

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRR No. 963 of 2019**

- Jateen S/o Mahendra Singh, Aged About 14 Years, Minor Through Mother-Anita Muchhawad W/o Mahendra Singh, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Q/6, 7th Battalion, Bhilai, Police Station- Supela, District - Durg, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The District Magistrate, Durg, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Shri B.P. Singh, Advocate.
For Respondent/State : Shri Anil Tripathi, PL

Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey
Order on Board**28/08/2019**

1. The present revision has been preferred under Section 101 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. 184/2019 by the Fifth Additional Sessions Judge (FTC), Children Court, Durg, District Durg (C.G.), whereby the learned Sessions Judge has rejected the appeal arising out of order dated 22.06.2019 passed in Crime No. 448/2019 dismissing the bail application of the present applicant by the Chairman, Juvenile Justice Board, Durg, C.G.
2. This is the revision petition filed by the accused, who is juvenile. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the mother of prosecutrix made written complaint stating that on

01.05.2019, PM. when the prosecutrix was playing outside at her house, at the same time, applicant came there and took her to his home on the pretext of giving chocolate and tried to outrage her modesty. The prosecutrix somehow managed to free from the spot, and came to her parents whom she narrated the whole incident based on this, an FIR was lodged against the applicant. On the date of occurrence, the present applicant was juvenile. He was sent to juvenile home on 03.05.2019. 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 submits that in view of provision contained in Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice Act, the applicant deserves to be released on bail. The applicant is in Jail since 03.05.2019 and he has completed more than 3 months in custody, therefore, he may be extended benefit of 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 dismissed.
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.

Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge