

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82446 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2025 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

Govinda Ravidas Son of Munarik Ravidas @ Mundrika Das Resident Of
Village - Tejpur, P.S. - Telhara, Dist. - Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nityanand Neeraj, Advocate
	:	Ms. Kumari Anjani Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ram Sumiran Rai, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for
the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the
B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner along
with other co-accused persons is said to have committed the
murder of the son of the informant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits
that the present case is based only on suspicion inasmuch as,
neither the informant nor any other person is an eye-witness to
the occurrence. The First Information Report itself has been
lodged after a delay of two days inasmuch as, while the



occurrence is said to have taken place on 06.02.2025, the F.I.R. was lodged on 08.02.2025 and no explanation has been tendered for such delay. Further, it has been argued that the deceased was having a love affair with some co-villager and it is possible that on account of such reason the deceased was killed. The petitioner has been made an accused since there was some earlier dispute between the petitioner and the deceased with regard to game of cricket which has also transpired during the course of investigation. The witnesses examined during the course of examination are all hearsay witnesses and one witness Birendra Choudhary in paragraph-7 of the case diary has claimed to be an eye-witness, but the very fact that he has stated that he was looking for the dead body of the deceased along with the family of the deceased itself goes to show that he also was not an eye-witness. The petitioner is in custody since 21.08.2025 with no criminal antecedent and on 04.02.2026 the charges have also been framed and the petitioner undertakes to cooperate in the trial by appearing on each and every date.

5. Learned APP for the State opposed the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner has been named in the First Information Report.



6. Taking into consideration the facts and considering the fact that the case against the petitioner is based only on suspicion and further charges have also been framed, let the above named petitioner, who has no criminal antecedent, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned C.J.M., Jehanabad/concerned Court below in connection with Ghoshi P.S. Case No. 58 of 2025, subject to condition that the petitioner shall remain physically present in court on each and every date during trial and in the event of failure on two consecutive dates without sufficient reasons, his bail bonds shall be liable to be cancelled by the learned court concerned.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

anand/-

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

