

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CRR No. 590 of 2015

1. Sanjay Pramanik S/o Shri Mukti Pramanik, aged about 15 years, R/o Pujari Nagar, Tikrapara, PS Tikrapara, Raipur District Raipur (CG) through his natural guardian Mukti Pramanik S/o Atulchandra aged about 42 years, R/o Pujari nagar Tikrapara, PS Tikrapara, Raipur, District Raipur, Civil and Revenue District Raipur, CG

---- Applicant

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the District Magistrate, Raipur, District Raipur CG.

---- Respondent

For Applicant: Shri Vivek Tripathi, Advocate

For Respondent/State: Shri Avinash K. Mishra, PL

Order On Board by Pritinker Diwaker, J

03/11/2015

On mention being made, this case is taken up for being decided finally.

2. This revision petition has been filed by the applicant against the order dated 29.6.2015 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Raipur, in Criminal Appeal No. 90/2015 dismissing the appeal preferred by him against the order dated 12.5.2015 passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Raipur in Criminal Case No. 145/2015.

3. As per the case of prosecution, on 7.2.2015 the deceased namely Babita Sonkar committed suicide by hanging, and the allegation against the applicant is that he threatened to upload her obscene SMS and video clip on internet, for which the offence under Section 306 IPC was registered against him.

4. Counsel for the applicant submits that both the Courts below have erred in law in rejecting the bail application by order dated

12.5.2015 as also the appeal filed by the applicant, by order dated 29.6.2015. He submits that the provisions of Section 12 of the Act of 2000 have been completely ignored by both the Courts below. According to the counsel for the applicant the report of the Probation officer does not indicate anything against the applicant, rather it says that the applicant has good conduct and does not have any criminal tendency. Referring to the report of the PO it is submitted that the applicant has become the victim of indiscriminate use of modern means of electronic communication, otherwise he was a boy of normal behaviour. Taking this Court through the said report, it is further argued that in the institution where he is lodged also he did not display anything unbecoming, and it would be in his paramount welfare, if he is given a chance to improve and streamline himself by stepping into the congenial societal atmosphere. According to the counsel for the applicant, the report of the Probation Officer nowhere says that release of the applicant on bail would expose him to moral, physical or psychological danger or bring him into association with any known criminal.

5. State counsel however supports the orders impugned passed by the Courts below and submits that the application for release of the applicant on bail and then the appeal preferred subsequently have rightly been dismissed and there is no infirmity or illegality in the same.

6. Heard counsel for the parties and perused the documents on record.

7. Before drawing any conclusion regarding correctness or otherwise of the orders impugned, glance of the relevant provisions such as Section 12 of the Act of 2000 becomes necessitous, which is reproduced as follows:

“Section 12 : Bail of Juvenile. - (1) When any person accused of a bailable or non bailable offence, and apparently a juvenile, is arrested or detained or appears or is brought before a Board, such person shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or in any other law for the time being in force be released on bail with or without surety [or placed under the supervision of a Probation Officer or under the care of any fit institution or fit person] but he shall not be so released if there appear reasonable grounds for believing that the release is likely to bring him into association with any known criminal or expose him to moral, physical or psychological danger or that his release would defeat the ends of justice.

(2) When such person having been arrested is not released on bail under sub-section (1) by the officer in charge of the police station, such officer shall cause him to be kept only in an observation home in the prescribed manner until he can be brought before a Board.

(3) When such person is not released on bail under sub-section (1) by the Board it shall, instead of committing him to prison, make an order sending him to an observation home or a place of safety for such period during the pendency of the inquiry regarding him as may be specified in the order.”

A bare reading of section 12 (1) makes it clear that any person accused of a bailable or non bailable offence, and apparently a juvenile, is arrested or detained or appears or is brought before a Board, such person shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or in any other law for the time being in force be released on bail with or without surety. It further says that such person shall not be so released if there appear reasonable grounds for believing that the release is likely to bring him into association with any known criminal or expose him to moral, physical or psychological danger or that his release would defeat the ends of justice.

8. Similarly, Section 13 of the Act of 2000 reads as under:

“13. *Information to parent, guardian or probation officer.*- Where a juvenile is arrested, the officer in charge of the police station or the special juvenile police unit to which the juvenile is brought shall, as soon as may be after the arrest, inform-

(a) the parent or guardian of the juvenile, if he can be found of such arrest and direct him to be present at the Board before which the juvenile will appear; and

(b) the probation officer of such arrest to enable him to obtain information regarding the antecedents and family background of the juvenile and other material circumstances likely to be of assistance to the Board for making the inquiry."

9. In the case in hand the report of the probation officer says that applicant has no criminal background against him, that he has good conduct and does not have any criminal tendency. Report further shows that the applicant has become the victim of indiscriminate use of modern means of electronic communication, otherwise he was a boy of normal behaviour. As per the report, in the institution where he is lodged also the applicant did not display anything unbecoming, and it would be in his paramount welfare, if he is given a chance to improve and streamline himself by stepping into the congenial societal atmosphere. The report nowhere says that if the applicant is released on bail, he would come into association with any known criminal or it would expose him to moral, physical or psychological danger or it would defeat the ends of justice.

10. Thus considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the report of the Probation Officer, present revision is allowed. Orders impugned are hereby set aside. Applicant is directed to be released on bail on his guardian or parents furnishing a bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000 with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Juvenile Justice Board. The applicant is directed to appear before the said Board on all the dates as are given to him.

11. Revision allowed.

Sd/-
(Pritinker Diwaker)
Judge