



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

CWP-28658-2025

Date of Decision : **24.09.2025**

AMI PRABHU MEMORIAL CHARITABLE

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATION AND ORS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Amit Jhanji, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Shashank Shekhar Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.t

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

1. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, under Employees Provident Fund Organisation, in exercising its powers under Section 7A of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act of 1952'), passed by invoking of provisions of Section 17-B thereof, held liable the petitioner to pay a total sum of Rs.1,62,55,816/-, through the impugned Awards dated 26.06.2024 (Annexure P-12) and 27.09.2024 (Annexure P-13).

2. The petitioner filed a review which was dismissed, and thereafter, on account of Awards (*supra*), the orders which are annexed as Annexure P-8 to P-10 and P-14, were issued, primarily, for seeking compliance thereof.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, at the very outset, submits that in view of Section 7-I of the Act of 1952, which prescribes the forum of appeal, only against original orders passed under the relevant provisions, and not against subsequent orders merely seeking compliance with the original order, the petitioner is left with no remedy of appeal. Therefore, the instant petition has been filed before this Court.

4. This Court is not in consonance with the submissions, as made learned senior counsel, for the reason that the original order is, in fact, an appealable order, in view of Section 7-I of the Act of 1952, however, the other subsequent orders are merely a consequence of the main order. Therefore, the petitioner, at the first instance, for redressal of its grievance ought to have invoked the statutory provisions of appeal, instead of filing the instant petition.

5. There is no wrangle amongst the parties that the impugned orders were passed after giving due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. Accordingly, there are no extraordinary grounds warranting interference by invoking the extra-ordinary powers by this Court of writ, especially when, as observed above, the orders are amenable to challenge by way of statutory appeal.

6. In view of the above, the petitioner is relegated to the appellate authority concerned.

7. In case, the petitioner files an apt motion before the appellate authority concerned within a period of 15 days from today, the latter

concerned, shall make all its endeavours to decide the same within a period of 04 months thereafter, after giving an adequate opportunity of hearing to all the parties concerned.

8. Application seeking seeking condonation of delay, if any, filed therewith, shall also be considered most sympathetically, considering the fact that the petitioners had filed a misconceived motion before this Court.

9. **Disposed of** accordingly.

September 24, 2025
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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