ground of passing matriculate examination – In instant case retrenchment of appellatant by striking off name from rolls held to be retrenchment- Retrenchment effected in violation of Section 25-B is invalid."

2. **Trade-Wings Limited Vs. Prabhakar Dattaram Phodkar of Bombay and Ors. (1992 I CLR, 480)** wherein it is held that-

"S-25-F Industrial Disputes (Bombay) Rules, 1957-Rule 81-Display of Seniority List Category-wise before effecting retrenchment-Failure to display such list-Effect- The said provision being mandatory, retrenchment will have to be quashed."

Both the matters were relating to permanent employee. Therefore, ratio does not apply to case in hand.

3. **Umesh Saxena Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Agra and others (1993 FLR (66) 566)** wherein it is held that-

"Section 25-F of the Act would certainly apply to the petitioner even if his appointment was adhoc or temporary. The fact that he had worked for more than 240 days in a year immediately preceding the issuance of termination order would make it imperative for the employer to follow the procedure laid down under the Act."

It is not proved he has given 240 days service.

4. **Divisional Secretary, Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Secondary Education, Nagpur and another Vs. Mohd. Naim S/o Abdul Rahim (2009 (1) Bom.LC 453 (Bom))** wherein it is held that-

"Sections 25-F, 25-G, 25-H- Termination- And, reinstatement of an employee-Mode, or manner of entry into service- Is one of relevant factors, to be considered-And, distinction between cases of prayer for regularization and reinstatement being made earlier, is now not available after Constitutional Bench of Apex Court in the case of Secretary State of Karnataka Vs. Umadevi-In public employment."

5. **Jayantibhai Raojibhai Patel Vs. Municipal Council, Narkhed (Civil Appeal No. 6188/ 2019)** wherein it is held that-

"Illegal termination-Reinstatement without back wages- Denial of back wages to employee who has suffered due to illegal act of employer would amount to indirectly punishing employee concerned and rewarding employer by relieving him of obligation to pay back wages including emolument- Charge of misconduct not substantiated-Convening of fresh enquiry without recording any reasons."

No question arise regarding back wages.

6. **M.P. Electricity Board, Vidisha Vs. Hariram and another (2000 (57) FLR, 750)** wherein it is held that-

" Section 25-F- Constitution of India] 1950-Article 226-Award of reinstatement- passed by Industrial Court in appeal Employees engaged in daily wages."

7. **Samishta Dube Vs. City Board, Etawah & Anothr (1999 LLR 460)**, wherein it is held that-

"Section 6-P read with Section 6(N)- Retrenchment-Last come, first go- principle applicable even in case of those employed on daily wages- Section 6-P does not require any particular period of continuous service."

No ratio apply to case in hand and there is recruitment process.

8. **General Manager, Telecom, Nagpur Vs. Naresh Brijlal Charote (2001 LAB.I.C 2127)**, wherein it is held that-

"25-F Workman-Definition of- Does not make any distinction between part time employee and full time employee-Respondent appointed as part time sweeper and required to do manual and skilled work-Is a workman- Non compliance of mandatory provision of S.25-F before terminating his services- Order of termination is void ab initio."

This matter for reinstatement and not for compliance of Section 25-F.

9. **Gauri Shanker Vs. State of Rajasthan (2015 LLR 785)** wherein it is held that-

"Award of back wages will be on the basis of several factors including length of service financial position of the employer, un-employment of the workman after termination of his services etc."

No question arise regarding back wages.

10. **Bright Export Limited Vs. Central Board of Trustees, EPF Organisation (2016 LLR 487)** wherein it is held that-

" When a particular fact is within the special knowledge of the opposite party, the burden to prove the same lies upon the opposite party in terms of section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, even if the same has been pleaded by other party."

11. **Sanjay Kumar S/o Surendra Kumar Sharma Vs. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Ratlam (2010 LLR 1065)** wherein it is held that-

"If the party possesses best evidence and is not produced before the Court, an adverse inference can be drawn under the Evidence Act against such a party."

No appointment letter was given and salary given day to day therefore ratio not applicable to here.

12. **Central Welfare Board and Others Vs. Ms. Anjali Bepari and others (1996 LLR 1089)** wherein it is held that-

"CASUAL EMPLOYEE- Regularisation of Project is being would up in phased manner and services also being phased out-Service of Petitioner cannot be regularised- Direction to continue her in any other temporary scheme issued- Dispensing of service should be done on basis of last come first go."

13. **Samishta Dube Vs. City Board, Etawah & Another (199 LLR 460)** wherein it is held that-

"Section 6 P read with 6(N)- Retrenchment- Last come, first go- Principle applicable even in case of those employed on daily wages- Section 6P does not require any particular period of continuous service."

Ratio not applicable here.

14. **Vilas Agaji Pawar and others Vs. The Union of India Additional Solicitor General and others (W.P. No. 379 of 2024 dated 12-1-2024)**

In the present matter the language of advertisement should be in vernacular as per verdict of Hon'ble Supreme Court and therefore, I have recorded negative finding to issue No.1.

Issue No.2:

18. This employee was working towards bank as unskilled labour he did not prove that he has given continuous service for 240 days and therefore, no question arise of any reinstatement alongwith back wages and therefore, issue no.2 does not survive. In the interest of justice, I am inclined to pass the following order:-

AWARD

1. The reference is answered in the "negative".
2. No order as to costs.
3. Four Copies of this award be sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Pune for publication and necessary action.

Ahmednagar

Dated :25.07.2024

SHARAD G.DESHPANDE, Presiding officer,

नई दिल्ली, 13 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1788.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयर इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-सह-श्रम न्यायालय, मुंबई-I**, के पंचाट (संदर्भ सीजीआईटी संख्या **1/23/2003**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 11012/29/2003-आई.आर.(सीएम-I)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 13th August, 2026

S.O. 1788.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. CGIT.No. 1/23/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Mumbai- 1, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of M/s. **Air India** and their workmen.

[No. L-11012/29/2003- IR (CM-I)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI

PRESENT

(JUSTICE ARVIND KUMAR MISHRA)

PRESIDING OFFICER

Reference No. CGIT-1/23 of 2003

Air India Limited

...Management

Versus

Their Workmen (Pankaj Baghudia & Ors)

...Workmen/Claimants

Appearance:

For the Management

: Mr. L.D'souza and Ms. Deepika Agarwal(Adv.)

For the Workmen

: Mr. Chintan Joshi(General Secretary)

Mumbai dated 10th June 2026.

AWARD

The present industrial dispute was referred by the Central Government vide Order No. L-11012/29/2003-IR(C-1) dated 14.05.2003 under Section 10(1)(d) and 10(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the following issues:

1. *Whether the contract between Air India and its contractors was sham and bogus and a camouflage to deprive the concerned workmen of benefits available to permanent workmen of Air India?*
2. *Whether the concerned workmen should be declared permanent workmen of Air India?*
3. *What wages and consequential benefits are payable to the concerned workmen?*

The dispute originated from Writ Petition No. 2991 of 1999 filed before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court wherein directions were issued to the Central Government to refer the industrial dispute for adjudication. Pursuant thereto, the present reference came to be registered before this Tribunal.

During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties entered appearance and filed their respective pleadings, documents and evidence. Subsequently, the Claimants, represented through Kamgar Utkarsha Sabha and its General Secretary Shri Chintan Joshi, approached the Management for an amicable settlement of the dispute.

A Memorandum of Settlement has thereafter been executed between Air India Limited and the 52 Claimants covered under the present Reference. The Settlement records that the parties, after several rounds of discussions, have

voluntarily resolved all disputes forming the subject matter of the reference. The settlement provides for payment of retrenchment compensation, gratuity and other monetary benefits as detailed in Annexure-A annexed thereto. The names of all 52 claimants and the amounts payable to each of them are specifically incorporated in the settlement.

The Settlement further records that the concerned claimants have accepted the amounts mentioned against their respective names in full and final satisfaction of all claims arising out of the present reference and have agreed not to pursue any further claim of reinstatement, permanency, wages or consequential benefits against Air India Limited. It is also recorded that certain amounts payable to deceased workmen shall be paid to their legal heirs in accordance with law.

The Tribunal has carefully perused the Memorandum of Settlement, the annexures thereto and the signatures of the parties. The settlement appears to be lawful, voluntary and arrived at during conciliation of the pending industrial dispute. There is nothing on record to suggest coercion, fraud, misrepresentation or undue influence.

The law is well settled that a fair and bona fide settlement of an industrial dispute deserves acceptance by the adjudicating authority and should ordinarily be given effect to.

In *Herbertsons Ltd. v. Workmen of Herbertsons Ltd.*, (1977) 2 SCC 687 : 1977 Lab IC 1621, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that a settlement arrived at between management and workmen in the course of collective bargaining should be respected and given due weight unless shown to be unfair, unjust or mala fide.

Similarly, in *National Engineering Industries Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan*, (2000) 1 SCC 371 : 2000-I-LLJ-247 (SC), the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated that settlements entered into by parties under the Industrial Disputes Act constitute an important method of industrial peace and industrial adjudication should ordinarily encourage and uphold such settlements when they are fair and voluntary.

Having examined the terms of settlement and the surrounding circumstances, this Tribunal is satisfied that the settlement is just, fair, reasonable and in the larger interest of industrial harmony. The settlement comprehensively resolves all disputes forming the subject matter of the present reference.

Accordingly, the Reference deserves to be disposed of in terms of the settlement.

AWARD

The Memorandum of Settlement executed between Air India Limited and the 52 Claimants represented through Kamgar Utkarsha Sabha is hereby taken on record and shall form part of this Award.

The Reference No. CGIT-1/23 of 2003 is answered in terms of the said Settlement.

It is declared that the rights and liabilities of the parties shall stand governed by the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum of Settlement and Annexure-A appended thereto.

Air India Limited shall make payment of the amounts specified in Annexure-A to the respective claimants and/or legal heirs, wherever applicable, in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

Upon such compliance, all claims, demands and disputes forming the subject matter of the present reference shall stand finally settled and extinguished.

The Settlement shall be binding upon the parties in accordance with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Accordingly, the present Reference is disposed of and a No Dispute Award is passed in terms of the Settlement.

Let a copy of this Award be sent to the Central Government for publication as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Justice ARVIND KUMAR MISHRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1789.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार लेडी हार्डिंग मेडिकल कॉलेज और श्रीमती एस. के. स्पताल, के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-सह-श्रम न्यायालय नं. II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (आई डी नम्बर 176/2019) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-20013/01/2026 – आईआर (सीएम-1)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 13th August, 2026

S.O. 1789.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (**ID No. 176/2019**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court N0.II, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **Lady Harding Medical College & Smt. S.K. Hospital**, and their workmen,

[No. L-20013/01/2026 – IR (CM-I)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM – LABOUR COURT NO. II, NEW DELHI
ID No. 176/2019**

Sh. Jaswant, S/o Sh. Ram Kumar, R/o House No. T-106, Gali Hanuman Mandir, NabiKarim, Pharganj, New Delhi – 110055....**Applicant/Claimant**

Versus

1. **The Director**, Lady Harding Medical College & Smt. S.K. Hospital, ShaheedBhagat Singh Marg, New Delhi – 110002

...**Respondent/Management No. 1**

2. **The Director**, M/s M.S. Vigilant Security, Placement & Detective Service Pvt. Ltd., P-23, Old Double Story, Lajpat Nagar – IV, New Delhi – 110024. ...

.....**Respondent/Management No. 2**

**Award
21.05.2026**

Item No.- 05

I.D. No. 176/2018

21th May 2026

Present:

None for the parties.

On 11.12.2025, the proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the claimant had sought further time to file an application for impleading the legal heirs in place of the deceased claimant. It was submitted that the widow of the deceased claimant had also unfortunately expired, and that only their children survived.

Record perused. It is noted that on 14.01.2025, the proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the claimant had submitted that the claimant had expired and that an application for impleadment of legal heirs in place of the deceased claimant would be moved.

As a rule, an application for impleadment of legal heirs ought to be filed within 90 days. However, more than one year has elapsed, but no such application has been filed till date. Record further reveals that the cross-examination of the claimant had been deferred on 10.04.2023.

In these circumstances, when no application for impleadment of legal heirs has been filed for a considerable period and no one has appeared on behalf of the claimant to participate in the proceedings, this Tribunal has no other option but to pass a 'No Dispute Award' in the matter. Award is passed accordingly. Let a copy of this Award be sent to the Appropriate Government for publication/notification under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. File be consigned to the Record Room.

Dated 21.05.2026

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1790.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस सी सी एल के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-सह-श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद** के पंचाट (पहचान संख्या **182/2025**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 22013/01/2026-आई.आर. (सी.एम-II)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 13th August, 2026

S.O. 1790.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (**ID. No. 182/2025**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, HYDERABAD** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **SCCL**, and their workmen,

[No. L-22013/01/2026 – IR (CM-II)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No.182/2025

Between:

Shri Syed Javeed,
C/o The Singareni Miners and Engineering Workers Union,
HMS, Qtr.No.D/704, HMS Office, Godavarikhani,
Telangana-505209
7095829508

.....Petitioner

AND

The General Manager,
M/s. Singareni Colliers Company Ltd., (SCCL),
Srirampur Area, Mancheria District,
Telangana-505303.

..... Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: None

For the Respondent: M/s. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. 1/4/2025-B1 dated 24.07.2025 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s. Singareni Colliers Company Ltd., Srirampur Area Miners and Engineering Workers Union (HMS) and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the dismissal of Shri Syed Javeed, E.C.No2921147, ex-badli filler, RK.7 Incline, Srirampur Area, by the management of M/s. Singareni Colliers Company Limited (SCCL), Srirampur Area is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 182/2025 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Petitioner absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to file the claim statement. It appears that the Petitioner does not want to prosecute the case. Therefore, a ‘No Claim Award’ is passed. Transmit.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for the

Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 13 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1791.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दिल्ली इंटरनेशनल एयरपोर्ट लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-सह-श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 129/2024) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-20013/01/2026-आई. आर. (सी एम-1)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 13th August, 2026

S.O. 1791.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (**Ref. No. 129/20204**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court NO. 1, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **Delhi International Airport Ltd.** and their workmen,

[No. L-20013/01/2026 – IR (CM-I)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

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

ID No.129/2024

Sh. Manoj Kumar and 11 others, through Airport Employees Union, BTR Bhawan, 13A, Rouse Avenue, New Delhi.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The CEO, M/s CELEBI Delhi Cargo Terminal Management India Pvt. Ltd., Cargo Terminal, IGI Terminal, New Delhi-110037.
2. The CEO, M/s Delhi International Airport Ltd., Uddan Bhawan IGI Terminal, New Delhi-110037.

...Management

AWARD

Present: None for the Claimant.

Ms. Muskan Kaushik, A/R for the Managements.

1. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-ND-25/I-110/2023-IR dated 06.05.2024 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 services of the workmen Shri Manoj Kumar & 11 others (Details mentioned in Annexure-A) have been terminated w.e.f. 30.06.2020 illegally and/or unjustifiably by the management of M/s BR Power Control & Automation Services contractor of M/s CELEBI Delhi Cargo Terminal Management Pvt. Ltd? If so, then what relief the workmen concerned are entitled and what directions are necessary in this respect?’

Sh. Manoj Kumar and 11 others Vs. The CEO, M/s CELEBI Delhi Cargo Terminal Management India Pvt. Ltd. and another.

2. In the endorsement made in 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 fifteen 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 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. In pursuance to the notices sent, none appeared on behalf of the claimant. No claim statement was filed on behalf of workman despite repeated adjournments. 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: 12.05.2026

AJAY KUMAR JAIN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1792.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और श्री उग्गीना विश्वनाधम के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 13/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/21/2017-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1792.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 13/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Uggina Viswanadham** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29011/21/2017-(IR(M))]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE
IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
 Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 13/2018

Between:

Sri Uggina Viswanadham,
 S/o Mahalakshmi,
 Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),
 Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
 M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
 Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
 Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
 Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
 Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
 Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None
 For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29011/21/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Uggina Viswanadham, S/o Mahalakshmi, Workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is not legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 13/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 17th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
 Petitioner

Witnesses examined for the
 Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1793.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री डुप्पेटी रामू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 21/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/15/2017-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1793.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 21/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Duppeti Ramu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/15/2017-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th day of July, 2026**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 21/2018**

Between:

Sri Duppeti Ramu,
S/o Pydithalli,
Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None
For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/15/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Duppeti Ramu, S/o Pydithalli, Workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is not legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 21/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 17th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1794.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री कानुमारेड्डी अप्पलनायडू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 22/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/14/2017-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1794.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 22/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Kanumareddy Appalanaidu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/14/2017-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 22/2018

Between:

Sri Kanumareddy Appalanaidu,
S/o Appili,
Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None
For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/14/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Kanumareddy, S/o Appaili, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 22/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. None appeared on behalf of the Petitioner. Respondent is present. Notice sent to the Petitioner was returned with the endorsement "Expired." No legal representative has come on record on behalf of the deceased Petitioner despite service of notice. Accordingly, as there is no one to prosecute the case, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 17th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1795.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री एरोथी रामुनायडू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 27/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/09/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1795.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 27/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Erothi Ramunaidu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/09/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 27/2018

Between:

Sri Erothi Ramunaidu,
Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/9/2018-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Erothi Ramunaidu, S/o Sanyasi, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 27/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1796.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री रापथी कनक राव के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 29/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/07/2017-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1796.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 29/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Raparathi Kanaka Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/07/2017-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 29/2018

Between:

Sri Raparathi Kanaka Rao,
S/o Gangayya,
Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None
For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/7/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Raparathi Kanaka Rao, S/o Gangayya, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 29/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for the

Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1797.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री रापर्थी पायदय्या के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 31/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/05/2017-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1797.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 31/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Raparathi Pydayya** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/05/2017-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 31/2018

Between:

Sri Raparathi Pydayya,

S/o Demudu,

Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),

Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/5/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Raparathi Pydayya, S/o Demudu, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 31/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 17th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1798.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री सीतिना देमुडु के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 32/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/04/2017-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1798.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 32/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Seetina Demudu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/04/2017-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 32/2018

Between:

Sri Seetina Demudu, C/o Appili,
Porlupalam (V), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531045.

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/4/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Shri Seetina Demudu, C/o Appili, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 32/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1799.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री सिद्धार्थ, मैसर्स अन्नय बल्क कैरियर्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और विशाखा जिला कॉन्ट्रैक्ट वर्कर्स यूनियन (सीटू) के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 33/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/59/2017-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1799.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 33/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Sri Siddarth, M/s Annaye Bulk Carriers** and **Visakha district Contract Workers Union (CITU)** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-30011/59/2017-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 33/2018

Between:

Sri Siddarth,
M/s Annaye Bulk Carriers,
D. No. 1/85, Parmati Road,
Namkal, Tamilnadu – 637001.

.....Petitioner

AND

The Secretary,
Visakha district Contract Workers Union (CITU),
8-6-8, Yellammathota, Jagadamba Jn.,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) - 530020

..... Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-30011/59/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Annaye Bulk Carriers, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of M/s Annaye Bulk Carriers Contractor of HPCL, Vizag LPG Bottling Plant, Vishakhapatnam in discontinuing the service of Sh. B. Sanyasi Rao working as a driver without paying four months’ salary and full and final settlement is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 33/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 17th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for the

Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1800.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री गोम्पा वेंकटप्पा राव के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेंस नं.- 36/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/10/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1800.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 36/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Gompa Venkataappa Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/10/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 36/2018

Between:

Sri Gompa Venkataappa Rao,
S/o Simhachalam,
Eppilivanipalem (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayat),
Pendurthi (M),
Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/10/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Shri Gompa Venkatappa Rao, S/o Simhachalam, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 36/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1801.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और श्री गोम्पा देमुदु के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 37/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/09/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1801.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 37/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Gompa Demudu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/09/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 37/2018

Between:

Sri Gompa Demudu,
S/o Simhachalam,
Eppilivanipalem (V), Chentagatla (Panchayat),
Pendurthi (M),
Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
 2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022
- Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/9/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Shri Gomp Venkata Rao, S/o Simhachalam, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 37/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1802.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री किल्लानी रामू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 38/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/08/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1802.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 38/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Killani Ramu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/08/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 38/2018

Between:

Sri Killani Ramu,
S/o Venkappa,
Eppilivanipalem (V), Chentagatla (Panchayati),
Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/8/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Killani Ramu, S/o Venkappa, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 38/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 17th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for the

Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1803.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री उग्गीना नागराजू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 39/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/07/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1803.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 39/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Uggina Nagaraju** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/07/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 39/2018

Between:

Sri Uggina Nagaraju,
S/o Thathalu,
Porlupalam (V), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,

Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/7/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Uggina Nagaraju, S/o Thathalu, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 39/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1804.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री एप्पिली थाटा राव के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 40/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/06/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1804.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 40/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Eppili Thata Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/06/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 40/2018

Between:

Sri Eppili Thata Rao,
S/o Sri Sanyasi, Eppilivanipalem (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayati), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/6/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Eppili Thata Rao, S/o Sanyasi, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 40/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1805—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री एप्पिली अप्पलानायडू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 41/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/05/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1805.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 41/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Eppili Appalanaidu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/05/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 41/2018

Between:

Sri Eppili Appalanaidu,
S/o Nookalu, Eppilivanipalem (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayati), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
 2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022
- Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/5/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Eppili Appalanaidu, S/o Nookalu, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 41/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for the

Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1806.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री दसारी डेमुडु के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेंस नं.- 42/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/04/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1806.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 42/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Dasari Demudu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/04/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 42/2018

Between:

Sri Dasari Demudu,
S/o Venkanna, Eppilivanipalem (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayati), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Works, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/4/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Dasari Demudu, S/o Venkinaidu, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the past services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 42/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1807.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री पुलामरासेट्टी चाइना सूरी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 45/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/01/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1807.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Reference No. 45/2018) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Pulamarasetty China Suri** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/01/2018-IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE
IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
 Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of February, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 45/2018

Between:

Sri Pulamarasetty China Suri,
 S/o Late Ramunaidu, Padmnabhanagar,
 R.R.V. Puram, Gopalapatnam,
 Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531029

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
 M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
 Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
 Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
 Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
 Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
 Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent : None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/1/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Pulamarasetty China Suri, S/o Late Ramunaidu, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 45/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

22. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of February, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
 Petitioner
 NIL

Witnesses examined for the
 Respondent
 NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1808.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री डेमूडु के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 66/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/11/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1808.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 66/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Demudu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/11/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 66/2018

Between:

Sri Demudu,

S/o Late Sanyasi,

D. No. 6-81, Padmanaba Nagar (V), R.R.V.

Puram (Post), Chinnagadhilli (M),

Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531029

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,

M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,

Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),

Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,

Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,

Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,

Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/11/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Ch. Demudu, S/o Late Sanyasi, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Demudu or Sri Ch. Demudu, S/o Late Sanyasi by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Ch. Demudu, S/o Late Sanyasi or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Ch. Demudu, S/o Late Sanyasi is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 66/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. None appeared on behalf of the petitioner. Respondent is present. Notice sent to the petitioner was returned with the endorsement "Expired." No legal representative has come on record on behalf of the deceased petitioner despite service of notice. Accordingly, as there is no one to prosecute the case, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1809.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री कोम्मू अप्पा राव के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 67/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/12/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1809.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 67/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Kommu Appa Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/12/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 67/2018

Between:

Sri Kommu Appa Rao,

S/o Simhachalam,

Amara Pinnavanipalem, SC Colony,

Peddagollepalem, Sabbavaram (M),

Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.)

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,

M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,

Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),

Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,

Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,

Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,

Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022

..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/12/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Kommu Appa Rao, S/o Simhachalam, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractors) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Kommu Appa Rao or Sri Kommu Appa Rao, S/o Simhachalam by M/s Aztec Services (contractors) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Kommu Appa Rao, S/o Simhachalam or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Kommu Appa Rao, S/o Simhachalam is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 67/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite service of notice by Registered post, petitioner did not file any claim statement. Sufficient opportunity already granted. Therefore, in the absence of claim statement 'No claim' award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1810.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री गोम्पा बंगारय्या के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 69/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/14/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1810.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 69/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Gompa Bangarayya** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/14/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 69/2018**

Between:

Sri Gompa Bangarayya,

S/o Chinnamudu,

Eppilivanipalem (V), Chentagatla (Panchayat),

Pendurthi (M), Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/14/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Gompa Bangarayya, S/o Chinnamudu, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractors) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Gompa Bangarayya or Sri Gompa Bangarayya, S/o Chinnamudu, by M/s Aztec Services (contractors) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Gompa Bangarayya, S/o Chinnamudu, or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Gompa Bangarayya, S/o Chinnamudu, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 69/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1811.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री चप्पा डेमूडु के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 70/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/15/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1811.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 70/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Chappa Demudu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/15/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 70/2018

Between:

Sri Chappa Demudu,

S/o Erukulu, Eppilivanipalem (V),

Chentagatla (Panchayat),

Pendurthi (M), Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/15/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Chappa Demudu, S/o Erukulu, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractors) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Chappa Demudu, S/o Erukulu, or Sri Chappa Demudu, S/o Erukulu, by M/s Aztec Services (contractors) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Chappa Demudu, S/o Erukulu, or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Chappa Demudu, S/o Erukulu, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 70/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1812.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री कम्परा थाटा राव के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 71/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/16/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1812.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 71/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Kampara Thata Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/16/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 71/2018

Between:

Sri Kampara Thata Rao,

S/o Gangayya,

Padmanadha Nagar (V), Venkatapuram (PO),

Gompalapatnam, Dist.

Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530029

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/16/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Kampara Thata Rao, S/o Gangaya, supplied by M/s Aztec services (contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Kampara Thata Rao or Sri Kampara Thata Rao, S/o Gangaya, by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Works, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Kampara Thata Rao, S/o Gangaya, or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Kampara Thata Rao, S/o Gangaya is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 71/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement, none appeared on behalf of the Petitioner. Notice sent to the petitioner was returned with the endorsement "Expired." No legal representative has come on record on behalf of the deceased petitioner despite service of notice. Accordingly, as there is no one to prosecute the case, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1813.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री बोडी अप्पाला राजू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 73/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/18/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1813.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 73/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Bodi Appala Raju** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/18/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 73/2018

Between:

Sri Bodi Appala Raju,

S/o Potanna,

Eppilivanipalem (V), Chentagatla (Panchayati),

Pendurthi (M), Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,

M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,

Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),

Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,

Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,

Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,

Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/18/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Bodi Appala Raju, S/o Potanna, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Bodi Appala Raju or Sri Bodi Appala Raju, S/o Potanna, by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Bodi Appala Raju, S/o Potanna or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Bodi Appala Raju, S/o Potanna is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 73/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1814.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री चांदका सिम्हाचलम के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 78/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/24/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1814.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 78/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Chandaka Simhachalam** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/24/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 78/2018

Between:

Sri Chandaka Simhachalam,

S/o Durgalu,

Eppilivanipalem (V), Chentagatla (Panchayati),

Pendurthi (M), Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/24/2018-IR(M) dated 16.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Chandaka Simhachalam, S/o Durgalu, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Chandaka Simhachalam or Sri Chandaka Simhachalam, S/o Durgalu by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Chandaka Simhachalam, S/o Durgalu or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Chandaka Simhachalam, S/o Durgalu is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 78/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1815.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री कडुपुतला अप्पा राव के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 79/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/25/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1815.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 79/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Kaduputla Appa Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/25/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD****Present: - Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 79/2018**

Between:

Sri Kaduputla Appa Rao,

S/o Venkunaidu,

Eppilivanipalem (V), Chentagatla (Panchayati),

Pendurthi (M), Dist.

Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/25/2018-IR(M) dated 16.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Kaduputla Appa Rao, S/o Venkunaidu, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Kaduputla Appa Rao or Sri Kaduputla Appa Rao, S/o Venkunaidu by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Kaduputla Appa Rao, S/o Venkunaidu for services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is no paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Kaduputla Appa Rao, S/o Venkunaidu is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 79/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite service of notice by Registered post, Petitioner did not file any claim statement. Sufficient opportunity already granted. Therefore, in the absence of claim statement 'No claim' award is passed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1816.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री दसारी मुसलाय्या के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 81/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/27/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1816.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 81/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Dasari Musalayya** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/27/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 81/2018

Between:

Sri Dasari Musalayya,

S/o Late Venki Naidu,

Eppilivanipalem (V), Chentagatla (Panchayati),

Pendurthi (M), Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/27/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Dasari Musalayya, S/o Late Venki Naidu, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Dasari Musalayya or Sri Dasari Musalayya, S/o Late Venki Naidu by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Dasari Musalayya, S/o Late Venki Naidu or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works Sri Dasari Musalayya, S/o Late Venki Naidu is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 81/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1817.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्रीमती गुरी गंगम्मा के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 96/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/32/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1817.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 96/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Smt. Guri Gangamma** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/32/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 96/2018

Between:

Smt. Guri Gangamma,

W/o Late Guri Demudu,

Mogalipuram (V), Mallunaidupalem (PO),

Sabbavaram (M), Visakhapatnam (A.P.) - 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,

M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,

Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),

Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,

Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,

Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,

Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/32/2018-IR(M) dated 25.10.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Late G. Demudu supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Smt. Guri Gangamma, W/o Late G. Demudu or Late Demudu, ex-workmen, S/o Late Pyditalli supplied by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Smt. Guri Gangamma, W/o Late G. Demudu for services rendered by Late G. Demudu is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief Smt. Guri Gangamma, W/o Late G. Demudu the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Late Demudu, workmen, S/o Late Pyditalli is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 96/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1818.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री पल्ला अप्पा राव के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 97/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/33/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1818.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 97/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Palla Appa Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/33/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 97/2018

Between:

Sri Palla Appa Rao,

S/o Late Simhachalam,

Gullepalli (V), Sabbavaram (M),

Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) - 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/33/2018-IR(M) dated 25.10.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Palla Appa Rao, S/o Late Simhachalam, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Palla Appa Rao or Sri Palla Appa Rao, S/o Late Simhachalam by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as

alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Palla Appa Rao, S/o Late Simhachalam or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is no paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Palla Appa Rao, S/o Late Simhachalam is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 97/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1819.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री नम्मी डेमल्लू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 98/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/34/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1819.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 98/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Nammi Demullu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/34/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 98/2018**

Between:

Sri Nammi Demullu,

S/o Appalaswamy,

Gullepalli (V), Sabbavaram (M),

Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) - 531035 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/34/2018-IR(M) dated 25.10.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Nammi Demullu, S/o Appalaswamy, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractors) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Nammi Demullu or Sri Nammi Demullu, S/o Appalaswamy by M/s Aztec Services (contractors) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Nammi Demullu, S/o Appalaswamy or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Nammi Demullu, S/o Appalaswamy is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 98/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1820.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री पल्ला समुद्रम के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 99/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/35/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1820.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 99/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Palla Samudram** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/35/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 99/2018

Between:

Sri Palla Samudram,

S/o Maridaiah,

Gullepalli (V), Sabbavaram (M),

Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) - 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztec Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/35/2018-IR(M) dated 25.10.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Palla Samudram, S/o Maridaiah, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Palla Samudram or Sri Palla Samudram, S/o Maridaiah by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Palla Samudram, S/o Maridaiah or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is no paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Palla Samudram, S/o Maridaiah is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 99/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement, Petitioner remained absent. Despite service of notice by Registered post, Petitioner did not file any claim statement. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for the

Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1821.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री नकेल्ला रामू के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 100/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/36/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1821.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 100/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Nakella Ramu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/36/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD**Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th day of July, 2026**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 100/2018**

Between:

Sri Nakella Ramu,

S/o Appalaswamy,

Gullepalli (V), Sabbavram (M),

Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/36/2018-IR(M) dated 25.10.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Nakella Ramu, S/o Appalaswamy, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Nakella Ramu or Sri Nakella Ramu, S/o Appalaswamy, by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Nakella Ramu, S/o Appalaswamy, for services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is no paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Nakella Ramu, S/o Appalaswamy, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 100/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 17th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1822.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार हिंदुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री विनोद पराटे के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 38/2013-14) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-30012/12/2013-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1822.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 38/2013-14**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Nagpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited** and **Sri Vinod Parate** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-30012/12/2013- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

Reserved On 11.06.2026

Delivered on 15.07.2026

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NAGPUR

CASE NO. CGIT/NGP/38/2013-14

Vinod Parate– Petitioner

Vs

Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited - Management

Present: Shri. Kavimandal for the Petitioner.

N. W. Almelkar advocate for the Management.

1. In exercise of powers conferred by clause D of sub section 1 and sub section 2-A of section 10 of the industrial disputes act, 1947 (14 of 1947) (the act in short). The central government has referred the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited and their workman Shri. Vinod Parate, HPCL workers organization in adjudication as per letter No. L-30012/12/2013 IR(M) dt. 18.06.2013 with the following schedule: **-Whether the action of the disciplinary authority HPCL, Nagpur in imposing the penalty of dismissal from service on Shri. Vinod Parate, Chief Administrative Clerk vide his order dt. 08.08.2012 is just fair and legal? If not to what relief the applicant entitled to?**

2. On receipt of the reference parties were noticed to file their respective statement of claim and written statement in response to which the workman in short file the statement of claim and the management of HPCL, Party No. 1 in short file their written statement.

