

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53090 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-54 Year-2023 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Golu Kumar @ Shivam Kumar S/O Manoj Kumar Singh Resident of Village-
Tilaktazpur, P.S.- Runnisaidpur, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bauye Jee Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Lalan Kumar, A.P.P

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 19-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 54 of 2023 arising out of S.Tr. No. 883 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, petitioner and other are said to have made firing from pistol which hit the chest of informant's son as a result of which he died on the spot.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier bail prayer of the present petitioner has been rejected vide order dated 11.01.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 67438 of 2023. Petitioner is in custody since 30.01.2023 and bears criminal antecedent of three cases. Learned counsel further



submits that investigation has been initiated immediately after lodging the FIR which indicates that the prosecution story has been made in accordance with the suitability of facts and circumstances of the case in order to frame case against the petitioner. It has been further submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged in the FIR.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that earlier bail prayer of the present petitioner has been rejected vide order dated 11.01.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 67438 of 2023. He further submits that after lodging sanha, the police initiated the investigation. He further submits that there is specific allegation the petitioner to shot the informant's son, which is supported by statement of eye witness namely Prem Shankar, Kiran Devi, Deepak Singh and Chitranjan Jha as mentioned in para 8, 9, 10 and 39 of the case diary respectively and the same is corroborated by the post-mortem report also. Learned counsel further submits that there is no fresh ground for considering the bail prayer of the petitioner.

6. In pursuance of direction by this Court, the trial court vide letter no. 42 of 2025 dated 05.08.2025 has sent its report in which it has been reflected that out of seven witnesses,



four charge sheet witnesses have been examined and the concerned court has reported that the case would be concluded in six months.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly keeping in view that earlier bail prayer of the petitioner has been rejected as well as report of the trial court, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, the learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

vashudha/-

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

