

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.780 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-170 Year-2021 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

SURAJ KUMAR S/O Damodar Yadav R/O Village- Kolhayapatti, Dumariya,
P.S- Murliganj, District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shankar Kumar, Advocate.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Nagendra Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-08-2023 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

2. This Criminal Revision has been filed against the judgment and order dated 30.07.2022 passed by Shri Vinod Kumar Gupta, learned 1st Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Madhepura, in Criminal Appeal No. 19 of 2022 (C.I.S. No. 19/2022) arising out of Murliganj P.S. Case No. 170 of 2021 (JJB No. 101 of 2021). By impugned order, the learned 1st Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Madhepura, has affirmed the order, dated 15.11.2021 passed by learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Madhepura, in JJB No. 101 of 2021, G.R. No. 942 of 2021 arising out of Murliganj P.S. Case No. 170 of



2021 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302/34, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, Section 27 of the Arms Act and Sections 3(V)(va) of SC/ST Act.

3. The allegation as per the First Information Report, is that on 18.05.2021 at about 8:45 p.m. night when the brother of the informant namely Pawan Ram had gone for purchasing potato from Madho Paswan and during course of his returning home, in the way, near Behlai Ward No. 7, his brother was shot and, thereafter was taken to the Hospital where the Doctor declared him dead.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was declared juvenile after coming to the conclusion that the petitioner was minor at the time of alleged occurrence. He next submits that by the impugned order, the learned 1st Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Madhepura, has rejected the prayer of the petitioner for bail on erroneous conclusion that petitioner may fall into bad company and it may expose the petitioner to moral, physical and psychological danger. He next submits that learned 1st Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Madhepura, did not consider the social investigation report in



correct legal perspective and the petitioner is in custody since 25.07.2021.

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. He next submits that the name of the petitioner has come on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case due to village politics.

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 1st Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Madhepura, 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 and it would expose him to physical, moral and psychological danger.

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 judgment reported in 2019(4) PLJR 833 Lalu Kumar @ Lalbabu @ Lallu Vs. State of Bihar 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 Cr. P.C.

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 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 1st Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Madhepura, that the petitioner may fall into bad company, is not sustainable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

13. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision is allowed and the order dated 30.07.2022 passed in Criminal Appeal No. 19 of 2022 (C.I.S. No. 19/2022) by learned 1st Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Children Court, Madhepura, affirming the order dated 15.11.2021 passed by the learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board Madhepura, in JJB No. 101 of 2021, GR No. 942 of 2021 arising out of Murliganj P.S. Case No. 170 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 Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board,



Madhepura, in Gr. No. JJB No. 101 of 2021, GR No. 942 of 2021 arising out of Murliganj P.S. Case No. 170 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, Madhepura, 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)

S.Ali/-

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

