

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL REVISION No.837 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-21 Year-2022 Thana- TIKAPATTI District- Purnia

=====

MONU KUMAR Son of Rakesh Mandal @ Khagesh Mandal Resident of at
Sri Matta, Ward No.- 4, P.S.- Tikapatti, Dist.- Purnea, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Thakur
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA

ORAL ORDER

4 11-09-2023 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 27.09.2022 passed by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, Purnea, in Criminal Appeal No. 29 of 2022/C.I.S. No. 29 of 2022. By impugned order, the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, Purnea, has affirmed the order, dated 29.07.2022, passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Purnea, in G.R. No. 977 of 2022, arising out of Tika Patti Police Station Case No. 21 of 2022, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.



3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that on 05.03.2022, husband of the informant had gone to his field for irrigation. At about 03:000 PM, informant sent her daughter to the field and when she could not find her father, the informant sent her son in search of her husband. The informant's son, when reached the place of occurrence, saw three to four persons fleeing away, among whom he recognized the petitioner. The informant's son then saw his father lying dead on the ground. It has further been alleged that the petitioner, along with other persons, has murdered the informant's husband by slitting his throat by means of sharp weapon.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was declared juvenile by order, dated 18.07.2022 passed by the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Purnea, after coming to the conclusion that the petitioner was minor at the time of alleged occurrence and was aged about 15 years, 10 months and 01 days. He next submits that by the impugned order, the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, Purnea, 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 association with



any known criminal(s) and/or grant of bail to the petitioner may cause moral and psychological danger to him which would defeat the ends of justice. He next submits that learned 1st Additional District and Sessions Judge, Aurangabad, did not consider the social investigation report in correct legal perspective. The petitioner is in custody since 07.03.2022.

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 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, Purnea, 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 association with known criminal and/or he may expose to the moral and 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 is a school going student having no criminal antecedent 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 into association with any known criminal(s) and/or he may expose to the moral and psychological danger which would defeat the ends of justice. As such, the conclusion arrived at by learned Special Judge, Purnea, is not sustainable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

13. Accordingly, this revision application is allowed and the order dated 27.09.2022, passed by learned repatriation, in Criminal Appeal No. 29 of 2022/C.I.S. No. 29 of 2022, and order, dated 29.07.2022, passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Purnea, in G.R. No. 977 of 2022, 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, Purnea, in connection with G.R. No. 977 of 2022, arising out of Tika Patti Police Station Case No. 21 of 2022, 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, Purnea, 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	
---	--	---	--

