

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63237 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-25 Year-2024 Thana- PIPRIYA District- Lakhisarai

Ravindra Yadav S/O Nande @ Nandlal Yadav @ Nande Yadav R/O Village-
Dih Pipariya, P.S- Pipariya, Distt.- Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Managing Director, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Patna.
Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Parmanand Pd. Nr. Sahi, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Nawal Kishore Prasad, APP
For the SBPDCL	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

7 01-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no.
2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Pipriya P.S. Case no.25 of 2024 registered under section
135 of the Electricity Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he has
committed theft of electricity as total sanctioned load is only 8
KW and hence, the petitioner has caused a loss to the State
exchequer to the tune of Rs. 4,58,340/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a poor man, who has been falsely implicated in the



case and as a matter of fact no inspection and assessment has been carried out on his premises and to support his said statement he relies upon F.I.R which has been lodged by the same informant on 13.03.2024 which is said to be the date of inspection stating therein that the petitioner did not allow him to conduct the inspection. However, on the following day i.e. on 14.03.2025 the present F.I.R was filed showing the inspection was done and the electricity theft was found to be done by the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that he has been regularly paying electricity bills and it is only a matter of dispute with regard to the load of electricity.

5. The application for anticipatory bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 submits that the F.I.R clearly indicates that the petitioner is committing theft of electricity and caused loss to the State exchequer.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner in order to show his *bona fide* has agreed to pay an amount of Rs. 50,000/- in the name of SBPCL and the same will be deposited in the Office of the said company before furnishing bail bonds.

7. Considering the nature of allegation made in the F.I.R, as well as, the offence being compoundable, the petitioner



above named, is directed to be released on pre-arrest bail, for availing the remedy as contained in Section 152 of the Electricity Act, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks, in connection with Pipriya P.S. Case no.25 of 2024 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 Chief Judicial Magistrate, Lakhisarai, subject to the condition laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S, 2023.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

harsh/-

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

