



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-4977-2022

Date of Decision : 22.09.2025

FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES , EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION AND ORS**

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. K.K.Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Hooda, Advocate,
for respondents no.1 and 2.

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the notice dated 21.06.2013 (Annexure P-2) and letter dated 09.07.2013 (Annexure P-4), issued by respondent no.2, as well as order dated 17.02.2020 (Annexure P-8) read with order dated 02.07.2021 (Annexure P-10) passed by respondent no.3 in an appeal preferred by the petitioner-corporation.
2. On dated 15.09.2025, this Court passed the hereinafter extracted order:-

“This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at length.

The fulcrum of arguments advanced on behalf of the petitioner is that, petitioner-Corporation was not aware about the pendency of proceedings under Section 14-B of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, before the authorities concerned.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2, produces a compilation of 13 documents, to show that not only the petitioner was aware about the pendency of the proceedings (supra), but the order dated 04.12.2000, was also passed with the consent of a representative of the petitioner, in his presence. He submits that, to substantiate his abovesaid plea, he can also produce the original records. He has handed over a copy of the documents (supra), to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

A copy of the abovesaid compilation has also been taken on record as 'Mark A'.

Faced with the above, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment to have apt instructions from the quarter concerned, as to whether, the petitioner still intends to pursue the instant writ petition, challenging the order dated 09.07.2013 (Annexure P-4), vide which, an only amount of Rs.31,852/- approximately, including interest, has been imposed upon it, on account of delay in making payment to EPF.

Adjourned to 22.09.2025.

Interim order to continue, till the next date of hearing.

To be shown in the urgent list. It is made clear that, on the subsequent date of hearing, no request for adjournment would be entertained on behalf of either side."

3. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner-corporation submits that his office has received a written instruction vide communication dated 21.09.2025, whereby, the documents which was provided to the petitioner-corporation, does neither discloses the name of the contractor who has committed default in not timely depositing the EPF, nor the workers *qua* whom such dues were to be deposited. If the EPFO discloses the name of the contractor and the workers, *qua* whom dues were to be deposited, they can verify the record, and can also recover the amounts from the concerned contractor.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents no.1 and 2, on instructions, informs this Court that there is no inhibition on their part, in sharing the desired information as observed above. The information so required shall be provided to the petitioner-corporation, as per the record available with them before making the recovery.

5. In view of the aforesaid statement, as suffered by learned counsel for the respondents no.1 and 2, the petitioner- corporation opted not to press the instant petition.

6. Therefore, the instant petition, stands **dismissed** as not pressed.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

September 22, 2025
dharamvir

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No