

Ajay

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1212 OF 2025

Aslam Ramzan Shaik @
Aslam Ramzan Mansoori

.. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

.. Respondents

-
- Ms. Shifa Khan a/w. Mr. Avesh Qureshi i./by Mr. Wahab Khan, Advocates for Applicant.
 - Ms. Mahalakshmi Ganapathy, APP for Respondent – State.
 - Ms. Saili Dhuru, appointed Advocate for Respondent No.2.

.....
CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : MAY 07, 2025.

P.C.:

1. Heard Ms. Khan, learned Advocate for Applicant; Ms. Ganapathy, learned APP for Respondent No.1– State and Ms. Dhuru, learned appointed Advocate for Respondent No.2.

2. This is an Application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhhita, 2023 seeking Regular Bail in connection with C.R. No.505 of 2024 registered with Versova Police Station for offences under Sections 64(1), 64(2)(i), 65(1) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 readwith Sections 6, 8 and 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (for short "POCSO Act").

3. Applicant in the present case is 19 years old whereas the prosecutrix is 16 years old. Alleged date of incident is 01.09.2024.

According to prosecution case, the prosecutrix left her house on 01.09.2024 at about 04:00 p.m. to visit Phoenix Mall but did not return till late in the night. She returned back at 10:00 p.m. and disclosed to her mother that she had gone out with her friends to visit Chowpatty at Versova and on reaching there she was given a cold-drink called sprite to drink after which the Applicant took her to a dark lonely place and outraged her modesty and threatened her from disclosing the incident to anyone. FIR is lodged on 04.09.2024 by mother of prosecutrix.

4. Ms. Khan, learned Advocate appearing for Applicant would persuade me to consider the fact that there was a love affair between the prosecutrix and Applicant, they having known each other since long, working as tailors in the same profession and most importantly between the alleged date of incident and date of filing of FIR the family members of Applicant and prosecutrix both met each other for performing their Nikah (marriage) ceremony between them. She would draw my attention to paragraph No.10 of the rejection order passed by the Sessions Court dated 03.03.2025 denying bail to the Applicant. *Prima facie* on perusal of paragraph No.10 it is seen that substantial material in the nature of photographs was placed on record *prima facie* indicating some kind of ceremony was performed between Applicant and prosecutrix by their family members. Despite the same, the learned trial Court rejected the bail Application in view of the

minor age of prosecutrix i.e. 16 years of age and invocation of the provisions of POCSO Act.

5. Ms. Ganapathy, learned APP for State has vehemently objected to the grant of bail stating that the learned trial Court has rejected the bail Application of the Applicant on merits and on *prima facie* consideration it is evident that Applicant outraged the modesty of the prosecutrix which does not entitle him to grant of bail. She would also vehemently invoke the presumption envisaged under Section 29 of the POCSO Act to contend that Applicant committed a heinous act and therefore deserves incarceration pending trial.

6. Ms. Dhuru, learned appointed Advocate for Respondent No.2 would support and adopt the submissions made by Ms. Ganapathy, learned APP and additionally would submit that even if prosecutrix went with Applicant to the beach, from perusal of the material on record it is seen that Applicant had taken advantage of the tender age of prosecutrix and outraged her modesty. Hence considering seriousness and gravity of the offence, she would urge the Court to reject the bail Application.

7. I have heard the learned Advocates at the bar and with their able assistance perused the record of the case. Submissions made by the learned Advocates have received due consideration of the Court.

8. At the outset it is seen that statement of prosecutrix was recorded on the date of filing of the FIR i.e. 04.09.2024 appended at page No.65 of the Application wherein she has recorded and narrated the history in her Medico-Legal Examination. She has stated that she knew the Applicant who was resident of Sakinaka, Mumbai and working as tailor in a factory for the past two years prior to filing of FIR, that she was acquainted with him, that they used to go out together and remained in touch on phone all throughout and thereafter she has narrated the alleged incident of 01.09.2024 as stated in the FIR alleging that he outraged her modesty.

9. *Prima facie* this statement is in contradiction with the FIR filed by the first informant – mother of prosecutrix where the aforesaid facts are not reflected. Having noticed this contradiction, it is further seen that both prosecutrix and Applicant were tailors, rather working as tailors and therefore knew each other, were friends and acquainted with each other and according to her own statement used to go out together. In that view of the matter the statement referred to herein above assumes significance with respect to prosecutrix's proximity with the Applicant. Though it is stated in the FIR that Applicant had spiked her cold-drink, the Medico-Legal Examination negates that fact in column 15(B) of the Medico Legal Examination papers appended at page No. 73 of the Application.

10. That apart, the fact that there was an intervening event / ceremony between the parties attended by the family members of both parties about which *prima facie* material is placed on record cannot be disregarded. Learned Advocate for Applicant has placed a pen-drive on record and persuaded me to see the videography of the said incident. I have seen the same. Learned APP would submit that this material is not provided to the Investigating Officer. However that cannot be a ground for objection since the Trial Court has taken cognizance of the said incident / ceremony between the Applicant and prosecutrix, rather it is referred to as the marriage being performed between them in presence of their family members in paragraph No.10 of the trial Court's order.

11. In the facts of the present case, assistance is drawn from the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *S. Varadarajan v. State of Madras*¹ wherein the Court in paragraph No.2 has held thus:-

“2. Where a minor girl alleged to be taken away by the accused person, had left her father's protection knowing and having capacity to know the full import of what she was doing and voluntarily joined the accused, it could not be said that the accused had taken her away from the keeping of her lawful guardian within the meaning of section 361 of the Penal Code, 1860 (“IPC” for short). Something more had to be done in a case of that kind, such as an inducement held out by the accused person or an active participation by him in the formation of the intention either immediately prior to the minor leaving her father protection or at some earlier stage.”

¹ AIR 1965 942

12. Though the above referred case was decided well before the POCSO Act was enacted, this Court is well conscious of the presumption ingrained in Section 29 of the said Act and that argument on prosecutrix's consent is irrelevant but *prima facie* if the statements of prosecutrix recorded are read, it is clearly borne out that she has been consenting to the actions which is gathered from the record of the case.

13. In this regard attention is drawn to the decision of this Court (*Coram: Mridula Bhatkar, J.*) in the case of ***Sunil Mahadev Patil Vs. The State of Maharashtra***² to contend that consensus of the prosecutrix who is below the age of 18 years is a mitigating circumstance for Trial Court to consider. In furtherance to the above Court has laid down certain specific guidelines after taking into consideration relevant cases as also the ethos and development of the age of young offenders in the Indian Society in general. Court in paragraph Nos.8, 9, 11 and 12 of this decision laid down certain principles which I find it apt to reproduced herein below for consideration of bail in such situations.

Paragraph Nos. 8, 9, 11 and 12 read thus:-

“8. It is to be noted that the case of S. Varadarajan was decided in the year 1967 when the women were not enjoying the freedom which today the women have. Albeit the Hon'ble Supreme Court then has taken a pragmatic view and has acquitted Varadarajan. Now we come across such cases everyday. If a girl is a minor between the age group of 15 to 18 years and if it can be safely inferred that her consent was obvious, then it is a mitigating circumstance. Some trial Courts dealing with such Bail Applications, especially after Nirbhaya

² Bail Application No. 1036 of 2015, decided on 03.08.2015.

case, started taking a strict approach and the accused are denied the bail only on the ground that the prosecutrix being minor below 18 years, her consent is immaterial, therefore, in the case of rape on such minor, no bail can be granted. This is a matter of concern.

9. In view of the increasing offences against the women especially of rape, the legislature and judiciary both found it obligatory to deal these offences with severe punishment and women can be protected if the laws are made rigorous. Therefore, report of Justice Verma Committee was accepted and necessary and significant amendments were made in these two sections. A wrong doer is to be punished, guilty is to be convicted. However, at the stage of bail, the Court has to consider *prima facie* under what circumstances the offence is committed by the accused. In the Criminal law, the Court cannot ignore the intention or motive behind the act and that is an important factor in the commission of offence so also to decide the quantum of sentence at the end of trial, so in the case of bail.

10. ...

11. Today teenagers are exposed to more sex related issues and lot of material is also available to them to know the sexual relationship between a man and a woman. Because of their impressionable age, girls and boys both may tend to get provoked and there can be a curious and very compelling demand of the body to get into such kind of relationship. Sexual urge differs from person to person and there cannot be any mathematical formula in respect of sexual behavioral pattern of teenagers, as biologically whenever the child turns into puberty, the child starts understanding his or her sexual needs. The nature of response depends on the upbringing, peer pressure, how civilized the environment is etc. Sex requires proper physical and emotional preparation, as it results in many physical and emotional consequences. This is all considered as a sexual maturation. Therefore, some sects with view to regularize sexual behaviour of the community have acknowledged this biological factor and therefore, the early age marriages are performed in some religions or communities. Taking into consideration this social and biological factors, the law makers have considered the age of 15 as a age of consent when the marriage is performed. Taking into consideration this background, the trial Judge has to pass an order of bail in such cases.

12. The overall considerations while deciding such applications can be summed up as -

When a boy and a minor girl are in love with each other and chose to live together without consent of their parents, then the following factors are to be considered:

(i) What is the age of the prosecutrix, who is minor.

- (ii) Whether the act is violent or not.
- (iii) Whether there are antecedents or not.
- (iv) Whether the offender is capable of repeating the Act or not.
- (v) Whether there is likelihood of threats or intimidation, if at all the boy is released.
- (vi) Whether any chance of tampering with the material witnesses when their statements are recorded.
- (vii) It is also to be taken into account in such cases that a boy in his early 20's deserves to get employment and to plan, stabilize and secure his future.”

14. Next the decision of this Court (Coram: Sandeep K. Shinde, J.) in the case of *Anirudha Radheshyam Yadav Vs. The State of Maharashtra*³ is also relevant in the facts of the present case. Relevant paragraph No.4 is reproduced below for reference and reads thus:-

“4.The conduct of the victim is indicative of the fact that she had left the home of her parents by her own will and that she had surrendered to the physical desires of the applicant out of her love and affection for him. It is not the case of the prosecution that the applicant had promised to marry her. Additionally, it is also not a case where under the misconception of the fact, she had served herself to the desire of the applicant for physical relations. No doubt, that the applicant, under the preview of POCSO Act, is a minor, however, the facts of the present case indicate that she had sufficient knowledge and capacity to know full import of what she was doing and had only thereafter voluntarily joined the complainant (applicant).”

15. This Court is not oblivious of the fact that there is a statutory presumption under Section 29 of the POCSO Act. However it does not mean that the prosecution version has to be accepted as gospel truth in every case. Presumption does not mean that the Court cannot take into consideration *prima facie* facts of the particular case which are evident from the face of record.

³ Criminal Bail Application No.2632 of 2019 decided on 09.01.2020

16. Court is of the opinion that presumption would come into play only when prosecution is able to bring on record facts that would form the foundation for the presumption. Otherwise, all that the prosecution would be required to do is to raise some allegation against the accused and to claim that the case projected by it is true. The Court will have to be on guard to see that the application of presumption without advertent to the essential facts shall not lead to injustice. The presumption under Section 29 of the POCSO Act is not absolute. Attention in this regard is invited to the decision of High Court of Kerala in the case of *Joy Vs. State of Kerala Represented through the Public Prosecutor*⁴. The relevant paragraphs are reproduced thus:-

"10. This court is not oblivious to Section 29 of the Act which contains a legislative mandate that the court shall presume commission of the offences by the accused unless the contrary is proved. Section 29 of the Act states that where a person is prosecuted for committing or abetting or attempting to commit any offence under Sections 3, 5, 7 and 9 of the Act, the Special Court shall presume, that such person has committed or abetted or attempted to commit the offence, as the case may be, unless the contrary is proved. The court shall take into consideration the presumption under Section 29 of the Act while dealing with an application for bail filed by a person who is accused of the aforesaid offences under the Act (See State of Bihar v. Rajballav Prasad, (2017) 2 SCC 178 : AIR 2017 SC 630).

11. However, the statutory presumption under Section 29 of the Act does not mean that the prosecution version has to be accepted as gospel truth in every case. The presumption does not mean that the court cannot take into consideration the special features of a particular case. Patent absurdities or inherent infirmities or improbabilities in the prosecution version may lead to an irresistible inference of falsehood in the prosecution case. The presumption would come into play only when the prosecution is able to bring on record facts that would form the foundation for the presumption. Otherwise, all that the prosecution would be required to do is to raise some allegations against the accused and to claim that the case projected by it is

4 2019 SCC OnLine 783.

true. The courts must be on guard to see that the application of the presumption, without advertent to essential facts, shall not lead to any injustice. The presumption under Section 29 of the Act is not absolute. The statutory presumption would get activated or triggered only if the prosecution proves the essential basic facts. If the accused is able to create serious doubt on the veracity of the prosecution case or the accused brings on record materials which would render the prosecution version highly improbable, the presumption would get weakened. As held by the Apex Court in Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, (2011) 1 SCC 694 : AIR 2011 SC 312, frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and in the event of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of anticipatory bail. No inflexible guidelines or straitjacket formula can be provided for grant or refusal of anticipatory bail. It should necessarily depend on facts and circumstances of each case in consonance with the legislative intention."

17. Attention is drawn to the decision of High Court of Kerala in the case of ***XXXXXX Vs. State of Kerala Represented through the Public Prosecutor and Ors⁵***. The relevant paragraphs are reproduced thus:-

"19. Before parting with the judgment, we will also deal with the appellant's contention based on Section 29 of the POCSO Act. Section 29 is extracted herein below:

"29. Presumption as to certain offences.— Where a person is prosecuted for committing or abetting or attempting to commit any offence under sections 3, 5, 7 and section 9 of this Act, the Special Court shall presume, that such person has committed or abetted or attempted to commit the offence, as the case may be unless the contrary is proved."

20. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant based on Section 29 of the Act that reverse burden is cast on the accused to prove that they have not committed the offences under Sections 3, 5, 7 and 9 of the Act, the only precondition being that the accused is prosecuted for committing or abetting or attempting to commit any of the offences above referred. According to the learned counsel, the accused persons herein failed to discharge the reverse burden and therefore, they are liable to be convicted for the offences alleged. We cannot accept the above contention of the learned

⁵ CRA(V) No. 19 of 2020 decided on 24.02.2022.

counsel. The argument, if accepted on its face value, is pregnant with the peril of accepting every prosecution charge, where offences under Sections 3, 5, 7 and 9 of the Act are canvassed, irrespective of its merits. Section 29 only creates an exception to the ordinary rule of innocence available to the accused in a criminal trial and puts the onus on the accused to rebut the presumption and establish his innocence. However, this presumption will operate only if the foundation to the prosecution case is laid by leading legally admissible evidence. The statutory presumption under Section 29 cannot be understood to mean that in every case when a person is prosecuted for the specified offences, the prosecution version should be taken as gospel truth. The presumption will not mitigate the primary duty of the prosecution to establish the foundational facts constituting the offence, which duty is static on the shoulders of the prosecution. Once the same is done, the burden shifts to the accused by virtue of Section 29 of the Act to prove that he had not committed or abetted or attempted to commit the offence, as the case may be. Our conclusions afore referred are in accord with the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, where presumption under various statutes have been analysed and interpreted: (1) *K.Veeraswami v. Union of India* [(1991) 3 SCC 655], (2) *State of Maharashtra v. Wasudeo Ramachandra Kaidalwar* [(1981) 3 SCC 199], (3) *Noor Aga v. State of Punjab* [(2008) 16 SCC 417], (4) *Kumar Exports v. Sharma Carpets* [(2009) 2 SCC 513], (5) *Abdul Rashid Ibrahim Mansuri v. State of Gujarat* [(2000) 2 SCC 513], (6) *Chandran & Others v. State of Kerala and Others* [AIR 2011 SC 1594], (7) *Naresh Kumar v. State of Himachal Pradesh* [AIR 2017 SC 3859] and (8) *Gangadhar @ Gangaram v. State of Madhya Pradesh* [AIR 2020 SC 3656]. These decisions were taken note of and discussed by a learned Single Judge of this Court in *Justin @ Renjith & Another v. Union of India* [ILR 2020 (4) Ker 679]. To the same effect is the judgment of another learned Single Judge of this Court in *David v. State of Kerala* [2020 (4) KHC 717 : 2020 CrLJ 3995]. We, therefore, reject the said contention of the appellant on the legal premise. On factual premise also, we find that the accused persons have rebutted the presumption under Section 29 by virtue of the evidence and circumstances already discussed, which were given due weightage in confirming the impugned judgment.”

