

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.3887 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2022 Thana- SARAIYA District- Muzaffarpur

VIKASH KUMAR Through his father who is his natural guardian, Namely  
Ramlakhan Ray Resident of village - Turki Kararo, P.S.- Minapur, District -  
Muzaffarpur

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar @ S.K., Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      22-08-2023

1.    Heard the parties.

2.    This is an appeal under Section 101(5) of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 against refusal of the prayer for bail to the appellant by order dated 19.08.2022 passed by I<sup>st</sup> Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Spl. Judge, Children's Court, Muzaffarpur in connection with Saraiya P.S. Case No. 10 of 2022.

3.    Learned counsel for the appellant (juvenile) submits that appellant has been implicated in the present case merely on the basis of coercive confessional statement of the appellant. It is also submitted that the appellant has been languishing in judicial reformation confinement since 22.03.2022.



4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the appellant and submits that the Court below after considering all the material available on record has rejected the prayer for bail of the appellant by a reasoned order. It is also submitted that the appellant has five criminal antecedents. The order of the Court below also mentions that the appellant has confessed his active complicity in this alleged crime with other accused persons and if he gets bails, there is a possibility that he may again be indulged in criminal activity.

5. The probation report reveals that earlier the appellant had a bad company due to which he was indulged in anti-social activity and hence has many criminal antecedents and the appellant is behaving properly at the special home.

6. Considering the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, the material available on record this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of bail to the appellant. The prayer for bail of the appellant is, accordingly, rejected.

7. The appeal stands dismissed.

**(Arvind Srivastava, J)**

anuradha/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