3. Workman file a statement of claim through the union by asserting that he was appointed in the HPCL as a clerk on 17.07.1979 at Khapri LPG plant and he was promoted as General Clerk in June 1992 and was posted at LPG department Nagpur, Regional Office, Sadar, Nagpur. He was working their till 1998. In august 1998 he was transferred to Khapri at Nagpur LPG Regional Office as Senior Assistant. He was working their till the period 2003. The plant of the Party No. 1 and the offices at Khapri are in the same premises. He was reassigned to Khapri LPG plant on lateral basis till 2005. In the year 2005 he was again transferred to Nagpur LPG Regional office. In the year 2006 he was promoted as chief administrative assistant. In 2007 he was again transferred at Khapri LPG plant. He further submits that since the date of his initial joining till his suspension dt. 12.02.2008 he was working sincerely and honestly with Party No. 1. From the progress of the Party No. 2, it can be seen that he was performing his duty and

was thus on merits was granted permission. The service record of the Party No. 2 is clean excellent and unblemished. During entire service tenure of the Party No. 2, he was never served with any memo, warning or chargesheet. It is also contended that the Party No. 2 was union member. The officers of the Party No. 1 were not happy with the progress of the Party No. 2 and his union activity. Suddenly on 12.02.2008 Party No. 2 was suspended without his fault. While suspending the Party No. 2 it was alleged that he has committed grievous misconduct for preparing of fake BDS update option. Since his suspension from 12.02.2008 no action was taken against the Party No. 2 till the chargesheet dt. 11.09.2009 was issued to him. a chargesheet was issued against the Party No. 2 after almost 1 year and 3 months which is prohibited under the standing orders applicable to the Party No. 2 establishment. As per the standing order clause 32(4)(A) statement of charges in detail has to be supplied within 7 days of suspension however in the case of Party No. 2 the chargesheet was issued after 15 months of suspension information office. On 11.05.2009 he was suspended and on 12.02.2008 a chargesheet was issued. At the time of suspension, no documents or statements were supplied to the Party No. 2. The chargesheet dt. 11.05.2009 was issued along with annexure I, II, III and IV. The charges level in annexure I article of **charge 1st A** was in respect of preparation of cash receipt and manual fitting the BDS nos. by using the BDS update option intentionally. **Charge B** was in respect of fraudulently preparing cash receipt in the JDE system using Shri.V. G. Paunikers transactions ID in the name of Jeevan Gas agency and Satyashree Gas company with fictitious cheque no. and in order to enable the dealers to unlawfully gain for themselves thereby causing financial loss by making false entries by using BDS update option. Chargesheet was in respect of deliberately misusing ERP excess of Shri. V.G. Paunikar for preparing erroneous BDS nos. by updating BDS update option causing financial loss to the corporation. **Charge D** was in respect of neglecting while preparing in the CR in respect Siva Gas Agency. Charge E was in respect of deliberately concealing all the transaction concerning movable property including loans and advances. The said misconduct as alleged is covered under the clauses 6A, 31(4), 31(5), 31(9), 31(15), 31(20), 31(38) and 31(39) of the standing orders applicable to the non-management employees working in the marketing division of the corporation. It is contended by Party No. 2 that the charges levelled against the Party No. 2 was false concocted and levelled without having any material evidence along with the chargesheet dt. 11.05.2009 no relevant documents were supplied to the Party No. 2 in respect of the charges levelled. The Party No. 2 demanded documents vide letter dt. 18.05.2009 from the Party No. 1. The management Party No. 1 replied by letter dt. 19.05.2009 and supplied certain documents which were not at all according to the demand made by the Party No. 2. However, the Party No. 2 without wasting any further time replied to the chargesheet vide reply dt. 28.05.2009. thereafter the intimation dt. 11.05.2009 was given to the Party No. 2 regarding appointment of enquiry officer.

4. The departmental inquiry was conducted against the Party No.2 which was not according to the principals of natural justice and was continued for a period of more than three months. The Party No. 2 was dismissed from services on basis of the said enquiry by an order dt. 08/08/2012. Party No.1 management examined total 5 witnesses. The main charges levelled against the Party No.2 was for the period of 2005 to 2007. It was alleged in the charges that the Party No. 2 on 8/08/2006 and 16/09/2006 cash receipts were made in favour of Jeevan Gas Agency from Shri. V.G. Paunikar's I.D. by the Party No.2 from his computer, though Shri V.G Paunikar was not posted during the said tenure in Khapri LPG Plant. It was further observed that on 08.08.2006, C.R. was prepared in the name of Jeevan Gas Agency from D.D No.86599, though no such instrument was ever issued by the bank. Similarly, on 16.09.2006 C.R. was prepared in the name of Jeevan Gas Agency from D.D No.87172, though the bank had denied issuance of such D.D in favour of HPCL. Further it was alleged that similar fraudulent entries were made from Shri.V.G Paunikar's I.D. though later was not handling the said activities. The memorandum of charges is described in the chargesheet dt. 11.05.2005. It was also further alleged against the Party No.2 that he had offered Mr. Manoj Junghare, the manager of Jeevan Gas Agency for manipulation of cash receipts and updating the BDS manually so that while generating the BDS the said cash receipts detailed does not appear and the draft also was not deposited. After recording the evidence of management witnesses the complainant also submitted his statement of defence. There after enquiry against the Party No.2 was completed by letter dt. 05.04.2011 the report of the enquiry of dt. 31.03.2011 was sent to the Party No.2. The Party No.2 submitted his reply on 30.04.2011 there by giving explanation regarding his innocence against the alleged proved misconduct. However, the Party No.1 Corporation did not consider his explanation and a dismissal order dt. 08.08.2012 was issued against the Party No.2. That after the said dismissal the Party No.2 filed the reference before the Assistant Labour Commissioner Central, Nagpur for conciliation. The Party No. 1 appeared in the matter and filed his formal reply in the form of denial; nothing was explained by the Party No.1 about the alleged charges of the misappropriation. That the conciliation ended in failure and was sent to Ministry of Labour and Employment Government of India referred the matter to the Hon'ble Tribunal for appropriate decision.

5. The Party No. 2 also contended that the enquiry conducted against the complainant is against the provisions of law and in violations of principles of natural justice. The Enquiry Officer appointed to conduct the enquiry was an officer of the corporation. Therefore, an insider cannot be appointed as an Enquiry Officer under the provisions of law as an Enquiry Officer under the provision of law. As the Enquiry Officer was himself an employee of the corporation holding a high post, therefore, he was not a natural person to conduct the fair enquiry against the Party No. 2. The Enquiry Officer was biased, did not conducted the enquiry proceedings in fair manner. The Enquiry Officer did not explain the gravity of charges levelled against the Party No. 2 and the procedure of the enquiry. The Enquiry Officer did not allow the Party No. 2 to engaged a lawyer so as to defend himself in the enquiry as the charges levelled

against the Party No. 2 was serious and criminal in nature. The charges levelled against the Party No. 2 was for the period 2005-2007. The Party No. 2 has working at Nagpur LPG Regional Office. The Party No. 2 was reassigned by letter dt. 05.06.2007 and he joined on 09.06.2007 at Khapri LPG plant. The Enquiry Officer failed to appreciate that since June 2005 to May 2007 the nature of duties of the Party No. 2 was viz. marketing, sales, stationary distribution cheque preparation and distribution, drafting of Hindi correspondence. The Enquiry Officer totally neglected the fact that it was not the duty and work of the Party No. 2 to prepare invoices and other BDS invoices, preparation of receipt, cash receipt preparation, BDS preparation, SV.TV. punching. The Party No. 2 demanded number of documents by letter dt. 17.06.2010. however, it was not supplied to the Party No. 2 as those documents were supporting the defence and was very much relevant for fair trial of the enquiry. That non supply of relevant documents to the Party No. 2 though demanded several times amounts to denial of opportunity to defend himself in the enquiry. The Party No. 2 was charge-sheeted for the work for which he was not responsible. The charges regarding preparation of cash receipts entry is that the dealers sent the cheque or demand drafts to the office. The person responsible for doing the said work prepares the cash receipt and it is kept outside and after the entry the stock is release to dealer. The dealer's man then takes away the receipt. However, by dealing with the said charges the Enquiry Officer was totally neglected though it was pointed out by the Party No. 2 that it was not his duty. The manager of Jeevan Gas Agency who had complained against the Party No. 2 for 50-50% sharing basis for preparing false generation of BDS in respect of cash receipt No. 7005044 dt. 25.06.2007 for Rs. 86,000/- and other allied charges, was not at all called in the enquiry by the management and the Enquiry Officer to verify the truthness of his complaint. However, the proprietor of the Jeevan Gas Agency was examined in the enquiry by the management as its witness and as per his deposition he was and hearsay witness and such a witness is absolutely is not permissible when there are serious allegations of criminal misappropriation of funds. That non examination of the complaint i.e. the manager of the Jeevan Gas Agency by the management and the Enquiry Officer amounts to denial of opportunity to the Party No. 2 to defend himself in the enquiry as only on the basis of his statement dt. 23.01.2008 (Exh. M-3), the said charge was proved against the Party No. 2.

6. The manager of the Jeevan Gas Agency was a material witness and non-production of material witness in a trial where criminal charges are levelled against the delinquent employee renders the enquiry illegal and amounts to denial of opportunity to the Party No. 2. Even his statement Exh. C-2 was not properly considered by the enquiry officer. The Enquiry Officer failed to appreciate the fact that the statement and complaint given by the manager of the Jeevan Gas Agency against the Party No. 2 was written on the letter head of Jeevan Gas Agency. This clearly goes to show that entire affair was managed to falsely implicated the Party No.2. Further the Enquiry Officer conducted the enquiry and the evidence procedure in a very illegal manner. That the recording of evidence of the management witnesses was recorded only in question-and-answer form. Because of such recording of evidence all the relevant facts, questions were put by the management representative in the mouth of the management witnesses. This has also prejudiced the right of the delinquent employee as the witnesses were prompted and tutored and direct suggestions were given to them which is not permissible under the law.

7. All the documents supplied were in incomplete form and therefore, the Party No. 2 could not defend himself in the enquiry. Further, in respect of allegation regarding undue credit given to the SIBA Gas Agency alleging that the Party No. 2 had prepared cash receipt No. 4014214 dt. 15.02.2005 which was made on 30.12.2004 against the cheque of Rs. 20,869/- from the said gas agency and further CR was not reflected in the BDS print out and latter on cheque was debited in HPCL account on 25.02.2005. It is submitted that the Enquiry Officer totally neglected the said fact that the said agency is located at Amravati District and it was an out-station instrument and a post-dated cheque. The Party No. 2 was not at all responsible for a clearing process for the outstation cheques. Further in case the credit given to said gas agency or any other agency it is the practice of the corporation to issue credit letter to the concerned dealer upon the instruction of SRM of HPCL. However, all these documents were not at all brought on record by the management and even not supplied to the Party No. 2 though demanded. The Party No. 2 has filed number of documents under C-3 clearly demonstrating his bank entries and accounts, loan and advances taken by him from various institutions including new Nagpur Urban Credit Co-operative Society Ltd, Nagpur. Further the Party No. 2 also submitted the certificates of the architect regarding estimated cost of the construction which he was undertaking further the Party No. 2 also filed valuers certificate on records. The Party No. 2 had also filed documents relating to sanctioned on loan from Government employees provident fund scheme. All relevant documents regarding the said loan were also filed on record. The Party No. 2 had elaborately described and clarified the financial transition vide Exh. C-3 in the enquiry. Therefore, he cannot be held responsible for clause-6(A) of the standing orders. However, the Enquiry Officer totally turned a blind eye in respect of the said submission and documents produced on record. This clearly goes to show that the Enquiry officer was biased and was only acting on the instructions of the management. The findings recorded in the enquiry report therefore, are perverse and therefore, liable to be quashed and set aside. The enquiry conducted against the Party No. 2 is therefore, illegal and against the principles of natural justice and is therefore liable to be quashed and set aside. Looking to the charges levelled against the Party No. 2 and the material placed on record, the punishment awarded to the Party No. 2 is shockingly disproportionate.

8. The Party No. 2 further submits that since many years the Party No.2 was sincerely and honestly working with Party No.1 management. The Party No.2 was made a scapegoat in the present matter only to save the skin of higher officials of the management who were having cordial relations with some dealers. That the Enquiry Officer

being an insider was a puppet in the hands of management of the Party No.1. Therefore, it was but natural that he gave a report where in charges were proved against the Party No.2. The enquiry report is seems as written by the management and signed by the enquiry officer. The entire enquiry report is based on surmises and conjuncture. The enquiry report submitted by the Enquiry Officer suffers from non-application of mind to the facts of this case charges levelled and evidence and documents based on record the entire enquiry was conducted one sided as none of the pleadings submissions documents and evidence of the complainant was considered by the enquiry officer. Therefore, it can be said that the said enquiry proceedings were conducted ex- party though the Party No. 2 was present in the enquiry. The entire enquiry proceedings was a smoke screen and was a farce only to eliminate the Party No. 2. The Party No. 2 is having good service record and was not even issued with a warning for memo during his entire service period. That the Party No.2 has a family to maintain and the elder son of the Party No. 2 is seeking education in engineering college and the daughter of the Party No. 2 is also seeking higher education in college. Due to such charges levelled against the Party No. 2, the Party No.2 has suffered mental and physical harassment and trauma of the society since the date of his suspension as serious charges of criminal nature were levelled against the Party No.2. That even Party No.2 has been isolated by the society and the people around him are even avoiding the Party No.2 due to the said allegation. The entire family of the Party No.2 has been demonstrated by the said charges. That even the wife and the children of the Party No.2 had to face humiliation in the society whenever they go out. That since the date of his dismissal the Party No.2 is out of service and is unable to carry forward education of children in these hard days life and is unable to maintain his family. The Party No.2 has no other source of income to maintain himself and his family. He is therefore entitle to be reinstated in services with continuity and full back wages along with consequential benefits.

9. It is therefore most respectfully prayed that this honourable authority may kindly be pleased to declare that the enquiry conducted against the Party No.2 on the basis of chargesheet dt 11.05.2009 and further to pass and award in affirmative as per the schedule given above in the interest of justice. Direct the Party No.1 to reinstate the Party No.2 on his former post with continuity of service, full back wages and along with all other consequential benefits.

10. Per Contra, management filed a written statement asserting that factual position regarding workman his qualification and transfer are all a matter of record but it is denied that he was suspended without his fault and all of a sudden. According to him he had conducted serious misconduct for preparing fake BDS update option. Even otherwise, the Order of suspension dt. 12.02.2008 is a matter of record. It is true that the Party No. 2 came to be charge-sheeted on 11.05.2009. it is submitted that after the party no. 2 came to be suspended in February 2008, the management of HPCL was required to carefully go through various office transaction to which the workman, Shri. Parate was a party. Hence it requires thorough preliminary investigation. Hence, it requires some time for the management to issue the charge-sheet. However, it is absolutely false and hence denied that there was any bar or prohibition under the standing orders, applicable to the Party No. 2, to issue the charge sheet after one year and three months. It is also false and hence denied that the standing orders, and Clause 32-4(a) in particular required that Statement of Charges in detail must be supplied to the delinquent workman within seven days of his suspension. It is not correct for the party no. 2 to allege that he was suspended on 11.05.2009 and that charge sheet was issued on 12.02.2008. In fact, the factual position is just opposite. He was suspended on 12.02.2008 and charge-sheet came to be issued on 11.05.2009. It is true that at the time when order of suspension pending enquiry was issued to him, no documents were supplied to him. The charge sheet issued to the party no. 2 along with its annexures etc. are, however, a matter of record. It is true that he was called upon to submit his written reply/ explanation to the charge-sheet within a period of three days. It is also true that several documents were supplied to the party no. 2 along with the charge sheet.

11. The HPCL Management would like to submit with emphasis that the said charge-sheet along with all its Annexures and documents etc. are matter of record. The said charge-sheet, its Annexures and the relevant documents were supplied to him when his explanation was called in the matter. The first charge levelled against the Delinquent workman was that while working as Chief Administrative Assistant at Khapri LPG Plant, he had acquiesced and connived in committing fraud, dishonesty, wilful falsification, breach of rules/ violation of procedure and that he prepared cash receipts, manually feeding the BDS numbers by using the "BDS update option" intentionally. All the particulars of this particular charge were incorporated in the charge-sheet. The next charge or **charge B** against the workman was in respect of fraudulently preparing cash receipts in the "JDE system" using one Shri. V. G. Paonikar's Transaction ID in the name of "Jeevan Gas Agency" and "Satyashree Gas Company" with fictitious cheque numbers, though the dealers confirmed that no such cheques were ever issued by them in favour of HPCL, in order to enable the dealers to unlawfully gain for themselves thereby causing financial loss to HPCL. Particulars of this charge were also furnished to him through the charge-sheet. The next charge or '**Charge C**' was in respect of deliberately misusing the ERT access of Shri V. G. Paunikar for preparing erroneous BDS numbers by updating "BDFS update operation" in order to facilitate the Dealer to cause wrongful gain to themselves and for causing financial loss to the Corporation. All the details of this particular charge were also furnished through the said charge-sheet. The next charge or charge D was in respect of negligence while preparing CR in respect of "SIBA Gas Agency" which resulted in delayed credit of the instrument against which the BDS was prepared. The next and the last charge or charge E was in respect of deliberately concealing all the transactions concerning movable property (including loans, advances taken by him, whether secured or not) owned or held by him in his own name or in the name of his family members,

though the value of such property exceeded Rs. 20,000/-. Particulars of this charge were also furnished to him through the charge-sheet dt. 11.05.2009. It is true that these charges were levelled against the Party No. 2 workman under clauses 6(a), 31(4), 31(5), 31(9), 31(15), 31(20) and 31(38) of the certified standing orders applicable to the workman.

