

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM  
LABOUR COURT, DELHI**

**D-2/27/2021**

**M/s DLF Golf Resorts LTD. vs. RPFC –Gurugram (East)**

Present: Sh. Vinod Kumar, A/R for the Appellant.  
Sh. Narendra Kumar, Ld. Counsel & Sh. Sarfaraz, A/R  
for the Respondent.

**Order Dated-10.11.2025**

Respondent forgot to bring the record regarding the proceeding u/s 7A. He is directed to bring the record of enquiry u/s 7A. Put up for 17.11.2025.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM  
LABOUR COURT, DELHI**

**D-2/02/2024 & 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.

**Order Dated-10.11.2025**

Record perused. The matter has already been heard on behalf of the appellant and is listed today for argument on behalf of the respondent. Put up for further argument on 17.11.2025. Assistant Registrar is directed to place the brief history of this case on the next date of hearing. A copy of this order be placed in both the files.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM  
LABOUR COURT, DELHI**

**D-2/38/2024**

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

Present:       None for the Appellant.  
                  Sh. S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

**Order Dated-10.11.2025**

Office has placed on record an email communication of appellant counsel stating that he is unable to attend cases listed today however, no reason has been assigned by him for his unavailability. Respondent has argued the matter already. The case is reserved for order.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM  
LABOUR COURT, DELHI**

**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. Narendra Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

**Order Dated-10.11.2025**

Argument has been heard on behalf of the appellant. Appellant based his argument in respect of admitted dues mentioned in the Table A on which the amount he is ready to make payment so far so the Table B,C,D are concerned, Table B is in regard to the employee whose salary has been above 15,000/- and the same is disputed by the Ld. Counsel for appellant. Table C is in regard to the allowances for which PF department has sought dues. So far so the Table D is concerned, counsel has stated that PF department has unnecessarily assessed the dues on maintenance and other activities which are not core activities of the appellant establishments. Put up for further arguments on 21.11.2025.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)