D-2/04/2020

M/s BHP Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

Record perused. On the last date of hearing Regional Provident Fund Commissioner was directed to appear along with in-charge of legal cell to submit the clarification. However, nobody appeared on behalf of the respondent.

It is also important to mention that Coordination Committee of All District Bar Association has given a call for abstinence of work from the court. May be in this pretext nobody has appeared. In these circumstances, list the case on 24.02.2025 for appearance of the called officers.

D-2/14/2022

M/s BHP Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

List the case with another appeal of the same establishment bearing number D-2/04/2020 on 24.02.2025.

D-2/05/2017

M/s D.R.R. Security Services Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Santosh Kumar & Ravi Shankar Dwivedi, Ld. Counsel, for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

It has been submitted by the A/R appearing for the respondent that Id. counsel could not appear due to the strike called by the Coordination Committee of Delhi Bar Association.

Record perused. Respondent was directed to make clarification whether different officer other than the assessing officer who has passed the order u/s 7A, can pass the order u/s 7C of the EPF & MP Act, 1952. Put up for 24.02.2025 for arguments.

D-2/19/2021

M/s Ghatak Security Services Vs. APFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Shubham Kadam, A/R for the Appellant.

Sh. Shailender Arya, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

Both the counsels are not present due to the strike called by Coordination Committee of Delhi Bar Association today. Accordingly, this matter is adjourned to 07.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/17/2022 M/s ACIL Ltd. Vs. RPFC-II Gurugram (Haryana).

Present: Sh. Prakhar Shukla proxy, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

The written submission filed on behalf of Sh. Ravi Loonkar, the IRP appointed in this case.

Record perused. On the last date of hearing he was directed to file the brief note of submission running not more than 2 to 3 pages. However, the submission which is produced today consists of more than 20 pages and annexure running into 100 pages that is not permissible. The written submission along with annexure are returned to the respondent. The matter is reserved for order on the said misc. application.

D-2/32/2022 M/s ACIL Ltd. Vs. RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Prakhar Shukla proxy, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

The written submission filed on behalf of Sh. Ravi Loonkar, the IRP appointed in this case.

Record perused. On the last date of hearing he was directed to file the brief note of submission running not more than 2 to 3 pages. However, the submission which is produced today consists of more than 20 pages and annexure running into 100 pages that is not permissible. The written submission along with annexure are returned to the respondent. The matter is reserved for order on the said misc. application.

D-2/33/2022

M/s Oyo Hotels & Homes Pvt. Ltd. Vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. Satish Kumar, A/R for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

Both the counsels are not present due to the strike called by Coordination Committee of Delhi Bar Association today. Accordingly, this matter is adjourned to 07.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/19/2021

M/s Ghatak Security Services Vs. APFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Shubham Kadam, A/R for the Appellant.

Sh. Shailender Arya, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.02.2025

Both the counsels are not present due to the strike called by Coordination Committee of Delhi Bar Association today. Accordingly, this matter is adjourned to 07.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/9/2020 M/s Vitalife Laboratories vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, for the Respondent.

Order Dated- 19.02.2025

During the course of arguments, it is stated on behalf of Id. counsel for respondent that an application has been filed by the appellant along with a copy of the order dated 15.05.2024 passed by NCLT Mumbai admitting the CIRP against the company an appointing IRP in the matter. After filing of the application nobody has been appearing on behalf of the appellant. It is a matter of fact that one of the appeal bearing no. 1001(16)2016 has been reserved for order by this tribunal on 20.02.2024. Let both these appeal files be clubbed and the matter be heard from the counsel of the respondent in the light of the above said order. In the meanwhile appellant be notified about the next date of hearing along with the copy of this order. Put up for 12.03.2025.

1001(16)2016

M/s Vitalife Laboratories Vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-19.02.2025

During the course of arguments, it is stated on behalf of Id. counsel for respondent that an application has been filed by the appellant along with a copy of the order passed by NCLT Mumbai admitting the CIRP office against the company an appointing IRP in the matter. After filing of the application nobody has been appearing. It is matter of fact that one of the matter bearing no. 1001(16)2016 has been reserved for order by this tribunal on 20.02.2024. Let both this file be clubbed and the matter be heard from the counsel of the respondent in the light of the above said order. In the meanwhile appellant be notified about the next date of hearing along with the copy of this order Put up for 12.03.2025.

D-2/26/2024

M/s Navneet Enterprices vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-19.02.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed the photo copies of three inspection report dated 06.09.2010, 09.03.2011, & 22.01.2024 to the court from the trial court record. Same has been taken on record with additional copies which is meant for appellant.

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has made prayer appellant has not been appearing so the appeal be dismissed. However, it is in common knowledge that Bar is on strike for the last three days and in some matter counsels have not been appearing Industrial tribunal as well as this appeal. This tribunal has adjourned the matter on this ground because it is not feasible to dismiss the matter in the absence of one party. In these circumstances, list the matter on 21.04.2025.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENTINDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI;

Appeal No. D-2/39/2024

M/s. Leeway Manpower Pvt. Ltd.

Appellant

Through:- None for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East Respondent

Through:- Sh. S.N. Mahanta, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order <u>Dated:-19.02.2025</u>

Sh. S.K. Khanna, ld. counsel for the appellant has requested for an adjournment informing this tribunal that his mother has passed away and he is at Chandigarh to perform the rituals. In the interest of justice, adjournment is allowed. List the matter on 24.03.2025 for filing of reply to the appeal by the ld. counsel for the respondent.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

D-2/10/2019

M/s Lakhani Footwear Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-20.02.2025

Since the Bar is on strike, this case is adjourned to 26.03.2025 for filing of legible copies of the documents annexed with the appeal by and on behalf of the appellant.

D-2/11/2019

M/s Lakhani Rubber Works vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-20.02.2025

Since the Bar is on strike, this case is adjourned to 26.03.2025 for filing of legible copies of the documents annexed with the appeal by and on behalf of the appellant.

D-2/18/2019

M/s Lakhani Armaan Shoes Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-20.02.2025

Since the Bar is on strike, this case is adjourned to 26.03.2025 for filing of legible copies of the documents annexed with the appeal by and on behalf of the appellant.

D-2/38/2024

M/s Zabi Enterprises Vs. RPFC/ APFC Gurugram East

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-20.02.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed the trial court record which is retained with the case file of this tribunal. Reply to this appeal filed on 06.02.2025 is also taken on record. Since the Bar is on strike, this case is adjourned to 27.03.2025 for filing of rejoinder, if any, by the ld. counsel for appellant.

D-2/01/2025

M/s Chennai MSW Pvt. Ltd. Vs. RPFC/ APFC Noida

Present: Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Santosh Kr. Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-20.02.2025

Proxy counsel appearing for the appellant stated that he had deposited the cost imposed on the last date of hearing and shall submit the receipt within a day or two.

The A/R appearing for the respondent informed to this tribunal that his counsel has informed that since the Bar is on strike, no reply to misc. application filed under Section 7O of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 is submitted today. Respondent is directed to produce the same on next date of hearing after supplying an advance copy to ld. counsel for appellant. List the matter on 07.04.2025 for hearing the misc. application filed u/s 7O of the Act. In the meanwhile, interim orders to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/13/2024

M/s I.I. Inspection & Export Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. C. Panda, Ld. Counsel, & Sh. Ved Prakash A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-24.02.2025

List the matter on 05.04.2025 in the special drive which is to be held on the instructions of the Ministry of Labour and Employment. Office is directed to issue notice to both the parties in this regard.

D-2/36/2024

M/s Rathi Steel & Power Ltd. vs. APFC Meerut.

Present: Sh. Kumar Vikram for the Appellant.

Sh. Kanhaiya Singhal, Ld. Counsel for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-24.02.2025

Final arguments heard in part. Ld. Counsel for the appellant is directed to submit the additional documents along with the signature and a certificate under section 63 of Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam. List the matter on 15.04.2025 for continuation of the arguments.

Item 1 D-2//20 M/s vs. APFC.

Present: for the Appellant.

for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.02.2025

Argument heard in part. Respondent is directed to furnishing the chart showing that how the deduction are made considering which allowances/salaries heads. List the matter on 24.04.2025.

D-2/17/2020

M/s Egelhof Controls India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Ansul Goel, A/R for the Appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Vishnu, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Santosh Singh, Vijay pal

Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-25.02.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. List the matter on 21.04.2025 for continuation of the arguments.

D-2/33/2021

M/s Kabir Leathers vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Ashish Ojha, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-25.02.2025

- 1. This order shall dispose an appeal filed by and on behalf of the appellant against the impugned orders passed u/s 14B & 7Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 (herein after referred as the Act) by which an amount of Rs.25,95,130/- and Rs.12,50,422/- were assessed as damages and interest for the belated payment of EPF dues for the period 14.02.2019 to 24.07.2020.
- 2. The appellant herein has assailed the orders on several grounds inter alia stating that the delay in remittances occurred due to following several factors which were beyond the control of the appellant;-
 - I. Delayed receipt of duty drawback/MEIS licenses.
 - II. Delayed receipt of GST/IGST refund receivable.
 - III. Fire in the factory on 17.10.2018.
- IV. Wrongful claims from the appellant buyer LF credit/LF centennial PTE Ltd/ LF fashion PTE Ltd.
 - V. Effect of covid-19.
- 3. Citing the aforementioned circumstances, the appellant also raised following objection as grounds of appeal;-
 - I. Whether the respondent has considered that the appellant had suffered huge losses at the relevant time which resulted into delayed deposited of contribution?
 - II. Whether the respondent has applied its judicial mind to consider, analyses the present issue in judicial manner and thereafter, decide the various objection raised during enquiry before the respondent authority or not by way of passing a speaking order?
 - III. Whether the impugned order of the respondent is perverse and contrary to the provision of the Act?

- 4. Per contra the ld. Counsel for the respondent has supplied his written objection/reply to the appeal wherein it is stated that the factors which are claimed to be beyond the control of the appellant are not a sufficient ground to avoid payment as the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Hindustan Times Vs. RPFC, AIR 1988 SC 688 has observed that financial crunch is not a sufficient ground to avoid payment of EPF dues.
- 5. Ld. Counsel for the respondent has also rebutted the grounds raised above by and on behalf of the appellant stating that the question raised by the appellant are misleading as the appellant attainted the enquiry only once and failed to submit any fact of record. The appellant was given ample opportunities but the appellant never responded to the summons served upon the appellant through email and speed post. He further submitted that the order passed by the respondent is justifiable in itself. Relying upon several judgments, the respondent stated that the method of determining damage is entirely reasonable and it shows that no officer acting under section 14B can Act arbitrarily but must follow the reasonable guidelines made by the government.
- 6. During the oral arguments conducted on 07.01.2025, Sh. K.K Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondent stated that this is the first time when the establishment has deposited the PF accumulations belatedly. To counter this averment, Ld. Counsel for the respondent submitted the trial court record and pointed out that the appellant is a habitual defaulter in making the PF accumulations and the enquiry under section 14B of the Act had been conducted at least three times in the past. The trial court record was retained with the tribunal and the ld. Counsel for the appellant was granted an opportunity to inspect the trial court record. Ld. Counsel for the appellant conducted the inspection on 24.02.2025 and the case was listed for further arguments on 25.02.2025. Today the proxy counsel is appearing on behalf of the appellant who stated that the case be decided by this tribunal on basis of the records.
- 7. I have heard the argument and perused the records which reveals that the appellant establishment had conducted the default in EPF payment in the past also and the respondent had passed the

- orders u/s 14 B and 7Q previously which were complied by the appellant establishment.
- 8. The appellant has failed to establish sufficient grounds to set aside the impugned orders and therefore, the appeal is dismissed. The order passed by the respondent u/s 14B and 7Q of the Act are confirmed. The appellant is directed to deposit the amount of Rs.25,95,130/- and Rs.12,50,422/- within one month from the date of this order. Office is directed to consign the record to the record room.

D-2/23/2022

M/s Polyplastic Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-25.02.2025

This tribunal has received a request on behalf of the appellant to list this case in the Lok Adalat. Although no such proposal for conducting a lok adalat is under consideration with this tribunal. However, a special campaign for disposal of the matter is going to be conducted on 05.03.2025 and 07.03.2025. Therefore, list this case on 05.03.2025 in the special campaign.

D-2/33/2022

M/s Oyo Hotels & Homes Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Ashish Ojha proxy, for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-25.02.2025

As the main counsel for the appellant is not present, List the matter on 03.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/41/2022

M/s Sterling Mobikes Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-25.02.2025

Office has informed that the mother of ld. Counsel for the appellant Sh. S.K. Khana has passed and a request for adjournment is received through email.

According, list the matter on 09.04.2024 for final arguments.

D-2/17/2024

M/s BSC-C & C 'JV' vs. APFC/RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel & Ms. Rachna Bajaj, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-25.02.2025

Office has informed that the mother of ld. Counsel for the appellant Sh. S.K. Khana has passed and a request for adjournment is received through email.

According, list the matter on 09.04.2024 for final arguments.

D-2/43/2024

M/s General Security & Information Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Ms. Shrabani Chakrabarty, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Sanjeev Mishra, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-27.02.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant submitted that she has send the mail to this tribunal at 11:48 am today stating that director Sh. Jitenjal Sinha has given the telephonic message that he was struck with family in at the occasion of Maha Shivratri function and for that reason he was unable to appear today before this tribunal.

This tribunal vide order dated 23.12.2024 has directed presence of the person who had signed the appeal. On 15.01.2025 again the time was sought and the same was granted but he had not appeared today also and made a request that he was struck in the Prayagraj.

In these circumstances, the presence of the appellant be secured under the provisions of Order XVI Rule 12 CPC. Put up on 17.03.2025.

