

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68400 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-136 Year-2025 Thana- PARASBIGHA District- Jehanabad

Shailendra Kumar, son of late Sukhdeo Prasad, R/O Village- Shyam Nagar,
Kutiyapar, P.S- Jehanabad, Distt.- Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 08-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, apprehending his arrest,
in connection with Parasbigha P.S. Case No. 136 of 2025, dated
17.06.2025 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 105 and 3(5) of B.N.S. 2023.

3. As per allegation, the husband of the informant was
got electrocuted while he was working as a Mason during
construction of the house of the petitioner. It is further alleged
that electric connection was taken illegally and the deceased got
the current while he was working in the house of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case. He further submits that there is delay of 19 days in lodging
the FIR. He also submits that the electric wire was outside the



house.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one in the instant case.

6. It has further been stated in paragraph no.3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

7. However, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the Petitioner for bail submitting that in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioner is imputed with the knowledge that anybody who comes in the touch of this electricity, will get killed, and despite such knowledge, he has not taken precautionary measures to protect the worker/labourer working in the construction of the house to protect the life of innocent persons. Hence, it is a case of murder and this is not a fit case of anticipatory bail.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

9. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

S.Ali/-

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

