

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRWP No.1070 of 2019
Date of decision: 13.11.2019**

Nasim

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Narinder Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus for appointment of warrant officer to visit the spot and get the persons mentioned in para No.4 of the petition released from the illegal custody of respondents No.4 to 8 along with their belongings.

It has been held by this Court in “**Murti versus The State of Punjab and others**”, LPA No. 32 of 2013 decided on 11.01.2013, as under:-

“It may be mentioned here that the allegations of the appellant in the writ petition are that the alleged detenues mentioned in para No.3 of the writ petition who are working as labourers at the brick kiln of respondent Nos.4 & 5 are being kept as bonded labours. There can indeed be no doubt that if a labourer has been detained as bonded labour, it amounts to an offence under Sections 16 & 17 of the Bonded Labour (Abolition) Act, 1976. We, however, clarify that the aforesaid observation does not mean that the allegations levelled by the appellant have been accepted. Suffice it to observe that under the Act, the District Magistrate is under statutory obligation to hold a fact finding enquiry as and when a complaint alleging violation of the provisions of Bonded Labour (Abolition) Act, 1976 is received. Since the appellant in the instant case has specifically averred that the persons mentioned in para No.3 of the writ petition have been detained as bonded labourers, we allow this appeal and set aside/

modify the order dated 9.1.2013 passed by the learned Single Judge to the extent that the petitioner's writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the District Magistrate, Sangrur, to treat this writ petition as a complaint under the 1976 Act and take immediate action in accordance with law, within a period of one week from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order alongwith a copy of the writ petition.”

Accordingly, this Criminal Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2–District Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Kaithal to treat this petition as a complaint under the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 and take immediate action in accordance with law within a period of one week from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order along with a copy of the writ petition.

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

13.11.2019

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No