IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32332 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010461822026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-347 Year-2025 Thana- JANDAHA District- Vaishali

==========

Ranjeet Kumar Chaudhary @ Golu Chaudhary S/o Ramanand Chaudhary R/o Village - Marai, P.S - Jandaha, District - Vaishali

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, Advocate Mr. Purushottam Kumar, Advocate Ms. Kajal, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Dinesh Jha, Advocate Mr. Nikhilesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar No. 2, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY

CAV ORDER

5 28-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 127(2), 103, 61(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the informant’s son, namely, Shivam Kumar, was busy making preparations for the Shri Krishna Janmashtami fair at Brahma Sthan, about 500 metres south of his house. The informant was also present there, along with his cousin, Pintu Kumar. In the meantime, seven named accused persons arrived there on three

WEB COPY

motorcycles, while three of their accomplices, namely, Rahul Kumar @ Bablu Singh and Golu Kumar, who is the brother-in-law of Bablu Kumar, were already present at the place of occurrence with their faces covered. They surrounded Shivam Kumar and threatened him by brandishing their pistols, which led to an altercation between them. Upon hearing the commotion, the informant's cousin, Pintu Kumar, rushed towards the place of occurrence. It is further alleged that, by the time Pintu Kumar reached near Shivam Kumar, Ramanand Choudhary @ Chunni Chaudhary ordered the other accused persons to shoot Shivam Kumar, alleging that he was a police informant. Pursuant to the said order, Ranjit Kumar Choudhary @ Golu Chaudhary (the petitioner) fired at the head of Shivam Kumar, while Manjit Kumar fired at his chest. Ashish Kumar and Sonu Kumar also fired at him, but their shots missed the target. Pintu Kumar also reached the spot and raised an alarm. Subsequently, the informant's son succumbed to his injuries.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that, from perusal of the FIR, it transpires that the alleged occurrence took place on 15.08.2025,

WEB COPY

whereas the FIR was lodged on 16.08.2025. Learned counsel further points out that the alleged time of occurrence is 19:00 hours on 15.08.2025, whereas the FIR was lodged at 17:30 hours on 16.08.2025. He submits that, although the informant has posed himself as an eyewitness to the alleged occurrence,but the delay in filing of the FIR goes to show that he was not present at the place of occurrence.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that from perusal of paragraph no. 3 of the case diary, it appears that, on 15.08.2025, information was given to the police, pursuant to which the police reached the place of occurrence and found the dead body of the deceased lying on the ground. A Bullet motorcycle was also found there. Thereafter, the family members took the dead body to their house, following which the inquest report was prepared and the body was forwarded for post-mortem examination. Subsequently, Mahisaur P.S. Case No. 418 of 2025 was registered. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the prosecution has not brought on record the *Sanha* entry or the police case recording the initial information received by the police, stated to have been recorded as Mahisaur Thana Sanha No. 418 of 2025 dated 15.08.2025.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits

WEB COPY

that the seizure memo of the Bullet motorcycle was also prepared on the same day. However, from perusal of the seizure memo, it appears that Mahisaur P.S. Case No. 347 of 2025 has been mentioned therein, although no written application had been submitted to the police at that time.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that, in receiving the written application, how the number of Mahisaur P.S. Case No. 347 of 2025 has been mentioned in the seizure memo. He further submits that the post-mortem report goes to show that two bullet entry wounds were found on the person of the deceased, with no corresponding exit wounds.

8. Learned counsel also submits that during the course of investigation, independent witnesses stated that they could not identify the assailants due to darkness. In this regard, he refers to the statements of the said witnesses recorded in paragraphs 176 and 177 of the case diary.

9. The prayer for bail is vehemently opposed by learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that Pintu Kumar is an eyewitness to this case who has stated that the petitioner fired at the deceased.

10. It is an admitted position that the place of occurrence

WEB COPY

is situated about 8 kilometers from the house of the deceased. The alleged occurrence took place at 07:00 P.M. in the month of August. Generally, sunset in August occurs around 06:25 to 06:30 P.M., and it would not be completely dark within half an hour after sunset. However, the place of occurrence is situated away from the village, and the delay in lodging the FIR also casts serious doubts on the prosecution's version. Moreover, the petitioner has two criminal antecedents and has been in judicial custody since 30.10.2025.

11. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail **with the conditions that the petitioner shall cooperate in trial, shall remain physically present on each and every date fixed by the learned trial court, and if the petitioner absents himself for two consecutive dates, his bail bond should be cancelled by the learned trial court.**

12. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-VII, Vaishali at Hajipur in connection with Jandaha (Mahisaur)

WEB COPY

P.S. Case No. 347 of 2025.

13. Accordingly, the prayer for application of regular bail of the petitioner stands allowed.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV Date	15.10.2026
Uploading Date	28.10.2026
Transmission Date	28.10.2026

WEB COPY