

GAHC010023562015



**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT**  
**(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**

**Case No. : WP(C)/6373/2015**

KAGAJ NIGAM KARMI UNION  
HINDUSTAN PAPER CORPORATION LIMITED, NAGAON PAPER MILL, REP.  
BY THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE SAID UNION P.O. KAGAJ NAGAR-  
782413, DIST. MORIGAON, ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE UNION OF INDIA and 3 ORS  
REP. BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF LAO BUR  
AND EMPLOYMENT, SHARAM SHAKTI BHAWAN, RAFI MARG, NEW  
DELHI- 110001.

2:THE ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA

REP. BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAO BUR AND EMPLOYMENT  
SHRAM SAKTI BHAWAN  
RAFI MARG  
NEW DELHI-110001.

3:THE EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND ORGANIZATION

MINISTRY OF LAO BUR AND EMPLOYMENT GOVT.OF INDIA  
HEAD OFFICE BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN  
14  
BHIKAIJI CAMA PLACE  
NEW DELHI-110066.

4:THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER -1  
PENSIONS EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANIZATION  
MINISTRY OF LAO BUR AND EMPLOYMENT  
GOVT. OF INDIA

HEAD OFFICE BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN  
-14  
BHIKAIJI CAMA PLACE  
NEW DELHI-110066

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : MR. T U LASKAR

**Advocate for the Respondent** : ASSTT.S.G.I.

**BEFORE**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. UNNI KRISHNAN NAIR**

**ORDER**

**Date : 25.06.2024**

None has appeared for the petitioner on call.

Mr. P. K. Roy, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. S. K. Chakraborty, learned counsel appearing for the Employees Provident Fund Organization, representing respondents no. 3 & 4 are present.

It is contended by Mr. P. K. Roy, learned counsel that the challenge to the notification dated 22.08.2014 as made in the present proceedings was also the subject matter of challenge before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Petition No. 8658-8659/2019 and the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide Judgment dated 04.11.2022 had upheld the validity of the said notification dated 22.08.2014 and accordingly, in view of the said decision, there would arise no live issue for consideration in the present proceeding.

However, since none has appeared for the petitioner, this Court refrains from considering the matter on its merit and the writ petition stands

dismissed for non-prosecution.

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**