

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(133)

CRWP-9262-2022

Date of decision: - 22.09.2022

Vinod Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Abhinav Kalia, Advocate, for the petitioner.

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 roving writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus to release the detenues (as mentioned in para 7 of this petition), who are stated to be in the illegal detention of respondent No.6, who is stated to be owner of the brick klin.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner and detenues were working with respondent No.6 in the brick klin and when they demanded their due money, respondent No.6 forced them to remain inside the brick klin, in illegal confinement and the petitioner was able to come out from the brick klin with great difficulty and has managed to escape, but the others detenues, as detailed in para No.7 of the petition, are still in the illegal custody of respondent No.6. It is further submitted that the said act of respondent No.6 is in violation of the provisions of the Bonded Labour (Abolition) Act, 1976 (hereinafter to be referred as “the Act of 1976”).

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, Sonapat-respondent No.3 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 22, 2022
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes
No