

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

Item no. 1

D-2/03/2026

M/s Genus Paper & Board Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Meerut.

Present: None for the appellant.

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

Order dated-16.04.2026

Respondent's counsel stated that he has received the reply of the appeal as well as reply of the application for condonation of delay from the department through mail and he seeks time for filing the same before the Hon'ble Tribunal.

Record perused. This appeal has been placed before this Tribunal on 19.03.2026. On that date, the status-quo was directed to be maintained in respect of the recovery of the amount assessed under section 14B and 7Q of the Act, considering the fact that, the establishment/appellant is the subsequent purchaser of M/s Genus Paper & Board Ltd., pursuant to an order passed by the Hon'ble NCLT.

In view of the fact that, the respondent's counsel seeks time for filing the reply, this matter be listed for filing of reply of the appeal as well as reply of the application for condonation of delay on 28.04.2026. In the meanwhile, status-quo to be maintained in respect of the recovery under impugned order.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 2

D-2/01/2025

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

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan Mishra alongwith Ms. Nidhi Mishra, Ld.
Counsels for the appellant.
Ms. Santwana Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2026

Counsel for the appellant seeks time for filing the rejoinder. Let he be given opportunity to file the rejoinder within a week with direction to supply the copy of the same to the counsel of the respondent.

Let this matter be listed in the category of final argument on 13.05.2026.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 3

D-2/14/2025

M/s Balaji Manpower Recruitment Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: None for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2026

Appellant is required to file the rejoinder. Considering the fact that both parties are not present, one more opportunity is given to the appellant to file the rejoinder within a week with direction to supply the copy of the same to the respondent's counsel, otherwise right to file the rejoinder would be closed.

Let this matter be listed in the category of final argument on 13.05.2026. A copy of this order be sent to both the parties through mail.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 4

D-2/26/2021

M/s Convergys India Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram.

Present: Sh. S.K Gupta, Sh. Rajkumar, and Sh. Tapony Ghose, Ld.
Counsels for the appellant.
Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Lalit Kumar, AR for
the respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2026

Part arguments heard. Trial Court record in two volumes are retained.

Let this matter be listed for further arguments on 26.05.2026.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 5

D-2/22/2022

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

Present: Sh. Jitesh Pandey, Sh. Aniket Singh & Sh. Naman Arora, Ld.
Counsels for the appellant.

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

Order dated-16.04.2026

Ld. Counsel for the appellant submitted his vakalatnama stating that he is the new counsel in this case appointed on behalf of 'M/s Max Healthcare'. Appellant's counsel also submitted certain documents in compliance of the order dated 26.11.2025 of this Tribunal wherein it was directed to bring entire record related to the proceedings conducted before NCLT as well as takeover of the appellant by 'M/s Max Health Care'.

Per contra, Ld. Counsel for the respondent stated that the present appeal is filed by and on behalf of 'M/s Jaypee Health Care' and if now 'M/s Max Super Speciality Hospital' wants to persue the case then a formal application for impleadment is required to be moved on behalf of the appellant.

To this, Ld. Counsel for the appellant agreed and requested to grant some time to move an application for impleadment. In the interest of justice, prayer to grant time to file application for impleadment is allowed. List the matter on 14.05.2026.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no.6

D-2/34/2024

M/s Rangi International Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurgaon East.

Present: None for the appellant.

Sh. Prakhar Pushp, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Lalit Kumar, AR for
the respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2026

EO has placed on record, the report on the letter being sent to the Standard Chartered Bank for the recovery of the damages and interest levied under impugned order. He has stated that bank has reported that the account of the establishment had already been closed in the year 2006 itself.

In the said letter, it was mentioned that it was the reminder, however, nothing has been mentioned in the said letter about the earlier letter sent to the bank manager. Though, the letter was reported to be sent through speed post but no follow up action has been taken nor any official has visited to the bank to know about the outcome on 23.01.2026 which was actually delivered on 02.02.2026.

Record perused. Vide order dated 25.09.2025, this court had directed the appellant to deposit the interest components while granting the stay on the execution of the impugned order, however, that order has not been complied with. Vide order dated 11.12.2025, stay on the execution stood vacated and the respondent was given liberty to execute the order.

The above said communication submitted to this court is a half hearted measure. Appellant had deposited the amount through net

banking or other modes with the respondent at least prior to 2014 of which this order has been passed for levying the damages under section 14B and 7Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952.

However, since, the appellant has neither adhered to the order nor appeared to argue the appeal, the appeal stands dismissed. File is consigned to record room. Respondent is directed to execute the order as soon as possible by making serious efforts. A copy of this order is sent to the respondent through mail.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 7

D-2/44/2024

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

Present: None for the appellant.
Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Lalit, AR for the
respondent.

Order dated-16.04.2026

It was reported by respondent's counsel that appellant's counsel has
expressed his unavailability to appear today.

Let this matter be listed for argument on 14.05.2026.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 8

D-2/08/2025

M/s Fluor Projects Inc. vs. APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East.

Present: Sh. M. Dias, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

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

Order dated-16.04.2026

Appellant's counsel submits that the case was listed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 14.04.2026. Since 14.04.2026 was declared holiday on account of Dr. Ambedkar Jayanti, hearing could not take place in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and the matter was adjourned.

Appellant's counsel seeks two months time to argue the matter and hope that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India will decide the issue in respect of international workers.

Let the matter be listed for argument on 03.08.2026.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)