

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**Cr. Revision No.206 of 2013**

Sunil Vishwakarma @ Sunil Kumar Vishwakarma @ Dhania	.....	Petitioner
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand	....	Opposite Party

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

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Dhanajay Kr. Dubey
For the State	:	A. P.P.

-----

**4/22.03.2013** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 28.1.2013 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Dhanbad, in Cr. Appeal No.25 of 2013, whereby the appeal filed against the order dated 11.12.2012 passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Dhanbad, in G.R. No.2675 of 2011, rejecting the bail application of the juvenile petitioner, has been dismissed by the Appellate Court Below.

3. Petitioner has been made accused in Jharia P.S. Case No.311 of 2011, corresponding to G.R. No.2675 of 2011 for the offence under Section 363, 366A of the Indian penal Code. There is direct allegation against the petitioner to have kidnapped the minor daughter aged about 15 years, of the informant, from her school. The impugned order shows that the victim has been recovered and her statement was recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., wherein she has stated that she had forcibly been taken away from her school by the petitioner and the other co-accused persons and they took her to Gaya, where the petitioner had committed rape upon her.

4. Petitioner, however, was declared to be a juvenile and he filed his application for bail before the Juvenile Justice Board, Dhanbad, which was rejected by the Juvenile Justice Board, taking into consideration the social investigation report of the Principal Probation Officer, which was against the petitioner, and coming to the conclusion that the release of the petitioner shall defeat the ends of justice and it shall also expose him to physical, moral and physiological danger. The appeal filed against the said order was also dismissed by the Appellate Court below on the same grounds.

5. I do not find any illegality and / or irregularity in the impugned order worth interference in the revision jurisdiction. There is no merit in this application, which is accordingly, dismissed.

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

R.Kumar