

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

249

CWP-36114-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision : February 04, 2026

M/S C.T. SCAN RESEARCH CENTRE PVT. LTD.

-PETITIONER

V/S

**REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER AND
ANOTHER**

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Jatinder Kumar Kansal, Advocate, for
Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Hooda, Advocate
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of the proceedings initiated under Section 7-A of the Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act of 1952"). The challenge is premised on the assertion that the impugned proceedings have been initiated on the basis of frivolous complaints and are contrary to the guidelines issued by the department concerned.

2. At the outset, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that an identical issue came up for consideration before a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP-20285-2019 and other connected writ petitions. The said writ petitions were disposed of by the Co-ordinate Bench vide order dated 02.04.2025, granting liberty to the petitioners therein to raise all their grievances before the authority(ies) concerned during the

course of the enquiry under Section 7-A of the Act of 1952. The relevant paragraphs of the order dated 02.04.2025 are reproduced hereinbelow:-

“10. Learned counsel for the respondents-RPFC submits that it is not the case that the proceedings under Section 7-A of the 1952 Act have been initiated against the petitioner(s)-Institutions without due application of mind and that there has been enough material available with the department concerned to initiate the said proceedings under Section 7-A of 1952 Act and that as when any final order will be passed, the same will be reflected in the said order.

11. Learned counsel for the respondents-RPFC further submits that in case, the petitioner(s)-Institution has any grievance that as per the instructions issued by the Ministry, no enquiry could have been initiated against petitioner(s)-Institution under Section 7-A of the 1952 Act qua a particular institution, if such an grievance is raised before the authorities concerned, the same will be dealt with in accordance with law and appropriate order will be passed on the said objections by taking into consideration the relevant facts and the instructions mentioned hereinbefore on the basis of which said objections have been taken.

12. Learned counsel for the respondents-RPFC submits that due reasons will be given while passing the final order on the enquiry initiated under Section 7-A of the 1952 Act.

13. Learned counsel for the petitioners(s)-Institution submits that keeping in view the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents-RPFC, no further grievance of the petitioners(s)-Institution survives as of now and the present petitions may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioners(s)-Institution to raise all the grievance before the authorities concerned. Learned counsel for the petitioners(s)-Institution submits that in case, any order causing prejudice to the petitioners(s)-Institution is passed, liberty be given to the petitioners(s)-Institution to avail appropriate remedy.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondents fairly concedes that the present writ petition may also be disposed of in the same terms as CWP-

20285-2019 and the connected writ petitions.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of in the same terms as CWP-20285-2019 and the connected writ petitions.
5. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of accordingly.

February 04, 2026
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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