



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

LPA-894-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.04.2025

G4S Secure Solutions (India) Pvt. Ltd.

.....Appellant

Versus

Employees Provident Fund Organisation and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present: Mr. Ashok Aggarwal, Senior Advocate,
with Mr. Amitabh Chaturvedi, Advocate,
Mr. Pankaj Gupta, Advocate,
Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Advocate,
Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, Advocate,
and Mr. Paras Jain, Advocate,
for the appellant.

SUDHIR SINGH (ORAL)

The challenge in the instant intra Court appeal is to the order dated 10.02.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court, whereby writ petition (CWP-37689-2019) filed by the appellant was disposed of.

2. Before the learned Single Judge, the appellant had laid challenge to the summons dated 11.05.2017 and the order dated 20.12.2019 (Annexures P-10 and P-21 with the writ petition), vide which, respondent No.2 had initiated the proceedings/enquiry against the appellant in terms of Section

7A of the Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952.

3. A perusal of the impugned order would show that till the date of passing of the said order, only a show cause notice dated 27.11.2017 had been issued by the authorities concerned with regard to certain claim(s) being raised against the appellant by the authorities of the Provident Fund Commissioner.

4. Before the learned Single Judge, learned counsel for the respondents had submitted that in case, any issue of jurisdiction or maintainability was raised, the same would be addressed by the authorities concerned while passing a speaking order on the show cause notices issued to the appellant and all the objections raised would be decided in a legal manner. It was further submitted that in case, any liability was to be fastened upon the appellant, due reasons would be given in the speaking order itself to arrive at the said conclusion and while doing so, due opportunity of hearing would be afforded to the appellant to present its case before the authorities concerned.

5. Since no order causing any prejudice to the appellant had been passed by the respondents, the learned Single Judge, had directed the authorities concerned to pass an order keeping in view the undertaking given by the respondents.

6. Though, the learned Senior counsel appearing for the appellant has argued that the summons/notices issued to the appellant are totally illegal, yet we find that till date, no final order in the inquiry proceedings has been passed by the respondents. This being the position, we do not find any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge.

7. In view of the above, finding no merit in the present appeal, the same is hereby dismissed.

8. At this stage, learned Senior counsel for the appellant has prayed that the appellant may be permitted to file additional objections before the authorities concerned.

9. In case, any such additional objections are filed by the appellant within a period of two weeks, the authorities concerned may look into the same before passing the final order.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUDHIR SINGH)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

02.04.2025
Ajay Prasher

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No