

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

Appeal no. D-2/07/2026

M/s. V.K. Electricals

....Appellant

Through:- Sh. Kumar Vikram, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Meerut

.....Respondent

Through:- None for the respondent.

Order Dated:- 29.04.2026

Record perused. On the last date of hearing, Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the respondent, was present and had opposed the prayer of the appellant for stay of execution of the impugned order on the ground of jurisdiction. However, he is not present today. It is noted that the matter is listed today; however, the Ld. Counsel for the respondent has neither appeared nor filed any reply.

The application seeking execution of stay is taken up. The applicant submits that it has challenged the order passed by the respondent under section 14B of the **Employees Provident Fund and Misc. Provisions Act, 1952 (Hereinafter referred to as 'the Act')** wherein the respondent has determined the damages to the tune of Rs. 7,65,785/- for delayed remittances. The Ld. Counsel for the appellant has stated that the appellant is a proprietorship concern having its office at 361, street no. 4, Kailash Nagar, Ghaziabad-201009. The establishment obtained PF code no. MR/MRT/0052755000 in the year 2011. The appellant is engaged in the business of providing electrical services and has been remitting challans of provident fund from year 2015 onwards as per its workforce.

It is further submitted that the delay has been occurred due to reasons beyond the control of the appellant, and it was neither intentional nor deliberate. It is contended that there was no element of *mens rea* on the part of the appellant in contravention of the statutory provisions, and that the impugned order has been passed in violation of the principles of natural justice, the authority not having acted as a neutral adjudicator but as a party to the proceedings. It is further submitted that the delay occurred due to non-remittance of payments by the principal employer in a timely manner.

I have perused Annexure-1 annexed with the notice, wherein the delay has been marked from the year 2016–2025. The delay ranges from 3 days to 284 days. As the appeal is at the admission stage, no finding on merits can be given at this stage. However, considering the circumstances, the appellant is directed to deposit an amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- within six weeks from the date of this order, by way of FDR in favour of the Registrar, CGIT, initially for a period of one year having auto renewal mode thereafter. Till then, the interim order shall be continued.

The respondent is directed to file its reply to the main appeal within six weeks, and thereafter, the appellant shall file its rejoinder within the following two weeks before the Registrar of this Tribunal.

The matter is listed in the category of final arguments on 20.07.2026. A copy of this order is sent to counsels for both parties via email.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 2

D-2/22/2018

M/s Shivalik Prints vs. APFC/RPFC, Faridabad.

Present: Sh. JR Sharma & Sh. Bhupesh Sharma, Ld. Counsels for the
appellant.
Ms. Neeru, Clerk of Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the
management.

Order dated-29.04.2026

Respondent is required to file written submission. It was mentioned in the order sheet dated 06.04.2026 that it was last chance to file written arguments; however, neither he has appeared nor filed the written argument. Hence, right to file the written argument is struck off having failed to comply the order.

Let the matter be listed for oral argument, if any, on 21.05.2026.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

Item no. 3 & 4

D-2/19/2021 & D-2/05/2023

M/s Ghatak Security Services vs. APFC/RPFC, Noida.

Present: Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Neeru, Clerk of Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel alongwith Sh.
Avneesh Kumar Meena, AR for the respondent.

Order dated-29.04.2026

These are the two cases filed by the establishment against the same respondent. One has been filed under section 7-A of the **EPF & MP Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act')**, and the other has been filed under section 14B & 7Q of the Act. Having common respondent and establishment, these cases are taken together for recording the proceedings.

Respondent's counsel is required to furnish the chart showing the determination of the alleged amount in question; however, neither he has appeared nor has he furnished the required information sought by this Tribunal through his clerk Neeru.

Let RPFC-II who is responsible for keeping updates, is required to furnish the following information as per the order dated 21.04.2026. He is also required to appear along with the information and the compliance file. A copy of this order is also annexed herewith.

Put up for 13.05.2026. A copy of this order is placed in each of the file.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)

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

D-1/40/2024

M/s MFB Geotech Pvt. Ltd. vs. APFC/RPFC, Delhi West.

Order dated-29.04.2026

This is an application filed by the Ld. Counsels for the appellant Sh. JR Sharma & Bhupesh Sharma with the prayer to direct the registry to provide the certified copy of the order passed in this appeal on 09.12.2025.

Let the registry is directed to make the report as to why the certified copy has not been furnished to the appellant within a week. Let this matter be listed for 05.05.2026.

Atul Kumar Garg
(Presiding Officer)