

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**Cr. Revision No.427 of 2013**

Ramij Raja	.....	Petitioner
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand	....	Opposite Party

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.C. MISHRA**

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Gautam Kumar
For the State	:	A. P.P.

-----

**2/17.5.2013**      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2.      Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 1.5.2013 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Sahebganj, in Cr. Appeal No.22 of 2013, whereby the appeal filed by the against the order dated 6.2.2013 passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Sahibganj, in G.R. Case No.502 of 2012, rejecting the bail application of the juvenile petitioner, has been dismissed by the learned Appellate Court below.

3.      Petitioner has been made accused in Barharwa P.S. Case No.113 of 2012, corresponding to G.R. No.502 of 2012, for the offence under Sections 385/387/324/302/307/34 of the I.P.C. The case relates to demand of Rs.5,00,000/- in ransom and when the same was not paid, the deceased was assaulted by knife, who subsequently, died in course of treatment. The petitioner was apprehended at spot, while the others managed to flee away, and the confessional statement of the petitioner has led to the recovery of the blood stained knife. As much as 18 knife wounds were found on the person of the deceased. The petitioner, however, was declared to be a juvenile and he filed his application for bail before the Juvenile Justice Board, Sahebganj, which was dismissed, holding that the release of the petitioner shall bring him in association of the known criminals and shall also expose him to moral, physical and physiological danger. The appeal filed against the said order was also dismissed by the Appellate Court below.

4.      Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for bail of the petitioner, being a juvenile.

5.      In the facts of this case, the nature of the offence clearly shows that the petitioner was in association of the known criminals, as the case relates to demand of ransom of Rs.5,00,000/- by the criminals and the petitioner had gone to the deceased along with other criminals and had assaulted him by knife, and he was apprehended at the spot. The association of the petitioner with known criminals is clear from the FIR itself. I am of the considered view that the Court below has rightly come to the conclusion that the release of the petitioner shall bring him to the association of the known criminals and shall also expose him to moral, physical and physiological danger. I am also of the view, that the release of the petitioner on bail shall also defeat the ends of justice.

6.      As such, I do not find any illegality and/or irregularity in the impugned order worth interference in the revisional jurisdiction. There is no merit in this application and the same is accordingly, dismissed.

**(H. C. Mishra, J)**

R.Kumar