



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(138)

CWP No. 9087 of 2025

Date of Decision : 01.04.2025

Balwant Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Dinesh Nagar, Advocate with
Ms. Vibha Nagar, Advocate and
Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Hooda, Advocate for the respondent-EPF.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that the claim of the petitioner for the grant of benefit as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Employee Provident Fund Organization Vs. Sunil Kumar***, 2022 SCC Online SC 1521 has been declined vide impugned order dated 13.08.2024 (Annexure P-02) but thereafter, the similar claim raised in CWP No. 5378 of 2024 titled as ***Inderjit Singh Kakanian and others Vs. Union of India***, decided on 12.09.2024, certain reliefs have been granted to the similarly situated employees but the petitioners are not being considered for the grant of relief in terms of the judgment in ***Inderjit Singh Kakanian and others (supra)***, which act on the part of the respondents is arbitrary and illegal.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the claim of the petitioner is liable to be considered afresh in terms of the judgment in ***Inderjit Singh Kakanian and others (supra)*** by passing an appropriate order afresh.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Rajesh Hooda, Advocate, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-EPF and submits that the claim of the petitioner will be considered afresh in terms of the judgment in ***Inderjit Singh Kakanian and others (supra)*** and afresh appropriate order will be passed within a period of three months of the receipt of copy of this order and in case, it is found that the petitioner is similarly situated as petitioners in ***Inderjit Singh Kakanian and others (supra)***, appropriate relief will be given otherwise due reasons will be mentioned for not accepting the claim of the petitioner, which reasons will be conveyed to the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.

6. Ordered accordingly.

April 01, 2025
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No