

**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. 59(4)2017

M/s. I.V. Communication Appellant
Through Sh. S.P Arora & Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (S) Respondent
Through Sh. S.C Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

The order in this matter could not be pronounced. List the matter
on 28.07.2022 for pronouncement of order.

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-1/15/2022

M/s. First Flight Couriers Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

None is present on behalf of the Appellant to make submissions on admission of the appeal. Further, the Ld .Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the appeal submitted by the Appellant is defective and he has not provided with a complete set of appeal along with all its enclosures. He further submitted that on the last date of hearing also none was present on behalf of the Appellant. Heard the submissions made by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent and accordingly, it is ordered to dismiss the appeal due no non-prosecution. Send the copy of the order to both the parties. Thereafter, consign the record to the record room.

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-1/16/2022

M/s. First Flight Couriers Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

None is present on behalf of the Appellant to make submissions on admission of the appeal. Further, the Ld .Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the appeal submitted by the Appellant is defective and he has not provided with a complete set of appeal along with all its enclosures. He further submitted that on the last date of hearing also none was present on behalf of the Appellant. Heard the submissions made by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent and accordingly, it is ordered to dismiss the appeal due no non-prosecution. Send the copy of the order to both the parties. Thereafter, consign the record to the record room.

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-1/27/2022

M/s. IRCON International Ltd.
Through Sh. Suman K. Doval, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC-1 Delhi
Through Sh. Chirag Damwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent no. 1
Sh. Yogender Singh Ld. Counsel for the Respondent no. 2 to 5.

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

Arguments on the admission of the appeal heard and concluded.
List the matter on 20.07.2022 for pronouncement of order on the same.
Meanwhile, the respondent authority is directed not to take any coercive
measure for recovery of the amount as mentioned in the impugned order
till next date of hearing.

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-1/34/2022

M/s. PCR Buildtech Pvt. Ltd.
Through Ms. Shivani Gole Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (S)
Through Sh Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

Arguments on the admission of the appeal heard in part. The Ld. Counsel for the Respondent submitted his written reply on the application filed for condonation of delay as well as grant of stay on operation of the impugned order. The Ld. Counsel for the Appellant asked for some time to verify the submissions made by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent and submit the counter to the same. Accordingly, List the matter on 24.05.2022 for continuation of the admission proceedings.

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-1/14/2020

M/s. Lighton India Contractors Pvt. Ltd.
Through Ms. Usha Nandini, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (S)
Through Sh. Manish Dhir, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

More time requested for filing the rejoinder by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant. Accordingly, list the matter on 27.07.2022 for filing the 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. 967(4)2014

M/s. Ascot Hotels & Resorts Pvt. Ltd.
Through Raj Kumar A/R for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi
Through Sh.Rajesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

The Ld. Counsel for the Respondent wants some time to file the written reply to the miscellaneous application filed on behalf of the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant. Accordingly, list the matter on 05.07.2022 for filing the reply of consideration.

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. 1051(4)2014**

M/s. Santa Events & Exhibition Pvt. Ltd.
Through Sh. B.K Chhabra Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi
Through Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

The Ld. Counsel for the Respondent wants some time to file the written reply to the miscellaneous application filed on behalf of the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant. Accordingly, list the matter on 05.07.2022 for filing the reply of consideration.

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. 1064(4)2015

M/s. Wood Craft Furnishers
Through Ms. Neetu Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (N)
Through Sh. Rikesh Singh, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

There is one application for vacation of stay filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent. Heard and the following order is passed:-

This order deals with the application filed by the Respondent of the appeal, praying vacation of the interim stay granted by this Tribunal on the execution of the order impugned in the appeal, the objection raised by the appellant to the said application, and the specific argument advanced by the learned counsel for the respective parties.

Perusal of the record shows that the Tribunal, at the time of admission of the appeal had passed a conditional order of interim stay on the execution of the order challenged pending disposal of the appeal. Since, the appeal is pending for a long period and more than six months have passed since the date of the above said interim stay order, the Respondent, by filing the present petition has prayed for vacation of the stay in view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Asian Resurfacing of Road Agency Pvt Ltd & Another vs C B I.

