

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-II, ROUSE AVENUE,  
DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, DELHI.**

Present:

Smt. Pranita Mohanty,  
Presiding Officer, C.G.I.T.-Cum-Labour  
Court-II, New Delhi.

**ATA No. D-1/18/2022**

M/s. SRS Engineers

Appellant

VS.

RPFC-II, Delhi (N)

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :-14/07/2022**

Present:- Shri S.P Arora & Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.  
Shri Manu Parashar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

The appeal has been filed challenging two separate orders passed by the RPFC Delhi North u/s 14B and 7Q of the EPF&MP Act levying damage and interest of Rs 89,028/-and Rs 70,244/- respectively.

This order deals with the admission of the appeal and the prayer made by the appellant for an interim order of stay on the execution of the impugned orders, pending disposal of the appeal.

Registry has pointed out the delay caused in filing the appeal.

Notice of the appeal being served on the respondent, the learned counsel Shri Manu Parashar representing the respondent participated in the hearing and raised objection to the prayer for interim stay.

The appellant has challenged the orders dt04/01/2022 received on 07/01/2022, passed by the RPFC Delhi u/s 14B and 7Q of the EPF &MP Act assessing the damage and interest payable by the appellant establishment on account of delayed remittance of PF Dues of it's

employees for the period 04/2019 to 02/2020. Describing the same as illegal and non speaking order, the appellant has prayed for admission of the appeal and stay on the execution of both the orders. It has further been alleged that the order of damage has been passed in a mechanical manner, without application of mind in as much as no reason has been assigned for imposition of penal damage @100%. No finding has been given on the mensrea of the establishment for the delayed remittance. No opportunity was also afforded to the appellant establishment for setting up a proper defence. Not only that the establishment during the inquiry under challenge, though had deputed it's representative to ask for an adjournment, the commissioner, without application of mind and without giving reasonable opportunity on the very first day concluded the inquiry and passed the impugned orders holding that the establishment representative wanted the proceeding to be closed so that they can challenge the order in appeal. The learned counsel for the appellant also submitted that damage is leviable only when the establishment is found to have delayed the remittance with some ulterior intention. In this case the representative of the establishment had submitted before the commissioner about the acute financial difficulty faced by the appellant establishment, an electrical contractor for non release of funds in time by it's clients who are none other than Govt. Departments and PSUs. Those mitigating circumstances were not considered at all by the commissioner during the inquiry. It is also pleaded that the Respondent had created a lien on it's Bank account soon after passing of the order and without serving notice u/s 8F of the Act, recovered the entire amount. Copies of letter correspondence between the appellant and it's clients in the nature of reminders have been placed on record to point out the mitigating circumstances.

The learned counsel for the appellant thereby submitted that the appellant has a strong case to argue having fair chance of success. He thereby argued for admission of the appeal by condoning the period of delay if any which has been allowed by the Hon'ble SC and an unconditional interim order of stay in respect of both the orders. In alternative, the learned counsel for the appellant submitted that both the orders impugned in this appeal be set aside and matter be remanded to the commissioner for a fresh inquiry with a direction for refund of the amount recovered pending conclusion of the fresh inquiry.

The learned counsel for the respondent while supporting the impugned order argued that the provision aims at safeguarding the interest of the employees in the hands of the mighty employer. He

also pointed out that the delay in remittance as evident from the calculation sheet is for more than a year. More over it is not the case of the appellant that for financial difficulties it had withheld the salary of it's employees. When the salary was paid every month, the appellant has to explain as to why the employees' share deducted was not deposited. Since the appellant had omitted to discharge it's statutory obligation, the commissioner has rightly passed the order. He also submitted that mensrea, a state of mind inferred from the circumstances of the case is no more a condition to be considered in view of the recent judgment passed by the Hon'ble SC in the case of **Horticulture Experiment Station, Gonikoppal, Coorg vs. the RPFC (Civil Appeal No. 2136 of 2012 order dated 23.02.2022)**.

Whereas the learned counsel for the appellant has placed reliance in the judgment of **McLeod Russel India Limited vs. Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Jalpaiguri & Others reported in (2014)15 S.C.C 263** and **DCW Employees Co-operative Canteen Pvt. Ltd vs. P.O.EPFAT,2018 LLR 672**, decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, the learned counsel for the Respondent besides the judgment in Horticulture referred supra has also relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh in the case of **Sumedha Vehicles Pvt. Ltd vs. CGIT** to argue that the appeal is not maintainable as against the order passed u/s 7Q of the Act. He also pointed out that the written submission stated to have been filed during the inquiry has not been placed on record. He also argued that the reminders sent by the appellant to his client for release of payment can not absolve him of the statutory liabilities.

There is no dispute on facts that remittance has been made after considerable delay. On hearing the argument advanced by the counsel for both the parties it is found that the appeal has been filed after the prescribed period of sixty days but within 120 days up to which the Tribunal has power to extend the period of limitation. The Appeal does not suffer from any other defect. Hence the delay is condoned and the appeal is admitted.

Now a decision is to be taken on the prayer for interim relief of stay made by the appellant. The factors which are required to be considered at this stage are the period of default and the amount of damage levied.

In this case the period of default as seen from the impugned order is almost for one year. The financial hardship pleaded by the appellant is on account of none release of its bills. The most striking aspect of the appeal is that the commissioner has passed a very cryptic order which doesn't contain any reason behind the order passed by the quasi judicial authority. In the case of **Kranti Associates Pvt. Ltd. and another vs. Masood Ahmed Khan and others (2010)9SCC 496** have held that:-

“insistence on reason is a requirement for both judicial accountability and transparency. If a judge or quasi judicial authority is not candid enough about his decision making process, then it is impossible to know whether the person deciding is faithful to the doctrine of precedent or to principle of incrementalism. Reason in support of decisions must be cogent, clear and succinct. A pretence of reason or rubber stamp reason is not to be equated with a valid decision making process”

In this case the commissioner started the inquiry on 16.12.2021 and on the same day after appearance of the A/R of the establishment concluded the inquiry for the reason that the said A/R stated before him that the inquiry may be closed and he will challenge the order in appropriate forum. It is not understood how a responsible quasi judicial authority in the cadre of RPFC acted upon the submission of the A/R ignoring his own responsibility as such authority to pass a reasoned order. In several decisions including the case of **wear well India Pvt. Ltd. vs. PF commissioner and others, MANU/DE/2811/2019** the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi have stated that it is always incumbent upon the respondent to deal with the contention of the establishment, however briefly may be, while passing the order which in essence fastens a huge financial liability upon the petitioner. In this case the lapses on the part of the respondent in dealing with the objection of the appellant and giving out reasons in support of the finding are vividly evident. On this ground alone the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

Hence, for the non speaking order passed by the commissioner bereft of any reason in support of the finding it is felt proper at this stage to remand the matter for fresh inquiry by the commissioner. Now the question arises if the order passed u/s 14B would be set aside and the matter would be remanded, what would be the fate of the order passed u/s 7Q of the Act. The Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the case of **M/s Ever green Engineers Pvt. Ltd. vs. EPFO, 2016LLR1096** have clearly held that if appeal u/s 14B is allowed in

totality, the order u/s 7Q passed simultaneously will also be set aside as the same is an outcome of the finding with regard to the delay in deposit. In that view of the matter it is felt proper to set aside both the orders passed u/s 14B and 7Q of the Act and remand the matter to the RPFC for reconsideration and assessment expeditiously.

The Ld. Counsel for the appellant during course of argument informed that the respondent authority soon after the passing of the order had created a lien on the bank account of the appellant. Before admission of the appeal the respondent has realized the entire amount assessed as damage and interest. He thereby argued that a direction be issued to the respondent authorities to return the same. Keeping the submissions in view the following order is passed.

