

Panaji, 10th September, 2026 (Bhadra 19, 1948)

SERIES II No. 24

OFFICIAL GAZETTE GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note: There is one Extraordinary issue to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 23 dated 3/9/2026, namely, Extraordinary dated 9-9-2026 from pages 1087 to 1432 regarding Notification from State Election Commission, Goa.

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Agriculture

Directorate of Agriculture

Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2025-26/Part(II)/1162

Date : 04-Sep-2026

Read: (1) Order No. 2/9/95-AGR/2025-26/Part(II)/975 dated 1/9/2025.

The approval of the Government is hereby accorded to extend the officiating promotion of following 02 Assistant Director of Agriculture, Group 'A' Gazetted of this Directorate for a further period of one year w.e.f. 01/09/2026 or until the posts are filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier, in public interest.

1. Shri Saieesh Gandhi.
2. Shri Adolfo Rajesh D'Costa.

They shall continue on the same place of posting presently held by them.

This is issued with approval of Government vide entry No. 5688/F dated 25/08/2026.

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

Chandrahas K. Naik Dessai, Director of Agriculture & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Tonca, Caranzalem.

Order

No. 2/9/95-AGR/2026-27/Part(II)/1163

Date : 04-Sep-2026

Read: (1) Order No. 2/9/95-AGR/2025-26/Part(II)/976 dated 1/9/2025.

The approval of the Government is hereby accorded to extend the officiating promotion of following 05 Agriculture Officers, Group 'B' Gazetted of this Directorate for a further period of one year w.e.f. 01/09/2026 or until the posts are filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier, in public interest.

1. Kum. Santoshi B. Sawant Dessai.
2. Shri Deepak G. Gadekar.
3. Shri Sarvanand R. Sarvankar.
4. Kum. Jovita R. Siqueira.

5. Shri Mayuresh A. Bhat.

They shall continue on the same place of posting/additional charge presently held by them.

This is issued with approval of Government vide entry No. 5688/F dated 25/08/2026.

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

Chandrasah K. Naik Dessai, Director of Agriculture & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Tonca, Caranzalem.



Department of Archives

Notification

No. 1/426/Comm. Of Experts/Part File/2024/DA-09

Date : 02-Sep-2026

Read: 1. Order No. 4/1/83/Man 'B'-831 dated 27/08/2024.

2. Addendum No. 4/1/83/2023/Man 'B'-986 dated 27/09/2024.

3. Order No. 4/1/83/2023/Man B-968 dated 03/09/2025.

In addition to the Orders mentioned above, sanction of Government is hereby accorded for extension of the tenure of the Committee of Experts for a period of one year w.e.f. 27/08/2026 to 26/08/2027.

This order is issued with the approval of the Government vide U. O. No. 5809/F dated 26/08/2026.

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

Dr. Balaji S. Shenry, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Archives).

Panaji.



Department of Co-operation

Office of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies

Order

No. 3/9/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/Vol.I/2138

Date : 14-Aug-2026

Read: 1. Order No. 48-8-2001-TS-RCS/III dated 21-04-2017.

2. Order No. 3/9/Urban credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/632 dated 17-06-2021.

3. Letter No. 4-3-00/TS/Vol-I/NZ/280 dated 02/06/2026, received from Co-operative Officer/Unit Incharge, North Zone, Mapusa.

Whereas, vide Order read at Sr. No. 1 above, Adv. Shivaji B. Sinai Bhangui, having office at above Bank of Maharashtra, 2nd floor, SF-8, Goa Housing Board Commercial & Residential Complex, Journalist Colony, Alto-Betim, Porvorim, Goa was appointed as Registrar's Nominee under Section 86(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 (Goa Act No. 36 of 2001) read with Rule 116(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003 and his name is reflecting at Sr. No. 24 of the said Order.

And whereas, vide Order read at Serial No. 2 above, Adv. Shivaji B. Sinai Bhangui, was authorized as dedicated Registrar's Nominee for "Candolim Multipurpose Primary Agricultural Co-op. Society Ltd.," Candolim, Bardez-Goa [Regd. No. RES-(a)-8/NZ/Goa], to directly receive and adjudicate disputes referred by the said society, without routing through this office.

And whereas, said authorization was initially for period of one year w.e.f. 17/06/2021 till 18/06/2022 and was further extended the term upto 16/06/2026.

And whereas, the Co-operative Officer/Unit Incharge, O/o The Asstt. Registrar of Co-operative Societies, North Zone, Mapusa-Goa vide letter dated 02/06/2026 referred at Sr. No. 3 above, has forwarded the request of "Candolim Multipurpose Primary Agricultural Co-op. Society Ltd.," [Regd. No. RES-

(a)-8/NZ/Goa], Candolim, Bardez-Goa for extending the above referred authorization for a further period of one year w.e.f. 17/06/2026.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 123(B) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 read with Rule 116 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, I, the undersigned, Registrar of Co-operative Societies do hereby extend the authorization of Adv. Shivaji B. Sinai Bhangui, having office at Above Bank of Maharashtra, 2nd floor, SF-8, Goa Housing Board Commercial & Residential Complex, Journalist Colony, Alto-Betim, Porvorim, Goa as dedicated Registrar's Nominee for the Candolim Multipurpose Primary Agricultural Co-op. Society Ltd., Candolim, Bardez-Goa [Regd. No. RES-(a)-8/NZ/Goa] for a period of one year with retrospective effect from 17/06/2026 to 16/06/2027.

Further, if a purported dispute is referred by the said society, the above named Registrar's Nominee is authorized to first decide under sub-section (1) of Section 86 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 whether the matter referred by the society involves a dispute and pass appropriate orders under sub-section (1) of Section 86 of the Act.

Further, only upon the Nominee satisfying that there exists a dispute, he shall proceed to adjudicate the same and give Award accordingly. The Nominee shall abide by the terms and conditions on which he was originally appointed as the Registrar's Nominee vide Order read at Sr. No. 1 above.

This order is subject to the following conditions:

1. The Nominee appointed is required to maintain all the case files in terms of Civil Manual issued by the Hon'ble High Court for the guidance of all the subordinate courts keeping in view the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
2. The Nominee shall refrain himself from representing before any other Registrar's Nominee/Board of Nominee as a legal practitioner of a party to the dispute under the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
3. Arbitration fee shall be charged as provided under the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
4. The application regarding reference of dispute shall be accompanied with documentary proof towards payment of fees payable to the Government by way of e-challan and e-receipt as prescribed under the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003 without which proceedings should not be commenced;
5. This order shall remain in force for one year unless extended and its issue can also be withdrawn at anytime without assigning any reasons by the undersigned. Henceforth extension of term of its dedicated Registrar's Nominee, then such proposal shall be submitted to the office of the Asstt. Registrar of Co-operative Societies, North Zone, Mapusa-Goa well in advance before a month of expiry of its term and any deviation on the same shall be summarily rejected.

Given under the seal of this office.

Ashutosh Apte, Registrar of Co-op. Societies & ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Panaji.

Order

No. 23/12/91/TS/RCS/Vol.II/2213

Date : 20-Aug-2026

Read: 1. Order No. 48-8-2001-TS-RCS/III/311 dated 21-04-2017.

2. Circular No. 6-13-81/EST/RCS/Part V dated 06-03-2020.

3. Order No. 23/12/91/TS/RCS/Vol.II/2173 dated 05-09-2023.

4. Order No. 23/12/91/TS/RCS/Vol.II/496 dated 21-05-2024.

5. Letter No. BUCB/CO/924/2024-25 dated 06/02/2024 of Managing Director of the Bicholim Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bicholim, Goa.

6. Order No. 23/12/91/TS/RCS/Vol.II/4503 dated 06-03-2025.

7. Letter No. BUCB/CO/802/2025-26 dated 16/02/2026 of the Managing Director of the Bicholim Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bicholim-Goa.
8. Letter No. 23/12/91/TS/RCS/Vol.II/396 dated 20-04-2026.
9. Letter No. BUCB/ARCS/2025/26/226 dated 01-06-2026.

Whereas, vide Order read at Sr. No. 1 above, Adv. Shivaji B. Sinai Bhangui, having office at above Bank of Maharashtra, 2nd floor, SF-8, Goa Housing Board Commercial & Residential Complex, Journalist Colony, Alto-Betim, Porvorim, Goa was appointed as Registrar's Nominee under Section 86(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 (Goa Act No. 36 of 2001) read with Rule 116(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003 and his name is reflecting at Sr. No. 24 of the said Order.

And whereas, vide Order No. read at Serial No. 3 above, Shivaji B. Sinai Bhangui, was authorized as dedicated Registrar's Nominee for the Bicholim Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Central Office, "Nandanvan", Bicholim-Goa (hereafter referred as "said Bank"), to directly receive and adjudicate disputes referred by the said Bank, without routing through this Department.

And whereas, the said authorization was initially for period of one year which was further extended till 31/03/2026; however, the said Bank vide letter dated 16/02/2026 read at Sr. No. 7 above, has requested this office to extend the said authorization for further period of one year.

And whereas, the Asstt. Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Bicholim Zone, Sankhali-Goa vide letter referred at Sr. No. 9 above, forwarded the additional information which was sought by this office for consideration of request of the said Bank.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 123(B) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 read with Rule 116 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, I, the undersigned Registrar of Co-operative Societies, do hereby authorize Adv. Shivaji B. Sinai Bhangui, having office at above Bank of Maharashtra, 2nd floor, SF-8, Goa Housing Board Commercial & Residential Complex, Journalist Colony, Alto-Betim, Porvorim, Goa as dedicated Registrar's Nominee for the Bicholim Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Central Office, "Nandanvan", Bicholim-Goa, for a period of one year with retrospective effect from 01/04/2026 to 31/03/2027.

Further, if a purported dispute is referred by the said Bank, the above named Registrar's Nominee is authorized to first decide under sub-section (1) of Section 86 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 whether the matter referred by the society involves a dispute and pass appropriate orders under sub-section (1) of Section 86 of the Act.

Only upon the Nominee satisfying that there exists a dispute, he shall proceed to adjudicate the same and give Award accordingly. The Nominee shall abide by the terms and conditions on which he was originally appointed as the Registrar's Nominee vide Order read at Sr. No. 1 above.

This order is subject to the following conditions:

1. The Nominee appointed is required to maintain all the case files in terms of Civil Manual issued by the Hon'ble High Court for the guidance of all the subordinate courts keeping in view the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
2. The Nominee shall refrain himself from representing before any other Registrar's Nominee/Board of Nominee as a legal practitioner/Advocate, to the dispute under the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
3. Arbitration fee shall be charged as provided under the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
4. The application regarding reference of dispute shall be accompanied with documentary proof towards payment of fees payable to the Government by way of e-challan and e-receipt as prescribed under the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003 without which proceedings should not be commenced. In case proceeding is commenced without obtaining a copy of paid challan, then the Registrar's Nominee shall pay such fees to the Government;

5. This order shall remain in force for one year unless extended and it may also be withdrawn at anytime by the undersigned without assigning any reason.

Given under the seal of this office.

Ashutosh Apte, Registrar of Co-op. Societies & ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Panaji.

Order

No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/2214

Date : 20-Aug-2026

- Read: 1. Order No. 48-8-2001-TS-RCS/III/311 dated 21/04/2017.
 2. Circular No. 6-13-81/EST/RCS/Part V dated 06/03/2020.
 3. This Office Order No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/2013 dated 17/09/2020.
 4. This Office Extension Order No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS dated 07/07/2022.
 5. Letter No. ARCS/NZ/PLN/Registrar Nominee/912 dated 05/09/2022.
 6. This Office Extension Order No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS dated 10/10/2022.
 7. Letter No. 4-21-00-TS/Vol.V/NZ/1164 dated 06/09/2023.
 8. This Office Order No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/2338 dated 15/09/2023.
 9. Letter No. SKUCCS/APPOINTMENT/24-25/652 dated 15/10/2024.
 10. Letter No. 4-21-00-TS/Vol.V/NZ/3222 dated 18/12/2024.
 11. This Office Letter No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/4113 dated 13/02/2025.
 12. Letter No. SKUCCS/RS NOMINEE/24-25/912 dated 24/02/2025.
 13. This Office Order No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/443 dated 07/05/2025.
 14. Letter No. 4/21/00/TS/Vol-V/NZ/736 dated 13/08/2025.
 15. This Office Order No. 3/6/Urban Credit/TS-II/NZ/2018/RCS/3626 dated 26/11/2025.
 16. Letter No. 4/21/00/TS/Vol-V/NZ/624 dated 04/08/2026.

Whereas, vide Order read at Sr. No. 1 above, Adv. Shivaji B. S. Bhangui, c/o Adv. P.J. Kamat, above Bank of Maharashtra, 2nd floor, SF-8, Goa Housing Board Comm. & Residential Complex, Journalist Colony, Alto-Betim, Porvorim, Goa-403521 was appointed as Registrar's Nominee under Section 86(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 (Goa Act No. 36 of 2001) (hereafter referred as "Act") read with Rule 116(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003 and his name is reflecting at Sr. No. 24 of the said Order.