D-2/44/2024

M/s JPM Automobiles Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-27.02.2025

Office has informed that the mother of ld. Counsel for the appellant Sh. S.K. Khanna has passed away and a request for adjournment is received through email.

Accordingly, list the matter on 25.03.2025 for hearing on misc. application filed u/s 70 of the EPF & MP Act, 1952. In the meanwhile, interim order, if any, to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/14/2024 M/s UPSRTC, Noida Region vs. APFC/RPFC NOIDA.

Present: Sh. Shadab Khan, for the Appellant.

Sh. Avnish Meena, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-27.02.2025

Written arguments on behalf of both the parties stand filed. List the matter on 17.04.2025 for oral arguments.

D-2/06/2021 M/s UPSRTC, Noida Region vs. APFC/RPFC NOIDA.

Present: Sh. Shadab Khan, for the Appellant.

Sh. Avnish Meena, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-27.02.2025

Written arguments on behalf of both the parties stand filed. List the matter on 07.04.2025 for oral arguments.

D-2/19/2024

M/s ATC Tower Company India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Arjun Singh, Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel (Vakalatlama filed) & Sh. Chhatar

Singh Yadav A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-27.02.2025

Trial court record on behalf of the respondent is filed which is kept with this case file. List the matter on 03.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/23/2021

M/s N1 Media Consultancy (P) Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. K.K. Pandey, Id. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. K.K. Dey, Id. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-03.03.2025

D-2/25/2022

M/s Louis Berger Consulting Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-II Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Rochit Abhishek, ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-03.03.2025

Sh. B.B. Pradhan Id. counsel for the respondent is not present, he has sent the telephonic message about the inability to appear this tribunal for today.

Considering the fact that matter is likely to be listed in the Punjab & Haryana High Court on 20.03.2025 which has been filed against the order passed u/s 7A of the Act. This appeal is listed on 07.05.2025.

D-2/03/2021

M/s Umang Appliances & Equipment (P) Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Mahender Singh Sharma, Id. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. K.K. Dey, Id. Counsel & Sh. Vaibhav Chauhan A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-03.03.2025

Final argument in the matter heard in part. List the matter on 01.04.2025 for continuation of the arguments.

D-2/10/2024

M/s National Institute of Open Schooling vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Sunil Kumar. Ld. Counsel, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Shravan Kumar

Mishra, A/R the Respondent.

Order Dated-03.03.2025

Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant stated that the brother of other arguing counsel is ill and hence, he is unable to appear today.

Written notes of arguments filed on behalf of the respondent are taken on record. List the matter on 01.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/22/2024

M/s Universal Manpower Services vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. C. Panda, Id. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-03.03.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant is not present. His request has been made through email for inability to appear today in the tribunal.

Ld. Counsel for the respondent submitted that he has also received the mail from the appellant counsel. Further, on perusal of the record it is revealed that as per order dated 15.01.2025 this case was listed on 27.02.2025. However, the cause list as well as appearance of the party who made the presence suggest that the date was wrongly typed as 27.02.2025 instead on 03.03.2025 and the same be read as 03.03.2025. Put up on 21.04.2025.

D-2/34/2024.

M/s Rangi International Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: A/R for the Appellant.

Sh. Vaibhav proxy for Sh. B.K. Tambar, Ld. Counsel the

Respondent.

Order Dated-04.03.2025

A/R for the appellant submitted the compliance report. Proxy counsel appearing for the respondent submitted the reply to this appeal. Copy of the same stands supplied to A/R appearing for appellant.

Now list the case for hearing on the misc. application filed for seeking stay. Put up on 27.03.2025.

D-2/07/2021.

M/s International Hospital Ltd. vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Anil Bhatt, Ld. Counsel & Sh. K.K. Pandey, for the Appellant.

Sh. C. Panda, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Mishra, for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-04.03.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Copy of the list showing how the amount assessed in the impugned order is arrived at by the Enforcement Officer of the respondent department is also supplied to ld. Counsel for the appellant for verification. List the matter on 15.04.2025 for continuation of the arguments.

D-2/25/2021.

M/s Natwest Digital Services India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Sanjay Ghose, Soumya Dasgupta, Mukesh Seju counsels &

Ms. Bhavna Dhami, A/R for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-04.03.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. List the matter on 16.04.2025 for continuation of the arguments.

D-2/25/2021.

M/s Akasva Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Vaibhav proxy for Sh. B.K. Tambar, Ld. Counsel the

Respondent.

Order Dated-04.03.2025

Perusal of the order sheet shows that the case is listed for final arguments today, however, the same is not listed in today's cause list.

Now list the case on 02.04.2025 for final arguments. Office is directed to inform the next date of hearing to both the parties through email.

D-2/06/2020

M/s Zapdor Engineering Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, ld. counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel, & Sh. Deepak Meena A/R

for the Respondent.

Order Dated-05.03.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant has stated that he has not been in touch with his client i.e., appellant in the present case. Several reminders through mail & WhatsApp messages have been sent but no reply has come from the appellant.

Record perused. This appeal has been filed against the order dated 30.08.2019 passed u/s 7A of the **EPF & MP Act, 1952** and subsequent order dated 15.10.2019 passed u/s 7B of the Act.

Vide order dated 08.12.2021 stay was granted upon the execution subject to deposit of 20% of the assessed amount, even the extension was allowed on 22.02.2022. Vide order dated 31.03.2022 a subsequent extension was allowed and ultimately the appeal was dismissed on 12.04.2022 for non-compliance of the order.

Thereafter, an application has been filed for revival and restoration of the appeal in terms of the directions given by Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) No. 12631 dated 05.09.2022. Accordingly, the appellant submitted a FDR amounting of Rs.7,77,620/-, therefore, the appeal was restored.

The conduct of the appellant as such that no further leniency is required and on basis of the submissions made by Id. Counsel for the appellant, the present appeal stands dismissed. Office is directed to consign the record to the record room.

D-2/09/2024

M/s Vaco Binary Semantics LLP Consultants (India) vs. RPFC, Gurgaon.

Present: Ms. Tanvi Malpani, proxy counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-05.03.2025

Proxy counsel appearing for the appellant submitted the rejoinder. Copy of the same supplied today to ld. Counsel for the respondent. Pleadings in the matter are complete. List the matter on 10.03.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/01/2024

M/s Teleperformance Global Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram East.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. C. Panda, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-06.03.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant is not present. No communication has been received regarding the compliance with the order passed for the stay of the impugned order. In these circumstances stay on execution is vacated. Put up on 07.04.2025 for filing of the reply.

D-2/01/2024

M/s Teleperformance Global Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Saumitra Singhal, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. C. Panda, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-07.03.2025

File is taken up on the application filed by the appellant with the prayer that stay order be continued because he has complied with the order passed by this tribunal and placed on record the FDR No. 054413060392 dated 03.03.2025 for Rs.3,04,319/- ICICI Bank Ltd.

Record perused. Yesterday, appellant had failed to comply with the condition imposed by this tribunal which resulted in vacation of stay. Today appellant had complied the condition of deposit 10% of the amount, therefore, stay on the impugned order passed u/s 14B and 7Q of the Act shall be continued till the disposal of this appeal. Put up on 28.03.2025.

D-2/41/2024

M/s Bhagpat Industries Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Meerut.

Present: Sh. Arvind Kumar, for the Appellant.

Sh. Kanhaiya Singhal, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-06.03.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of rejoinder by and on behalf of the appellant, however, more time is prayer on behalf of the appellant to file the rejoinder. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed. List the matter on 08.04.2025 for filing of rejoinder.

D-2/10/2023

M/s TS Tech Sun India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-06.03.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of a brief note of submission on behalf of the respondent.

D-2/01/2022

M/s Tenneco Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Ms. Vaishnavi for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-06.03.2025

A request for adjournment is moved on behalf of the AR appearing for the respondent. In the interest of justice, adjournment granted. List the matter on 09.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/03/2025

M/s Sandha & Company vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Pradeep Shukla & Ms. Mukta Arora, for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel, & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-10.03.2025

This appeal is filed against the impugned order dated 17.01.2025 in respect of the period 01/01/2021 to 11/07/2024 whereby the respondent has assessed the damages and interest to the tune of Rs.32,39,511/- & Rs. 25,76,394/-.

I have perused the record and office report, present appeal is filed well within the period of limitation as prescribed under Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1997. Record also reveals that the appellant has never participated in the proceeding before respondent authority. According to him, he has received the order from the department for depositing of the dues and thereafter, he came to know that the order has been passed.

Respondent department has submitted that appellant has been informed regularly. As per record, the matter is listed to webex hearing however, the copy of sharing link has not been produced in this file nor the dispatch register. Respondent department is directed to bring all the records including the dispatch register as well as notice issued through webex.

The respondent is further directed to bring the record whether the pronouncement of order has been reflected in the cause list of the day. Put up on 27.03.2025. Till then operation of the impugned order is stayed.

M.A. No. 01/2025 for restoration of dismissed appeal no. D-2/20/2024 M/s Pine Tree Hospitality vs. RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Ms. Neetu Mishra, for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel, & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for

the Respondent.

Order Dated-10.03.2025

Ld. Counsel for the applicant pressed her application filed for restoration of the appeal. Ld. Counsel for the respondent vehemently opposed the application citing that the appeal was dismissed due to the absence of ld. counsel for the appellant on a previous occasion on 01.05.2024 also and the same was restored by this tribunal imposing a cost of Rs.1000/- on 09.05.2024.

Ld. Counsel for the appellant stated that her absence was due to the illness and throat infection. Praying for restoration of the appeal, she submitted that despite of the direction her junior failed to appear on the fixed date and the non-appearance on her part was neither deliberate nor intentional.

I have heard the arguments of both the counsels and perused the record. This tribunal is of the opinion that though the conduct of the ld. counsel for appellant cannot be appreciated, however, in the interest of justice the misc. application for restoration of the appeal is allowed subject to a cost of Rs.1000/- which shall be paid to the respondent. After the payment of cost, the appeal shall be restored to its original position. Put up on 03.04.2025 for payment of cost and further proceedings.

D-2/22/2022

M/s Jaypee Healthcare Ltd. vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-10.03.2025

At the outset, counsel for the respondent submits that appeal should have been filed by the IRP and not by the appellant who is the HR Manager.

It is admitted fact by the counsel for the appellant that now Jaypee Healthcare Ltd. has been taken over by the Max Healthcare. He also admitted the pendency of the appointment of the RP as well as their process when this appeal was filed.

In spite of this, respondent has preceded further in the present case and decided the dues. Respondent counsel submits he will file appropriate application in this regard along with all the enclosure in relation to the relevant question. Put up for filing of the application by the respondent. Respondent is directed to furnish the advanced copy along with enclosures to the appellant on 15.04.2025.

D-2/09/2024

M/s Vaco Binary Semantics LLP Consultants (India) vs. RPFC, Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. Siddharth Dias & Ms. Tanvi Malpani, Ld. Counsel, for the

Respondent.

None for the Appellant.

Order Dated-10.03.2025

As none is appearing on behalf of the appellant, list the matter on 02.04.2025.

D-2/09/2020 & 1001(16)2016 M/s Vitalife Lab. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. Nikhil Kumar, counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-12.03.2025

The counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant and submitted two order dated 15.05.2024 and 27.02.2025 respectively passed by National Company Law Tribunal. He further sought time to file his vakalatnama. Accordingly, list both these matters on 30.04.2025 for further proceedings.

D-2/35/2024

M/s R.B. Enterprises vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Id. counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.03.2025

Today the matter is listed for reporting compliance of the order dated 14.01.2025 wherein the appellant was directed to deposit an amount of Rs.25,00,000/- as a condition for stay. However, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant stating that he requires more time to comply with the directions of depositing the above amount. In the interest of justice, a time of further two weeks is granted for reporting compliance. List the matter on 01.04.2025 for reporting the compliance aforementioned as well as filing of reply to the appeal by and on behalf of the respondent. In the meanwhile, interim order, if any, to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/43/2024

M/s General Security & Information Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Ms. Shrabani Chakrabarty, ld. counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. Sanjeev Mishra, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.03.2025

Today ld. counsel for the appellant moved one print out of application u/s 151 CPC for clarifying limitation and permanent exemption of personal appearance of the director Sh. Jitenjal Sinha on hearing dates.

The said application is also having a photo copy of affidavit of Sh. Jitenjal Sinha signed at New Delhi in which the day column is empty and it is duly notarized by Sarbani Mitra of Sealdah Court on 17.03.2025. Ld. Counsel for the appellant further submitted that the original application shall reach to her within two or three days and she shall file the same on receiving it.

Accordingly, list the matter on 08.04.2025 for consideration of this misc. application.

D-2/07/2020

M/s H.K. Corporation vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Id. counsel, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.03.2025

As none appeared on behalf of the respondent. List the matter on 04.04.2025 for final arguments.

Atul Kumar Garg (Presiding Officer)

Later at 03.15 P.M.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda appeared on behalf of the respondent and noted the next date of hearing.

D-2/02/2023

M/s Wear well India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, ld. counsel, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.03.2025

As none appeared on behalf of the respondent. List the matter on 22.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/16/2021

M/s. Satish Kumar Sharma SPCBP (Bilaspur) vs. APFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-18.03.2025

AR for the respondent has filed the LCR which is kept with the record of this appeal. The AR appereing on behalf of the respondent also informed that his counsel Sh. B.B. Pradhan is appearing before NCLT and he is not aware till what time he shall appear today.

Accordingly, in the interest of justice, list the matter on 28.03.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/02/2025

M/s. Qspear Consultancy vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Hemant Kumar, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-19.03.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of compliance of the order dated 10.02.2025 wherein the appellant was directed to deposit 30% of the amount assessed u/s 14 & 7Q both as a condition for stay by way of FDR.