### **ORDER**

The impugned orders passed u/s 14B and 7Q are hereby set aside and at this stage of admission the matter is remanded to the RPFC for reconsideration and assessment after giving opportunity to the establishment for hearing and setting up its defence. The amount recovered by the respondent as per the impugned assessment shall be kept deposited in an interest fetching FDR in a Nationalized Bank till conclusion of the inquiry and shall be utilized/released subject to the result of the inquiry. It is further directed that the appellant shall appear before the commissioner within 15 days from the date of communication of this order to participate in the hearing and the respondent shall conclude the hearing within 3 months from the date of appearance of the appellant before him.

Presiding Officer

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT-II, ROUSE AVENUE,  
DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, DELHI.**

Present:

Smt. Pranita Mohanty,  
Presiding Officer, C.G.I.T.-Cum-Labour  
Court-II, New Delhi.

**ATA No. D-1/24/2022**

M/s. Bristol Aircon Pvt. Ltd.

Appellant

VS.

RPFC, Delhi (N)

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :-14/07/2022**

Present:- Shri S.K Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.  
Shri Manu Parasar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

This order deals with the admission of the appeal and separate petitions filed praying waiver of the condition prescribed u/s 70 of the Act and condonation of the delay.

Copy of the petitions being served on the respondent Shri Manu Parasar the Ld. Counsel for the respondent appeared and participated in the hearing. No written objection has been filed by the respondent.

Perusal of the record and the note of the registry reveals that the impugned order was passed on 29.09.2021 and the appeal has been filed on 12.04.2022 i.e. beyond the prescribe period of limitation. The appellant in the application for the condonation of delay has stated that the impugned order was passed on 29.09.2021 and the appellant being a company the issues and challenges are required to be placed before the Board of Directors. The said activities could not be taken up due to the slowdown on account of the outbreak of the Corona Virus Pandemic. Citing the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in the suomoto WPC NO. 03 of 2020 and the order dated 10.01.2022 passed in the MA No. 21 of 2022 extending the period of limitation for the difficult situation created by the pandemic he submitted that the appeal is very well within the period of limitation for the extension granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. He thereby submitted that this tribunal should consider the matter and condone the delay. The Ld. Counsel for the respondent though initially argued that no circumstances have been made out explaining the inordinate delay in filing of the appeal, later on fairly conceded about the extension of limitation granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Hence, hearing the submission advanced by the counsel for both the parties it is felt to be a proper case for condonation of delay. Accordingly the delay is condoned.

The other petition filed by the appellant is for waiver/ reduction of the pre deposit amount contemplated u/s 70 of the Act. On behalf

of the appellant it has been submitted that the inquiry was initiated pursuant to summon dated 03.02.2020 for the period 11/2018 to 12/2019 alleging omission in Pf Contribution by the employer. The inquiry was taken up on 28.02.2020 when the representative of the appellant appeared and requested for time. The case was adjourned to 13.03.2020 but for the grim situation prevailing since 2020 on account of COVID-19 and subsequent lockdown from mid march 2020, the establishment could not participate in the virtual hearing despite effort made for the same. The Directors and his family members were down with COVID. The EO never visited the establishment for verification of the record but submitted a report before the commissioner on 12.07.2021 recommending assessment of Rs. 30470766/- for the excluded employees as no F11 was produced. The EO also recommended assessment of Rs. 88300/- in respect of the employees already enrolled as PF members. The order was passed in absence of the appellant and the submissions made to the EO report by the appellant was never considered. The appellant could know about the impugned order which was passed behind his back, when the banker of the appellant informed about the attachment of the account for recovery of the assessed amount. In this appeal the appellant has stated that the impugned order is bad in law since, the assessment has been made in respect of the excluded employees basing on the report of the EO only and opportunity for setting up a defence was denied to the establishment. Thereby the Ld. Counsel for the appellant argued that the appellant has a strong case to argue and has a fair chance of success. Unless the appeal would be admitted and execution of the order would be stayed serious prejudice shall be caused.

