

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Criminal Revision No. 662 of 2016**

Mahendra Yadav S/o Dehru Yadav Aged About 17 Years R/o Village Samoda, Tahsil Arang, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, Through His Father Dehru Yadav, Aged About 45 Years, S/o Kusau Yadav, R/o Village Samoda, Tahsil Arang, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Arang, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant	Shri Suresh Tandan, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	Shri Anupam Dubey, Dy. Government Advocate.

SB: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.Sam Koshy

Order On Board

22/07/2016

Heard learned Counsel for the Applicant and the Non-applicant.

2. The present Criminal Revision has been preferred challenging the order dated 16.06.2016 passed in Criminal Appeal No. 105/2016 by the Special/ Additional Sessions Judge, Raipur (C.G.). The Special / Additional Sessions Judge vide impugned order has affirmed the order of the Juvenile Justice Board, Mana Camp, rejecting the bail application on 10.05.2016 in Criminal Case No. 117 of 2016.

3. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant admittedly is a juvenile, aged about 17 years 7 months, and the prosecutrix also being a juvenile, of the same age group, were having a love affair for a considerable

long period of about 3 years; that the offences which have been charged against him are under Sections 363, 366 and 376 IPC and also Section 4 and 6 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act. That, there is no criminal antecedent of the present applicant. Further, that he is in Observation Home since 05.04.2016 and therefore he may be enlarged on bail taking into consideration the provisions of Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice Act. That it is not a case where he was got into wrong company of criminals which made him commit the offence, rather it was a folly of youth which led to the commission of offence.

4. In case of **Dayasagar Yadav @ Sagar Vs. State of Chhattisgarh**¹ wherein in para -6, this court has observed as under:

“The scope and object of provision regarding grant of bail to a Juvenile as envisaged under Section 12 of the Act came up for consideration before the Single Judge of this Court in the case of Bharat @ Bhurat & Another (supra), wherein it was held that the use of word "Shall" by the legislative provisions in the Section 12 of the Act is of great significance and which raises a presumption that the particular provision is imperative and makes it manifest that ordinarily the Board is under obligation to release the Juvenile on bail with or without surety, but the Juvenile shall not be so released in certain circumstances as latter part of the Section also uses the word "Shall" imposing certain mandatory conditions prohibiting the release of the Juvenile by the Board. It has also been held that ordinarily the bail has to be granted to the Juvenile and would be liable to be rejected only when it appears to the Board that either of the three conditions mentioned in Section 12 of the Act are existing.”

5. The said observations of the court was based upon the decisions

1

2011 (1) CGLRW-140

rendered in case of **Akhilesh Kumar Vs. State of Chhattisgarh**² as well as judgment delivered by the MP High Court in case of **Rahul Mishra Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh**³.

6. Considering the total facts and circumstances of the case particularly the fact that the Applicant being a juvenile is already in the Observation Home for more than three months and also considering the nature of offence and the ratio of law laid down in Dayasagar (Supra), it is a fit case where he can be released on bail.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision is allowed. The impugned order dated 16.06.2016 is set aside. It is directed that the Applicant shall be released on bail on his and one of his guardian furnishing a personal bond for the sum of Rs.25,000/- with two sureties in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court, for his appearance as and when directed.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

kishore

2 2006 (1) CGLJ 305

3 2001 Cri.LJ 214