

133 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH
CRWP-432-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 15.01.2024

RAMMEHAR
V/S ...Petitioner

THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

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

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of habeas corpus for release of detenues as mentioned in para 4 of the petition alleged to be detained illegally by respondents No. 4 to 6.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, contends that inadvertently, the complaint of the petitioner (Annexure P-1), has been written to District Magistrate, Bhiwani. However, the same was sent to District Magistrate, Sonapat and prays that the complaint (Annexure P-1) be read to be sent to District Magistrate, Sonapat.
3. Prayer is allowed and the complaint (Annexure P-1) be read as to be sent to respondent No. 2-District Magistrate, Sonapat.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that respondent No. 4 had contacted detenues for working at his Brick Kiln for *moulding of kacha bricks*. The detenues started their work and till date, they have an outstanding amount of Rs.85,000/- towards respondents No. 4 to 6. It is

CRWP-432-2024

further contended that respondents No. 4 to 6 have forcefully detained the detenues in their brick kiln and are being forced to work without payment of wages. The petitioner herein escaped from illegal detention of respondents No. 4 to 6 on 10.01.2024 and made a complaint to respondent No.2-Deputy Commissioner, Sonapat to get released the detenues from illegal detention of respondents No. 4 to 6.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.32 of 2013 titled as **Murti Vs. State of Punjab and Others** decided on 11.01.2013 to contend that as per the ratio decidendi culled out in the said judgment, respondent No.2-District Magistrate, Sonapat has to conduct an enquiry as per Section 12 of the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 by treating the representation submitted by the petitioner as a complaint and to get the detenues released forthwith in case they are found to be bonded labour by private respondents but till date, no action has been taken by respondent No. 2 on the representation of the petitioner herein.

6. Notice of motion.

7. Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents and submits that the official respondents will look into the matter and will take a decision on the representation of the petitioner. Let sufficient number of copies of the complete paper book be supplied to him during the course of day.

8. In view of the above, the instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 to treat the representation (Annexure P-1) made by the petitioner as a complaint and conduct an enquiry as per Section 12 of the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 and in case the

detenues are found in illegal detention of private respondents No. 4 to 6, they be released forthwith.

15.01.2024
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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