It has been stated in the petition that the Tribunal by order dt **15.09.2015** has directed that there would be an interim stay on execution of the impugned order on compliance of the condition set out in the order. More than six months have passed since the date of that order and the stay granted has not been extended for a further period by a specific speaking order. The Hon'ble SC in the case of Asian Resurfacing of Road Agency & Anr vs Central Bureau of Investigation(Crl Appeal No1375-1376/2013)have held that

Para 36- " At times proceedings are adjourned sine die on account of stay. Even after stay is vacated intimations are not received and proceedings are not taken up. In an attempt to remedy the situation we consider it appropriate to direct that in all pending cases where stay in against the proceedings of a civil or criminal trial is operating, the same shall come to an end on expiry of six months from today unless in an exceptional case by a speaking order the stay is not extended. In cases where stay is granted in future, the same will end on expiry of six months from the date of such order unless similar extension is granted by a speaking order. The speaking order must show that the case was of such exceptional nature that continuing the stay is more important than having the trial finalized. The trial court where order of stay of civil or criminal proceeding is produced, may fix a date not beyond six months of the order of stay so that non expiry of the period of stay, proceeding can commence unless order of extension of stay is produced."

In view of the said order and since no extension of stay has been granted by the Tribunal by a speaking order, the stay stands vacated on expiry of six month. Hence an order to that effect need to be passed for clarity .

Having heard the argument and on a mindful reading of the order passed by the Hon'ble SC in March 2018 in the case of Asian Resurfacing it appears that the directions given in para 35 and 36 will apply when

- i. A civil or criminal case is pending in a court, meaning thereby a trial court or the High Court exercising original civil jurisdiction
- ii. The trial has commenced either by framing of issue in a civil trial and or on framing of charge in a criminal trial
- iii. When the High court or civil or criminal Appellate/Revisional court have granted stay on the said trial proceedings and more than six months have passed since the date of order and no extension of stay has been allowed by a speaking order. The aforesaid directions will not apply to cases where a quasi judicial body or Tribunal grants stay.

Here is a situation, where the stay granted has not stayed the trial of any civil or criminal proceeding and the stay is specifically with regard to the recovery proceeding pursuant to a concluded inquiry and decision rendered by a quasi judicial authority, which is under challenge in the appeal.

It is true that the The Hon'ble SC , by their order dt 15th October 2020 passed in Asian Resurfacing case have reiterated that whatever stay granted by any court, including High Court, the same automatically expires after a period of six months , unless extension is granted for good reasons as per the judgment of March 2018. But this order can not be read in isolation. A conjunctive reading of para 35 and 36 the judgment of March 2018 and order dt 15th Oct 2020, leads to the only meaning that "A stay granted by any court" means and refers to a stay granted by the civil and criminal Appellate/ Revisional courts mentioned in para36 of the judgment and specifically with reference to a pending civil or criminal trial. It is not applicable to an appeal pending challenging the order passed in an already disposed of proceeding by a quasi judicial authority.

It will not be out of place to mention that the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the case of Oracle Financial referred supra have held in clear terms that there being no allegation that the petitioner is responsible for delay , merely relying on the judgment of the Hon'ble SC the stay can not be vacated in an appeal where the stay is in respect of the implementation of an already decided order by a quasi judicial Authority and challenged in the appeal.

In view of the aforesaid discussion, it is held that the petition filed by the Respondent for vacation of stay is without merit and rejected. Call on 29/09/2022 for arguments.

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. 1065(4)2015

M/s. Prime Services Appellant
Through Sh. S.P Arora & Sh. Rajiv Arora Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi Respondent
Through Sh.Rajesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

The Ld. Counsel for the Respondent has moved one application for review. Issue notice to the Appellant for filing reply and consideration of the said application for 05.07.2022.

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. 1232(4)2015**

M/s. Panex Overseas Appellant
Through Sh. S.P Arora & Sh. Rajiv Arora Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi Respondent
Through Sh. A.k Verma, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

There is one application for vacation of stay filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent. Heard and the following order is passed:-

This order deals with the application filed by the Respondent of the appeal, praying vacation of the interim stay granted by this Tribunal on the execution of the order impugned in the appeal, the objection raised by the appellant to the said application, and the specific argument advanced by the learned counsel for the respective parties.

Perusal of the record shows that the Tribunal, at the time of admission of the appeal had passed a conditional order of interim stay on the execution of the order challenged pending disposal of the appeal. Since, the appeal is pending for a long period and more than six months have passed since the date of the above said interim stay order, the Respondent, by filing the present petition has prayed for vacation of the stay in view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Asian Resurfacing of Road Agency Pvt Ltd & Another vs C B I.

