

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

CRWP No.86 of 2016

Date of Decision: January 20, 2016

Parveen

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Nand Lal Sammi, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the detinue, who is stated to be in relation of the petitioner had an agreement with the brick kiln owner-respondent No.4. Now, the detinue has completed his work but respondent Nos.4 and 5 have not paid the amount due to him. They have also restricted his movement and work is being extracted from him forcibly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the authority of Hon'ble the Supreme Court delivered in “***Bandhua Mukti Morcha vs Union of India***”, 1984 AIR (SC) 802.

Under Section 12 of the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976, it is the duty of the concerned District Magistrate to ensure that there is no bonded labour.

In these circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the District Magistrate, Kaithal, to look into the matter and ensure that the detnue Vijay Pal is not treated as a bonded labour by respondent Nos.4 and 5.

January 20, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE