

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36768 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2025 Thana- GOVINDGANJ District- East Champaran

Laukesh Kumar @ Laukesh Pandey @ Lokesh Pandey S/O Late Sharanagat Pandey R/O- Vill- Lokahan, P.S- Paharpur, Distt- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 40870 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2025 Thana- GOVINDGANJ District- East Champaran

Ujjawal Pandey @ Ujjwal Kumar Pandey S/O Arvind Pandey @ Arbind Pandey R/O Vill.- Lakhnipur, P.s.- Paharpur, Dist.- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 42009 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2025 Thana- GOVINDGANJ District- East Champaran

Manir Alam S/O Muslim Mian @ Muslim Ansari R/O Village-Ekderwa, Ps- Paharpur, Distt-East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 36768 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Sarvesh Kashyap, Advocate
Mr. Deppak Kumar, Advocate
Ms. Kumari Aakanshi Rai, Advocate
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 40870 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suraj Kumar Tiwari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Sarvesh Kashyap, Advocate
Mr. Deppak Kumar, Advocate



Ms. Kumari Aakanshi Rai, Advocate
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 42009 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suraj Kumar Tiwari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Anant Kumar I, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Sarvesh Kashyap, Advocate
Mr. Deppak Kumar, Advocate
Ms. Kumari Aakanshi Rai, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 19-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP
for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioners seek bail in connection with
Govindganj P.S. Case No. 02 of 2025 instituted for the offence
under Sections 103(1), 61(2) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023.

3. The informant alleged that her husband, who
initially appeared to have died in an accident on 31.12.2024,
was found in post-mortem to have died due to bullet injury. She
alleged that her brother-in-law Laukesh Pandey, neighbour
Manoj Pandey, and others killed him to grab his property, citing
prior threats and conspiracies. The deceased had even submitted
a complaint before the SDM a month earlier regarding the
accused persons' plot against her husband.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners
that the petitioner, namely, Laukesh Kumar is in custody since
02-01-2025, having no criminal antecedent, whereas petitioner,
namely, Ujjawal Pandey is in custody since 03-03-2025, having



two criminal antecedents, whereas petitioner, namely, Manir Alam is in custody since 03-03-2025, having one criminal antecedent.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioners' counsel that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner, namely, Laukesh Kumar is named in the FIR, whereas petitioners, namely, Ujjawal Pandey and Manir Alam are not named in the FIR. Name of petitioner namely, Ujjawal Pandey, has surfaced in this case on the basis of his self-confessional statement, whereas, name of petitioner, namely, Manir Alam has surfaced in this case on the disclosure made by petitioner, namely, Ujjawal Pandey. There is no eye witness to the occurrence. So far as allegation against petitioner, namely, Laukesh Pandey of conspiring is concerned, it is submitted that the same is after thought which has not been corroborated by any eye witness or any other incriminating material. So far as allegation against the petitioner, namely, Ujjawal Pandey is concerned, the same is based on his own self-confessional statement and the same has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. So far as allegation against the petitioner, namely, Manir Alam is concerned, it is alleged that there is recovery of motorcycle which was used in crime and he is the



owner of the motorcycle, save and except this, there is no material against petitioner, namely, Manir Alam.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners. Referring to the confessional statement of petitioner, namely, Laukesh Pandey, it is submitted that he has confessed his guilt and has very categorically confessed that at his instance, co-accused persons have committed murder of his brother. Petitioner, namely, Ujjawal Pandey has also confessed his guilt in his confessional statement. Petitioner, namely, Manir Alam's motorcycle was used in the offence. Hence, involvement of the petitioners in the alleged occurrence cannot be denied as they have acted in a criminal conspiracy. Postmortem report also corroborates the allegation as the cause of death is found to be shock and hemorrhage associated with injuries caused by fire arms.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being involvement of all the petitioners in the commission of the offence and nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners. Prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners is *rejected* at this stage.

8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as



expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