Accordingly, Id. counsel for the appellant has filed an FDR no. 9249787109 amounting to Rs.37,05,550/- (Kotak Mahindra Bank) favoring Registrar CGIT. The same is kept in the case file in a plastic cover. As the appellant has complied with the direction dated 10.02.2025, the operation of the impugned orders is stayed till finalization of the appeal.

The A/R appearing on behalf of the respondent stated that more time is required to file the reply to this appeal. In the interest of justice, prayer to more time is allowed. Put up on 16.04.2025 for filing of reply by the respondent.

D-2/25/2024

M/s. Seasons Textiles vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi proxy counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Hemant Kumar, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-19.03.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of the rejoinder by the appellant, however, proxy counsel appearing for the appellant requested for more time. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed. Put up on 16.04.2025 for filing of rejoinder by the appellant.

D-2/22/2018

M/s. Shivalik Prints vs. APFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. J.R Sharma, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Bhupesh Sharma for the

Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel, & Sh. Devesh Garg, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-19.03.2025

The ld. counsel for the respondent has filed original trial court record (running into two volumes) pertaining to the proceeding conducted under section 7A of the Act.

Ld. Counsel for the appellant seeks leave of this tribunal to inspect the same. Prayer for inspection of the TCR is allowed and ld. counsel for the appellant is free to inspect the record after submitting an application in this regard. Put up on 17.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/16/2024

M/s. Brij Laxmi Paper Products Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Vivek Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Mishra, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-19.03.2025

Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant stating that they have received an amount of Rs.2,16,925/- as agreed to be refunded by the respondent. He further prayed for more time to assess that whether more amount is required to be refunded by the respondent. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 16.04.2025.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI;

D-2/04/2025

M/s. Bimalraj Outsourcing Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. J.R. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Satpal Singh Adv., & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-24.03.2025

This is an appeal filed against an order passed u/s 14B & 7Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred as the Act). Office has reported that the appeal is filed within limitation having been filed on 19.03.2025 against the impugned order dated 18.02.2025, the same is admitted for hearing.

Counsel for respondent has sought time stating that he will file a detailed reply within two weeks to the stay application. He is at liberty to do so. Put up for arguments on the stay application on 17.04.2025. Till then, no coercive steps be taken against the appellant.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI;

D-2/05/2025

M/s. Soorya Nextech Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Ishaan Mukherjee, for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.03.2025

- 1. This is a fresh appeal filed under section 7-I of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred as the Act) assailing the order passed u/s 7A of the Act dated 23.01.2020. Along with the appeal, an application for condonation of delay has been filed by the appellant.
- 2. Office has reported that delay has been of more than five years. In the application, the applicant has also admitted the above said delay. However, he has stated that the appellant had taken the wrong route. First he had approached the Punjab and Haryana High Court in the writ petition bearing No. CWP- 12172-2023 against the order of attachment dated 01.12.2020 passed by respondent authority. However, subsequently he had withdrawn the writ petition on 13.10.2023. Even again, he had filed a civil suit bearing CNR no HRGR020053022023 before Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Gurugram, against the order of RPFC, which he had also withdrawn on 21.03.2024. In these circumstances he submits that the delay be condoned.
- 3. Respondent counsel has opposed the above said plea taken by the respondent and submits that this tribunal has no discretion to condone the delay beyond 60 days.
- 4. Before proceeding further, it is important to quote the provisions of Rule 7(2) of the Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1997 which are as under:-

Rule 7(2) Fee, time for filing appeal, deposit of amount due on filing appeal. - (1)....

(2) Any person aggrieved by a notification issued by the Central Government or an order passed by the Central Government or any other authority under the Act, <u>may within 60 days from the date of issue of the notification/order prefer an appeal to the Tribunal:</u>

Provided that the Tribunal may, if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from preferring the appeal within the prescribed period, extend the said period by a further period of 60 days:

Provided further that no appeal by the employer shall be entertained by a Tribunal unless he has [deposited with the Tribunal a Demand Draft payable in the Fund and bearing] 75 per cent of the amount due from him as determined under section 7A:

Provided also that the Tribunal may for reasons to be recorded in writing, waive or reduce the amount to be deposited under section 7-0.

- 5. From the perusal of the above said rules, it becomes guite clear that this tribunal can extend the period of limitation for another sixty days after expiry of the period of first sixty days from issuance of the impugned order, if the appellant is able to show bonafide. Here in the present case, the delay is of not 120 days in filing the appeal from the issuance of the impugned order dated 23.01.2020 but it has extended up to more than five years. Reasons assigned by the appellant is not satisfactory. Even if it is assumed that the limitation falls within the Covid period that begins from the last week of March, 2020 till February, 2022, then also the appeal shall have been filed in the month of March or April, 2022. However, instead of filing the appeal before this tribunal, against an order passed by the respondent under section 7 A of the Act, the appellant had approached the Punjab and Haryana High Court by way of writ petition, assailing the order of attachment dated 01.12.2020 which is against the recovery of the amount due. It cannot be said that he has not the knowledge of the impugned order. At least he had come to know the passing of the order on 01.12.2020.
- 6. Circumstances stated above, does not warrant of using any discretion of this tribunal for condoning the delay in filing the appeal. Hence, the application filed for condonation of delay is dismissed. Consequent thereto, the appeal filed by the appellant is also dismissed. Consign the record to the record room as per Rules.

D-2/39/2024

M/s. Leeway Manpower Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.03.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed the reply to this appeal. Copy of the same stands supplied to ld. counsel for the appellant who does not file to any rejoinder and prays for listing of the case for final arguments. Put up on 24.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/07/2023

M/s. Sandhar Han Sung Technologies Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Adv. Sumayya Khatoon, for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.03.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks time to file written arguments. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 24.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/28/2024

M/s. Widmans Laboratory vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Gaurav, proxy for Ms. Neetu Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the

Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.03.2025

Proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up on 24.04.2025.

D-2/44/2024

M/s JPM Automobiles Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-25.03.2025

The A/R appearing on behalf of the respondent seeks an adjournment as the counsel is unable to attend the hearing before this tribunal today. Put up on 09.04.2025. In the meanwhile, interim order, if any, to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/10/2019

M/s Lakhani Footwear Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-26.03.2025

Today the case is listed for filing the legible copies of the documents on behalf of the appellant. Ld. Counsel for the appellant filed the documents. Copy of the same supplied today to ld. Counsel for the respondent. Put up on 22.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/11/2019

M/s Lakhani Rubber Works Vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-26.03.2025

Today the case is listed for filing the legible copies of the documents on behalf of the appellant. Ld. Counsel for the appellant filed the documents. Copy of the same supplied today to ld. Counsel for the respondent. Put up on 22.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/18/2019

M/s Lakhani Armaan Shoes Pvt. Ltd. Vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-26.03.2025

Today the case is listed for filing the legible copies of the documents on behalf of the appellant. Ld. Counsel for the appellant filed the documents. Copy of the same supplied today to ld. Counsel for the respondent. Put up on 22.04.2025 for final arguments.

808(14)2016 M/s Viraj Exports Vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Counsel for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order dated-26.03.2025

This tribunal is in receipt of one application seeking adjournment on behalf of Sh. Narender Kumar, the ld. Counsel for the respondent, on account of hospitalization of his sister. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 23.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/32/2019

M/s Viraj Exports Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CBT; APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Sanjay, Proxy Counsel, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order dated-26.03.2025

This tribunal is in receipt of one application seeking adjournment on behalf of Sh. Narender Kumar, the ld. Counsel for the respondent, on account of hospitalization of his sister. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 23.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/38/2024

M/s Zabi Enterprises vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East.

Present: Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-27.03.2025

Proxy counsel for the appellant request for an adjournment on behalf of Sh. Prakash Kumar, Id. Counsel for the appellant could not appear before this tribunal due to some personal difficulty. Accordingly, list the matter on 23.04.2025 for filing of rejoinder as the last chance.

D-2/39/2022

M/s Sudhir Power Ltd. Vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Umesh Gulati, Ld. Counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-27.03.2025

Arguments in the matter heard in part. List the matter on 29.04.2025.

D-2/16/2021

M/s Satish Kumar Sharma SPCBP (Bilaspur) Vs. APFC, Gurugram (West)

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for

the Respondent.

Order dated-28.03.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard and concluded. The matter is reserved for pronouncement of order.

D-2/35/2024 M/s R.B. Enterprises vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Devesh, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order dated-01.04.2025

Today the case is listed for reporting compliance of the order dated 14.01.2025 by the appellant. However, neither the compliance has been reported by the appellant nor anybody has appeared on behalf of the appellant despite several calls made till 03:30 P.M. Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. Counsel for the respondent is present throughout the calls. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution. File be consigned to the record room.

Sd/-

D-2/30/2019

M/s Greater Noida Industrial Development Authority vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Santosh Singh A/R

for the Respondent.

Order dated-01.04.2025

Respondent is granted more time to ascertain the status of the case pertaining to Mathura Vrindavan Development Authority. Ld. Counsel for the appellant is also granted liberty to file his written notes of arguments as well as the case is relied upon by him. Put up on 21.04.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/23/2021

M/s N 1 Media Consultancy (P) Limited Vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. K.K. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena,

A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-01.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has failed to file his written notes of arguments. In the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted as a last chance. Put up on 29.04.2025 for filing of written notes of arguments as well as for final arguments.

D-2/03/2023

M/s Umang Appliances & Equipments (P) Ltd. vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-01.04.2025

The ld. Counsel for the respondent has informed this tribunal that he has received one request for seeking adjournment by and on behalf of the ld. Counsel for the appellant. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 29.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/10/2024

M/s National Institute of Open Schooling vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. B.K. Singh, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-01.04.2025

The counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant stated that the arguing counsel Sh. Sunil Kumar Srivastava, is unable to appear today and requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 01.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/10/2024

M/s National Institute of Open Schooling vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. B.K. Singh, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-01.04.2025

The counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant stated that the arguing counsel Sh. Sunil Kumar Srivastava, is unable to appear today and requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 01.05.2005 for final arguments.

D-2/23/2020

M/s Antony Road Transport Solutions Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Rajesh Kumar, proxy counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-02.04.2025

Office has reported that it has received the mail from the respondent counsel (Sh. Sandeep Vishnu Adv.) mentioning that he has returned all the files of the matters pertaining to CGIT to the respondent with a request to appoint some other advocate because he is not at the best of his health.

In these circumstances, case is adjourned to 02.05.2025. In the meanwhile, trial court record in compliance of the order dated 06.12.2024 be requisition. Copy of the order be sent to both the parties through email.

D-2/09/2024

M/s Vaco Binary Semantics LLP Consultants (India) Vs. RPFC, Gurgoan.

Present: Sh. Siddharth Dias & Ms. Tanvi Malpani, for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel & Ms. Reshma Bajaj, A/R for

the respondent.

Order dated-02.04.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Ld. Counsel for the respondent is directed to produce the record pertaining to the enquiry conducted u/s 7A of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 along with the E.O. report consisting of the bifurcation made with regard to the basic wages and minimum wages. Put up on 17.04.2025 for production of the record as directed today as well as further arguments.

D-2/20/2024

M/s Pine Tree Hospitality vs. RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-03.04.2025

Record perused. On the last date of hearing i.e. 10.03.2025 restoration of the appeal was allowed subject to the cost of Rs.1000/- which was to be paid to the respondent. However, neither the cost has been paid nor counsel has appeared. Record further reveals that on the date of first listing of the appeal i.e. on 01.05.2024, it was dismissed due to nonappearance of the ld. Counsel for the appellant. Thereafter, on the application of the appellant, appeal was restored subject to a cost of Rs.500/- on 09.05.2024.

On 13.05.2024, this tribunal had stayed the impugned order subject to deposit of Rs.4,00,000/- by way of FDR payable in favour of Registrar CGIT initially for a period of one year having auto renewal mode thereafter and the case was listed for 22.07.2024. On 22.07.2024, the order was complied but again appeal was dismissed on 09.01.2025 as nobody was appearing for the last three dates i.e. 28.10.2024, 26.11.2024 & 09.01.2024.

Subsequently, the appellant counsel had moved application for restoration of the appeal and order has been passed by this tribunal on 10.03.2025 wherein the application for restoration of the appeal was allowed subject to a cost of Rs.1000/- as mentioned above.

Considering the fact, neither the cost has been paid nor the counsel had appeared for argument, the appeal stands dismissed. Stay granted earlier is vacated automatically.

Atul Kumar Garg (Presiding

Officer)

Immediately, after the dismissal of this appeal, at 02:28 P.M., Ms. Neetu Mishra, appeared and prayed to record her presence. She has also paid the cost of Rs.1000/- to the ld. Counsel for the respondent. Accordingly, the above order of dismissal of this appeal is recalled. Appeal is restored. Put up the case on 11.04.2025.

Atul Kumar Garg

(Presiding Officer)

D-2/18/2020

M/s Bata India Limited vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Himashu Chaudhary, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-03.04.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that father of one of the counsels from his legal firm has expired and all the counsels have to visit the Shamshan Ghat for cremation. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. List the matter on 13.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/02/2024

M/s Cadence Design Systems (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-I, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Santosh Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-03.04.2025

The A/R appearing on behalf of the respondent stated that he has received the information from his counsel Sh. Sandeep Vishnu that he has returned all the file of the CGIT to the respondent with a request to appoint some other advocate because he is not at the best of his health.

In these circumstances, case is adjourned to 13.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/03/2024

M/s Cadence Design Systems (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-I, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Santosh Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-03.04.2025

The A/R appearing on behalf of the respondent stated that he has received the information from his counsel Sh. Sandeep Vishnu that he has returned all the file of the CGIT to the respondent with a request to appoint some other advocate because he is not at the best of his health.

