

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-2, MUMBAI**

**APPEAL NO. CGIT- 2 / EPFA 126 /2024**

M/s. Pristine Properties. - Appellant

V/s.

The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner,

EPFO, Pune. - Respondent

**ORDER**

**(Delivered on 28-10-2024)**

Read application filed on behalf of the appellant.  
Peruse the say given on behalf of the respondent.

Heard both the parties.

It seems that, the respondent on the basis of prohibitory order u/s. 8-F dated 09.08.2024, FREEZED the bank accounts of the appellant. Though, it is contended on behalf of the appellant that, the prohibitory order was passed during the pendency of the appeal, however the present appeal has been filed on 19.09.2024, i.e., after passing the prohibitory order still without going to the legality or illegality of the action of the respondent, considering the inconvenience and hardship which is likely to be caused to the appellant in regular transaction including the salary of the employees of the appellant, I am inclined to direct the respondent to keep the prohibitory order in abeyance during pendency of appeal and direct the bank of the appellant to DE-FREEZE the bank accounts of the appellant, only on the

condition to deposit the whole amount of interest i.e., Rs. 36,43,231/- assessed by the appellant with the respondent. If the whole amount is already recovered, then I am directing the respondent to keep the amount of interest with them and Refund the amount of damages to the appellant within two weeks from the date of order.

Sd/-

Date: 28-10-2024

(Shrikant K. Deshpande)  
Presiding Officer  
CGIT -2, Mumbai