

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69885 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2024 Thana- RAHUI District- Nalanda

=====

Amit Kumar, S/O Dilip Mahto, R/O Village- Pahsara, P.S.- Navakothi
(Navkothi), District- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 08-10-2025 Heard Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Dr. Ajeet Kumar, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection
with Rahui P.S. Case No. 85 of 2024 registered for the offence
punishable under Section 136 of the Electricity Act and Sections
411/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 15.02.2024 the
informant received an information from the villagers that three
phase four wire AB cable in Nadi Khanda of Bhenda has been
stolen. When the informant went there he found wire of Sosandi
Khanda and Nadi Khanda stolen by putting off the AB switch
causing loss of Rs. Three lakhs to SBPDCL.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner
that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has



been falsely implicated in the present case. The F.I.R. was lodged against unknown miscreants. During course of investigation, one night guard Binod Kumar was apprehended and he has disclosed the name of this petitioner and others. It has also been submitted that nothing has been recovered from possession of this petitioner rather the recovery has been made from the possession of Binod Kumar. He is in judicial custody since 12.08.2025.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and has submitted that petitioner is having criminal antecedent of eight cases.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. However, petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge in the trial Court itself.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

lata/-

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

