

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

138

**CRWP-1850-2021
Date of decision: 22.02.2021**

Ikhlaq Mohammad

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate for
Mr. Nischal Chetanya Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

(The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.)

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 a Warrant Officer for release of the detainees, whose names are mentioned in para No.5 of the petition, from illegal custody of respondents No.4 and 5.

On oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, District Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Yamuna Nagar is impleaded as respondent No.6. Memo of parties be amended accordingly.

Notice of motion restricted to respondents No.1 to 3 and 6 only at this stage.

Pursuant to supply of advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. A.G. Haryana has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and 6.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State counsel.

Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court observed 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.”

In view of the above referred judicial precedent, this Criminal Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.6-District Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Yamuna Nagar to treat this petition as a complaint under the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 and take immediate action on the same in accordance with law and conclude the enquiry within a period of one week from the date of receiving a copy of this order along with a copy of the writ petition.

Respondent No.6-District Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Yamuna Nagar is further directed to send the compliance report to this Court immediately on completion of his inquiry but in any case within 15 days and the same be placed on judicial side.

A copy of this order be supplied to learned State counsel and be also sent to respondent No.6-District Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Yamuna Nagar for ensuring requisite compliance.

22.02.2021

Vishal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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