In these circumstances, case is adjourned to 13.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/07/2020

M/s H.K. Corporation vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-04.04.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. List the matter on 24.04.2025 for final argument.

D-2/23/2022

M/s Polyplastic Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R

for the Respondent.

Order dated-04.04.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. List the matter on 24.04.2025 for final argument.

D-2/01/2025

M/s Chennai MSW Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan Mishra, Ld. counsel for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Santosh Kumar

Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-07.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed reply to misc. application filed u/s **70 of the EPF & MP Act, 1952** seeking waiver of the pre deposit amount. Copy of the same stands supplied to the ld. Counsel for the appellant who request some time for arguing the matter on this misc. application. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 25.04.2025.

D-2/14/2018 M/s UPSRTC, Noida Region vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Shadab Khan, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-07.04.2025

Written submission on behalf of both the parties stands filed. Put up on 08.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/06/2021 M/s UPSRTC, Noida Region vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Shadab Khan, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-07.04.2025

Written submission on behalf of both the parties stands filed. Put up on 08.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/19/2021 M/s Ghatak Security Services vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan Mishra, for the Appellant.

Sh. Santosh Kumar Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-07.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant stated that he has received one request from Sh. Sandeep Vishnu, stating that he has left all the cases in which he was representing the respondent and as in one of the appeals bearing no D-2/19/2021, Sh. Sandeep Vishnu is the counsel. He further submitted that he wants to argue both the matters at the same time and therefore, an adjournment be given to him. Considering the above submission, respondent authority is directed to appoint a new counsel before the next date of hearing in appeal no D-2/19/2021. Put up both this case on 23.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/05/2023

M/s Ghatak Security Services vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan Mishra, for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel and Sh. Santosh Kumar Singh,

A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-07.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant stated that he has received one request from Sh. Sandeep Vishnu, stating that he has left all the cases in which he was representing the respondent and as in one of the appeals bearing no D-2/19/2021, Sh. Sandeep Vishnu is the counsel. He further submitted that he wants to argue both the matters at the same time and therefore, an adjournment be given to him. Considering the above submission, respondent authority is directed to appoint a new counsel before the next date of hearing in appeal no D-2/19/2021. Put up both this case on 23.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/27/2019

M/s Hi-Tac Manpower Services Pvt. Ltd. Vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-09.04.2025

As Ld. Counsel for the respondent is not present, list the matter on 28.04.2025 for filing of written notes of arguments by the appellant.

D-2/01/2022

M/s Tenneco Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Ms. Vaishnavi, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-09.04.2025

As arguing counsels for both the parties are not present. List the matter on 28.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/41/2022

M/s Sterling Mobikes Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Satpal Singh, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for

the Respondent.

Order dated-09.04.2025

The Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed his written notes of argument. Final arguments in the matter heard at length and completed. The matter is reserved for pronouncement of order.

D-2/44/2024

M/s JPM Automobiles Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

None for the respondent.

Order dated-09.04.2025

As none is present on behalf of the respondent. List the matter on 30.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/20/2024

M/s Pine Tree Hospitality vs. RPFC Gurugram West

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R

for the respondent.

Order dated-11.04.2025

Office has reported that appellant counsel has expressed her inability to appear before this tribunal because she was under the impression that court would be closed.

Record perused. On the last date of hearing, this tribunal had restored the appeal subject to the cost of Rs.1000/- which has been paid by the appellant. Record further reveals, this appeal was dismissed three time already for want of prosecution. Today's date was given by this tribunal in the presence of the counsels. In these circumstances, case is listed for final arguments subject to the cost of Rs.5000/- out of which Rs.3000/- shall be deposited with DLSA and remaining amount of Rs.2000/- is to be paid to ld. Counsel for the respondent. Put up on 14.05.2025.

D-2/43/2024

M/s General Security & Information Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Faridabad, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Adv. Sandeep Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-15.04.2025

Appellant counsel is not present. This tribunal has given so many opportunities to the appellant for complying with the directions of securing presence of Sh. Jitenjal Sinha, who had been called for explaining the fact for communicating the details about closure of the establishment to the respondent. Let the case be fixed for consideration on 17.04.2025. In the meanwhile, department is directed to produce the trial court record.

Atul Kumar Garg (Presiding Officer)

Later, at 03:30 P.M. Ms. Shrabani Chakrabarti appeared and filed original application along with affidavit the same is kept in the file for consideration on 17.04.2025.

M.A. No. 02/2025 in dismissed appeal no. D-2/06/2020 M/s Zapdor Engineering Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Anshuman Upadhyay & Sh. Manish Kumar Mishra, for

the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena,

A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-15.04.2025

Appellant counsel is present. He has pressed his misc. application for restoration of the appeal. Office has stated that the previous counsel Sh. Rajiv Arora has filed a caveat citing that before deciding this application, he be heard.

Record perused. Earlier on 05.03.2025 this tribunal had dismissed the appeal recording the averment of Sh. Rajiv Arora regarding his submission that he is not in touch of his client despite of several communications made through email and WhatsApp. In these circumstances, put up the present application on 22.04.2025. Office is also directed to inform the previous counsel Sh. Rajiv Arora about the next date of hearing.

D-2/07/2021

M/s International Hospital Ltd. vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Sarthak Tyagi, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Mishra,

A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-15.04.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment citing that the main counsel Sh. Anil Bhatt is arguing a matter before Hon'ble Supreme Court. Accordingly, adjournment is granted. Put up on 17.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/22/2022

M/s Jaypee Healthcare Ltd. vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-15.04.2025

During the hearing conducted on 10.03.2025, ld. Counsel for the respondent had sought permission to file appropriate application along with all the enclosures relating to the question that appeal should have been filed by the IRP and not by the appellant who is the H.R. Manager.

However, Id. Counsel for the respondent wants more time to file the application. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed. List the matter on 20.05.2025 for filing of the application and thereafter consideration of the same.

D-2/36/2024 M/s Rathi Steel & Power Ltd. vs. APFC Meerut.

Present: Sh. Kumar Vikram, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Kanhaiya Singhal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-15.04.2025

During the hearing conducted on 24.02.2025, ld. Counsel for the appellant was directed to submit additional documents along with the signature and a certificate u/s 63 of Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam. However, ld. Counsel for the appellant seeks more time to file the above said documents. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed. List the matter on 15.05.2025 for filing of the said documents and final arguments thereafter.

D-2/41/2024

M/s Bhagpat Industries Ltd. vs. APFC/ RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Arvind Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Kanhaiya Singhal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-15.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant has moved an application with the prayer that direction be given to the respondent to deattach the property which has been attached in pursuance of the order passed by the RPFC/ Recovery Officer on 04.07.2024. He submits that the said property pertains to the applicant namely Smt. Saroj Sharma who is wife of the appellant in this appeal and she has been facing financial problem. For this, ld. Counsel for the appellant has made reference to the order of this court dated 07.11.2024.

I have perused the application pressed today. The order dated 07.11.2024 does not speak anything regarding recalling of the order which has been passed earlier. It had only restrained the respondent from taking any further coercive step in regard to the execution of the order dated 04.07.2024.

Actually the appellant had taken a contradictory view. He has said that the property is in the name of the appellant firm and in the other line of the application he has said that the said property belongs to the applicant which is the wife of the appellant and she is facing financial problem. This tribunal has nothing to do with the financial problem as well as the wife's problem while dealing with an appeal filed under section 7I of the EPF & MP Act, 1952. Hence, the application being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed. The matter being ripe for final arguments, is listed for 19.05.2025.

D-2/25/2024

M/s Seasons Textile vs. APFC Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2025

Record perused. Appellant is required to file a rejoinder. However, none has appeared on behalf of appellant. The right of the appellant to file rejoinder stands closed. Put up on 30.04.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/02/2025

M/s Qspear Consultancy vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the reply of the appeal. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 30.04.2025 for filing of the reply.

D-2/16/2024

M/s Brij Laxmi Paper Products Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Abhishek Arora, for the Appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant submits that the matter regarding excess amount has been resolved. He wants to argue on his appeal u/s **14B of the EPF & MP Act, 1952** whereby he had made prayer for reducing the damages. Considering the circumstances, which has not been taken consideration by the authority. Put up on 16.05.2025 for arguments on the appeal.

D-2/43/2024

M/s General Security & Information Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-17.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has brought the original trial court record along with recovery file and the same is kept with the appeal file of this tribunal. Put up on 01.05.2025 for further consideration.

D-2/04/2025

M/s Bimalraj Outsourcing Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. J. R Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Satpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-17.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the reply of the stay application. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 13.05.2025 for filing of the reply of the stay application and thereafter consideration of the same. In the meanwhile, interim orders, if any, to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/07/2021

M/s International Hospital Ltd. vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. K.K. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-17.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant seeks an adjournment stating that the arguing counsel Sh. Anil Bhatt is unable to appear today. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 13.05.2025.

D-2/22/2018

M/s Shivalik Prints vs. APFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. J. R Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-17.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant submits that he has inspected the trial court record and does not found first squad report dated 11.07.2022. Assuming the there is no report on record, parties are directed to give an advance copy of their brief submission/written argument. Put up on 20.05.2025 for arguments.

D-2/09/2024

M/s Vaco Binary Semantics LLP Consultants (India) vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. Siddharth Dias, & Ms. Tanvi Malpani, Ld. Counsels for

the Appellant.

Sh. S. N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-17.04.2025

Arguments in the matter heard and concluded. Trial court record retained with the case file of this tribunal. The case is reserved for orders. In the meanwhile, parties are at liberty to file a brief submission of their arguments in not more than two pages within a period of two weeks from today.

D-2/38/2024

M/s Zabi Enterprises vs. RPFC/ APFC Gurugram East

Present: Sh. Prakash Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-23.04.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of rejoinder by Id. Counsel for the appellant, however, more time is prayed for submitting the rejoinder by Id. Counsel for the appellant. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed. Put up on 15.05.2025 for filing of rejoinder by Id. Counsel for the appellant.

808(14)2016 M/s Viraj Exports vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena, A/R

for the Respondent.

Order dated-23.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed reply to the queries placed by this tribunal. Copy of the same stands supplied to ld. Counsel for the appellant. Put up the case on 19.05.2025 for final arguments. In the meanwhile, ld. Counsel for the appellant shall have the liberty to file his written objection to the reply filed today in the form of rejoinder.

D-2/32/2019

M/s Viraj Exports Pvt. Ltd. vs. CBT; APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena, A/R

for the Respondent.

Order dated-23.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed reply to the queries placed by this tribunal. Copy of the same stands supplied to ld. Counsel for the appellant. Put up the case on 19.05.2025 for final arguments. In the meanwhile, ld. Counsel for the appellant shall have the liberty to file his written objection to the reply filed today in the form of rejoinder.

D-2/19/2021

M/s Ghatak Security Services vs. APFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-23.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for respondent, Sh. B.B. Pradhan, has filed his vakalatlama and seeks some time to prepare the final arguments. Accordingly, list the matter on 20.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/05/2023

M/s Ghatak Security Services vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-23.04.2025

List the case along with another appeal pertaining to the same establishment bearing no. D-2/19/2021 which is listed for final arguments on 20.05.2025.

D-2/06/2025

M/s Origo Commodities India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram East & Others.

Present: Sh. Suhail Sehgal & Sh. Olson Nair, for the Appellant.

Sh. Naresh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.04.2025

This is a fresh appeal which is placed by the office for admission hearing. The office report reveals that the appeal is filed well within the time, hence, ordered to be registered. Further along with appeal, ld. Counsel for the respondent has prayed for interim relief against the recovery of the amount mentioned in the impugned orders. Ld. Counsel for the respondent wants some time to submit his reply to the main appeal as well as to the interim prayer. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 28.05.2025 for filing of reply to the main appeal and thereafter, consideration of the same on the interim prayer. In the meanwhile, respondent authority is directed not to take coercive measure for recovery of the amount as mentioned in the impugned order till next date of hearing.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI

M.A. No. 02/2025 in dismissed appeal no. D-2/06/2020 M/s Zapdor Engineering Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Manish Kumar Mishra, proxy counsel for the Applicant.

Sh. Deepak Meena, A/R for the Respondent (EPFO). Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel who has filed the caveat.

Order dated-24.04.2025

- 1. Proxy counsel for the applicant has submitted that he has not been directly in touch with the client who has authorized him to move the application for restoration. Though in the vakalatnama, a signature has been affixed by him on asking of his senior. Privilege of indirectly engaged has been given only to the designated senior not by any advocate registered with the Bar Counsel. If the assertion of Mr. Manish Kumar Mishra is taken to be true, then he has not been authorised by the client.
- 2. Record further reveals that application has been filed on behalf of the appellant for postponing the date which was fixed for 25.04.2025 because counsel was not available. Further record perused and it is found that that there is an application pending for restoration of the appeal which was fixed for 22.04.2025. Since undersigned was on leave on the date, case was listed on 25.04.2025. Accordingly, the matter is heard today for preponing the date. A caveat has also been found on record filed by the previous counsel. On his submission that his client has not been touch for more than one year, appeal was dismissed. This tribunal also considered the conduct of the appellant on the earlier occasions while dismissing the appeal.
- 3. Mr. Rajiv Arora, Id. Counsel who has filed the caveat is also present and he had annexed the document showing the conduct of the appellant, Sh. Amresh Anand earlier also when his application was rejected for want of prosecution by Hon'ble Justice Manoj Kumar Gupta, Allahabd High Court in an another case. He had also enclosed the whatsapp chat wherein he had informed regularly Sh. Amresh Anand about the proceedings of the case. He has stated before this

tribunal that the address of the appellant given in the appeal along with the address given in the affidavit of the present application is wrong. The office of Zapdor Engineering Pvt. Ltd. is not in existence at the mentioned address. Even in the website of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, the address has been shown as **M/s. Zapdor Engineering, 602, 6**th **Floor, Rishabh Complex, Karkardoma, Delhi-110092** where the appellant is not in existence since 2017.

