



\$~9

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LPA 611/2025 & CM APPL. 61951/2025, CM APPL. 61952/2025
RAVI AND ORSAppellant

Through: Mr. Khagesh B. Jha, Adv.

versus

EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATION THROUGH
CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Braja Bandhu Pradhan, Adv for
R-1 and 2.
Mr. Rajiv Arora, Adv. for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIMAL KUMAR YADAV

ORDER

%

26.09.2025

1. The challenge in this appeal is to the Order dated 10.07.2025 passed in W.P.(C) No. 15583/2023.
2. The Petitioner has filed the instant Writ Petition with the following prayers:-

“a) Set aside the impugned order dated 10.07.2025 passed in W.P.(c) No. 15583/2023 and allow the prayers of writ petition.

b) allow the present Appeal with cost to the Appellant.

c) or pass any other order of further orders this Hon'ble court be fit based on above-mentioned facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Shorn of unnecessary details, the facts of the case are that according to the Petitioners and the Authorities, Respondent No.4/ School is under the purview of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions



Act, 1952 [“**EPF Act**”] and was allotted EPF code No. DL/11058. The Appellants have joined the school between 2007-2010 and are working as school bus drivers. It is submitted that the Appellant No. 1 was getting a salary of Rs. 6600/- whereas the Appellant Nos. 2 & 3 were getting a salary of Rs. 6000/-. It is the contention of the Appellants that initially the salaries were paid in cash but after getting directions from the Department of Education their salaries were credited in the account of the Petitioners.

4. Action has been initiated against the School by the Authorities for compliance of the statutory obligations under the EPF Act. Since there has been a delay in recovery of the PF and allied dues from Respondent No.4/ School, the Appellants sought for expediting the proceedings. There are other disputes which are not covered under the EPF Act between the Appellants and Respondent No.4/ School. Since the proceedings before the Tribunal were not getting adjudicated, the Appellants approached this Court with the reliefs as sought for earlier. The learned Single Judge has disposed of the Writ Petition by upholding the Judgment vide Order dated 10.07.2025.

5. As far as the reliefs pertaining to the EPF dues, the learned Single Judge in the impugned order has held as under:-

“2. Learned counsel for respondent No. 4, refers to its counter affidavit and the order dated 08.04.2021 passed by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, to submit that the issue insofar as prayer (A) of the present petition is concerned, is still pending consideration before the Appellate Authority. It is also submitted that the operation of the order dated 09.12.2019 passed by respondent No.2 is stayed under the said proceedings, vide order dated 11.11.2021.

3. I find force in the contention of the learned counsel for respondent No. 4 that the upto to the year 2018 is already under consideration of beyond the year 2018 would depend on the outcome of the same. In view thereof, the



present petition is disposed of alongwith pending applications.

4. Needless to state that this Court has not commented upon the merits of the case of either side. The parties shall be entitled to raise their submissions before the Appellate Authority.”

6. After some arguments, Mr. Jha, learned Counsel for the Appellants states that he would be satisfied with a order granting a permission to the Appellants to file an impleadment application in the lis pending between the School and the Authorities. In the opinion of this Court, the Judgment impugned herein permits the filing of such an impleadment application, however, this Court for the sake of clarification permits the Appellants to get themselves impleaded in the proceedings limited to the disputes which arise under the EPF Act.

7. With this clarification, no further interference is called for in the Impugned Judgment. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observation on the merits of the case.

8. Since the grievances of Appellants was raised way back in the year 2007 and considering the fact that the Appellants come from a very poor strata of the society, the Tribunal is requested to expedite the proceedings.

9. The Writ Petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

10. Pending applications also stands disposed of.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/neha