

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.286 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-50 Year-2021 Thana- PUNAURA District- Sitamarhi

GUDDU KUMAR @ GUDDU PASWAN Son of Anutha Paswan Resident of Village- Parri, P.S.- Punaura, District Sitamarhi. Under Guardianship of Chamili Devi (Mother), wife of Anutha Paswan, Resident of Village- Parri, P.S.- Punaura, District Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Guriya Nisha
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Akhileshwar Dayal
For the Informant	:	Mr. Santosh kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 17-07-2023 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

2. This appeal has been filed against the judgment and order dated 27.10.2021 passed by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Special Judge, Sitamarhi, Criminal Appeal No. 28 of 2021. By impugned order, the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Special Judge, Sitamarhi, has affirmed the order, dated 11.08.2021, passed by the J. J. Board, Sitamarhi, in J. J. Board Case No. 1223 of 2021, arising out of Purnaura P. S. Case No. 50 of 2021, registered for the offences punishable under Section 364-A/302/210/120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The petitioner is not named in the First Information Report. The allegation against the petitioner, as per the First



Information Report, is that the son of the informant, namely, Rahul Kumar, aged about 15 years (now deceased) had left his home on a bicycle on 16.03.2021 and did not return home. At about 09:10 AM, on 17.03.2021, an unknown person had demanded Rs. 10 Lakhs as ransom on the mobile phone of informant's husband. During the course of investigation, the petitioner and other co-accused persons were apprehended by the police and they confessed before the police that they have killed the son of the informant.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was declared juvenile by order, dated 29.07.2021 passed by the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Sitamarhi, after coming to the conclusion that the petitioner was minor at the time of alleged occurrence and was aged about 14 years and 10 months and 03 days. He next submits that by the impugned order, the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Special Judge, Sitamarhi, has rejected the prayer of the petitioner for bail on erroneous conclusion that there is a possibility that the petitioner would fall into bad company, if released on bail and grant of bail to the petitioner may cause moral, physical and psychological danger to him. He next submits that learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Special Judge, Sitamarhi, did



not consider the social investigation report in correct legal perspective.

5. Learned Counsel for the petitioner relies upon Section 3 (i), (iv), (v) and (xiv) of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”), which are quoted herein below:-

“(i) Principle of presumption of innocence:- Any child shall be presumed to be an innocent of any mala fide or criminal intent up to the age of eighteen years.

(iv) Principle of best interest:- All decisions regarding the child shall be based on the primary consideration that they are in the best interest of the child and to help the child to develop full potential.

(v) Principle of family responsibility:- The primary responsibility of care, nurture and protection of the child shall be that of the biological family or adoptive or foster parents, as the case may be.

(xiv) Principle of fresh start:- All past records of any child under the Juvenile Justice system should be erased except in special circumstances”



6. Learned Counsel for the petitioner, referring to above mentioned provisions of law, submits that as per the scheme of the Act there is presumption of innocence of a child in conflict with law and all decisions regarding the child shall be taken in consonance with the principle of the best interest of the child. He further submits that the principle of family responsibility and principle of fresh start have also been recognized under the Act.

7. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further relied upon Section 12 of the Act, which is quoted as follows:-

“12. Bail to a person who is apparently a child alleged to be in conflict with law.- (1) When any person, who is apparently a child and is alleged to have committed a bailable or non-bailable offence, is apprehended or detained by the police or appears or brought before a Board, such person shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or in any other law for the time being in force, be released on bail with or without surety or placed under the supervision of a probation officer or under the care of any fit person:

Provided that such person shall not be so released if there appears reasonable



grounds for believing that the release is likely to bring that person into association with any known criminal or expose the said person to moral, physical or psychological danger or the person's release would defeat the ends of justice, and the Board shall record the reasons for denying the bail and circumstances that led to such a decision.

(2) When such person having been apprehended is not released on bail under subsection (1) by the officer - in-charge of the police station, such officer shall cause the person to be kept only in an observation home in such manner as may be prescribed until the person can be brought before a Board.

(3) When such person is not released on bail under sub-section (1) by the Board, it shall make an order sending him to an observation home or a place of safety, as the case may be, for such period during the pendency of the inquiry regarding the person, as may be specified in the order.

(4) When a child in conflict with law is unable to fulfill the conditions of bail order within seven days of the bail order, such child shall be produced before the Board for modification of the conditions of bail.”

8. In reference to Section 12 of the Act, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that bail to a child in conflict



with law is a rule and denial is exception.

9. Learned Counsel for the petitioner, in the aforesaid background, submits that the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Special Judge, Sitmarhi, has failed to consider the scheme of the Act and has committed irregularity in arriving at the conclusion that the petitioner may fall into bad company, if released on bail.

10. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the mother of the petitioner is ready to take proper care of the petitioner after release on bail and shall not allow him to fall into bad company and would try to bring change in his behaviour, if required.

11. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that from perusal of Section 12 of the Act, it appears that bail is a matter of right to a child in conflict with law and denial is exception and in view of the fact that mother has given an undertaking to reform her child, i.e. the petitioner, this Court may consider to pass appropriate order in the best interest of the child in conflict with law.

12. Having regard to the submissions made by the parties and on perusal of the impugned order, I am of the considered opinion that there is possibility of reform in the



petitioner inasmuch as he has got no criminal antecedent and the mother of the petitioner is ready to take proper care of the petitioner after his release on bail and there is no likelihood that the petitioner will fall into association with any known criminal(s). As such, the conclusion arrived at by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Special Judge, Sitamarhi, that the petitioner may fall into bad company, is not sustainable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

13. Accordingly, this appeal is allowed and the order dated 03.01.2020, passed by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Special Judge, Sitamarhi, in Criminal Appeal No. 28 of 2021, is hereby set aside.

14. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Juvenile Justice Board, Sitamari, in connection with J.J. Board Case No. 1223 of 2021, arising out of Punaura P. S. Case No. 50 of 2021, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) that one of the bailors shall be the mother of the petitioner;

(ii) that the mother of the petitioner shall file an affidavit before the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Sitamarhi,



giving specific undertaking that after release of the petitioner on bail, she will take proper care of the petitioner and will not allow him to fall into bad company.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

ashwani/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

