



Jose

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.1560 OF 2026 (F)

DIOCESAN SOCIETY OF  
EDUCATION REPRESENTED  
BY ITS SECRETARY FR. JESUS  
NAZARETH RODRIGUES

... Petitioner.

*Versus*

REGIONAL P.F. COMMISSIONER-I  
AND ANR.

... Respondents.

Mr G. K. Sardessai with Ms Smrati Bangera, Advocates for  
the Petitioner.

Mr Vishnu Lingawat, Advocate for Respondent No.1.

Mr Nikhil Prakash Kulkarni, Chief Manager, Bank of India,  
Panaji Branch, present.

CORAM: DR. NEELA GOKHALE, J.

DATED: 9<sup>th</sup> June, 2026

P.C:

1. Upon mentioning for urgency, production of the papers was allowed.
2. The Applicant seeks to assail order dated 27<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 bearing reference No. 2025-26/ENF/12632/50202, passed by the Regional P.F. Commissioner-I i.e. Respondent No.1 herein, under Section 7A of the Employees Provident Fund and



Miscellaneous Provisions Act of 1952.

3. By way of the impugned order, the Petitioner has been directed to pay an amount of Rs.1,84,28,498/-. Pursuant thereto, by demand notice dated 7<sup>th</sup> April, 2026, the Petitioner was directed to pay the aforesaid amount within 15 days of the receipt of the said notice failing which the recovery was to be made in accordance with the provisions of Section 8B to 8G of the Employees Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952.

4. Thereafter, by letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2025, the Employees' Provident Fund Organization issued a letter to the Branch Manager, Bank of India (BOI), Panaji Branch, Kamat Towers, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa, requiring the Bank to deposit the said amount held by the Bank of the Petitioner's establishment upto the amount of arrears as specified in the order and also requested the Branch Manager to pay any money which may subsequently become due to them or any other arrears thereof.

5. Mr G. K. Sardessai, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner, states that in view of the above, the Petitioner has apprehension that the Branch Manager, Bank of India, will debit the Petitioner's account of the said amount for the purpose of recovery of the alleged dues. He submits that the Petitioner has preferred an appeal assailing the order dated 27<sup>th</sup> March, 2026



before the concerned Tribunal in Mumbai. However, there is a vacancy in the Tribunal at Mumbai, and presently there is no officer presiding over the said Tribunal in Mumbai. Mr Sardessai submits that hence, the matters before the Mumbai Tribunal are being heard by the Nagpur Bench of the Tribunal.

6. Mr Vishnu Lingawat, learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent No.1, states that he has received the notice of the petition only in the afternoon at 1:30 p.m. and was hence unable to take instructions. The Manager of Bank of India, Panaji Branch, Goa i.e. Respondent No.2, is personally present in the Court. He says that the Bank is likely to debit the amount from the Petitioner's account today itself.

7. In view of the aforesaid, it is necessary that the appeal preferred by the Petitioner be heard expeditiously by the Presiding Officer of the Nagpur Bench, who is, I am told, ordinarily hearing matters pertaining to the Mumbai Bench. The Presiding Officer of the Nagpur Bench is thus requested to hear the appeal and/or application for interim relief preferred by the Petitioner and pending before the Mumbai Bench at the earliest.

8. In the meantime, the effect and operation of order dated 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2026, issued by the Respondent No.1, shall remain stayed.



9. It is made clear that I have not heard the matter on merits and the Tribunal concerned to hear the matter and decide the same on its own merits without being influenced by the ad interim relief granted by this Court. The restraint order is granted solely in the interest of justice and expediency, since there is a vacancy in the Tribunal concerned at Mumbai.

10. In view of the aforesaid, nothing survives in the present petition. Petition is accordingly disposed.

**DR. NEELA GOKHALE, J.**