

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55757 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-69 Year-2025 Thana- CHANAN District- Lakhisarai

Umesh Kumar @ Umesh Prasad Gupta, aged about 40 years, Male, S/o
Suresh Modi, R/o Vill. - Mananpur Bazar, P.S.- Chanan, District- Lakhisarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. S.K. Lal, Advocate Mr. Umesh Prasad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ganesh Prasad Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 09-09-2025 Heard Mr. S.K. Lal, learned counsel along with Mr. Umesh Prasad, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Ganesh Prasad Singh, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with Chanan P.S. Case No. 69 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 352, 351(2), 132, 324(2), 303(2), 109 of the B.N.S. and Section 03 of the Damage of Public Property Act.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, petitioner along with nine named accused persons and fifty unknown co-villagers, had vandalised the government property and had also assaulted the officials of the Electricity Department, which put



loss of rupees one lac to the government and the power holding company.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Petitioner is named in the FIR but allegation against him is general and omnibus. Petitioner is consumer of electricity and due to frequent power cut, he along with other co-accused persons and co-villagers, had went to make complain, to which, the officials of the Electricity Department gave no notice and had became violent against the petitioner and other accused persons, in which the petitioner, in his self defence, may have caused some injury to the injured person. Petitioner has clean antecedent. On these grounds, petitioner seeks to be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. Learned APP for the State submitted that the government property has been put at loss and petitioner doesn't deserve to be released on pre-arrest bail.

6. Considering the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well as, the allegation being general and omnibus against the petitioner. The deficiency on the part of the Electricity Department is evident, as has been admitted in the FIR itself. Petitioner has clean antecedent. I am of the opinion



that petitioner has, *prima facie*, made out a case to be released on pre-arrest bail.

7. The petitioner, above named, is directed to be released on pre-arrest bail, in the event of his/her arrest or surrender before the learned District Court within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned A.C.J.M.-1st, Lakhisarai, in connection with Chanan P.S. Case No. 69 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

8. The learned District Court is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. If any other case is pending against the petitioner as what has been stated in paragraph no. 3, this order will lose its force automatically.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

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