18. In so far as offences punishable under Sections 6, 8 and 12 of the POCSO Act (special law) are concerned, it may be stated that the provisions of this law are, though, stringent in nature, but in the given facts rather *prima facie* facts of the present case, it would not deter the

Court to grant or refuse bail in order to secure the ends of justice.

19. Considering Applicant's age, if he is enlarged on bail Court is hopeful that Applicant's family will undoubtedly do their duty to make every effort and attempt to reform and aid the Applicant in leading a reformed life while on bail rather than keep him in prison and expose him to criminal outlook and life in prison. However on the flip side, if a chance is given to the Applicant because of his young age by enlarging him on bail, there is a possibility that he will be remorseful and repent in retrospect. This is a chance required to be taken by the Court because punishment has to be believed to be inflicted for a reformative result rather than being punitive in nature.

20. Undoubtedly the trial will determine the complicity of Applicant in the offence. While considering Bail Application in such facts, Court feels that reform and rehabilitation of the under trial accused needs to be considered especially when age of the accused is young so that the accused gets an opportunity / or is given an opportunity to reform, rehabilitate and earn his livelihood honorably from the perspective of social integration. This is a chance which the Court must take considering the young age of accused. The age of the Applicant is very young. If the Applicant is incarcerated in prison further, there is every possibility that he might lose faith in the institution and society at large and may tread the path of criminality or

would waste his life. Incarceration in prison exposes many youth to abuse as is shown statistically.

21. There are several harms of incarceration which are inflicted disproportionately on the youth. This is the reason why Court feels that any / every semblance of a chance towards a reformatory approach in punishment should be adopted, especially in the case of young offenders. Hence every opportunity or to that extent risk should be constructively taken by the Court in the case of young offenders – accused before committing such accused to further custody and give such accused an opportunity to become a good citizen in the Society. These observations are only in the view of the young age of the Applicant before me and it is only a means to explore an alternative to incarceration so that the Applicant can become a good citizen.

22. In view of the aforesaid *prima facie* observations and considering the age of the Applicant at 19 years and age of prosecutrix at 16 years alongwith the *prima facie* material on record, I am inclined to enlarge the Applicant on bail. Needless to state that complicity of Applicant in the crime can be proved by prosecution at the trial.

23. Bail Application stands allowed subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) Applicant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with

one or two sureties in the like amount;

- (ii) Before his actual release from jail, Applicant shall furnish his address where he proposes to reside after his release from jail to the concerned Police Station and also to the trial Court;
- (iii) After his release from jail, Applicant shall report to the Investigating Officer as and when called for;
- (iv) Applicant shall attend the trial Court on first Tuesday of every month between 11.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. to mark his presence. If the first Tuesday of the said month falls on a holiday and / or non Court working day, the Applicant shall mark presence on the next working day;
- (v) Applicant shall not make any attempts to re-associate with the prosecutrix in any manner either through a device or in-person and shall not reside in the jurisdiction of the Police Station wherein the prosecutrix is residing until the trial is concluded. Investigating Officer shall specifically ensure that this condition is followed;
- (vi) Applicant shall co-operate with the conduct of trial and attend the trial Court on all dates unless specifically exempted and will not take any unnecessary

adjournments, if he does so, it will entitle the prosecution to apply for cancellation of this order;

(vii) Applicant shall not leave the State of Maharashtra without prior permission of the Trial Court;

(viii) Applicant shall not influence any of the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner; and

(ix) In case of any infraction of the above conditions and / or two consecutive defaults in marking his attendance before trial Court, it shall attract the provisions of Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C. i.e. for cancellation of bail.

24. It is clarified that the observations made in this order are limited for the purpose of granting Bail only and I have not made any observations on merits of the case. The trial shall be adjudicated on the strength of the evidence led and strictly on its own merits being uninfluenced with any of the *prima facie* observations made herein above in this order.

25. Fees of the learned Advocate Ms. Dhuru, learned Advocate appointed through Legal Aid to represent and espouse the cause of Respondent No.2 shall be released by the Registry of this Court within a period of one week from the date of presentation of a server copy of this order on compliance.

26. Bail Application is allowed and disposed.

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]

Ajay

Digitally
signed by AJAY
TRAMBAK
UGALMUGALE
Date:
2025.05.08
19:54:20
+0530