

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

Item no. 01

D-2/19/2025

M/s. Shree Durga Sagar Factory vs. RPFC-II, Meerut

Present:

Sh. Prakash Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the
appellant.

None for the Respondent.

Order dated- 23.03.2026

Record perused. An application has been placed before the Tribunal by the registry stating that it was filed on 10.12.2025, whereby the appellant has made prayer for modification of the order dated 30.10.2025 passed by the Tribunal, wherein the appellant was directed to deposit 75% of the assessed amount.

The reason given for moving the application is that the respondent authority had assessed the amount on excluded employees, which, according to the appellant, is not permissible. However, no record of such excluded employees has been placed on record. Another contention of the appellant is that the respondent was well aware about the change in name of the entity, and that the appellant had deposited its remittances in both names up to the year 2012.

The record reveals that this Tribunal had disposed of an application under section 7-O of **Employees' Provident Funds & Misc. Provisions Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act')** on 30.10.2025, directing the appellant to deposit 75% of the assessed amount within six weeks. The present application was filed on 10.12.2025, just before the last date of reporting compliance. It appears that the application had been filed only to delay the deposit of the said amount; otherwise, the counsel would have filed an appropriate application for amendment in the contents of the appeal, which he submits was not done by the previous counsel.

In view of the above discussion, the application stands dismissed. The Ld. Counsel for the appellant has made prayer that he may be given three weeks' time to deposit the amount. The same is granted. The appellant is directed to deposit the amount as directed by this Tribunal within three weeks, failing which the appeal shall stand dismissed. He is at liberty to move an appropriate application for amendment in the appeal, if he wishes so, with direction to supply an advance copy to the Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

The matter is listed on 15.04.2026 for reporting compliance and for filing of reply to the appeal by the respondent. In the meanwhile, interim order if any be continued.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Appeal No. D-2/20/2025

M/s. Launch My Career Pvt. Ltd. Appellant

Through:- Sh. Prakash Kumar, ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Noida and Ors. Respondent

Through:- Ms. Saumya, proxy counsel & Sh. Ankit Gupta, A/R
for the respondent

Order Dated:-23.03.2026

Appellant counsel has placed on record a fixed deposit receipt issued in the name of the proprietor of the appellant establishment purported to be endorsed in the name of 'Registrar CGIT'. Reason being is that the appellant establishment has no balance in its account and it is the proprietor who has arranged the money by borrowing the same from his relative and friends and made the FDR in his name. If the amount has been deposited in the bank of the appellant, then the lien would be created. So in order to save the same, he has prepared the FDR in his own name and got it endorsed in the name of 'Registrar CGIT' by the bank.

On perusal of the FDR, it is found that the stamp has been affixed by Bank of Baroda, Manak Vihar Karkardooma Delhi. In the extreme left, it is mentioned on the said FDR 'on account of Registrar CGIT', however, no signature or stamp has been affixed under it, meaning thereby it is not ascertained that the lien/ endorsement has been created/ made.

In these circumstances the Bank Manager, Bank of Baroda, Manak Vihar Karkardooma Delhi is directed to appear on the next date of hearing and explain the status that how

and in what manner the lien/endorsement has been created/ made in favour of 'Registrar CGIT'.

It is also important to mention here that this tribunal vide its order dated 12.11.2025 has stayed the impugned order passed by respondent subject to a condition that interest component has to be deposited within six weeks. However, even after more than passing of nineteen weeks, the compliance has not been made. The above said compliance is only the halfhearted compliance which is not a compliance in spirit.

At the request of the appellant, he is directed to deposit the above said amount along with a cost of Rs.5000/- within two weeks. Put up for 06.04.2026. Copy of this order be sent to the Branch Manager, Bank of Baroda, Manak Vihar Karkardooma Delhi through email.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

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

Appeal No. D-2/07/2025

M/s. Ambience Hotel & Resorts Pvt. Ltd. Appellant

Through:- Sh. Sanjay Kumar, ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram East Respondent

Through:- Sh. S.N. Mahanta, ld. counsel & Sh. Lalit Kumar,
A/R for the respondent

Order Dated:-23.03.2026

Ld. counsel for respondent seeks adjournment for filing the reply stating that he has been under impression that still the compliance has to be made.

Considering the fact that this matter has come on board after a long gap because of the illness of the undersigned, respondent is directed to file the reply within four weeks with a direction to furnish the advance copy to ld. counsel for the appellant. List the matter on 27.04.2026.

Counsel for the appellant also submitted that in the order dated 01.12.2025, the word 'excluded' is wrongly typed while it actually has to be typed as 'absolute'. After perusing of the said order, the contention of ld. counsel for appellant is found correct. Therefore, in the order dated 01.12.2025, the last word of the first para, the word 'excluded' be read as 'absolute'. Copy of this order be sent through email to both the parties.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

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

Appeal No. D-2/01/2025

M/s. Chennai MSW Pvt. Ltd.

..... Appellant

Through:- None for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Noida

.... Respondent

Through:- Ms. Saumya, proxy counsel & Sh. Ankit Gupta, A/r
for the respondent

Order Dated:-23.03.2026

Proxy counsel for respondent has filed the reply to this appeal. An additional copy meant for ld. counsel for appellant is also submitted and kept with the record for handing it over to ld. counsel for appellant as and when he appears before this tribunal. List the case on 16.04.2026 for filing of rejoinder, if any, by ld. counsel for the appellant.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

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

Appeal No. D-2/14/2025

M/s. Balaji Manpower Recruitment Pvt. Ltd. Appellant

Through:- Sh. Prakash Kumar, ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Faridabad

.... Respondent

Through:- Sh. B. B. Pradhan, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order Dated:-23.03.2026

Ld. counsel for respondent has filed the reply to this appeal. Copy of the same supplied to ld. counsel for the appellant. List the case on 16.04.2026 for filing of rejoinder, if any, by ld. counsel for the appellant.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer