

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85608 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-134 Year-2023 Thana- KASIMBAZAR District- Munger

Golu Kumar S/o Chandrashekhar Ram Resident of village - Mokbira, P.S.-
Kasim Bazar, District- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Abhinav Alok

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nirmala Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 08-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Kasim Bazar P.S. Case No. 134 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Sections 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of prosecution is that when the informant went to orchard of Gautam Kumar to demand his dues of Rs. 40,000/-, in the meantime, the petitioner fired upon him due to which he sustained gunshot injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. There was some money dispute between the informant and co-accused Kishan Mandal due to which the alleged incident occurred and



this petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 8.9.2023.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the petitioner is named in the FIR who has specifically been alleged to fire upon the informant by his pistol due to which he sustained gunshot injury. The injury report of informant/injured supported the prosecution case in which doctor opined the nature of injury is grievous caused by firearm. It is also submitted that the petitioner has got one criminal antecedent.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direction allegation of firing upon upon the informant, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same at the earliest and the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Amandeep/-

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