It has been stated in the petition that the Tribunal by order dt 21.10.2015 has directed that there would be an interim stay on execution of the impugned order on compliance of the condition set out in the order. More than six months have passed since the date of that order

and the stay granted has not been extended for a further period by a specific speaking order. The Hon'ble SC in the case of Asian Resurfacing of Road Agency & Anr vs Central Bureau of Investigation(Crl Appeal No1375-1376/2013)have held that

Para 36- " At times proceedings are adjourned sine die on account of stay. Even after stay is vacated intimations are not received and proceedings are not taken up. In an attempt to remedy the situation we consider it appropriate to direct that in all pending cases where stay in against the proceedings of a civil or criminal trial is operating , the same shall come to an end on expiry of six months from today unless in an exceptional case by a speaking order the stay is not extended. In cases where stay is granted in future, the same will end on expiry of six months from the date of such order unless similar extension is granted by a speaking order. The speaking order must show that the case was of such exceptional nature that continuing the stay is more important than having the trial finalized. The trial court where order of stay of civil or criminal proceeding is produced ,may fix a date not beyond six months of the order of stay so that non expiry of the period of stay, proceeding can commence unless order of extension of stay is produced."

In view of the said order and since no extension of stay has been granted by the Tribunal by a speaking order, the stay stands vacated on expiry of six month. Hence an order to that effect need to be passed for clarity .

Having heard the argument and on a mindful reading of the order passed by the Hon'ble SC in March 2018 in the case of Asian Resurfacing it appears that the directions given in para 35 and 36 will apply when

- i. A civil or criminal case is pending in a court, meaning thereby a trial court or the High Court exercising original civil jurisdiction
- ii. The trial has commenced either by framing of issue in a civil trial and or on framing of charge in a criminal trial
- iii. When the High court or civil or criminal Appellate/Revisional court have granted stay on the said trial proceedings and more than six months have passed since the date of order and no extension of stay has been allowed by a speaking order. The aforesaid directions will not apply to cases where a quasi judicial body or Tribunal grants stay.

Here is a situation, where the stay granted has not stayed the trial of any civil or criminal proceeding and the stay is specifically with regard to the recovery proceeding pursuant to a concluded inquiry and decision rendered by a quasi judicial authority, which is under challenge in the appeal.

It is true that the The Hon'ble SC , by their order dt 15th October 2020 passed in Asian Resurfacing case have reiterated that whatever stay granted by any court, including High Court, the same automatically expires after a period of six months , unless extension is granted for good reasons as per the judgment of March 2018. But this order can not be read in isolation. A conjunctive reading of para 35 and 36 the judgment of March 2018 and order dt 15th Oct 2020, leads to the only meaning that "A stay granted by any court" means and refers to a stay granted by the civil and criminal Appellate/ Revisional courts mentioned in para36 of the judgment and specifically with reference to a pending civil or criminal trial. It is not applicable to an appeal pending challenging the order passed in an already disposed of proceeding by a quasi judicial authority.

It will not be out of place to mention that the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the case of Oracle Financial referred supra have held in clear terms that there being no allegation that the petitioner is responsible for delay , merely relying on the judgment of the Hon'ble SC the stay can not be vacated in an appeal where the stay is in respect of the implementation of an already decided order by a quasi judicial Authority and challenged in the appeal.

In view of the aforesaid discussion, it is held that the petition filed by the Respondent for vacation of stay is without merit and rejected. Call on 27.09.2022 for arguments.

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-1/24/2019

M/s. Quami Partika Appellant
Through Sh. S.P Arora & Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld.Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (N) Respondent
Through Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

Arguments on the restoration petition filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant heard and concluded. List the matter on 21.07.2022 for pronouncement of order on the same.

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. 604(4)2015**

M/s. Pearson India Education Services Pvt. Ltd
Through Sh. Shantanu Malik, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi (N)
Through Sh. Manu Parashar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

As no time left list the matter on 27.09.2022 for final arguments.

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-2/13/2022

M/s. AA Foundation for Safety Appellant
Through Sh. S.P Arora & Sh. Rajiv Arora, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

RPFC-II, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) Respondent
Through Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

Arguments heard in part. List the matter again on 06.07.2022 for continuation of the hearing for admission of the appeal.

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-2/06/2019

M/s. Flexo Foams Pvt. Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Gurgaon
Through Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

This order deals with the application filed by the Respondent of the appeal, praying vacation of the interim stay granted by this Tribunal on the execution of the order impugned in the appeal, the objection raised by the appellant to the said application, and the specific argument advanced by the learned counsel for the respective parties.

