



2026:CGHC:19472

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 385 of 2026

- Juvenile in Conflict with Law Nil

---Applicant

versus

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through Police Station Mahasamund, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh.

---Non-applicant

CRR No. 412 of 2026

- Juvenile in Conflict with Law Nil

--Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through Police Station Mahasamund, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

---Non-applicant

For Applicant	: Mr. Shubhank Tiwari, Advocate.
For Non-applicant	: Mr. Aman Tamrakar, Panel Lawyer.

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Radhakishan Agrawal)

Order on Board

27/04/2026

1. Since both the criminal revisions arise out of the same Crime No.65/2026, they are being heard together and disposed of by this common order.
2. The present criminal revisions under Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (for short, "the Act, 2015") have been preferred by the applicants against the impugned

order dated 27.02.2026 passed by the learned Juvenile Court/Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court, Mahasamund (C.G.) in Criminal Appeal No. H-16/2026, affirming the order dated 23.02.2026 passed by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Mahasamund (C.G.), whereby the bail applications of the applicants were rejected in connection with Crime No.65/2026 registered at Police Station Mahasamund, District Mahasamund (C.G.) for the offences punishable under Sections 296, 115(2), 351(3), and 308(2) of the BNS.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 10.02.2026, complainant-Lilesh Pal lodged a report at Police Station Mahasamund alleging that on 09.02.2026 at about 7:45 PM, while returning to his village Sorid after work, he was stopped near a nursery at Nayapara, Mahasamund by three unknown persons. They abused and threatened him, assaulted him with fists, and one of them, hit him on the right cheek with a metal bangle, causing injury. It is further alleged that they forcibly took two mobile phones and cash of Rs.4,800/- from him and fled from the spot. On the basis of the report, the aforesaid offences were registered against the applicants.
4. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that they have no criminal antecedents and have been in the Observation Home since 13.02.2026. It is also submitted that the FIR was lodged after about 24 hours of the alleged incident, which creates doubt regarding the prosecution case. No incriminating property has been recovered from their possession. It is further submitted that the Social Investigation Report is in favour of the

applicants and there is no likelihood that their release would bring them into association with any known criminal or expose them to any moral, physical, or psychological danger. He further submits that both the learned Courts have rejected the bail applications without proper consideration of the evidence on record. Therefore, considering the provisions of the Act, 2015, it is prayed that the applicants be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that the applicants were involved in the alleged crime and were duly identified during the Test Identification Parade (TIP). He further submits that, considering the nature and gravity of the offence, if the applicants are released on bail, there is a likelihood that they may indulge in similar criminal activities. It is also submitted that under Section 12 of the Act, 2015, bail can be denied where release is likely to bring the juvenile into association with known criminals or defeat the ends of justice. Therefore, it is submitted that the applicants are not entitled to be released on bail at this stage.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.
7. From the perusal of the case diary, the Social Investigation Report of the applicants, and the material available on record, it *prima facie* appears that on the date of the incident, the juveniles in conflict with law, along with another juvenile, after consuming intoxicants in the evening, were moving near *Nayapara* Nursery on Sorid Road with the intention of committing robbery. On noticing the complainant alone during the night hours, they wrongfully restrained him, abused and

assaulted him, and committed robbery of two mobile phones and cash. It is further reflected from the case diary that the juveniles were allegedly involved in a similar incident of robbery committed in November, 2025, which *prima facie* indicates their inclination towards criminal activities.

8. Section 12 of the Act, 2015 makes it absolutely clear that a child alleged to be in conflict with law should be released on bail with or without surety or placed under the supervision of a probation officer or under the care of any fit person. The only embargo created is that in case the release of the child is likely to bring him into association with known criminals or expose the child to moral, physical or psychological danger or where the release of the child would defeat the ends of justice, then bail can be denied.
9. In the present case, considering the gravity and nature of the offence, the circumstances in which it was committed, and the apparent prior involvement of the applicants in similar criminal activity, this Court finds reasonable grounds to believe that if the juvenile applicants are released on bail, they are likely to come into association with known criminals and may be exposed to moral and psychological danger. Further, their release at this stage would defeat the ends of justice. Accordingly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of bail to the juvenile applicants.
10. Consequently, both the criminal revisions are devoid of merit and are hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
(Radhakishan Agrawal)
Judge