And whereas, vide this office Order read at Sr. No. 3 above, Adv. Shivaji B.S. Bhangui was authorized as dedicated Nominee of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies for "Shree Kalika Multipurpose Primary Agriculture Co-operative Society Limited, [RES-(a)-4/NZ/Goa dated 18/01/1991], Kalika Bhavan, Deshmukh Capital, Behind Maruti Temple, Mapusa-Goa" (hereafter referred as "said Society") to entertain all the disputes referred to him in matters of recovery of outstanding loans of the said Society, without routing through this Department.

And whereas, said authorisation was initially for period of one year w.e.f. 17/09/2020 till 16/09/2021 and was further extended from time to time till 16/09/2026.

And whereas, vide letter dated 04/08/2026 read at Sr. No. 16 above, the Asstt. Registrar of Co-operative Societies, North Zone, Mapusa-Goa, has forwarded the request of "Shree Kalika Multipurpose Primary Agriculture Co-operative Society Limited" for extending the above referred authorization for a further period of one year from 17/09/2026.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 123B of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 read with Rule 116 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, I, the undersigned, Registrar of Co-operative Societies do hereby extend the authorization of Adv. Shivaji B.S. Bhangui, c/o Adv. P. J. Kamat, Above Bank of Maharashtra, 2nd floor, SF-8, Goa Housing Board Comm. & Residential

Complex, Journalist Colony, Alto-Betim, Porvorim, Goa, as dedicated RCS Nominee for a period of one year with effect from 17/09/2026 to 16/09/2027 for “Shree Kalika Multipurpose Primary Agriculture Co-operative Society Limited, [RES-(a)-4/NZ/Goa dated 18/01/1991] Kalika Bhavan, Deshmukh Capital, Behind Maruti Temple, Mapusa-Goa”.

Further, when a purported dispute is referred by the said Society, the above named dedicated Nominee is authorized to first decide under sub-section (1) of Section 86 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 whether the matter referred by the Society involves a dispute and pass appropriate Orders under sub-section (1) of Section 86 of the Act. He shall also ensure that the said society encloses the documentary proof towards payment of fees payable under Rule 115 by way of e-challan and e-receipt.

Further, only upon the Nominee satisfying that there exists a dispute, he shall proceed to adjudicate the same and give Award accordingly. The Nominee shall abide by the terms and conditions on which he was originally appointed as Registrar’s Nominee vide Order read at Sr. No. 1 above.

Additionally, this order is subject to the following conditions:

1. The Nominee appointed is required to maintain all the case files in terms of Civil Manual issued by the Hon’ble High Court for the guidance of all the subordinate courts keeping in view the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
2. The Nominee shall refrain himself from representing before any other Registrar’s Nominee/Board of Nominee as a legal practitioner of a party to the dispute under the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
3. Arbitration fee shall be charged as provided under the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and Rules, 2003;
4. The application regarding reference of dispute shall be accompanied with documentary proof towards payment of fees payable to the Government by way of e-challan and e-receipt as prescribed under the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003 without which proceedings should not be commenced. In case the proceedings is commenced without payment of Government fees, then Registrar’s Nominee shall be liable to pay such fees to the Government;
5. This order shall remain in force for one year unless extended and its issue can also be withdrawn at anytime without assigning any reasons by the undersigned;
6. The society shall upload its statements of accounts, loan statements and return on the departmental portal within fifteen days which are pending for uploading.

Given under the seal of this office.

Ashutosh Apte, Registrar of Co-op. Societies & ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Panaji.

Order

No. 1/28/Marketing Fed/2026-27/Wing-I/HQ/RCS/2382

Date : 01-Sep-2026

Read: 1) Letter No. EST/CORS-RCS/2026-27/242 dated 25/06/2026 of the Managing Director of the Goa State Co-operative Marketing and Supply Federation Ltd., Panaji-Goa.

2) Letter No. ARCS/CZ/GSCMSFL/GEN/2026/519 dated 07/07/2026.

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 67A of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and with the approval of the Government, I, the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Government of Goa hereby fix the honorarium payable to the Committee of Administrator of the Goa State Co-operative Marketing and Supply Federation Ltd., Post Box No. 294, Sahakar Bhavan, near Municipal Market, Panaji-Goa:

1. Chairman of Committee of Administrator – Rs. 20,000/- per month.
2. Members of Committee of Administrator – Rs. 15,000/- per month.

The above prescribed honorarium shall be drawn from the funds of the aforesaid Federation.

Given under the seal of this office.

Ashutosh Apte, Registrar of Co-operative Societies & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Co-operation).

Panaji.

Notification

No. 3/3/Urban Credit/TS-II/PZ/2017/RCS/Suppl/2192

Date : 20-Aug-2026

Read: 1. Notification No. 3/3/Urban Credit/TS-II/PZ/2017/RCS/Suppl/5306 dated 10-02-2020.

2. Letter No. VPK/HO/June-26/9265 dated 28/03/2026 received from the Chairman of VPK Urban Multipurpose Co-operative Society Ltd., Head Office, Mardol-Goa regarding appointment of additional Sales-cum-Recovery Officers for Execution of Orders Decrees.

Whereas, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 91D(1) of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 (Goa Act 36 of 2001), read with Rule 124 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, the Registrar of Co-operative Societies is empowered to appoint officers of Co-operative Credit Societies, Village Agricultural Credit Societies having credit counters and Multipurpose Co-operative Societies as Recovery Officers and Sale Officers upon receipt of individual proposals, subject to such terms and conditions as may be specified;

And whereas, pursuant to the aforesaid Notification and on the request of the Chairman of VPK Urban Multipurpose Co-operative Society Ltd., Head Office, Mardol-Goa, the Managing Director, General Manager and Deputy General Manager of the said Society were appointed as Recovery Officers vide Order dated 04/04/2025, which authorization was subsequently extended vide Order dated 09/06/2026;

And whereas, with a view to ensuring expeditious execution of awards, decisions, recovery certificates and decrees and reducing the pendency of recovery proceedings, the Chairman of the said Society, vide the letter referred to at Sr. No. 2 above, has requested this Office to appoint Shri Nilesh Mardolkar, Senior Manager, as an additional Sale-cum-Recovery Officer;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Sections 91D and 123B of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, read with Rule 124 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, I, Ashutosh R. Apte, Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Goa, hereby appoint Shri Nilesh Mardolkar, Senior Manager, VPK Urban Multipurpose Co-operative Society Ltd., Mardol-Goa, as an additional Sale-cum-Recovery Officer for execution of awards, decisions, recovery certificates and decrees passed by the Arbitrator or the Registrar's Nominee under the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, and for recovery of dues by attachment and sale of movable and immovable properties in accordance with the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, for a period of one year with effect from 01/08/2026 to 31/07/2027, subject to the following conditions:

1. The officer so authorized shall strictly comply with the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, the Goa Co-operative Societies Rules, 2003, the Bye-laws of the Society and all other applicable laws while conducting execution and recovery proceedings.
2. A detailed statement of account showing the calculation of the outstanding dues, together with all recoverable charges, shall accompany the first recovery notice issued to the borrower/member.
3. The authorized officer shall maintain the highest standards of professional conduct. The use of abusive language, intimidation, coercion or any form of inhumane treatment during recovery proceedings is strictly prohibited.
4. The authorized officer shall maintain strict confidentiality and safeguard all financial and personal information of borrowers obtained during the course of recovery proceedings.
5. No recovery proceedings shall ordinarily be initiated against a surety unless all reasonable efforts to recover the outstanding dues from the principal borrower have first been exhausted, except where otherwise permissible under law. Any violation of this condition shall render this authorization liable to withdrawal.

6. The Board of Directors and the Chief Executive Officer of the Society shall be jointly responsible for ensuring that all execution and recovery proceedings are conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Act, the Rules, the Bye-laws and the conditions stipulated herein.
7. The Board of Directors shall review the performance and functioning of the authorized Sale-cum-Recovery Officer every month and ensure strict compliance with the provisions governing execution and recovery proceedings.
8. The Society shall pay the prescribed execution fees to the Government in the manner prescribed under the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, the Rules made thereunder and the instructions issued by the Government from time to time.

The Registrar of Co-operative Societies reserves the right to withdraw, modify or cancel this authorization at any time, subject to the provisions of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001 and the Rules made thereunder.

Given under the seal of this office.

Ashutosh R. Apte, Registrar of Co-op. Societies & ex officio Addl. Secretary (Co-operation).

Panaji.



Office of the Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies, South Zone

Notification

No. 5-2151-2026/ARSZ/HSG

Date : 16-Apr-2026

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, “The Rich Nest Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Sernabatim, Salcete, Goa is registered under code symbol No. RCSSZ2026270200.

Arvind G. Naik, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

“The Rich Nest Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society Limited”, Sernabatim, Salcete, Goa has been registered on 16-04-2026 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2026270200 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7(d)-Co-operative Housing Maintenance Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

Arvind G. Naik, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

Notification

No. 5-2164-2026/ARSZ/HSG

Date : 04-Jun-2026

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, The Tridentia Panache Co-operative Housing Society Limited, Near Chinmaya Krishna Ashram, Chinmaya Mission Road, Gogol, Margao, Salcete-Goa is registered under code symbol No. RCSSZ2026270215.

Arvind Gurudas Naik, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

The Tridentia Panache Co-operative Housing Society Limited, Near Chinmaya Krishna Ashram, Chinmaya Mission Road, Gogol, Margao, Salcete-Goa has been registered on 04-06-2026 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSSZ2026270215 and its classified as Co-operative Housing Society under sub-classification No. 7-(b)-Co-partnership Housing Society in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

Arvind Gurudas Naik, Asst. Registrar of Co-op. Societies, South Zone.

Margao.

Department of Education

Directorate of Technical Education, Polytechnic Section

Order

No. 25/4/67/08/DTE/1373

Date : 10-Aug-2026

Approval of the Government is hereby conveyed for transfer of Shri Ashish Kamlakar Surlakar, Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering, Government Polytechnic, Bicholim on the vacant post of Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering at Government Polytechnic, Panaji, until further orders.

Shri Ashish Kamlakar Surlakar, shall join the above vacant post at Government Polytechnic, Panaji, after his relieving from Government Polytechnic, Bicholim.

He is transferred at his own request and shall not be entitled for transfer TA and joining time. A copy of relieving order and joining report be submitted for records to this office.

Bhushan K. Savaikar, Director of Technical Education.

Porvorim.

**Department of Home**

Home-General Division

Order

No. 19/2/2025-HD(G)/2432

Date : 04-Sep-2026

In compliance with the instructions issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs, IS-II Division, Government of India vide Order No. 1-12023/02/2017-NCB-II(Vol-1) dated 25/03/2022 and in line with the Model Structure for Anti-Narcotics Task Force prepared by the Narcotics Control Bureau, New Delhi, the Government of Goa is pleased to reconstitute the “Anti-Narcotics Task Force” (ANTF) to improve coordination among various stakeholders in policy matters and to strengthen mechanism to tackle drug trafficking and prevention of illegal drug trade in State.

The composition of Anti-Narcotics Task Force is as follows:

S. No.	Designation	ANTF HQ
1.	Deputy Inspector General of Police	01
2.	Superintendent of Police	01
3.	Deputy Superintendent of Police	05
4.	Police Inspector	03
5.	Police Sub Inspector	06
6.	Head Constable	06
7.	Police Constable	24
8.	Public Prosecutor	01
9.	Deputy Director	01
10.	Office Superintendent	02
11.	Head Clerk	02
12.	Upper Division Clerk	02
13.	Lower Division Clerk	02
14.	MTS	01
	Total	57

Specialist Posts for ANTF

S. No.	Post	Head Office
1.	Cyber Expert/Investigators	02
2.	Forensic Accountants	01
3.	Sr. Data Analyst	01
4.	Data Analyst	02
	Total	06

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

Manthan Manoj Naik, Under Secretary (Home-I).

Porvorim.



Department of Labour

Notification

No. 28/02/2026-LAB/Part-IV/396

Date : 27-Aug-2026

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 07/08/2026 in Case No. IT/14/2018 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

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

Manesh Hari Kedar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim.

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

(Before Mrs. Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Case No. IT/14/2018

Workmen, Rep. by General Secretary,
Cadila Healthcare Employees Union,
Kundaim, Ponda-Goa

... Workmen/Party I

V/s

M/s. Cadila Healthcare Ltd.,
Ploty No. 203 to 213,
Kundaim Industrial Estate,
Kundaim-Goa

... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I represented by Shri Subhash Naik Jorge.

Employer/Party II represented by Learned Advocate Shri M. S. Bandodkar.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 7th day of the month of August of the year, 2026)

By Order dated 27th September, 2018 bearing No. 28/22/2018-LAB/656, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act of 14 of 1947), has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

“(1) Whether the demand raised by the Cadila Healthcare Employees Union for payment of difference of arrears of bonus as per the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Act, 2015 (Central Act 6 of 2116) to all the employees for the accounting year 2016-2017 is legal and justified?

(2) If so, what relief the workmen are entitled?”.

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/14/2018 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Pursuant to service of notice, Party I filed their Claim Statement at Exhibit 6.

