



CWP-6719-2025

-1-

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

110

CWP-6719-2025

Date of Decision :11.03.2025

M/s Punjab State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd.

...Petitioner

Versus

Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate for petitioner-Corporation.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner-Corporation is that the appeal preferred by the petitioner-Corporation has been rejected by the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh vide order dated 21.08.2023 (Annexure P/3) on the ground of delay.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Corporation argues that the delay could have been condoned even if, the same is beyond 120 days.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-Corporation and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

4. The same question of law came up for consideration before this Court while deciding **CWP-1121-2025 titled as Bank of Baroda vs. Union of India and others on 17.02.2025** wherein, it has been held that the



CWP-6719-2025

-2-

Appellate Authority does not have the power to condone the delay beyond 120 days.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Corporation has not been able to rebut the said principle of law.

6. Keeping in view the said fact, present petition is also dismissed in terms of *CWP-1121-2025 titled as Bank of Baroda vs. Union of India and others, decided on 17.02.2025* keeping in view the findings recorded by this Court.

7. It may be noticed that in the case of *Bank of Baroda (supra)*, a cost has been imposed by this Court but in the present case, no such order is being passed.

March 11, 2025
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No