



accelya

Accelya Solutions India Limited
Regd. Office: 5th & 6th Floor, Building No.4,
Raheja Woods, River Side 25A, West Avenue,
Kalyani Nagar, Pune – 411006, India
CIN: L74140PN1986PLC041033
T: +91 20 6608 3777
Email: accelyaindia.investors@accelya.com
Website: w3.accelya.com/investors

28 October 2026

The Manager,
Listing Department,
National Stock Exchange of India Limited,
Exchange Plaza, 5th Floor,
Plot No. C-1/ G Block,
Bandra- Kurla Complex,
Bandra (East) Mumbai – 400 051

Deputy General Manager,
Corporate Relationship Department,
BSE Limited,
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers,
Dalal Street Fort,
Mumbai – 400 001

Scrip Code: ACCELYA

Scrip Code: 532268

Dear Sir / Madam,

Sub: Disclosure under Regulation 30 of Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (“SEBI Listing Regulations”)

Please find below the details of the order given by Regional P. F. Commissioner – II which was received by the Company by email on 27 October 2026 at 5.34 p.m. in respect of proceedings initiated through Summons No. MH/PF/PN/COMP/50201/PUPUN003008500A/277 issued under section 7A of Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 which falls within the purview of Regulation 30 read with Schedule III Part B of SEBI Listing Regulations. The order is dated 31 August 2026.



Name of the Statute	Name(s) of the opposing party court / tribunal / agency where litigation is filed	Court / Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc. (Rs. in Lakhs)	Quantum of claims, if any (Rs. in Lakhs)	Period
Employees Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1952 ("EPF & MP Act 1952")	Enforcement Officer, Regional Office, Employees Provident Fund Organisation	Regional Provident Fund Commissioner – II / Adjudicating Authority, Regional Office, Pune – I	i) The Order arises out of the enquiry initiated by EPFO under section 7A of the EPFMP Act 1951., relating to treatment of various reimbursements such as medical, conveyance, Children education allowance, as a part of basic pay for the purpose of calculating employee provident fund coverage along with administrative charges for voluntary PF contributions etc. ii) The order relates to total outstanding dues for the inquiry period from September 2014 to March 2019 iii) The order directs us to deposit INR 2,72,50,894/- (Rupees two crores seventy two lakhs fifty thousand eight hundred and ninety four only) accessed for the period September 2014 to March 2019 in the respective accounts, within 60 days from the receipt of this order and the paid challans to be produced in support thereof before the authority thereafter.	1. Order amount : 272.51 2. <i>We may be subject to additional interest on the above amount if and to the extent determined by the EPFO in a sperate inquiry under Section 14B and 7 Q of the Act."</i> 3. Based on the Company's assessment, the said order is not expected to have any material financial impact on the Company.	272.51	September 2014 to March 2019



Name of the Statute	Name(s) of the opposing party / court / tribunal / agency where litigation is filed	Court / Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc. (Rs. in Lakhs)	Quantum of claims, if any (Rs. in Lakhs)	Period
			iv) The order also directs the PF department to initiate separate inquiry under section 14B & 7Q of the Act for belated payment and interest after receipt of the outstanding dues assessed under section 7A, of the Act. v) The Company had furnished supporting records and submissions and is of the view that these have not been duly considered in the order. The Company reserves its right to file an appeal against the aforesaid Order as may be advised by our lawyers.			

We request you to kindly take the above on record.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,
For Accelya Solutions India Limited

NINAD
GAJANAN
UMRANIKAR

Digitally signed by NINAD GAJANAN UMRANIKAR
DN: cn=NINAD GAJANAN UMRANIKAR, o=Accelya Solutions India Limited, email=Ninad.Gajanan@accelya.com, c=IN
cN=NINAD GAJANAN UMRANIKAR, o=Accelya Solutions India Limited, email=Ninad.Gajanan@accelya.com, c=IN

Ninad Umraniakar
Company Secretary
Membership No: ACS 14201

BEFORE THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER-II,

PUNE (CANTT)

Diary No: 264/2025

Period: September 2014 to March 2019

In the matter of proceedings u/s 7A of the Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 between:

**Employees' Provident Fund Organisation
(Through Enforcement Officer)**

[Represented by: Shri Sagar Shelke, Smt. Kumudini Bhosale, Smt. Deepali Shirish Tilwankar and Smt. Vrushali Khollam, Enforcement Officers]

