

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9951 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-107 Year-2023 Thana- BAKHTIYARPUR District- Patna

=====

GOLU KUMAR @ GOLU @ KUNDAN KUMAR @ GOLLA Son of
Radheyshyam @ Radheyshyam Rai Resident of Village-Ghoshwari, P.S.-
Bakhatiyarpur, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Usha Kumari Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 27-02-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No.107/2023 registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 307 and 34 of the Indian
Penal Code & Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the
informant who is not an eyewitness to the occurrence but still
alleges that this petitioner along with other named accused
persons shot his brother, who received three gun shot injuries. It
is next submitted that the genesis of the occurrence also has not
been disclosed and the injured was not treated in a government



hospital rather in the F.I.R. it is stated that the injured was brought to Paras hospital, Patna and the F.I.R. also was instituted after a lapse of four days without any plausible explanation for delay.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner has antecedent of 8 serious criminal cases. It is also submitted that no doubt the informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence but then from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that he was informed by the friends of his brother who were present at the place of occurrence and informed who shot. It is next submitted that even the investigation is going on.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