4. In the above circumstances, the presence of the appellant **Sh. Amresh Anand** is required. Counsel appearing for the applicant is directed to furnish the email id of Sh. Amresh Anand. Let he be summoned on 02.05.2025.

D-2/28/2024

M/s. Widmans Laboratory vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Ms. Neetu Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant filed his written submission. Copy furnished to the respondent. Put up on 14.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/07/2020

M/s H.K. Corporation vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Id. counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.04.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Ld. Counsel for the respondent is directed to submit copies of the Audited balance sheet which were submitted with the authorities for establishing the mitigating circumstances as stated by the appellant. Put up on 22.05.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/23/2022

M/s Polyplastic Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.04.2025

D-2/07/2023

M/s. Sandhar Han Sung Technologies Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Vinod Kumar, Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-24.04.2025

Written arguments are filed on behalf of the respondent. Put up on 26.05.2025 for final arguments.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI

D-2/01/2025

M/s Chennai MSW Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC/ APFC Noida

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan Mishra, Sh. Siddharth Sapra, Ms. Nidhi Mishra, &

Ms. Puja Das, Counsels for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-25.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant has moved an interim application for defreezing the account no 915020049664536 on which the Axis Bank had created lien/freezed the account in pursuance of the communication dated 28.01.2025 to the Branch Manager, Axis Bank Ltd., B 21 & 22, Sector-16, Noida Gautam Buddha Nagar, U.P.-201301. He has prayed that Bank has received the order u/s 8F of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 passed by the respondent on 24.02.2025. Earlier this tribunal has restrained the respondent from taking any coercive measure for recovery of the amount on 06.02.2025. Even subsequently, the stay was in operation.

The copy of the application moved today has been supplied to the respondent counsel during the course of hearing. Respondent counsel was asked to verify from the department. She has submitted that actually order was issued through email & speed Post on 28.01.2025 and 29.01.2025 respectively by the respondent department to the Bank much prior to the passing of the first order by this tribunal. She submits that the officer has been following the order, he had served the copy of the order passed u/s 8F of the Act to the bank by hand on 24.02.2025. Subsequently, on 21.03.2025 respondent department has written the Bank not to take further action. On 06.03.2025 Bank has freezed the above mentioned account. Bank has given the information to the respondent for marking of the lien on 06.03.2025 itself.

In substance, her plea is only that the train had already been started much prior to the order passed by this tribunal. However, she does not dispute with the order of stay has been passed by this tribunal on 06.02.2025 and the department was well aware about the order. She had stated that department is at fault by not informing the Enforcement Officer who had served the order

on 24.02.2025 to the Bank for marking lien. It amounts to total disregard of the order passed by this tribunal as red signal had been given to halt the train. However, he has not stopped the train. It amounts to disobedience of this tribunal's order. In these circumstances, the Branch Manager, Axis Bank Ltd., B 21 & 22, Sector-16, Noida Gautam Buddha Nagar, U.P.-201301b is directed to lift the lien on the current Bank Account no. 915020049664536 with immediate effect. Office is directed to send the copy of this order to the said Bank through email. A copy be also given dasti to ld. counsel for the appellant for serving to the Bank.

Further, Sh. Ramakant Yadav, Enforcement Officer is directed to appear before this tribunal on the next date of hearing and explain the reason for disobeying the orders of this tribunal. Respondent department is also directed to explain the action taken on the letter dated 10.04.2025 submitted by the appellant establishment to the respondent authority requesting to withdraw directions issued to the Bank vide order dated 28.01.2025 passed u/s 8F of the Act. Put up on 15.05.2025. In the meanwhile, interim orders, to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/27/2019

M/s Hi-Trac Manpower Services Pvt. Ltd. Vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. K, Ld. counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-28.04.2025

As Ld. counsel for the respondent is not present, put the matter on 22.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/01/2022

M/s Tenneco Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-28.04.2025

Part arguments on behalf of the appellant heard. Now list the case on 02.05.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/23/2021

M/s N1 Media Consultancy (P) Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. K.K. Pandey, Id. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. K.K. Dey, Id. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-29.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent prays for an adjournment as he has to rush for attending another matter listed before Delhi High Court. Put up on 08.07.2025 for final arguments.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI

D-2/39/2022

M/s Sudhir Power Limited vs. RPFC/APFC Gurugram-2

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Pardeep Batra, A/R for

the Respondent.

Order dated-29.04.2025

Today, the case is fixed for final arguments, however, office of the tribunal has placed an application filed through email seeking adjournment on behalf of the ld. counsel for the appellant, Sh. Umesh Gulati stating that he is unable to reach the tribunal since he is not feeling well as his blood pressure is on the higher side and the Doctor has advised him not to drive and travel.

Perusal of the case file shows that earlier also, the ld. counsel for the appellant has sought adjournments on several occasions citing one pretext or another. Accordingly, it is directed to list the case on 01.05.2025 for final arguments. It is further made clear that no adjournment shall be allowed to either of the parties on the next date fixed. Send the copy of this order to ld. counsel for the appellant through email.

D-2/03/2023

M/s Umang Appliances & Equipments (P) Ltd. vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Mahender, for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-29.04.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent prays for an adjournment as he has to rush for attending another matter listed before Delhi High Court. Put up on 20.05.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/02/2025

M/s. Qspear Consultancy vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-30.04.2025

Reply has filed on behalf of the respondent. As none is present on behalf of the appellant, office is directed to inform the next date of hearing to ld. counsel for the appellant. Put up on 27.05.2025.

D-2/09/2020 & 1001(16)2016 M/s Vitalife Lab. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurgaon.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-30.04.2025

Put up the matter on 05.06.2025 for further consideration.

D-2/25/2024

M/s. Seasons Textiles vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-30.04.2025

Case called up several times, none appeared on behalf of the appellant. Ld. Counsel for the respondent is present throughout the calls. Accordingly, the matter is dismissed in default due to non-prosecution on behalf of the appellant. Record be consigned to the record room.

D-2/44/2024

M/s JPM Automobiles Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for

the Respondent.

Order Dated-30.04.2025

D-2/43/2024

M/s General Security & Information Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Sanjeev Mishra, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-01.05.2025

Record reflect that appellant counsel was not present on the last date of hearing even on 15.04.2025 she was appeared about 12 p.m. already appeal was postponed for consideration on 17.04.2025.

Trial court has been retained by this tribunal. Appeal be dismissed on maintainability as well as other issued raised by the office. The matter is reserved for consideration of maintainability of this appeal.

D-2/39/2022

M/s Sudhir Power Ltd. Vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Umesh Gulati, Ld. Counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-01.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard at length and concluded. The matter is reserved for pronouncement of order on the same.

D-2/10/2024

M/s National Institute of Open Schooling vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. B.K. Singh Ld. Counsel, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Sh. Shrawan Mishra & Sh. Deepak

Mishra, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-01.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Put up on 23.05.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/06/2020

M/s Zapdor Engineering Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, ld. counsel, for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel, & Sh. Deepak Meena A/R

for the Respondent.

Order Dated-02.05.2025

D-2/23/2020

M/s Antony Road Transport Solutions Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. counsel for the Respondent

(Vakalatnama filed).

Order dated-02.05.2025

Final arguments on behalf of the appellant heard and completed. Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks some time to rebut the arguments made today on behalf of the appellant. Written arguments filed on behalf of the appellant are taken on record. Put up on 14.05.2025 for further arguments on behalf of the respondent.

D-2/01/2022

M/s Tenneco Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. counsel & Sh. Pradeep Batra, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-02.05.2025

Respondent wants to file his written submissions only. Advance copy is to be furnished by him to ld. counsel for the appellant. Accordingly, list the matter on 27.05.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/04/2025

M/s Bimalraj Outsourcing Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. J.R. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Satpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-13.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed reply to the stay application. He has also filed another application under Rule 21 read with section 7-I to 7-L of the **EPF & MP Act, 1952** for dismissal of the present appeal against 7Q order dated 18.02.2025 passed by the respondent. Copy of the reply to stay application as well as the application moved today on behalf of the respondent is handed over to Id. Counsel for the appellant.

Ld. Counsel for the appellant wants some time to file reply to the application moved today seeking dismissal of the appeal. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 05.06.2025 for consideration of the misc. application filed for seeking stay as well as the application moved today. In the meanwhile, interim order, if any, to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/18/2020

M/s Bata India Limited vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Anil Bhatt, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-13.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks an adjournment stating that he has sought some clarification from the respondent department which are still awaited. Accordingly, the case is adjourned in the interest of justice. Put up on 04.06.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/07/2021.

M/s International Hospital Ltd. vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Anil Bhatt, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-13.05.2025

The case is adjourned on the request of ld. Counsel for the appellant. Put up on 04.06.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/36/2022

M/s IPSAA Holding Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurgaon East.

Present: Sh. M.K. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-13.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant seeks an adjournment stating that he is unable to locate his case file due to shifting of his office. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 15.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/09/2023

M/s Oravel Stays Limited vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Anil Bhatt, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-13.05.2025

The case is adjourned on the request of ld. Counsel for the appellant. Put up on 04.06.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/01/2024

M/s Teleperformance Global Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Sooraj, proxy Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-13.05.2025

Today the case is listed for filing reply to the appeal by and on behalf of the respondent. Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks more time to file the reply. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Put up on 15.07.2025 for filing of reply to the main appeal by the respondent.

D-2/02/2024

M/s Cadence Design Systems (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-I, Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

(Vakalatnama filed).

Order dated-13.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent stated that he is newly engaged counsel in this matter. He further requests for an adjournment as he needs some time to go through the case file. In the interest of justice, time of granted. Put up on 16.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/03/2024

M/s Cadence Design Systems (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-I, Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

(Vakalatnama filed).

Order dated-13.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent stated that he is newly engaged counsel in this matter. He further requests for an adjournment as he needs some time to go through the case file. In the interest of justice, time of granted. Put up on 16.07.2025 for final arguments.

Appeal No. D-2/23/2020

M/s. Antony Road Transport Solutions Pvt. Ltd. Appellant

Through: Sh, Raj Kumar, A/R for the appellant

penani

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Noida

Respondent

Through:- Sh. B. B. Pradhan, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order Dated:-14.05.2025

The A/R appearing for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the arguing counsel, Sh. S.K. Gupta is unable to attend the hearing today as he is arguing a matter before CGIT Lucknow camp court at Dehradun.

Final arguments on the part of appellant stands already concluded. Ld. counsel for the respondent is also directed to file written notes of arguments not more than two pages on or before next date of hearing after supplying advance copy to ld. counsel for the appellant. Put up on 05.06.2025 for oral arguments by ld. counsel for respondent.

Appeal No. D-2/04/2024

M/s. E Meditek Insurance Ltd.

Appellant

Through:- Sh, Amit Bansal, proxy counsel (For Sh. Rajiv Shukla), ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Respondent

Through:- Sh. S.N. Mahanta, ld. counsel & Ms. Rachna Bajaj, A/R for the respondent

Order Dated:-14.05.2025

The proxy counsel appearing for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the arguing counsel, Sh. Rajiv Shukla is unable to attend the hearing today as he is arguing a matter before Delhi High Court. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant adjournment is allowed. Put up on 21.07.2025 for final arguments.

Appeal No. D-2/13/2024

M/s. I.I. Inspection & Export Pvt. Ltd.

Appellant

Through:- Sh, Raj Kumar, A/R for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East Respondent

Through:- Sh. Chakradhar Panda, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order Dated:-14.05.2025

The A/R appearing for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the arguing counsel, Sh. S.K. Gupta is unable to attend the hearing today as he is arguing a matter before CGIT Lucknow camp court at Dehradun. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant adjournment is allowed. Put up on 23.07.2025 for final arguments.

Appeal No. D-2/14/2024

M/s. Knit Craft Apparels International Pvt. Ltd. Appellant

Through:- Sh, Raj Kumar, A/R for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East Respondent

Through:- Sh. S.N. Mahanta, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order Dated:-14.05.2025

The A/R appearing for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the arguing counsel, Sh. S.K. Gupta is unable to attend the hearing today as he is arguing a matter before CGIT Lucknow camp court at Dehradun. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant adjournment is allowed. Put up on 23.07.2025 for final arguments.

Appeal No. D-2/20/2024

M/s. Pine Tree Hospitality

Appellant

Through:- Ms. Neetu Mishra, ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West Respondent

Through:- Sh. Chakradhar Panda, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order Dated:-14.05.2025

On the last date of hearing, a cost of Rs. 5000/- was imposed upon the ld. counsel for appellant, however, no cost is deposited by the appellant. Ld. counsel for the appellant requested to waive the cost as well as prayed for more time to file her written notes of arguments. Ld. counsel for the respondent has filed his written notes of arguments after supplying a copy to ld. counsel for appellant. Written arguments filed on behalf of the respondent are taken on record.

Put up on 23.05.2025 for filing of written notes of arguments in not more than two pages by the ld. counsel for appellant as well as consideration of the prayer for waiver of cost imposed upon the appellant.

Appeal No. D-2/28/2024

M/s. Widmans Laboratory

Appellant

Through:- Ms. Neetu Mishra, ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West Respondent

Through:- Sh. Chakradhar Panda, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order Dated:-14.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard and concluded. Ld. counsel for the respondent has filed his written notes of arguments after supplying a copy to ld. counsel for appellant. Written arguments filed on behalf of the respondent are taken on record. The matter is reserved for pronouncement of order.