3. In the Claim Statement the Party I stated that M/s Cadila Healthcare Limited is a pharmaceutical Company which has Factories located at Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa and is manufacturing pharmaceutical products. Party I is an union recognized by Party II and it represents the grievances of its members before Party II and also signs wage settlements on behalf of its members with Party No II. It improves wages and service conditions of its members from time to time.

4. The Party I states that the Party II pays 20% bonus to workers every year. Even the workers who are outside the purview of Payment of Bonus Act are paid 20% bonus as per Payment of Bonus Act and as per the settlement that Party I and Party II have signed to that effect. The first settlement signed for the period 1993 to 1996 pertaining to bonus as per clause 5 states *"In view of the understanding reached, the management offered and the Union and the workmen accept that for the accounting year 93-94, 94-95, 95-96, payment of bonus/ex gratia will be @ 20% of the eligible salary, calculated as per the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 and it is agreed that the Union and the workmen shall not raise any dispute/demand in this regard during the operative period of the Settlement"*. All the subsequent settlements signed a clause that the existing practice for payment of bonus shall continue. Clause No 15 of the Settlement dated 03/10/2016 signed between Party I and Party II states *"15. Bonus- It is agreed between the parties that the bonus shall be paid as per the Payment of Bonus Act. Employees who are out of purview of the Payment of Bonus Act shall be paid ex gratia as per the existing practice"*.

5. The Party I states that maximum amount of 20% bonus due to the workmen prior to the amendment in Payment of Bonus Act was Rs. 8,400/- per annum prior to 2014-2015. As such, prior to 2014-15, all workmen were paid 20% bonus/ex-gratia of Rs. 8,400/- every year. After 2014-15, Payment of Bonus Act was amended in the year, 2015. As per the said amendment, applicability for payment of bonus was raised to Rs. 21,000/- and for calculations, the wage ceiling was raised to Rs. 7,000/- or the minimum wages for the scheduled employment as fixed by the appropriate Government whichever is higher, Rs. 466.80/- per day or Rs. 12,136.80 per month. As per calculations on the basis of Rs. 7,000/-, the 20% bonus/ex gratia works out to Rs. 16,800/- and on the basis of Rs. 12,136.80, it works out to Rs. 29,128.32. The Party I states that the Party II says that the bonus due to the Party I/Workmen is Rs. 16,800/- which it has paid for the year 2016-17 whereas the Party I states that bonus due to them is Rs. 29,128.32. Hence, they are claiming the difference of the amount paid less to them between Rs. 16,800/- and Rs. 29,128.32.

6. The Party I states that for the financial year 2016-17, the minimum wages fixed for highly skilled workers by the Goa Government was Rs.466.80 per day or Rs. 12,136.80 per month. All the workers in Party II Company are highly skilled workers having worked in the Company for the last several years. As such, as per the Payment of Bonus Act and as per the Settlements signed between the Parties, Party I/Workmen are entitled for payment of bonus/ex gratia of Rs. 29,128.32.

7. It is stated that however, Party No. I calculated the payment of bonus/ex gratia for the financial year 2016-17 taking into account the wage ceiling of Rs. 7,000. As per this wage ceiling, Party II calculated bonus/ex gratia of Rs. 16,800 and paid this amount for the financial year 2016-17.

8. Aggrieved by the decision of Party II to pay less bonus/ex gratia to the Party I/Workmen for the financial year 2016-17, the Party I addressed a letter dated 09/10/2017 to the Party II demanding payment of bonus/ex gratia paid less to them. As Party II did not pay the difference of bonus due to them, the Party I addressed a letter dated 15/02/2018 to the Asst Labour Commissioner/Conciliation Officer complaining that the bonus as per the amendment was not paid to them for the financial year 2016-17. The Party I states that as there was no settlement before the Asst Labour Commissioner, the present dispute came to be referred to this Tribunal. Hence, the Party I is entitled to the difference of bonus paid less to them for the financial year, 2016-2017.

9. In the Written Statement filed by the Party II at Exhibit 7 it is submitted that the Party I have demanded the bonus more than @ 20% of wages and therefore it is illegal and unjustified and ought to be rejected. No bonus can be paid to anybody who is out of the purview of Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 whereas in this case the Party I is asking the demand to the employees who are outside the purview of the Act which is not permissible under the law.

10. The Party II submits that the demand of the Union for payment of difference of arrears as per Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Act to all the employees for accounting year 2016-17 is absolutely not legal and justified and the amendment made by the Government of India being Amendment (Central Act 6 of 2016) is applicable only to the employees who are getting minimum wages and not for employees who are out of purview of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965. The present demand of the Union is for employees who are out of purview of Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 i.e whose Basic plus DA is more than Rs. 21,000/- per month and on that ground alone the demand ought to be rejected.

11. The Party II submits that it is following all the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 including the recent amendment made in Payment of Bonus Act in 2015 i.e Amendment (Central Act 6 of 2016). The Company submits that the provisions of Amendment are not applicable to the employees who are not covered under the Payment of Bonus Act, specifically those employees who are drawing Basic, DA, VDA more than Rs.21,000/- per month and these employees being out of purview of the Act, they could get only ex-gratia as per the desire of the Management or otherwise agreed by the Management specifically. The Management has not agreed to pay bonus to non-eligible employees and this demand in the reference is a fresh demand beyond the purview of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965.

12. The Party II submits that the calculation as made and paid by the Company to all the eligible employees is correct and the interpretation sought for by the Union demanding the alleged difference of bonus is absolutely false and baseless and they are not entitled for the said bonus. The Party II submits that it has paid bonus to the employees as per Settlement dated 03/10/2016 to the eligible employees and non-eligible employees and ex gratia as per existing practice. The Company submits that the persons who are outside the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 cannot demand bonus under the provisions of the Act and present ex-gratia is paid to them as per existing practice.

13. The Party II submits that the Party I has made out no case and no case exists for granting any money, ex-gratia or bonus to Party I/Workmen and it is bad in law, not maintainable, illegal, unjustified and ought to be rejected.

14. Based on the Claim Statement filed by Party I and the Written Statement filed by the Party II, the following Issues were framed on 16/03/2021 at Exhibit 8 by this Tribunal which reads as under:

ISSUES

1. *Whether the demand raised by the Party I for payment of difference of arrears of bonus as per the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Act, 2015 (Central Act 6 of 2016), to all the employees for the accounting year 2016-2017 is legal and justified?*
2. *What Relief? What Award?*

15. From the issues framed hereinabove, both the Parties to the proceeding did not lead any evidence in respect of the issues more particularly the Party I on whom the burden of proof to prove the said Issue was. However, heard arguments advanced by Ld. Advocate Shri P. Bandodkar on behalf of Party II. My findings to the same with reasons are as follows:

Issue No. 1 : In the Negative

Issue No. 2 : As per Final Order

REASONS

16. *Issue No. 1:* Though the Party I in this present reference has claimed for the difference of arrears for the accounting year 2016-2017 to be paid to them as according to them they are entitled for the same on account of the amendment in Payment of Bonus Act and in view of the Settlement signed between Party I and Party II from time to time. On the basis of the facts pleaded in the Claim Statement, Party I claimed that both their demands are legal and justified. The above claim of Party I has been out-rightly rejected by

the Party II more particularly for the facts and reasons pleaded in their Written Statement opposing the claim of Party I.

17. That based on the pleadings in the Claim statement and the Written Statement, this Tribunal was pleased to frame the issue putting the burden to prove on the Party I/Workmen. The Party I was given ample opportunities to step in the witness box to prove their case of their entitlement for difference in bonus, however, no evidence of whatsoever has been led by Party I in support of their case set up in the Claim Statement. The Party II also has not led any evidence in their defence.

18. That since it is the Party I at whose behest this reference was sent for adjudication and as per the Issue framed by this Tribunal it was the Party I who ought to have led necessary evidence for grant of the relief as prayed in the Claim Statement. The burden to prove the only issue was also on the Party I. The Party I having not discharged their burden by leading any evidence on record, therefore for want of evidence the Issue stands answered in the negative.

Hence the following Order:

ORDER

- i. The reference stands dismissed.
- ii. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-, (Vijayalaxmi R. Shivolkar), Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court.
Panaji.

Notification

No. 28/02/2025-LAB/Part-VI/401

Date : 27-Aug-2026

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 07/08/2026 in Case No. IT/05/2016 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

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

Manesh Hari Kedar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim.

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

(Before Mrs. Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Case No. IT/05/2016.

Workmen, Rep. by General Secretary,
Cadila Healthcare Employees Union,
Kundaim, Ponda-Goa

V/s

M/s. Cadila Healthcare Ltd.,
Ploty No. 203 to 213,
Kundaim Industrial Estate,
Kundaim-Goa

... Workmen/Party I

... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I represented by Shri Subhash Naik Jorge.

Employer/Party II represented by Learned Advocate Shri. M. S. Bandodkar.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 7th day of the month of August of the year, 2026)

By Order dated 05/11/2015 bearing No. 28/50/2015-LAB/988, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act of 14 of 1947), has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

- “(1) *Whether the Management of M/s Cadila Healthcare Limited, Plot No. 203 to 213, Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa in deducting seven days wages for the wage period June, 2013 of all 163 workmen, who were on the roll of the management as on 30/06/2013 is legal and justified?*
- (2) *If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?”.*

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/05/2016 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Pursuant to service of notice, Party I filed their Claim Statement at Exhibit 7.

3. In the Claim Statement the Party I stated that M/s Cadila Healthcare Limited is a pharmaceutical Company which has Factories located at Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa and is manufacturing pharmaceutical products. Party I is an union recognized by Party II and it represents the grievances of its members before Party II and also signs wage settlements on behalf of its members with Party No II. It improves wages and service conditions of its members from time to time.

4. The Party I states that for the month of June, 2013 all its members numbering 163 were paid 7 days salary less than what was due to them despite they having worked for the whole month.

5. The Party I states that aggrieved by the decision of Party II they having paid 7 days' salary less than what was due to them despite they having worked for the whole month to all its members numbering 163, the Party I/Union addressed letter dated 23/07/2014 to Party II requesting them to look into the matter and pay the said amount for 7 working days which was paid less for that month.

6. The Party I states that the Party II however did not pay the difference of wages i.e. payment for 7 days which was paid less to them, as such the Party I addressed a letter dated 01/09/2014 to the Asst. Labour Commissioner/Conciliation Officer complaining that the wages for 7 days were not paid despite working for the whole month.

7. The Party I states that as there was no settlement before the Asst. Labour Commissioner, the present dispute came to be referred to this Tribunal. Hence, the Party I is entitled for the payment of wages of 7 days for the period June, 2013 to all the 163 workmen concerned in the present reference.

8. In the Written Statement filed by the Party II at Exhibit 7 it is submitted that the workers concerned in the present reference after joining the Party I/Union i.e. the Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh, at the instigation of Party I refused to report for overtime w.e.f. 30th March, 2013, thereby substantially disrupting the production process in terms of the earlier Settlement between the Parties in the matter of optimising manpower and cooperation of maximum production. The Party I thereafter from 16/04/2013 onwards did not allow the workers of the 2nd Shift to report for work thereby affecting the production activities and causing loss to the production.

9. Thereafter, on 19/04/2016 at around 11.45 a.m. the workmen who are the members of Party I abruptly stopped the work thereby causing immense loss to production work. The workmen concerned again continued to stop the work in 3rd Shift on 23/04/2013 from 1st Shift onwards and thereafter all the workmen illegally resorted to strike on 14/04/2013 and 20/04/2013.

10. The Party II submitted that during the entire period from April to 5th July, 2013 the workmen not only committed illegal and unjustified strike but also committed many violent activities. Therefore, the Party II invoked clause 15B of the Certified Standing Orders and deducted 7 days' wages in the month of July, 2013 apart from not paying salary for the days on the principle of 'no work, no pay'. The Party II therefore denied that the deduction of 7 days' wages was illegal and unjustified and prayed that the reference be rejected accordingly.

11. Based on the Claim Statement filled by Party I and the Written Statement filed by the Party II, the following Issues were framed on 30/03/2017 at Exhibit 11 by this Tribunal which reads as under:

ISSUES

1. Whether the Party I proves that the deduction of seven days wages for the wage period June, 2013 of all 163 workmen who were on the roll of the Management as on 30/06/2013 is illegal and justified?
2. Whether the Party I proves that the deductions were made in violation of Certified Standing Orders?
3. Whether the Party II proves that the management in deducting 7 days wages for the continuous strike without notice is legal and justified?
4. What Relief? What Award?

16. From the issues framed hereinabove, the Party I in support of their case partly examined Shri Prashant Gaude, however, no evidence came to be recorded on behalf of Party II in respect of these issues and my findings to the same with reasons are as follows:

Issue No. 1 & 2 : In the Negative

Issue No. 3 : In the affirmative

Issue No. 4 : As per Final Order

REASONS

17. *Issue No. 1 & 2:* Though the Party in this present reference has claimed for 7 days wages for the period June, 2013 for all 163 workmen who were on the Roll of the Management as on 30/06/2013 as according to them the wages for 7 days has been denied illegally and by violating the principles of natural justice. The above claim of Party I has been out-rightly rejected by the Party II more particularly for the facts and reasons pleaded in their Written Statement opposing the claim of Party I.

