

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

Misc. Application in Appeal No. D-2/08/2026

M/s. Shreya Hospitality Services Pvt. Ltd. Appellant

Through:- Ms. Saumya Bajaj, Ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram Respondent

Through:- Sh. B.B. Pradhan, ld. counsel for the respondent

Order Dated:-02.07.2026

File is taken up on the application of the appellant seeking extension of time to deposit the interest component in terms of the order dated 21.04.2026 passed by this tribunal. Ld. counsel for the appellant/ applicant submits that due to the financial crunch suffered, the appellant is not able to deposit the interest component in time as such she seeks extension of time to comply the order dated 21.04.2026.

Without going into the controversy that whether the bank account of the appellant has been freezed or de-freezed, appellant is granted time by the next date of hearing already fixed in the matter i.e. 15.07.2026 to comply with the order dated 21.04.2026. In the meanwhile, interim orders to continue till next date of hearing.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

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

Appeal No. D-2/17/2026

M/s. Home and Facility ManagementAppellant
Through:- Sh.Kumar Vikram, ld. counsel & Ms. Anita Dhar,
A/R for the appellant.

Vs.

RPFC/APFC, Noida ...Respondent
Through:- Sh. B.B. Pradhan, ld.counsel & Sh. Navin Kr.
Srivastava for the Respondent. (vakalatnama filed)

Order Dated:-02.07.2026

This is a fresh appeal filed by the appellant against the impugned order passed by the respondent under Section 14B & 7Q of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred as 'the Act') whereby an amount of Rs.3,79,977/- & Rs.2,00,865/-has been assessed as damages and interest for belated payment of EPF dues.

Appellant has pressed his application for condonation of delay in filing of the appeal. He submits that the delay of four days was caused because certain document which were in the custody of the proprietor was not available with the office staff of the appellant, therefore, could not be handed over to the counsel for drafting the appeal.

The explanation offered by the appellant is satisfactory, therefore, exercising the powers conferred under Rule 7 (2) of the Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1997, the delay of four days is condoned by this tribunal and the application for condonation of delay is disposed of.

Now the ld. counsel for the appellant has pressed his another application filed for stay on execution of the impugned order passed by the respondent. He submits that due to financial crunch, he was unable to deposit the dues in time. The payment was also received very late from the principal employers to whom

the appellant used to render its services. Moreover, the assessment done pertains to the Covid-19 period and the respondent has not given any relaxation to that effect. Ld. counsel for the respondent has opposed the prayer and submits that financial difficulty is no ground to grant stay on execution on the impugned order which is a reasoned order.

Considering the fact that the case is at initial stage and the department is yet to file its reply to the appeal, it is appropriate that the execution of impugned order is stayed subject to the deposit of the interest component. Ordered accordingly. Appellant is directed to deposit the interest component within six weeks from today by way of FDR favouring 'Registrar CGIT' initially for a period of one year having auto renewal mode thereafter. Put up on 25.08.2026. In the meanwhile, respondent is directed not to take any coercive measures for recovery of the amount mentioned in the impugned orders till next date of hearing.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

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

Appeal No. D-2/18/2026

M/s. Suryavanshi Security Services

(through Sh. Atul Pratap Singh)

..... Appellant

Through:- Sh. Birendra Kumar Pandey, Ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Rohtak

.... Respondent

Order Dated:-02.07.2026

Ld. counsel for the appellant has pressed for admission of this appeal before this tribunal.

Record perused. Office has also made a report about the maintainability of this appeal before this tribunal stating that appeal does not file under the jurisdiction of this tribunal. Impugned order as well as the recovery order have been passed by the Assistant PF Commissioner, Rohtak so the appellant has to approach the appropriate jurisdiction. Moreover, there is no application for condonation of delay because the order has been passed in the year 2021 and there is no explanation as to why the appeal has been filed belatedly.

This tribunal has asked the ld. counsel for appellant as to how he has invoked the jurisdiction of this tribunal, appellant has no answer except stating that the area of Delhi NCR falls within the jurisdiction of this tribunal.

The plea of the appellant nowhere stands because of the fact that this tribunal has the jurisdiction over only two districts of Haryana namely Gurugram and Faridabad. Office of the APFC, Rohtak does not fall within the jurisdiction of this tribunal. At this, counsel for the appellant agrees to withdraw the appeal. The appeal is dismissed as withdrawn. File is consigned to the record room.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

