

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/01357/2018**

**DATED THIS THE 21<sup>st</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2019**

**HON'BLE DR.K.B.SURESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**HON'BLE SHRI C.V. SANKAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

G.S. Ravindra,  
S/o Sri G. Suryanarayana Rao,  
Aged about 61 years,  
Assistant Director (Retired)  
National Institute of Miners' Health  
Marikuppam Post, K.G.F 563 119  
Kolar District, Karnataka  
Residing at No. 88, 2<sup>nd</sup> Cross,  
BSK III Stage, III Phase, 5<sup>th</sup> Block,  
Bangalore 560 085.

..... Applicant

(By Advocate Shri B.S. Venkatesh Kumar)

Vs.

1. Union of India,  
Represented by its Secretary,  
Ministry of Mines,  
No. A-320, Shastri Bhavan,  
Rajendra Prasad Road,  
New Delhi 110 001

2. National Institute of Miners' Health  
Represented by its Director,  
C/o JNARDDC Campus,  
Opp. Wadi Police Station,  
Amaravathi Road, Nagpur 440 023

3. M/s Bharat Gold Mines Limited,  
By its Managing Director,  
Regd. Office: Suverna Bhavan,  
Oorgaum Post, KGF 563 122.

4. Regional Provident Fund Commissioner-I,  
Employees' Provident Fund Organization,  
Regional Office (Annex Building),  
Shambag, Umred Road,  
Nagpur 440 009.

....Respondents

(By Shri S. Sugumaran, Counsel for Respondent No. 1 & 2 and  
Smt. Shwetha Anand, Counsel for Respondent No.4)

ORDER

(PER HON'BLE SHRI C.V.SANKAR, MEMBER (ADMN.))

The case of the applicant is that he was appointed in the Research and Development(R&D) Department of the Bharat Gold Mines Ltd.,(BGML) w.e.f. 20.2.1978. He was promoted to the post of Scientific Assistant in the year 1983. He was further promoted as Sr.Scientific Assistant in the year 1989. Since the R&D Department of BGML was separated and a new Society namely the National Institute of Miner's Health(NIMH)(2<sup>nd</sup> respondent) came to be formed in the year 1989, the employees and assets of the said Department were transferred to the new society and the services of the applicant were also transferred to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent vide memorandum dtd.9.8.1989(Annexure-A1). Options were called from the employees and the applicant opted to be absorbed in the new institution. However, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent did not absorb the applicant but in the year 2001, he took steps to repatriate the applicant to the BGML which was defunct. Aggrieved by the same, the applicant approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP.No.43718/2001 which was allowed on 29.5.2008 directing the 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> respondents to absorb the applicant and extend him all the consequential benefits with a further direction not to shift the Institute from KGF to elsewhere in the country. Since the said order was not implemented, the applicant filed contempt in CCC No.499/2008 before the High Court of Karnataka. In the meantime, the respondents filed a Writ Appeal and the same came to be dismissed. During the pendency of the aforesaid contempt petition, the respondents filed a memo dtd.15.2.2010 stating that they would extend all

the benefits to which the applicant was eligible and they assured that they would pay the applicant the arrears of pay and other benefits and the contempt petition was disposed of. Thereafter the applicant was absorbed on 10.2.2010(Annexure-A2). By order dtd.31.3.2010(Annexure-A3), the applicant was promoted to the post of Assistant Director w.e.f. 1.3.2010 and his pay was fixed in the cadre of Assistant Director. By a letter dtd.5.4.2010(Annexure-A4), NIMH wrote to BGML requesting to transfer of service records including provident fund amount of the applicant. The applicant also wrote a letter dtd.2.9.2010(Annexure-A5) to NIMH to provide the details of the provident fund statement from the date of his absorption till the date of said letter. 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent wrote a letter dtd.2.5.2011(Annexure-A6) to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent crediting the provident fund contribution of the applicant to the account of the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent. The applicant having come to know that all his provident fund contribution with that of employers' contribution from the date of joining 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent viz., 21.2.1990 till January 2012 are not properly accounted/maintained and that the entitled amount of interest had not been credited to his account, he wrote a letter dtd.18.1.2012(Annexure-A7) to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and requested for updating the records. He followed up with another letter dtd.18.3.2012(Annexure-A8) to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent requesting to provide updated EPF records showing his contributions from Feb., 1978 to 20.2.1990, revised EPF collected from 21.2.1990 to 28.2.2001 and cumulative interest for the entire period. As nothing was settled in the matter, the applicant wrote a letter dtd.5.2.2013(Annexure-A9) to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent requesting the EPF account be updated and cumulative interest on both the employer's and employee's contribution be credited to the applicant's account. On

