

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.89770 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-147 Year-2025 Thana- NAUTAN District- West Champaran

1. Golu Kumar Pandey @ Golu Pandey Son of Kameshwar pandey R/o Mangalpur Kala, Ward no. 3, P.S. - Nautan, Distt. - West Champaran.
2. Jhunna Kumar @ Jhunna Kumar Pandey @ Jhuna Kumar Son of Arvind Pandey R/o Mangalpur Kala, Ward no. 3, P.S. - Nautan, Distt. - West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 18-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no. 1 has antecedent of one case and petitioner no. 2 is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on account of dispute relating to measurement of land, Kameshwar assaulted Ravikant by lathi and iron rod causing fracture of his left leg while Pramod assaulted the informant by an iron rod causing injury on his shoulder and back and also assaulted



Aman causing injury on his head. Further, on orders of Kameshwar, petitioner no. 1 fired missing the informant but then his mother received firearm injury on her leg.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that as far as petitioner no. 2 is concerned, no specific allegation is alleged against him and his case is on a much better footing than Pramod Pandey who has been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by an order dated 11.08.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 51100 of 2025 passed by a learned Coordinate Bench of this Court. It is next submitted that as far as petitioner no. 1 is concerned, the allegation against him initially in the FIR is of assaulting the side of the informant by rod and thereafter it is alleged that he fired at the informant but missed causing firearm injury to his mother. It is also submitted that if petitioner no. 1 had any intention of causing firearm injury then why he would have initially used rod for assault. It is further submitted that no doubt, in the FIR, it is alleged that petitioner no. 1 fired causing firearm injury to the mother of the informant but then the Doctor, in the injury report, has recorded suspected firearm



injury which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution as to whether the mother of the informant was hit by firearm.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners. It is submitted that no doubt, the allegation against petitioner no. 2 is general and omnibus in nature but then as far as petitioner no. 1 is concerned, there is specific allegation against him of causing firearm injury to the mother of the informant. It is further submitted that the Doctor also has opined that the injury is suspected to be caused by firearm. It is next submitted that investigation in the case is continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners, the petitioners may abscond.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner no. 1, namely, Golu Kumar Pandey @ Golu Pandey, who is alleged to have fired causing firearm injury to the mother of the informant, accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

7. As far as petitioner no. 2, namely, Jhunna Kumar @ Jhunna Kumar Pandey @ Jhuna Kumar is concerned, let the petitioner no. 2, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a



period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Nautan P.S. Case No. 147 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