18. That based on the pleadings on the Claim statement and the Written Statement, this Tribunal was pleased to frame the issue putting the burden to prove on the Party I/Workmen. The Party I examined their witness Shri Prashant Gaude who filed his Affidavit-in-Evidence at Exhibit 13 and also placed on record documents from Exhibit 14 to Exhibit 21. The said witness Shri Prashant Gaude offered himself to be cross-examined by the adverse Party i.e. the Party II/Employer partly. The further cross-examination of the witness Shri Prashant Gaude was closed pursuant to his continuous absence as per the Rojnama records.

19. On behalf of Party II, the Management examined Shri Rajesh Nandekar. He filed his Affidavit-in-Evidence at Exhibit 28 asserting the defence taken by the Management and in support produced on record documents from Exhibit 29 to Exhibit 67 Colly. As per the Rojnama entry, the Party I closed their evidence without cross-examining the witness Shri Rajesh Nandekar of Party II. Subsequently, even Party II closed their evidence.

20. That, since it is the Party I at whose behest this reference was sent for adjudication and as per the Issues framed by this Tribunal it was the Party I who ought to have taken pain to keep their witness present for the purpose of cross-examination. However, the evidence of Party I was closed for non-appearance of the witness who was under cross-examination by the Party II. Secondly, when Party II examined their witness Shri Rajesh Nandekar and reiterated and reproduced through their Affidavit in Evidence all their defence duly supported by documentary evidence, it was the duty of Party I to cross-examine Shri Rajesh Nandekar to discard the evidence led by Party II through this witness, however, the Party I again failed to cross-examine the witness of Party II Shri Rajesh Nandekar.

21. Thus, the testimony of Shri Rajesh Nandekar remained unshaken nor the same was discarded by Party I thereby the Party II succeeded in his defence as regards the Party I not entitled for any relief as prayed for in the Claim Statement. In fact, the burden to prove the only issue was also on the Party I. The Party I having not discharged their burden and has led only incomplete evidence, therefore for want of sufficient material evidence on record and the Party I having failed to keep his witness present for the purpose of cross-examination by the Party II, therefore has failed to prove the Issue No. 1 and 2 of which the burden to prove the same was on the Party I. Hence, both these issues stands answered in the negative.

22. *Issue No. 3:* The Party II through their witness Shri Rajesh Nandekar substantially by way of oral as well as documentary evidence could prove their defence of their right to deduct 7 days wages on account

of Party I resorting to illegal and unjustified strike in June, 2013, claiming that such deduction was fully legal and justified. The evidence brought on record by Party II through their witness Shri Rajesh Nandekar remained unchallenged, thus the Party II succeeded in proving their defence to the extent that the action of the Management in deducting 7 days wages for the continuous strike without notice being legal and justified. Hence, the Issue No. 3 stands answered in favour of the Management in the affirmative.

Hence the following Order:

ORDER

- i. The reference stands dismissed.
- ii. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-, (Vijayalaxmi R. Shivolkar), Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court.
Panaji.

Notification

No. 28/03/2026-LAB/Part-IV/406

Date : 31-Aug-2026

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 30/07/2026 in Case No. LC-II/IT/06/2020 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

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

Manesh Hari Kedar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim.

THE LABOUR COURT-II GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI

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

Case No. Ref. LC-II/IT/06/2020.

Shri Jitesh Gaonkar,
Rep. by United Balrath Employees Union,
Panaji-Goa.

..... Workman/Party-I

V/s

The Management,
M/s. Panchasheel English School,
Panchwadi, Ponda-Goa.

..... Employer/Party-II

Party-I/Workman represented by Ld. Adv. Shri T. D'costa.

Party-II/Employer represented by Ld. Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat.

Panaji, dated: 30/07/2026.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa, by Order dated 08/09/2020, bearing No. 28/16/2020-LAB/946 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Labour Court-II of Goa, Panaji-Goa.

“(1) *Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Panchasheel English School, Panchawadi, Ponda, Goa, in terminating the services of Shri. Jitesh Gaonkar, driver, with effect from 13/12/2018, is legal and justified?*

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

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/IT/06/2020 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Parties put in their appearance. The Workman/Party-I (for short 'Workman'), filed his Statement of Claim on 06/04/2021 at Exb-4. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workman are that he was employed by the Employer /Party II (for short, 'Employer') as 'Bus Driver' under the Bal-Rath Scheme (To provide School Buses to the aided schools), instituted by the Directorate of Education, Government of Goa. He stated that the appointment of the Drivers/Attendants is directly done by the concerned Educational Institution. He stated that though he was appointed as a Bus Driver by the Employer, no letter of appointment was given to him. He stated that after six years of dedicated service, he received a show cause notice Ref. No.PES/2018-19/1022 on the grounds that:

- (1) "he is misbehaving with the School Head",
- (2) "the students are facing difficulties in attending programmes organized by other schools, educational organizations and also school field trips", and
- (3) "because of his non-cooperation the students prepared for the programme and settled in the bus were made to get down".

3. He stated that at no point of time before the said show cause notice dt. 23/06/2018, the Employer had issued/given any "NOTE" and/or "MEMO" informing him of the offences/misconducts alleged in the said show cause notice. He stated that the Employer has not informed him when and where he misbehaved with the school head. He stated that the Employer has also not informed him that due to any such misbehavior with the School Head, the School along with the students are facing difficulties in attending programmes organized by other schools, educational organizations and also school field trips. He stated that again, the Employer has not informed him when and where he did not co-operate and due to this the students prepared for the programme and settled in the bus were made to get down. He stated that the alleged misconducts mentioned in the said show cause notice are pure fabrications and totally false made with the view to victimize him in order to have grounds to employ another Bus Driver in his place. He stated that after he received the show cause notice, he met Shri Gurudas Palkar who is in-charge of the Employer School and explained to him that the said show cause notice was not factually correct. He stated that thereafter he was informed that the said show cause notice would be accordingly withdrawn and cancelled. He stated that on 10/12/2018, the Employer instructed him to take the School Bus for inspection at RTO Office on 11/12/2018. He stated that he informed the Employer that he could not drive the bus to the RTO Office as the fitness certificate of the bus had expired. He stated that the Employer informed him that they would take the documents to the RTO Office and request the RTO Authorities to send an Official to inspect the bus in the school premises.

4. He stated that on 12/12/2018 the Employer served upon him a letter of termination Ref. No. PES/2018-19/1124 and stated therein "We got plenty of misconduct complaint against you". He stated that the Employer did not specify what are the "plenty of Misconduct Complaint" and who has made them and the alleged misconducts done by him. He stated that the Employer had also not paid his due salary along with the Letter of Termination. He stated that that he was never given any opportunity to explain and/or reply to the "plenty of Misconduct Complaint" stated in Letter of Termination. He stated that no inquiry was held by the Employer to find out the veracity of the alleged complaints. He stated that he is sought to be victimized and harshly punished with the extreme punishment of termination in a high handed and arbitrary manner by the Employer, giving a go by to the Principles of Natural Justice. He stated that he had given the complaint to the Commissioner of Labour and Employment at Panaji with respect to the unjustified termination of services by the Employer. He stated that he learnt for the first time of the Letter dt.08/10/2018 Ref. No.: PES/2018-19/1090. He stated that the Employer had never informed him to take the students to the Ponda Sports Complex for the kho-kho competition as stated in the said Letter dt.08/10/2018 and the same is a pure fabrication and false which is mischievously made by the Employer, with the malafide intention to have a ground to justify his termination.

5. He stated that he denied that he stopped the school bus at the Borim-Ponda circle on 01/01/2019. He stated that the said bus had halted due to the traffic and he was passing by and noticed the in-charge of the Employer in the bus. He stated that he inquired with the in-charge as to why the Employer had not paid

him his due salary. He stated that the Employer thereafter gave a false complaint to the Ponda Police Station stating that he stopped the school bus and detained the vehicle for almost one hour and created nuisance in the public place. He stated that he informed the Police that he had not stopped and detained the school bus but had only inquired with the in-charge of the Employer who was in the bus, when his due salary would be paid. He stated that the in-charge of the Employer School told him that he was nobody and did not have any right to enquire with the in-charge of the Employer about the payment of the due salary. He stated that the Police were satisfied with his explanation and informed the in-charge of the Employer to pay his due salary. He stated that the Employer thereafter on 02/01/2019 paid his due salary amount in the bank account. He stated that the letter of termination is malafide and deliberately made to victimize him and the same deserves to be set aside in the interest of justice. The Workman therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court be declared that the letter of termination dt. 12/12/2018 Ref. No. PES/2018-19/1124 be quashed and set aside and he be reinstated in service with full back wages.

6. The Employer controverted the claim of the workman by filing its written statement on 23/04/2021 at exb.5. The Employer, as and by way of his reply, submitted that the reference is not maintainable as the Employer school is not an industry as defined under Section 2(j) of the said Act., that the appointment of the Workman was a contractual appointment for specific period of 10 months and could be terminated within in contractual period, that the Workman was not employed in terms of relevant rules or procedure and that there is no sanctioned post of a driver in the Employer School.

7. Without prejudice to the above, the Employer stated that it is an English School recognized by the Govt. of Goa (Dept. of Education) and Goa Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education. The Employer stated that it is an aided school and is in receipt of grant in aid from the Govt. of Goa under Chapter VI of the Goa, Daman and Diu School Education Act 1984 and Rules there under. The Employer stated that being in receipt of the Grant in Aid from the Govt. of Goa, it has to follow the various directions issued by the Department of Education from time to time for recruitment of an employee. The Employer stated that under the provisions of the Act of 1984, the recruitment of employees in the recognized private school, aided or unaided, shall be made on the recommendation of the selection Committee. The Employer stated that in respect of the recruitment of non-teaching staff, the selection committee shall consisting of the Chairman of the Managing Committee or member of managing committee to be nominated by the Chairman, Head of institution and the Dy. Education officer of the area or his nominee. The Employer stated that all such appointments in the school are subject to the approval of the Director of Education. The Employer stated that there is no sanctioned post of the Driver to them. The Employer stated that in the year 2011, the Director of Education, Govt. of Goa introduced the Bal-Rath Scheme whereby all the schools have been provided with Bal-Rath Buses for commutation of the students from their residences to the school and vice versa. The Employer stated that such services were provided for 10 months from June to March in the academic year.

8. The Employer admitted that the Workman was engaged by them as a driver w.e.f. 18.07.2012 BN on the Balrath bus provided to the school by the Govt. of Goa. The Employer stated that such appointment is a contractual appointment for a specific period of 10 months w.e.f. June to March of the following year i.e. Academic year of the school. The Employer stated that such appointment comes to an end by efflux of time i.e. in March of the following year. The Employer stated that its school timings is from 08.00 AM to 4.30 PM from Monday to Saturday. The Employer stated that as the school starts at 8 AM, the students who are studying in the school and are from far distant places, have to be brought to the school at least fifteen minutes before the schedule time of the school. The Employer stated that for the above purpose, he has to arrive at 07.00 AM to the school and drive the Bal-Rath to different locations to collect the students from their residences.

9. The Employer stated that the introduction of the Scheme of Bal-Rath is to look after the safety of the students who are studying in the school and who come to the school from far distance places where the public transport is very rare. The Employer stated that after the students are brought to the school, it is the duty of the driver to look after the bus, its maintenance, cleanliness etc. with the help of his cleaner during the period the bus is in the school premises. The Employer stated that the driver of the bus has also to take the bus for inspection of the vehicle by the RTO as and when necessary. The Employer stated that initially he was performing, all the said duties diligently and honestly with the help of its cleaner. The Employer stated that thereafter he started misbehaving with the school management, non-cooperation etc. The Employer stated that he was orally warned on many occasions in the past for such acts. The Employer

stated that on 23/06/2018 a show cause notice was issued to the Workman for misbehaving with the school head, non-co-operation with the management whereby the students who were to attend programmes have to get down from the bus. He stated that the Workman did not file any explanation to the said show cause notice. The Employer stated that on 08/10/2018 a complaint was made by Mr. Gurudas Palkar, In-charge of the Employer School, that the Workman was instructed to take students to Ponda Sports Complex for Kho Kho Competition. He stated that the Workman refused the order of his superior. The Employer stated that on 10/12/2018 Mr. Gurudas Palkar, In-charge of the Employer School had issued a written note to the Workman instructing him to take the Balrath bus for inspection at RTO office Ponda. On 11/12/2018 Mr. Palkar also instructed the Workman in the said note that the Workman should be at RTO Office on time with all the required documents for inspection. The Employer stated that in spite of the said written note, the Workman did not attend the RTO with the bus for inspection on 11/12/2018. The Employer stated that on account of non-cooperation by the driver, the Employer had no alternative then to terminate the services of the Workman for the misconducts of "Disobedience of the Orders of the Superior". The Employer stated that the Workman was appointed as a driver of the Balrath, which is meant for transportation of the students from various parts of the area to its School. The Employer stated that safety of the students primarily is with the driver who drives the bus and collects the students from various places and ultimately lies with its management who has engaged the driver. The Employer stated that its management to all and every right to take decision to protect the interest of the school and the safety of the students, whose custody is with the driver during the period the students are in bus. The Employer stated that they cannot retain such driver whose behavior is detrimental to the interest as well as the safety of the students who are travelling in the bus driven by the Workman. The Employer stated that considering all the above facts they took the decision to terminate the services of the Workman as the Employer could not repose any confidence in the Workman. The Employer stated that after the termination of the Workman, they instructed Mr. Prashant Panchawadkar, other driver to take the Balrath for RTO inspection at Ponda. The Employer stated that when Mr. Prashant Panchawadkar was taking the vehicle for inspection, the Workman stopped the said vehicle at Borim Circle and unauthorisedly kept hostage the bus by the Workman for almost one hour causing inconvenience to the In-charge of the School and created nuisance on the Public Road. The Employer stated that a Police complaint was made of the said incident based on which investigation was conducted by the Police where the Workman admitted the incident to the Police. The Employer stated that the Workman undertook not to interfere in the matter of the school functioning anymore and thereafter he was released by the police. The Employer stated that the action of the Employer in terminating the services of the Workman is legal, just and proper and is in interest of the safety of the students. The Employer denied the overall case as pleaded by the Workman and prayed for dismissal of the present reference.

