



CGHC010309062026



2026:CGHC:43072

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No.1094 of 2026

1 - A E (Child In Conflict With Law Juvenile)

Applicant (s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Bagbahara, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

Respondent(s)

For Applicant (s) : Mr. Virendra Kashyap, Advocate

For Respondent (s) : Mr. Vikhyat Arora, PL

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi

Order on Board

05/10/2026

1. This criminal revision has been preferred by the applicant/juvenile under Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (henceforth 'referred as 'JJ Act') challenging the order dated 30.04.2026 passed by the learned Upper Session Judge (FTC)/Juvenile Court, Mahasamund in Criminal Appeal No.36/2026, whereby the appeal preferred by the applicant/juvenile has been rejected upholding the order dated

Digitally
signed
by R
NIRALA

22.04.2026 passed by the learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Mahasamund (C.G.) in Crime No.74/2026, by which the bail application of the applicant/juvenile under Section 12 of the JJ Act was rejected.

2. Facts of the case in nutshell are that the complainant Chhannu Chakradhari lodged a written report at the Police Station Bagbahra alleging therein that when he was assisting his friends, Monesh Yadav and Vinod Yadav in selling goods at Deepak Chandrakar's snack shop near the government liquor shop in Bagbahara, then Ganpat Nishad arrived and began abusing him over the issue of buying cigarettes. Ganpat Nishad then took out an iron weapon and began hitting him. Monesh Yadav pushed him away and after pacifying him, sent him away. A short while later, Ganpat returned with his friends, Akash Nishad, Arjun Goswami and others, armed with sharp weapons and he stabbed Monesh Yadav multiple times in the back, right arm, left shoulder, and abdomen with an iron knife. The injured Monesh Yadav was immediately taken to Bagbahara Hospital for treatment, from where he was referred to Mahasamund. Upon lodging a report of this incident at Bagbahara Police Station, a First Information Report (FIR) was registered against the accused under Sections 109, 296 and 3(5) of the BNS. After investigation, charge sheet was filed against the applicant/juvenile for the aforesaid offence before the Juvenile Justice Board, Raipur. The bail application filed by the applicant/juvenile was rejected by the Juvenile

Justice Board, Mahasamund vide order dated 22.04.2026 and thereafter the appeal preferred by him has also been rejected vide impugned order dated 30.04.2026 (Annexure-A/1) by the learned Upper Session Judge (FTC)/Juvenile Court, Mahasamund (C.G.). Hence this criminal revision.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant/juvenile would submit that the applicant is juvenile, aged about 17 years and he has been falsely implicated in the crime in question. The applicant/juvenile is in Observation Home since 08.04.2026, charge sheet has already been filed and as per charge sheet, no active role has been played by the applicant/juvenile and conclusion of trial may take long time, as such keeping applicant/juvenile for further period in the Observation Home may change his conduct and behavior, hence it is prayed that the orders passed by the learned Appellate Court as well as learned Juvenile Justice Board be set aside and the applicant be enlarged on bail.
4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the bail application of the applicant/juvenile.
5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
6. As per the social status report of the applicant/juvenile, this is the second conflict with law of the applicant/juvenile and his conduct and behavior in the observation home has been reported to be good, whereas as per charge sheet though there are 3 criminal

antecedents against the applicant/juvenile, but in the instant case, no active role has been played by the applicant/juvenile.

7. Having considered the aforesaid report and for the fact that as per the charge sheet though there are 3 criminal antecedents against the applicant/juvenile, but in the instant case, no active role has been played by the applicant/juvenile and further considering the detention period of the applicant/juvenile and other attending circumstances, therefore, on due consideration of the aforesaid aspects of the matter, this Court is inclined to allow the instant revision.
8. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 30.04.2026 passed by the learned Upper Session Judge (FTC)/Juvenile Court, Mahasamund and the order dated 22.04.2026 passed by the learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Mahasamund are hereby set aside.
9. It is directed that if the mother or father of the applicant/juvenile furnishes their own bail bond of Rs.25,000/- along with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Juvenile Justice Board, Mahasamund for appearance of the applicant/juvenile before it, as and when directed by it, the applicant shall be released into the custody of his parents.

Sd/-

(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge