

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SCONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 41993/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 04-11-2022 in C.A. No. No. 8155/2022 passed by the Supreme Court of India]

AMIT MUKHERJEE & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAMESH KRISHNAMURTHY & ANR.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 242699/2025 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION

IA No. 213958/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

Date : 19-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.V. ANJARIAFor Petitioner(s) :Mr. Md. Shahid Anwar, AOR
Mr. Md Shahid Anwar, Adv.
Mr. Syed Rehan, Adv.
Ms. Uzma Lhatoom, Adv.
Ms. Anam Khan, Adv.For Respondent(s) :Mr. Siddharth, AOR
Ms. Himanshi Girdhar, Adv.
Mr. Deepanshu Grover, Adv.Mr. Ashish Rana, AOR
Mr. Bhim Singh, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Raj, Adv.
Mr. Amitabh Yash Singh, Adv.UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.
2. Permission to file Contempt Petition is granted.
3. Mr. Siddharth, learned counsel for respondent would submit that non-compliance of this court's order was

concerning non-processing of their claim for switching over from Provident Fund to Pension Scheme regarding 77 employees, out of which, the processing has already commenced for 76 employees and for the remaining one employee, the needful shall be done as soon as the employer-Central Electronics Limited completes the formalities.

4. Mr. Ashish Rana, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 2 - Central Electronics Limited would submit that the Central Electronics Limited and the Central Provident Fund Commissioner, EPFO shall coordinate to complete the formality in respect of the remaining one employee namely Satyendra Prakash also, which shall be completed within four weeks.

5. In view of the above statement made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 and 2, nothing survives in this Contempt Petition. Accordingly, the Contempt Petition stands disposed of.

6. The rule issued against the respondents are discharged, however, if the cause of action still subsists, petitioner would be at liberty to move afresh before this court.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(RAHUL KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(AKSHAY KUMAR BHORIA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)