1.3.2013(Annexure-A10), the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent wrote to 4<sup>th</sup> respondent transferring the EPF account of the applicant together with the balances etc. He also wrote a letter to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent on 5.3.2013(Annexure-A11) enquiring whether the Institute should pay the cumulative in respect of the PF account of the applicant. On 29.9.2014(Annexure-A12), the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent wrote a letter to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent regarding payment of interest/damages/penalty on EPF in respect of the applicant and sought for certain details from the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent. By a letter dtd.16.10.2014, 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent replied to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent giving details of payment of interest/damages/penalty on EPF in respect of the applicant(Annexure-A13). On 17.9.2014(Annexure-A14), 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent wrote a letter to 1<sup>st</sup> respondent seeking directions of the Ministry in the aforesaid matter. In the meanwhile when the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent sought legal advice regarding payment of interest/damages etc., the legal adviser vide his letter dtd.17.7.2014(Annexure-A15) stated that the department need not pay any interest on EPF from 1989 and consequential damages/penal charges. On 11.12.2014, 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent issued a letter to 4<sup>th</sup> respondent certifying that the applicant is the permanent employee of the said institute since 21.2.1990 and there is no break in service(Annexure-A16). 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent also issued a certificate on 1.8.2004 stating that there is no break in service of the applicant from 1978 till his transfer to 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent(Annexure-A17). As there were errors in the EPF annual statement of the applicant, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent sent a letter dtd.9.7.2015(Annexure-A18) to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent seeking necessary action regarding payment of cumulative interest on difference of EPF credited. The applicant has again made a request on 12.7.2015(Annexure-A19) for updating his EPF records with cumulative compounding interest. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent vide

his letter dtd.14.8.2015(Annexure-A20) replied to the applicant regarding updating of EPF records. When the applicant found that there were some inconsistencies in the statement for the month of August 2015, he submitted a letter dtd.1.10.2015(Annexure-A21) pointing out the inconsistencies in the statement. Applicant submits that despite writing so many letters, no action was taken by the respondents to settle the dispute. But the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent by his letter dtd.23.5.2016(Annexure-A22) informed the applicant that the Regional Office, Nagpur had levied damages of Rs.562487/- under Section 14B and Rs.309970/- under Section 7Q against the establishment and the same is also recovered from the establishment. The applicant retired from service on 30.6.2016 on attaining the age of superannuation but his dispute remained unsettled. The applicant made representations dtd.24.8.2016(Annexure-A23) and dtd.26.12.2016(Annexure-A24). After lapse of long time, 4<sup>th</sup> respondent by his letter dtd.28.2.2017(Annexure-A25) has replied to the applicant stating that there is no provision to pay the interest/damages realized from out of the applicant's contribution which is unjust, arbitrary and unsustainable. Contribution made by the applicant towards his PF is from his hard earned money and as per rules the employer has also made its contribution which also rightfully belongs to the applicant. Therefore, denying the cumulative interest and other damage/penalty earned on his money is illegal and therefore unsustainable. Despite lapse of considerable time and when nothing fruitful came out of prolonged correspondence and the matter remained unsettled, the applicant finally got a legal notice issued to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> respondents on 9.6.2018 (Annexure-A26) calling for payment of the amount of Rs.955751.50/- towards the cumulative interest within a period of two weeks.

