



2026:AHC:59235

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION No. - 540 of 2026

Junvenile

.....Revisionist(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Revisionist(s)	:	Pavan Kumar
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 84

HON'BLE JAI PRAKASH TIWARI, J.

As per office report dated 20.3.2026, notice has been served on opposite party no.2, but no one has turned up to opposed this revision.

Heard learned counsel for the revisionist and learned A.G.A. for the State.

The present criminal revision has been filed to quash the order dated 19.12.2025 passed by Additional District and Sessions Judge/ Special Judge (POCSO Act)-I, Amroha in Criminal Appeal No. 160 of 2025 (Minor "X" Vs. State of U.P.) and the order dated 13.12.2025 passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Amroha in Case Crime No. 170 of 2025 under Sections 103(1), 3(5) BNS, Police Station Hasanpur, District Amroha.

Learned counsel for the revisionist submits:

(i) admittedly, the applicant was a juvenile aged about 17 years, 7 months and 24 days on the date of alleged incident; He is in observation home since 15.5.2025;

(ii) the applicant has been falsely implicated;

(iii) there is no specific or strong objection raised in the DPO report, other than the general and vague observations;

(iv) applicant/revisionist was not named in the FIR;

(v) there is no criminal history of the applicant;

(vi) two co-accused namely Anuj and Viresh Alias Desh Kumar, who were major and named in the FIR, have been released on bail by co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 27.11.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application Nos. 41846 of 2025 and 41910 of 2025 and both the orders have been annexed along with instant revision;

- (vii) there is no hope of early conclusion of the trial;
- (viii) the revisionist has remained confined in the child observation home for an unduly long period of time;
- (ix) none of the grounds contemplated under section 12 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) are available, to deny the bail to the applicant.
- (x) therefore, the impugned orders have been assailed as erroneous and contrary to law.

Learned A.G.A. for the State vehemently opposed the present criminal revision. It is submitted, the incident reported is true and it is wrong to say that the allegations made against the applicant are false, and/are motivated. Also, reliance has been placed on the findings recorded in the bail rejection orders to submit that the instant revision may be dismissed.

It is not in dispute that the applicant is a juvenile and is entitled to the benefits of the provisions of the Act. Under Section 12 of the Act, the prayer for bail of a juvenile may be rejected 'if there appear reasonable grounds for believing that the release of the juvenile 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'.

The court has to see whether the opinion of the learned appellate Court as well as Juvenile Justice Board recorded in the impugned judgment and orders are in consonance with the provision of the Act. Section 12 of the Act lays down three contingencies in which bail may be refused to a juvenile offender. These are:-

- (i) if the release is likely to bring him into association with any known criminal, or
- (ii) expose him to moral, physical or psychological danger, or
- (iii) that his release would defeat the ends of justice?

Thus, it remains largely undisputed that the applicant - was a juvenile on the date of occurrence; does not appear to be prone to criminal proclivity or criminal psychology, in light of the observations of the D.P.O; does not have a criminal history; has been in confinement for an unduly long period of time, in as much as the trial has not concluded within time frame contemplated by the Act. Even otherwise, there does not appear to exist any factor or circumstance mentioned in section 12 of the Act as may disentitle the applicant to grant of bail, at this stage. The father of the applicant undertakes to address the statutory concerns expressed in section 12 of the Act, as to the safety and well being of the applicant, upon his release.

In view of the above, it appears that the findings recorded by the learned Court below are in conflict with the settled principle in law, for the purpose of grant of bail and are erroneous and contrary to the law laid down by this court. Consequently, those orders cannot be sustained. The impugned order dated are hereby set aside.

In view of the observations made above, the present criminal revision is **allowed**. Let the revisionist **Junvenile** under the guardianship of his father Sri Birmu @ Birampal involved in the aforesaid case crime be released on bail, on his furnishing personal bond of Rs. 20,000/- with two sureties each of like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:

- (i) The revisionist shall not tamper with the evidence or threaten the witnesses;
- (ii) The revisionist through guardian shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the date fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial Court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law;
- (iii) The revisionist through guardian shall remain present before the trial Court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial Court may proceed against him under Section 229-A of the Indian Penal Code/269 B.N.S.S.

Registrar (compliance) is directed to communicate the order to the Child Observation Home concerned within a week.

March 23, 2026
KK Patel

(Jai Prakash Tiwari,J.)