Versus

M/s Accelya Solutions India Limited [PU/PUN/30085/A]

[Represented by: Shri Jasprit Singh, Manager (HR), Shri Hence Dabre, Shri Rupesh D. Sanghvi, Adv. and Shri Amey Nargolkar, Authorised Representatives]

**ORDER
[31-08-2026]**

By this order proceedings initiated through Summons No. MH/PF/PN/COMP/50201/PUPUN003008500A/277 dated 17.10.2025 issued under section 7A of Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) in respect of M/s Accelya Solutions India Limited, 5 and 6 Floor, Building No. 4, Raheja Woods, River Side, 25A, West Avenue, Kalyani Nagar, Pune - 411006 (hereinafter referred to as the establishment) are being disposed of.

2. Brief facts that lead to this case are as follows. The respondent herein is an establishment covered under section 1(3)(b) of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 with effect from 01.04.1987 under scheduled head "Expert Services" and has been allotted a distinctive identity through code number PU/PUN/30085/A for the purpose of identification and facilitation of compliances. The respondent, therefore, is mandated by law to remit

provident fund contributions of its employees, on or before 15th of preceding month of salary, in terms of the provisions of the Act and its subordinate legislations.

3. The department has analysed the remittance made by the establishment for the month of August and September 2014. The wage ceiling has been revised in the month of Sep 2014 from Rs. 6500/- to Rs. 15,000/-, however, during the analysis it was noticed that the same has not appeared to be maintained by the establishment. Accordingly, the department has initiated an inquiry under section 7A of the Act for determination of dues for the period in question and summons dated 17.10.2025 issued to the establishment. This was the basis for initiation of this instant inquiry.

4. During the course of the proceedings, the respondent has submitted following records / documents for examination: -

- (i) Audited Balance Sheet for the inquiry period
- (ii) Salary statement for the inquiry period from Sep 2014 to Mar 2019 in soft copy
- (iii) Uploaded copy of Form-5A and digital signature
- (iv) Copies of ECR and challans for the inquiry period in soft copy
- (v) Attested copies of 142 Form-11 along with 121 copies of Aadhar.
- (vi) Form-5A and digital signature
- (vii) Cancelled cheque in respect of SBI, Pune Mumbai Road
- (viii) Letter dated 25.11.2025 for clarification regarding International Worker

5. The records submitted by the respondent were directed to be examined by the squad of Enforcement Officers of the department. The squad of Enforcement Officers, through its report dated 24.02.2026 has made following observations:

- (i) The respondent establishment has bifurcated the gross salary into various components which is as many as twenty seven components. The details of these components / allowances bifurcated by the respondent is already a

part of the report dated 24.02.2026 which was sent to the respondent establishment.

- (ii) The basic contention of the squad of the department is that the establishment has deducted PF contribution on basic and basic arrears irrespective of statutory wage ceiling. The PF contribution deducted is below the statutory wage ceiling of Rs. 1500/-. Further, it is noticed by the squad that "Conveyance", "Medical Reimbursement" and "Education Allowance" is paid universally to all employees. In most of the cases, the percentage is above 90 percentage. The squad contended that as these allowances paid universally to more than 90% of the employees, hence, it attracts PF liability with regards to Head Office circular dated 14.03.2019 and relied upon the judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Vivekanand Vidyamandir Vs RPFC (WB) and section 2(b) of the Act.
- (iii) The departmental representative has calculated the dues for the tune of Rs. 2,50,32,628/- in respect of such allowances paid to all the employees of the respondent establishment for the inquiry period restricting the same to the wage ceiling of Rs. 15000/-.
- (iv) It is further stated in their report that the establishment has treated some employees as excluded employees whose basic wages are more than statutory wage ceiling. The establishment has submitted total 142 copies of Form-11 along with Aadhar copies in respect of 121 employees for verification. The squad has observed that out of these 121 employees only one employee namely Shri Raju Patel is having PF membership, and he is not to be treated as excluded employee. Further, the establishment has not submitted copies of Aadhar card in respect of 21 employees. The squad has opined that these 21 employees cannot be treated as excluded employees under para 2(f) of the EPF Scheme 1952 and calculated dues in respect of these employees for an amount of Rs. 20,20,122/-.



