

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2361 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-158 Year-2025 Thana- BARHIYA District- Lakhisarai

Gholu @ Keshri Nandan Son of Late Ram Sewak R/o Village - Chetan Tola,
Khutha, P.S - Barhiya, District - Lakhisarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shivam .
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nawal Kishore Prasad
Mr.Samrendra Kumar Jha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 21-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in Barhiya P. S. Case No.158 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 238, 61(2), (B), 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Sections 25(1-B)A, 26, 35, 27 of the Arms Act.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 25.11.2025 and is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his son a student of Class-VIII, on 24.07.2025 had gone to school at 10.00 AM, further Raunak and Kanhaiya forcibly took him to the bank of river Ganga where Kanhaiya caught his son and Raunak shot



him on his forehead, when his son did not return home, a search was made and thereafter the dead body was recovered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR. It is also submitted that specific allegation of firing is against Raunak. It is next submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence nor has disclosed that on what basis he came to know that it were Raunak and Kanhaiya who took his son on bank of river Ganga and committed the occurrence of killing. It is further submitted that name of the petitioner in the case transpired based on the confessional statement of Kanhaiya in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the bail application. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that son of the informant was killed by firearm injury. It is next submitted that FIR is not an encyclopedia, but then, during the course of investigation material transpired connecting Kanhaiya and Raunak with the offence and the weapon was also recovered from the house of Kanhaiya and Kanhaiya disclosed that it was petitioner who had provided the



gun to Raunak based on which the occurrence was committed. It is further submitted that a young boy aged about 14 years lost his life for no fault of his and petitioner facilitated the occurrence by providing gun to Raunak.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for regular bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

