

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.3583 of 2025

Baldeo Yadav @ Baldev Singh Yadav, S/o Late Gokul Gope.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. Assistant Electrical Engineer (Vidhyut Apurti Awar Pramandal)
Electric Supply Sub-Division, P.O. Kathara, P.S. Gomia, District
Bokaro.

... ... Opposite Parties

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Atanu Banerjee, Advocate
Mr. Aditya Banerjee, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Kaushik Sarkhel, Advocate
Mr. P.A.S. Pati, Advocate

03/ 10.07.2025

Heard the parties.

- 2.** This anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been preferred by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Bokaro Thermal P.S. Case No.24 of 2025, for offence under Section 135 of the Indian Electricity Amendment Act, 2003. The case is presently pending before the Court of learned Additional District Judge-II, Bermo at Tenughat.
- 3.** There is an allegation against this petitioner that he was unauthorizedly drawing electricity without authority for using the same in his eight-roomed house.
- 4.** Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is absolutely false as the transformer of the area was malfunctioned and the petitioner had obtained electricity from the Central Coalfields Limited, as he is a displaced *raiyat* living in the radius of CCL area. The petitioner

denies that the petitioner was drawing the electricity without there being any connection.

5. Mr. Kaushik Sarkhel, learned counsel representing the JUVNL, submits that wayback in the year 2017, the electricity connection of the petitioner was disconnected but in spite of the said disconnection the petitioner was illegally drawing electricity from the power supply of the JUVNL and was enjoying the same illegally. Thus, the JUVNL has assessed the loss to be Rs.1,05,120/- for the entire period.

6. When the matter was heard earlier, this Court put a specific question to the petitioner as to whether he is agreeable to pay the fine amount without being prejudiced to this case.

7. Today, when the matter has been listed, learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not in a position to pay the amount. Thus, I am hearing the case on merits. On merits, I find that the allegation against this petitioner is of drawing energy illegally, more so, when his authorized connection was already disconnected in the year 2017.

8. Considering the aforesaid fact, I am not in favour of granting anticipatory bail to this petitioner.

9. Accordingly, this Anticipatory Bail Application stands **dismissed.**

10. If the petitioner appears before the Court concerned, his case will be considered on its own merits without being prejudiced by the order of dismissal passed by this Court.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)