



CRWP-11499-2025

-1-

120 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-11499-2025

Date of decision: 29.10.2025

RAJPAL

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Aditya Partap Singh, Advocate (through V.C)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karanveer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

[1]. This petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for seeking issuance of a direction in the nature of habeas corpus for the release of detenues as mentioned in para no.2 of the present petition.

[2]. Petitioner has also shown his relationship with that of detenues. It is a case of the petitioner that the detenues as shown in para no.2 of the present petition have been illegally detained by respondents No.4 & 5 and they are still in illegal detention of the aforesaid respondents.

[3]. In LPA No.32 of 2013 titled "Murti vs The State of Punjab and others" following order was passed by the Division Bench of this Court:-

"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 Bounded Labour (Abolition) Act, 1976. We, however, clarify that the aforesaid observation does not mean that



CRWP-11499-2025

-2-

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.”

[4]. Keeping in view the averments of learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2–The District Magistrate, Kurukshetra, Haryana, to look into the averments made in the application/representation dated 23.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) and to take action in accordance with law.

29.10.2025
renubala

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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