

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.41 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-192 Year-2022 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

NITESH KUMAR Son of Muntun Prasad R/V- Olipur, Ward no. 11, P.S-
mahindwara, Dist- Sitamarhi (Bihar) under Guardianship of his mother
Sushila Devi Aged 42 years Wife of Muntun Prasad, R.V- Olipur, P.S-
Mahindwara, Dist- Sitamarhi, Pin Code 843117 Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Uday Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Md. Fahimuddin

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 31-07-2023 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 23.11.2022 passed by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Children Court, Sitamarhi, in Criminal Appeal No. 62 of 2022. By the impugned order, the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Children Court, Sitamarhi, has affirmed the order, dated 25.07.2022, passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Sitamarhi, in J. J. B. Case No. 1592 of 2022, arising out of Runnisaidpur Police Station Case No. 192 of 2022, registered for the offences punishable under Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code, whereby the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Sitamarhi, has rejected the prayer for



bail of the petitioner, on the ground that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is likelihood that the petitioner may get into the association with the known accused persons/criminals and he may be exposed to moral, physical and psychological danger

3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report, is that while the informant was returning to his house on a motorcycle, three persons, on a motorcycle, intercepted him and on the point of pistol, looted away the motorcycle of the informant, cash, chain etc. The petitioner is not named in the First Information Report and he was arrested in course of investigation and the allegedly looted motorcycle was recovered from his possession.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was declared juvenile by the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Sitamarhi, on 12.07.2022, 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 Sessions Judge -cum- Children Court, Sitamarhi, has rejected the prayer of the petitioner for bail on erroneous conclusion that there is a possibility that the petitioner would fall into bad company, if released on bail and grant of bail to the



petitioner may cause moral danger to him. He next submits that learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Children Court, Sitamarhi, did not consider the social investigation report in correct legal perspective and the petitioner is in custody since 16.06.2022.

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. Learned Counsel further relied upon Section 12 of the Act, which is quoted as follows:-

“12. Bail to a person who is apparently a child alleged to be in conflict with law.- (1) When any person, who is apparently a child and is alleged to have committed a bailable or non-bailable offence, is apprehended or detained by the police or appears or brought before a Board, such person shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or in any other law for the time being in force, be released on bail with or without surety or placed under the supervision of a probation officer or under the care of any fit person:



Provided that such person shall not be so released if there appears reasonable grounds for believing that the release is likely to bring that person into association with any known criminal or expose the said person to moral, physical or psychological danger or the person's release would defeat the ends of justice, and the Board shall record the reasons for denying the bail and circumstances that led to such a decision.

(2) When such person having been apprehended is not released on bail under subsection (1) by the officer - in-charge of the police station, such officer shall cause the person to be kept only in an observation home in such manner as may be prescribed until the person can be brought before a Board.

(3) When such person is not released on bail under sub-section (1) by the Board, it shall make an order sending him to an observation home or a place of safety, as the case may be, for such period during the pendency of the inquiry regarding the person, as may be specified in the order.

(4) When a child in conflict with law is unable to fulfill the conditions of bail order within seven days of the bail order, such child shall be produced before the Board for modification of the conditions of bail.”



8. 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.

9. Learned Counsel, in the aforesaid background, submits that the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Children Court, Sitamarhi, 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

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, as such there is no likelihood that the petitioner will fall into association with any known criminal(s). Accordingly, the conclusion arrived at by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Children Court, Sitamarhi, is not sustainable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

13. In the result, this application is allowed and the order, dated 23.11.2022, passed by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge -cum- Children Court, Sitamarhi, in Criminal Appeal No. 62 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) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Juvenile Justice Board, Sitamarhi, in J. J. B. Case No. 1592 of 2022, arising out of Runnisaipur Police Station Case No. 192 of 2020, 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, Bhojpur, 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.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