2. Applicant submits that after his transfer to 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent office in February 1990, the PF account was continued to be maintained by 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent till its closure in 2001. From March 2001 salary of the applicant in the pre-revised scale was being paid by 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent but his PF amount was being credited to the PF account with the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent up to 2004. Thereafter 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent refused to accept PF contribution of the applicant and the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent did not deduct PF contribution from the applicant nor contributed the employer's contribution from 2004 to till October 2010. From October 2010 onwards 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent transferred the PF amount maintained by it to 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and the same came to be credited to PF account maintained by 4<sup>th</sup> respondent. In this process though PF was being deducted from 21.2.1990, only principal amount has been credited to PF account in November 2011 and interest earned by the applicant from 1990 to 2011 has not been paid and now by impugned order it has been denied to the applicant on the ground that there is no provision to do so. Being aggrieved by the same, the applicant filed the present OA seeking the following relief:

- a. *Call for records of the case from the respondents and on perusal*
- b. *Quash and set aside the impugned communication bearing No.RO/NGP/PGHS/2015/79 dated 28.2.2017(Annexure A25) passed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent as arbitrary, illegal, unjust and unsustainable.*
- c. *Issue a consequential direction to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent to forthwith pay the entitled interest amount of Rs.9,55,751.50 as arrived by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in its letter dated 16.3.2015 along with interest thereon from the said date till its payment to the applicant.*
- d. *Grant such other relief/s as this Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit to grant to the applicant including an order as to costs of this litigation for unnecessarily making him approach this Hon'ble Tribunal in the interest of justice.*

3. Respondents No.1 & 2 have filed reply statement submitting that the applicant was the employee of their institute from 21.2.1990 to 30.6.2016. He was absorbed in the services of their institute after the Court order in WP-43718/2001

by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent has erroneously placed the applicant in higher post and further erroneously implemented the promotion policy. Later on after receiving vigilance complaint, the necessary corrective measures were taken and applicant was placed in correct designation and pay scale. Aggrieved by the same, the applicant filed OA.618/2016 before this Tribunal and got relief. But department filed appeal against the order of this OA before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP.No.5652/2016 which is pending. During his employment with their institute, the applicant applied for EPF cumulative interest. The institute submitted all the service details and all the documents to EPF Commissioner, Nagpur(R4) for their necessary action as EPF Commissioner is the statutory body for calculation and payment of EPF in respect of employees of the institute. Accordingly, 4<sup>th</sup> respondent levied damages of Rs.562487/- under Section 14B of EPF act and Rs.309970/- under Section 7Q against the institute and the amount is paid to the EPFO Nagpur for onward payment to applicant. At present there is no liability on respondents No.1 & 2 for EPF payment as they have paid all the dues as per the instructions and advice of R4. This matter is between applicant and R4. Therefore, R1 & 2 may be dropped from the matter.

4. The 4<sup>th</sup> respondent has filed reply statement wherein he submits that the averments made by the applicant in the present OA are false, baseless and unsupported either under law or on facts and hence denied. EPF Scheme notified by the Central Govt. under Section 5 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1952 (Central Act 19/1952) manages the Fund vested in it and administer the same by the Central Board constituted under Section 5-A of the said Act. Provision for establishing parallel Board for the State

is provided under Section 5-B of the said Act. Central Board is governed by the Board of Trustees consisting of a Chairman and Vice-Chairman and also the Central Provident Fund Commissioner as Ex-Officio in addition to such other members as stated under Section 5-A of the above mentioned Act. He submits that the applicant was not an employee of EPF Organisation. He was working with the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent. The said establishment was covered under EPF & MP Act-1952 and it has failed to remit PF dues within due date and an enquiry u/s 14(B) of the Act has been conducted for the period 1.1.2005 to 31.3.2011 and determined damages of Rs.5,62,487/- & Rs.3,09,970/- vide orders dtd.23.11.2015(Annexures-R1 & R2). The applicant who was working in the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is seeking for crediting the damages and interest amount to his account. Further the cumulative interest has been credited to the members of the account already and there is no provision to credit the amount recovered under Section 14(B) as damages/penalty for delayed remittance made by the establishment under the statute(Annexure-R3). The applicant is not entitled for the refund of penalty received from the respondent No.2 levied under Section 14(B) of the statute, as he is neither an employee of the EPFC nor part of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent hence precluded from raising the issue in the present OA. He cannot seek for repayment of the damages before this Tribunal as the provisions of either the CCS Rules 1972 or the provisions of FRSR are not applicable to him. Hence, on this score too, the present OA is not maintainable as this Tribunal has no jurisdiction since the applicant is not a central Govt. servant and they have not passed any administrative order contrary to the Statute. Grievance of the applicant cannot be adjudicated before this Tribunal for want of cause of action against the respondent.

5. The applicant has filed rejoinder to the replies filed by R1&2 and R4 reiterating the submission already made in the OA and submits that the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent agrees that the applicant was an employee of the respondent institute since 21.2.1990. Due to inadequate information provided to 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, they have charged damage and interest of Rs.8.71 lakh in respect of two employees viz., the applicant and another Jayakumar under Section 14B & 7Q. R2 being the principal employer of the applicant, he cannot be dropped from the matter. The WP.No.5652/2016 filed by the 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> respondents has been dismissed. Another WP filed by the respondents No.1 & 2 has not been admitted till date nor have they been able to obtain any order on it till date.
6. The applicant submits that the total cumulative interest payable in respect of applicant alone is Rs.9.55 lakhs as per the statement at Annexure-A14 provided by R2. However, the damages and interest paid to R4 by R2 in respect of two employees is only Rs.8.71 lakhs, which clearly establishes there exists misrepresentation of facts. If everything is correct, R2 ought to have furnished monthly/yearly returns of the applicant as per the Enforcement Officer's notice dtd.14.6.2014. This was not done despite many reminders and notices from R4 to R2. When the applicant has not made any representation to the Central PF Commissioner, how has he come into the picture? It appears that the Addl. Central PF Commissioner warned the Regional PF Commissioner-II to confine to the accounts from 1.1.2005 i.e. date from which establishment opened the account with EPFO at Nagpur and not to bother what has happened from 1990. All these factors have culminated in updating the PF records of the applicant only from 1.1.2005. Nothing is forthcoming about account upgradation from 1990 to 2005. He is not concerned with the quantum of damage and interest from R2 but

his concern is about Rs.9.55 lakhs of interest. If the same is already paid to the applicant, the concerned respondents should have produced the statement of account details.

7. The applicant further submits that this Tribunal has jurisdiction to adjudicate the present OA as the EPF Scheme was established under EPF &MP Act-1952. From the statements made in Annexure-R1 & R2, it is shocking to note that the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent has conducted an enquiry U/s.14(B) of the Act for the failure of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent to remit PF dues for the period from 1.1.2005 to 31.3.2011 and has determined certain damages unilaterally. This enquiry report and the results are not acceptable as the applicant is not aware of any enquiry. This is a one sided enquiry conducted entirely in favour of the Establishment/R2. Thus entire enquiry report is unjust and requires to be rejected. The claim of the applicant is not for damages and interest claimed under Section 14(B) and 7Q into his account. His claim is for the credit of a cumulative interest on the arrears of EPF amount to his account since 1990 to 2010 as per the details provided by R2. If this amount is already credited into the account of the applicant, the respondent should provide the updated statement in the format as is done by M/s.National Institute of Rock Mechanics. If the statement so generated matches with the final settlement paid to the applicant by R4, it satisfies the claim of the applicant. The records provided by R4 vide Annexure-R3 shows the account has been updated from 1.1.2005 only. Even in this statement, applicant cannot make out on what basis such calculations are made. R4 is trying to escape from the responsibility of updating the records of the applicant from February, 1990 by stating that the date of coverage of establishment(R2) under EPF & MP Act 1952 is only from 1.12.2004 and hence they are responsible for the accounts from 2005 and not

concerned for the account since 1990. If such is the case, then how did R4 accept the PF amount transferred by BGML which held the amount in the Trust since 1978, how did R4 accept lump-sum payment of PF arrears from R2 during November, 2011 without obtaining statement month wise/annual returns since 1990 and why R4 did not call upon the applicant to attend the hearing/enquiry against R2. Therefore, the applicant prays for a direction to provide updated month wise/annual statement of records similar to that provided by its sister concern M/s.National Institute of Rock Mechanics to justify that cumulative interest has already been credited to the account of the applicant since Feb., 1990 as per the statement provided by R2 at Annexure-A14.