- (v) The departmental representatives have further noticed and observed difference in amount booked as Salary, Wages and Bonus under “Employee Benefit Expenses” in balance sheet for the year 2014-15 to 2018-19 and salary sheets for the corresponding years. The departmental representatives has prayed that the establishment to submit the clarification for the same.
- (vi) The departmental representatives have further verified the records with regards to compliance in respect of international workers. It is noticed that the establishment has engaged one inbound international worker and two outbound international workers and submitted a letter dated 25.11.2025 stating that the contribution made by the company on behalf of employees working in UK branch of the company and salary of these employees was paid directly from UK branch. On verification of the same, it is noticed that the establishment has remitted their contribution till their date of leaving. It is further submitted by the establishment that the inbound international worker namely Shri Thomas Anthony Wanjohi is having Kenyan nationality and does not have social security agreement for this employee. The establishment has remitted his contribution till his date of leaving.
- (vii) The squad of EOs has further reported that there are twenty eight contractors engaged by the establishment during the inquiry period. All these contractors are separately covered under the Act and their compliance may be verified through their respective office / compliance division.
- (viii) Another issue raised by the squad is regarding less remittance of administrative charges in respect of the employees for which voluntary provident fund has been paid. The squad has calculated dues for an amount of Rs. 1,98,144/- as administrative charges for these employees.



- (ix) The squad has further noticed short remittance for an amount of Rs. 2,76,56,099/-, for which it is prayed by the squad to direct the establishment for further reconciliation from the concerned accounts section.
- (x) The total outstanding dues calculated by the departmental representative vide its report dated 24.02.2026 is as follows:

Period 09/2014 to 03/2019	Employees Share of PF (A/c I)	Employer Share of PF (A/c I)	Adm. Charges (A/c 2)	Pension Fund contributions (A/c 10)	EDLI Fund contributions (A/c 21)	EDLI Adm. Charges (A/c 22)	Dues Total
Dues on allowances	1,18,50,997	36,24,430	8,29,388	82,26,567	4,93,791	7,454	2,50,32,628
Dues in r/o non enrolled employees	9,56,491	2,92,527	66,721	6,63,964	39,854	565	20,20,122
VPF Admin Charges	0	0	1,98,144	0	0	0	1,98,144
Total Dues	1,28,07,489	39,16,957	10,94,253	88,90,531	5,33,645	8,019	2,72,50,894

(All values are in Rupees)

- (xi) The departmental representative has also calculated dues for an amount of Rs. 3,16,02,858/- towards interest under section 7(Q) of the Act.
6. Inspector's report was served upon the respondent on which the establishment has submitted its say and stated as follows:

- (i) The establishment vide its reply dated 20.08.2026 has stated that on the basis of department own record, following issues concluded in favour of the establishment and dues has not been determined on these issues:
- (a) Dues were calculated on the statutory wage ceiling with reference to actual days worked, vindicating the establishment payroll methodology.
- (b) No dues calculated on difference on balance sheet and salary register.
- (c) No dues calculated in respect of both inbound and outbound international workers and contributions remitted up to date of separation.

(d) The matter of short remittance only raised by the department and no dues has been calculated in the instant 7A inquiry for the specific period. Only reconciliation sought from accounts section.

(e) The computation of interest if tentative and for information only. It is premature and cannot be determined in these proceedings.

(ii) The establishment has stated that section 2(b) of the Act defines “basic wages” and expressly excludes, inter alia, house rent allowance and any other allowance payable to the employee. The establishment is relying upon the judgement on *Bridge and Roof Co. (India) Ltd. Vs. Union of India* (AIR 1963 SC 1474), *Manipal Academy of Higher Education Vs. Provident Fund Commissioner* (AIR 2008 SC 1951), *Kichha Sugar Company Ltd. Vs. Tarai Chini Mill Majdoor Union* (air 2014 SC 898) and *Regional Provident Fund Commissioner(II) Vs. Vivekanand Vidyamandir* (AIR 2019 SC 1240). The establishment has stated that the test lay down is one of universality of entitlement only payment universally, necessarily and ordinarily paid to all employees, unconditionally and not linked to any contingency, form part of basic wages. It is further stated by the establishment that the universality is a test of entitlement, not of statistics. A conditional payment does not become unconditional because many employees satisfy the condition in a given year. The establishment raised the question on department’s observations on the allowances rests on percentage as percentage measures frequency not the nature of entitlement. It is contested by the establishment that the department has misquotes Vivekanand Vidyamandir case.

