

ORDER SHEET

DATE OF ORDER OF PROCEEDING	ORDER OR PROCEEDING WITH SIGNATURE OF PRESIDING OFFICER	REMARK
	Case No. EPFA/249/2017 M/s. Laxmidas Ramji Vs. APFC, Jabalpur	
17.02.2026	Matter taken up. Mr. Uttam Maheshwari Learned Counsel present for Appellant Establishment. Mr. Vivek Rana Learned Counsel present for Respondent Authority. Heard on application of Appellant Establishment dated 25-11-2020, seeking permission to file additional evidence, which in form of a settlement, said to be reached at between the Appellant Establishment and the complainant Rajendra Prasad, in which, he is said to have stated that in fact he was not an employee of the Appellant Establishment during the period involved in the impugned order. The copy of the settlement is on record. There is no such averment, though there is copy of an application dated 25-11-2020, said to have been filed by the complainant Rajendra Prasad Pandey before Regional Labour Commissioner (C) in a pending dispute between he complainant and Appellant Establishment relating to Industrial Disputes Act, in which he has stated in para 3 of the application that the complainant agrees and admits that he was not an employee of the Appellant Establishment from September 2009 to September 2012 and had rendered only professional services for which he was paid. Perusal of the impugned order, makes it clear that the Respondent Authority is recorded a finding after inquiry,	

ORDER SHEET

DATE OF ORDER OF PROCEEDING	ORDER OR PROCEEDING WITH SIGNATURE OF PRESIDING OFFICER	REMARK
	Case No. EPFA/249/2017 M/s. Laxmidas Ramji Vs. APFC, Jabalpur	
	which was commenced on the complaint of this Rajendra Prasad Pandey, that he was an employee of the Appellant Establishment during the period mentioned in the impugned order and the Appellant Establishment was under obligation in law to deposit EPF dues of this employee also. When there is a specific finding of fact by the Respondent Authority recorded after inquiry, which is under challenge in this appeal, any such application, not filed by the complainant during the inquiry or before this Tribunal also claiming that in fact he was not an employee of the Appellant Establishment, is no relevant in the case in hand. As stated earlier also, the settlement paper does not mention this fact. Hence, the documents proposed to be admitted are not taken on record. The application for additional evidence stands disposed accordingly. Hence, list on 29-04-2026 for final arguments on the request from Respondent Authority. Upload this order. PRESIDING OFFICER	