Item No. 01

D-1/24/2023

M/s Indraprastha Services vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi West.

Present:

Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Vishnu with Sandeep, Ld. Counsels for the

respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Counsel for the appellant has pressed an application under section 7-O of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') seeking waiver of condition of pre-deposit. He has stated that entire case set out by the respondent is false. Appellant has assailed the order, stating that there was no basis to initiate any enquiry against the appellant. The Enquiry was held in haste and pursuant to an e-mail received from the Head office of the respondent, instructing to carry inspection of the records of the establishment. Within two days, the enquiry officer investigated the matter and, on the same day, found that the two establishments namely Ms. Indraprastha Services and M/s Indraprastha Intercity Travels were operating at the same premises. He had concluded that both were the same, as such enquiry has been done.

On the other hand, the respondent's counsel has stated that some amount should be deposited, although, he has admitted that there was undue haste in concluding the enquiry. Despite this, he had defended the order.

Before proceeding further, provision of Section 7-O of the Act is required to reproduced herein:

7-O. Deposit of amount due, on filing appeal.—No appeal by the employer **shall be entertained** by a

Tribunal <u>unless he has deposited with it seventy-five per</u> <u>cent. of the amount due from him as determined by an</u> <u>officer referred to in section 7A:</u>

Provided that the Tribunal may, for reasons to be recorded in writing, waive or reduce the amount to be deposited under this section

I have heard the counsel for both the parties and perused the records. In the order itself, there was mention of the e-mail having received from the head office instructing to carry the inspection of the establishment having a list of 34 vehicles registered in the name of **Mr. Rahul Sejwal**. Enquiry officer within two days has reached the establishment and on the same day he found that two establishments were functioning at the same address and he tried to club those. In less than 8 months, 10 dates have been fixed i.e. 13.04.2016, 26.04.2016, 01.07.2016, 14.07.2016, 28.07.2016, 10.08.2016, 01.09.2016, 06.10.2016. 24.10.2016, 25.11.2016 seeking information from the establishment, even the penalty was imposed repeatedly and the bank account has been attached before concluding the enquiry.

Considering these circumstances, application under section 7-O stands allowed without any pre-deposit of any condition. Operation of the impugned order is stayed till fill finalization of the appeal.

Reply has already been filed by the counsel of the respondent. A copy of the same furnished to the appellant's counsel. Put up for filing of rejoinder on behalf of the appellant on 10.11.2025. Respondent is also directed to collect the Trial Court Record from the office of the Tribunal.

Item No. 02

D-1/03/2025 M/s PCI Limited vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi North.

Present: None for the appellant.

Ms. Kavya Dikshit, Proxy Counsel along with Sh. Anil Kumar

Meena, AR for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Proxy counsel for the respondent submits that due to illness, counsel of the respondent is not in a position to come before the Tribunal.

Considering the absence of the appellant's counsel and the request of the proxy counsel for the respondent, this case is adjourned to 04.11.2025 for final argument on the stay application. Till then, interim order be continued.

Item No. 03

D-1/34/2023

M/s Multiples Zones India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi East.

Present: None for the appellant.

Sh. Sunil Ranjan, Ld. AR for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

A request has been received from the counsel of the appellant that there is water logging in his town due to heavy rain. At request, this case is adjourned for filing of rejoinder on 10.10.2025.

Item No. 04

D-1/70/2024

M/s Hindustan Infrastructure Co. vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi.

Present: Sh. Surjeet Kumar, Proxy Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Tejasvi Goyal, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Reply has been filed by the respondent's counsel. Copy furnished to the appellant.

Respondent has also filed an application for waiver off cost. He submits that delay was occurred because the department had taken time for vetting the reply and the process is time consuming. He submits that he has not fault, the cost is imposed the same be given to him from his pocket.

A cost of Rs. 5,000/- was imposed by this Tribunal to the respondent department for delaying the matter in filing the reply for eight months. Instead of filing the reply, on the next date of hearing, counsel of the respondent again has not filed the reply. He was directed to pay the cost.

Considering the fact that the counsel has made prayer for taking lenient view and submitted that he has to pay the cost from his own pocket, cost is waived. Department is careful in future in complying the order. Put up for filing of rejoinder, if any on 13.11.2025.

Item No. 05

1298(4)2015

M/s Amil Pharmaceutical vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi.

Present: None for the appellant.

Sh. Faizal Khan, Proxy Counsel along with Sh. Anil Kumar

Meena, AR for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Considering the fact that, counsels of both the parties are not present, this matter is listed for final argument on 12.11.2025. A fresh notice is issued to the counsel of the appellant to appear and argue the matter. A copy of this order is also attached with the notice.

Item No. 06

1449(4)2015

M/s Kundan Industrial Carburettors vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (South).

Present: Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Proxy Counsel for the appellant.

None for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Sh. Sanjay Kumar submits that he had received a phone call from Sh. R.D. Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the appellant, stating that, he would be available after two weeks. Let this case be listed for final hearing on 27.11.2025.

Item No. 07

712(4) 2016
M/s G4S Cash Solutions (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (N).

Present: None for the appellant.

Sh. Sandeep, AR for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Record perused. This appeal has been adjourning en-bloc since 02.08.2023. Let notice be issued to both the parties for appearance and argue the matter on 02.12.2025.

Item No. 08

1005(4)2016

M/s STV Enterprises vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (S).

Present: None for the appellant.

Sh. Yash Narayan, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Record perused. This appeal has been adjourning en-bloc since 17.10.2023 and has not come on board for hearing. Let this matter be listed for hearing on 09.12.2025.

Item No. 09

D-1/32/2019

M/s N & N Chopra Consultants vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (S).

Present: Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Prateek Tyagi,

AR for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

Part argument has been heard on behalf of both the parties. Put up for further argument on 04.12.2025.

Item No. 10

D-1/34/2019

M/s D.D. Gears Ltd. STV Enterprises vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (N).

Present: None for the appellant.

Sh. S.N Mahanta, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Anil Kumar

Meena, AR for the respondent.

Order dated-02.09.2025

A request has been received from the counsel of the appellant that there is water logging in his town due to heavy rain. At request, this case is adjourned for argument on 04.12.2025.

Item No. 11

D-1/07/2020 M/s Wear Well India Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (East).

Present: None for the appellant.

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

Order dated-02.09.2025

A request has been received from the counsel of the appellant that there is water logging in his town due to heavy rain. At request, this case is adjourned for argument on 04.12.2025.