D-2/38/2024

M/s Zabi Enterprises vs. RPFC/ APFC Gurugram East

Present: Sh. Prakash Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant submitted that he does not want to file a rejoinder. Pleadings in the matter are complete. Put up on 21.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/17/2024 M/s BSC-C & C 'JV' vs. APFC/RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.05.2025

Counsel for both the parties are directed to file their written notes of arguments not exceeding more than two pages before the oral arguments. Put up on 10.07.2025 for filing of written notes of arguments.

D-2/19/2024

M/s ATC Tower Company India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Vinod Kumar Saini, Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.05.2025

Written arguments filed on behalf of the appellant. Copy furnished to the respondent. Put up on 10.07.2025.

D-2/24/2024

M/s Balaji Associates vs. APFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Yash, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.05.2025

Proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant request for an adjournment stating that the main counsel is out of station. Put up on 14.07.2025.

D-2/36/2024

M/s Rathi Steel & Power Ltd. vs. APFC Meerut.

Present: Sh. Kumar Vikram, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Kanhaiya Singhal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant was directed to file additional documents along with signatures and certificate u/s 63 of Bhartiya Sakhshay Adhiniyam. Accordingly, the appellant has filed an application along with the balance sheet of the appellant praying to consider the same. Copy of the same stands supplied to ld. Counsel for the respondent. The documents filed today by the ld. Counsel for the appellant are taken on record as the ld. Counsel undertakes to provide the certificate on and before the next date of hearing. Put up on 14.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/16/2024

M/s. Brij Laxmi Paper Products Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, proxy for Sh. Sandeep Mishra, for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-16.05.2025

As none of the regular counsel are present. Accordingly, put up on 21.07.2025 for final arguments.

808(14)2016 M/s Viraj Exports vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-19.05.2025

Due to paucity of time, the matter is listed for 25.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/32/2019 M/s Viraj Exports vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-19.05.2025

Due to paucity of time, the matter is listed for 25.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/32/2024

M/s Akasva Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Vaibhav Dayma & Sh. Lalit Kumar A/R for the

Respondent.

Order dated-19.05.2025

The ld. Counsel for the respondent is not present. Put the matter on 22.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/33/2024

M/s Huawei Telecommunication (India) Co. Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Ankit Gurav, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-19.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant stated that the matter is under adjudication before Hon'ble Delhi High Court, therefore, a date after the date of High court may be given. Put up on 11.08.2025.

D-2/34/2024.

M/s Rangi International Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. Pankaj Malik, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Vaibhav Dayma, proxy & Sh. Ashok Kumar Meghwal, A/R the

Respondent.

Order Dated-19.05.2025

The ld. Counsel for the respondent is not present. Put the matter on 23.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/22/2018

M/s Shivalik Prints vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad

Present: Sh. J.R. Sharma & Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. Himanshu Rai, proxy counsel for Respondent.

Order Dated-20.05.2025

The proxy counsel appearing for the respondent requested for an adjournment stating that the main counsel Sh. B.B. Pradhan is busy in arguments before Delhi High Court. In the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up the matter on 22.07.2025 for final arguments.

(Atul Kumar Garg)
Presiding Officer

Later:

At 04:15 P.M. Sh. B. Pradhan appeared and noted the next date of hearing in the matter.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

D-2/19/2021

M/s Ghatak Security Services vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan , ld. counsel for appellant

Sh. Himanshu Rai, proxy counsel for Respondent.

Order Dated-20.05.2025

The proxy counsel appearing for the respondent requested for an adjournment stating that the main counsel Sh. B.B. Pradhan is busy in arguments before Delhi High Court. In the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up the matter on 28.07.2025 for final arguments.

(Atul Kumar Garg)
Presiding Officer

Later:

At 04:15 P.M. Sh. B. Pradhan appeared and noted the next date of hearing in the matter.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

D-2/05/2023

M/s Ghatak Security Services vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan , ld. counsel for appellant

Sh. Himanshu Rai, proxy counsel for Respondent.

Order Dated-20.05.2025

The proxy counsel appearing for the respondent requested for an adjournment stating that the main counsel Sh. B.B. Pradhan is busy in arguments before Delhi High Court. In the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up the matter on 28.07.2025 for final arguments.

(Atul Kumar Garg)
Presiding Officer

Later:

At 04:15 P.M. Sh. B. Pradhan appeared and noted the next date of hearing in the matter.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

D-2/22/2022

M/s Jaypee Healthcare Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, proxy counsel for appellant

Sh. Kaushik Kr. Dey, ld. counsel for Respondent.

Order Dated-20.05.2025

The proxy counsel appearing for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the main counsel Sh. S.K. Gupta is busy in arguments before Dwarka Court. In the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up the matter on 28.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/03/2023

M/s Umang Appliances & Equipments Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida

Present: Sh. Mahendra Singh Sharma, ld. counsel for appellant

Sh. Kaushik Kr. Dey , ld. counsel for Respondent.

Order Dated-20.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed his written notes of arguments. Ld. Counsel for the appellant also stated that oral arguments in the matter have already been completed and this matter be decided on the basis of oral arguments made on the previous date and the written notes of arguments. Accordingly, the matter is reserved for pronouncement of order.

D-2/07/2025

M/s Ambience Hotel & Resorts Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Id. counsel (Vakalatnama filed) & Sh. Lalit

Kumar, A/R for Respondent.

Order Dated-21.05.2025

This is a fresh appeal which is filed against the orders passed u/s 14 B & 7 Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 by respondent department whereby an amount of Rs.9,38,541/-- is assessed as damages and & Rs.6,07,906 /-is assessed as interest.

As the appeal is filed within time, the same is admitted for hearing. Though, the appellant has not filed any separate application seeking stay on executing of the impugned orders, however, the same is prayed by way of interim prayers in the appeal itself.

Ld. counsel for the respondent prayed that the stay be subjected to some condition and he seeks some time to file reply to the appeal as well as to the prayer for seeking stay. In the interest of justice, time granted. Put up the matter on 07.07.2025 for filing of reply by respondent and thereafter consideration of the prayer for granting stay. In the meanwhile, respondent is directed not to take coercive measures for recovery of the amount as mentioned in the impugned orders till next date of hearing.

D-2/10/2019

M/s Lakhani Footwear Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan for Respondent.

Order Dated-21.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Now put up the case on 28.07.2025 for remaining arguments.

D-2/11/2019

M/s Lakhani Rubber Works Vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan for Respondent.

Order Dated-21.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Now put up the case on 28.07.2025 for remaining arguments.

D-2/18/2019

M/s Lakhani Armaan Shoes Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan for Respondent.

Order Dated-21.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Now put up the case on 28.07.2025 for remaining arguments.

D-2/02/2023

M/s Wear well India Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna, ld. counsel for appellant

Sh. Hemant Kumar, A/R for Respondent.

Order Dated-21.05.2025

As the ld. counsel for the respondent is not present, put up the matter on 29.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/07/2023

M/s. Sandhar Han Sung Technologies Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Mahender Singh, Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-26.05.2025

Proxy counsel appearing for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the main counsel Sh. Toofan Singh is not able to attend the hearing today. Perusal of the record shows that since last two dates the main counsel is not appearing to represent the matter. Today also he is not present. Accordingly, it is directed the main counsel for appellant shall remain present on the next date of hearing. Put up the case on 28.05.2025.

D-2/27/2019

M/s Hi-Trac Manpower Services Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Present: None for appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. counsel for Respondent.

Order Dated-22.05.2025

Today the case is listed for final arguments, however, office has placed one email received in the official mail id of this tribunal sent by ld. Counsel for the appellant Sh. J.R. Sharma wherein he has requested for an adjournment as he has to attend lagan sagai ceremony of his cousin. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up the case on 29.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/07/2020

M/s H.K. Corporation Vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, A/R for appellant

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-22.05.2025

As none of the regular counsels are present, put up the matter on 29.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/08/2025
M/s Fluor Projects Inc. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Present: Sh. M. Dias, Sh. Siddharth Dias & Sh. Mayank Dias, Counsel

for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-23.05.2025

This is a fresh appeal filed on behalf of the appellant against the order dated 26.03.2025 passed by the respondent authority u/s **14B of the EPF & MP Act, 1952,** wherein an amount of Rs.12,61,21,185/- as damages for the belated payment of dues.

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks some time to study the case and argue after filing his reply on the admission of this appeal. He is allowed to file a reply on and before next date of hearing after supplying a copy of the same to the opposite party. Put up on 27.07.2025. In the meanwhile, respondent is directed not to take coercive measure for recovery of the amount as mentioned in the impugned order till next date of hearing.

D-2/10/2024

M/s National Institute of Open Schooling vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Sunil Kumar Srivastava & Sh. B.K. Singh. Ld. Counsel, for the

Appellant.

Sh. Shailender Arya, A/R the Respondent.

Order Dated-23.05.2025

The AR appearing on behalf of the respondent requested for an adjournment stating that Id. Counsel Ms. Santwana Agarwal is unable to attend appear today before Hon'ble Supreme court. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. List the matter on 24.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/20/2024

M/s Pine Tree Hospitality vs. RPFC Gurugram West

Present: Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

Order dated-23.05.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of written notes of arguments and thereafter, oral arguments. However, no written arguments are filed on behalf of the appellant and more time is prayed for the same. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed as a last chance. Put up on 28.05.2025 for filing of written notes of arguments in not more than two pages by the ld. counsel for the appellant.

D-2/07/2023

M/s. Sandhar Han Sung Technologies Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Mahender Singh, Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-26.05.2025

Proxy counsel appearing for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the main counsel Sh. Toofan Singh is not able to attend the hearing today. Perusal of the record shows that since last two dates the main counsel is not appearing to represent the matter. Today also he is not present. Accordingly, it is directed the main counsel for appellant shall remain present on the next date of hearing. Put up the case on 28.05.2025.

D-2/22/2024

M/s. Universal Manpower Services vs. APFC/RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. J.R Sharma & Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, Ld. Counsels for the

Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-26.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Put up the matter on 24.07.2025 for continuation of the arguments.

D-2/26/2024

M/s. Navneet Enterprises vs. APFC/RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. R.D Sharma, Ld. Counsels for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-26.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard and concluded. The matter is reserved for pronouncement of the order.

D-2/22/2024

M/s. Universal Manpower Services vs. APFC/RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. J.R Sharma & Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, Ld. Counsels for the

Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-26.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. Put up the matter on 24.07.2025 for continuation of the arguments.

D-2/02/2025 M/s Qspear Consultancy vs. APFC/RPFC Noida

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Shailendra Arya, A/R for the respondent.

Order dated-27.05.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of rejoinder by Ld. Counsel for the appellant, however, it is stated on behalf of the appellant that they have not received the reply to this appeal filed on behalf of the respondent. Accordingly, copy of the reply is given to Ld. Counsel for the appellant from the office record. Now, put up the matter on 16.07.2025 for filing of rejoinder.

D-2/30/2019

M/s Greater Noida Industrial Development Authority vs. APFC/RPFC Noida

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, A/R for the Appellant.

Sh. Utkarsh Kumar Singh, A/R for the respondent.

Order dated-27.05.2025

Today the case is listed for final argument, however, Ld. Counsel for both the parties are not present and request for adjournment is moved on behalf of both the parties. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up the matter on 16.07.2025 for final arguments. Respondent is also directed to furnish the status of the case pertaining to Mathura Vrindavan Development Authority on the next date of hearing.

D-2/17/2020

M/s Egelhof Controls India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida

Present: Sh. Anshul Goel, A/R for the Appellant.

Sh. Ramakant Yadav, A/R for the respondent.

Order dated-27.05.2025

Today the case is listed for final argument, however, A/R appearing on behalf of the respondent requested for adjournment stating that his counsel is unable to attend the hearing today. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up the matter on 21.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/06/2025

M/s Origo Commodities India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram East & Others.

Present: Sh. Prashant, Id. counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Naresh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-28.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks more time to file reply to the main appeal as well as to the interim prayer. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed. Put up the matter on 17.07.2025 for filing of reply & consideration on the prayer of stay thereafter. In the meanwhile, interim order to continue till next date of hearing.

Misc. application M/s Zapdoor Engineering vs. APFC Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena, A/R

for the Respondent.

Order Dated-28.05.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks some time to file proper application. In the interest of justice, time is granted. Let it be fixed for filing of reply on 17.07.2025

D-2/20/2024

M/s Pine Tree Hospitality vs. RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Ms. Neetu Mishra, for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel, & Sh. Manjeet, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-28.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard and concluded. The matter is reserved for pronouncement of order.

D-2/07/2023

M/s Sandhar Han Sung Technologies Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Vinod Kumar Singh, for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-28.05.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard and concluded. The matter is reserved for pronouncement of order.

D-2/01/2022

M/s Tenneco Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Present: Sh. S.P Arora and Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsels for the

Appellant.

Sh. Lalit Kumar, A/R for the Respondent.

Order dated-27.05.2025

The A/R appearing for the respondent requested for an adjournment stating that his main counsel Sh. B.B. Pradhan is unable to appear today due to personal difficulty. The request for adjournment is strongly objected by Id. Couynsel for the appellant, however, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjournment. Put up the matter on 02.06.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/01/2022

M/s Tenneco Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Present: Sh. S.P Arora and Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsels for the

Appellant.

Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order: 02.06.2025

Today, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent filed written notes of argument. Copy of the same has been supplied to the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant. Ld. Counsel for the Appellant objected on filing of the written notes of argument stating that he shall file a formal application for not taking the arguments filed today on record, if on studying the same, it is found that the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent has taken some contrary view to the submissions made in his counter reply or something additional which has not been submitted by way of reply is now taken in defense of the impugned order. Put up the case on 02.07.2025 for final argument.

D-2/18/2020

M/s Bata India Limited vs. RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Saurabh Munjal, Sh. Saarthak Tyagi, Sh. Ashish Ojha,

counsels for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-04.06.2025

Written arguments on behalf of both the parties have been filed. On the request of both the counsel the matter is reserved for pronouncement of orders.