Relying upon different judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court of Delhi he submitted that reason is the spirit of any judicial, executive or quasi judicial order passed. The authority passing the order is expected to render the reason driving him to the conclusion. If the order lacks the finding in that regard the same becomes illegal, arbitrary and not sustainable in the eye of law. He also submitted that the companies and business houses are encountering huge loss for the aftermath of COVID. In such a situation, compliance of the provisions of section 70 of the Act for admission of the appeal shall force the appellant into undue hardship. Thereby he argued that the tribunal having power to waive the condition of the pre deposit should allow the appeal to be admitted without pre deposit. At the end of the hearing of the appeal if the assessed amount would be found payable the appellant shall not flee away from the liability.

In reply the Ld. Counsel for the respondent while supporting the impugned order as a reasoned order pointed out the very purpose of the beneficial legislation and insisted for compliance of the

provision of section 7O by depositing 75% of the assessed amount. He also submitted that the commissioner while passing the impugned order had considered all the materials and record available and the said order being a reasoned order suffers from no infirmity.

Considering the submission advanced by the counsel for both the parties an order need to be passed on the compliance/waiver of the conditions laid under the provisions of sec 7-O of the Act. There is no dispute on the facts that the commercial activities in all sectors are facing a backlash on account of the outbreak of COVID-19 and the preventive shut down of commercial activities. At the same time it need to be considered that the period of default in respect of which inquiry was initiated is for more than one year and the amount assessed is Rs. 4,36,066/- Without going to the other detail as pointed out by the appellant for challenging the order as arbitrary, and at this stage of admission without making a roving inquiry on the merits of the appeal, it is felt proper to extend protection to the appellant pending disposal of the appeal keeping the principle of law laid down by the Hon'ble SC in the case of *Mulchand Yadav and another*. Thus on hearing the argument advanced, it is felt proper and desirable that pending disposal of the appeal, the said amount be protected from being recovered from the appellant as has been held by the Apex court in the case of **Mulchand Yadav and Another vs. Raja Buland Sugar Company and another reported in(1982) 3 SCC 484** that the judicial approach requires that during the pendency of the appeal the impugned order having serious civil consequence must be suspended.

In view of the said principle laid down and considering the grounds taken in the appeal, the period of default ,the amount assessed, it is felt that the circumstances do not justify total waiver of the condition of pre deposit. But the ends of justice would be met by reducing the amount of the said pre deposit from 75% to 30%. Accordingly the appellant is directed to deposit 30% of the assessed amount within 6 weeks from the date of this order towards compliance of the provisions of sec 7-O of the Act by way FDR in the name of the Registrar CGIT initially for a period of one year with provision for auto renewal. On compliance of the above said direction, the appeal shall be admitted and there would be stay on execution of the impugned order till disposal of the appeal. The earlier order of interim stay shall continue till the next date. Call the matter on 05.09.2022 for compliance of the direction.

Presiding Officer



**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/53/2019**

M/s. S.S. Mota Singh Sr. Sec. Model School  
Through Sh. Satyender Verma, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi (W)  
Through Sh. Prem Prakash Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

The Ld. Counsel for the Respondent submitted the reply to the appeal. Taken on record. Copy of the same supplied to the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant. List the matter on 08.09.2022 for filing rejoinder by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/17/2020**

M/s. Ambitious Pens Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi (W)  
Through Sh. Prem Prakash, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

The Ld. Counsel for the Appellant has moved one application for granting adjournment. List the matter on 16.11.2022 for final arguments. The Ld. Counsel for the Appellant shall have the liberty to file the rejoinder in between along with serving a copy of the same upon the Respondent.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/27/2021**

M/s. Impressive Data Services Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi (E)  
Through Sh. S.N Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 08.09.2022 for filing rejoinder by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant as the matter is adjourned today on the request made by Ld. Counsel for the Appellant, the previous day on account of injury in her leg. .

