

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

261

CRWP-951-2019

Date of decision: 19.02.2020

Onkar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 3.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus for the release of detenues detailed in para No.4 of the petition from illegal custody of respondents No.4 and 5 by appointment of a warrant officer.

The Coordinate Bench of this Court, while issuing notice of motion vide order dated 15.10.2019, directed respondent No.2— District Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Panipat to look into the allegations and file an affidavit in this regard by the next date of hearing i.e. 22.10.2019.

As per office report, notices to respondents No.4 and 5 could not be issued as process fee was not filed.

In compliance with order dated 15.10.2019, short reply dated 22.10.2019 by way of affidavit of Sumedha Kataria, IAS, District Magistrate, Panipat has been filed on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 mentioning that pursuant to the order of this Court a team comprising

Tehsildar, Madlauda, Assistant Labour Commissioner, Panipat, Station House Officer, Madlauda was constituted for conducting raid at the alleged premises of M/s BBC Brick Kiln situated at Village Dumiana, Tehsil Madlauda and for submitting report. The team conducted raid at the premises of the said brick kiln on 19.10.2019 and submitted report dated 19.10.2019. In view of report dated 19.10.2019, Sumedha Kataria, IAS, District Magistrate, Panipat has concluded in the short reply that no person/alleged detainee as mentioned in criminal writ petition was found to have been kept as bonded labour at M/s BBC Brick Kiln situated at Village Dumiana, Tehsil Madlauda.

None has appeared on behalf of the petitioner to dispute the correctness of factual averments made in the above referred reply.

In view of the above referred reply, no further action is required to be taken on the present habeas corpus petition which is disposed of accordingly.

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

19.02.2020
Vinay

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