

**NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL**  
**PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**Comp. App. (AT) (Ins) No. 1325 of 2026**

**&**

**I.A. No. 5178 of 2026**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**Employees Provident Fund  
Organisation**

**...Appellant(s)**

**Versus**

**Vandana Garg  
Chairperson of Monitoring Committee of Vilsons  
Roofing Products Pvt. Ltd.**

**...Respondent(s)**

**Present:**

**For Appellant(s)** : Appearance not marked.

**For** : Mr. Rajeev Pandey, Advocate for R-1.

**Respondent(s)**

**O R D E R**  
**(Hybrid Mode)**

**13.10.2026:** Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 2 at the outset indicated that in the order dated 28.09.2026 certain wrong facts have been recorded as in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> line of the said order the Respondent No. 1 has been mentioned while the prayer mentioned therein was in fact made by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 2. We thus clarify that in the 4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> line of the order dated 28.09.2026 “Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 1” shall now be read as “Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 2”.

We have heard Ld. Counsel for the Appellant as well as Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 1 and 2.

Arguments concluded.

**‘Order Reserved’.**

Ld. Counsel for the parties if so wish may file their written submissions containing not more than 3-4 pages along with relevant citations on which they rely indicating specific paragraphs within four days from today. (Times New Roman, Font Size-14)

At this juncture, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 2 submits that one-day delay has occurred in filing the reply to the delay condonation application filed by the Appellant and the same be taken on record. We direct the office to take the reply filed by the Respondent No. 2 on record immediately.

**[Justice Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan]**  
**Member (Judicial)**

**[Naresh Salecha]**  
**Member (Technical)**

*sr/kam*