10. Thereafter, the Workman filed his re-joinder on 17/08/2021 at exb. 6. The Workman, as and by way of his re-joinder, confirms and reiterates all his submissions, averments and statements made in his Claim Statement to be true and correct and denies all the statements, averments and submissions made by the Employer in its Written Statement, which are contrary to his Statement and averments made in his Claim Statement. He stated that his post was sanctioned under the Balrath scheme of the Govt. of Goa which is to be implemented by all the schools. He stated that these educational institutions/schools had to recruit/select and appoint the candidates for the post of driver based on the recommendation of the selection committee and upon the approval of the Director of Education. He stated that the school management is responsible to pay the salaries of the drivers and to instruct the drivers to carry out the assigned duties. He stated that the termination of his services is malafide, arbitrarily and perverse and illegal and that the charges in the show cause notice are vague and made without inquiry. He stated that the so called loss of confidence by the management in him is a fabrication, false and perverse.

11. Based on the pleadings filed by both the parties this Hon'ble Court was pleased to frame the following issues on 11/11/2021 at Exb. 9.

1. *Whether the Workman/Party I proves that the action of the management of the Employer in terminating his services with effect from 13/12/2018 is illegal and unjustified?*
2. *Whether the Employer/Party II proves that M/s. Panchasheel English High School, Panchwadi, Ponda-Goa, is not an 'industry' as defined u/s 2(j) of the I. D. Act, 1947?*

3. *Whether the Employer/Party II proves that the present reference is not maintainable in view of the reasons stated in para 2(2), (3) and (4) of the Written Statement?*
4. *Whether the Workman/Party-I is entitled to any relief?*
5. *What order? What award?*

12. My answers to the aforesaid issues are as under:

- (a) Issue No. 1 : In the Affirmative
- (b) Issue No. 2 : In the Negative
- (c) Issue No. 3 : In the Negative
- (d) Issue No. 4 & 5 : As per final order

I have heard the oral arguments of Ld. Adv. Shri T. D'costa appearing for the Party-I as well as Ld. Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat representing the Employer. Ld. Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat representing the Employer also filed the synopsis of written arguments. I have carefully perused the entire records of the present case including the written synopsis filed on the behalf of both the parties. I have carefully considered the submissions advanced before me and is of the opinion as under:

REASONS

13. Issue No. 1:

Indisputably, the Workman was appointed by the Employer school as a driver on the Balrath (Exb. 24) which is meant for transportation of the students from the various parts of the area to the Employer school. The driver appointed on Balrath is under the Balrath Scheme of Govt. of Goa through the Director of Education. The evidence on records indicates that the services of the Workman were terminated by the Employer school vide its letter of termination No. PES/2018-19/1124 (Exb.14). Upon perusal of the said letter of termination indicates that the services of the Workman has been terminated w.e.f. 13/12/2018 on account of his misconducts. The said letter of termination further stated that *"we got plenty of misconduct complaint against you. This is very harmful for goodwill and growth of our school. We can't give you chance regarding this matter. Higher authorities of Kalyan Ashram Goa Panchsheel English School has decided that you are not the right person to our school (Bus driver) so, they are issuing this letter.* In other words, the services of the Workman has been terminated on account of his plenty of misconducts against him without specifying the alleged misconduct. The Employer also did not make a reference about the allegations leveled against the Workman which constitutes misconducts. No show cause notice or Charge-sheet was issued to the Workman nor held disciplinary inquiry against the alleged misconduct committed by him. The aforesaid acts on the part of the Employer is in violation of the well established principles of natural justice. The aforesaid action of the Employer school in terminating the services of Workman is therefore malafide, arbitrary, perverse, illegal and unjustified. Hence it is held that the Workman proved that the action of the management of the Employer in terminating his services is illegal and unjustified. The issue No.1 is therefore answered in the Affirmative.

14. Issue No. 2:

The Employer, as and by way of its preliminary objections, submitted that the reference is not maintainable as it is not an "industry" as defined u/s 2(j) of the I. D. Act, 1947. It is therefore necessary to refer to the provisions of section 2(j) of the I. D. Act and its reads as under:

15. The term "industry" has been defined u/s 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and it means

- (j) any systematic activity carried on by co-operation between an employer and his workmen (whether such workmen are employed by such employer directly or by or through any agency, including a contractor) for the production, supply or distribution of goods or services with a view to satisfy human wants or wishes (not being wants or wishes which are merely spiritual or religious in nature), whether or not,-
 - (i) any capital has been invested for the purpose of carrying on such activity; or
 - (ii) such activity is carried on with a motive to make any gain or profit, and includes –

- (a) any activity of the Dock Labour Board established under section 5-A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948);
- (b) any activity relating to the promotion of sales or business or both carried on by an establishment, but does not include –
 - (1) any agricultural operation except where such agricultural operation is carried on in an integrated manner with any other activity (being any such activity as is referred to in the foregoing provisions of this clause) and such other activity is the predominant one.
Explanation— For the purposes of this sub-clause, “agricultural operation” does not include any activity carried on in a plantation as defined in clause (f) of section 2 of the Plantations Labour Act, 1951; or
 - (2) hospitals or dispensaries; or
 - (3) educational, scientific, research or training institutions; or
 - (4) institutions owned or managed by organisation wholly or substantially engaged in any charitable, social or philanthropic service; or
 - (5) khadi or village industries; or
 - (6) any activity of the Government relatable to the sovereign functions of the Government including all the activities carried on by the departments of the Central Government dealing with defence research, atomic energy and space;
 - (7) any domestic service; or
 - (8) any activity, being a profession practised by an individual or body of individuals, if the number of persons employed by the individual or body of individuals in relation to such profession is less than ten; or
 - (9) any activity, being an activity carried on by a co-operative society or a club or any other like body of individuals, if the number of persons employed by the co-operative society, club or other like body of a individuals in relation to such activity is less than ten.

16. In the case of **Bangalore Water Supply and Sewarage Board etc. Vs. A. Rajappa & Ors.** reported in **1978 (36) FLR 266**, wherein the Constitution Bench of 7 judges has held at page 316 B.

- a. Where (i) systematic activity, (ii) organized by cooperation between employer and employee (the direct and substantial element is chimerical. (iii) for the production and/or distribution of good and service calculated to satisfy Human wants and wishes (not spiritual or religious but inclusive of material things or serves geared to celestial bliss i.e. making on a large scale prasad or goods prime facie, there is an industry in that enterprise.
- b. Absence of profit motive or gainful objection is irrelevant, be the venture in the public joint, private or other sector.
- c. The true focus functional and for decisive test is the nature of the activity with special emphasis on the employer-employee relations.
- d. If the organization is a trade or business it does not cease to be one because the philanthropy animating the undertaking.

17. In the case in hand, the burden was cast on the Employer school to prove that it is not an “industry” as defined u/s 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947. However, the Employer has miserably failed to lead any evidence in support of its contention that it is not an “industry” within the meaning of section 2(j) of the I. D. Act, 1947. On the contrary, indisputably, the Employer school is recognized by the Govt. of Goa (department of Education) and Goa Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education and that it is an aided school and is in receipt of grant in aid from the Govt. of Goa under Chapter VI of Goa Daman and Diu School Education Act, 1984 and rules there under: The Workman was appointed by the Employer vide

its letter dt.18/08/2012 at exb.26. The Employer School was running over the systematic activity between the Employer school and the Workman to transport the students on various locations to the school and vice versa. The Employer also paying salary to the Workman. This shows that the Employer school is an industry within the meaning of provision 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Employer thus failed to prove that it is not an “industry” as defined u/s 2(j) of the I. D. Act, 1947. The issue No.2 is therefore answered in the Negative.

18. *Issue No. 3:*

The Employer, as and by way of its preliminary objections, submitted that the reference is not maintainable as the Employer school is not an “industry” as defined under Section 2(j) of the said Act., that the appointment of the Workman was a contractual appointment for specific period of 10 months and could be terminated within in contractual period, that the Workman was not employed in terms of relevant rules or procedure and that there is no sanctioned post of a driver in the Employer School.

19. While deciding the issue No. 2 is hereinabove, I have come to the conclusion that the Employer school is an “industry” within the meaning of Section 2(j) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

20. During the course of his cross examination, the Workman admits that he was appointed as a “Driver” on Balrath under the Balrath Scheme of Govt. of Goa through Directorate of Education. He admits that the appointment of driver on Balrath is specific period of 10 months i.e. June to March. He admits that the Employer filed its written statement to his claim statement. He admits that he had filed his re-joinder to the written statement of the Employer on 17/08/2021. He admits that before filing re-joinder, he was explained the contention of the Employer school filed in his written statement and thereafter drafted the re-joinder based on his say. He admits that his re-joinder was drafted by his advocate and thereafter read over and explained to him before he signed. He admits that in para 15 of his re-joinder, he has admitted the contents of para 28 and 29 of the written statement of the Employer. He admits that the Employer school used to pay the salary for 10 months. The aforesaid evidence on record indicates that the Workman was appointed on Balrath of the Employer school under Balrath Scheme for 10 months.

21. The evidence on record indicates that the Workman submitted his application dt. 13/07/2012 (Exb. 19-Cross) to the manager of the Employer School and his interview was taken on 2nd August, 2012 by the management of the Employer society. The evidence on record indicates that the Workman was issued appointment letter dt. 18.08.2012 (Exb. 26) by the Chairman of the Employer society. The Workman also joined his duties w.e.f. 18/07/2012 (B. N.) (Exb. 20-Cross). The evidence on record indicates that the Workman signing on the muster roll maintained by the Employer School. The sole witness of the Employer Shri Anand Gaonkar admits that they used to disburse the salary in the account maintained by the Workman. He deposed that the service conditions of the Workman was as per criteria laid down by the Govt. of Goa in the Balrath Scheme and not as per the conditions of service of the school. The aforesaid evidence on record clearly indicates that the appointment of the Workman was done as per terms of the relevant rules or procedure applicable to the school. The evidence on record indicates that there was no sanctioned post of driver in the Employer school. Thus, it is held that the Employer failed to prove that the present reference is not maintainable in view of the reasons stated in para 2(2), (3) & (4) of the written statement. The issue No. 3 is therefore answered in the Negative.

22. *Issue No. 4:* While deciding the issue No. 1 hereinabove, I have discussed and come to the conclusion that the action of the management of the Employer in terminating the services of the Workman w.e.f. 13/12/2018 is illegal and unjustified. The evidence on record indicates that the appointment of the Workman as a ‘Driver’ on Balrath for specific period of 10 months i.e. from June to March. The pass book of the Workman on record at Exb.24-Cross clearly indicates that the Workman deposited an amount of Rs. 2,52,688/- in his account on various dates. The Workman admits that he had deposited an amount of Rs. 1,79,000/- in his account during the period from 01/01/2021 to 30/06/2021 an amount of Rs. 98,500/- for a period from 01/07/2021 to 31/03/2022 and thereafter deposited an amount of Rs. 1,23,000/- for the period from 01/04/2022 to 03/07/2023. The Workman deposed that he was depositing the aforesaid amount in his account as and when he received the money and that the amount deposited by him were received by him for his working with different person for driving the vehicle and other works.