12. It is incorrect for the Party No. 2 to allege that along with the charge-sheet dt. 11.05.2009, relevant documents were not supplied to him. It is true that the Party No. 2 had demanded certain documents vide his letter dt. 18.05.2009 and that the Management had supplied certain documents along with the covering letter dt. 19.05.2009. It is, however false and hence denied that these documents supplied to him were not as per the demand made by the Party No. 2. The Management would like to submit that the documents which were relevant and which pertained to the charges of misconduct levelled against the workman were supplied to him. It is true that the workman had submitted his written explanation dt. 28.05.2009 in response to the charge-sheet dt. 11.05.2009.

13. It is true that the Departmental Enquiry continued for a period of more than three years. It is also true that after conducting the Enquiry, since the charges of misconduct levelled against the Party No. 2 were duly proved, he was dismissed from service vide order dt. 08.08.2012. The management would like to reply upon the enquiry record, the proceedings of the Enquiry, oral and documentary evidence, led before the Enquiry Officer and the findings of the Enquiry Officer, in order to avoid unnecessary elaboration and to avoid confusion. It is, however, absolutely false and hence denied that HPCL did not consider his explanation and a dismissal order dt. 08.08.2012 came to be passed overlooking his defence. It is true that after he came to be dismissed from service, the Party No. 2 workman raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Central, Nagpur. The matter was admitted for conciliation by the said Authority. Conciliation Proceedings were initiated. It is true that HPCL appeared before the said Authority in Conciliation Proceedings, filed its reply etc. However, there was no possibility of amicable settlement of the dispute during the Conciliation Proceedings. Hence, Conciliation Proceedings ended in failure. Failure Report was sent by the said Authority to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi. The said Ministry then referred the matter to this Hon'ble Tribunal for adjudication.

14. It is absolutely false and hence specifically denied that the Departmental Enquiry conducted against the Party No. 2 was against the principles of natural justice, it was conducted illegally and without following proper procedure. It is equally false and hence denied that the Enquiry Report submitted by the Enquiry Officer is false. In fact, from the pleadings of the workman in the foregoing paragraphs of the Statement of Claim itself. It could be seen that even the workman has not disputed the fact that all fair and reasonable opportunity was extended to him by the Enquiry Officer to participate in the Enquiry and meet the charges of misconduct levelled against him. Further, he himself has admitted that he has participated in the Enquiry and meet the charges of misconduct levelled against him. Further, he himself has admitted that he has participated in the Enquiry fully, that all the Management witnesses were examined in his presence, that he had cross-examined the Management witnesses, that he had submitted his written defence statement before the Enquiry Officer, that a copy of the findings of the Enquiry Officer was supplied to him, that he had submitted his reply/comments on the findings of the Enquiry Officer and that only thereafter he came to be dismissed from service by the Disciplinary Authority, only when it was found that the charges of misconduct levelled against him were duly proved in the Enquiry. It is submitted that those proven charges constituted a serious misconduct under the Certified Standing Orders applicable to the Party No. 2 workman. Therefore, the claim of the Party No. 2 that he was denied the opportunity to defend himself in the Enquiry etc. has no legs to stand and as such, the present Reference deserves to be answered in negative, against the Party No. 2 workman and in favour of the Party No. 1 Management.

15. It is also false and denied that the Enquiry conducted against the Party No. 2 workman was against the provisions of law and in violation of the principles of natural justice. It is equally false and hence denied that HPCL Management had no authority under the Certified Standing Orders to appoint one of its officers as the Enquiry Officer. In fact, there is absolutely no bar under those Standing orders to appoint an officer within the Organization to conduct a Departmental Enquiry against the charge-sheeted employee. Therefore, the Party No. 1 acted well within its rights to appoint one of its officers as the Enquiry Officer. It is also false and hence denied that the Enquiry Officer was biased against the Party No. 2 workman and that he did not conduct the Enquiry in a fair manner. It is also false that the gravity of charges of misconduct levelled against the workman were not explained to him by the Enquiry Officer. Furthermore, the Delinquent workman had fully understood the charges even before the Party No. 1 Management set up the Departmental Enquiry in as much as, he had already submitted his detailed written explanation to the charge-sheet. Therefore, at this stage, such an allegation is being levelled by the workman only by way of an afterthought. Even in the matter of engaging a Lawyer as his Defence Representative, a grievance has been raised for the first time here. He did not raise this point earlier. Even otherwise, under the Certified Standing Orders applicable to the workman, he could engage only a co-employee from within the Organization and thus, there was a specific bar for him to engage an outsider to defend himself, even if his representative was a lawyer by profession. It is false and hence denied that the charges of misconduct against the workman were such that they warranted the workman to engage a lawyer as his Representative.

16. The Party No. 2 workman has touched upon the documentary evidence that was placed by HPCL before the Enquiry Officer, in certain grounds raised by him. It is, therefore, submitted that the oral and documentary evidence forms a part and parcel of the Enquiry Proceedings and as such, the Party No. 1 would like to rely upon the same in

support of its contention that the charges of misconduct were satisfactorily proved against the workman. It is, however, false and hence denied that the Enquiry Officer neglected the facts and documents on record. As regards supply of documents, it is submitted that all those documents which were relevant and which were directly connected with the charges of misconduct levelled against the workman were supplied to him. the documents which were irrelevant and had no nexus with the charges of misconduct were not required to be produced and were not supplied to him. it is, therefore, not correct for the workman to allege that material documents were not supplied to him. it is false and hence denied that the Party No. 2 was charge-sheeted for the work for which he was not responsible. It is equally false and hence denied that charges regarding preparation of cash receipts were false and fabricated. In fact, these charges have been duly proved in the Enquiry with the help of large number of documents and the Enquiry Officer has held, in no uncertain terms, that the charges were very much proved against the workman.

17. It is submitted that examination of witnesses and leading appropriate oral and documentary evidence before the Enquiry Officer in support of the charges of misconduct was the prerogative of the Management. It is, therefore, not open for the Party No. 2 to allege that material witnesses were not examined in the Enquiry. If at all the workman felt that any particular person was a key or material witness, nothing prevented him from examining the said person as a defence witness. The burden to prove charges lay on the shoulders of the Management and that burden has been duly discharged by the Management, that enquiry has been conducted in an illegal manner. It is also false and hence denied that by recording evidence of the witnesses in question-and-answer form, any prejudice was caused to the workman. Most importantly, the workman has not raised any grievance in the matter during the course of Enquiry. These allegations are being levelled for the first time by way of an afterthought. As such, they could not be sustained at all. It is also false and hence denied that the documents which were supplied to the workman on demand were in incomplete form and therefore, the Party NO. 2 could not defend himself in the Enquiry as alleged. Even these allegations are being levelled for the first time and it clearly shows that this is nothing but an attempt on part of the workman to find fault with the Management at every level, realising duly well that his dismissal from service was quite evidence after the charges of misconduct were proved against him. It is true that a large number of documents were placed on record by the Party No. 2 workman in defence. It is, however, absolutely false for him to allege that his documents were not properly appreciated or taken into account by the Enquiry Officer while appreciating the evidence on record. It is equally false and hence denied that the Enquiry Officer was biased against the workman and that he was acting only under the instructions of the Management. It is also false and hence denied that the findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse and that they are liable to be quashed and set aside. It is equally false and hence denied that the punishment awarded to the Party No. 2 is shockingly disproportionate. It is submitted that the charges of misconduct which were proved against the workman in the Enquiry were extremely serious as they included the charges of dishonesty, misappropriation etc. Therefore, it was just not possible for the Disciplinary Authority to take any lenient view in the matter. In fact, while ordering his dismissal from service, all the aggravating and extenuating circumstances of the case were taken into consideration including past service record of the workman. And on the basis of overall analysis of all those facts, it was thought fit and proper by the Management to dismiss him from service. It is false and hence denied that the Party No. 2 workman was performing his duties sincerely and honestly as alleged. It is also denied that the Enquiry Officer was a puppet in the hands of the Management and hence he submitted the Enquiry Report holding the workman guilty of the charges of misconduct as alleged by him. it is denied that the Enquiry Report suffers from non-application of mind to the facts of the case and evidence on record. It is equally false and hence denied that the entire Enquiry was conducted one sided and that the pleadings of the workman in defence and the documents placed on record by him were not considered by the Enquiry Officer. It is absolutely false and hence denied that the Enquiry proceedings were conducted ex-parte. In fact, the Party No. 1 Management is at a loss to understand as to how the workman can describe the Enquiry as ex-parte when he has taken part in the Enquiry throughout. All these allegations appear to have been levelled by the workman by way of an afterthought and out of frustration.

18. It is false and hence denied that the past service record of the workman is neat and clean. He has tried to explain his family background, that his children are undergoing education etc. However, the workman has no right to gain any sympathy out of this in as much as the disciplinary action has been taken against him after conducting full-fledged Departmental Enquiry and after the charges of misconduct were proved against him. the allegations of physical and mental harassment isolation in the society, etc. are false, most irrelevant and unsustainable. If at all he and his family have to suffer, as contended by him, the Party NO. 2 has to blame himself for the same. Had he discharged his duties sincerely and honestly, there would have been no question of any disciplinary action against him. It is, therefore, false and hence denied that he is entitled to be reinstated in service with continuity and full back wages along with consequential benefits. In fact, the statement of claim as filed is false, frivolous and misconceived. It is devoid of substance. It deserves to be answered in negative. The workman is not entitled to any relief whatsoever prayed for by him in the prayer clause of his statement of claim.

19. From perusal of record, it is apparent that on the point of validity of departmental enquiry my predecessor has observed on 08.01.2019 that the departmental enquiry held against the workman is legal proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice and after that this case was listed for hearing on the question of perversity of findings and quantum of punishment. In view of this my learned predecessor has passed an order on 05.03.2020 on

this point and found that the finding of Enquiry Officer not based on proper appreciation of evidence on record and did not consider the defence taken by the workman and did not give cogent reason before giving any observation regarding finding. Therefore, it is hold that finding is perverse and required to be proved before this tribunal. So, in the light of the above observation an opportunity to the management has been given to prove the misconduct of the workman before this tribunal. In the compliance of this order, management has adduced his evidences which is Sr. No.1 to 40 as per list dt. 09.04.2014. The management has adduced two additional documents as per list dt. 08.04.2025. It is also noteworthy that management has examined Shri Jeevan Singh as MW-1 and Shri Rakesh Kumar Vaimanya MW-2 and Shri Madhukar MW-3 and Shri Kamlesh Seth MW-4 in support of his contention. No other oral witness has been examined on behalf of the management.

20. Per contra, applicant/ petitioner has filed documentary evidence as per list dt. 02.09.2013 to 1 to 8 documents. All these documents are related with this enquiry and two other additional documents has also been produced by the applicant/ petitioner which are Exhibit No. W-I and W-II and Shri Vinod Anandrao Parate has been examined as PW-1 in support of the contentions of the petitioner/applicant. No other witnesses have been examined on behalf of the petitioner/applicant.

21. Heard learned counsel for both the parties at length and perused the materials available on record. It is contended by the applicant/petitioner that he came to be appointed with Party No. 1 on 17.07.1989 as a clerk at Khapri Plant. The duty of Party No. 2 was as per the shift. Party No. 2 on the basis of good performance was promoted as general clerk in June 1992 and was posted at LPG Department, Nagpur Regional Office, Sadar Nagpur. He was working on the said post till 1998. Thereafter, he was transferred to Khapri at Nagpur LPG Regional Office as Senior Assistant. He was working their till the period 2003. In the year 2005 he was again transferred to Nagpur LPG Regional office. In the year 2006 he was promoted as chief administrative assistant and in June 2007 he was again transferred to Khapri LPG Plant. It is also alleged that he was a union member of the employees of Party No. 1 and Party No. 1 was not happy with the union activities of Party No. 2. Suddenly on 12.02.2008 the Party No. 2 was suspended without any fault on the part of Party No. 2 by alleging that he has committed a grievous misconduct for preparing of fake BDS option. Party No. 2 was suspended on 12.02.2008 but no chargesheet was served on the Party No. 2 for more than a year and on 11.05.2009 chargesheet was issued by Party No. 1 which is prohibited under the standing orders applicable to the Party No. 1 and 2 as per standing orders clause 32-4(a) statement of charges has to be supplied within 7 days of suspension order but in the present case charge sheet was issued to the Party No. 2 by the Party No. 1 after 15 months of suspension order.

22. It is also contended that chargesheet dt. 11.05.2009 was issued to the Party No. 2 along with annexure I-IV. The charges level in annexure I **charge Ist A** was in respect of preparation of cash receipt and manually feeding the BDS nos. by using the BDS update option intentionally. **Charge B** was in respect of fraudulently preparing cash receipts in the JDE system using transactions ID Shri.V. G. Paunikers in the name of Jeevan Gas agency and Satyashree Gas company with fictitious cheque nos. in order to enable the dealers to unlawfully gain for themselves delivery of LPG cylinders without paying money to Party No. 1 thereby causing financial loss to the corporation by making false entries by using BDS update option. **Charge C** was in respect of deliberately using ERP excess of Shri. V.G. Paunikar for preparing erroneous BDS nos. causing financial loss to the corporation. **Charge D** was in respect of neglecting while preparing in the CR in respect Siva Gas Agency. **Charge E** was in respect of deliberately concealing all the transaction concerning movable property including loans and advances. It has been argued on behalf of the respondent that the aforesaid act on the part of the workman constituted misconduct under clauses 6A, 31(4), 31(5), 31(9), 31(15), 31(20), 31(38) and 31(39) of the certified standing orders applicable to the workman.

23. Learned counsel for the respondent has argued that it is well settled position of law that when the disciplinary enquiry is proved to be conducted following the principles of natural justice and penalty imposed is found to be commensurate to the charges levelled and duly proved the industrial tribunal should not interfere with the disciplinary authority's order. In support of charge-sheet dt. 11.05.2009 management has laid his evidence the first witness examined by HPCL Shri. Jeevan Singh Son of Nwalsingh wayam as MW-1 who confirm that as per the procedure laid down by HPCL for every Gas Agency his agency was also required to first deposit the amount/money in the office of HPCL against the LPG Cylinders which were collected by the said gas agency from the LPG Bottling Plant of HPCL situated at Khapri Wardha Road Nagpur and after deposit of such amount his agency was allowed to lift/ collect LPG Cylinders from its Khapri LPG plant. MW-1 deposed that he had engaged one Shri. Manoj Jhunghare as the manager in his Gas Agency. Shri Junghare used to visit bank and he used to purchase demand draft in the name of HPCL after depositing the same in the office of HPCL he used to collect loads of filed gas cylinders from Khapri LPG Plant. The MW-1 pointed out that he was not highly educated and had studied up to 12th standard

and hence he had engaged the service of Shri. Junghare as a manager of the agency to handle and operate the office computers maintain accounts including cash collection, purchase of demand draft from the bank etc. The MW-1 also pointed out that he posed confidence in his manager Shri Junghare and as such Shri Jeevan Singh used to visit the gas agency on 2-3 occasions in a week. The incident occurred in the year 2007, Shri Manoj Junghare the manager had played a fraud and cheated HPCL by not depositing the demand drafts before lifting the load from LPG Bottling Plant HPCL at Khapri when the mis-chief came to the notice of the witness. Shri Jhunghare stopped reporting for duties in the agency and also fail to submit details of account cash transactions. MW-1 has written a letter dt. 20.03.2008 which is most relevant in this case. The letter dt. 20.03.2008 written by Jeevan Singh is reproduced here as under which is in Hindi.

प्रति

सेवा में,

प्रबंधक साहेब,

हिन्दुस्तान पेटोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड,

खापरी क्षेत्रिय कार्यालय, एल. पी. जी. प्लांट,

खापरी नागपुर(म. रा.)

fo"K; % nu ckdH Hkxrku lc/k eA

महाशय,

मैं जीवनसिंग नवलसिंग वायम जीवन गैस एजेंसी खापा का प्रोप्रायटर हूँ। मैं जीवन गैस एजेंसी खापा एजेंसी 2004 में एस. टी. कंटेंगरी में स्थापित हुई थी। मुझे बैंकिंग का काम पूरा नहीं आता था। मेरे एजेंसी का काम मैनेजर मनोज जुनघरे रा. कळमेश्वर करता था। इनके जरिए से मैं कंपनी के डी. डी. जमा करना, लोड उठाना, माल बेचना कंप्यूटर का काम, ऑफिस काम और पैसे की लेन देन करता था। मैं एजेंसी में सप्ताह में 2-3 बार जाता था।

कंपनी कि तरफ से मुझे पता चला हमारे मैनेजर ने बैंकसे डी. डी. न लेते हुए पैसे की कंपनी के साथ धोखाधड़ी की।

पिछले एक महिने से एजेंसी में आना बंद कर दिया और पैसे की लेन देन बता नहीं पा रहा। उन्हें पैसे कि धोखाधड़ी करने से मैं खुद ऑफिस में पैसे का व्यवहार देख रहा हूँ। मैं मनोज जुनघरे द्वारा की गई सभी गलतियों का प्रो. होने के नाते जिम्मेदारी लेता हूँ।

कंपनी की तरफ से जो भी पैसे निकलते हैं। सभी पैसे का भुगतान एक माह में एक लोड के पैसे जमा करता जाऊँगा। दि. 30.09.2008 तक पूरे पैसे भुगतान करूँगा।

अब मैं खुद एजेंसी का काम देखता हूँ और प्रतिदिन एजेंसी में जाता हूँ। भविष्य में ऐसी दुबारा गलती नहीं होगी। कृपया मुझे गलती सुधारने का सिर्फ एक बार मौका दीजिए।

प्रोप्रायटर

जीवनसिंग नवलसिंग वायम

24. In this letter the proprietor gave an undertaking to HPCL that he would deposit the entire amount against the already lifted load of gas cylinders from the said LPG Plant on or before 30.09.2008. The MW-1 also tendered an apology to the management through the said letter and assured it that he would herein after personally look after the affairs of his gas agency. MW-1 has stated further in his evidence that on 23.01.2008 his manager shri Manoj Junghare had submitted a letter to HPCL when he was questioned by the management of HPCL about the fraud and misappropriation committed by him. said letter is at exhibit M-24 which is reproduced for ready reference here as under. This letter is also in Hindi.

प्रति,
वरिष्ठ क्षेत्रीय प्रबंधक,
नगपुर एल. पी. जी. क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय,
खापरी नागपुर

fo"K; %& Mh- Mh- 93411 fnukd 25-06-2007 : 86000@& d l nHk eA

महोदय,

मैं मनोज धनराजजी जुनघरे मैं जीवन गैस एजेंसी खापा में मैनेजर पद पर कार्यरत हूँ। मैं एजेंसी में बैंक का पूरा काम, कंपनी में डी. डी. भेजना, कंपनी से लोड मंगवाना, लोड प्राप्त करना तथा सिलेंडर वितरण करना यह सारे काम को मैं खुद देखता हूँ।

मुझे जून 2007 माह के तीसरे सप्ताह में कंपनी खापरी एल. पी. जी. सयंत में कार्यरत श्री विनोद पराते से ऑफर नीचे लिखे अनुसार आया था।

मैं कंपनी में लोड मंगवाने के लिए डी. डी. जमा करने के बाद उसकी नगद रसीद बनाने तथा उस डी. डी. के बदले लोड मिल जाने के बाद यह डी. डी. वो खुद मुझे वो डी. डी. कंपनी से वापस करेंगे। उसके बाद मुझे वो डी. डी. कैंसिल करके डी. डी. राशी के आधे पैसे उन्हें देने होंगे और आधे पैसे मुझे इस काम के मिलेंगे।

उनका यह ऑफर स्वीकार करने का कारण यह है कि मेरी मनोज ध. जुनघरे कि व्यक्तिगत आर्थिक परिस्थिती ठीक न होने के कारण लालच में आकर मैंने स्वीकार कर लिया।

मेरी एजेंसी से 25.06.2007 को लोड के लिए स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, सावनेर 'गाखा से डी. डी. निकाला गया। डी. डी. नंबर 93411 रु 86000/- दिनांक 25.06.2007 को कंपनी में भेजा गया जिसके बदले कंपनी से 25.06.2007 को लोड प्राप्त हुआ।

दिनांक 27.06.2007 को विनोद पराते ने डी. डी. नंबर 93411 वापस भेज दिया। वो डी. डी. मैंने दिनांक 28.06.2007 को डी. डी. खराब हो जाने का कारण दिखाकर कैंसिल किया और उसके बदले में मैंने खुद के नाम पर बैंकर चेक बनवाया, उसके चार दिन बाद मैंने वह बैंकर चेक नगद करा लिया। उसके दो दिन बाद मुझे विनोद पराते का फोन आया। उन्होंने मुझे पैसे लेकर नागपुर बुलाया। नागपुर को शाम को 7 से 8 बजे के बीच उन्हें बिग बाजार के पार्किंग में मिला। वहाँ उन्हें मैंने 43000/- रु बात के अनुसार दे दिए।

मेरी आपसे विनती है कि लालच में आकर मैंने खुद ये काम किया है। इस प्रकरण में मैं जीवन गैस एजेंसी का दोषी न ठहराया जाऊँ और आपके कंपनी के श्री विनोद पराते के विरुद्ध कार्यवाही करें।

आपका

मनोज जुनघरे

25. Through this letter, Shri Junghare had admitted that he fell into a trap when the Workman Shri Vinod Parate, the then Employee of HPCL, had lured him to commit a fraud and grab money by cheating HPCL. On that occasion, the Workman had asked Shri Junghare to deposit the Bank Demand Draft of Rs. 86,000/- in HPCL to lift the load of gas cylinders. A Cash Receipt Number 7005044 dt. 25.06.2007 was prepared and issued by workman Shri Parate in the said transaction in favour of the Dealer (Mr. Jeevan Gas Agency) for SBI Demand Draft Number 93411 dt. 25.06.2007. Shri Junghare was then supposed to lift the load of gas cylinders. However, the Workman Shri Parate had promised Shri. Junghare to return the Bank Demand Draft to him with an understanding that Shri Junghare cancel the Demand Draft and collect the amount against it and then said amount would be shared equally by both of them, i.e., Shri Junghare and Workman Shri Parate. Shri Junghare also admitted that he had accepted the aforesaid offer given to him by workman Shri Parate as he (Shri Junghare) was facing financial problems. Out of greed, to grab money, he had fallen into the aforesaid trap of workman Shri. Parate.

26. MW-1 has categorically deposed that accordingly, Shri Junghare had purchased the Demand Draft of Rs. 86,000/- from State Bank of India, Saoner Branch. It was deposited by him in HPCL. Load of gas cylinders was lifted against the said Demand Draft. Thereafter, the workman returned the Demand Draft to Shri Junghare, who in turn, deposited the said Demand Draft in the Bank, got it cancelled and against the cancellation of the Demand Draft, he got issued a Cheque from the Bank in his personal/ own Name. The MW-1 further confirmed in his examination that

the cheque was deposited and encashed by Shri Junghare at a later stage and the amount of Rs. 86,000/- was equally shared (Rs. 43,000/- each) by Shri Junghare and workman Shri Parate subsequently. The MW-1 also pointed out that Shri Junghare had admitted his guilt in his letter dt. 23.01.2008 which is at Exhibit- M-24. Incident was later reported to him by HPCL and at that stage, he gathered that Shri Manoj Junghare, his the then Manager, had committed a fraud, in collusion with Workman Shri Parate. It was clearly confirmed out by the MW-1 that after the aforesaid episode, workman Shri Parate himself had contacted the MW-1 on phone with an assurance that whatever amount he had received through a deal with Shri Manoj Junghare would be returned by him to the MW-1. In is every vital and convincing deposition the MW-1 categorically stated that the workman Shri Parate had also requested him on that occasion to withdraw the letter which was submitted by him to HPCL about the aforesaid illegal transaction involving Shri. Junghare and the workman.

27. The MW-1 stated that there were similar instances in the year 2005-2006 also when HPCL had informed him that although no Demand Drafts were issued by the Bank in favour of HPCL for lifting the load of gas cylinders, Cash Receipts were issued in the name of his Gas Agency which had ultimately caused pecuniary loss to HPCL. The MW-1 also pointed out that since he was totally unaware about these illegal transactions in the initial stage, he had lodged a Police Complaint with the Station Officer, Police Station, Khapa on 26.03.2008. Attention of this Hon'ble Tribunal is also drawn to the Police Complaint lodged by the MW-1 with Police Station, Khapa on 26.03.2008 which was filed on record at Serial No. 10 along with the List of Documents dt 09.04.2014. The contents of the said Police Complaints support and corroborate what the MW-1 has deposed in his evidence before this Hon'ble Tribunal. During the Cross-examination the MW-1, reiterated his deposition what he alleged in the examination-in-chief further, when a question was put to the witness by this Court, the MW-1 maintained as it is and stated that Manoj Junghare had committed a fraud against HPCL as well as M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency. From the aforesaid evidence and particularly the Cross-examination of the MW-1, it could be seen that the Witness has maintained and has stood by what he as deposed in his affidavit/examination in chief and there is absolutely nothing in his cross examination to disbelieve his testimony. It may also be kept in mind here that Shri Junghare has committed fraud at the instance of workman as Shri Parate had lured him and Shri Junghare had fallen into the trap laid down by workman Shri Parate in as much as Shri Junghare was suffering from financial crisis and wanted to make quick money. Shri Jeevan Singh has lodged a Police Complaint against Shri. Junghare and his other companion who jointly has committed fraud in a normal course no person would lodge a false police complaint.

28. The testimony of Shri Jeevan Singh is consistent, trustworthy and in tune with the documents placed on record, particularly Exhibit M-22, Exhibit M-24 and also the Police Complaint lodged by him with Police Station, Khapa. The defence has not been able to falsify or discredit the testimony of this particular witness. Not only this applicant/petitioner has never denied the contents written in Exhibit M-22 and M-24. Jeevan Singh has admitted in his letter dt. 20.03.2008 Exhibit M-22 that the fraud has been committed by his manager Manoj Junghare in connivance with the officer of the HPCL and the letter which is written by Manoj Junghare on 23.01.2008 addressed to the HPCL. The commitment of fraud has also been admitted by the Manoj Junghare with the connivance of Shri Vinod Parate. Learned counsel for the petitioner/ applicant has never denied in whole of the Statement of Claim. Vinod Parate has also been examined in his defence as PW-1 but in his chief as well as in his cross-examination he never denied the averments written in the letter dt. 23.01.2008 Exhibit M-24 and letter dt. 20.03.2008 Exhibit M-22. The applicant/ petitioner and his counsel if not denied it means the contents written in those letters are impliedly admitted to the applicant.

29. The Workman Shri Rakesh Kumar Vaimanya MW-2 has also been examined on behalf of the management to prove the contentions written in the Written Statement. The MW-2 was working as Dy. Manager Finance at Khapri LPG Plant during the relevant period when the Workman was also employed at the said Khapri LPG Plant. The MW-2 was posted at Mumbai prior to his transfer to Khapri LPG Plant and he was well conversant with the computerised system which was introduced at various locations of HPCL throughout India, including Khapri LPG Plant, to keep the computerised record of accounting and financial transactions. This witness has noticed various discrepancies and irregularities in the financial transactions in the matter of supply of LPG Gas Cylinders to the Dealers of HPCL, without actually receiving the amount in the Bank of HPCL against the Cash Receipts. The MW-2 explained that cash Receipts were prepared by the concerned staff in the office of HPCL at its Khapri LPG Plant, but actually, the instrument i.e., Demand Drafts/ Cheques were not deposited in the Bank though Bank Deposit Slips (BDS). It was later revealed during the close scrutiny that those instruments were never deposited in the Bank Account of HPCL through BDS with the result that it caused huge financial loss to HPCL. In fact, according to the MW-2 although the instrument for cash receipts were never deposited in the Bank, loads (filled gas cylinders) were released to the dealers. HPCL did not receive money/ consideration from its Dealers and yet products/ loads were delivered to them. The MW-2 pointed out that the consideration amount is mandatorily and compulsorily accepted by HPCL from its Dealers through Banker's Demand Drafts/ Cheques which are negotiable instruments. However, the words "Cash Receipt" were used in common parlance in the internal business transactions of HPCL against the Demand Drafts/ Cheques received from the Dealers.

30. He further stated that the system generates BDS automatically on giving BDS print command, basis the details available in the cash receipt. He further mentioned that the user normally gives certain inputs in the system

through BDS print version and other details are automatically captured by the system from the CRs. The MW-2 further clarified that there is no difference in generation of BDS for post-dated cheques since the system generates BDS as per the cash receipt due dates only. As to specific query of the PO, the MW-2 admitted that BDS number can be manually updated in the JDE since such provision is available in the system under cash receipt menu/ program as “BDS update”. The MW-2 further mentioned that BDS update Option has been provided in JDE to rectify any error or in a cash receipt for which the BDS in final mode had already been taken. In normal circumstances, one is required to cancel the incorrect CR which is made with wrong inputs and prepare fresh CRs with correct inputs and manually update the same with concerned BDS. As to specific query of the PO. The witness stated that wrong inputs meant inputs such as incorrect customer code, wrong amount, erroneous dates, etc. However, the person using BDS update option is required to ensure cancellation of the cash receipts made with wrong inputs and make fresh cash receipts and update the same with the concerned BDS. This witness has also stated that when financial irregularities were noticed by him and when it was found that Cash Receipts were prepared but instruments were never deposited in the Bank through BDS, and yet, the load of Gas Cylinders was released in favour of the concerned Dealers of HPCL, he personally took up the matter with the concerned Dealers and took them into confidence. The MW-2 reconciled their Accounts and when the Dealers were also satisfied that they had lifted the load without depositing the Demand Drafts/ Cheques in the office of HPCL, the MW-2 was successful in recovering substantial outstanding amounts from such dealers. This witness also named various Gas Agencies in relation to whom financial irregularities were noticed and they included M/s Prayagraj Gas Agency, M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency, M/s. Pendam Gas Agency, M/s. Satyashree Gas Company, etc. it was also revealed by the bankers of these dealers that in certain cases the Demand Draft were not issued in favour of the HPCL at all by these respective banks. Although cash receipts entries were made in the computerised system of HPCL at its Khapri Plant. MW-2 referred and deposed the same incident about which the Proprietor of M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency, Shri Jeevan Singh Wayam (MW-1) had deposed in detail earlier. Since that part of the deposition of Shri Rakesh Kumar is the corroboration of what is deposed by the MW-1. The MW-2 also pointed out that the manager of M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency, Shri Junghare had colluded with the Workman, Shri Vinod Parate, and had defrauded HPCL and had shared the amount involved, between two of them. This witness has also stated that the proprietor of M/s Jeevan Gas Agency had written a letter dt. 16.04.2008 to the Vigilance Officer of HPCL. It is as Exhibit M-28. In that letter, the Proprietor had stated that Demand Draft No. 93411 was cancelled by his manager Shri. Manoj Jhughare without his knowledge and that the amount was siphoned off from his account. The MW-2 has referred to Exhibit- M-24, a letter dt. 23.01.2008 in which the Manager, Shri Manoj Junghare had also admitted that he had committed a fraud in collusion with Workman Shri Parate and that the money was shared by both of them. This position was confirmed by the MW-1 in his aforesaid letter Exhibit – M-28. It could also be seen that in the said letter Exhibit M-28, the MW-1 has empathetically stated that on one occasion, workman Shri Parate had called/ phoned him saying that he (Workman Shri Parate) would refund the money if Jeevan Singh was ready to withdraw his letter addressed to HPCL. The MW- 2 has then referred to Exhibit- M-29 which is a detailed Statement prepared by him with regard to recoveries made from various Dealers. It pertains to such cases where Cash Receipts were made but instruments were not deposited in the Bank of HPCL through BDS. However, due to the efforts made by the MW-2 substantial recovery was made from the Dealers and that is also reflected in Exhibit- M-29. The MW-2 has further stated that Exhibit M-30 is the extract of JDE Statement reflecting the details of Accounts showing instruments. These are the Screenshots taken from the computer. After referring to the details in Exhibit M-30, the MW-2 has pointed out that both these batches were prepared from employee used ID 30070320 which is the employee ID of the workman. This updation was done manually with a malafide intention, instead of opting for Automatic System Updating process. The MW-2 has deposed further that State Bank of India, Saoner Branch had addressed one letter dt. 12.04.2008 to M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency, Khapa. It has been filed on record by the Party No. 1 (HPCL) before this Hon’ble Tribunal, at Serial No. 21 along with the list of documents dt. 09.04.2014. The Bank had informed inter-alia that although certain Demand Drafts were issued by the Branch in the name of HPCL, there were as many as five other Demand Drafts for various amounts which were not issued by the Bank in favour of HPCL. The MW-2 has emphasized that from this letter of bank, it was clear that certain Demand Drafts were not brought to the Office of HPCL, Khapri LPG Plant and yet Cash Receipts were generated against those Demand Drafts, although they were not issued in favour of HPCL. Thus, false instruments were generated through computerised system. The MW-2 concluded his deposition by stating that this particular letter dt. 12.04.2008 issued by State Bank of India, Saoner Branch, supported his findings that a fraud was committed against HPCL and loads of gas cylinders were lifted without depositing the Demand Drafts with HPCL as consideration, thereby causing huge financial loss to HPCL. The said letter of State Bank of India is at Exhibit M-32. The MW-2 during his cross examination confronted that the workman was working at LPG Regional Office from June 2006 to May 2007 and that he later on worked at Khapri LPG Plant from 09.06.2007. However, it is pertinent to note here Nagpur LPG Plant are both situated in the same Office Building within the premises of Khapri LPG Bottling Plant. Therefore, the workman cannot take advantage of his place of work during these two periods in as much as he was working within the premises of Khapri LPG Plant on both the occasions. The workman Shri Parate had taken advantage of manual updation facility available in the computerised system to siphond off money which actually belonged to HPCL by adopting the modous operandi of making entries of negotiable instruments, Demand Drafts, cheques in the computerised system and along with dealers to lift the loads of gas cylinders although such negotiable instruments were actually never deposited in the

bank account of HPCL. Again, the document speak for themselves and these documents cannot be brushed under the carpet as these documents and the deposition of these two witnesses are in tandem and support each other.

31. Shri Madhukar Igole has been examined as MW-3 in support of the contentions of the management. He has also supported the contentions as alleged by the management against the delinquent workman Shri. Vinod Parate. He has been cross-examined by learned counsel for the respondent but this witness has consistently supported the version of the management which is alleged against the delinquent employee.

32. The next and the last witness examined by HPCL in the case is Shri Kamlesh Sheth who at the relevant point of time, was working as Deputy Manager- Finance at West Zone Office, Mumbai. This witness has referred to one particular incident involving one Shri V. G. Paunikar. Shri Paunikar had submitted a leave application to the management on 19.12.2005 and had sought one day casual leave for 09.12.2005. leave was sanctioned. However, although Shri Paunikar was on leave on 09.12.2005, cash receipt No. 5014907 had been prepared against Demand Draft No. 81072 for an amount of Rs. 86,300/- on that day in favour of M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency by using Shri Paunikar's User ID. However, in fact, no such instrument was issued by the State Bank of India and it was subsequently confirmed by the Bank vide aforesaid letter dt. 12.04.2008 (Exhibit-M-32). Therefore, the witness highlighted the fact that a Cash Receipt was generated using Shri Paunikar's ID. Although he was on leave on that particular day. In the event an employee was on leave at that point of time, he could not prepare a cash receipt for any customer since at the relevant time JDE access was available only in the corporation's office which is also evident from the deposition of workman during his cross examination. Exhibit M-26 provides login details given by HQO ERP Server (software). As per the above login report, the login ID of two employees i.e., Employee Number 3070320 (Vinod A. Parate) and Employee Number 30061250 (V. G. Paunikar) were used to log-in to JDE Software system through same IP Address on 08.08.2006, 16.09.2006, 25.06.2007 and 14.07.2007. Shri V. G. Paunikar was assigned to Customer Service Cell at Nagpur (LIC Building) during 01.06.2005 to (including aforesaid period of Leave dt. 09.12.2005) whereas many cash receipts were made from his Employee User ID during the said tenure from Khapri LPG Plant premises wherein Nagpur LPG RO is also situated. The MW-4 has then referred to the Statement given by the workman on 20.03.2008 in the presence of the then Deputy Chief Vigilance Officer. It is at Exhibit M-38 and the original copy has also been filed on record subsequently. The workman has signed the said Statement on every page. Thus, the workman confirmed, by putting his signatures on all the six pages, that his Statement was correctly recorded. In that Statement Exhibit M-38, the workman admitted that he was physically present at the Nagpur LPG Regional Office on 08.08.2006. During the recording of his Statement, the workman was shown the attendance register for the said date and, upon verification, confirmed that the signature appearing therein was his own. This admission on the part of the workman clearly indicates that although Shri V.G. Paunikar was working in Nagpur City (LIC Building) at that time, workman Shri Parate had used his Log-in-ID while sitting at Khapri LPG Plant Premises.

33. Not only this, the workman has also admitted that his duties also included cheque preparation, Preparation of Cash Receipts, printing of Bank Deposit Slip (BDS), etc. Hence, these admissions of the workman clearly fortify the stand of HPCL that the duties assigned to him included preparation of BDS, Cash Receipts, etc. Hence these admissions of the workman clearly fortify the stand of HPCL that the duties assigned to him included preparation of BDS, Cash Receipts, etc. Shri Manoj Junghare vide his letter dt. 23.01.2008 & 13.02.2008 at Exhibit M-24 & Exhibit M-10, clearly gives an inference that workman Shri Parate in connivance with Shri Manoj Junghare had misused the ERP access of Shri V.G. Paunikar and committed the fraudulent activities by using the BDS Update Option thereby giving credit to the respective dealers/ customers and assisting them to lift the product basis the same at the expense of the corporation. While referring to another document at Exhibit M-30 which is the screen shot taken from the computer about the extract of JDE Statements, witness has highlighted that in this particular document, remarks column was left blank deliberately so that further manipulation could be done while preparing Cash Receipts and Bank Deposit Slips using manual updation option, generally in the remark's column, BDS details will be reflected. However, since the workman updated the entries using manual updation option, he kept the column blank deliberately.

34. MW-4 has then referred to other set of JDE screenshots taken from the computer system and placed on record along with the list of documents dt. 08.04.2025. They pertain to Cash Receipts Nos. 6007343, 6009701 and 7005044, all created in favour of M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency and corresponding Demand Draft Nos. are 86599, 87172 and 93411 respectively. Now, when we cross check these details with the details furnished by the State Bank of India vide Exhibit M-32, it could be seen that the Bank had clearly informed M/s. Jeevan Gas Agency that Cheque Nos. 86599 and 87172 were not issued by the Bank at all, whereas Cheque No. 93411 was issued by the Bank in favour of HPCL. The discrepancies in the record, therefore, speak volumes about the Mal-practices adopted by the workman using not only his own log-in ID but also that of Shri Paunikar.

35. All the four witnesses adduced by the management in support of his contention have deposed consistently and in complete corroboration with each other not only through their oral testimonies but also by specifically referring to the documents already placed on record and duly exhibited before this court. Accordingly, the depositions of all four witnesses are mutually supportive, consistent, and reliable, particularly when nothing material has emerged

during their cross-examinations to indicate that they have deposed against workman Shri Parate on account of any personal rivalry, past enmity, mala fide intention, or vengeance.

36. Now, turning to the evidence led by workman Shri Vinod Parate in his defence, it could be seen that he has never denied the contentions made on letter dt. 23.01.2008 and 20.03.2008 the allegations which are alleged against the workman were not denied. It means it is impliedly admitted the contentions written in both letters. Applicant/workman has also voluntarily admitted that Khapri LPG Plant and the Nagpur LPG Regional Office are both located in the same premises in Khapri. However, relying upon one particular letter dt. 08.04.2005 which came to be filed by him and which is marked as Exhibit W-1, the workman has deposed that he was required to perform the work as per the enclosed duty list / core-brief areas of work. Although, Exhibit W-1 is signed by Shri R.B. Bharadwaj, the then Plant Manager, the so-called enclosure laying down core-brief areas of work does not bear any signature or stamp or office seal of the Corporation. Therefore, the cryptic mention of RO JOBS & MARKETING JOB is wholly vague, inconclusive and does not advance the case of the workman in any manner. On the contrary, Exhibit W-1, itself clearly demonstrates that the duties assigned to the workman were exhaustive and inclusive in nature, as it is specifically mentioned that **“please note that in addition to the listed job, you are required to do all the job assigned by Deputy Manager Finance from time to time.”** Even as per the workman’s own document, the nature and scope of duties assigned to him were not confined or restricted to any particular category of work.

37. Insofar as the alleged delay in issuance of the charge-sheet to the workman is concerned, the corporation has already explained, in detail, the reasons for such delay in its Reply. The management was required to undertake careful scrutiny of voluminous transactions, computerized data, and related records, which necessarily involved a detailed preliminary investigation before issuance of the charge-sheet. Therefore, chargesheet was filed against the delinquent employee after careful scrutiny of the matter. Therefore, the workman has completely failed to establish his contention that false charges were levelled against him. In any case it was incumbent upon the workman to specifically plead and prove that HPCL and its officials were actuated by mala fide intentions or ulterior motives to falsely implicate him for any particular reason. The workman has utterly failed to establish any such ill motive, bias, personal animosity, or ulterior purpose on the part of the Management or its officials. The workman Shri Vinod Parate has admitted that the JD Edwards Enterprises One (JDE) Software System was introduced in HPCL in the year 2004 and that he was fully aware of the said system. The workman has also admitted that the said software system could be accessed only from within the office premises of HPCL and not from any external location. Significantly, he has further admitted that if any employee was on leave, it was not possible for such employee to access the said software system. These admissions clearly and unequivocally establish that the workman had logged into the JDE System by unauthorizedly and illegally using the Login ID of Shri Paunikar, his colleague, during the period when Shri Paunikar was on leave. No other person was suggested to perform this work at the relevant point of time in the work place mentioned above.

38. Mere denial of the charges or to say that he was not entrusted the work of handling software, preparing BDS, depositing negotiable instruments in the bank account of the HPCL cannot be accepted at all without any concrete proof in support thereof.

39. It is also argued on behalf of the management that management has completely lost confidence in the workman. Therefore, the acts involving financial irregularities, misappropriation or breach of trust are viewed with utmost seriousness. In the instant case the conduct of the workman as established on record has caused serious financial prejudice to the establishment and has irreparably shaken the confidence reposed in him by the management. In such circumstances the continuance of the workman in service was neither desirable nor in the interest of the organization. Accordingly having bonafide lost confidence in the workman, the management took the decision to dismiss him from service which action is fully justified, legal, and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

40. Although, learned counsel for the applicant/ petitioner has argued that Jeevan Singh is hearsay witness. He has not seen the occurrence before his eyes. Therefore, the evidentiary value of the hearsay witness is not credible. Learned counsel for the applicant/ petitioner have also referred one letter dt. 13.02.2008 which is addressed to Senior Manager HPCL, Khapri Wardha Road Nagpur written by Manoj Jhunghare in which Manoj Jhunghare had denied the all transaction between him and Vinod Parate and also given clean chit to Mr. Vinod Parate. But the contents written in this letter were not proved by the writer of this letter by adducing him as defence witness from the side of the petitioner. Not only this, the original copy of this letter was for the first time given to the enquiry officer by the delinquent employee himself. Whereas this letter was addressed to Senior Manager HPCL under which circumstances the original copy of this letter was received by delinquent employee Vinod Parate. It has not been cleared by him. meaning thereby afterthought and with connivance of the Manoj Jhunghare this letter was received by himself. Whereas this letter was addressed to Senior Manager Nagpur Khapri Branch. It transpires that this letter was prepared by Vinod Parate with connivance of Mr. Manoj Jhunghare. But the applicant Shri Vinod Parate has never adduced Manoj Jhunghare to prove the averments written in this letter. Therefore, the contents of this letter are not proved. Therefore, it has no value in evidence.

41. In catena of judgements, it is held that the loss of confidence is the primary factor and not the amount of money misappropriated and that the sympathy or generosity cannot be a factor which is impermissible in law. When an employee is found guilty of misappropriating the Corporation's funds, there is nothing wrong in the corporation losing confidence or faith in such an Employee and awarding punishment of Dismissal. In such cases, there is no place for generosity or misplaced sympathy on the part of the judicial forums and interfering therefore with the quantum of punishment. It is for the Management to maintain internal discipline, and particularly financial discipline, to keep the wheels of the Organization running smoothly. The theft, fraud, neglect of work, etc. are writ large in the conduct of the workman. For such an act of commission and omission, amount to wilful falsification of records, illegal gratifications, etc. the punishment of Dismissal from service cannot be said to be disproportionate; nor does the punishment call for interference by this Tribunal. One has to find out whether it is a case of no evidence or some evidence against. Secondly, one has to find out, whether material/ evidence available on record is sufficient for a prudent person to hold and arrive at a positive finding that the delinquent employee is guilty of the charges of misconducts levelled. In the instant case, on the one hand, management has led oral and documentary evidence before this Tribunal and on the other hand, the workman has completely failed to rebut the allegations levelled against him. Management has produced more than sufficient evidence from which it infers that the guilt of the delinquent employee is completely proved. That the alleged fraud has been committed by delinquent employee Vinod Parate.

42. In the case of **Mohammad Salim Siddique V/s State of UP and others 2011 (2UPLBEC1575) Allahabad High Court and Ajeet Kumar Nag V/s General Manager Indian Oil Corporation Ltd Haldia JT 2005 (8) SC 425**. The distinction between departmental enquiry and criminal proceedings has been drawn. The two proceedings i.e. criminal and departmental are indirect different. They operate in different fields and have different objectives. The object of criminal proceedings is to inflict appropriate punishment on offender as the purpose of enquiry proceedings is to deal with the delinquent departmentally and to impose penalty in accordance service rules. The rule relating the appreciation of evidence if the two proceedings if also not similar. In a criminal law burden of proof is on the persecution and unless the persecution is able to prove the guilt of accused beyond reasonable doubts, he cannot be convicted by the court of law. In departmental enquiry on the other hand penalty can be imposed on the delinquent officer on a finding recorded on the basis of preponderance of probability procedure with respect to standard to proof in criminal case and departmental enquiry are different. In the case of departmental enquiry, the technical rules of evidence have no application and the doctrine of proof of beyond doubt has also no application in the departmental enquiry. Criminal prosecution is launched for an offence for violation of a duty the offender owes to the society or for breach of which law has provided that the offender shall make satisfaction to the public. So, crime is an act of omission in violation of law or of omission of public duty. The departmental enquiry is to maintain discipline in the service and efficiency of public service. There would be no bar to proceed simultaneously with departmental enquiry and trial of criminal case. Looking to this law established by Hon'ble Supreme Court there is sufficient evidence on record to establish the guilt of the delinquent employee in this case the allegations alleged by the management. Therefore, in this matter penalty can be imposed on the delinquent officer on a finding recorded on the basis of preponderance of probability.

43. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **B.C. Chaturvedi V/s Union of India (1995) 6 SCC 749**, has categorically held that judicial review is not an appeal on merits but is limited to scrutiny of the decision-making process; accordingly, Courts/ Tribunals cannot reappraise evidence or substitute their own findings in place of those recorded by the competent authority.

44. In the case of **Om Kumar V/s Union of India, (2001) 2 SCC 386**, Hon'ble Supreme Court of India after considering the Wednesbury Principles and the Doctrine of Proportionality, has observed and held that the question of quantum of punishment in disciplinary matters is primarily for the disciplinary authority and the jurisdiction of the High Courts under Article 226 of the Constitution of India or of the Administrative Tribunals is limited and is confined to the applicability of one or other of the well-known principles known as Wednesbury Principles.

45. In **Depot Manager, A.P.S.R.T.C. V/s Raghuda Siva Sankar Prasad, Air 2007 Supreme Court 152**, the Hon'ble Apex held as:

It is also not open to the Tribunal and Courts to substitute their subjective opinion in place of the one arrived at the domestic Tribunal. In the instant case, the opinion arrived at by the Corporation was rightly accepted by the Tribunal but not by the Court. We, therefore, hold that the order of reinstatement passed by the Single Judge and the Division Bench of the High Court is contrary to the law on the basis of a catena of decisions of this Court. In such cases, there is no place for generosity or sympathy on the part of the judicial forums for interfering with the quantum of punishment of removal which cannot be justified. Similarly, the High Court can modify the punishment in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of Constitution of India only when it finds that the punishment imposed is shockingly disproportionate to the charges proved.

46. In the case of **Lucknow Kshetriya Gramin Bank (now Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh Gramin Bank) & Anr. V/s Rajendra Singh, (2013) 12 SCC 372** in Paragraph 16 the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed and held as under:

“16. The principles discussed above can be summed up and summarised as follows:

a. when charges(s) of misconduct are proved in an enquiry the quantum of punishment to be imposed in a particular case is essentially the domain of the departmental authorities.

b. The courts cannot assume the function of disciplinary/ departmental authorities and to decide the quantum of punishment and nature of penalty to be awarded, as this function is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the competent authority.

c. limited judicial review is available to interfere with the punishment imposed by the disciplinary authority, only in cases where such penalty is found to be shocking to the conscience of the court.

d. Even in such a case when the punishment is set aside as shockingly disproportionate to the nature of charges framed against the delinquent employee, the appropriate course of action is to remit the matter back to the disciplinary authority or the appellate authority with direction to pass appropriate order of penalty. The court by itself cannot mandate as to what should be the penalty in such a case.

e. the only exception to the principle stated in para 19.4 above, would be in those cases where the co-delinquent is awarded lesser punishment by the disciplinary authority even when the charges of misconduct were identical or the co-delinquent was foisted with more serious charges. This would be on the doctrine of equality when it is found that the employee concerned and the co-delinquent are equally placed. However, there has to be a complete parity between the two, not only in respect of nature of charge but subsequent conduct as well after the service of charge-sheet in the two cases. If the co-delinquent accepts the charges, indicating remorse with unqualified apology, lesser punishment to him would be justifiable.”

47. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Union of India & Others V/s. P. Gunasekaran**, (2015) 2 SCC 610, after relying upon its earlier judgements in the cases of **B.C Caturvedi V/s Union of India & Other**, (1995) 6 SCC 749; **Union of India & Another V/s G. Ganayatham**, (1997) 7 SCC 463; **Om Kumar & Other V/s Union of India**, (2001) 2 SCC 386; **Coimbatore District Central Cooperative Bank Employees Assn. & Another**, (2007) 4 SCC 669; and **chairman-cum- Managing Director, Coal India Limited & Another V/s Mukul Kumar Choudhuri & Other**, (2009) 15 SCC 620; has held that authoritatively delineated the contours of judicial review in disciplinary matters. It has been categorically held that High Courts cannot re-appreciate evidence, cannot interfere with findings of fact if they are based on some evidence and cannot interfere with the quantum of punishment unless the same is shockingly disproportionate or vitiated by perversity, illegality, or procedural impropriety. The Hon’ble Apex Court emphasised that adequacy or sufficiency of evidence is beyond the scope of judicial review.

48. Further the Hon’ble High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad in **Rajendra G. Parikh V/s. Chief General Manager & Anr.**, C/SCA/12390/2012 vide judgement dt. 12.07.2024, observed, as under:

“The above-mentioned decisions of this Court give a clear idea of the limited scope of judicial review of the discretion exercised by the employer to impose the particular penalty on the delinquent employee. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasised that the High Courts cannot exercised appellate jurisdiction in such matters and substitute their opinion for the one formed by the disciplinary authority. It has been held that the punishment imposed by the competent authority cannot be modified. Substituted with a lesser penalty unless the court is satisfied that the same is grossly or shockingly disproportionate or is so unreasonable that no person of reasonable prudence would have imposed such punishment in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

49. The act of putting Employee’s money to jeopardy speaks ill of the Honesty and integrity of the workman. The act of dishonesty or fraud or misappropriation lowers down the reputation of employer in public. The public loose their confidence in the company, which affects business and finally the national economy. That, the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Air-India Corporation, Bombay V/s. V.A. Rebellow and Ors.**, AIR 1972 SC 1343 observed that:

“Once the employer has lost confidence in the employee and the Bonafide loss of confidence is affirmed, the order of punishment must be considered to be immune from challenge, for the reason that discharging the office of trust and confidence requires absolute integrity, and in a case of loss of confidence, reinstatement cannot be directed.”

50. In **Kanhaiyalal Agrawal and Ors. V/s. Factory Manager and Ors.**, AIR 2001 SC 3645; the Hon’ble Apex Court laid down the test for loss of confidence to find out as to whether there was bona fide loss of confidence in the employee, observing that:

“(i) the workman is holding the position of trust and confidence;

(ii) by abusing such position, he commits act which results in forfeiting the same; and

(iii) to continue him in service/ establishment would be embarrassing the inconvenient to the employee, or would be detrimental to the discipline or security or the establishment. Loss of confidence cannot be subjective,

based upon the mind of the management. Objective facts which would lead to a definite inference of apprehension in the mind of the management, regarding trust worthiness or reliability of the employee, must be alleged and proved.”

51. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Regional Manager, U.P.S.R.T.C, Etawah & Ors. V/s. Hoti Lal & Anr., (2003) 3 SCC 605**, outlined the mode to be adopted for determining whether the punishment imposed by the disciplinary authority is shockingly disproportionate and observed as under:

The court or tribunal while dealing with the quantum of punishment has to record as to why it is felt that the punishment was not commensurate with the proved charges. The scope for interference is very limited and restricted to exceptional cases. In the impugned order of the High Court no reasons whatsoever have been indicated as to why the punishment was considered disproportionate. Failure to give reasons amounts to denial of justice. A mere statement that it is disproportionate would not suffice. It is not only the amount involved but the mental set-up, the type of duty performed and similar relevant circumstances which go in to decision-making process while considering whether the punishment is proportionate or disproportionate. If the charged employee holds a position of trust where honesty and integrity are inbuilt requirements of functioning, it would not be proper to deal with the matter leniently. Misconduct in such cases has to be dealt with iron hands. Where the person deals with public money or is engaged in financial transactions or act in a fiduciary capacity, the highest degree of integrity and trustworthiness is a must and unexceptional.”

52. That the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State Bank of India and Anr. V/s. Bela Bagchi & Ors., (2005) 7 SCC 435**, observed the following in Para 15:

“15. A Bank officer is required to exercise higher standards of honesty and integrity. He deals with money of the depositors and the customers. Every officer/ employee of the Bank is required to take all possible steps to protect the interests of the Bank and to discharge his duties with utmost integrity, honesty, devotion and diligence and to do nothing which is unbecoming of a bank officer. Good conduct and discipline are inseparable from the functioning of every officer/ employee of the Bank. As was observed by this Court in Disciplinary Authority-cum-Regional Manager V/s Nikunja Bihari Patnaik (1996) (9) SCC 69, it is no defence available to say that there was no loss or profit resulted in case, when the officer/employee acted without authority. The very discipline of an organisation more particularly a Bank is dependent upon each of its officers and officers acting and operating within their allotted sphere. Acting beyond one's authority is by itself a breach of discipline and is a misconduct. The charges against the employee were not casual in nature and were serious. That being so, the plea about absence of loss is also sans substance.”

53. Apex Court in **Divisional Controller, N.E.K.R.T.C. V/s H. Amaresh reported in (2006) 6 SCC 187** upheld the dismissal of the delinquent who had misappropriated Rs. 360.95/-. The court held that “the loss of confidence is the primary factor and not the amount of money misappropriated and that the sympathy or generosity cannot be a factor which is impermissible in law.”

54. Recently the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the **General Manager (P), Canara Bank V/s/ Ganganarasimhaiah, 2025 INSC 1088** ruled as under:

When a court is considering whether the punishment of **“termination from service”** imposed upon a bank employee is shockingly excessive or dis-proportionate to the gravity of the proved misconduct, the loss of confidence in the employee will be an important and relevant factor. When an unknown person comes to the bank and claims to be the account-holder of a long inoperative account, and a bank employee, who does not know such person, instructs his colleague to transfer the account from “dormant” to “operative” category (contrary to the instructions regulating dormant accounts) without any kind of verification, and accepts the money withdrawal from such person, gets a token and collects the amount on behalf of such person for the purpose of handing it over to such person, he in effect enables such unknown person to withdraw the amount contrary to the banking procedures; and ultimately, if it transpires that the person who claimed to be the account- holder was an impostor, the bank cannot be found fault with if it says that it has lost confidence in the employee concerned. A bank is justified in contending that not only the employees who are dishonest, but those who are guilty of gross negligence, are not fit to continue in its service.

55. A disciplinary proceeding is not a criminal trial. The standard proof required is that of preponderance of probability and not proof beyond reasonable doubt. The principle of preponderance of probability in departmental enquiries has been succinctly summed-up by the **Hon'ble Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer in State of Haryana and another V/s Rattan Singh (1977) 2 SCC 491**. To quote the unparallel and inimitable expressions:

“In a domestic enquiry the strict and sophisticated rules of evidence under the Indian Evidence Act may not apply. All materials which are logically probative for a prudent mind are permissible. There is no allergy to hearsay evidence provided it has reasonable nexus and credibility. It is true that departmental authorities and Administrative Tribunals must be careful in evaluating such material and should not glibly swallow what is strictly speaking not relevant under the Indian Evidence Act. For this proposition it is not necessary to cite decisions nor text books, although we have been taken through case-law and other authorities by counsels on

both sides. The essence of a judicial approach is objectivity, exclusion of extraneous materials or considerations and observance of rules of natural justice. Of course, fair play is the basis and if perversity or arbitrariness, bias or surrender of independence of judgement vitiate the conclusions reached, such finding, even though of a domestic tribunal, cannot be held good.”

56. That in the departmental enquiry, the standard of proof required in a departmental order enquiry differs materially from the standard of proof required in a criminal trial. The Supreme Court in the cases **Union of India V/s. Sardar Bahadur (1972 SLR SC 355)**; **State of Andhra Pradesh V/s. Shree Rama Rao (AIR 1963 SC 1723)** and **Nand Kishore Prasad V/s State of Bihar (1978 (2) SLRSC 46)**, has held; “A disciplinarily proceeding is not a criminal trial and that standard of proof required in a disciplinarily enquiry is that of preponderance of probability and not proof beyond reasonable doubt, which is the proof required in a criminal trial.”

57. It is worthwhile to refer to the decision of High Court of Gujrat at Ahmedabad in the case of **C. S. Amin V/s. Assistant General Manager SBI, Region III & 2 reported in 2016 Law Suit (Guj) 2016** wherein the Hon’ble Court has observed as under: -

“I take notice of the fact that the inquiring authority has examined each and every charge levelled against the writ applicant including the documents produced by the Presenting Officer and came to the conclusion that all the charges were fully proved. In a departmental inquiry, the disciplinary authority is expected to prove the charges on preponderance of proportionality and not on proof beyond the reasonable doubt.”

58. The Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in **Orissa Mining Corporation Appellants and Another Vs. Ananda Chandra Prusty, (1996) 11 SCC 600**, (at Para 6), held as:

“On a consideration of the totally of the facts and circumstances of the case including the nature of charges we are not inclined to interfere in the matter. The position with respect to burden of proof is as clarified by us herein above viz., that there is no such thing as on absolute burden of proof, always lying upon the department in a disciplinary inquiry. The burden of proof depends upon the nature of explanation and the nature of charges. In a given case the burden may be shifted to the delinquent officer, depending upon his explanation. For example, take the first charge in this case. The charge was that he made certain false nothing on account of which loans were disbursed to certain ineligible persons. The respondent’s case was that those nothing was based upon certain documents produced and certain records maintained by other employees in the office. In such a situation it is for the respondent to establish his case. The department is not expected to examine those other employees in the office to show that their acts or records could not have formed the basis of wrong noting’s made by the respondent.”

59. It is also to be noted at this juncture that there is an essential distinction between burden of proof and onus of proof. Burden of proof lies upon a person who has to prove the fact and it never shifts, onus of proof on the other hand, shifts. Such a shifting of onus is a continuous process in the evaluation of evidence. For instance, in a suit for possession based on title, once the Plaintiff has been able to create a high degree of probability so as to shift the onus on the Defendant, it is for the Defendant to discharge his onus and in the absence thereof, the burden of proof lying on the Plaintiff shall be held to have been discharged so as to amount to proof of the Plaintiffs title, vide **RVE VENKATACHALA Gounder V. Arulmigu Viswesaraswami and V.P. Temple, AIR 2003 SC 4548 (4558-59); (2003) 8 SCC 752**. That once the misconduct is proved either in the enquiry conducted by an employer or by the evidence placed before a Tribunal for the first time, punishment imposed cannot be interfered with by the Tribunal except in cases where the punishment is so harsh as to suggest victimization.

60. Learned counsel for the applicant has placed reliance on the following judgements: -

i. (2009) 2 Supreme Court cases 570, **Roop Singh Negi V/s Punjab National Bank and Others, Civil Appeal No. 7431 of 2008**

ii. (2022) 13 SCC 1, **Abhay Jain V/s High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan and another, Civil Appeal No. 2029 of 2022**

iii. 1995 SCC Online Bom 434: (1995) 2 LLN 720: 1995 Lab IC 1496: (1997) 1 LLJ 206, **Chandrakumar Madhukar Deshmukh and others V/s Board of Trustees of Port of Bombay and others.**

iv. AIR 2010 SC (Supp) 753, **Civil Appeal No. 893 of 2007, LIC of India and Anr. V/s Ram Pal Singh Bisen**

v. 1969 AIR (SC) 983, **Central Bank of India Ltd. V/s Prakash Chand Jain, Case No. 498 of 1966**

vi. AIR 1972 Supreme Court 330 **Civil Appeal No. 1254 of 1966, M.s Bareilly Electricity Supply Corporation Ltd. V/s the workmen and others.**

vii. 2009 SCC Online P&H 6827, **Diwan Chand V/s The Presiding Officer Labour Court, Amritsar and another, Civil W.P. No. 10899 of 1988.**

Viii. AIR 2020 Supreme Court 4908, **Arjun Punditrao Khotkar V/s Kailash Kushanrao Gorantyal and Others.**

The above case laws are not applicable as the facts and circumstances are different with the present case in hand.

61. In view of the above discussions and deliberations, I am of the opinion that there are repeated transactions involving acts of moral turpitude committed by the workman which resulted into loss. So far, the proportionality of the punishment is concerned it is found that commission of grave misconduct of dishonesty, act highly prejudicial to the interest of the management and causing loss to the management have been proved against the workman. The misconduct reflects lack of integrity with the workman and lack of devotion towards duty. Keeping in view the seriousness of the charges proved a punishment cannot be said to be shockingly excessive or disproportionate. So, there is no scope to interfere with the punishment. Hence, the punishment of dismissal given with effect from 08.08.2012 to Shri. Vinod Anandrao Parate who was working as Chief Administrative Clerk at Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited (HPCL) Nagpur in imposing the penalty of dismissal from service is just fare and legal. On the basis of above findings and discussions reference is answered as follows.

AWARD

“The action of the disciplinary authority, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation, Nagpur, in imposing the penalty of Dismissal from service on Shri. Vinod Parate, Chief Administrative Clerk vide his order dt. 08.08.2012 is just, fair and legal. The applicant is not entitled to any relief.”

A copy of this order be sent to both the parties as per the rules and file be consigned to the record room after due compliance.

(Justice (Retd.) SHIV SHANKAR PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1823.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑयल एंड नेचुरल गैस कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और ओएनजीसी मद्रास पोर्ट कॉन्ट्रैक्ट एम्प्लॉइज यूनियन के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 48/2017) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-30011/37/1999-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1823.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 48/2017**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Chennai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.** and **ONGC Madras Port Contract Employees Union** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-30011/37/1999- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

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

Date: 28-07-2026

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR-II,

PRESIDING OFFICER

I.D. No. 48 /2017

BETWEEN

The Secretary,

ONGC Madras Port Contract Employees Union,
New No.22 (Old 8),

Venkatesapuram Second Street,
Triplicane, Chennai-600 005.

: 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

The Regional Director

Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.

SRBC, MMDA Building, Egmore,

Chennai-600 008.

: 2nd Party/Respondents

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/ Petitioner : M/s. Hari Radhakrishnan, Advocates

For the 2nd Party/Respondent : M/s. P.N.Radhakrishnan, Advocates

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour & Employment, New Delhi vide its order No.L-30011/37/1999-IR(M) dated 17.05.2017 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:-

2. The schedule mentioned in that order is:

“Whether the demand of ONGC Madras Port Contract Employees Union seeking regularization of 55 contract workmen in the Principal Employer establishment of Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd., Chennai listed in Annexure A as ONGC is Principal Employer is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

Facts of the case:-

3. The Joint Secretary, Transport and Dock Workers Union and three others submitted a request before the Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, New Delhi to refer the dispute before this Tribunal. The said representation was decided by the Government of India on the following terms:-

The workmen were never employed by the ONGC, but were all employed by various contractors. No ID therefore, exists against M/s.ONGC Ltd. for their employment. Later on 07.11.1999 and Corrigendum dated 0/2000 was issued by the Central Government in the proceedings vide reference No. L-30011/37/1999-IR(M) dated 17.05.2017. The ONGC filed a Writ Petition No.31157 of 2001 before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras to quash the order dated 17.11.1999 and corrigendum 00/2000 on the ground that the Petitioner had to transport materials and other supplies from on shore to off shore. The contract for stevedoring, shipping services, loading and unloading of materials and transport of materials by tempo, trucks, vans, trailers, etc. within a radius of 35 kms., from Madras Port and movement of materials by crane, fork lifts, etc. was awarded by calling for tenders from various entrepreneurs. The last of such contracts was entered into between the petitioner and M/s Pandian Transports for a period of one year commencing from 18.08.1994 which was terminated with effect from 04.01.1995. The union raised demands in respect of wages payable to them. The union and Transporter had entered into a settlement under Section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 29.08.1994. On the termination of the contract between the petitioner and the contractor, the said Union made a demand for payment of earned wages for the month of December, 1994 and 3 days in January, 1995. The contractor had settled all the claims by 1996. The Union raised an industrial dispute with respect to revision of wages of the workmen of the contractor. The establishment was also impleaded as a party. Conciliation proceedings took place. The ONGC took a stand that there was no privity of contract between the establishment and the members of the Union and it had no control over the said contract work. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) passed an order on 19.09.1995 specifically stating that the dispute was not fit for adjudication as the workmen were never employed by ONGC, but were employed by various contractors and no industrial dispute exists against the ONGC. However, the Labour Ministry, Govt. of India passed an order dated 17.11.1999 stating that industrial dispute exists between the ONGC management and their workmen. This order was subsequently revised by corrigendum dated 13.10.2000. the ONGC establishment claimed that Labour Ministry's order under reference for ID is invalid because there is no relationship of employer and employee between the ONGC and the workmen mentioned in the list Annexure-A – in the list of corrigendum.

4. The Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No.21407 of 2000 has observed as under:-

“It had been specifically stated that the petitioner was never the direct employer at any point of time which was accepted earlier on the same set of facts. It cannot be said that some new facts were brought to the notice of the Respondent (Labour Ministry Vs. Union of India) or that there was some other relevant consideration for referring the matter u/s.10(1) of the Act.

The power of the Respondent does not appear to have been exercised reasonably and in a rational manner....

The order of reference shall stand set aside. The matter is remanded to the Respondent for consideration afresh.”

5. This judgement was challenged by the ONGC Contract Employees Union in W.A. No.3622 of 2002 against the management of ONGC and 4 others. The Hon'ble Writ Appellate Court had observed that there is no force in the Writ Appeal and accordingly, the same was dismissed. Thereafter, the Labour Ministry, Govt. of India referred the present Industrial Dispute.

6. As per the claim petition, the workmen are represented by the petitioner Union affiliated to Hind Mazdoor Sabha Sangh. The members of the petitioner union had been employed for more than 60 years doing handling job for the Respondent through various contractors. Even though the 2nd party had been changing contractors year after year, the members of the petitioner union continued in employment as such with the Respondent. The Respondent entered into a settlement with the contractors and names of the members of 1st Party are mentioned in the said settlement.

7. It is further stated that the work in which Petitioner Union's members were involved is perennial and permanent in nature and the Respondent instead of employing the workmen directly to do the said handling job engaged the members of the Petitioner through contractors in order to deny benefits of regularization of service and extension of various welfare status. When the members of the Petitioner union were employed through M/s.Pandian Transport for the Respondent, the erstwhile union raised industrial dispute regarding charter of demands and the said conciliation ended in failure on 31.01.1995. The members of the Petitioner gave notice of strike and struck work from 04.01.1995. the Respondent instead of negotiating and settling dispute took extreme step of terminating the contract itself in order to deny work to the members of the 1st party who lost even the status of contract workman. Thus, the Respondent revalidated the contract with M/s. Pandian Transport on 30.05.199 for a brief period of three months and the members of the Petitioner were again engaged for the said period of three months. The Madras Port Trust had also issued harbour entry permit passes to the members of the Petitioner union for carrying out contract work of the Respondent.

8. It is also stated that in a similar situation, Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ONGC Vs Petroleum Coal Labour Union and others vide its order dated 17.04.2015 in Civil Appeal No.3727 of 2015 has directed the ONGC to regularize the service of the concerned workmen and to give back wages from the date of their entitlement. Therefore, the Petitioner prays to hold that demand of the Petitioner Union for regularization of 54 workmen covered by the order of the 2nd Party is fully justified and direct the Respondent to reinstate the 54 workmen into service with full back wages, continuity of service with other attendant benefits.

9. During the pendency of references, it is informed that 17 workmen died. It was requested by this Tribunal that legal heirs may be substituted on behalf of the deceased workmen .

10. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the workmen filed substitution petition only for 14 deceased workmen, but this petition is not supported by an affidavit and there was no request to set aside the abatement which had already took place on failure of the substitute of LR's within 90 days after the death of the concerned workmen. Therefore, this petition was dismissed. Therefore, the matter with reference to 17 workmen who died and their legal heirs are not substituted as abated.

11. The Respondent filed written submissions and stated that the workmen never employed by the respondent, but were employed by various contractors, no industrial dispute exists against the respondent for their employment. It was the contractors responsibility to handle the material with his own men and using his own supervisor to supervise the work. The Respondent did not have any control over such work. It was the total responsibility of the contractor to carry out the obligation as per the terms of contract with the respondent. There is no employer-employee relationship between the ONGC Ltd and members of the Petitioner union.

12. It is further stated that members of the Petitioner union were not directly employed by the respondent and no identity card was ever issued for their employment. The claim made by the Petitioner union is not maintainable either in law or on facts and are not entitled to any relief whatsoever. It is also stated that the Petitioner union does not have any right or locus standi to represent the workmen of the contractors. The Petitioner union is not a recognized union by the respondent. The claim made by the petition union is barred by labour laws. The Transport & Dock Workers Union have arrived at a final settlement with the contractors as evidenced by Memorandum of Settlement dated 07.05.1996 and the matter has become final. There has been no victimization or unfair labour practice on the part of the Respondent and no signature has been appended by the officials of the Respondent on the entry passes issued by Madras Port Trust and if any such signature, it would have been only the work carried out on a particular date on contract basis.

13. In the case of ONGC Ltd. vs. Petroleum Coal Labour Union and Others , it relates to regularization of term based security personnel who were directly engaged by ONGC and not through contractors. Therefore, it is submitted that the facts involved in the present case on hand and the above cited case are not the same and thus, not applicable.

Witnesses Examined:

For the First Party Petitioner : WW1 Shri Alex, Secretary

For the 2nd Party/Management : MW1 Shri Vinod K.B., DGM (Legal)

Documents Marked:On the Petitioner's side:

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.W1	-	Copy of Resolution of ONGC Madras Port Contract Employees Union
Ex.W2	29.08.1994	Memorandum of Settlement U/s. 18(1) of Industrial Disputes Act between M/s. Pandian Transport and their Laborers
Ex.W3	29.08.1994	Memorandum of Settlement U/s. 18(1) of Industrial Disputes Act between M/s. Pandian Transport and their supervisory staff
Ex.W4	28.09.1994	Contract between ONGS and M/s. Pandian Transport
Ex.W5	19.09.1995	Order declining reference of Industrial Dispute raised by the workman of M/s. Pandian Transport AND CLEAN COPY
Ex.W6	21.05.1996	Communication from 4th Respondent to the M/s. Pandian Transport
Ex.W7	24.05.1996	Challan for the payment of provident fund by M/s. Pandian Transport
Ex.W8	24.05.1996	Challan for the payment of provident fund by M/s. Pandian Transport
Ex.W9	27.05.1996	Memorandum of Understanding between M/s. Pandian Transport and Transport and dock work union
Ex.W10	21.08.1997	Representation of Petitioner to the Regional Labour Commissioner
Ex.W11	21.11.1997	Communication (from ONGS to Asst. Labour Commissioner (C)-II
Ex.W12	17.11.1999	Order of reference
Ex.W13	13.10.2000	Corrigendum issued by Respondent to order of reference
Ex.W14	28.11.2000	Affidavit in W.P 21407 of 2000
Ex.W15	17.02.2001	Counter affidavit in W.P 21407 of 2000
Ex.W16	19.04.2002	Order of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in in W.P 21407 of 2000
Ex.W17	25.08.2016	Letter from Petitioner counsel to respondent
Ex.W18	26.10.2016	Letter from Dy.CLC (Central) to counsel for Petitioner
Ex.W19	13.11.2016	e-mail communication
Ex.W20	03.11.2016	Letter from Petitioner counsel to Dy.CLC (Central)
Ex.W21	08.12.2016	Letter from Petitioner counsel to Dy.CLC (Central)
Ex.W22	28.01.2017	Letter from Petitioner counsel to respondent
Ex.W23	18.02.2017	Letter from Petitioner counsel to respondent
Ex.W24	24.05.2017	Notice issued to CGIT Chennai
Ex.W25	01.06.2017	High Court order in W.P. 7098 of 2017
Ex.W26	-	Certified standing order for contingent employees of ONGC
Ex.W27	01.03.83 TO 31.03.83	Harbour entry pass
Ex.W28	12.01.1984	ID card and receipt evidencing Transport & Dock Workers Union affiliated to Hind Mazdoor Sabha
Ex.W29	01.07.1984	Attendance slip of 1 st Party at Madras harbour
Ex.W30	22.10.1985	Letter issued to Deputy Director to Assistant Commandant of CISE, Madras Port Trust

Ex.W31	20.05.1992	Memorandum of Settlement between Sanco Trans Ltd and Transport & Dock Labour Union for 13 staff
Ex.W32	20.05.1992	Memorandum of Settlement between Sanco Trans Ltd and Transport & Dock Labour Union for 44 labourers
Ex.W33	30.03.1994	Strike notice given by Union to Respondent
Ex.W34	April, 1994	Salary slip issued by M/s.Sanco Trans Ltd
Ex.W35	Nov.1994	Salary slip issued by M/s. Pandian Transports
Ex.W36	17.05.2017	Order of reference by Central Govt.
Ex.W37	-	Monthly photo pass issued by Madras Port Trust to K.Thameem

On behalf of Respondent/Management :

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.M1	23.04.1991	Advertisement of Notice Inviting Tenders For transportation and handling of material at Madras Harbour.
Ex.M2	-	Section 2 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948
Ex.M3	-	Section 3 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948.
Ex.M4	-	Section 5A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948.
Ex.M5	30.08.1997	1998 (3) L.L.N.374 - S.Karuppaiah and others Vs.Chennai Dock Labour Board
Ex.M6	04.05.1994	Letter from M/S.SANCO Trans Ltd. to Respondent
Ex.M7	29.08.1994	Settlement under Sections 2(p) and 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between Pandian Transport and Transport and Dock Workers' Union – Labourers
Ex.M8	29.08.1994	Settlement under Sections 2(p) and 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between Pandian Transport and Transport and Dock Workers' Union Staff
Ex.M9	28.09.1994	Contract Agreement - Respondent with M/s. Pandian Transport Pandian Transport
Ex.M10	21.05.1996	Letter - Transport and Transport and Dock Workers' Union Staff to M/s.Pandian Transport
Ex.M11	19.09.1996	Order Ministry of Labour
Ex.M12	16.08.2000	Statement of claim in ID 8 of 2000
Ex.M13	02.05.2002	Order of CGIT Chennai in ID 8 of 2000
Ex.M14	28.02.2005	Order of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.A. 3622 of 2002.

14. Heard the learned counsels appearing for either side and perused the records.

15. The point that arises for determination is whether the members of the Petitioner union were workmen of the Respondent Corporation?

16. This position can be ascertained after consideration of real nature of relationship. In the present case on hand, the following facts are admitted by the Petitioner Union in the claim statement as well as during the course of arguments that -

- (i) Contractor recruited the workmen;
- (ii) Salary and PF contribution was paid by the contractor;
- (iii) The contractor exercised disciplinary control and entered into agreement with the union. (This issue shall be discussed in later part of this Award).

17. It is argued on behalf of the Petitioner that the contract was sham or camouflage to evade the labour laws. The Respondent ONGC had exercised direct supervision and effective control over the workmen, issued identity card and contractor was merely a name lender with no independent business. He relied on the document marked as Ex.W27 by the Petitioner which is harbour entry pass issued by the Assistant Commandant of CISF. But, this document cannot be termed as identity card issued by M/s. ONGC Ltd. This document is mere an entry pass to enter in the secured area issued by security authority i.e, CISF.

18. Another document relied on by the Petitioner is Ex.W28, is an identity card issued by Secretary, Transport and Dock Workers Union and the same was affiliated to Hind Mazdoor Sabha. This document is also not a proof of document for employment of workmen in the office of the Respondent. It is argued on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex.W29 is attendance register. But this document is not issued by the Respondent ONGC Ltd and this register relates to Hind Mazdoor Sabha Sangh and not the attendance register of Respondent/Management. There is no other documentary evidence available on record which may suggest that the Respondent issued an identity card or provided any attendance register in favour of the workmen of the Union.

19. Now, I have to consider Memorandum of Settlement Ex.W2. This document was carried out between the Transport & Dock Workers Union and M/s.Pandian Transport. Mr. Pandian, proprietor was the person who represented the management and General Secretary and Joint Secretary of the Union and 44 labourers were covered under this agreement. This agreement came into effect forthwith from 10.08.1994 to 28.02.1996. This agreement was between the contractor and workmen regarding salary, sick leave, casual leave, earned leave and allowances etc. is an important piece of evidence that workmen were employed by the contractor and not by the Respondent, because the workmen accepted the contractor as their employer, and it was the contractor who paid wages, EPF and other benefits and therefore, the contractor was their employer.

20. Now, I have to consider the whether the contract arrangement is sham as argued by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner?

21. There is no proof available on record which may suggest that M/s. ONGC Ltd. had selected or approved the workmen or the contractor had not recruited the workmen. There is also no evidence that any official of the ONGC directly supervised the day to work of the members of Petitioner Union or assigned duty or fixed working hours or grant leave or evaluated performance to the concerned workmen. There is no evidence on record that concerned workmen were under the disciplinary control of ONGC. The Petitioner union failed to submit any documents which may prove that ONGC has issued any warning to any of the employees of the Petitioner union or put them under suspension or passed any transfer order or termination order against them. There is no evidence that the contractor supplied labourers to the ONGC. There is clear evidence on record that contractor was provided with the contract and he performed the contract by engaging his own labourers.

22. Even, during the course of oral evidence, the witness appeared on behalf of the Petitioner Union i.e., Secretary of the Union himself admitted in his cross examination that workmen were not appointed by the respondent directly. The relevant part of the evidence runs as under:-

“It is true that our Union members were not directly employed by the Respondent at any point of time. It may be true that the contract between M/s. ONGC Ltd. and M/s.Pandian Transport were wholesome

It is true that our names may not appear on record of the ONGC. It is true that M/s.ONGC Ltd has no direct control over the workmen and they are under the control of M/s.Pandian Transport.”

In view of the above discussion, the above point is decided against the Petitioner Union.

23. Now, I have consider applicability of case law in M/s.ONGC Ltd. Vs. Petroleum Coal Labour Union & Ors (supra). On perusal of the facts of this case, it appears that corporation employed some workmen as security guards and security supervisors through contractors. However, vide Notification dated 08.12.1976 issued by Government of India u/s.10(1) of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 abolished the contract labour. The concerned workmen employed as per settlement arrived at between the trade union and the management of ONGC u/s.18(1) of the Act. On 20.11.1982, the Respondent corporation passed a resolution by its policy decision to entrust the security work to the CSIF to protect their installations. The said resolution was sanctioned by the President of India on 16.12.1985. Thereafter, the workmen concerned raised an industrial dispute claiming regularization of their services in the respondent corporation. The matter was referred to the Tribunal and taken as ID No.66/1991 and passed Award dated 26.05.1999 directing the Respondent Corporation to regularize the services of concerned workmen. The said Award was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P No.1846 of 2000 and ultimately the Award was confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

24. The facts of the present case on hand are totally different. In the case of M/s. ONGC Ltd Vs. Petroleum Coal Labour Union & Ors (supra), the Respondent engaged the workmen through contractors. But in the present case on hand, the workmen were engaged by the contractor himself for his own work and not for the Respondent establishment.

25. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant submitted a copy of certified standing order for contingent employees of the ONGC. But, this standing orders are applicable to the employees of ONGC. This issue is already decided that the workmen, members of the Petitioner Union were not the employees of the Respondent ONGC.

26. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant submitted a copy of Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and stated that this Act abolished the supply of labour through contractor. But, in the present case on hand, the employees are engaged by the contractor himself for his own work.

27. The Appellant filed the copy of following case laws :-

- (i) M/s.Steel Authority of India Vs. National Union Waterfront Workers & Ors (2001) 7 SCC 1.
- (ii) Umesh T.N & Ors. Vs. State of Karnataka in W.P No.19588 of 2023;
- (iii) Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd Vs. Brajrajnagar Coal Mines Workers' Union (2024) SCC online SC 270;
- (iv) Ranbir Singh Vs. S.K.Roy (2022) SCC online SC 521;
- (v) Air India Statutory Corporation Vs. Union Labour India (1997) 9 SCC 377;
- (vi) Order dated 27.01.2026 of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Civil) No.12192 of 2023 in M/s.Premium Transmission P. Ltd Vs. K.S.Rathod & Others

28. I have perused all the case laws relied on and considered the applicability of these case laws to the facts of the present case on hand. In all these cases cited above employees were engaged by the management itself. But, in the present case on hand, workmen are engaged by the contractor for his own work which was awarded by ONGC to the contractor. Therefore, these case laws are not applicable to the facts of the present case.

AWARD

In view of the above discussion, the claim petition filed by the Petitioner Union is dismissed as devoid of any merit. Ordered accordingly.

The Reference is answered accordingly.

Record be consigned to the record room.

Place : CHENNAI

SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

Date : 28.07.2026

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1824.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़ के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री रापरथी सोमनाइडु के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 72/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 11.08.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं- एल-29012/17/2018-आईआर(एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2026

S.O. 1824.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 72/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services and Sri Raparathi Somunaidu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 11.08.2026.

[No. L-29012/17/2018- IR(M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE LC No. 72/2018

Between:

Sri Raparathi Somunaidu,

S/o Chena Sanyasi,

Porlupalam (V), Pendurthi (M),

Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047 Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/17/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 1JJ0(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Raparathi Somunaidu, S/o Chena Sanyasi, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractors) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Raparathi Somunaidu or Sri Raparathi Somunaidu, S/o Chena Sanyasi, by M/s Aztec Services (contractors) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Raparathi Somunaidu, S/o Chena Sanyasi or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Raparathi Somunaidu, S/o Chena Sanyasi is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 72/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for appearance and filing of claim statement, Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, Petitioner has failed to appear and did not file any claim statement. Hence, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL