

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRR No. 940 of 2019**

- Sonu Sahu son of Fattelal Sahu, aged about 16 years, resident of Dondekala, Police Station- Vidhansabha, District- Raipur (C.G.)

---- Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh through the Station House Officer, Police Station Vidhansabha, Raipur District Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Shri Kamlesh Kumar Pandey, Adv.
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Akhtar Hussain, PL.

Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey
Order on Board

23/08/2019

1. The present revision has been preferred under Section 102 of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (in short 'the Act 2015') against the order dated 09.07.2019 passed in Criminal Appeal No. 362/2019 by Seventh Additional Sessions Judge, District Raipur (C.G.), whereby the learned Sessions Judge has rejected the appeal arising out of order dated 27.06.2019 passed in Crime No. 253/2019 dismissing the bail application of the present applicant by Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Raipur.
2. This is the revision petition filed by the accused, who is juvenile. The prosecution story in brief is that on 15.05.2019 in between 11-12 AM, the applicant has tried to commit rape with the prosecutrix while she went to play in the house of applicant. On

12.06.2019 the prosecutrix narrated the whole story to her mother. Thereafter, prosecutrix' mother lodged FIR against the applicant. On the date of occurrence the present applicant being juvenile. He filed an application under Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice Act for granting bail which was dismissed. Against the said dismissal, an appeal was preferred which was also dismissed. Hence, this revision.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that in the present case, the Juvenile Justice Board as well as the Appellate Court have completely ignored to consider the statutory scheme of Section 12 of the Act of 2015 which itself is *pari materia* of Section 12 of the Act of 2000 while considering the application for grant of bail under Section 12 of the Act of 2015. He further submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has no criminal background. Orders passed by both the Courts below are improper and contrary to the law. He further submitted that learned Courts below have failed to consider that the FIR has been registered after about one month from the date of incident. There is dispute between the applicant's family members and family members of prosecutrix, due to which, the applicant has falsely roped in this case. Therefore, in view of provision contained in Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice Act, the applicant deserves to be released on bail.
4. Counsel for the State submits that the order passed by the two

Courts below being fully justified and in accordance with the provisions of Section 12 of the Act does not warrant any interference and the instant revision deserves to be set aside.

5. I have heard learned counsel both the parties and perused the material available on record. On perusal of the record I do not find any reasonable ground having been brought before the Juvenile Justice Board or the Police Authorities in respect of the so called threat of the juvenile getting exposed to moral, physical or psychological danger or come in the company of known criminal.
6. In view of above consideration, the impugned order dated 09.07.2019 could not be sustained and is therefore, set aside. The application under Section 12 of the Act of 2015 is allowed. The applicant shall be released on bail forthwith on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/-, by the parents or guardians of the applicant, as the case may be, to the satisfaction of the Juvenile Justice Board for his appearance before the Board, as and when directed.
7. The revision is accordingly allowed.

Vijay Sahu

Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge