



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. _____/2025
[Arising out of Special Leave Petition (Crl.)
No.18636/2025]

JUVENILE IN CONFLICT WITH LAW AA APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF RAJASTHAN RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
3. This appeal impugns an order dated 17th September, 2025 passed by the Rajasthan High Court, Bench at Jaipur, in Criminal Revision Petition No.1297/2025, whereby the High Court dismissed the appellant's revision, filed under Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (for short, 'the JJ Act'), and thereby affirmed the order rejecting his bail prayer.
4. A perusal of the record would reflect that the first bail prayer of the appellant, who is admittedly a juvenile, was rejected on the ground that it might expose him into association with bad

company. The order of rejection of the bail prayer was appealed under Section 101 of the JJ Act before the appellate court. The appellate court dismissed the appeal vide order dated 13th February 2025 against which, a revision was filed before the High Court under Section 102, which was also dismissed on 22nd April 2025.

5. At that time investigation was not complete. After conclusion of the investigation, the appellant applied afresh for grant of bail, which was rejected vide order dated 24th June 2025.

6. Aggrieved therewith, he filed an appeal under Section 101 of the Act, 2015 which too was dismissed on 14th July 2025. Being aggrieved by rejection of his bail prayer, the appellant filed Criminal Revision Petition No.1297/2025, which was dismissed by the impugned order.

7. A perusal of the impugned order would reveal that the High Court rejected the revision on the ground that the same is not maintainable being a second revision based on no new grounds.

8. In our view, the High Court committed an error in holding that the subject revision being a second revision is not maintainable. This we say so, because, firstly, it was not a second revision on the same cause of action. The first revision arose from rejection of the first bail prayer

filed while investigation was pending. Second, there is no embargo on filing a second bail application. No doubt, a second bail prayer may have to be considered on new grounds. But, in the context of bail, period of detention may, in circumstances, constitute a fresh ground. More so, in the context of a Juvenile where bail is the rule and denial of it is an exception. Third, when the second bail application was filed, investigation was over, and co-accused, who was also a juvenile, was admitted to bail.

9. In such circumstances, the bail prayer of the appellant ought to have been considered on merit and should not have been rejected on the ground of maintainability.

10. Apart from above, we find that as per the social investigation report on the record, rehabilitation of the juvenile in his family is considered appropriate. Social investigation report does not disclose that there are persons with criminal antecedents in the family of the appellant, or that on being released on bail, he would fall in bad company. In such circumstances, in our view, the High Court ought to have granted bail to the appellant taking into consideration the mandate of Section 12 of the JJ Act.

11. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed. The

order of the High Court dismissing the revision and, consequently, rejecting the bail prayer of the appellant is set aside. The appellant shall be released on bail without surety.

12. However, the jurisdictional Juvenile Justice Board shall issue appropriate directions to the Jurisdictional Probation Officer to keep the juvenile under supervision and to submit periodical reports to the Board about his conduct.

13. Pending applications shall stand disposed of.

J

[MANOJ MISRA]

J

[JOYMALYA BAGCHI]

New Delhi
December 10, 2025

ITEM NO.6

COURT NO.14

SECTION II-D

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 18636/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 17-09-2025 in SBCRRP No. 1297/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur]

JUVENILE IN CONFLICT WITH LAW AA Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF RAJASTHAN Respondent(s)

IA No. 297536/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 301103/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 301102/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 10-12-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Ashima Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Pankaj Singhal, Adv.
Mr. Chandan Kashyap, Adv.
Mr. Harshita Raj, Adv.
Mr. Monu Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ayush Anand, AOR

**For Respondent(s) :Ms. Sansriti Pathak, A.A.G.
Ms. Shagufa Khan, Adv.
Mr. Aman Prasad, Adv.
Ms. Nidhi Jaswal, AOR**

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order which is placed on the file.
3. The operative portion of the signed order reads thus:

“11. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed. The order of the High Court dismissing the revision and, consequently, rejecting the bail prayer of the appellant is set aside. The appellant shall be released on bail without surety.

12. However, the jurisdictional Juvenile Justice Board shall issue appropriate directions to the Jurisdictional Probation Officer to keep the juvenile under supervision and to submit periodical reports to the Board about his conduct.”

4. Pending applications shall stand disposed of.

(KAVITA PAHUJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SAPNA BANSAL)
COURT MASTER (NSH)