8. The respondents No.1 & 2 have filed additional reply statement reiterating the submission already made in their reply statement and submitted that the WP.No.5652/2016 filed by them was disposed of with a direction to file fresh writ petition on the same issue and accordingly they filed fresh WP(C).1754/2019 which is pending. They submit that they paid EPF and other dues as per the instructions of R4 which is the statutory authority for this purpose and at present no dues of applicant are pending with them. Therefore, they may be dropped from the matter.
9. We have heard the Learned Counsel for both the parties and perused the materials placed on record in detail. Applicant has filed written arguments note. Respondents have filed relevant provisions of EPF & MP Act, 1952 along with a synopsis. At the outset, we have to accept that the penal damages under Section 14B and interest under Section 7Q are levied by the respondent organisation EPFO against the erring establishments for non-remittance of the PF contributions in time and interest thereon since if the EPF had been credited on

time, the amount would also have earned interest for the organisation. These two are not to be credited into the members' account and therefore, the applicant cannot claim any benefit based on the penalty and interest thereon which has been collected from R2 by R4 organisation. The correspondence and calculations as per Annexure-A18 & A29 are related to penal damages and interest thereon to which the applicant is not entitled to. This leads to the balance of payments due to the applicant. The respondents have furnished a synopsis wherein the various amounts credited to the account of the applicant have been given. The applicant in his written argument based on the synopsis has informed in para-9 as follows:

*"The applicant may be permitted to place on record the errors/lapses on the part of EPFO/R-4 in updating the service details of the applicant, which has resulted in wrong statement of Accounts and considerable loss to the applicant.*

i. *Attention is drawn to statement of objection filed by Respondent-4 enclosing Annexure-R3 @ page no.84 (internal reference page no.9 under the head Service details, it is shown that:*

- a) *Date of Joining previous Org(BGML)*  
*With Acc.No. KN/BNG/924/13007* = 20/02/1978
- b) *Date of Exit from BGML* = 20/02/1990
- c) *Past service* = 0 yrs/ 0 mths/ 0 days
- d) *Date of joining Current org(NIMH)*  
*With Acc.No.NG/NAG/64556/22* = 02/11/2010
- e) *Date of Exit from NIMH* = 30/06/2016
- f) *Non Contributory Period(NCP)* = 2282 days
- g) ***Actual Service*** = 3 yrs/ 7 mths/ 5 days

*The above incorrect service particulars have resulted in wrong Statement of Accounts.*

ii. *Under the head Account Statement vide Annx-R-3 @ Page No.84-85 (internal page no.9-10): The Statement of Account is given from 2010-11 to 2016-17. OB adj for 2015-16 is shown as EE=Rs.1,03,394/- ER=Rs.83,134/- and pension Rs.38,411/-. This account should have updated from 20.02.1978 to 30.06.2016 to reflect the Account Statement for total service period. This has not*

*been done because monthly/Annual returns are not filed by Principle employer/R-2 from 1990 to 2016 in respect of the applicant.*

iii. *Under the head OB adjustment details vide Annexure-R3 @ Page N.94 (internal page no.19):*

- a) *From SI.5 to 16 IPR (Back Period interest and contribution only) is accounted from 2005-2006 to 2010-2011, instead of accounting from 21.02.1990 to 30.06.2016. The basis of this calculation is not known and which salary statement is taken for updating the records from 2005 to 2010 is also not known.*
- b) *Vide s.No.13, the Amount adjusted as per APCC Accounts is reflected as EE = negative Rs.3,08,545/- and ER = negative Rs.2,57,902/- . The details of negative account is not furnished.*
- c) *The net result of this negative adjustment would not have arisen if the Statement of Account would have been updated from 20.02.1978 to 30.06.2016.*
- d) ***The net result/benefit of entire exercise to the applicant is OB adj for 2015-16 is shown as EE=Rs.1,03,394/- ER=Rs.83,134/- and pension Rs.38,411/- which is negligible when compared to amount collected by EPFO from NIMH U/s.7Q the interest of Rs.3,09,970/- & Damage of Rs.5,62,482/- U/s.14B.”***

