Child Trafficking Bail Appeals: Pinki v State of UP

- Factual Background
  - Interstate Child Trafficking Racket
  - Multiple FIRs (193/2023, 50/2023, 201/2023, 76/2023, 74/2023)
  - FIR No. 193/2023
  - FIR No. 50/2023
  - FIR No. 201/2023
  - Operation Across States (UP, Rajasthan, Bihar, Jharkhand)
- High Court Order (Allahabad)
  - Bail Granted to 13 Accused
  - Reasons for Granting Bail
    - Not Named in Initial FIR
    - Names Disclosed by Co-accused (Police Custody)
    - Victim Not Directly Recovered
    - Parity with Co-accused Granted Bail
    - No Evidence of Tampering/Intimidation
    - "Bail is a rule, jail is an exception"
- Supreme Court Analysis
  - Appeals Allowed, Bail Orders Set Aside
  - Criticism of High Court's Approach ("Very Callous")
  - Undermining Seriousness of Child Trafficking
  - Failure to Consider:
    - Gravity of Crime
    - Organised Nature of Racket
    - Potential to Influence Victims/Witnesses
    - Paramount Importance of Societal Interest
  - Concern: Accused Absconding After Bail
  - Dubious Role of Purchasers (e.g., Santosh Sao)
  - Reiterated Principles for Granting Bail (Precedents)
- Directions of the Court
  - Accused to Surrender (Committal Court, 2 Weeks)
  - Remand to Judicial Custody
  - Expeditious Trial Mandated
  - State Govt: Appoint 3 Special Public Prosecutors
  - State Govt: Police Protection (Victims & Families)
  - State Police: Apprehend Absconding Accused (2 Months)
  - State Govt: Trafficked Children Admitted to Schools (Educational Support)
  - Trial Court: Orders for Victim Compensation
  - National Directives (All State Governments)
  - National Directives (All High Courts)
  - Message to Parents: Remain Vigilant
  - Delhi Child Trafficking Case (TOI Report): Police Officer to Appear