

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRR No. 949 of 2019**

- Praveen Sonwani S/o Santosh Sonwani, aged about 17 years, through his legal/natural guardian Mother Deepa Sonwani W/o Santosh Sonwani, aged about 45 years, Resident of Village Amapara Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, C.G.

---- Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh through, Police Station City Kotwali Dhamtari, District- Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Shri Tarun Dansena, Adv.
 For Respondent/State : Shri Sameer Sharma, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey
Order on Board

29/08/2019

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 27.07.2019 passed in Criminal Appeal No. 76/2019 by Additional Sessions Judge (FTC) Dhamtari, District Dhamtari (C.G.), whereby the learned Sessions Judge has rejected the appeal arising out of order dated 10.07.2019 passed in Crime No. 184/2019 dismissing the bail application of the present applicant by Juvenile Justice Board, Dhamtari.
2. This is the revision petition filed by the accused, who is juvenile. The prosecution story in brief is that at Police Station City Kotwali, an FIR was lodged against the applicant and other co-accused alleging that the present applicant with the other co-

accused had brutally assaulted the Durgesh Yadav alias Bhurru, with the help of bricks and deadly weapons, due to which Durgesh Yadav had died. 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. Applicant is in jail since 01.05.2019, 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 27.07.2019 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