

**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. 440(4)2015

M/s. Radhey Shyam Solanky
Through Sh. Manish Malhotra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

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.

Sh. Manu Parashar, the learned counsel for the respondent argued on the petition being assisted by Sh Rajesh Kumar, Mr Sidharth, Sh Sivnath Mahanta, Sh Rakesh Singh and others, who are the empaneled counsels of the Respondent department. On the other hand on behalf of the appellant Ms Akanksha Narang advanced her argument opposing the petition being assisted by advocates Sh Rajiv Arora, Sh S K Gupta, Sh Rajiv Shukla, Sh Manish Malhotra Sh Sailesh Kapoor and others who are the counsel in respect of other appeals in which similar petitions have been filed. The counsels, other than the advocate having power in a particular case were allowed to participate and assist since applications of similar nature have been filed in a number of cases involving similar question of fact and law. A common order can not be passed in respect of all the cases as the order to be passed is not likely to finally dispose off the litigation.

It has been stated in the petition that the Tribunal by order dt **15.05.2029** 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 .

During course of argument, besides relying on the judgment of Asian Resurfacing referred supra, Sh Rajesh Kumar Advocate for the Respondent drew

the attention to the judgment of the Hon’ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh in the case of Rajmata Vijayraje Sciendia Krishi Vishwavidyalaya VS EPFO, wherein the Hon’ble court, in absence of a specific order extending stay, came to hold that the stay granted by the CGIT Lucknow stands vacated automatically in view of the judgment of Asian Resurfacing. The Respondent thereby insisted for vacation of the interim stay granted. On behalf the respondent the learned counsel also submitted that under Rule 21 of the Appellate Tribunal Rules the Tribunal may make such orders which is expedient to give effects to it’s orders or to prevent abuse of process and secure the ends of justice. Citing several other judgments of the Hon’ble SC , he submitted that EPF & MP Act being a social welfare legislation interpretation of the provision and decided principles of law should be made in a manner to extend the benefits of law to the weaker section of the society.

Argument on the petition was advanced by the counsel for the appellant who challenged the applicability of the order passed in Asian Resurfacing judgment to the appeals pending before the Tribunal. The main objection taken is that the order passed by the Hon’ble Apex Court ,on a plain reading clearly shows that the said order was with reference to the civil and criminal trial proceedings delayed and pending for long time on account of stay orders passed. The same has no applicability to the appeal pending before this Tribunal. Learned counsel Sh Rajib Arora citing the judgment of the Hon’ble High Court of Bombay in the case of Oracle Financial Services Software Ltd vs Dy Commissioner Income Tax, (WPC 542/2019 –order dt 23rd Feb 2019)submitted that the applicability of Asian Resurfacing Judgment passed in the context of civil and criminal proceedings pending before trial courts , can not be imported to the set of quasi judicial proceedings. He also placed reliance in the case of Commissioner of Central Goods & Services Tax vs Anmol Chlorochem (2019 (367) ELT 584 Guj) to submit that the Hon’ble High Court of Gujurat have held that the observation made by the Hon’ble SC can not be made applicable to a Tax Appeal as the said judgment was exclusively with reference to civil or criminal proceedings arising from a trial.

Sh S K Gupta the learned counsel, by referring to the observation made by the Hon’ble Bombay H C in the case of Oracle Financial services argued that when there is no allegation by the Respondent counsel that the delay in disposal of the appeal is attributable to the appellant, the prayer for vacation of stay is not maintainable. He also submitted that the factors causing

delay in disposal of the appeal, which is the main grievance of the Respondent, be taken into consideration while passing order on the present petition.

The learned counsel Sh Sailesh Kapoor added that the appellants are ready to argue the appeals for final disposal and the stay granted was never un conditional. In such a situation any order vacating the stay , when the judgment of Asian Resurfacing is not applicable would be prejudicial to the appellants.

Learned counsel Sh Rajiv Shukla while drawing attention to the opinion expressed by the Ministry of Law and Justice, Dept. of Legal Affairs , on a query made by the Central Board of Indirect Tax& customs , submitted that the said department has issued a clear guideline to the effect that the Asian Resurfacing Judgment is with reference to civil and criminal Trial proceedings. He also submitted that the said judgment can be made applicable to an individual case and it has no general applicability.

Learned counsel Sh Manish Malhotra added that the judgment has been passed by the Hon'ble S C to remedy the position where a trial proceeding is stayed. The interim order passed by this tribunal since does not stay any trial proceeding and specific to the execution of the final order, the petition filed by the Respondent is on a misconception and mis interpretation of the said judgment.

In reply to the submissions made by the counsel for the appellants , the learned counsels Sh Rajesh Kumar and Sh S N Mahanta submitted that different High courts and other courts since interpreted the Judgment of Asian Resurfacing in different manner the Hon'ble SC in another order dt 15th October 2020 (Misc Application No 1577/2020 arising out of CrI Appeal no 1375-1376/2013) have clarified that the judgment of Asian Resurfacing applies to all courts and whatever stay has been granted by any court including the High Court shall automatically expire after six months. Hence the application filed by the respondent be allowed and the order of interim stay be vacated.

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 28/04/2022 which is the date already fixed in this matter.

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. 965(4)2016

M/s. Softage Information Technology Ltd. Appellant
Through Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi(S) Respondent
Through Sh. Sanjay Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

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.

Sh. Sanjay Aggarwal, the learned counsel for the respondent argued on the petition being assisted by Sh Rajesh Kumar, Mr Sidharth, Sh Sivnath Mahanta, Sh Rakesh Singh and others, who are the empaneled counsels of the Respondent department. On the other hand on behalf of the appellant Ms Akanksha Narang advanced her argument opposing the petition being assisted by advocates Sh Rajiv Arora, Sh S K Gupta, Sh Rajiv Shukla, Sh Manish Malhotra Sh Sailesh Kapoor and others who are the counsel in respect of other appeals in which similar petitions have been filed. The counsels, other than the advocate having power in a particular case were allowed to participate and assist since applications of similar nature have been filed in a number of cases involving similar question of fact and law. A common order can not be passed in respect of all the cases as the order to be passed is not likely to finally dispose off the litigation.

It has been stated in the petition that the Tribunal by order dt **08.11.2016** 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 .

During course of argument, besides relying on the judgment of Asian Resurfacing referred supra, Sh Rajesh Kumar Advocate for the Respondent drew

the attention to the judgment of the Hon’ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh in the case of Rajmata Vijayraje Sciendia Krishi Vishwavidyalaya VS EPFO, wherein the Hon’ble court, in absence of a specific order extending stay, came to hold that the stay granted by the CGIT Lucknow stands vacated automatically in view of the judgment of Asian Resurfacing. The Respondent thereby insisted for vacation of the interim stay granted. On behalf the respondent the learned counsel also submitted that under Rule 21 of the Appellate Tribunal Rules the Tribunal may make such orders which is expedient to give effects to it’s orders or to prevent abuse of process and secure the ends of justice. Citing several other judgments of the Hon’ble SC , he submitted that EPF & MP Act being a social welfare legislation interpretation of the provision and decided principles of law should be made in a manner to extend the benefits of law to the weaker section of the society.

Argument on the petition was advanced by the counsel for the appellant who challenged the applicability of the order passed in Asian Resurfacing judgment to the appeals pending before the Tribunal. The main objection taken is that the order passed by the Hon’ble Appex Court ,on a plain reading clearly shows that the said order was with reference to the civil and criminal trial proceedings delayed and pending for long time on account of stay orders passed. The same has no applicability to the appeal pending before this Tribunal. Learned counsel Sh Rajib Arora citing the judgment of the Hon’ble High Court of Bombay in the case of Oracle Financial Services Software Ltd vs Dy Commissioner Income Tax, (WPC 542/2019 –order dt 23rd Feb 2019)submitted that the applicability of Asian Resurfacing Judgment passed in the context of civil and criminal proceedings pending before trial courts , can not be imported to the set of quasi judicial proceedings. He also placed reliance in the case of Commissioner of Central Goods & Services Tax vs Anmol Chlorochem (2019 (367) ELT 584 Guj) to submit that the Hon’ble High Court of Gujrat have held that the observation made by the Hon’ble SC can not be made applicable to a Tax Appeal as the said judgment was exclusively with reference to civil or criminal proceedings arising from a trial.

Sh S K Gupta the learned counsel, by referring to the observation made by the Hon’ble Bombay H C in the case of Oracle Financial services argued that when there is no allegation by the Respondent counsel that the delay in disposal of the appeal is attributable to the appellant, the prayer for vacation of stay is not maintainable. He also submitted that the factors causing delay in disposal of the appeal, which is the main grievance of the Respondent, be taken into consideration while passing order on the present petition.

