

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

222

CRWP-11292-2021

Date of Decision: 03.02.2022

Raja

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANT PARKASH

Present: Mr.R.K.Bagga, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amreek Singh Narwal, DAG, Haryana

SANT PARKASH, 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 with request for appointment of a Warrant Officer to get the detainee namely Manoj son of the petitioner released from illegal custody of respondents No. 4 and 5.

Notice of motion restricted to respondents No.1 to 3 only was issued on 30.11.2021 and respondent No. 2- Superintendent of Police, Kaithal was directed to depute a Gazetted Officer for visiting the Brick Kiln of respondents No. 4 and 5 or any other place pointed out by the petitioner and make an enquiry as to whether the detainee has been illegally or forcibly detained by respondents No. 4 and 5 and if found in illegal custody then he be released immediately and submit a detailed report before this Court.

In compliance to the directions issued on 30.11.2021, reply on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 was filed.

In para 3 of the reply, it has been specifically mentioned that about three months ago petitioner Raja and his son Manoj, who runs JCB machine, had engaged his JCB machine on the brick kiln of petitioner No.4 and 5. On account of some money dispute, hot words were exchanged between Manoj and owners of brick kiln. On making of telephonic call by the alleged detainee - Manoj to his father over the said issue, the

present petitioner on account of misconception approached this Court alleging that his son Manoj has been illegally detained by the owners of the brick-kiln.

It has been further submitted in the reply that the petitioner and his son Manoj in their statements recorded before the enquiry officer have stated that they not want to pursue with the present petition and the same may be filed.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that the petitioner do not want to pursue the present petition and the same may be disposed of as having become infructuous.

In view of the reply filed by the respondent/State and submissions made by learned Counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is disposed of as having become infructuous.

03.02.2022
Kavneet singh

(SANT PARKASH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes / No
Whether Reportable:	Yes / No