

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43914 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-807 Year-2024 Thana- FATUA District- Patna

Golu Kumar @ Lakki S/o Nanhak Singh @ Jaikishun Singh R/o Vill-
Sukulpur, P.S.- Fatuha, Distt- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ravi Ranjan, Advocate
		Mr. Abhishek Rai, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

6 19-12-2025 Heard Mr. Ravi Ranjan, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Binod Kumar No.3, the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner, who is in custody, seeks bail in connection with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 807 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 137, 96, 109, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has alleged that his daughter, who was around 14-15 years had gone out to attend call of nature and she did not return till late night. It has further been alleged that it was one Sudhir Kumar and the petitioner who had been seen in an unidentified vehicle. It has



been alleged that around 10 days earlier, the petitioner had shot upon the son of the informant, who was also undergoing treatment and for the same an FIR has been lodged against the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated and no such incident as alleged has occurred. It has further been submitted that the victim (daughter of the informant) was in love with other co-accused, namely, Sudhir Kumar @ Rasal and subsequently they had also married. It has further been submitted that from the perusal of the 183 BNSS statement made by the victim, it would be evident that she had married one Sudhir Kumar @ Rasal out of her own sweet will and it is informed that she is also in a family way now. It has thus been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that from perusal of the statement of the victim, it could be clear that she has not alleged anything against the petitioner and he was in no way connected with the said offence. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents.

5. The learned A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions made by the parties, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on



furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection Fatuha P.S. Case No. 807 of 2024, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative and the other shall be local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the court concerned.

(iv) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

(v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below



shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

8. It is made clear that the observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