The learned counsel Sh Sailesh Kapoor added that the appellants are ready to argue the appeals for final disposal and the stay granted was never un conditional. In such a situation any order vacating the stay , when the judgment of Asian Resurfacing is not applicable would be prejudicial to the appellants.

Learned counsel Sh Rajiv Shukla while drawing attention to the opinion expressed by the Ministry of Law and Justice, Dept. of Legal Affairs , on a query made by the Central Board of Indirect Tax& customs , submitted that the said department has issued a clear guideline to the effect that the Asian Resurfacing Judgment is with reference to civil and criminal Trial proceedings. He also submitted that the said judgment can be made applicable to an individual case and it has no general applicability.

Learned counsel Sh Manish Malhotra added that the judgment has been passed by the Hon'ble S C to remedy the position where a trial proceeding is stayed. The interim order passed y this tribunal since does not stay any trial proceeding and specific to the execution of the final order, the petition filed by the Respondent is on a misconception and mis interpretation of the said judgment.

In reply to the submissions made by the counsel for the appellants , the learned counsels Sh Rajesh Kumar and Sh S N Mahanta submitted that different High courts and other courts since interpreted the Judgment of Asian Resurfacing in different manner the Hon'ble SC in another order dt 15th October 2020 (Misc Application No 1577/2020 arising out of Crl Appeal no 1375-1376/2013)have clarified that the judgment of Asian Resurfacing applies to all courts and whatever stay has been granted by any court including the High Court shall automatically expire after six months. Hence the application filed by the respondent be allowed and the order of interim stay be vacated.

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.

There is also one application filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent for early hearing of the appeal. As the present appeal pertains to CGIT –I Delhi, which is lying vacant and the undersigned is assigned the additional charge of CGIT –I Delhi, the early hearing in this matter is not possible. Accordingly, list the matter on the date already fixed i.e. 12.05.2022.

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. D-1/11/2022

M/s. Walter Bushnell Medipure Pvt. Ltd. Appellant
Through Sh. Sachin Proxy, Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

EPFO, Delhi(S) Respondent
Through Sh. Manu Parashar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

The Proxy Counsel appearing for the Appellant asked for an adjournment. Granted. List the matter on 07/04/2022 for admission proceedings in the matter.

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-1/09/2019

M/s. Shaka Electrical
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Although the case was listed for hearing on the petition filed for granting stay on operation of the impugned order, however, none pressed the said application on behalf of the Appellant. Accordingly, the said application for stay of recovery proceedings filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant, stands dismissed as not pressed. List the matter on 03.08.2022 for filing reply of the main 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-1/48/2019

M/s. Poly Process Corporation
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Although the case was listed for hearing on the petition filed for granting stay on operation of the impugned order, however, none pressed the said application on behalf of the Appellant. Accordingly, the said application for stay of recovery proceedings filed by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant, stands dismissed as not pressed. List the matter on 03.08.2022 for filing reply of the main 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. 42(4)2017

M/s. FIIT JEE Foundation
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED:- 23/03/2022

The early hearing petition filed on behalf of the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is allowed. List the matter on 24/05/2022 for final arguments in the matter.

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. 133(4)2016

M/s. FIIT JEE Foundation For Education
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

The early hearing petition filed on behalf of the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is allowed. List the matter on 24/05/2022 for final arguments in the matter.

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. 354(4)2013

M/s. Harish Sahni
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Delhi
Through Sh. Jai Kumar Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Sh. Jai Kumar Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent appeared in this matter and requested for early hearing in this matter. Allowed. List the mater on 24/05/2022 for final arguments in this matter.

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. 300(4)2010**

M/s. Satyaguru Marvellous Creations
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Delhi
Through Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

List the matter on 05/05/2022 for consideration of application
filed under order XXII rule 4 read with section 151 of CPC.

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. 1332(4)2014

M/s. Apex Buildsys Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

List the matter on 02/06/2022 for consideration of the interim relief of stay on operation of the impugned order as directed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in W.P.(C) no. 6005/2015.

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. 10(4)2017

M/s. Cross Country Hotel Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Delhi(S)
Through Sh. Jai Kumar Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. 1452(4)2017**

M/s. Neel Punj Services
Through Sh. S.K Khanna, Proxy Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi(S)
Through None for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel appeared on behalf of the Respondent and asked the permission of this Tribunal to file an application for recalling of the order dated 15/03/2017 wherein this Tribunal has proceeded by declaring the Respondent as ex-parte. Granted. List the matter on 03/08/2022.

