

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 8036 OF 2024

TBR Infra Pvt Ltd

...Petitioner

Versus

The Employees Provident Fund Organization

Thr Central Provident Fund Commissioner And Ors ...Respondents

Mr. Vaibhav Jagdale for the Petitioner.

None for the Respondents

**CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR &
M. M. SATHAYE, JJ.**

DATED : 18 JUNE 2024

P.C.:

1. Heard learned Counsel for the Petitioner.
2. The Petitioner-employer is before us seeking to quash the pending proceedings under section 7A of the Employees Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (for short "*the Act of 1952*").
3. The Act of 1952 is a beneficial legislation. It provides for a complete self-contained machinery for the grievance redressal. If an order is passed under section 7A of the Act of 1952, then remedy of appeal is provided under the statute and even the order passed in Appeal can therefore be tested under the supervisory jurisdiction.
4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner sought to contend that the

summons issued is not in the Petitioner's name and several dates have taken place in the proceedings. These two cannot be the ground for quashing of the proceedings. All the contentions of the Petitioner as regards the Petitioner's liability, can be pointed out to the concerned authority. The proceedings are in the nature of quasi judicial proceedings.

5. As regards the long pendency of the proceedings, the same is also against the interest of the employees. The concerned authority will consider expediting the proceedings and to pass final order as early as possible preferably within a period of six months. In case the order is against the Petitioner, all contentions are kept open.

6. The Writ Petition is disposed of.

(M. M. SATHAYE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)