

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

**D-1/38/2025**

**M/s Punj Lloyd vs. RPFC, Delhi (South)**

Present:

Sh. S.K. Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Prateek Tyagi, AR for the Respondent.

**Order dated- 17.09.2025**

The office has reported that the appeal has been filed within the period of limitation as prescribed under rule 07 (2) of Employees' Provident Fund Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1997.

The AR for the respondent, Sh. Prateek Tyagi, has submitted that the present case has been assigned to Adv. Santwana Aggarwal. However, she has not appeared yet. Upon being contacted, she stated that she would appear within 30 minutes, but even after 45 minutes she has not turned up.

In these circumstances, after hearing the submissions from the Ld. Counsel for the appellant, the matter is adjourned to 14.10.2025 for arguments on the stay application. Till then, the respondent is restrained from taking any coercive action.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR  
COURT, No. 1 DELHI**

**D-1/39/2025**

**M/s R. N. Industries vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi (East).**

Present: Sh. Prakash Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Deepak Kumar, A/R for the respondent.

**Order dated-17.09.2025**

1. This is a fresh appeal preferred by the appellant against the **demand notice dated 22.07.2025** whereby he is asked to pay an amount of Rs.5,56,986/- which was assessed by the respondent vide an order dated 14.06.2024 passed under section **7A of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred as the Act)**.

2. His submission is that he has complied the order dated 14.06.2024 passed by the Regional P.F. Commissioner. He had deposited the said amount from 17.04.2024 to 24.07.2024. According to him, in spite of this, respondent is making a communication daily to the appellant establishment instructing him to deposit the said amount, though, he has already complied with the order.

3. It is also important to mention here that in the said demand notice dated 22.07.2025, it was mentioned that ***if the arrears have already been remitted, the establishment was required to make written submission along with proof of remittance and 7A details to the recovery officer within 15 days.*** In response to the demand notice, the establishment had submitted it's representation on 30.07.2025 enclosing the copies of challans, payment receipts, dues and deposit details along with ECR copies. The said representation is enclosed with this appeal and bear a receipt stamp of 31.07.2025 affixed by the respondent department. However, instead of closing the recovery proceedings, the respondent has chosen to harass the appellant.

4. Though, this tribunal is cognizance of the fact that an appeal under Section 7 I of the Act is not maintainable against a recovery notice, yet, considering the circumstances where appellant has suffered unnecessarily, appeal is admitted for hearing. The fact of filing of this appeal itself demonstrates that the appellant has been harassed, otherwise nobody takes the headache of filing the appeal and incur the legal expenses.

5. This tribunal has been created to safeguard the interest of the appellant as well as the respondent. In the circumstances as discussed, respondent is hereby restrained from taking any coercive action in respect of demand notice dated 22.07.2025. In the meanwhile, respondent department is directed to produce all the records i.e. recovery file and the file pertaining to the order passed under Section 7 A. respondent is also directed to produce a report regarding the dues & deposit statement pertaining to the order passed under section 7 A of the Act. Put up on 25.09.2025.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)