

29.10.2025
Ct. No. 30
S.L. No. 18
SM

WPA 23452 of 2025
M/s. Industrial Services
Versus
Regional Provident Fund Commissioner & Anr.

Mr. Lakshman Chandra Halder
.....for the petitioner
Mr. Rajib Ray
.....for the respondent no. 1 and 2

1. The writ application has been preferred being aggrieved by the notice dated 19.09.2025 issued by the respondent no. 2 being the Recovery Officer under the EPF organization.
2. It was the case of the petitioner that during pendency of the appeal preferred by the petitioner before the authorities concerned, the Recovery Officer had proceeded by issuing a recovery notice when there was a specific direction not to take any coercive measure during pendency of the appeal.
3. Learned counsel for the EPF authority has placed a report before the Court wherein it appears that the said notice dated 19.09.2025 issued during the pendency of the appeal has been withdrawn.
4. The said fact is admitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner who submits that his grievance has been duly addressed.
5. Admittedly the petitioner has preferred one provident fund appeal being no. 26/2024 on 20.11.2024.

6. Considering all these facts, the report of the respondent/EPF authority be kept with the record and the writ application stands disposed of.
7. Applications, if any, connected thereto stand disposed of consequently.
8. Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties on priority basis upon compliance of all formalities.

[Shampa Dutt (Paul). J]