

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.347 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-520 Year-2022 Thana- KHARHAGPUR District- Munger

SOURABH KUMAR @ SOURABH KUMAR DAS son of Pravin Kumar @
Pravin Kumar Das Village- Shivpur Loungay, Ps- Kharagpur Dist- Munger
through the Natural guardian (father) Pravin Kumar Das

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Indu Bhushan, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Amitesh Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 31-07-2023 Heard Mr. Indu Bhushan, learned counsel for
revisionist/petitioner and Mr. Amitesh Kumar, learned APP for
the State.

2. The present Cr. Revision application has been filed
against the judgment and order dated 21.03.2023 passed in Cr.
Appeal No. 06/2023 by the learned 1st Additional Sessions
Judge, Munger along with order dated 09.01.2023 passed by
Juvenile Justice Board, Munger in connection with JJB
No.223/2022 arising out of Kharagpur (Shampur OP) PS Case
No. 520/2022 for the offence punishable under Sections
302/201/34 of the IPC whereby and whereunder both the
learned courts below have refused to release the
revisionist/petitioner on bail.

3. The allegation, as per prosecution story, lodged by



the informant, is that on 24.10.2022 at about 08.30 PM, petitioner along with other accused persons came to the house of informant and took away his son to show fair (*Mela*) and when the victim boy did not return till next morning, the informant with his family members started hectic search during course of which, the informant met the petitioner and asked about his son's whereabouts who told them that the victim boy had already returned to his home in the night itself. Thereafter, on 26.10.2022, the dead body of the informant's son was found in an under-constructed house. It is further alleged that the informant has strong apprehension that the petitioner along with other named accused persons had eliminated his son.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner/revisionist has not committed any offence in the manner alleged inasmuch no body has seen the occurrence. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of suspicion due to village enmity. It is out and out a case of conjecture and surmises. The findings arrived at by the learned appellate courts for rejection of the bail application are based upon no material who by impugned judgment arrived at an erroneous conclusion that the release of the petitioner would not only expose him to moral, physical and psychological danger



but would also lead to defeat of ends of justice. It has next been submitted that the learned court below has passed the impugned order mechanically and without application of judicial mind. He next submits that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent and he was declared juvenile by the JJ. Board, Munger.

5. Learned counsel has placed reliance upon Sections 3 (i) (iv) (v) and (xiv) of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') which are quoted hereinbelow:-

(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, referring to the above mentioned



provisions, 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 best interest** of the child. Learned counsel further submits that the **principle of family responsibility** and **principle of fresh start** have also been recognized in the Act.

7. Learned counsel further relies upon Section 12 of the Act which is 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 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 maybe, 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 an exception.

9. Learned counsel, in the aforesaid background, submits that the learned court below has failed to consider the scheme of the Act and has committed material irregularity in arriving at the conclusion that the petitioner, if released on bail would defeat the ends of justice as the petitioner has committed a heinous crime.

10. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that from perusal of Section 12 of the Act, it appears that bail is a matter of right to the petitioner and denial is an exception, this Court may consider to pass an appropriate order in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

11. From perusal of the records, it appears that



petitioner has been declared juvenile by the JJB, Munger.

12. Having regard to the submissions made by the parties and taking into consideration the material on record and the fact that there was no material before the learned appellate court to come to the conclusion that the petitioner is not having any respect for social relationship and the court below has rejected the bail application on the ground that the release of the petitioner would not only expose him to moral, physical and psychological danger but would also lead to defeat of the ends of justice, this Court is of the considered view that the impugned judgment and order passed by both the courts below are not sustainable in the eyes of law inasmuch as they are not consistent with the aims and objects of the Act.

13. Accordingly, the judgment and order dated 21.03.2023 passed in Cr. Appeal No. 06/2023 by the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Munger along with order dated 09.01.2023 passed by Juvenile Justice Board, Munger in connection with JJB No.223/2022 arising out of Kharagpur (Shampur OP) PS Case No. 520/2022 for the offence punishable under Sections 302/201/34 of the IPC, are hereby, set aside and the revisionist/petitioner, ***Sourabh Kumar @ Sourabh Kumar Das*** is directed to 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, Munger in connection with JJB No.223/2022 arising out of Kharagpur (Shampur OP) PS Case No. 520/2022, subject to the condition that one of the bailors will be the father of the petitioner.

14. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the instant application is allowed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

U		T	
---	--	---	--

