



2026:CGHC:13412

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPL No. 39 of 2026

- M/s. M.S. Public School, Korla Through The Principal Smt, Arpana Singh Baikunthpur, Distt. Korla Chhattisgarh
... Petitioner

versus

- Central Board Of Trustees (EPF) Through The Enforcement Officer, District Office Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
... Respondent

For Petitioner	: Mr. Sudeep Johri, Advocate
For Respondent	: Mr. Suil Pillai, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

20.03.2026

1. Mr. Sudeep Johri would submit that an order was passed by the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner-II, Bilaspur dated 18.11.2025, whereby the petitioner/institution has been directed to deposit an amount of Rs. 17,34,338/- according to the provisions of Section 7A of Employees Provident Fund Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952. He would contend that against said order, a review application was moved before the said authority, which was rejected vide order dated 19.12.2025. Mr. Johri would further contend that against order passed under the provisions of Section 7A of the Act of 1952, an appeal has been preferred before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal(CGIT), Jabalpur bearing registration No.

CGIT/LC/EPFA/07/2026, which is pending consideration since month of February, 2026. He would contend that application for waiver of mandatory deposit was moved and the learned Tribunal directed the petitioner to deposit 40% of the amount under appeal by way of demand draft. It is also informed that respondent has recovered a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- from Bank account of the petitioner. He would submit that the Bank account of the petitioner/institution has been attached pursuant to order passed by the EPF Commissioner. He would submit that the petitioner/institution is unable to make payment of salary of its employees due to attachment of its Bank account. He would pray to set-aside the order dated 12.02.2026.

2. Mr. Sunil Pillai would submit that the appeal preferred by the petitioner before the CGIT was barred by limitation. He would contend that the learned Tribunal has considered application moved by the petitioner for grant of waiver and directed the petitioner to deposit 40% of amount under appeal. He would submit that as appeal is still pending consideration before the learned Tribunal, therefore, no order may be passed in favour of the petitioner.
3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record.
4. Taking into consideration the fact that the appeal preferred by the petitioner before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal is still pending consideration, therefore, without making any observation on the merits of the case, this petition is disposed of with a direction to the concerned Tribunal to make all endeavours to conclude the proceeding of pending appeal bearing Case No. CGIT/LC/EPFA/07/2026 preferably within a period of 60 days

from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

5. With the aforesaid observation(s), and direction(s), the instant petition is hereby **disposed of**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Siddhant