CGHC010281012026 2026:CGHC:44426

NAFR

Digitally signed by RAMESH KUMAR VATTI
Date: 2026.10.15 11:26:41 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 932 of 2026

*** -** ABC (Juvenile in Conflict with Law)

... Applicant

Versus

*** -** State Of Chhattisgarh Through P. S. Lalpur, District- Mungeli, Chhattisgarh

... Non-Applicant

And

CRR No. 1333 of 2026

1 - ABC

2 - XYZ

(Juvenile In Conflict With Law)

... Applicants

Versus

* **-** State Of Chhattisgarh Through-Station House Officer, Police-Station - Lalpur, District - Mungeli (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant (CRR No. 932/2026)	:	Mr. Chanmeet Singh, Advocate
For Applicants (CRR No. 1333/2026)	:	Mr. Ayush Lal, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Deputy Advocate General and Mr. Jitendra Shrivastava, Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

14/10/2026

1. Since both the criminal revision arise out of same crime number i.e. 40/2026 registered at Police Station- Lalpur, District Mungeli, therefore, they are being disposed of by this common order.

2. Both the criminal revisions under Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act has been preferred against the orders dated 14.07.2026 and 17.08.2026 passed by the 1st Additional Sessions Judge /Children Court, Mungeli, Disrtrict Mungeli (C.G.) in Criminal Appeal No. 36/2026 and Criminal Appeal No. 42/2026, upholding the orders dated 01.07.2026 and 08.07.2026 passed by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Mungeli rejecting the bail applications of the applicants/juveniles in connection with Crime No. 40/2026 registered at Police Station- Lalpur, District Mungeli (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 140(2) & 238 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 22.03.2026, Balveer Singh lodged a missing person report regarding his brother, Damodar Singh Rajput, at Police Station Lalpur. During the course of investigation, co-accused Sanjay Yadav was arrested on 30.03.2026. His memorandum statement was recorded, wherein he stated that co-accused Ranjeet Singh Rajput alias Munna and Rampal Rajput had directed him to commit the murder of the deceased, Damodar Singh Rajput, for consideration. He further stated that he had met the other co-accused persons and, pursuant to the conspiracy, they planned to commit the murder of the deceased, which was thereafter committed on 21.03.2026. On the basis of the memorandum statement of co-

accused Sanjay Yadav, the involvement of 15 accused persons came to light, out of whom were found to be juveniles. Accordingly, the FIR was registered against the accused persons. Thereafter, the police completed the investigation and filed the charge-sheet before the competent Court.

4. Learned Advocates appearing for the respective applicants/juveniles would argue that the present applicants have been implicated in the case on the basis of memorandum statement of co-accused- Sanjay Yadav. They would argue that the applicants were not involved in commission of crime. They would submit that other co-accused persons namely- Ajay Singh Rajput, Paragraj and Paleshwar Singh Rajput have already been enlarged on bail by this Court in MCRC No. 6332/2026, MCRC No. 7723/2026 and MCRC No. 6652/2026. They would further submit that the social status reports of the applicants are in their favour. They would contend that the applicants are in Observation Home since 23.03.2026 and 30.03.2026, charge-sheet have already been filed. They would pray to release the applicants/juveniles on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned Deputy Advocate General and Government Advocate appearing for the State/non-applicant would oppose. They would submit that the applicants are involved in heinous offence of murder of Damodar Singh Rajput and therefore, both the criminal revisions may be dismissed.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the material available on record.

7. Having considered the fact that the present applicants, who are juveniles have been implicated in the case on the strength of

memorandum statement of co-accused- Sanjay Yadav, social status reports are in their favour, charge-sheet have already been filed, applicants/juveniles have no criminal history, they are in Observation Home since 23.03.2026 and 30.03.2026, as per Section 14 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act inquiry is to be completed within a period of four months from the date of first production of child before the Board which can be extended by two more months by the Board, the provisions of Section 12 of the said Act, without commenting anything on merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that present is a fit case to release the applicants/juveniles on bail. Accordingly, both the criminal revisions are **allowed**.

8. The impugned orders passed by both the Courts below are set-aside. It is directed that on furnishing a surety of Rs.50,000/- along with a bond of the same amount, which is to be of the natural guardian mother/father of each of the juvenile, to the satisfaction of the concerned Juvenile Justice Board, for their appearance as and when required before Juvenile Justice Board or Child Court, the applicants-juveniles shall be given in custody of their natural guardian mother/father.

9. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

vatti