



\$~25 to 27

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

(25) W.P.(C) 10810/2016 & CM APPL. 42299/2016, CM APPL. 42406/2016, CM APPL. 42407/2016, CM APPL. 52628/2018, CM APPL. 29927/2021

GAS SECURE SOLUTIONS (INDIA) PVT. LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Amitabh Chaturvedi & Ms.
Aakshi Batra, Adv.

versus

REGIONAL P.F. COMMISSIONER-I & ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, SC, EPFO
with Mr. Yash Narain, Adv.

(26) W.P.(C) 2137/2017 & CM APPL. 11571/2017, CM APPL. 12973/2017, CM APPL. 21580/2017, CM APPL. 24214/2021, CM APPL. 24215/2021

G4S SECURE SOLUTIONS (INDIA) PVT. LTD.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Amitabh Chaturvedi & Ms.
Aakshi Batra, Adv.

versus

REGIONAL P.F. COMMISSIONER-I & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, SC, EPFO
with Mr. Yash Narain, Adv.

(27)+ W.P.(C) 2580/2017 & CAV 259/2017, CM APPL. 11163/2017, CM APPL. 11164/2017, CM APPL. 11167/2017, CM APPL. 1827/2020, CM APPL. 23967/2021, CM APPL. 23968/2021,



CM APPL. 10997/2024, CM APPL. 32524/2024

G4S SECURE SOLUTIONS (INDIA) PVT. LTD.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Amitabh Chaturvedi & Ms.
Aakshi Batra, Adv.

versus

REGIONAL P.F. COMMISSIONER-I & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, SC, EPFO
with Mr. Yash Narain, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER

%

12.08.2025

1. The learned counsel for the respondent states that the present petition is not maintainable. The learned counsel for the petitioner, referring to the Order of dated 20.02.2024, submits that on the said date also, the learned counsel for the respondents had raised the issue regarding the maintainability of the captioned petitions and were therefore, required to file an affidavit stating therein as to why the instant petitions are not maintainable.
2. It is stated that till date, no such affidavit has been filed by the respondents in pursuance of the said Order dated 20.02.2024.
3. In response, the learned counsel for the respondents submits that they had already raised the issue of maintainability in the counter-affidavit filed by the respondents wherein, in paragraph No. 3 of the said counter-affidavit, it is specifically mentioned that the present petition challenging the Impugned Order dated 06.03.2017 passed under Section 7A of the Employees' Provident Funds and



Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as 'EPF Act') is not maintainable on the ground that Section 7-I of the EPF Act provides a statutory remedy to prefer an appeal to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

4. The learned counsel for the respondents, therefore, submits that in view of the efficacious alternate remedy available to the petitioner, the present writ petition is not liable to be entertained under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by way of the present writ petitions.

5. *Per Contra*, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petitions are maintainable since the order under Section 7A of the EPF Act was passed only during the pendency of the writ petition without affording an opportunity to the petitioner to be heard or to file reply and also without supplying the requisite documents.

6. Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

7. The learned counsels for both the parties are directed to file their written submissions not exceeding five pages, referring to the e-pagination of the Court file, within a period of six weeks, along with an advance copy to the other side.

8. They shall also file compilation of the Judgments sought to be relied upon, if any, within a period of four weeks.

9. Re-notify for arguments on 11th December, 2025.

10. *Interim* orders to continue till the next date of hearing.

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

AUGUST 12, 2025/pr/sm