

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

**Appeal no. D-2/34/2024**

**M/s. Rangi International Pvt. Ltd.**

.....Appellant

Through:- Sh. Pankaj Mallik, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

vs.

**RPFC, Gurgaon East.**

.....Respondent

Through:- Sh. B.K. Tamber, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Lalit Kumar,  
AR, for the respondent.

**Order:-oral**

**Order Dated:- 25.09.2025**

The appellant's counsel has pressed his application seeking stay of execution of the impugned orders passed by the respondent on 08.11.2023 under sections 14-B and 7-Q of the **Employees' Provident Funds & Misc. Provisions Act, 1952 (Hereinafter referred to as 'the Act')**, whereby the respondent assessed the damages to the tune of Rs. 30,71,678/- and Rs. 15,01,414/- respectively. The appellant's counsel has drawn attention towards the orders passed by this Tribunal on 27.01.2025, whereby the respondent admitted to have received an amount of Rs. 5,61,077/- from the appellant.

It is submitted that the appellant had been facing financial difficulty in remittance of the Provident Fund contributions, as such the delay occurred. The delay was not intentional, but was due to the financial difficulties faced by the appellant. It further explained that the establishment was solely managed and operated by Sh. Surinder Singh as Managing Director and Mrs. Nila Rangi as the second Director. After demise of Sh. Surinder Singh in 2015, Sh. Amandeep Singh Rangi took over the role of his father in managing the overall operations of the company. In the meanwhile, the credit period by the Indian Overseas Bank was reduced to 120 days from 180 days, which worsened the appellant's financial condition. On these grounds, the appellant prayed

that his application be allowed, and the execution of impugned orders be stayed till the finalization of the appeal.

The respondent filed a reply to the appeal, stating that the appeal is frivolous, lacks merit, and is liable to be rejected. It placed reliance on the rule 07 (2) of Employees' Provident Fund Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1997, which reads as under:

*(2) Any person aggrieved by a notification issued by the Central Government or an order passed by the Central Government or any other authority under the Act, may within 60 days from the date of issue of the notification/order, prefer an appeal to the Tribunal. Provided that the Tribunal may if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from preferring the appeal within the prescribed period, extend the said period by a further period of 60 days.*

*Provided further that no appeal by the employer shall be entertained by the Tribunal unless he has deposited with the Tribunal a Demand Draft payable in the Fund and bearing 75% of the amount due from him as determined under Section 7-A. Provided also that the Tribunal may for reasons to be recorded in writing, waive or reduce the amount to be deposited under Section 7-O.*

The respondent submits that as per the said rule, no appeal by the employer shall be entertained by the Tribunal unless it has deposited 75% of the assessed amount. The respondent further submits that the appellant has not submitted any proof in support of his claim. However, it is admitted by the respondent that the appellant has deposited an amount of Rs. 5,61,077/-. Moreover, it is submitted that the appeal under section 7Q of the Act is not maintainable and financial constraint is not a ground for delay the remittance of the Provident Fund contributions.

I have heard the arguments advanced by both parties and perused the record. The respondent assessed the damages under sections 14-B and 7-Q of the Act to the tune of Rs. 30,71,678/- and Rs. 15,01,414/-

respectively. It has also admitted that an amount of Rs. 5,61,077/- had already been deposited by the appellant. In these circumstances, the appellant is directed to deposit the amount assessed under section 7Q of the Act after adjusting the amount that had already been paid, with the RPFC by way of challan within six weeks from the date of this order, so the same can be credited to the accounts of the subscribers. During this period of six weeks, there is a stay on the operation of the impugned orders.

So far so the stay in regard to the impugned order passed under section 14B of the Act is concerned, the same is allowed. The impugned order under section 14B of the Act shall remain stayed without imposing any condition for stay.

List the matter for 24.11.2025 for reporting compliance and for final arguments.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)

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

**Item no.- 02**

**D-2/14/2025**

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

Present: Sh. Sidhart Jha, Proxy Counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel along with Sh. Devesh Garg, AR  
for the respondent.

**Order dated-25.09.2025**

Record perused. The case is listed for reporting compliance of the order dated 05.08.2025. Proxy counsel for the appellant has submitted an FDR amounting to Rs. 6,21,342/- (ICICI Bank Ltd.). He has also filed the receipt to this effect. As the appellant has complied with the conditions laid down by this Tribunal for granting stay, operation of the impugned order is stayed till finalization of this appeal. Put up for filing of reply by the respondent on 24.11.2025.

Atul Kumar Garg  
(Presiding Officer)