(iii) The establishment has further contested that the medical reimbursement was conditional at every stage. It rose only upon medical expenditure being incurred subject to further verification and capped at Rs. 15,000/- per annum which required submission of bills and prescription. The establishment has further stated that they have a payment which must be supported by proof of actual



expenditure, is capped in quantum and is trued-up against bills is a reimbursement in substance whatever its payout frequency. The establishment has also contested that if monthly payment through payroll were the test, house rent allowance, statutory excluded would equally be “basic wages”. The establishment has stated that the reliance on Para 68-J was misconceived by the department.

(iv) The respondent establishment has further stated that the department has not clearly understood conveyance allowance and fuel reimbursement whereas Vivekanand Vidyamandir itself places conveyance in the excluded category, likening it to house rent allowance. As per salary structure, the employee not paid conveyance allowance were instead provided fuel reimbursement and describes the two as mutually substantial. This is an express admission that no employee received both and not all employees received the conveyance allowance.

(v) The respondent establishment has further contested on the PF calculation made by the department on education allowance. It is stated by the respondent that the entitlement of education allowance was confined to employees with dependent children pursuing education and capped to Rs. 100 per month per child for two children in line with section 10(14) of the Income Tax Act read with rule 2BB.

(vi) The establishment has further contention regarding calculation of PF dues in respect of 21 non enrolled employees and Shri Raju Patel. It is stated by the respondent that UAN began in January 2014 and Aadhar seeding made mandatory from July 2017. Several of these 21 employees exited between these periods thus the respondent should not be panalised for the absence of a verification infrastructure which was not in existence at the relevant period. The calculation of dues in respect of these 21 employees merely on the basis of non submission of Aadhar card by the establishment is wrongly made by the department. Further the dues in respect of Shri Raju Patel as per para 26B which governs continuity of



membership of an existing member and not imposed retrospective liability on the establishment.

(vii) The respondent establishment has further contested that the administrative charges on voluntarily provident fund opted by the employees of the respondent is wrongly calculated by the department as demand of the department on para 26(6) of the EPF Scheme itself defeat the demand. It is further stated by the establishment that the liability that arises only for a voluntary undertaking cannot be imposed where the conditions of the said para is not fulfilled.

(viii) The respondent has stated that there is no dues calculated for reconciliation of Rs. 2,76,56,099/- and only a direction have been issued to reconcile the data from the concerned Accounts section.

(ix) Lastly, the establishment has prayed that the proposed determination of Rs. 2,72,50,894/- on the issues described above and interest of Rs. 3,16,02,858/- may be dropped in the present proceedings.

7. I have given my thoughtful consideration to the facts and submissions made by both the parties. The case is pending since Oct 2025. There were twenty one (21) proceedings held in the said inquiry and the respondent has availed eighteen (18) opportunities to represent their case. There is nothing more to make submitted by either of the parties and thus I find it appropriate to close the case.

8. The case of the department is very simple and clear. The department has analysed the PF wages and contribution made by the establishment for the month of Aug & Sep 2014 and observed as follows:

Wage Month	No. of Employees	PF Wages	Total Contribution
Aug 2014	1337	2,76,32,948/-	53,14,644/-
Sep 2014	1861	2,27,99,936/-	49,79,278/-



It was seen from the above table that the revised enhanced wage ceiling from Rs. 6,500/- to Rs. 15,000/- does not appear to be maintained by the establishment from the month of Sep 2014 and thus the department has initiated the 7A inquiry against the establishment for determination of dues for the period from Sep 2014 to Mar 2019 vide summons dated 14.10.2025 and first date of hearing was scheduled on 27.10.2025.

