

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13256 of 2025

Arising out of PS. Case No.-176 Year-2024 Thana- DINARA District- Rohtas

Govind Kumar S/o Tej Narayan Singh R/o Village- Semridih, PS- Dinara,
Dist- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate
For the State	:	Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 15-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the Informant and learned Additional Public Prose-
cutor for the state.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Dinara P.S. Case No.
176 of 2024 (S.Tr. No. 29 of 2025) instituted for the offences
under Sections 302 and 307 of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 27 of the Arms Act pending before the ASJ-13, Rohtas
at Sasaram. He has no criminal antecedent.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has
alleged that on 26.04.2024 while she was going on tractor along
with other family members, the petitioner is said to have
approached them on a motorcycle and, thereafter, fired upon the
father of the informant hitting him on his abdomen and,



thereafter, he fired upon the informant which hit near her waist. It is further alleged that her father was taken to the hospital where he was declared dead.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and during the course of investigation not a single independent witness has been examined despite the fact that the occurrence is stated to have taken place at 5 P.M. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated only on the ground that it was known to the father of the informant that informant was in love affair with the petitioner. It is also submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the allegation of firing upon the petitioner is a concocted story and no such incident as stated has occurred. It is next submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that from the statement of the witnesses recorded during the course of investigation it would appear that all of them are family members and there is no independent witnesses. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and is in custody since 30.04.2024.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State as well as learned counsel for the Informant has vehemently



opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and have stated that the informant happens to be the eye-witness of the occurrence and she had categorically stated that the petitioner has fired upon the informant and from perusal of the post-mortem report, the antemortem injuries finds corroborated with the allegations levelled in the FIR, as such, the petitioner should not be released on bail. Learned counsel for the Informant submits that the post-mortem report clearly depicts that the death of the informant's father was on account of shock caused by firearm injuries.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions of learned counsels and taking into account that there is specific allegation of assault upon the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail rejected.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Vikash/-

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

