

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 5056 of 2025 (Parsa P.S. Case No. 92/2024)**

Uma Shankar Singh & Anr. V/s State of Bihar

**ORDER**

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	24.03.2026	<p>1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor for the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioners-accused, namely, <i>i. Uma Shankar Singh and ii. Pappu Kumar Ray</i>, apprehending their arrest in this Parsa P.S. Case No. 92/2024, registered under Sections 147, 149, 188, 341, 323, 324, 307, 353, 332, 333, 506/34 of the IPC r/w section 3 &amp; 4 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984, pending in the Court of learned ACJM- 9<sup>th</sup>, Saran at Chapra.</p> <p>2. FIR of this case has been registered on the basis of a typed application of the informant, namely, <i>Sunil Kumar, PSI, Parsa P.S.</i>, stating that on 18.03.2024 at about 10:40 A.M., he received an information that a person had died due to electric shock. It was further reported that some individuals had gathered at <i>Daroga Ray Chowk, Parsa Bazar</i>, along with the dead body and were creating a disturbance to public order. Upon receiving this information, the informant along with other police personnel reached the spot. The police party tried to pacify the crowd and asked them not to disturb public peace. However, some persons present there became aggressive, abused the police personnel, assaulted them, and also damaged a police vehicle. During this incident, some police personnel sustained injuries. On the basis of this occurrence, a case was registered against 29 named accused persons including the petitioners-accused and about 40–50 unknown accused persons.</p> <p>3. It is asserted on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused that they are quite innocent, have not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. and have falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty local politics. Next added that no any regular or anticipatory bail petition has been filed or moved on behalf of the petitioners-accused prior to this either in this Court or Hon'ble High Court Patna, in connection with the present case and they got clean antecedent. Next contended that the prosecution story is totally false, baseless and concocted. Next added that there is no specific allegation against the petitioners-accused and they have no concern with this occurrence. Further submitted that some co-accused of this case have already been enlarged on bail by this Court and the</p>	

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 5056 of 2025 (Parsa P.S. Case No. 92/2024)**

Uma Shankar Singh & Anr. V/s State of Bihar

**ORDER**

	<p>Hon'ble High Court, Patna as well. The petitioners-accused are ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioners-accused may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.</p> <p>4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners-accused.</p> <p>5. Heard both the sides and perused the relevant materials available on record. From the same, it appears that the petitioners-accused are in accused in a serious and grave offence involving disturbance of public order, assault on police personnel, and damage to government property. It is further noted that the bail applications of similarly situated co-accused persons, arising out of the same case and based on identical allegations, have already been rejected by the Hon'ble High Court as well as by this Court. The role attributed to the present petitioners-accused is similar in nature, manner, and gravity to that of the co-accused persons whose bail has been denied. Therefore, on the ground of parity alone, the present petitioners-accused are not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.</p> <p>6. Hence, considering the seriousness of the offence, the grounds taken earlier in the ABP orders rejecting the bail applications of the co-accused of this case, and the reasons mentioned herein-above, the petitioners-accused are not entitled to get anticipatory bail. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners-accused, namely, <i>i. Uma Shankar Singh and ii. Pappu Kumar Ray</i>, is hereby <b>rejected</b>.</p> <p>[Dictated]</p> <p><b>(Puneet Kumar Garg),</b> Sessions Judg, Saran 24.03.2026</p>	