

**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH.**

131

2025:PHHC:132728



**CRWP-10420-2025 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 23.09.2025.**

SANDEEP KUMAR AND OTHERS

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Sahil Koundal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus directing the respondents to get detenues mentioned in paragraph No. 4 of the petition, released from the illegal custody of respondents No. 4 and 5.

2 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) contends that the petitioner(s) as well as the detenues so mentioned in the petition had been engaged by respondents No. 4 and 5 to work as labourers in the brickkiln owned and operated by the said respondents and that the

labourers were to be paid at the rate of Rs.600/- per 1000 bricks. He contends that despite the amount being overdue, the petitioner(s) as well as the other detenues are not being paid their dues and that the detenues have been illegally detained.

3 Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he will be satisfied in case the respondent No. 2, who is the competent authority in terms of Section 16 and 17 of the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the Act of 1976') is directed to take decision in terms of the judgment passed by this Court in **LPA No. 32 of 2013 titled as Murti Versus the State of Punjab and others.** The relevant extract of the said judgment reads thus:

“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 along with a copy of the writ petition."

4 A further reference was also made to the order passed in **Criminal Writ Petition No. 4666 of 2020 titled as Gurnam Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Others, decided on 08.07.2020** which reads thus:

"Accordingly, this Criminal Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to District Magistrate, Fazilka to treat this petition as a complaint under the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 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 along with a copy of the writ petition."

5 In view of the above, the instant petition is disposed of with a direction to the District Magistrate, Yamunanagar, Haryana, to treat the instant petition as a complaint under the Act of 1976 and to take action in accordance with law within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order along with copy of the criminal writ petition.

6 Criminal Writ Petition is disposed of in terms as aforesaid.

September 23, 2025.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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