

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL REVISION No.425 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-102 Year-2022 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Gaya

RISHU KUMAR Son of Late Ravindra Manjhi @ Ravindra Kumar Resident of Village - Amwan, P.S.- Bodh Gaya, Dist.- Gaya, Under the guardianship of his Mother namely Rupa Kumari Wife of Late Ravindra Manjhi @ Ravindra Kumar, Resident of Village - Amwan, P.S.- Bodh Gaya, Dist.- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nitya Nand Neeraj
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA

ORAL ORDER

3 08-08-2023 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

2. This revision application has been filed against the judgment and order dated 31.03.2023 passed by learned Special Judge, Children Court, Gaya, in Juvenile Appeal No. 04 of 2023. By impugned order, the learned Special Judge, Children Court, Gaya, has affirmed the order, dated 01.02.2023, passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya, arising out of Mahila Police Station Case No. 102 of 2022, dated 14.11.2022, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323/341/354(c)(d)/376/506 of the Indian Penal Code and



Sections 4/16 of the of the Prevention of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that the petitioner sexually exploited the informant and when she resisted, the petitioner threatened to kill her and her family and the petitioner also threatened to make her video viral. The informant told about the incident to her mother and when they went to the house of the petitioner, both were abused and assaulted by the petitioner and his family members.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was declared juvenile by the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya, after coming to the conclusion that the petitioner was minor at the time of alleged occurrence and was aged about 15 years, 03 months and 19 days. He next submits that by the impugned order, the learned Special Judge, Children Court, Gaya, has rejected the prayer of the petitioner for bail on erroneous conclusion that there is a possibility that the petitioner, if released on bail, would fall into bad company and/or grant of bail to the petitioner may cause physical and psychological danger to him which would defeat the ends of justice. He next submits that learned Special Judge, Children Court, Gaya, did not consider the social investigation report in



correct legal perspective. The petitioner is in custody since 15.11.2022.

5. Learned Counsel 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, 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. 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.

8. Learned Counsel, in the aforesaid background, submits that the learned Special Judge, Children Court, Gaya, has failed to consider the scheme of the Act and has committed irregularity in arriving at the conclusion that the petitioner, if release on bail, may fall into bad company and/or he may expose to the physical or psychological danger which would defeat the ends of justice.

9. Learned Counsel 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.

10. 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.

11. A Bench of this Court, in the case of **Lalu Kumar @ Lalbabu @ Lallu v. State of Bihar**, reported in **2019 (4) PLJR 833**, while interpreting Section 12 of the Act has laid down the principle that the Board while considering bail of a Juvenile is duty bound to follow the principle of 'best interest', 'repatriation' and 'restoration' of child. The gravity and nature of offence are immaterial for consideration of bail of a juvenile. As per Section 12 of the Act of 2015, an application for bail is not decided by reference to classification of offences as bailable or non-bailable under the Criminal Procedure Code.

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 is a student of Class XI and the mother of the petitioner is ready to take proper care of the petitioner after his release on bail as such



there is no likelihood that the petitioner will fall bad company and/or he may expose to the physical or psychological danger which would defeat the ends of justice. As such, the conclusion arrived at by learned Special Judge, Children Court, Gaya, that the petitioner may fall into bad company and/or he may expose to the physical or psychological danger, is not sustainable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

13. Accordingly, this revision application is allowed and the order dated 31.03.2023, passed by learned Special Judge, Children Court, Gaya, in Juvenile Appeal No. 04 of 2023, and order, dated 01.02.2023, passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya is hereby set aside.

14. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya, arising out of Mahila Police Station Case No. 102 of 2022, subject to the following conditions:-

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

(ii) that the father of the petitioner shall file an affidavit before the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya, 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	√
---	---	---	---