23. In the case in hand Ld. Adv. Shri P. J. Kamat representing the Employer during the course of his oral arguments submitted that the Workman was appointed for specific period of 10 months and hence he is not entitled for any reinstatement and relied upon a judgment of Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of **U.P. State Textile Corp. Ltd. and Suresh Kumar, reported in 2011 SCLJ 756.**

24. In the case of **U.P. State Textile Corp. Ltd.(Supra)**, the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 3 of its judgment held as under:

“3. In the facts of the case we need not examine the effect of the order dated 26th April, 1989 whereby the services of the respondent had been terminated as being stigmatic or not as we are of the opinion that in the light of the fact that appointment itself was for a fixed period of three years which would have come to an end on the 6th September, 1990, no relief beyond that period could have been given to the respondent by the Tribunal or the High Court. We accordingly feel that these orders need to be modified to the extent that the appellant shall be deemed to be in service upto the 6th September, 1990 and not thereafter. The other question relates to the back wages for a period of one year and five months. We are of the opinion that the grant of back wages is a matter of discretion vested in the Court and the conduct of an employee is an extremely relevant factor on this aspect. The financial status of the employer must also be kept in mind. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the conduct of the respondent and the financial status of the appellant does not justify the payment of any back wages”.

The principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in its aforesaid judgment is well established and is also applicable to the case in hand.

In the instant case, the Workman was appointed for a fixed term of 10 months from June to March on the following year and appointment comes to an end on 31st March, 2019. The services of the Workman were terminated w.e.f. 13/12/2018. The Workman is therefore not entitled to any reinstatement in service. The Workman is gainfully employed from the date of termination of his services w.e.f. 13/12/2018. The Workman is therefore entitled for a lumpsum amount of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) towards his back wages.

In view of the above, I proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

1. It is held that the action of the Management of M/s. Panchasheel English School, Panchawadi, Ponda, Goa, in terminating the services of Shri Jitesh Gaonkar, driver, with effect from 13/12/2018, is illegal and unjustified.
2. It is held that the management of M/s. Panchasheel English School, Panchawadi, Ponda, Goa, is hereby directed to pay to the Workman a sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty thousand only) towards his back wages.
3. No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

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

Panaji.



Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

Order

No. 8/543/2025-LD(Estt.)/Part-I/2054

Date : 03-Sep-2026

Read: Order No. 8/543/2025-LD(Estt.)/655 dated 04/03/2026.

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 20AA of the Societies Registration (Goa Amendment) Act, 2023, the Government of Goa hereby extends, for a further period of six months w.e.f. 05/09/2026, the appointment of Shri. Sakharam V. Naik, as the sole Administrator, for managing the affairs of the “Gomantak Bhandari Samaj” Society on terms and conditions specified in the Order dated 04/03/2026.

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

Gajanan X. Bhonsle, Under Secretary (Estt.), Law.

Porvorim.

Order

No. 2-1-97/LD-Estt-Part-I/2061

Date : 04-Sep-2026

On the recommendation of the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Mumbai, vide Confidential letter No. A.5504/G/2025/181/2026 dated 12/08/2026 and as per Rule 4 of Chapter-III of the Goa Judicial Service Rules, 2013, the Governor of Goa is pleased to appoint the following 02 Judicial Officers to the post of Ad-hoc District Judge under Fast Track Courts' Scheme in the State of Goa in Selection Process 2025 with immediate effect:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Judicial Officers
1	Ms. Shubhada A. Dalvi
2	Ms. Sarika Nilesh Fal Dessai

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

Amir Y. Parab, Joint Secretary (Estt.), Law.

Porvorim.

Notification

No. 8/564/2025-LD(Estt)/2078

Date : 08-Sep-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 78A of the Registration Act, 1908 (Central Act 16 of 1908), as in force in the State of Goa, the Government of Goa is hereby pleased to remit the registration fee amounting to Rs. 13,88,400/- (Rupees Thirteen lakhs eighty-eight thousand four hundred only) payable on the Deed of Exchange towards the transfer of land from the property bearing Survey No. 196/1, Raia Village, Salcete Taluka belonging to Fabrica Da Igreja De Raia, Party of the First Part to the Margao Municipal Council, Party of the Second Part to the extent an area of 1280 sq. mtrs. comprising an area of 1034 sq. mtrs. and 246 sq. mtrs. respectively.

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

Amir Y. Parab, Joint Secretary (Estt.), Law.

Porvorim.

◆◆◆

Lok Bhavan, Goa

Order

No. GS/EST/PER/180/2022/1414

Date : 01-Sep-2026

Read: (1) Application dated 04/06/2026 submitted by Smt. Sweta Sadanand Tari, Stenographer Grade-I.

(2) Letter No. Reg/Admin/Service file/2026/2597 dated 12/08/2026 from the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services, Registration Department, Panaji.

Consequent upon the issuance of No Objection Certificate by the State Registrar-cum-Head of Notary Services, Registration Department, Panaji, vide Ref. (2) above and with the approval of the Government conveyed vide Letter No. 2/11/2014-LD(Estt.)/1812 dated 04/08/2026 of the Department of Law & Judiciary, Law (Establishment) Division, Secretariat, Porvorim, and on the recommendation of the Board, the Hon'ble Governor of Goa is pleased to absorb and appoint Smt. Sweta Sadanand Tari, presently serving as Stenographer Grade-I on deputation in the Governor's Secretariat since 16th May, 2022, against the post of Private Secretary to the Governor, Group 'B', Non-Ministerial, Gazetted, in the Governor's Secretariat, Lok Bhavan, Goa, in Pay Level-6 of the 7th Central Pay Commission, with effect from 1st September, 2026, in terms of Section 3(b) of the Goa Governor's Secretariat (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 2010.

2. Smt. Sweta S. Tari shall be on probation for a period of two years from the date of joining as per the Office Memorandum No. 12/14/89/PER(Part)/977 dated 8/9/2022.

3. The pay of Smt. Sweta Sadanand Tari shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of F.R. 22(I)(a)(2).

4. The expenditure on account of the above appointment shall be debited to the Budget Head of Account: 2012—Governor; 03—Governor Administration/UTs; 090—Secretariat; 01—Secretariat of the Governor (Charged); 00—General; 01—Salaries.

Arjun Mohan, IAS, Secretary to Governor.

Dona Paula.



Department of Personnel

Order

No. 6/10/2020-PER/2764

Date : 02-Sep-2026

Read: 1. Order No. 6/10/2020-PER/5406 dated 17/12/2020.

2. Order No. 6/10/2020-PER/PF/3286 dated 21/06/2022.

3. Memorandum No. 6/4/2020-PER/679 dated 02/03/2026.

Whereas, on the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee held on 16/12/2020, as conveyed by Goa Public Service Commission vide letter No. COM/II/11/42(3)/2020/851 dated 17/12/2020, the Junior Administrative Grade Officers were promoted to Selection Grade of Goa Civil Service, in Level 13 of CCS (Revised Pay) Rules, 2016 vide Order dated 17/12/2020 read at Sr. No. 1 in the preamble;

And whereas, the DPC held on 16/12/2020 was reviewed on 27/05/2022 and vide recommendation of the Review DPC meeting held on 27/05/2022 conveyed by the Commission, Smt. Meena Naik Goltekar was promoted to Selection Grade of Goa Civil Service, in the order of her merit with due regard to the seniority within her respective grading as on 16/12/2020 vide order dated 21/06/2022 read at Sr. No. 2 in the preamble;

And whereas, a review DPC was held by Goa Public Service Commission on 17/10/2025 to review the DPC held on 15/10/2018 which was reviewed on 29/05/2019, 11/05/2020 & 23/05/2025 to consider the eligibility of additional officers for promotion to Junior Administrative Grade and based on the recommendation of Goa Public Service Commission, the additional officers were promoted to Junior Administrative Grade w.e.f. 23/10/2018 vide order dated 13/11/2025 with due regards to their seniority;

And whereas, on promotion of additional officers to Junior Administrative Grade retrospectively, the seniority dated 14/12/2021 of the Junior Administrative Grade officers has been re-casted vide Memorandum dated 02/03/2026 read at Sr. No. 3 in the preamble;

And whereas, a review DPC was held by Goa Public Service Commission on 19/08/2026 based on revised seniority to review the DPC held on 16/12/2020 which was reviewed on 27/05/2022 to consider eligibility of additional officers for promotion to Selection Grade;

Now therefore, on the recommendation of the review Departmental Promotion Committee held on 19/08/2026, as conveyed by the Commission vide letter No. COM/II/11/42(3)/2025/243 dated 20/08/2026, the Governor of Goa is pleased to promote the following Junior Administrative Grade Officers of Goa Civil Service in terms of Rule 33 of Goa Civil Service Rules, 2016 to the post of Selection Grade, in Level 13 of CCS (Revised Pay) Rules, 2016 w.e.f. 17/12/2020 with consequential monetary benefits and in the following order of their merit with due regard to the seniority within their respective grading as on 17/12/2020 as under:

1. Shri Dipak Desai
2. Shri V. P. Dangi
3. Shri Dipak M. Bandekar

4. Shri Vikas S. N. Gaunekar
5. Smt. Deepali D. Naik
6. Shri Raju V. Gawas
7. Shri Anthony J. D'Souza
8. Smt. Sandhya S. Kamat
9. Shri Damodar S. Morajkar
10. Smt. Meena H. Naik Goltekar
11. Smt. Laura Britto e Madre Deus
12. Smt. Irene Vitoria Sequeira
13. Shri Shivaji Dessai
14. Shri Vassudev N. Shetye
15. Shri Rajendra D. Mirajkar
16. Shri R. K. Satardekar
17. Smt. Sneha S. Morajkar
18. Shri Pravin M. S. Barad
19. Shri Ashok V. Rane
20. Smt. Upasana Mazgaonkar
21. Shri Prashant Shirodkar
22. Shri Sanjeev C. Gauns Dessai
23. Ms. Biju Naik
24. Shri Mahesh Corjuenkar
25. Shri Surendra Naik
26. Shri Johnson Fernandes
27. Shri Ajit Panchwadkar
28. Shri Agnelo A. Fernandes

On promotion, the officers shall continue to hold the post presently held by them.

The officers from Sr. Nos. 23-28 shall exercise option for fixation of pay in promotional grade in terms of F.R. 22(I)a(1), within a period of one month from the date of issue of the order. The option once exercised shall be final.

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

Raghuraj A. Faldesai, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim.



Department Public Health

Order

No. 4/38/2026-II/PHD/2174

Date : 11-Aug-2026

Read: Memorandum No. 4/38/2026-II/PHD/1756 dated 6/7/2026.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/1/5/30(10)/2026/104 dated 04/06/2026, Government is pleased to appoint Dr. Vineet Shambu

Sansguiri to the post of Lecturer in Orthopaedic Surgery (Group “A” Gazetted) under Goa Medical College & Hospital, Bambolim-Goa in Level-11 of Pay Matrix (Pre-revised: Pay Band-3 Rs. 15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs. 6600/-) with immediate effect and as per the terms and conditions in the Memorandum cited above.

Dr. Vineet Shambu Sansguiri shall be on probation for a period of two years.

Dr. Vineet Shambu Sansguiri has been declared medically fit by the Medical Board and his character and antecedents have been verified by the District Magistrate, North Goa District, Panaji-Goa at the time of his appointment as Junior Orthopaedic Surgeon under the Directorate of Health Services.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/18/2026-II/PHD/2117

Date : 13-Aug-2026

On recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their No. S2GPSC-LPCF0GMCH/10/2026 I/1081/2026/164 dated 08/07/2026, Government is pleased to declare the following officer as having satisfactorily completed his probation period of two years and to confirm him in the post of Assistant Professor in Medical Imaging Technology under Allied Health Science Courses in Goa Medical College and Hospital, Bambolim, with effect from the date of completion of his probation period.

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Date of completion of probation period
1.	Shri Rahul Kothari	02/12/2024

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/18/2026-II/PHD/Part/2123

Date : 13-Aug-2026

On recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their No. S2GPSC-LPCF0GMCH/11/2026/163/I/1082/2026 dated 08/07/2026, Government is pleased to declare the following officers as having satisfactorily completed their probation period of two years and to confirm them in the post of Assistant Professors in Optometry under Allied Health Science Courses in Goa Medical College and Hospital, Bambolim, with effect from the date of completion of their probation period.

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Date of completion of probation period
1.	Shri Bharat Kumar Bhayal	20/12/2024
2.	Shri Nitesh Pradhan	16/03/2025

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 2/11/2004-II/PHD/2166

Date : 19-Aug-2026

Government is pleased to accept the notice of Voluntary Retirement dated 15/05/2026 tendered by Dr. Rudresh G. Kurtikar, Assistant Lecturer, Department of Emergency Medicine, Goa Medical College, under Rule 43 of CCS (Pension) Rules, 2021 and is permitted to retire from service voluntarily w.e.f. 14/08/2026 (a.n.).

Dr. Rudresh G. Kurtikar, Assistant Lecturer, Department of Emergency Medicine, Goa Medical College, shall stand relieved from the Government Service w.e.f. 14/08/2026 (a.n.).

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/23/2002-II/PHD/Part I/2259

Date : 25-Aug-2026

On recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their No. COM/II/11/30(11)/2026/217 dated 10/08/2026, Government is pleased to promote following Assistant Professor to the post of Associate Professor in the Department of General Medicine (Group “A” Gazetted) in Goa Medical College and Hospital, Bambolim on regular basis in the Level 11 of Pay Matrix (PB-3; Rs. 15600-39100/- + GP Rs. 6600/-) and other allowance to be fixed as per rules with immediate effect.