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/21/2022**

M/s. SPML Infra Ltd.  
Through Ms. Shambhavi Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (E)  
Through Sh. S.N Mahanta, Proxy Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 17.08.2022 for filing reply by the Ld. Counsel  
for the Respondent. This be treated as a last chance for filing reply.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/35/2022**

M/s. Vishakha Facility Management Pvt. Ltd.  
Through Sh. Nikhil Patnayak, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Delhi (E)  
Through Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 17.08.2022 for filing reply of the appeal by the  
Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/37/2021**

M/s. Ghibellines Security Solutions Ltd.  
Through Sh. Raj Kumar A/R, for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC-Delhi (S)  
Through Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter again on 17.08.2022 for the purpose already fixed  
i.e. consideration of application filed for review of order dated  
08.11.2021 passed by this Tribunal.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 776(4)2014**

M/s. MM Shandilya  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi  
Through Sh. A.K Verma Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 1015(4)2014**

M/s. SPS Services  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi  
Through Sh. A.K Verma Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant.

**Presiding Officer**



**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 1016(4)2014**

M/s. KS Anodisers Aluminium Associated Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi  
Through Shri A.K. Verma, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 1094(4)2015**

M/s. Ambar Prakashan  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi (N)  
Through Sh. A.K. Verma, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 1449(4)2015**

M/s. Kundan Industries Carburettors  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi (S)  
Through Sh. A.K Verma Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 1453(4)2015**

M/s. Leather Tech.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi (S)  
Through Shri A.K. Verma, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 1456(4)2015**

M/s. Industrial Medical Engineers  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi  
Through Shri Satpal Singh Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. 946(4)2016**

M/s. Tejs  
Through Sh. Chandan Proxy Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC-Delhi (N)  
Through Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/44/2018**

M/s.Akash Ganga Infraventures India Ltd.  
Through Sh. Swetank Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC-Delhi (N)  
Through Shri A.K. Verma, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/15/2019**

M/s. Sehgal Packaging Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC-Delhi (N)  
Through Sh. Judy James, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant.

**Presiding Officer**



**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/41/2019**

M/s. Walltracts (India) Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (E)  
Through Sh. Arvind Kr. Verma Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

List the matter on 18.08.2022 for consideration of the application filed for vacation of stay. Meanwhile, the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to ensure the service of the miscellaneous application filed for vacation of stay upon the appellant

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-1/97/2019**

M/s. Reliance HR Services Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (S)  
Through Ms. Rashmi Malhotra, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

Although the matter was adjourned en-block, the same was mentioned by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent submitting that the stay prayer/petition filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant is still to be decided and the matter may be listed accordingly. Perused the record and it is directed to list the matter on 04.08.2022 for consideration of stay prayer/petition.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-2/08/2019**

M/s. Dexterity Projects Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Gurugram  
Through None for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

Perusal of the record shows that reply to the appeal stands filed on behalf of the Respondent with the Registry. Taken on record. List the matter on 18.08.2022 for filing rejoinder by the Ld. Counsel for Appellant.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.  
Appeal No. D-2/32/2019**

M/s. Viraj Exports Pvt. Ltd. Appellant  
Through Sh. Rajiv Shukl & Sh. Sanjay Kumar Counsels for the Appellant

Vs.

CBT, APFC, Noida Respondent  
Through None for the Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent has requested for a short adjournment and for some more time for filing the reply. Granted. List the matter on 17.08.2022 for filing reply by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-2/19/2021**

M/s.Ghatak Security Services  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC- Noida  
Through Sh. S.N Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

The Ld. Counsel for the Appellant requested for an adjournment. Granted. List the matter on 22.08.2022 for filing rejoinder.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-2/21/2021**

M/s. Rekhta Foundation  
Through Sh.Raj Kumar A/R for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC- Noida  
Through Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

The A/R for the Appellant requested for an adjournment. Granted. List the matter on 22.08.2022 for filing rejoinder.

**Presiding Officer**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI; ROOM No.208  
ROUSE AVENUE, DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI-110002.**

**Appeal No. D-2/02/2021**

M/s. Clixxo Broadband Pvt. Ltd.  
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Noida  
Through None for the Respondent

Respondent

**ORDER DATED :- 14/07/2022**

Counsels for the parties requested for an adjournment. List the matter on 22.08.2022 for consideration of miscellaneous application filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant for granting stay on operation of the order passed u/s 7 Q.

**Presiding Officer**