Item No. 01

D-1/55/2024

M/s Imperia Structures Limited vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (East).

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

Sh. Vaibhav Prasad, AR for the respondent.

Order dated-10.09.2025

Counsel for both the parties are not present, let this matter be listed for 26.09.2025 for argument on the application under section 7-O of the EPF & MP Act, 1952.

Atul Kumar Garg (Presiding Officer)

At 1:40 PM-

Sh. S.N Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the respondent has appeared and he is apprised about the proceedings.

Item No. 02

D-1/60/2024

M/s Sawhney Rubber Industries vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (East).

Present: Sh. Ankit, Proxy Counsel for Sh. Anurag Lakhotiya, Ld. Counsel

for the appellant.

Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Vaibhav Prasad,

AR for the respondent.

Order dated-10.09.2025

Counsel for the respondent submits that he had seen the order yesterday, passed under section 7-O of the EPF & MP Act, 1952. He seeks time for filing of reply of the main appeal.

It is also important to mention here that appearance of counsels of both parties has been wrongly mentioned. Appellant's proxy counsel Sh. Ankit and respondent's counsel Sh. B.B Pradhan submit that they were present on the last date of hearing and this Tribunal had passed the order in their presence.

Let the presence of proxy counsel of the appellant Sh. Ankit and respondent's counsel Sh. B.B. Pradhan be read in the said order instead of Sh. S.P Arora, Rajiv Arora and Sandeep Mishra on behalf of appellant and respondent respectively. Put up filing of reply of the main appeal on 15.10.2025.

Item No. 03

11(4)2011

M/s Mahle Filters Systems (Ind.) Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi.

Present: Sh. Raj Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Sh. S.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel

for the appellant.

Sh. Vicky, Clerk of Sh. Satpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the

respondent.

Order dated-10.09.2025

Counsels for both the parties are not present, let this matter be listed for final argument on tomorrow i.e. 11.09.2025.

Atul Kumar Garg (Presiding Officer)

At 2:00 PM-

Sh. Prateek Tyagi, AR for the respondent has appeared and he is apprised about the proceedings.

33(4)2017

Aimil Pharmaceutical vs. APFC, Delhi (North).

Present:

Sh. Chetan Singh, proxy counsel, for the appellant.

Sh. Faizal, proxy for the Respondent.

Order dated-10.09.2025

The matter is listed today for final arguments. However, the proxy counsels appearing on behalf of both managements have sought an adjournment on the ground of absence of their respective seniors.

Considering their request, the matter is adjourned to 20.11.2025 for the same purpose.

D-1/93/2019

M/s. Vikram Bakshi & Company Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC, Delhi (Central).

Present:

Sh. Rajkumar ,proxy counsel, for the appellant.

Ms. Anushka Zohra, proxy counsel, for the Respondent.

Order dated-10.09.2025

The matter is listed today for final arguments. However, the proxy counsels appearing on behalf of both managements have sought an adjournment on the ground of absence of their respective seniors.

Considering their request, the matter is adjourned to 19.11.2025 for the same purpose.

Item No. 06

D-1/107/2019

M/s Ex-Man Raghav Security Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. CBT, RPFC, Delhi (East) and 05 Others.

Present: None for the appellant.

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Vaibhav

Prasad, AR for the respondent.

Order dated-10.09.2025

Record perused. Since 04.02.2023, this case has been adjourning enbloc, let the appellant be given notice to appear and argue the matter. Put up for 24.11.2025.

Item No. 07

D-1/03/2020 M/s AXL Lighting Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (North).

Present: None for the parties.

Order dated-10.09.2025

Record perused. Since 02.05.2024, this matter has been adjourning enbloc, let a fresh notice be issued to both the parties. Put up for final argument on 24.11.2025.

Item No. 08

D-1/10/2022 M/s Rajindra Pvt. Ltd. vs. CBT, RPFC, Delhi (North).

Present: Sh. Kunal Arora, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

None for the respondent.

Order dated-10.09.2025

Record perused. On record, there is a reply of the appeal filed by the respondent and the same still has not been supplied to the appellant's counsel. A copy of the same has been given to the appellant's counsel.

It is also a matter of record that, since the filing of this appeal three or four counsels have appeared and changed on behalf of the respondent. Now, this Tribunal is not aware who is representing the respondent. Let a notice be issued to the respondent to engage a counsel who is well-versed with this appeal and advance the argument. Put up for 24.11.2025. In the meanwhile, appellant is at liberty to file the rejoinder with direction to supply the copy of the same to the respondent.