



2026:CGHC:10141



2026:CGHC:10141

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 210 of 2026

1 - Abc Nill

2 - Efg Nill

3 - Xyz Nill

--- Petitioner(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer Police Station
Khamhardih District- Raipur (C.G.)

--- Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Aakash Aahuja, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Ms. Supriya Upasane, Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J.

Order on Board

26/02/2026

1. This is criminal revision under Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (In short, 'the Act of 2015') read with Section 438 read with Section 442 of the Bharatiya Nagrik



Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 against the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge (F.T.C.), Raipur in Criminal Appeal No. 543/2025 whereby the criminal appeal filed by the petitioner under Section 101 of the Act of 2015 has been dismissed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioners who are juvenile in conflict with law and detained in observation home from 04.01.2025 in connection with crime No. 11/2005 registered at police station – Khamhardih, Raipur for the offence under Section 309(4), 106 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners admittedly are juvenile in conflict with law and they are in observation home since 04.01.2025. It is further submitted that as per Section 12 of the Act of 2015, for the purposes of releasing the juveniles on bail, the gravity of offence is not to be seen. It is also submitted that the learned Juvenile Justice Board as well as learned appellate Court have dismissed the application for bail on merits of the case but the merits of the case would be of no relevance while considering the bail applications of the juveniles. It is also submitted by him that the petitioners stay in observation home would affect their future prospects. There is no possibility that after releasing them on bail, they will again come in association of criminal persons or there is no reason to believe that release of the petitioners is likely to bring them into association with any known criminals or expose them to moral, physical or psychological danger or that their release to defeat



the ends of justice, therefore, the juveniles in conflict with law may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. She would further submit that this is the 3rd round of litigation by way of criminal revision filed by the petitioners. Initially, the petitioners' bail application under Section 12 of the Act of 2015 was rejected by the learned Juvenile Justice Board, Raipur on 23.01.2025 which was challenged by the petitioners before learned Additional Sessions Judge (FTC), Raipur in Criminal Appeal Nos. 87/2025 and 90/2025. Both these criminal appeals were dismissed by learned Sessions Judge vide order dated 24.02.2025 and 12.03.2025 respectively which were challenged by them under Section 102 of the Act of 2015 by filing their Criminal Revision Nos. 311/2025 and 415/2025 before this Court. Both these criminal revisions were decided on 23.04.2025 by this Court and dismissed the criminal revision filed by the juveniles in conflict with law/applicants, thereafter, the petitioners have again filed their application under Section 12 of the Act of 2015 for grant of bail which were rejected again on 07.11.2025 by learned Juvenile Justice Board, Raipur against which they again preferred a criminal appeal before the learned Additional Sessions Judge (FTC), Raipur in Criminal Appeal No. 543/2025 which were again dismissed vide order dated 25.11.2025. The said order dated 25.11.2025 was challenged by filing their Criminal Revision No. 10/2026 which was came up for hearing before Hon'ble the Coordinate Bench of this Court on 30.01.2026 and the petitioners/juveniles in conflict with law have



withdrawn their Criminal Revision with liberty to file appropriate application before an appropriate forum, thereafter, the petitioners again filed the present criminal revision against the order dated 25.11.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge (FTC), Raipur in Criminal Appeal No. 543/2025, however, the petitioners/juveniles in conflict with law have not disclosed the earlier rejection of their Criminal Revision Nos. 311/2025 and 415/2025 which is suppression of material facts. She would also submit that the earlier criminal revision have been dismissed on merits by the order dated 23.04.2025 and there is no change in circumstances. Therefore, no relief can be granted to the petitioners/juveniles in conflict with law in the present criminal revision. The trial of the case is in progress before the learned Juvenile Justice Board which reflected from the documents annexed with criminal revision and thus, their criminal revision may be dismissed.

5. When this Court raised a query from the learned counsel for the petitioners about the earlier rejection of the criminal revisions, he could not be able to answer the query and would submit that the said fact has not been disclosed by the person concerned on whose instructions, the present criminal revision has been filed.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material annexed with the present criminal revision. This Court has called the records of the Criminal Revision No. 311/2025 and 10/2026 and perused the same, also perused the material annexed with the Criminal Revision No. 210/2026.



7. Considering the rival submissions of the learned counsel for the respective parties, considering the fact that there is suppression of the fact that earlier Criminal Revision No. 311/2025 and 415/2025 have been rejected by this Court on 23.04.2025 after considering the provisions of Section 12 of the Act of 2015 and thereafter, the trial of the case is started and some of the witnesses have been examined before learned Juvenile Justice Board.
8. Although, the bail may be a rule but under three circumstances, the benefit of bail can be denied to a juvenile, where the alleged incident has been committed to the complainant, release of juvenile petitioners on bail would definitely defeat the ends of justice. One of the exceptional circumstances, wherein the benefit of bail can be denied to a juvenile, is that, in case, "the release would defeat the ends of justice". Justice is not a one way street which is only to be appreciated from the point of view of the juvenile in conflict with law. It is also a concept which would be alive both for the complainant and for the society at large. The manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, it cannot be said that the juvenile petitioners are immature, the nature of offence and the manner in which it has been committed, their conduct does comes under the exception of "defeat the ends of justice".
9. In the instant case, taking into consideration the report of the Probationary Officer as well as the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that if the petitioners are released on bail, there is all chances of their exposing to moral as well as



psychological danger, and their release would "defeat the ends of justice".

10. For the foregoing reasons, this Court is of the opinion that the finding given by learned Juvenile Justice Board as well as learned Appellate Court are based on proper appreciation of the facts as well as law which does not warrant any interference at its juncture, the present case does not fall within the ambit of Section 12(1) of the Act 2015 but would fall within the exception carved out in the said Section.
11. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case as well as the earlier rejection of the criminal revision filed by the juveniles in conflict with law/applicants, I do not find any change in circumstances and no good case has been made out for allowing this criminal revision calling for an interference with the order under challenge.
12. Accordingly, the criminal revision is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
JUDGE