Perusal of the record shows that the Tribunal, at the time of admission of the appeal had passed a conditional order of interim stay on the execution of the order challenged pending disposal of the appeal. Since, the appeal is pending for a long period and more than six months have passed since the date of the above said interim stay order, the Respondent, by filing the present petition has prayed for vacation of the stay in view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Asian Resurfacing of Road Agency Pvt Ltd & Another vs C B I.

It has been stated in the petition that the Tribunal by order **dt 14.05.2019** has directed that there would be an interim stay on execution of the impugned order on compliance of the condition set out in the order. More than six months have passed since the date of that order and the stay granted has not been extended for a further period by a specific speaking order. The Hon'ble SC in the case of Asian Resurfacing of Road Agency & Anr vs Central Bureau of Investigation(Crl Appeal No1375-1376/2013)have held that

Para 36- " At times proceedings are adjourned sine die on account of stay. Even after stay is vacated intimations are not received and proceedings are not taken up. In an attempt to remedy the situation we consider it appropriate to direct that in all pending cases where stay in against the proceedings of a civil or criminal trial is operating, the same shall come to an end on expiry of six months from today unless in an exceptional case by a speaking order the stay is not extended. In cases where stay is granted in future, the same will end on expiry of six months from the date of such order unless similar extension is granted by a speaking order. The speaking order must show that the case was of such exceptional nature that continuing the stay is more important than having the trial finalized. The trial court where order of stay of civil or criminal proceeding is produced, may fix a date not beyond six months of the order of stay so that non expiry of the period of stay, proceeding can commence unless order of extension of stay is produced."

In view of the said order and since no extension of stay has been granted by the Tribunal by a speaking order, the stay stands vacated on expiry of six month. Hence an order to that effect need to be passed for clarity .

Having heard the argument and on a mindful reading of the order passed by the Hon'ble SC in March 2018 in the case of Asian Resurfacing it appears that the directions given in para 35 and 36 will apply when

- i. A civil or criminal case is pending in a court, meaning thereby a trial court or the High Court exercising original civil jurisdiction
- ii. The trial has commenced either by framing of issue in a civil trial and or on framing of charge in a criminal trial
- iii. When the High court or civil or criminal Appellate/Revisional court have granted stay on the said trial proceedings and more than six months have passed since the date of order and no extension of stay has been allowed by a speaking order. The aforesaid directions will not apply to cases where a quasi judicial body or Tribunal grants stay.

Here is a situation, where the stay granted has not stayed the trial of any civil or criminal proceeding and the stay is specifically with regard to the recovery proceeding pursuant to a concluded inquiry and decision rendered by a quasi judicial authority, which is under challenge in the appeal.

It is true that the The Hon'ble SC , by their order dt 15th October 2020 passed in Asian Resurfacing case have reiterated that whatever stay granted by any court, including High Court, the same automatically expires after a period of six months , unless extension is granted for good reasons as per the judgment of March 2018. But this order can not be read in isolation. A conjunctive reading of para 35 and 36 the judgment of March 2018 and order dt 15th Oct 2020, leads to the only meaning that "A stay granted by any court" means and refers to a stay granted by the civil and criminal Appellate/ Revisional courts mentioned in para36 of the judgment and specifically with reference to a pending civil or criminal trial. It is not applicable to an appeal pending challenging the order passed in an already disposed of proceeding by a quasi judicial authority.

It will not be out of place to mention that the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the case of Oracle Financial referred supra have held in clear terms that there being no allegation that the petitioner is responsible for delay , merely relying on the judgment of the Hon'ble SC the stay can not be vacated in an appeal where the stay is in respect of the implementation of an already decided order by a quasi judicial Authority and challenged in the appeal.

In view of the aforesaid discussion, it is held that the petition filed by the Respondent for vacation of stay is without merit and rejected. Call on 12/07/2022 for arguments.

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-2/04/2017

M/s. TPG Wholesale Pvt. Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

Today the matter was taken up for hearing on the Misc. applications filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

There is one application for early hearing of the matter. Heard and the prayer for early hearing of the matter is allowed. List the matter on 12.07.2022.

Since, no stay on execution of the impugned order appears to be granted by this Tribunal in this appeal, the application for vacation of stay filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent stands rejected.

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. 790(16)2008

M/s. Arvind Yadav Hospital & Research Centre
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Gurgaon
Through Sh. B.B Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 17/05/2022

There is one application for early hearing of the matter. Heard and the prayer for early hearing of the matter is allowed. List the matter on 12.07.2022.

Presiding Officer