IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA ON THE 28TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2022 BEFORE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TARLOK SINGH CHAUHAN

R,

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATYEN VAIDYA

CIVIL WRIT PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION No. 3 OF 2022

Between:-

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

.....PETITIONER

AND

- 1. STATE OF HIMACHAL PRADESH THROUGH ITS CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF H.P., SHIMLA-2.
- 2. STATE OF H.P., THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY (HOME) TO THE GOVT. OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-2.
- 3. THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, SOLAN, DISTRICT SOLAN, H.P.
- 4. THE SENIOR SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, SOLAN, DISTRICT SOLAN, H.P.
- 5. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, B.B.N. BADDI, DISTRICT SOLAN, H.P.
- 6. SHRI VIKKY@ BABU, OWNER.
- 7. SHRI MOJI RAM, JAMANDAR.
- 8. SHRI SAGAR, MUNSHI.

RESPONDENTS NO. 6 TO 8 ARE R/O CHEEMA BRICK KILN, AT VILLAGE DHABOTA, POLICE STATION NALABAHM, TEHSIL NALAGARH, DISTRICT SOLAN, H.P.

.....RESPONDENTS

(BY. MR. RAJINDER DOGRA, SENIOR ADDITIONAL ADVOCATE

GENERAL, FOR R-1 TO R-5.

This petition coming on for orders this day, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tarlok Singh Chauhan, passed the following:

ORDER

Cognizance was taken on the basis of a letter written by one Bittu, son of Shri Ram Dhan, and the same was treated as Public Interest Litigation, wherein it has been alleged that Bittu alongwith other persons has been detained and made to work as labourer.

- 2. Notice of the petition was issued on 27.01.2022 with the direction to the respondents to file status report regarding the factual position.
- 3. Today, the status report has been filed in the open Court, which goes to reveal that it was only on account of certain monetary disputes that the complaint in-fact came to be lodged. As regards allegation that the complainant alongwith other persons have been made to work as bonded labourers, there is virtually no proof regarding the same.
- 4. As observed above, the complaint relates to certain monetary disputes and same stands settled and as a matter of fact the main complainant Bittu, has already left for his native place alongwith his family. As regards the other complainant, i.e. Praveen, he too alongwith his family intends to move back to his native place and there is no hindrance

3

created at least by the official respondents qua his return.

Lastly, the 3rd complainant, i.e. Sonu, he wants to stay back,

as he otherwise has no grievance against the official

respondents or owner of brick kiln, as is evident from his

statement made by him to the police, copy whereof stands

appended with the status report.

5. In this view of the matter, we deem it appropriate

to give quietus to the petition. Ordered accordingly.

6. However, it is made clear that in case the

complainant or any other person, who is similarly situate,

has any complaint regarding the subject matter, then he/she

is at liberty to approach this Court by filing a fresh petition or

reviving the instant petition.

(Tarlok Singh Chauhan)

Judge

(Satyen Vaidya)
Judge

28th January, 2022

(raman)