

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Revision No.1199 of 2025

Piyush Paul @ Aditya Paul Barla @ P. Paul @ Aditya Paul, aged about 19 years, son of Vijay Paul @ Vijay Paul Barla, resident of Village Chudi Tola, Suhana City, P.O. & P.S. Kanke, Dist. Ranchi ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Abhay Kr. Tiwari, APP

2/17.12.2025 Heard the parties.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been convicted by the judgment dated 29.07.2025 passed by the learned Juvenile Justice Board Ranchi in connection with POCSO Case No. 145 of 2021, arising out of Kanke P.S. Case No. 182 of 2021, whereby the learned court has been pleased to convict the petitioner for three years with fine of Rs.10,000/- for the alleged offence under section 376(2)(i)(f), 376(2)(i), 376(3) of IPC and section 4, 6 of the POCSO Act. He next submits that the petitioner has preferred the appeal against the said Judgment before learned Additional Judicial Commissioner-IV-cum-Special Judge, POCSO Act, Ranchi being Criminal Appeal No. 299 of 2025, which has been rejected by the judgment dated 7.11.2025.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been convicted for three years and he is in custody during the trial from 18.8.2021 to 16.01.2023 and after conviction since 29.7.2025, in view of that, he has remained in

custody for about 22 months. He next submits that this revision petition is of the year 2025 and there is no likelihood of taking up this revision recently.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that the petitioner has already convicted by two courts, in view of that, this revision petition may kindly be dismissed.

5. Considering that the petitioner at the time of alleged occurrence was aged about 15 years and so far, the medical report is concerned, nothing adverse has come against the petitioner and medical report is adverse against the co-accused namely Prince Paul. The petitioner has already remained in custody for about 22 months. This revision is not likely to be taken up recently as this revision is of the year 2025.

6. Considering the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Bhagwan Rama Sindhi Gosai & Ors. versus State of Gujarat* reported in (1999) 4 SCC 421 and in the case of "*Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Anr.* reported in (2022) 10 SCC 51 in para 57 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under: -

"57. Thus, we hold that the delay in taking up the main appeal or revision coupled with the benefit conferred under Section 436-A of the Code among other factors ought to be considered for a favourable release on bail."

7. In that view of the matter, I am inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner named above, is directed to be released on regular bail, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount

each to the satisfaction of learned Juvenile Justice Board, Ranchi in connection with in connection with POCSO Case No. 145 of 2021, arising out of Kanke P.S. Case No. 182 of 2021.

Cr. Revision No.1199 of 2025

9. Call for the scanned copy of the trial court record.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

17.12.2025
R.Kumar