



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S. M. SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K. SURENDER

WA No. 836 of 2026

and

CMP No. 8713 of 2026

The Central Board of Trustees,
Employees Provident Fund,
Rep. by Regional Provident Fund Commissioner-II,
Bhavishyanidhi Bhawan, Post Box No. 3875,
Dr.Balasundaram Road,
Coimbatore 641 018.

..Appellant

Vs

M/s.Tirupur Textiles Ltd.,
Post Box No.153, Gandhinagar,
Tirupur-603.

..Respondent

WA No. 836 of 2026

Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent praying to set aside the order made in WP.No. 33811 of 2019 dated 25.02.2025.

For Appellant :

Mr.C.Kulanthaivel

Judgment

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by S.M.Subramaniam J.)

The present intra Court appeal has been instituted under Clause 15 of Letters Patent by the Central Board of Trustees, Employees Provident Fund,



Rep. by Regional Provident Fund Commissioner II, challenging the order of the writ Court holding that the Board of Trustees, has no authority to maintain a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

2. Uncontroverted facts between the parties would show that the competent authority under the Employees Provident Fund passed an order under Section 14B of the Act on 14.12.2015. Aggrieved by the said order, Establishment preferred an appeal before the Appellate Tribunal and the Appellate Tribunal entertained the appeal under Section 7-I of the Act and passed final orders. Since the Employees Provident Fund Appellate Tribunal decided the issues against the Organisation, the writ petition has been instituted by the Central Board of Trustees.

3. Mr.C.Kulanthaivel, learned Panel Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant would contend that Union of India represented by the Central Board of Trustees is an aggrieved person and therefore, entitled to maintain the writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The appellant is a party respondent before the Employees Provident Fund Appellate Tribunal and contested the case on merits. Thus, the appellant is an aggrieved person for the purpose of maintaining a writ petition. Regarding the authority of the Central Board of Trustees, the learned Panel Counsel would rely on the resolution of the Central Provident Fund Commissioner, New Delhi, authorising the Central Board of Trustees to institute / file, conduct, prosecute



and defend civil and criminal cases etc. That apart, he would submit that assuming that the Central Board of Trustee is not an authority to maintain a writ petition under Article 226, then for all purposes, the order of the Tribunal will become final and the Department may not be in a position to ventilate their grievances and settle the issues before the High Court and the Supreme Court. Thus, the very proposition held by the writ Court is running counter to the established principle of law, infringing the basic right of an aggrieved person, to maintain a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

4. On behalf of the respondents it is stated that there are judgments to show that the Central Board of Trustees or any other authority under the Organisation has no authority to maintain a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. That apart, the order has been passed by the authority under the Act. Therefore, they cannot be construed as an aggrieved person and more so, they cannot challenge their own decision before the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions made between the parties to the lis.

6. Though in the present cases, appellate authority has passed an order on enquiry under Section 14B of the Act, it cannot be said that in the event of the said order is reversed by the Appellate Tribunal, no further challenge could



be made before the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. If the said arguments is accepted, in all cases, in the event of the order of the Original Authority is reversed on appeal by the Tribunal, the same would necessarily become final, without any further challenge before any other Forum or before the High Court or Supreme Court.

7. That apart, Section 5-C of the Employees Provident Fund Act stipulates Board of Trustees to be Body Corporate. Accordingly, every Board of Trust is constituted under Sections 5-A, 5-B shall be a body corporate under the name specified in the notification constituting it, having perpetual succession and a common seal and shall by the said name sue and be sued. In exercise of the powers conferred under the Act, resolution was passed by the Central Provident Fund Commissioner authorising the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner and the Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner to institute, file, conduct, prosecute and defend all Civil and Criminal cases, whether original appellate or revisional, instituted or launched by or against the Central Board of Trustees, Employees Provident Fund and/or Central Provident Fund Commissioner and/or any Regional Provident Fund Commissioner to act and appear in all the aforesaid proceedings for and on behalf of the Central Board of Trustees, Central Provident Fund Commissioner, or as the case may be, Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, to conduct and prosecute the same and all proceedings that may be taken in respect of any application connected with the same or any



decree or order passed therein, including proceedings in taxation and applications for review, to file and obtain return of the Central Board of Trustees, Central Provident Fund Commissioner or as the case may be, Regional Provident Fund Commissioner in all petitions and in applications for review and to represent them jointly or singularly and to take all necessary steps on behalf of them in all matters in case of need, to engage, appoint and instruct pleaders, advocates, barristers and attorneys to file and take back documents from courts, administrative tribunal and all Tribunals, authorities to withdraw from or abandon wholly or partly the suit/appeals/revision/claim/defence/ proceedings against all or any defendants/respondents/ appellants/ plaintiffs/ opposite parties, to enter into any agreement, settlement or compromise whereby the suit/ appeal proceedings is/are wholly or partly adjusted to refer all or any matter or matters arising or in dispute therein, to arbitration to withdraw or deposit any money for and on behalf of the Central of Trustees, Employees Provident Fund from or in any court or before any officer or authority and generally to do all that is necessary and proper for the aforesaid purpose including assigning and verifying pleadings, petitions, applications, appeals and complaints.

8. Approaching the High Court by an aggrieved person under Article 226 is the basic right, which cannot be denied. It is a constitutional right conferred and therefore, whether a State or Union of India or an authority authorised by the State or Union of India, has the authority to approach the



High Court, challenging any decision of the Tribunal or the Courts. In the event of accepting the arguments as advanced on behalf of the respondents as rightly contended by the learned Panel Counsel, the order of the Appellate Tribunal under Section 7-I of the Act will become final and all further adjudications will be stopped forthwith and such a scenario would defeat the basic right of an aggrieved person to approach the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

9. Though the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner in his official capacity passed an original Order under Section 14B of the Act, he has been authorised by the Central Board of Commissioner to institute and defend civil and criminal cases before the Courts, Tribunal etc. The power of judicial review under Article 226 empowers the High Court to decide the issues on merits in respect of the person instituting a writ petition challenging an order passed by the authority or a decision taken or otherwise. Such a power conferred to the High Court under Article 226, cannot be curtailed nor be taken away merely on the ground that the original authority, who passed an order, filed a writ petition before the High Court.

10. This Court is not inclined to deal with the merits, since the writ order impugned would show that the authority of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Central Board of Trustees to maintain a writ petition alone is decided. Therefore, this Court has no option, but to remand the matter to the



writ Court for adjudication of issues and merits raised between the parties in the writ petitions.

WEB COPY

11. Accordingly, the impugned writ order dated 25.02.2025 in W.P.No.33811 of 2019 is set aside. The Writ Petition is restored to its file. The Writ Court is requested to dispose of the writ petition on merits as expeditiously as possible. Accordingly, the Writ Appeal is **allowed**. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

(S.M.S.,J.) (K.S.,J.)
09-04-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

DSA

To
Tirupur Textiles Ltd.,
Post Box No.153,
Gandhinagar,
Tirupur-603.



WEB COPY

WA No. 836 of 2



**S.M.SUBRAMANIAM J.
AND
K.SURENDER J.**

DSA

WA No. 836 of 2026

09-04-2026