

120

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No.11365 of 2023

Date of decision : 23.11.2023

Pria Kaur

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and ors.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present :- Mr. Ravi Dangi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

This writ petition in the nature of Habeas Corpus is filed seeking direction to official respondents to get the detenues (mentioned in para No. 4 of the petition), released from the illegal detention of respondent No.4.

2 Issue notice of motion.

3 Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Requisite number of copies of the paper-books be handed over to him.

4 A Division Bench of this Court in LPA No. 32 of 2013, titled as '**Murti Versus The State of Punjab and others**', decided on 11.01.2013 has held 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 No. 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 compliant 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."

5 In the present case the petitioner has not approached the concerned authority. However, considering specific request made by counsel for the petitioner, a copy of this writ petition be sent to respondent No.2 (District Magistrate, Jhajjar), who shall treat the same as representation at the best of the petitioner and decide the same in accordance with law, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

23.11.2023
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No