D-2/07/2021.

M/s International Hospital Ltd. vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Saurabh Munjal, Sh. Saarthak Tyagi, Sh. Ashish Ojha,

counsels for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Mishra, for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-04.06.2025

The ld. Counsel for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that sh. Anil Bhatt, the arguing counsel is unable to attend the hearing today. In the interest of justice adjournment is granted. List the matter on 23.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/09/2023

M/s Oravel Stays Limited vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Saurabh Munjal, Sh. Saarthak Tyagi, Sh. Ashish Ojha,

counsels for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-04.06.2025

The ld. Counsel for the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that sh. Anil Bhatt, the arguing counsel is unable to attend the hearing today. In the interest of justice adjournment is granted. List the matter on 22.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/04/2025

M/s Bimalraj Outsourcing Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West

Present: Sh. J.R. Sharma & Sh. Bhoopesh Sharma, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. Satpal Singh, Id. counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-05.06.2025

Arguments on the misc. application filed by appellant for seeking stay on execution of the impugned order as well as misc. application moved by respondent under Rule 21 r/w Section 7 I to 7 L of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 for dismissal of the appeal against order passed u/s 7 Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 heard and concluded.

The matter is reserved for pronouncement of order on the same. In the meanwhile, interim orders to continue.

1001(16)2016

M/s Vitalife Laboratories Vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Present: None for appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-05.06.2025

Let the matter be listed on 15.07.2025 for consideration.

D-2/09/2020

M/s Vitalife Laboratories Vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Present: None for appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-05.06.2025

Let the matter be listed on 15.07.2025 for consideration.

D-2/23/2020

M/s Antony Road Transport Solutions Vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, ld. counsel for appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-05.06.2025

Today, five applications have been moved by Sh. Kapil Goel, Id. Counsel on behalf of workmen namely Sh. Subhashchandra, Sh. Chandrapal, Sh. Nagendra Kumar, Sh. Rajkumar and Sh. Bhanupratap under Order I Rule 10 r/w Section 151 & other enabling provisions of CPC to implead the applicants/workmen as party in the array of respondents of present appeal.

Ld. Counsel for appellant took a strong objection stating that this tribunal had earlier also dismissed such type of an application.

In the present matter, pleadings are complete and part arguments have already been heard. Therefore, in such circumstances, consideration of such applications shall result into delay in adjudication of the matter. Moreover, the say of these workmen has already been considered by the trial court and the impugned order has been passed by the respondent authority. Therefore, all the applications filed today are dismissed being devoid of any merit. Moreover, the ld. Counsel for applicant, if desires, can always assist the ld. Counsel for respondent for ensuring the interest of the workmen.

Further, the Id. Counsel for the respondent seeks adjournment stating that he needs some time to address the arguments as he is the newly engaged counsel in this matter. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, prayer to grant some time is allowed. Put up the matter on 24.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-1/27/2020

M/s Ashiana Housing Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi South

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla & Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. Sunil Ranjan, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-06.06.2025

The A/R appearing for the respondent stated that his counsel is unable to appear today and therefore, requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, adjournment granted. Put up the matter on 07.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-1/08/2023

M/s Ruchika Agencies Vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi Central

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla & Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Id. counsel for appellant

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-06.06.2025

As none is present for the respondent, put up the matter on 07.07.2025 for final arguments. Office is directed to inform the next date of hearing to the respondent RPFC through email.

D-1/13/2025

M/s Takshila Public School Education Society Vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi East

Present: Sh. Prakash Kumar, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. Tejaswi Goel, ld. counsel & Sh. Surender Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-06.06.2025

D-2/28/2024

M/s. Widmans Laboratory vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: None for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-12.06.2025

Final order in this matter is pronounced vide a separate order today.

D-2/09/2025

M/s. Anand Buildtech Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld. counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Avneesh Kumar Meena, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.06.2025

This is a fresh appeal which is filed against the orders passed u/s 14B & 7Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 by respondent department whereby an amount of Rs.5,38,730/- assessed as damages and Rs.3,35,829 /- as interest. The appeal is filed well within the period of limitation, hence, admitted for hearing.

- Ld. Counsel for the respondent has sent an email requesting for an adjournment because he is presently in his native place at Odisha, so he is unable to attend the hearing today.
- Ld. Counsel for the appellant stated that he has received the correct notice on 04.02.2025 when he demanded the same from the respondent authority. Earlier according to the appellant counsel, defective notice pertaining to some **SPS security services Indrapuram Ghaziabad had been supplied to him**. He also submitted that the said defective notice is also uploaded on the website. This tribunal also verified from the E-proceeding portal and found submission of the appellant correct. There was no occasion to the appellant to represent against such defective notice till 04.02.2025.
- Ld. Counsel for the appellant also drew the attention of this tribunal to Annexure A-4 wherein it is mentioned that the authorized officer has issued a certificate bearing no. 87 dated 14.05.2025 to the recovery officer for the recovery of the above assessed amount and the recovery officer has also issued EPF Certificate of Proceeding- 1 i.e. notice of demand dated 23.05.2025 to the defaulter establishment directing him to deposit the dues assessed by the authorised officer.

It is also pertinent to mention here that still the appellant's time for filing of the appeal has not been exhausted, however, the authorized officer as well as the recovery officer has started the recovery proceedings in total disregard of the land of law. Let the authorized officer who issued the certificate dated 14.05.2025 as well as the recovery officer remain present on 19.06.2025 for explaining their conduct. In the meanwhile, respondent is directed not to take coercive action for recovery of the amount mentioned in the impugned orders till next date of hearing. Let the respondent also file his written reply/objection to the misc. application filed for seeking stay on the next date of hearing.

D-2/20/2024

M/s Pine Tree Hospitality. Vs. RPFC, Gurugram West.

Present: None for the appellant.

None for the respondent.

Order dated-24.06.2025

The appeal filed by the appellant stands allowed partly vide a separate order pronounced in open court today. Let a copy of the order is sent to both the parties through email and the same be uploaded on the website. Office is directed to consign the record to the record room.

D-2/09/2025

M/s. Anand Buildtech Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld. counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel (Vakalatnama filed) & Sh. Avneesh

Kumar Meena, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-02.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed the reply to misc. application seeking stay as well as to the main appeal. Copy of the same stands supplied to the ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Today the case is listed for appearance of two officers from the respondent department, however, it is informed by the ld. Counsel for the respondent that the order dated 19.06.2025 passed by this tribunal has been challenged by the respondent department before Hon'ble Delhi High Court and to substantiate his averment he has filed one email communication made by Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, advocate to the office of the respondent informing the diary no. (4245838/2025).

Ld. Counsel for the respondent admitted that a defective notice had been supplied to the appellant and requested to remand back the matter to the respondent authority for considering it afresh.

Heard both the counsel. The matter is reserved for orders. In the meanwhile, interim orders to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/01/2022

M/s Tenneco Automotive India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. S.P. Arora, Sh. Rajiv Arora Id. Counsels and Sh. Manish

Dembla, Ms. Vaishnavi for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. Counsel & Sh. Lalit Kumar, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-02.07.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard and concluded. The AR appearing on behalf of the respondent has produced trial court record which is found to be incomplete. He is directed to submit the complete and paginated trial court record within a week from today. Matter is reserved for pronouncement of order.

D-2/07/2025

M/s Ambience Hotel & Resorts Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Id. counsel for appellant

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, ld. counsel & Sh. Lalit Kumar, A/R for

Respondent.

Order Dated-07.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks and is granted more time to file reply to the misc. application seeking stay incorporating all the facts regarding splitting of wages from the original case record pertaining to the enquiry conducted **u/s 7A of the EPF & MP Act, 1952**. Put up on 29.07.2025. In the meanwhile, interim order to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/23/2021

M/s N1 Media Consultancy (P) Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. K.K. Pandey, Id. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Santosh Singh, A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-08.07.2025

Record perused. Ld. Counsel for the respondent was required to file written arguments, however, he has not filed the same today. The AR appearing on behalf of the respondent stated that the main counsel would come within five or ten minutes. He is at liberty to file written arguments. Put up on 30.07.2025 for filing of written arguments.

Atul Kumar Garg (Presiding Officer)

Later Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Id. Counsel for the respondent, appeared and filed the written submission/arguments, after serving the same to Id. Counsel for the appellant.

Misc. Application appeal no. D-2/33/2019 M/s. SCT (P) Ltd. Vs. APFC Meerut

Order Dated- 08.07.2025

This file has been placed by the office stating that the matter has been reserved on 02.04.2024, however, since then more than one year has been passed, fresh arguments are required to be heard. Accordingly, the matter is relieved from the list of the matters reserved for orders. Put up the matter on 05.08.2025 for rehearing of the matter. Office is directed to inform the parties by way of notice through email.

679(14)2008
PGT Component vs. APFC Noida

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the appellant

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated- 09.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for both the parties informed that the SLP is still pending before Hon'ble Supreme Court and requested to list the matter after the outcome of the said SLP.

In view of the above submission of the parties, this appeal is consigned the record room sine die. Parties are at liberty to revive the same if they wish

352(14)2008 PGT Component Vs. APFC Noida

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the appellant

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated- 09.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for both the parties informed that the SLP is still pending before Hon'ble Supreme Court and requested to list the matter after the outcome of the said SLP.

In view of the above submission of the parties, this appeal is consigned the record room sine die. Parties are at liberty to revive the same if they wish.

D-2/44/2024
M/s JPM Automobiles Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna Ld. Counsel for the appellant

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated- 09.07.2025

Today the case is listed for filing of reply by the respondent as well as for reporting compliance of the order dated 30.04.2025 wherein the appellant was directed to deposit an amount of Rs.10,00,000/- by way of FDR favouring 'Registrar CGIT'.

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed the reply to this appeal after supplying a copy to the ld. Counsel for appellant the same is taken on record. Ld. Counsel for the appellant has also filed one FDR no. 000240600083102 dated 05.06.2025 amounting to Rs.10,00,000/favouring Registrar CGIT the same is also taken on record and is placed in the case file. As the condition laidown by this tribunal while disposing misc. application filed u/s 70 of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 stands complied, the respondent authority is directed not to take coercive measures for recovery of the impugned amount till finalization of this appeal. Put up the matter on 07.08.2025 for filing of rejoinder if any.

D-2/10/2020

M/s Navigant Technologies Pvt. Ltd. Vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. S.K. Khanna Ld. Counsel for the appellant

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Vinay Rana, A/R for the

Respondent.

Order Dated- 10.07.2025

Final argument in the matter heard and conclude. The matter is reserved for order.

D-2/25/2021.

M/s Natwest Digital Services India Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Sanjay Ghose, Soumya Dasgupta, Mukesh Seju counsels &

for the appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-10.07.2025

Arguments in the matter heard in part. List the matter on 12.09.2025 for further argument.

D-2/26/2021.

M/s Convergys India Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. S. K. Gupta, Sh. JB Panda, Id. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-10.07.2025

Due to paucity of time, the matter is listed for 05.08.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/17/2024. M/s BSC-C & C 'JV' vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. S. K. Khanna, ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-10.07.2025

Due to paucity of time, the matter is listed for 07.08.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/19/2024.

M/s ATC Tower Company India Pvt. vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Atal Kumar Sri, ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Vinay Rana, A/R for

the Respondent.

Order Dated-10.07.2025

Due to paucity of time, the matter is listed for 07.08.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/27/2021.

M/s DLF Golf Resorts LTD vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Vinod Kumar, A/R for the appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-14.07.2025

The AR appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment as the main counsel is not available today. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up the case for tomorrow i.e. 15.07.2025.

D-2/25/2022.

M/s Louis Berger Consulting Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-II Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Rochit Abhishek, proxy for the appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-14.07.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the case is listed before Punjab and Haryana High Court. Put up the case on 08.10.2025 after hearing before the High Court.

D-2/24/2024.

M/s Balaji Associates vs. APFC, Faridabad.

Present: None for the appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-14.07.2025

This tribunal is in receipt of one email sent by Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the appellant requesting for an adjournment due to medical problem. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 06.08.2025.

Atul Kumar Garg (Presiding Officer)

Later, Sh. S.N. Mahanta, ld. Counsel for the respondent appeared and noted the next date of hearing.

D-2/36/2024.

M/s Rathi Steel & Power Ltd. vs. APFC, Meerut.

Present: Sh. Kumar Vikram, for the appellant.

Sh. Rahul Bhaskar Proxy for Sh. Kanhaiya Singhal, Ld.

Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-14.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant has filed an application along with copy of the balance sheets requesting to take the same on record and considered the same while arguments. Proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent seeks time to file reply to the application moved today by the appellant. Accordingly, list the matter on 11.08.2025.

Diary no. 10/07-07-2025 M/s Home and Facility Management vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Kumar Vikram, for the appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant pressed his appeal which has been filed on 07.07.2025 against the revised notice dated 28.03.2025.

Record perused. Office of this tribunal has made objection that no order **u/s 14B of the EPF & MP Act, 1952** has been passed and the appeal is premature.

In this respect appeal u/s 7-I of the Act is required to be reproduced herein:-

7-I. Appeals to Tribunal.—(1) Any person aggrieved by a notification issued by the Central Government, or an order passed by the Central Government or any authority, under the proviso to sub-section (3), or sub-section (4), of section 1, or section 3, or sub-section (1) of section 7A, or section 7B

[except an order rejecting an application for review referred to in sub-section (5) thereof], or section 7C, or section 14B, may prefer an appeal to a Tribunal against such notification or order.

(2) Every appeal under sub-section (1) shall be filed in such form and manner, within such time and be accompanied by such fees, as may be prescribed.

From perusal of the above section, it appears that an appeal can be filed against the order passed by the authority under any of the sections mentioned above. Since, admittedly no order has been passed u/s 14B and the matter is still pending for adjudication with the RFPC, appeal being premature, stands dismissed.

It is also important to mention here that without giving formal notice, respondent counsel has appeared and brought the trial court record. In the proceeding conducted before the RPFC on 18.03.2025, nothing has been mentioned about dispatching the revised notice to the establishment and appearance of establishment. Though revise notice has been issued but no proceeding is carried out till today

The explanation that the concerned officer Sh. Rajan Chhabra, has been transferred to Meerut is no excuse for not allocating the pending enquiry to any other officer. Even after receiving the advance copy of this appeal, department has not woken up. In these circumstances, department is directed to give specific date to the appellant to present his case in response to the revised notice and then pass the appropriate order. A copy of this order is sent to department for compliance.

D-2/01/2024

M/s Teleperformance Global Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram East.

Present: Mr. Sooraj, Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks more time to file reply to the main appeal. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed as a last chance. Put up the case on 19.08.2025 for filing of reply by the respondent.

1001(16)2016 & D-2/09/2020 M/s Vitalife Laboratories Vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent (In

1001(16)2016.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the respondent (In D-

2/09/2020).

Order Dated-15.07.2025

Put up the matter for consideration on 19.08.2025.

D-2/27/2021.

M/s DLF Golf Resorts Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh.Puneet Saini & Sh. Kapil Hans, Ld. Counsels for the

appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant requested for an adjournment on account of Birthday of his son. Prayer to grant adjournment is allowed with a direction that no further arguments shall be given on the next date of hearing and the matter shall be heard positively. Put up on 25.07.2025.

D-2/31/2021.

M/s A2Z Infra Services Ltd. vs. RPFC-1 Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. J.R. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant is directed to file the record pertaining to the credit of amount in their account belatedly by highlighting the relevant entries. Put up on 19.08.2025 for production of record and final arguments thereafter.

D-2/09/2022.

M/s Xcelserv Solution Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, Proxy for the appellant.

Sh. Narender kumar, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Lalit Kumar, A/R

for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.07.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment as the main counsel is not available today. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up the case on 24.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/36/2022 M/s IPSAA Holding Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurgaon East.

Present: Sh. M.K. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-15.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant requested for an adjournment on account of his unpreparedness. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up the case on 23.07.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/10/2025

M/s FMI Automotive Components Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC/APFC Gurugram West.

Present: Sh. Anil Bhatt & Sh. K.K. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the

appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-16.07.2025

ORAL

Appellant counsel has pressed his application for condonation of delay. He has stated that it was the fault of appellants counsel in filing the appeal belatedly. He submitted that his client has handed over the copy of the impugned order to the counsel of the appellant in the last week of April, 2025 with the request to file the appeal. However, due to the sudden seepage problem arose in the office of the counsel for the appellant, that it was even difficult to stand in the office. The counsel immediately made arrangement for the repairs but the problem continue to persists as a result thereof he has no option but to search for some other place where he can temporarily shift his office and in between lot of time has been lapsed. He submits that the delay of 59 days in filing the appeal be condoned.

Respondent counsel has opposed the prayer stating that no reasonable explanation has been given by the appellant. He further stated that in his application for condonation of delay he has to explain the each and every day of delay along with reasons.

I have heard the argument at bar and gone through the record of this case. Before proceeding further Rule 7(2) of the Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1997 is reproduced herein:-

Rule 7(2) Fee, time for filing appeal, deposit of amount due on filing appeal. - (1)....

(2) Any person aggrieved by a notification issued by the Central Government or an order passed by the Central Government or any other authority under the Act, may within 60 days from the date of issue of the notification/order prefer an appeal to the Tribunal:

Provided that the Tribunal may, if it is satisfied that the appellant was <u>prevented by sufficient cause from preferring the appeal within the prescribed period, extend the said period by a further period of 60 days</u>:

Provided further that no appeal by the employer shall be entertained by a Tribunal unless he has [deposited with the Tribunal a Demand Draft payable in the Fund and bearing] 75 per cent of the amount due from him as determined under section 7A:

Provided also that the Tribunal may for reasons to be recorded in writing, waive or reduce the amount to be deposited under section 7-O.

No doubt there has been a delay in filing the appeal of 59 days. It is also the law that appellant has to explain the delay in filing the appeal. The council has taken the delay on himself stating that he has to shift his office and that his client has given the file to him for filing the appeal within the period of limitation.

Considering the above facts on record, delay in filing the appeal is condoned. Application stands disposed of. Put up on 20.08.2025 for filing reply of the stay application as well as to the main appeal. In the meanwhile, interim order, to continue till next date of hearing.

D-2/10/2025
M/s Qspear Consultancy vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Sanjay Kumar, proxy counsel for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-16.07.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant seeks more time to file rejoinder. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant more time is allowed as a last chance. It is also made clear that if the rejoinder is not filed on the next date of hearing, right of the appellant to file rejoinder shall be closed. Put up on 21.08.2025 for filing of rejoinder.

D-2/30/2019

M/s Greater Noida Industrial Development Authority vs. APFC/RPFC Noida

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Utkarsh Kumar,

A/R for the respondent.

Order dated-16.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks an adjournment to file the status of the proceedings conducted in respect of Mathura Vrindawan Development Authority. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 21.08.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/14/2018 M/s UPSRTC, Noida Region vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Shadab Khan, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-16.07.2025

Both the parties have filed the written submission which is found on record. Put up on 25.08.2025 for consideration.

D-2/06/2021 M/s UPSRTC, Noida Region vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Shadab Khan, for the Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-16.07.2025

Both the parties have filed the written submission which is found on record. Put up on 25.08.2025 for consideration.

D-2/02/2024

M/s Cadence Design Systems (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-I, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-16.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant has sent a request for adjournment through email. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 21.08.2025.

D-2/03/2024

M/s Cadence Design Systems (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC-I, Noida.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-16.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant has sent a request for adjournment through email. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 21.08.2025.

D-2/06/2025

M/s Origo Commodities India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Gurugram East & Others.

Present: Mr. Prashant, for the Appellant.

Sh. Kunal Surhatia, Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent has filed reply on behalf of the respondent (EPFO). Copy of the same stands supplied to the counsel for the appellant. Now list the matter on 25.08.2025 for arguments on the prayer seeking stay as well as filing of rejoinder by ld. Counsel for the appellant. In the meanwhile, interim order, if any, to continue till next date of hearing.

M.A. in disposed appeal D-2/06/2025.
M/s Zapdor Engineering Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Kaushik Kumar Dey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

Order Dated-17.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the applicant seeks more time to file the formal application. Put up on 20.08.2025.

D-2/27/2022

M/s IL & FS Engineering & construction Company vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: None for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.07.2025

As counsels for either of the parties are not present. List the matter on 11.09.2025.

D-2/29/2022

M/s IL & FS Engineering & construction Company vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: None for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.07.2025

As counsels for either of the parties are not present. List the matter on 11.09.2025.

D-2/33/2022 M/s OYO Hotels & Homes Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurgaon.

Present: Sh. Anil Bhatt & Sh. Ashish Kumar Ojha, counsel for the

Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-17.07.2025

Arguments in the matter heard in part. Trial court record is required to be produced within two weeks by Id. Counsel for the respondent. Thereafter, Id. Counsel for the appellant shall have the liberty to inspect the record. Put up on 08.09.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/17/2020

M/s Egelhof Controls India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Anshul Goel, for the Appellant.

Sh. Ramakant Yadav, for the Respondent.

Order Dated:-21.07.2025

The AR appearing on behalf of the appellant stated that the respondent was supposed to file the trial court record showing the details which were considered while passing the impugned order and on what basis the dues were assessed. Respondent is directed to produce the trial court record along with explanation sought on the next date of hearing positively. Put up on 26.08.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/04/2024

M/s E Meditek Insurance Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Amit Bansal, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated:-21.07.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment as the main counsel is not able to attend the hearing today. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 27.08.2025 for final argument.

D-2/14/2024

M/s. Knit Craft Apparels International Pvt. Ltd. Appellant vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East Respondent

Present: Sh. Yash, Proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated:-21.07.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment as the main is not able to attend the hearing today. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 27.08.2025 for final argument.

D-2/16/2024

M/s. Brij Laxmi Paper Products Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. Abhishek Arora Adv. for the Appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Mishra, Ld. Counsel, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-21.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the appellant while proceeding with his arguments stated that although the money recovered by the respondent in excess to the original dues has been refunded but he wants to pursue with the appeal on the legality of the impugned order passed u/s 14B and 7Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952. Ld. Counsel for the respondent has not brought the trial court record and seeks for an adjournment stating that he was under the impression that as the excess amount recovered by the respondent stands already refunded, the appellant would not proceed with this appeal.

In view of the above, put up the case on 01.09.2025 for final arguments in the matter. Respondent is directed to produce the trial court record positively on the next date of hearing.

D-2/38/2024
M/s Zabi Enterprises Vs. RPFC/ APFC Gurugram East

Present: Sh. Siddharth Jha proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. S.N. Mahanta, for the Respondent.

Order Dated-21.07.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment as the main is not able to attend the hearing today. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 27.08.2025 for final argument.

D-2/22/2018

M/s. Shivalik Prints vs. APFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. J.R Sharma & Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the

Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-22.07.2025

Ld. Counsel for the respondent is not present. Accordingly, list the matter on 09.09.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/09/2023 M/s Oravel Stays Limited vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. K.K. Pandey, for the Appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order Dated-22.07.2025

None is present on behalf of the respondent to argue the matter. Sh. K.K. Pandey, appearing on behalf of the appellant stated that his arguing counsel Sh. Anil Bhatt is also not available today. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjourned. Put up on 08.09.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/32/2024

M/s Akasva Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: None for the Appellant.

Sh. Vaibhav for Sh. B.K.Tamba, Ld. Counsel for the

Respondent.

Order dated-22.07.2025

The ld. Counsel for the appellant is not present. Put the matter on 09.09.2025 for final arguments.

D-2/34/2024.

M/s Rangi International Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurgaon.

Present: Ms. Kanishka Sharma, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Vaibhav proxy for Sh. B.K. Tambar, Ld. Counsel the

Respondent.

Order Dated-23.07.2025

Proxy counsel appearing on behalf of both the parties requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. Put up on 12.08.2025.

D-2/07/2021.

M/s International Hospital Ltd. vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Ashish Ojha, proxy counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena, for the

Respondent.

Order Dated-23.07.2025

The proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant requested for an adjournment stating that the main counsel Sh. Anil Bhatt is unable to appear today. In the interest of justice, adjournment is granted. List the matter on 12.08.2025.

D-2/36/2022

M/s IPSAA Holding Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurgaon East.

Present: Sh. M.K. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-23.07.2025

Final arguments in the matter heard in part. List the matter on 04.08.2025 for further arguments.

D-2/13/2024

M/s I.I. Inspection & Export Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, proxy for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Lalit Kumar,

A/R for the Respondent.

Order Dated-23.07.2025

- 1. This is an appeal preferred by the appellant assailing the orders dated 08.11.2023 passed by the respondent authority u/s 14B and 7Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred as the Act) whereby an amount of Rs.2,12,226/- and Rs.1,70 ,635/- is assessed as damages and interest for belated payment of EPF dues for the period of 17.03.2020 to 30.08.2022.
- 2. Today the case is listed for final arguments. This tribunal, while admitting this appeal on 24.04.2024 after perusing the order sheets available in the trial court record had observed that:-

Nothing has been reflected from the record where the notice has been served to the establishment for his appearance.

- 3. It was also observed by this tribunal that the impugned orders being passed by the respondent RPFC was without taking any assistance of the appellant and therefore, they are passed ex-parte.
- 4. Today while advancing the arguments, counsel for both the parties admitted that the appellant was not provided an opportunity of being heard before the respondent authority and the impugned orders are passed in total violation of the Principles of Natural Justice. Both the parties also requested to remand back this matter for fresh adjudication after giving due opportunity of hearing to the appellant.
- 5. I have heard the argument at bar and perused the record. This tribunal is of the view that when the order is passed without giving

any opportunity to the appellant to submit his averments, then such order has no value in the eyes of law and is fit to be set aside. Accordingly, the present appeal is allowed and the orders passed u/s 14B and 7Q of the Act are set aside. The matter is remanded back to the respondent authority to decide it afresh within a period of three months after giving due opportunity of hearing to the appellant. Let the appellant be remain present before the respondent RPFC on 29.09.2025 for presenting his case. Consign the record to the record room as per rules.

Sd/-

D-2/08/2025 M/s Fluor Projects Inc. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

Present: Sh. M. Dias, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-24.07.2025

D-2/23/2020

M/s Antony Road Transport Solutions Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Deepak Meena, A/R for

the Respondent.

Order dated-24.07.2025

D-2/09/2022.

M/s Xcelserv Solution Pvt. Ltd. vs. RPFC Gurugram.

Present: Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Narender kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.07.2025

D-2/10/2024

M/s National Institute of Open Schooling vs. RPFC Noida.

Present: Sh. Sunil Kumar Srivastava & Sh. B.K. Singh, Ld. Counsel for the

Appellant.

Ms. Santwana Agarwal, Ld. Counsel the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.07.2025

D-2/22/2024

M/s Universal Manpower Services vs. RPFC Faridabad.

Present: Sh. J.R Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Chakradhar Panda, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-24.07.2025

808(14)2016 M/s Viraj Exports vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-25.07.2025

D-2/32/2019 M/s Viraj Exports vs. APFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order dated-25.07.2025

D-2/27/2021.

M/s DLF Golf Resorts LTD vs. RPFC Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. Vinod Kumar, A/R for the appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

Order Dated-25.07.2025