

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CR.R. No. 179 of 2020

Prem Shankar Dongre @ Lohra, S/o. Late Ajit Dongre, aged about 17 years and 9 Months, R/o. Sweeper Colony, Siddharth Chowk, Tikrapara, Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, Through : the Station House Officer, Police Station - City Kotwali, Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.

-----Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Mr. Adil Minhaj, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant

Order On Board

04/01/2021

1. Challenge in this petition is to the order dated 17.12.2019, passed by Child Court, Additional Sessions Judge, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.), in Criminal Appeal No.577/2019, whereby the appeal preferred by the applicant/juvenile against the order of Juvenile Justice Board, Raipur dated 27.06.2019 in Criminal Case No. 05/2019, has been dismissed, whereby the applicant has been denied bail.
2. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of doubt. There is no direct evidence against him. The social status report also appears to be in his favour and the same was not appreciated by the Board and also by the appellate Court. Hence, the order passed by the Board as well as by the Appellate Court are

erroneous. Hence, interference is prayed for by this revision.

3. State counsel opposes the petition and the grounds raised in this respect. It is submitted that it is a case of commission of heinous crime of murder, in which, there are five deceased persons. There is clear evidence in form of dying declaration given by one of the deceased, in which she has stated about the presence and participation of this applicant in the crime committed. Therefore, the Courts below have not committed any error. Revision petition be dismissed.
4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record.
5. Considered on the submissions and the facts of the case. Although the social status report does not speak of any previous history or other circumstances against the applicant, but according to the facts of the case, it is a case, in which, the alleged act of the applicant and one co-accused has resulted in untimely death of five persons, therefore, it is certainly a case, in which, the grant of bail would defeat the ends of justice, therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the Board as well as by the appellate Court have not committed any error in passing the impugned rejection order.
6. Accordingly, the revision petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge