



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.2530 OF 2024

Siemens Limited

...Petitioner

V/s.

Regional Provident Commissioner-I

...Respondent

Mr. Karl Tamboly with *Ms. Mihika Jalan, Ms. Ishita Mundhra and Mr. Cyrus Jal i/b. M/s. Khaitan & Co. for the Petitioner.*

Ms. Sonali Humane for the Respondent.

CORAM: SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATED: 9 APRIL 2026.

P.C.:

1) In view of existence of alternate remedy of filing appeal under Section 7-I of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, the Petition cannot be entertained. Mr. Tamboly however, submits that the time spent in prosecuting the Petition be excluded while computing the period of limitation in filing the Appeal, if Petitioner is being relegated to the appeal remedy. He also prays for continuation of interim relief for a reasonable period of time so as to enable the Petitioner to apply for interim relief before the Tribunal.

2) The Petition is accordingly **disposed of** with liberty to the Petitioner to file Appeal under Section 7-I of the EPF Act. In the peculiar

facts of the case, time spent in prosecuting the Petition shall be excluded while computing the period of limitation in filing the Appeal.

3) Ad-interim relief granted earlier shall continue to operate for a period of three weeks.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]