9. The departmental representative has examined the documents / records submitted by the establishment and there is no dispute in submission of documents by either of the parties. The dispute is regarding the dues of Rs. 2,50,32,628/- calculated towards the various allowances like conveyance allowance, medical allowance and education allowance paid to the employees. Both the parties are relied upon the Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment in the matter of Vivekanand Vidyamandir Vs RPFC (WB). It is clearly given in the judgment that an allowance is part of the basic wage where it is universally, necessarily, and ordinarily paid to all employees across the board in a particular category without being linked to variable extra output or actual contingent out of pocket expenditure forms a essential part of basic wages for calculating statutory PF contribution under section 6 of the Act. In this instant case, first of all it evident from the analysis of wages and PF contribution for the month of Aug and Sep 2014 that the establishment has not implemented the enhanced wage ceiling from Rs. 6,500/- to Rs. 15,000/- and thus subterfuging the wages to reduce the PF liability. The illustration given by the departmental representative in their report proved that it is universally paid to all employees in a particular category. On the other hand, the respondent is contending that the universality is test of entitlement and not a statistics. In my opinion, before the consideration of any allowance into basic wages, it is important to first go through the definition of basic wages defined under section 2(b) of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 which describes as follows:



“basic wages” means all emoluments which are earned by an employee while on duty or on leave or on holidays with wages in either case in accordance with the terms of the contract of employment and which are paid or payable in cash to him, but does not include—

(i) the cash value of any food concession;

(ii) any dearness allowance (that is to say, all cash payments by whatever name called paid to an employee on account of a rise in the cost of living), house-rent allowance, overtime allowance, bonus commission or any other similar allowance payable to the employee in respect of his employment or of work done in such employment;

(iii) any presents made by the employer;

If we consider the above definition together with the Hon’ble Supreme Court order in the Vivekanand case and the attempt of subterfuging the PF wages by the establishment, I find that the department has rightly calculated the dues on these allowances and these allowances must be clubbed with basic wages as defined under section 2(b) of the Act for the purpose of assessing and depositing the statutory provident fund dues for the period of inquiry in question. Accordingly, I inclined with the report of department in this regard.

10. As far as calculation in respect of non enrolled employees is concerned, it is on records the documents submitted by the respondent establishment i.e. Form-11 in respect of 142 employees and copies of Aadhar card in respect of 121 employees. There is no dispute with regard to the 121 employees in respect of whom both the documents submitted by the respondent. The question is whether remaining 21 employees are to be considered as excluded employee or not. Before coming to the conclusion whether any employee is excluded or not, the legal aspect is to be seen first. The definition of excluded employee is clearly given in Para 2(f) of the EPF Scheme, 1952 which states as follows:

"excluded employee" means-

(i) an employee who, having been a member of the Fund, withdrew the full amount of his accumulations in the Fund under [clause (a) or (c) of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 69;

(ii) an employee whose pay at the time he is otherwise entitled to become a member of the Fund, exceeds [fifteen thousand rupees] per month; Explanation - "Pay" includes basic wages with dearness allowance, [retaining allowance (if any)] and cash value of food concessions admissible thereon;

(iii) [omitted];

(iv) an apprentice "

If we read the aforementioned provisions of the Act, for the consideration of any excluded employee, it is important to know that the submission of relevant documents is the duty of the establishment which the establishment has failed to do so and asking for exemption for their own mistake. I do not find any substantial grounds and evidence in establishment submission of penalising. The legislation is providing social security benefits to all the eligible employees. Non submission of required documents by the establishment should not be a reason for non inclusion of these so called excluded employees and not providing them the social security benefits. Accordingly, I find that the department has correctly calculated the dues in respect of so called 21 excluded employees.

11. As far as the dues in respect of Shri Raju Patel is concerned, it is evident from the submitted records that the employee concerned was having previous employment with UAN-101897729405 and as per para 26A of the EPF Scheme 1952, the establishment has to enrol him under the Act. It is important to mention here the said para which describe as follows:

26A. [Retention of membership. [Inserted by G.S.R. 584, dated 11.5.1959.]

(1) A member of the Fund shall continue to be member until he withdraws under paragraph 69 the amount standing to his credit in the Fund or is covered by a notification of exemption under section 17 of the Act or an order of exemption under paragraph 27 or paragraph 27-A. Explanation - In the case of claim for refund by a member under sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 69, the membership of the Fund shall be deemed to have been terminated from the date the payment is authorised to him by the authority specified in this behalf by Commissioner irrespective of the date of claim.

