



2026:CGHC:23748



2026:CGHC:23748

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 523 of 2026

- XYZ

---Applicant

versus

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station, Bhakhara, District-Dhamtari (C.G.)

---Non-applicant

CRR No. 578 of 2026

- XYZ

---Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Station House Officer of Police Station - Bhakhara, District - Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

---Non-applicant

CRR No. 579 of 2026

- XYZ

---Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Station House Officer of Police Station- Bhakhara, District- Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

--- Non-applicant

For Applicants	: Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Sahu, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Deputy Advocate General.

**(Hon'ble Shri Justice Radhakishan Agrawal)****Order on Board****15/06/2026**

1. Since all the criminal revisions arise out of the same Crime No. 07/2026, 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 orders dated 16.03.2026 and 27.03.2026 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge (F.T.C.) and Children's Court, Dhamtari, C.G., in Criminal Appeal Nos. 12/2026, 15/2026, and 16/2026, respectively, affirming the orders dated 05.02.2026 and 11.03.2026 passed by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari (C.G.), whereby the bail applications of the applicants were rejected in connection with Crime/Criminal Case No.12/2026 registered at Police Station Bhakhara, District Dhamtari, C.G., for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(1), 309(6), 3(5), and 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, "BNS").
3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 26.01.2026 at about 8:15 PM, complainant- Vinay Kumar Sahu lodged a report at Police Station Bhakhara stating that while his brother- Omkar Sahu was returning home from his shop, some unknown persons intercepted him on the way. It is alleged that they assaulted him with a club, causing injuries, and looted his Jio mobile phone worth about Rs.10,000/-. On the basis of this report, an FIR was registered against unknown persons for the



alleged offences. During the course of investigation, the present applicants were arrested.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have no criminal antecedents and are innocent, and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the FIR was lodged against unknown persons and the present applicants were not named or involved in the alleged crime. It is also submitted that they have been in the observation home since 31.01.2026, i.e., for about four months, and the social status report is in their favour. He contends that 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. It is further submitted that the learned trial Courts have rejected the bail applications of the applicants without proper consideration. 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 to the applicants. However, he submits that the social status report is in favour of the applicants, that they have no criminal antecedents, and that there is no apprehension of their involvement in the alleged crime.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
7. 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.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegations levelled against the applicants, and also taking into account that the social status report is not adverse to the applicants and does not indicate anywhere that their release on bail would bring them into contact with any known criminal or expose them to any moral, physical, or psychological danger, or otherwise defeat the ends of justice, and that they have no criminal antecedents, coupled with the fact that the applicants have been in the observation home since 31.01.2026, i.e., for about four months, and without commenting on the merits of the case, I find it appropriate to release the applicants on bail.
9. Accordingly, the orders passed by the Special Judge and the Juvenile Justice Board are set aside, and the criminal revisions are allowed. It is directed that upon each of the applicants furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- through their parents/guardians, along with one local surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Court, for their appearance as and when directed, the applicants shall be released into the custody of their respective parents/guardians. Along with the bail bonds, copies of the Aadhaar Cards and coloured passport-size photographs of the applicants as well as the sureties shall also be submitted, which shall be duly verified by the trial Court.



10. It is observed that the person stands as surety will furnish an undertaking that the applicants shall not come in contact with any bad element and in case, if they are found to be indulged in any unlawful act, the surety/father of the applicants shall inform to the concerned Police Station.

Sd/-
(Radhakishan Agrawal)
Judge

Akhilesh