10. Vide paragraph-10, he has requested for a payment due to him based on an approximate loss of interest for a period of 9 months from 18.10.2010 to 17.6.2011 and cumulative interest from thereon till the date of settlement to him from R2 organisation since the amount earlier collected from R3 was lying with the respondent organisation R2 for this period. In the same para-10, the applicant has also mentioned about the EPF contributions relating to the differential salary paid to him for the period from 21.2.1990 to 21.2.2010 on implementation of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka's order and therefore admits that this amount has been credited to the applicant's account during 10/2011. He claims that he is entitled for interest for the period from 21.2.1990 to 21.2.2010 on this EPF contribution also. However, it is apparent that the differential wages were paid only based on the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka's orders and no PF etc., was deducted for the period from 1990 to 2010 till the actual differential wages were paid after 2010. Therefore, since the backwages

as well as the PF contributions were not paid during this period and only later settled based on the Hon'ble High Court's order, interest for the period before such settlements will not arise. Finally, vide para-20 of his written arguments, the applicant has submitted that without prejudice to the rights of the applicant, R4 organisation may be directed to provide monthly/annualized updated statement of accounts of the applicant for his total service period from 20.2.1978 to 30.6.2016. We, therefore, direct the respondent No.4 organisation to submit the statement as requested by the applicant in a clear format so that the matter is set at rest, within a period of two(2) months from the date of issue of this order. We also direct the respondent No.2 organisation for compensating the loss of interest for the period from 18.10.2010 to 17.6.2011 and the cumulative interest from thereon till the amount is settled to the applicant. This they shall do so within a period of two(2) months from the date of issue of this order.

11. The OA is disposed of with the above orders. No costs.

(C.V. SANKAR)  
MEMBER (A)

(DR.K.B.SURESH)  
MEMBER (J)

/ps/

**Annexures referred to by the applicant in OA.No.170/01357/2018**

Annexure-A1: Copy of Memorandum dtd.9.8.1989

Annexure-A2: Copy of absorption letter of applicant dtd.10.2.2010

Annexure-A3: Copy of Memorandum dtd.31.3.2010

Annexure-A4: Copy of Letter dtd.5.4.2010

Annexure-A5: Copy of application dtd.2.9.2010

Annexure-A6: Copy of letter dtd.2.5.2011

Annexure-A7: Copy of letter dtd.18.1.2012  
 Annexure-A8: Copy of letter dtd.18.3.2012  
 Annexure-A9: Copy of letter dtd.5.2.2013  
 Annexure-A10: Copy of letter dtd.1.3.2013 with enclosures  
 Annexure-A11: Copy of letter dtd.5.3.2013  
 Annexure-A12: Copy of letter dtd.29.9.2014  
 Annexure-A13: Copy of letter dtd.16.10.2014  
 Annexure-A14: Copy of letter dtd.17.9.2014  
 Annexure-A15: Copy of letter dtd.17.7.2014  
 Annexure-A16: Copy of letter dtd.11.12.2014  
 Annexure-A17: Copy of details of service particulars  
 Annexure-A18: Copy of letter dtd.9.7.2015  
 Annexure-A19: Copy of letter dtd.12.7.2015  
 Annexure-A20: Copy of letter dtd.14.8.2015  
 Annexure-A21: Copy of letter dtd.1.10.2015  
 Annexure-A22: Copy of letter dtd.23.5.2016  
 Annexure-A23: Copy of letter dtd.24.8.2016  
 Annexure-A24: Copy of letter dtd.26.12.2016  
 Annexure-A25: Copy of letter dtd.28.2.2017  
 Annexure-A26: Copy of legal notice dtd.9.6.2018

**Annexures with reply statement filed by R1 & R2:**

-NIL-

**Annexures with reply statement filed by R4:**

Annexure-R1: The copy of the order passed under Section 14(B) dtd.23.11.2015  
 Annexure-R2: The copy of the order passed under Section 7Q dtd.23.11.2015  
 Annexure-R3: The copies of the account sheet maintained in respect of the applicant

**Annexures with rejoinder:**

-NIL-

**Annexures with additional reply statement filed by R1 & R2:**

Annexure-R1: Min. of Mines letter dtd.19.9.2018

**Annexures with written arguments note filed by the applicant:**

Annexure-A27 series: Orders dtd.14.6.2014, 2.7.2015 & 19.7.2015  
 Annexure-A28: Copy of PF contributions collected for the period 21.2.1990 to 21.2.2010  
 Annexure-A29: Copy of the letter dtd.3.3.2015

**Annexures with synopsis filed by the respondents:**

Annexure-1: Copy of the order dtd.11.12.14 w.r.t. applicant's salary payment calculation