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. 514(4)2015

M/s. Pure Diets India Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi
Through Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

The application filed for early hearing in this matter on the behalf of the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is allowed. List the matter on 06/05/2022 for final arguments in this matter.

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. 965(4)2014

M/s. Bhandari Builders Pvt. Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Delhi
Through Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

The application filed for early hearing in this matter on the behalf of the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is allowed. List the matter on 28/04/2022 for final arguments in this matter.

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. 626(4)2014

M/s. Indo Gulf Industries Ltd. Appellant
Through Sh. S.K Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Delhi Respondent
Through Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

The Ld. Counsel for the Appellant submitted that the Appellant has got the damages waived off from the CBT being a sick company and the interest amount has already been deposited by the Appellant. Accordingly, the appeal has become infructuous in the present circumstances and therefore be disposed off.

Considering the submissions made by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant, it is of no use to carry on with proceedings and therefore, it is directed to dispose the proceedings in this case as being infructuous. Consign the record as per rules after sending the copies of the order to both the parties.

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. 1349(4)2014

M/s. Maheshwari Gas Services
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi
Through None for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel appeared on behalf of the Respondent and asked the permission of this Tribunal to file an application for recalling of the order dated 29/02/2016 wherein this Tribunal has proceeded by declaring the Respondent as ex-parte. Granted. List the matter on 03/08/2022.

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. 1501(4)2014**

M/s. Heman Associates
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi(S)
Through Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

List the matter on 03/08/2022. The Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is directed to produce LCR along with responsible officer who is conversant with the facts of the case as directed vide order dated 13/02/2017 of this Tribunal on 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. 1041(4)2015

M/s. Pawan Mehra
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi(S)
Through Sh. J.K Sinha, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. D-1/18/2019

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

Vs.

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

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. D-1/19/2019

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

Vs.

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

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. D-1/20/2019

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

Vs.

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

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. 967(4)2016

M/s. Indra Sistemas India Pvt. Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. D-1/43/2019

M/s. Kochhar Impex Pvt. Ltd. Appellant
Through Ms. Nitu Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi(N) Respondent
Through Sh. Naresh Gutpa, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. D-1/27/2020

M/s. Ashiana Housing Ltd. Appellant
Through Sh. Rajiv Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

CBT, RPFC, Delhi (S) & APFC, Delhi (S) Respondent
Through Sh. Naresh Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. 681(4)2016**

M/s. Veolia Water (India)
Through Sh. Krishan Kartik, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi(N)
Through Sh. Naresh Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. 331(4)2016

M/s. Delhi Sikh Management Committee
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi
Through Sh. Naresh Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. D-1/18/2018

M/s. Mynah Designs
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. 405(4)2016

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

Vs.

APFC, Delhi Respondent
Through Sh. Naresh Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. 551(4)2015

M/s. Eagle Hunters Solutions Ltd. Appellant
Through Ms. Nitu Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi Respondent
Through Sh. Naresh Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. D-1/12/2019

M/s. Netree E-Services Pvt. Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments on the miscellaneous petition filed on behalf of the Respondent heard and concluded. List the matter on 30/03/2022 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. 629(4)2014

M/s. Indus. Construction Co.

Appellant

Through Ms. Nitu Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi

Respondent

Through Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments heard in part. List the matter on 31/03/2022 for further arguments in this matter.

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-1/79/2019

M/s. Unique Print Pack Pvt. Ltd.
Through None for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

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

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Due to paucity of time, arguments could not be heard. List the matter on 03.08.2022 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. 489(4)2016

M/s. Akshara Advertising Ltd.

Appellant

Through Ms. Nitu Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

APFC, Delhi

Respondent

Through Sh. Narender Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Arguments heard. Both the Counsels agreed to file written notes of arguments in this matter. Allowed. List the matter on 29/04/2022 for pronouncement of order on the same.

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-2/23/2021

M/s. N1 Media Consultancy (P) Ltd.

Appellant

VS.

APFC, Noida

Respondent

ORDER DATED:-23/03/2022

Present:- Shri K. K Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant.
Shri S.N. Mahanta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent.

This order deals with the application filed by the appellant for condonation of delay for admission of the appeal and for waiver of the condition for pre deposit provided u/s 70 of the Act. Matter was heard being argued by the counsel for both the parties.

