

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

133

CRWP-2891-2021

Date of decision: 22.03.2021

Sunil Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Chander Shekhar Singhal, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

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

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus to get the detenues named in para No.4 of the petition released from illegal custody of respondents No.4 to 6.

The petition has been filed on the averments that the petitioner and his family members/detenues were engaged to work on the brick kiln of respondents No.4 to 6 who agreed to pay amount of Rs.750/- per thousand for moulding kacha bricks but subsequently respondents No.4 to 6 stopped payment and illegally detained them and started forcibly taking work from them without any payment. The petitioner managed to escape and made representation dated 18.03.2021 to respondent No.2 but no action has been taken on the same.

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

Pursuant to supply of advance copy of the petition, Mr.Amrik Singh Narwal, DAG, Haryana has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

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

Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court observed in **“Murthi Vs. 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.2-District Magistrate, Jind to treat this petition as a complaint under the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 and take immediate action in accordance with law on receipt of a copy of this order along with a copy of the writ petition.

Respondent No.2-District Magistrate, Jind 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 before the Court on judicial side.

A copy of this order be supplied to learned State counsel and be also sent to respondent No.2-District Magistrate, Jind for ensuring requisite compliance.

22.03.2021

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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