(2) Every member employed as an employee other than an excluded employee, in a factory or other establishment to which this Scheme applies shall contribute to the fund, and the contribution shall be payable to the fund in respect of him by the employer. Such contribution shall be in accordance with the rate specified in paragraph 29: Provided that subject to the provisions contained in sub-paragraph (6) of paragraph 26 and in sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 27, or sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 27-A, where the monthly pay of such a member exceeds [six thousand and five hundred rupees] [the contribution payable by him, and in respect of him by the employer, shall be limited to the amounts payable on a monthly pay of [fifteen thousand rupees [including [dearness allowance, retaining allowance (if any) and cash value of food concession]

From the above para, it is clearly stated that the member has to be enrolled under the Act from first day of joining the establishment irrespective of nature of employment. Shri Raju Patel has to be covered under the Act from his first day of joining to the establishment and the departmental representative has rightly calculated dues in respect of Shri Raju Patel. I thus inclined with the EO's report in this regard.

12. Another dispute is regarding the administration charges calculated by the department in respect of the employee who have opted for voluntary provident fund. The department has calculated the dues for an amount of Rs. 1,98,144/- towards



administrative charges and relied upon para 26(6) of the EPF Scheme 1952. The respondent has rivalry contested the same and stated that none of the condition of the said para satisfying the voluntary provident contribution of the member of the respondent establishment. Let us go through the para 26(6) of the EPF Scheme, 1952:

Notwithstanding anything contained in this paragraph, an officer not below the rank of an Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner may, on the joint request in writing of any employee of a factory or other establishment to which this Scheme applies and his employer, enroll such employee as a member or allow him to contribute more than [rupees six thousand five hundred][of his pay per month if he is already a member of the fund and thereupon such employee shall be entitled to the benefits and shall be subject to the conditions of the fund, provided that the employer gives an undertaking in writing that he shall pay the administrative charges payable and shall comply with all statutory provisions in respect of such employee.]

The respondent is contesting that the condition of the said para is not satisfying in the case of the members contributing towards the voluntary PF. Now the question is that whether these members are to be considered as voluntary contributing members or not. If the respondent is not considering them as voluntary contributing members then why no question has been raised at the relevant time. The respondent is well within the knowledge of these voluntary contributing members and making the contribution accordingly and if it is so the respondent is liable to pay the administrative charges at the relevant quantum as per the above para. Thus, I find that the department has correctly calculated the dues in respect of these members and accordingly, declined the contention of the respondent.

13. As far as the observation made by the department towards difference in salary as per balance sheet and salary wages register, the department has sought only clarification from the respondent and no conclusion or no calculation is arrived at and thus need not to be interfere with.



14. The department has also reported engagement of 28 contractors for various services. However, as these contractors are separately covered under the Act and no dispute has been raised by the department, I am of the opinion that the issue need to be interfere with, however, I direct the department to get the verification of compliance in respect of these contractors through their respective jurisdictional area.

15. From the above facts and circumstances of the case, it is clearly stated that the department has rightly calculated the dues for an amount of Rs. 2,72,50,894/- and I inclined with the calculation made by the department in its report.

16. The respondent has no contestation on the computational methodology, I in the aforesaid circumstances accept the report of the department dated 24.02.2026, however, calculation of dues towards interest under section 7(Q) is not accepted with a direction to department to initiate separate inquiry under section 14B & 7Q of the Act for belated payment and interest after receipt of the outstanding dues assessed under section 7A of the Act.

17. In the final consequence, the following directions are issued: -

(i) The respondent is held in default of remittance of an amount of Rs. 2,72,50,894/- (Rupees Two Crores Seventy Two Lakhs Fifty Thousand Eight Hundred Ninety Four only) for the period from 09/2014 to 03/2019 as per the following distribution in relevant accounts: -

Period	Employees Share of PF (A/c I)	Employer Share of PF (A/c I)	Adm. Charges (A/c 2)	Pension Fund contributions (A/c 10)	EDLI Fund contributions (A/c 21)	EDLI Adm. Charges (A/c 22)	Dues Total
09/2014 to 03/2019	1,28,07,489	39,16,957	10,94,253	88,90,531	5,33,645	8,019	2,72,50,894

(All values are in Rupees)

(ii) The determination hereinabove is made on the basis of records submitted by the respondent. In case it is found, at any later stage, that the respondent had submitted manipulated records or in any other way submitted false evidence, the civil and criminal consequences will follow.

- (iii) Finally, I order that, if the establishment has concealed any facts or hide any records and information, which is relevant for the purpose of determining the dues, it is open for the department to re-open the case under Section 7C of the Act for assessment of escaped Provident Fund and allied dues.
- (iv) It is clarified that the establishment shall also be liable to pay interest under section 7Q & damages under section 14B in accordance with the provisions of the Act.
- (v) The department to verify the compliance in respect of the contractors engaged by the establishment.
- (vi) I further order that the aforesaid amount of Rs. 2,72,50,894/- (Rupees Two Crores Seventy Two Lakhs Fifty Thousand Eight Hundred Ninety Four only) assessed for the period from September 2014 to March 2019 shall be paid by the establishment in respective accounts within 60 days from the receipt of this order and the paid copies of challans be produced in support thereof, failing which the amount due shall be recovered in the manner prescribed under section 8B to section 8G of the Act read with section 129 to 131 of The Code on Social Security 2020 without any further notice in this regard

18. Case is disposed of with aforesaid directions. All notices issued, bonds furnished are discharged.

ISSUED UNDER MY SEAL AND SIGNATURE AT PUNE DATED 31.08.2026



(Signature)
31/08/2026

(Durgesh Kumar)
Regional P.F. Commissioner-II
Regional Office, Pune (Pune Cantt)

Diary No: 257/2025

From: [Uttamkumar Bhati](#)
To: [Ninad Umranikar](#); [Jasprit Singh Bamrah](#)
Cc: [Hence Dabre](#); [Kewal Gandhi](#); [Monica Saxena](#); [Nirmol Agarwal](#)
Subject: Fw: Forwarding of certified copy of Order u/a 7A of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 read with Section 125 of the Code on Social Security, 2020 - M/s. Accelya Solution India Pvt Ltd.,-PU/PUN/30085/A
Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 7:35:51 PM
Attachments: [7A Order - Accelya Solutions India Pvt Ltd...pdf](#)

Fyi

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Jasprit Singh Bamrah <Jasprit.bamrah@accelya.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 6:01:40 pm
To: Monica Saxena <monica.saxena@accelya.com>; Uttamkumar Bhati <uttamkumar.bhati@accelya.com>
Subject: Forwarding of certified copy of Order u/a 7A of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 read with Section 125 of the Code on Social Security, 2020 - M/s. Accelya Solution India Pvt Ltd.,-PU/PUN/30085/A

Hi Monica, Uttam

FYI

Warm regards, Jasprit

From: RPFC PUNE ONE <ro.pune@epfindia.gov.in>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 5:34 PM
To: Jasprit Singh Bamrah <Jasprit.bamrah@accelya.com>
Cc: Nirmol Agarwal <nirmol.agarwal@accelya.com>; Hence Dabre <hence.dabre@accelya.com>
Subject: Forwarding of certified copy of Order u/a 7A of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 read with Section 125 of the Code on Social Security, 2020 - M/s. Accelya Solution India Pvt Ltd.,-PU/PUN/30085/A

External Email Alert

This email came from outside Accelya's organization. Be alert for impersonation attempts. Do not open attachments, click links, or provide sensitive information unless you have verified the sender.

Sir,

With reference to above, kindly find attached herewith certified copy of the aforesaid Order for kind information and necessary action.

सादर /Regards

क्षेत्रीय भविष्य निधि कार्यालय , पुणे-१ /EPFO, RO PUNE -1

पुणे कॅंटॉन्मेंट बोर्ड बिल्डिंग, / PUNE CANTONMENT BOARD BUILDING,
फ्लोर २ और ३ , गोलीबार मैदान / 2nd and 3rd FLOOR, GOLIBAR MAIDAN
पुणे-४११००१ / PUNE-411001

Link UAN with Aadhar - File online claim using UMANG App *

*बेहतर सेवा के लिए : कृपया अपने यू ए एन से आधार संख्या लिंक करें **

*क भ नि सं की ऑनलाइन सेवाओं के लिए उमंग ऐप का प्रयोग करें**

* For better PF service : Please link Aadhar to your UAN number **

***** USE UMANG APP TO FILE ONLINE CLAIM*****

Save Paper, Save trees, Save the Environment.

Don't print this e-mail unless it's really necessary.