

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

(132)

CRWP-8502-2022

Date of decision: - 02.09.2022

Vijay

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Partap Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present Criminal Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus to release the detenues (as mentioned in para 2 of this petition), who are stated to be in the illegal custody of private respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner and detenues were contacted by respondents No.4 and 5, who are the brick klin owners and had entered into a contract with the petitioner for manufacturing *kachha* bricks, but the detenues found out that at the brick klin, the work of manufacturing the raw bricks has not been started and thus, requested respondents No.4 and 5 to permit them to leave the premises, but respondents No.4 and 5 refused to do so and have

given beatings to the petitioner and other detenues. The petitioner, however, managed to escape, but the others detenues, as detailed in para No.2 of the petition, are still in the illegal custody of respondents No.4 and 5 and the said act of respondents No.4 to 5 is in violation of the provisions of the Bonded Labour (Abolition) Act, 1976 (hereinafter to be referred as “the Act of 1976”) and in this regard, the petitioner has given a representation to respondent No.2-District Magistrate, Moga.

It has been held by this Court in “**Murti versus The State of Punjab and others**”, **LPA No. 32 of 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, the present Criminal Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to District Magistrate, Moga-respondent No.2 to treat this petition as a complaint under the Act of 1976 and take immediate action in accordance with law, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order alongwith copy of the writ petition.

**September 02, 2022**  
naresh.k

**( VIKAS BAHL )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No