This appeal was filed on 26/08/2021, challenging the order dated 29/07.2019. For the objection taken by the registry with regard to the delay, hearing was made on the delay condonation petition and the order was passed by this Tribunal on 13 /12/2021, holding that the appeal is barred by limitation and was dismissed on that ground. Now the appellant has come up with the petition filed under Rule 21 of the Tribunal (Procedure) Rules 1997, praying that the order dated 13/12/21 be recalled to prevent abuse of process and to secure the ends of justice.

By order dated 13/12/21 an opinion was formed that the appellant was served with the impugned order in it's e-mail id and the

appeal having been filed after the prescribed period of limitation, in absence of convincing explanation is barred by limitation. During the hearing held on 25/11/21, the appellant had raised objection about non service of the order in it's official mail id available in the Shram Subidha portal. Hence while closing the argument the respondent was directed to supply the details of the mail id in which the impugned order was dispatched and at the same time, liberty was granted to the appellant to counter the same by filing written reply if any on or before the date fixed for passing of the order. The matter was adjourned to 13/12 /21 for orders. Neither the Respondent nor the appellant filed any evidence and document as directed and on 13/12/21 order was passed dismissing the appeal as barred by limitation.

Now the appellant has come up with the present petition along with proof that the impugned order was never dispatched in the e mail id. On perusal of the same it is evident that the address in which the order was sent is not the address registered in the Shrama Subidha portal. Thus it can be concluded that the appellant got to know about the same when his Bank account was attached and thus filed the appeal in time and he could not furnish the details before passing of the order on 13/12/2021 due to wrong noting of the date of posting of the case. The explanation offered is thus accepted and the delay is condoned and the order dated 13/12/2021 is recalled.

In respect of the other petition filed u/s 70 of the Act, on behalf of the appellant it is submitted that the respondent has computed the amount payable on the basis of the gross salary, blindly relying upon the report of the EO. Not only that during the enquiry the period of inquiry was enhanced on the request of the department representative to the prejudice of the appellant. Though all the documents including the wage register was produced during the enquiry in support of the proof that the establishment has made deposit of the contribution on the basis of the ceiling limit of Rs 6500/- which was later enhanced to RS15000/- w.e.f 1.9.2014, the commissioner never considered the bonafides of the establishment. He thereby submitted that the appellant has a strong case to argue in this appeal and any condition of predeposit would be prejudicial and the Tribunal should consider to waive the same. It has also been argued that the impugned order has been passed without identifying the beneficiaries.

In reply the learned 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 provisions of sec 7-O by depositing 75% of the assessed amount. Learned counsel Mr. Mahanta also cited the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of M/S JBM Auto System Pvt. Ltd vs. RPFC, to submit that the Tribunal can not grant waiver in a routine manner which will have the effect of defeating the very purpose of the Act.

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. At this stage of admission it need to be considered that the period of default in respect of which inquiry was initiated are from 4/2014 to 12/2018 and the amount assessed is 26,41,552/-. There is no mention in the order about the basis of the calculation arrived at. At the same time it can not be ignored that the appellant establishment has admitted about the less deposit for lack of knowledge on the enhancement of ceiling limit which amounts to admission. Without going to the other detail as pointed out by the appellant 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 pass an order, taking into consideration the period of default, the amount assessed and the prevailing circumstances on account of the outbreak of COVID-19. However, 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 40%. Accordingly the appellant is directed to deposit 40% 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 of the tribunal 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. List the matter on 11/05/2022 for compliance of the direction failing which the appeal shall stand dismissed. The interim order of stay granted on the previous date shall continue till then. Both parties be informed accordingly.

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-2/23/2018

M/s. Valaya Clothing Pvt. Ltd.
Through Ms. Niut Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Appellant

Vs.

RPFC, Gurugram
Through None for the Respondent

Respondent

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

List the matter on 03/08/2022 for consideration of the miscellaneous petition on behalf of the Appellant for restoration of the matter.

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-2/17/2019

M/s. Schneider Electric Infrastructure Ltd. Appellant
Through Ms. Subhalaxmi, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

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

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

List the matter on 01/06/2022 for final arguments in the matter.

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-2/14/2019

M/s. Fernas Construction India Pvt. Ltd. Appellant
Through Sh. S.K Khanna, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant

Vs.

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

ORDER DATED :- 23/03/2022

Final arguments in the matter heard and concluded. List the matter on 02/08/2022 for pronouncement of order on the same.

Presiding Officer