



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

CWP-31233-2019

Date of Decision : 30.10.2025

GURPINDER SINGH AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Manglesh Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Shakti Mehta, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jugam Arora, Advocate for
Mr. Mayank Bajaj, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.

Mr. D.S.Binder, Advocate and
Ms. Indira, Advocate,
for respondent no.4.

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer has been made for issuance of a directions upon the respondents to release the service benefits, i.e EPF and other allowance to the petitioners.

2. On an earlier occasion, before this Court, as recorded vide order dated 08.10.2025, the contesting respondent no.4, had informed this Court that during the pendency of the instant petition, most of the petitioners have been paid off of the due amount, and the dispute has been settled *qua* them.

3. Today, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that he has no instructions to address arguments in the instant matter.

4. This Court has examined the examined the entire petition.

5. After perusal of the petition, this Court is of the considered view that in fact, the instant petition is a misconceived motion. In case there is any dispute with regard to non-payment of EPF, or dereliction on the part of respondent no.4, in not deducting the EPF contribution amount, the petitioners have an effective remedy to approach the authority concerned, constituted under the Employees' Provident Fund Act, 1952, for redressal of their grievances, yet they have sidetracked the said remedy, and have straightway accessed this Court, through instituting the present petition.

6. Further, the said Act, contains exhaustive remedy which not only includes imposition of 100% penalty, but also for initiation of proceedings against a defaulting employer. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the instant petition is not maintainable, in the present form. Consequently, the instant petition is **dismissed**.

4. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioners, to approach the competent authority concerned, under the apt provisions of law, in case they still have any grievance.

October 30, 2025

dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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