1. Dr. Ramnath Prasad Nevrekar.
2. Dr. Sumeet Vallabh Juwarkar.
3. Dr. Rukma Jagannath Kolwalkar.
4. Dr. Marina Vaz.

The promotion is made against the vacancy occurred due to:-

1. Promotion of Dr. Anar Khandeparkar to the post of Professor in the Department of General Medicine in Goa Medical College vide Order No. 4/23/2002-II/PHD/Part I/837/A dated 26/04/2021.
2. Voluntary retirement of Dr. Nicasia Furtado on 02/07/2021.
3. Death of Dr. Rachita Gupta Velho on 10/07/2021.
4. Retirement of Dr. Viraj Khandeparkar on 31/05/2026.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/33/2026-II/PHD/2271

Date : 25-Aug-2026

Read: Memorandum No. 4/33/2026-II/PHD/1585 dated 16/06/2026.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/1/5/30(11)/2026/66 dated 18/05/2026, the following candidates are offered a temporary post of Lecturer in Ophthalmology (Group “A” Gazetted) under Goa Medical College & Hospital, Bambolim-Goa in Level-11 of Pay Matrix (Pre-revised: Pay Band-3 Rs. 15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs. 6600/-).

1. Dr. Valerie Menezes.
2. Dr. Vishaka Amey Naik (OBC).

The above Doctors shall be on probation for a period of two years.

Dr. Valerie Menezes and Dr. Vishaka Amey Naik have been declared medically fit by the Medical Board and their character and antecedents has been verified by The District Magistrate, North Goa and stated that there is nothing adverse against the said Doctors and verification of their educational qualification has also been verified by Goa University.

The above appointment is made against the vacancy occurred due to promotion of Dr. Manasi Amar Prabhudesai and Dr. Aparna Kapil Naik, Lecturer to the post of Assistant Professor in Department of Ophthalmology vide Order No. 4/16/2005-II/PHD/3592 dated 20/12/2024.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/31/2026-II/PHD/2281

Date : 28-Aug-2026

Read: Memorandum No. 4/31/2026-II/PHD/1604 dated 17/06/2026.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/30(1)/2026/65 dated 18/05/2026, Government is pleased to appoint the following Doctors to the post of Lecturer in General Surgery (Group “A” Gazetted) under Goa Medical College & Hospital, Bambolim-Goa on temporary basis in Level-11 of Pay Matrix (Pre-revised: Pay Band-3 Rs. 15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs. 6600/-) with immediate effect and as per the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

1. Dr. Frazer Conceicao Souza Rodrigues.
2. Dr. Prajyot Pandurang Naik.
3. Dr. Shubham Shyam Gawas.
4. Dr. Sudhir Madanmohan Narsapur.
5. Dr. Janitta Shamkant Kundaikar (ST).

The above Doctors shall be on probation for a period of two years.

The above Doctors have been declared medically fit by the Medical Board, their character and antecedents has been verified by the District Magistrate, North Goa and South Goa and their educational qualification has also been verified through their respective Universities.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/01/2026-II/PHD/Part/2282

Date : 27-Aug-2026

On recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their No. COM/II/11/30(1)/2026/162 dated 08/07/2026, Government is pleased to promote Dr. Premila Rocha, Associate Professor to the post of Professor in the Department of Pathology (Group “A” Gazetted) in Goa Medical College and Hospital, Bambolim on regular basis in the Level 13 of Pay Matrix (PB-4; Rs. 37400-67000/- + GP Rs. 8700/-) and other allowance to be fixed as per rules with immediate effect.

The promotion is made against the vacancy occurred due to retirement of Dr. Francisco Couto from the post of Professor in the Department of Pathology in Goa Medical College on 30/04/2026.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/10/2022-II/PHD/Part/2301

Date : 31-Aug-2026

Read: Order No. 4/10/2022-II/PHD/Part/1914 dated 05/12/2023.

Government is pleased to extend the deputation period of Dr. Sangeeta Mahesh Amoncar, Associate Professor in the Department of Transfusion Medicine (Group “A” Gazetted) in Goa Medical College, Bambolim-Goa for further period of 03 years w.e.f. 07/12/2026.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/15/2002-II/PHD/Part I/2316

Date : 31-Aug-2026

On recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their No. COM/II/11/30(4)/2022/192 dated 27/07/2026, Government is pleased to promote Dr. Anuja Ramkrishna Ganoo, Lecturer to the post of Associate Professor in the Department of Microbiology (Group “A” Gazetted) in Goa Medical College and Hospital, Bambolim on regular basis in the Level 11 of Pay Matrix (PB-3; Rs. 15600-39100/- + GP Rs. 6600/-) and other allowance to be fixed as per rules with immediate effect.

The promotion is made against the vacancy occurred due to promotion of Dr. Anita Sandhya Estibeiro to the post of Professor in the Department of Microbiology in Goa Medical College vide Order No. 4/15/2002-II/PHD/Part I/400 dated 18/02/2026.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/13/2020-II/PHD/Part I/2348

Date : 31-Aug-2026

On recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their No. COM/II/11/30(1)/2026/194 dated 27/07/2026, Government is pleased to promote Dr. Aditya M. M., Assistant Professor to the post of Associate Professor in the Department of Paediatric Surgery (Group “A” Gazetted) in Goa Medical College and Hospital, Bambolim on regular basis in the Level 11 of Pay Matrix (PB-3; Rs. 15600-39100/- + GP Rs. 6600/-) and other allowance to be fixed as per rules with immediate effect.

The promotion is made against the vacancy occurred due to creation of posts vide Order No. 4/1/2018-II/PHD/1195 dated 14/08/2019 and bifurcated 01 post in the Department of Paediatric Surgery vide Order No. 4/1/2018-II/PHD/Part-I/3383 dated 23/10/2020.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.

Order

No. 4/13/2020-II/PHD/2349

Date : 31-Aug-2026

On recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their No. COM/II/11/30(5)/2026/193 dated 27/07/2026, Government is pleased to promote Dr. Sushmit Santosh

Kamat, Assistant Professor to the post of Associate Professor in the Department of Cardiac Anaesthesiology (Group “A” Gazetted) in Goa Medical College and Hospital, Bambolim on regular basis in the Level 11 of Pay Matrix (PB-3; Rs. 15600-39100/- + GP Rs. 6600/-) and other allowance to be fixed as per rules with immediate effect.

The promotion is made against the vacancy occurred due to creation of posts vide Order No. 4/1/2018-II/PHD/1195 dated 14/08/2019 and bifurcated vide Order No. 4/1/2018-II/PHD/Part-I/3383 dated 23/10/2020.

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

Sitaram G. Sawal, Under Secretary (Health-I).

Porvorim.



Department of Town and Country Planning

Notification

No. 36/18/39A/Notification (9NF)/TCP/2026/998

Date : 09-Sep-2026

Whereas, the Town and Country Planning Department of the Government of Goa has issued direction under sub-section (1) of Section 39A of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 (Act 21 of 1975) for change of zones in the Regional Plan for Goa 2021 in respect of the plots of land as specified in detail in Column Nos. (2) to (6) of the Table below (hereinafter referred to as “the said Proposals”);

TABLE

Sr. No.	Survey No./Sub-Division No./P.T. Sheet No./Chalta No.	Name of Village and Taluka	Published land use as per RPG-2021/ODP (Total Area) in m ²	Proposed land use	Area proposed in sq. mts.	Decision of the Government
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1.	89/1 to 12, 89/14 to 36, 89/38 to 50, 89/52 to 94, 89/97 to 98, 89/100 to 102, 89/104 to 113, 89/115 to 119, 89/132, 89/13 (P), 89/133 (P), 89/130 (P), 89/103 (P), 89/134 (P), 65/1 to 37, 65/39 to 83, 64/1 to 44, 62/1 to 20, 63/1 to 223, 60/1 to 85, 59/1 to 3p (P), 59/4 (P), 59/5 to 56, 57/1 to 27, 67/1 to 5, 67/6 (P), 67/7 to 30, 72/1 to 3 (P), 73/1 to 21 (P), 73/22, 74/1 to 11, 75/1 to 30 (P), 75/31 to 63 (P), 75/64 to 66, 75/68 & 69, 58/1 to 9, 56/1 to 7, 77/1 to 24, 71/1 to 32, 70/1 to 32, 68/1 to 82, 69/1, 88/1 to 40, 86/1 to 20, 90/2, 90/3, 81/1, 80/1, 79/1 to 11, 76/1 to 20, 82/1, 93/1 to 6, 42/2 to 36, 61/1 to 22, 61/24 to 26, 61/28 to 42 (P), 61/43 to 51 (P), 61/52 & 53 (P), 67/54 (P) to 89	Cavelossim, Salcete	Paddy Fields, Mangroves, Water Body, Khazan	No Development Zone	Total Area (6,97,028)	Approved for Non Developable Area leaving area under Settlement zone.
2.	90/1 to 31, 89/1 to 3, 91/1 to 14, 92/1 to 28, 68/1 to 6, 67/1 to 8, 106/1 to 25, 66/1 to 9 (P), 66/10 (P), 66/11 to 21-A, 66/22 to 39,	Benaullim, Salcete	Paddy Fields, Orchard, Paddy Fields with Irrigation	No Development Zone	Total Area (11,75,206)	Approved for Non Developable Area leaving

66/41 to 44, 64/1 to 29, 71/1 to 77, 72/1 to 15, 63/0, 61/3, 62/1 to 5, 59/1 to 42, 40/1 to 10, 39/1 to 19, 37/1 to 13, 35/1 to 22, 35/24, 36/0, 60/1 to 11, 112/1 to 12, 121/1 to 11, 119/8, 119/3-A, 119/3, 118/5, 118/3, 118/4, 117/1-A, 116/1 & 2, 115/3 (P), 114/5 (P) to 9, 102/1 to 8, 101/1 to 8, 417/1 to 14, 99/1 to 16, 100/1 to 11, 56/1 to 7, 84/1, 84/3, 84/4, 84/2 (P), 84/7, 120/1 to 12, 120/15		Command Area			area under Settlement zone.
---	--	--------------	--	--	-----------------------------

And whereas, in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 of the Goa Town and Country Planning (Change of zone of land in the Regional Plan or the Outline Development Plan) Rules, 2024 (hereinafter referred to as the “said Rules”), the Town and Country Planning Department after scrutinizing the said proposals placed such proposals alongwith its scrutiny reports before the Goa Town and Country Planning Board for its recommendations/approval/decision;

And whereas, the Goa Town and Country Planning Board approved the said proposals as specified in Column No. 7 of the above Table;

And whereas, notices as required by sub-rule (2) of Rule 4 of the said Rules were published,—

- (i) vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (9N)/TCP/2026/454 dated 03-06-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 10 dated 04-06-2026 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 1 & 2); and suggestions were invited from the public within a period of thirty days from the date of publication to the said Notifications in the Official Gazette.

And whereas, suggestions received from public were placed before the Goa Town and Country Planning Board in terms of sub-rule (3) of Rule 4 for its recommendation/approval and the Goa Town and Country Planning Board after due consideration of the suggestions received from the public recommended the proposals for change of zone as regards to Sr. No. 1 & 2 in its 239th Meeting held on 28-08-2026, directed to take further action as per sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 of the said Rules;

And whereas, as required by sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 of the said Rules, the recommendation/approval/decision of the Goa Town and Country Planning Board along with the said proposals were placed before the Government for its decision and the Government has approved the same;

Now, therefore, in view of the recommendation of the Goa Town and Country Planning Board being approved by the Government and in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 39A of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 (Act 21 of 1975) read with sub-rule (5) of Rule 4 of the Goa Town and Country Planning (Change of zone of land in the Regional Plan or the Outline Development Plan) Rules, 2024, the Regional Plan is hereby altered and modified as specified in Column No. (7) of above Table and as directed by the Government for carrying out change of zone of land in respect of the plots of land as specified in detail in Column Nos. (2) to (6) of above Table.

The alteration and modification of the Regional Plan as notified in this Notification shall be subject to the outcome of the PIL Writ Petition Nos. 53 of 2024 and 54 of 2024 which are pending final disposal before the Hon’ble High Court of Bombay at Goa.

Vertika Dagur, Chief Town Planner (Planning) & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji.

Notification

No. 36/18/39A/Notification (48F)/TCP/2026/999

Date : 09-Sep-2026

Whereas, the Town and Country Planning Department of the Government of Goa received applications under sub-section (1) of Section 39A of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 (Act 21 of 1975)

for change of zones in the Regional Plan for Goa 2021 in respect of the plots of land as specified in detail in Column Nos. (2) to (7) of the Table below (hereinafter referred to as “the said Proposals”);

TABLE

Sr. No.	Name of the Applicant	Survey No./Sub Division No./P.T. Sheet No./ Chalta No.	Name of Village and Taluka	Published land use as per RPG-2021/ODP (Total Area) in m ²	Proposed land use	Area proposed in sq. mts.	Decision of the Government
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	M/s Gangareddy Infra Pvt. Ltd. Varchavada, near Yuvraj Singh Villa	12/1-A-3	Morjim, Pernem	Partly Orchard (6820m ²), Partly Orchard with No Development Slope (1200m ²) Total Area (8020)	Settlement zone	8020	Approved for change of zone an area of 3390m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone and an area of 660m ² from Orchard with No Development Slope to Settlement zone being within permissible gradient. The secondary development shall be permitted strictly after obtaining NOC from Forest Department.
2.	Colleen Margaret Rozario alias Colleen Behrooz Abadian	338/3-L	Aldona, Bardez	Partly Settlement (32m ²), Partly Orchard (208m ²) Total Area (240)	Settlement zone	240	Approved for change of zone an area of 240m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone.
3.	Mahesh T. Gaonkar and Neeta M. Gaonkar	134/4-BT	Bordem, Bicholim	Natural Cover with Irrigation Command Area Total Area (272)	Settlement Zone	272	Approved for change of zone an area of 272m ² from Natural Cover with Irrigation Command Area to Settlement zone with Irrigation Command Area. The secondary development shall be permitted strictly after obtaining NOC from Water Resources Department.
4.	Sainath Rama Desai Satish Yeshwant Sawant	261/1-B	Pernem, Pernem	Partly Orchard (6060m ²), Partly Orchard with No Development Slope (3940m ²) Total Area (10000)	Settlement Zone	10000	Approved for change of zone an area of 6060m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone and an area of 3940m ² Orchard with No Development Slope to Settlement Zone being within permissible gradient. The secondary development shall be permitted strictly after obtaining NOC from Forest Department.
5.	M/s. Gangareddy Infra Pvt. Ltd., POA Prashant P. Shirodkar	245/1-B	Morjim, Pernem	Orchard Total Area (4747)	Settlement Zone	4747	Approved for change of zone an area of 4747m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone.
6.	M/s. Gangareddy Infra Pvt. Ltd., POA Prashant P. Shirodkar	245/1-A	Morjim, Pernem	Orchard Total Area (8095)	Settlement Zone	8095	Approved for change of zone an area of 8095m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone.

7.	Fritton Fernandes, Mrs. Robina Fernandes and Jezreel Fernandes	74/1-B-3	Ambelim, Salcete	Orchard Total Area (360)	Settlement Zone	360	Approved for change of zone an area of 360m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone.
8.	Divi Satchandra Kiran	238/10	Morjim, Pernem	Orchard Total Area (7479)	Settlement Zone	7479	Approved for change of zone an area of 7479m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone. The secondary development shall be permitted strictly after obtaining NOC from Forest Department.
9.	M/S Sarraf Tex Fab LLP	216/2 & 3	Socorro, Bardez	Orchard with No Development Slope Total Area (1400)	Settlement Zone	1400	Approved for change of zone an area of 1400m ² from Orchard with No Development Slope to Settlement Zone being within permissible gradient.
10.	Elvis Vaz	PT Sheet No. 258 Chalta No. 5/7 (Part)	Margao, Salcete	Agriculture zone Total Area (2779)	Settlement Zone	1240	Approved for change of zone an area of 1240m ² from Agriculture zone to Settlement zone being not low lying.
11.	Bennet & Bernard Custom Homes Private Limited	112/2-A (Part)	Assagao, Bardez	Partly Settlement (2070m ²), Partly Orchard (515m ²) Total Area (2585)	Settlement zone	298	Approved for change of zone 298m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone.
12.	Mr. Preetham Reddy Nalla POA Mr. Prashant P. Shirodkar	8/1-B	Morjim, Pernem	Partly Orchard (890m ²), Partly Orchard with No Development Slope (3125m ²) Total Area (4015)	Settlement Zone	4015	Approved for change of zone an area of 890m ² from Orchard to Settlement zone and an area of 3125m ² from Orchard with No Development Slope to Settlement zone being within permissible gradient. The secondary development shall be permitted strictly after obtaining NOC from Forest Department.
13.	Ganga Infra Residences Pvt. Ltd., Authorized Signatory Prashant P. Shirodkar	12/0	Morjim, Pernem	Orchard Total Area (4016)	Settlement zone	4016	Approved for change of zone. The secondary development shall be permitted strictly only after obtaining NOC from Forest Department.
14.	ELParaiso Ventures LLP, Rep. by Mr. Penumetcha Srinivasa	508/1 (Part)	Anjuna, Bardez	Partly Settlement (5218m ²), Partly Natural Cover (7933m ²), Partly Natural Cover with Irrigation Command Area (2812m ²) Partly Natural Cover with No	Settlement Zone	11082	Approved for change of zone an area of 2812m ² from Natural Cover with Irrigation Command Area to Settlement zone with Irrigation Command Area and an area of 3570m ² from Natural Cover to Settlement Zone. The secondary development shall be

				Development Slope (337m ²) Total Area (16300)			permitted strictly only after obtaining NOC from Forest Department and Water Resources Department.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

And whereas, in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 of the Goa Town and Country Planning (Change of zone of land in the Regional Plan or the Outline Development Plan) Rules, 2024 (hereinafter referred to as the “said Rules”), the Town and Country Planning Department after scrutinizing the said proposals placed such proposals alongwith its scrutiny reports before the Goa Town and Country Planning Board for its recommendations/approval/decision;

And whereas, the Goa Town and Country Planning Board approved the said proposals as specified in Column No. 8 of the above Table;

And whereas, notices as required by sub-rule (2) of Rule 4 of the said Rules were published,—

- (i) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (30)/TCP/2025/442 dated 13-08-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 24 dated 11-09-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 1);
- (ii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (41)/TCP/2025/767 dated 31-12-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 40 dated 01-01-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 2 & 14);
- (iii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (46)/TCP/2026/171 dated 18-03-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 51 dated 20-03-2026 (as regards proposals at Sr. No. 3);
- (iv) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (49)/TCP/2026/212 dated 01-04-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 1 dated 01-04-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 4);
- (v) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (53)/TCP/2026/304 dated 22-04-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 4 dated 23-04-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 5 & 6);
- (vi) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (58)/TCP/2026/386 dated 12-05-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 7 dated 14-05-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 7);
- (vii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (60)/TCP/2026/423 dated 27-05-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 9 dated 29-05-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 8);
- (viii) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (64)/TCP/2026/564 dated 24-06-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 13 dated 25-06-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 9);
- (ix) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (65)/TCP/2026/614 dated 01-07-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 14 dated 02-07-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 10 & 11);
- (x) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (66)/TCP/2026/651 dated 08-07-2026, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 15 dated 09-07-2026 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 12);
- (xi) Vide Notification No. 36/18/39A/Notification (40)/TCP/2025/735 dated 26-11-2025, published in the Official Gazette, Series III No. 35 dated 27-11-2025 (as regards proposal at Sr. No. 13); and suggestions were invited from the public within a period of thirty days from the date of publication to the said Notifications in the Official Gazette.

And whereas, suggestions received from public were placed before the Goa Town and Country Planning Board in terms of sub-rule (3) of Rule 4 for its recommendation/approval and the Goa Town and

Country Planning Board after due consideration of the suggestions received from the public recommended the proposals for change of zone as regards to Sr. No. 1, 11, 12, 13 & 14 in its 239th Meeting held on 28-08-2026, Sr. No. 2 in its 235th Meeting held on 10-06-2026, Sr. No. 3, 4, 8, 9 & 10 in its 238th Meeting held on 11-08-2026, Sr. No. 5, 6 & 7 in its 236th Meeting held on 29-06-2026 and directed to take further action as per sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 of the said Rules;

And whereas, as required by sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 of the said Rules, the recommendation/approval/decision of the Goa Town and Country Planning Board along with the said proposals were placed before the Government for its decision and the Government has approved the same;

Now, therefore, in view of the recommendation of the Goa Town and Country Planning Board being approved by the Government and in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 39A of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 (Act 21 of 1975) read with sub-rule (5) of Rule 4 of the Goa Town and Country Planning (Change of zone of land in the Regional Plan or the Outline Development Plan) Rules, 2024, the Regional Plan is hereby altered and modified as specified in Column No. (8) of above Table and as directed by the Government for carrying out change of zone of land in respect of the plots of land as specified in detail in Column Nos. (2) to (7) of above Table.

The alteration and modification of the Regional Plan as notified in this Notification shall be subject to the outcome of the PIL Writ Petition Nos. 53 of 2024 and 54 of 2024 which are pending final disposal before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa.

Vertika Dagur, Chief Town Planner (Planning) & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji.



Department of Transport

Directorate of Transport

Notification

No. D.Tpt/Lead Agency/12/2026/88

Date : 26-Aug-2026

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (3) and (4) of Section 215 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act No. 59 of 1988), the Government of Goa hereby constitutes a District Road Safety Committee for the Kushavati District, consisting of the following members for the purpose of discharging functions herein specified:-

I. The District Road Safety Committee (Kushavati):

(I)	District Magistrate and Collector-Kushavati District	—	Chairman
(II)	Additional Collector-Kushavati District	—	Member
(III)	Superintendent of Police-Kushavati District	—	Member
(IV)	Superintendent of Excise, Office of the Commissioner of Excise	—	Member
(V)	Chief Medical Officer of Health Services Department, Kushavati District	—	Member
(VI)	General Manager (Technical) and Project Director, National Highways Authority of India (NHAI)	—	Member
(VII)	Managing Director, Kadamba Transport Corporation Limited	—	Member
(VIII)	Deputy Director, Municipal Administration, Kushavati District	—	Member
(IX)	Deputy Director of Education, Kushavati Zone, Margao	—	Member
(X)	Deputy Director of Education, Central Zone	—	Member

(XI)	Additional Director of Transport-Kushavati District	—	Member
(XII)	Deputy Superintendent of Police (Traffic)-Kushavati District	—	Member
(XIII)	Assistant Director of Tourism (Planning), Department of Tourism	—	Member
(XIV)	Assistant Director, Government Veterinary Hospital, Sonsodo, Margao, Department of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services	—	Member
(XV)	Assistant Director of Transport, Quepem	—	Member
(XVI)	Executive Engineer, Electricity Department, Kushavati District	—	Member
(XVII)	Block Development Officer, Salcete-I	—	Member
(XVIII)	Representative of Regional Office MoRTH	—	Member
(XIX)	Representative of NGO-GOACAN	—	Member
(XX)	Superintending Engineer, C.O.-IV (Roads), (SH), (MDR) and (RR/VV), Public Works Department, Fatorda, Kushavati District	—	Member Secretary

II. Functions:- The District Road Safety Committee, Kushavati shall,—

- (I) carry out periodic review of the road accidents in the district.
- (II) monitor the implementation of the State Road Safety Policy and the targets set under it.
- (III) implement directions of the SCCORS, Government of India and the State Government as may be issued from time to time on matters of road safety.
- (IV) implement decisions of the State Road Safety Council in the district.
- (V) regularly track and update State Road Safety Council on details of road crashes that took place in the district, which shall include:-
 - a) Details of the vehicle;
 - b) Cause of crash;
 - c) Details of spot investigation, evidence, if any;
 - d) Details of offender/s (if any);
 - e) Details of victim/s and victim's latest condition;
 - f) Type of injury caused;
 - g) FIR registered, if any.
- (VI) publish road accident data on monthly basis in public domain on:
 - (i) the district website portal (to be widely published);
 - (ii) the MoRTH Portal (<http://morth-roadsafetynic.in/ediha/index.aspx>).
- (VII) develop a district road safety plan;
- (VIII) ensure forensic crash investigation under Section 135A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act No. 59 of 1988) for all mass fatality crashes in the district;
- (IX) ensure optimal placements of ambulances to help improve response time and handover time to hospitals;
- (X) ensure adequate availability of different ambulance type as per historic caseload in the district;
- (XI) prepare an Emergency Medical Plan for mass fatality accidents in the district;

- (XII) ensure linkage between hospitals and ambulance through setting up a prior notification system. Ensure linkages between hospitals to find out the availability of beds in case of emergency;
- (XIII) act as the nodal body for placing requirements and disbursal of road safety funds and interact with State Road Safety Council as and when required;
- (XIV) provide regular inputs to the State Road Safety Council/Lead Agency of State and recommend road safety measures especially with regard to identification of major accident-prone areas/black spots etc. and also impart importance of 4Es viz. Engineering, Education, Enforcement and Emergency.
- (XV) promote Good Samaritans to assist the road accident victims;
- (XVI) provide suggestion/s to Government as and when requested to frame or amend:
 - (a) Rules under Section 107, under Section 138, under Section 176, under Section 210D and under Section 215D of the Motor vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act No. 59 of 1988);
 - (b) Schemes under Section 135 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act No. 59 of 1988).
- (XVII) to discuss any other issue related to road safety.

III. The District Road Safety Committee (Kushavati) shall hold their meeting at least fortnightly on a virtual platform and meet physically at least once a month at the venue as decided by the Chairman. The Member Secretary of the Committee shall ensure that the minutes of the meeting shall be made public on the district website within 48 hours of the meeting and also be uploaded to the web portal of MoRTH as given in VI (ii) above and in the format designed and approved by MoRTH.

This Notification shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

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

Arvind B. Khutkar, Director and ex officio Addl. Secretary (Transport).

Porvorim.