

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.1279 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-244 Year-2024 Thana- MAHARAJGANJ District- Siwan

Satyam Kumar Singh @ Satyam Singh S/o Sri Sumant Singh Resident of
Village - Bhikhabandh, P.S - Daraunda, District - Siwan under the
Guardianship of his father Sri Sumant Singh Age - 37 Years, S/o Sri Gopal
Singh, R/o Village - Bhikhabandh, P.S - Daraunda, District - Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sudhir Kumar Singh S/O Sri Lalbabu Singh R/O Vill.- Rukundipur Ram
Bharos Kuer tola, P.S.- Daraunda, Dist.- Siwan

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Gajendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Dr. Indihar Kumari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 28-07-2026

The present revision petition has been filed against the order dated 13.11.2025 passed by the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Siwan in J.E. No. 402 of 2024, GR No. 3600 of 2024 arising out of Maharajganj P.S. Case No. 244 of 2024 whereby and whereunder the learned Juvenile Justice Board changed its earlier order dated 01.08.2024 by which the petitioner was declared juvenile.

02. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was apprehended in connection with Maharajganj P.S. Case No. 244 of 2024 and he was taken into protective custody with effect from 17.06.2024. Thereafter, his age was assessed and the learned Juvenile Justice Board, vide its order dated



19.07.2024, declared the petitioner as child in conflict with law assessing his age to be 16 years 02 months and 11 days. The petitioner approached this Court seeking bail in Cr. Revision No. 171 of 2025 and during the pendency of the said revision petition vide order dated 26.06.2025, the learned Coordinate Bench directed the learned Principal Judge, Juvenile Justice Board to send the petitioner to a medical board to ascertain the age of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner was sent to a medical board and taking into consideration the medical report, the learned Juvenile Justice Board *suo motu* took a decision and vide its order dated 13.11.2025 changed its earlier order dated 01.08.2024 declaring the petitioner to be an adult aged about 20 years 11 months and 10 days. The learned trial court also allowed the application of the prosecution and directed the office to send the record to the concerned court. Learned counsel further submits that once the Juvenile Justice Board has passed an order on determination of the age of the petitioner, it was not open to it to change that order on the basis of medical report. The learned Juvenile Justice Board has also failed to consider that vide order date 26.06.2025 this Court has not directed the learned Juvenile Justice Board to take decision on the basis of the medical report and to proceed accordingly rather



it was for the learned Juvenile Justice Board to send the report to this Court and it could have waited for further instructions from this Court. However, the learned Juvenile Justice Board did not do so and passed the order in haste which is not a legal order.

03. Perused the record.

04. From perusal of record, I find that though the age of the petitioner was determined by the learned Juvenile Justice Board vide its order dated 01.08.2024 however, when the matter came up before the learned Coordinate Bench, finding the matter to be suspicious, the learned Coordinate Bench directed the learned Juvenile Justice Board to refer the matter of the petitioner to a medical board for determination of age with certain stipulation. Thereafter, the age of the petitioner was assessed and he was found to be an adult aged about 20 years 11 months and 10 days. The order of the learned Coordinate Bench dated 26.06.2025 was not challenged by the petitioner and that order attained finality. Once orders have been passed by learned Coordinate Bench and the order was not challenged, the learned Juvenile Justice Board was duty bound to comply the order and seek medical opinion on the age of the petitioner which it did by referring the matter to the medical board. Thereafter, when the



report of the medical board came, naturally the learned Juvenile Justice Board was bound to act upon such report and if the report declared the petitioner to be an adult aged about 20 years 11 months 10 days, the learned trial court rightly sent the report to the Court concerned for trial of the petitioner as an adult.

05. Therefore, in the peculiar facts and circumstances, this Court in the revisional jurisdiction does not find any infirmity in the impugned order dated 03.11.2025 and accordingly, the present revision petition is found to be devoid of merit and the same is dismissed.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

Anuradha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	-
Uploading Date	29.07.2026
Transmission Date	29.07.2026

