

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.428 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-98 Year-2018 Thana- DELHA District- Gaya

=====

SINTU KUMAR @ SANTU KUMAR S/O MITHILESH RAM R/O
VILLAGE- DAYALI BIGHA, PS. PARASH BIGHA, DIST. JEHANABAD

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Tarun Prasad Mandal, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 21-08-2023 Heard Mr. Chandra Bhushan Singh, learned counsel

for revisionist/petitioner and Mr. Tarun Prasad Mandal, learned

APP for the State.

2. The present Cr. Revision application has been filed against the judgment and order dated 03.05.2023 passed in Cr. Appeal Juvenile No. 02/2023 by the learned Special Judge, (Children Court), Gaya along with order dated 10.02.2023 passed by Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya in connection with Delha PS Case No. 98/2018 for the offence punishable under Sections 366(A)/376/504/506/34 IPC and Sections 4/8/12 of the POCSO Act whereunder both the learned courts below have refused to release the revisionist/petitioner on bail.

3. The FIR lodged on 16.04.2018 discloses the fact that the daughter of the informant has allegedly been abducted



by one Dhiraj Sharma for the purpose of marriage as he himself had talked to the informant on mobile phone and informed him that he is going to marry with the daughter of the informant and if the informant files any case, the whole family will be eliminated.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner/revisionist has not committed any offence in the manner alleged inasmuch as he is not named in the FIR. Learned counsel next submits that he has been implicated in this case on the basis of statement made by the FIR named accused, Dhiraj Sharma who has already been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 2229/2019 *vide* order dated 17.01.2019. One another co-accused, namely, Anirudh Singh has also been granted bail by a Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 53009/2022 *vide* order dated 15.02.2023. It has further been submitted that the petitioner has been kept in jail custody with hardened criminals whereas he, being a juvenile, ought to have been kept in protective custody. 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 conduct of the CICL shows criminal proclivities and criminal



psychology, if he is released from the protective custody, there is likelihood of going back in the same environment. It has next been submitted that the learned court below has passed the impugned order mechanically and without application of judicial mind.

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. 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.

8. 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 fall in the same environment.

9. 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.

10. From perusal of the records, it appears that petitioner is in custody since 22.06.2022 having clean antecedents.

11. A Bench of this Court in the judgment reported in **2019 (4) PLJR 833** in the case of **Lalu Kumar @ Lalbabu @ Lallu v. State of Bihar** while interpreting Section 12 of the Act has laid down the principle that the Board while considering the 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 CrPC.

12. Having regard to the submissions made by the parties and taking into consideration the material on record and the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 22.06.2022, the main accused along with another similarly situated co-accused as that of petitioner have been granted bail by the Benches of this Court and there was no material before the learned appellate court to come to the conclusion



that the conduct of the CICL shows criminal proclivities and criminal psychology and if he is released from the protective custody, there is likelihood of going back in the same environment, 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, judgment and order dated 03.05.2023 passed in Cr. Appeal Juvenile No. 02/2023 by the learned Special Judge, (Children Court), Gaya along with order dated 10.02.2023 passed by Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya in connection with Delha PS Case No. 98/2018 for the offence punishable under Sections 366(A)/376/504/506/34 IPC and Sections 4/8/12 of the POCSO Act, are hereby, set aside and the revisionist/petitioner, **Sintu Kumar @ Santu Kumar** 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 Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Gaya in connection with aforementioned case.

14. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the instant application stands allowed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

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

