



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL REVISION No. - 1354 of 2025

Juvenile X Thru. The Natural Guardian / Mother
Smt. Roop Rani

.....Revisionist(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Deptt. Lko.
And Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Revisionist(s)	:	Alok Kumar Mishra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 27

HON'BLE RAM MANOHAR NARAYAN MISHRA, J.

1. Heard Sri Alok Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for the revisionist and learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the State.
2. The captioned criminal revision has been filed challenging therein, the order dated 14.08.2025 passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Raebareli in Case No.140 of 2025, arising out of Case Crime No. 95 of 2025 registered under Sections 3 (5), 191(2), 191 (3), 103(1), 118 (1), 352, 351(3) BNS, 2023 in Police Station Lalganj, District Raebareli, whereby the application filed by the revisionist for grant of bail had been rejected. The revisionist through this revision has also challenged the order dated 14.8.2025/11.11.2025 passed by the Juvenile Court/Special Judge POCSO Act (Exclusive) First, Raebareli, whereby the appeal filed by the revisionist against the order of the Juvenile Justice Board dated 14.8.2025 had been dismissed.
3. It has been contended on behalf of the revisionist that in the FIR, Pradeep Paswan alias Chaudhary and Ajit Verma had been named as accused and along with those accused, two unknown persons had also been implicated as accused. It has further been contended that during investigation, name of the revisionist had been included as co-accused in the said crime.
4. Learned counsel for the revisionist has submitted that the main accused Pradeep Kumar Pasi @ Pradeep Paswan alias Chaudhary had already been granted bail vide order dated 18.09.2025 passed by this Court in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.6417 of 2025. He has also submitted that another accused named in the FIR i.e Ajeet had also been granted bail by this Court in Criminal Misc Bail Application No.7251 of 2025. He has, thus, argued that once main accused of the crime in question had already been granted bail, there is no occasion for Juvenile Justice Board, Raebareli to deny bail to revisionist. Another co-accused

who has been declared as juvenile in conflict of law, has already been released on bail by orders of this Court dated 08.10.2025 passed in Criminal Revision No.1133 of 2025 against bail rejection orders passed by Juvenile Justice Board, Raebareli and Special Judge (POCSO Act), Raebareli.

5. Learned A.G.A has opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the revisionist.
6. I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for revisionist and learned A.G.A. appearing for the State and I find that two main accused named in the FIR have already been granted bail by this Court. I also find that the role assigned to the revisionist in the crime in question is general in nature and therefore, I do not find any rationale in denying bail to revisionist.
7. Accordingly, this criminal revision is allowed. The order dated 14.08.2025 passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Raebareli and the order dated 11.11.2025 passed by the Juvenile Court/Special Judge POCSO Act (Exclusive) First, Raebareli, Raebareli, are hereby set-aside.
8. The competent court/Juvenile Justice Board, Raebareli is hereby directed to enlarge the revisionist on bail in the aforesaid case crime number on furnishing two sureties and a personal bond to the satisfaction of the competent court/Juvenile Justice Board with the following conditions:-
- (i) The revisionist shall cooperate in early disposal of the case without seeking unnecessary adjournment.
- (ii) The revisionist shall not indulge in any criminal activity or commission of any crime after being released on bail.
9. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a ground for cancellation of bail.

(Ram Manohar Narayan Mishra,J.)

December 16, 2025

mks