

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

Appeal No. D-2/26/2026

M/s. Fair Deal Car Pvt. Ltd Appellant

Through:- Sh. Rajeev Sharma, ld. Counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Faridabad Respondent

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

Order Dated:-05.08.2026

Appellant has preferred the appeal assailing the order dated 01.02.2024 passed by Ld. RPFC under Section 7A (hereinafter referred as 'the impugned order') of the **EPF & M.P. Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred as 'the Act')** whereby the respondent has assessed an amount of Rs. 58,60,054/- as EPF and allied dues. Along with the appeal, an application for condonation has also been annexed. Reason given by the appellant for filing this appeal after the prescribed period of limitation is that he has changed the address of the establishment and shifted to **63/1, Hitkari Complex, Industrial Area Faridabad 121001**. Earlier it was situated at **64, Hitkari Complex, NIT, Faridabad-121001**.

According to the ld. Counsel for appellant, he has communicated this fact about the change in address to the respondent vide letter dated which is enclosed with the appeal.

As per the impugned order, EPFO authorities have also visited the establishment in the year 2019 and collected the

information of the employees. In these circumstances, respondent is directed to clarify at which place the EPFO authorities had visited and why the order has not been communicated to the changed address.

At this, ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks time to file detailed reply to the application for condonation of delay. Put up on 13.08.2026. In the meanwhile, status-quo in regard to the recovery in question is to be maintained.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM
LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI;
Appeal no. D-2/03/2026**

M/s. Genus Paper & Board Ltd.Appellant

Through:- Sh. Prakash Kumar, ld. counsel for the appellant.

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Meerut.Respondent

Through:- Sh. Narender Kumar & Sh. Anirudh Kumar, ld.
counsel for the respondent.

Order Dated:- 05.08.2026

Ld. Counsel for the appellant seeks time to file the rejoinder. He further submits that he has also preferred an appeal against the order passed by the respondent under Section 7 A of the EPF& MP Act, 1952 registered as appeal no. D-2/20/2026 for which the amount he has already deposited and both these appeals have the bearing upon each other and therefore, he requested to list this appeal for final arguments and in between he will file the rejoinder. Let this matter be listed along with other appeal on 03.09.2026.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM
LABOUR COURT, No. 2 DELHI;
Appeal no. D-2/20/2026**

M/s. Genus Paper & Board Ltd.Appellant

Through:- Sh. Prakash Kumar, ld. counsel for the appellant.

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Meerut.Respondent

Through:- Sh. Narender Kumar & Sh. Anirudh Kumar, ld.
counsel for the respondent.

Order Dated:- 05.08.2026

Respondent's counsel has not filed any reply to the application for condonation of delay. However, he seeks time to file reply to the application filed for condonation of delay.

Now looking into the application filed for condonation of delay wherein It is stated by the appellant that he was shocked to receive the recovery order dated 06.02.2026 directing him to pay a sum of Rs.22,00,024/- towards damages and interest under Sections 14B and 7Q of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"). According to the appellant, upon contacting the department, he came to know that an ex parte order under Sections 14B and 7Q of the Act had been passed on 11.05.2026. After obtaining a copy of the said order, he preferred Appeal No. D-2/03/2026, which is presently pending before this Tribunal.

It is further stated that the appellant submitted a letter dated 04.05.2026 setting out the facts and circumstances of the case and sought clarification regarding the amount of Rs.59,42,022/-, which had been deposited by the appellant pursuant to the Resolution Plan towards any liability that might arise in future. The respondent, vide letter dated 11.05.2026, received by the appellant on 16.05.2026, informed him that the said amount had been adjusted against the ex parte order dated 22.11.2023 passed under Section 7A of the Act.

The appellant further submits that upon receiving a copy of the order passed under Section 7A of the Act on

16.05.2026, he filed a review application under Section 7B of the Act. The said review application was rejected by the respondent vide order dated 04.06.2026 on the ground that it was barred by limitation. It is, therefore, contended that if the period of limitation is computed from the date of the order passed under Section 7B of the Act, i.e., 04.06.2026, there is no delay in filing the present appeal.

Considering the fact that the appellant has taken over the erstwhile "M/s. Rana Paper Mill Ltd." in pursuance of the resolution plan approved by National Company Law Tribunal, Allahabad in the year 2022 and the impugned order of the respondent authority is passed in 2023 subsequent to the deposit of this liability which according to the appellant still has not been disbursed to any PF account of subscribers and the fact that erstwhile "M/s. Rana Paper Mills Ltd." had already deposited the dues in respect of its employees, the appeal is assumed to be filed in time because the order has not been passed against the successful resolution applicant which is the appellant in present case. Therefore, delay, if any, is condoned.

Since the appellant has already deposited the amount assessed in the impugned order, the case is listed for filing the reply of the appeal by ld. Counsel for the respondent within four weeks. In the meanwhile, respondent is directed to submit the information regarding name of the PF subscribers in whose account the assessed amount of Rs. 59,42,022/- has been deposited/ credited. Put up the case on 03.09.2026.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

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

Item No. 1

Appeal No. D-2/08/2026

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

Through:- None for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram

.... Respondent

Through:- Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Id. Counsel & Sh. Himanshu Kumar,
A/R for the respondent

Order Dated:-05.08.2026

Record perused, vide order dated 15.07.2026 this tribunal had vacated the stay granted to the appellant due to non-compliance of the condition laid down for granting stay.

Reply to the appeal has been filed today by Id. Counsel for the respondent. Additional copy is placed on record. Appellant is directed to collect the hard copy of the reply from the registry of this tribunal. Since, nobody is present on behalf of the appellant and considering the situation of heavy rain, appellant is given a chance to file the rejoinder on the next date of hearing i.e. on 20.08.2026. Office is directed to inform the next date of hearing to the counsel for the appellant through email.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
CUM LABOUR COURT, DELHI
Appeal no. D-2/10/2026**

M/s. Tulsi Ram Maheshwari Public SchoolAppellant

Through:- Sh.S.K. Gupta, ld. counsel for the appellant.

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, MeerutRespondent

Through: Sh. B.B. Pradhan, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

Order Dated:- 15.07.2026

Reply to the appeal has been filed today by ld. Counsel for the respondent. Copy of the same is supplied to ld. Counsel for the appellant who wishes to file the rejoinder. He is allowed to do so within four weeks and deposit it before the registrar after supplying advance copy to ld. Counsel for the respondent. Case be listed in the category of final arguments on 28.09.2026.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

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

Appeal No. D-2/26/2021

M/s. Convergys India Services Pvt. Ltd. Appellant

Through:- Sh. S.K. Gupta, ld. counsel for the appellant

Vs.

APFC/RPFC, Gurugram West Respondent

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

Order Dated:-05.08.2026

Ld. Counsel for the respondent seeks an adjournment stating that he could not prepare his arguments which is not opposed by ld. Counsel for the appellant. Therefore, in the interest of justice, adjournment granted. List the matter on 24.09.2026 for final arguments.

(Atul Kumar Garg)

Presiding Officer

