

(2020) 05 P&amp;H CK 0035

**High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh****Case No:** Criminal Revision No. 3398 Of 2019 (O&M)

Sukhwinder Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Punjab

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision:** May 27, 2020**Acts Referred:**

- Indian Penal Code, 1860 - Section 120B, 148, 149, 302, 506
- Juvenile Justice (Care And Protection Of Children) Act, 2000 - Section 12, 12(1)

**Hon'ble Judges:** Jaishree Thakur, J**Bench:** Single Bench**Advocate:** Mandeep Kumar Dhot**Final Decision:** Allowed

---

**Judgement**

Jaishree Thakur, J

The present revision petition has been filed to challenge the impugned order dated 18.10.2019 passed by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice

Board, Sangrur whereby the application for grant of regular bail to the petitioner has been denied, which order was upheld on 06.12.2019 by the Court

of Addl. Sessions Judge (Children's Court) Sangrur. The petitioner, being juvenile, has prayed for setting aside the impugned orders passed by the

Courts below.

The case of the petitioner is that he was arrested in FIR No.75 dated 11.07.2019 registered under Sections 302, 506, 148, 149, 120-B IPC at Police

Station Khanauri, District Sangrur. He moved an application for grant of bail before Juvenile Justice Board being Juvenile but the same was dismissed.

The appeal preferred by him before the Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur was also dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the bail application of the petitioner has been dismissed by the Courts below only on the ground of

presumption that in case, the juvenile is released on bail, he may be exposed to moral and psychological danger and his release would defeat the ends

of justice, whereas, no such finding was recorded as to how he will come in contact with criminals and how he will be exposed to moral, physical or

psychological danger, which would defeat the ends of justice. Learned counsel further would rely upon Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice Act to

contend that a child in conflict with law cannot be denied bail. It is argued that the petitioner was born on 21.10.2001 and on the date of the

occurrence he was a juvenile. He would further argue that the sharp kirch blow which was inflicted upon the neck of the deceased Gurtej Singh was

given by one Ravi and no role has been attributed to him for inflicting any injuries. It is also contended that co-accused Gudeep Singh alias Deepa has

already been granted bail by this Court in CRM-M-9675-2020 while further submitting that the petitioner is not a previous convict and he is not

associated in any kind of un-social or criminal activities.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has also relied upon the judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench in case Gaurav vs. State of Haryana, 2016 (5) RCR

(Criminal) 781 as well as judgment of this Court in case of Naveen (minor) vs. State of Haryana, CRR-2485-2018 decided on 27.09.2018 in support of

his arguments.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State opposes grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground of heinousness and seriousness of offence and also

because of the fact that the victim was minor at the time of occurrence but he is not in a position to deny the fact that the main injury that has been

inflicted upon the deceased was by one Ravi and not by the petitioner herein who is a juvenile.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also perused the impugned orders as well as the allegations levelled in the FIR.

Admittedly, as per allegations levelled in the complaint, the FIR, in question, was registered against the petitioner. The petitioner was tried by Juvenile

Justice Board, where, he moved an application for grant of bail, being juvenile, which was dismissed. Thereafter, an appeal filed against the said order

before the Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur was also dismissed. The petitioner has been declined bail on the ground that in case, he is released on

bail, his release would defeat the ends of justice which would bring him in association with known criminals and expose him to moral, physical and

psychological danger.

Section 12 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (here-in-after referred to as 'Act') is relevant in the present

controversy, which is reproduced as under :-

â€œ12. Bail of juvenile.-

(1)When any person accused of a bailable or non-bailable offence, and apparently a juvenile, is arrested or detained or appears or is 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 1 [or placed under the supervision of a Probation Officer or under the care of any fit

institution of fit person] but he shall not be so released if there appear reasonable grounds for believing that the release is likely to bring him into

association with any known criminal or expose him to moral, physical or psychological danger or that his release would defeat the ends of justice.

(2)When such person having been arrested is not released on bail under sub-section (1) by the officer incharge of the police station, such officer shall

cause him to be kept only in an observation home in the prescribed manner until he can be brought before a Board.

(3)When such person is not released on bail under sub section (1) by the Board it shall, instead of committing him to prison, make an order sending him

to an observation home or a place of safety for such period during the pendency of the inquiry regarding him as may be specified in the order.â€

From the bare reading of the provisions of Section 12 of the Act, it appears that the intention of the legislature is to grant bail to the juvenile

irrespective of the nature or gravity of the offence, alleged to have been committed by him and the same can be declined only in case where

reasonable grounds are there for believing that the release is likely to bring him into the association of any known criminal or expose him to moral, physical or psychological danger or that his release would defeat the ends of justice. Meaning thereby, as per aforesaid provision, a juvenile can be denied the concession of bail, if any of the three contingencies specified under Section 12(1) of the Act is available.

In the present case, while declining the bail application, the relevant provision has not been considered by both the Courts below as in accordance with

Section 12 of the Act, the juvenile is entitled to bail as a matter of right unless the case falls in the exceptions carved out in the provision itself but

nothing was available on record to show that any of the three exceptions specified under Section 12(1) of the Act was existing.

Similar view was observed in cases Manoj Singh vs State of Rajasthan 2004(2) RCC 995, Lal Chand v.State of Rajasthan 2006(1) RCC 167, Prakash

v. State of Rajasthan 2006(2) RCR (Criminal) 530 and Udaibhan Singh alias Bablu Singh v. State of Rajasthan 2005(4) Crimes 649.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State has also not pointed out any material available on record to show that there are reasonable grounds for

believing that the petitioner is likely to come into the association of any known criminal if released on bail or his release will expose him to moral,

physical or psychological danger. Petitioner is in custody since 12.07.2019 and no purpose will be served, in case, he is kept in custody.

In view of the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and law position as discussed above,I am of the view that both the Courts below

have not satisfied the requirement of provisions of Section 12(1) of the Act and without having any material on record, the bail application of the

petitioner has been declined. The impugned orders are not sustainable in the eyes of law and as such, are liable to be set aside.

Accordingly, the present revision petition is allowed and the impugned orders i.e order dated 18.10.2019 and order dated 06.12.2019 passed by the

Courts below are hereby set aside. The petitioner is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bond/surety bonds to the

satisfaction of the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Sangrur.