

THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- II, JAMUI
JITENDRA NARAYAN SARDUL VS. THE STATE OF BIHAR
A.B.A. NO. - 586 Of 2026

ORDER

Present: Sudhir Sinha

11.06.2026

This anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of petitioner **Jitendra Narayn Sardul** in connection with Complaint Case No. 26C/2024, U/s- 406 IPC & 138 N.I Act, the copy of which is served upon the Id. P.P.

The Id. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that no any bail petition has been filed on behalf of petitioner either in this Id. Court or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna except the present one. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent. The petitioner is quite innocent, has committed no offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. Neither the Section 406 IPC nor Section 138 N.I Act is made out against the petitioner. As a matter of fact Jayant Kumar Singh and this complainant and others have formed a group and used to blackmail the innocent person. Jayant Kumar has also filed a complaint case no. 11C/2024 against this petitioner for similar offence. The petitioner neither issued any cheque of Rs. 2,00,000/- nor committed any offence of criminal breach of trust with the Complainant. The petitioner is man of means and there is no chance of his absconding and he is ready to furnish bail bond to the satisfaction of Id. Court. In such view the Id. Counsel prayed to admit the petitioner to anticipatory bail.

The Id. Addl. PP opposed the prayer for bail.

On perusal of the LCR it is clear that the petitioner is named accused. The case of complainant Niraj Kumar Singh is that the accused had a good relationship with Complainant due to which he used to meet him. The accused told the complainant that if he pays Rs. 350,000/-, he would provide him a job in the Agriculture Department within 6 months. On 23.4.2023 then Complainant called Jayant kumar Singh, Sumant Kumar Singh, Pradeep Kumar Singh from the locality and went to his house and gave Rs. 3,50,000/- (three lakh fifty thousand rupees) in cash to accused at his home in the presence of his father and the above witnesses. After six months of payment the accused did not get complainant joined in the Agriculture Department, then complainant asked the accused to return him Rs. 3,50,000/- (three

THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- II, JAMUI
JITENDRA NARAYAN SARDUL VS. THE STATE OF BIHAR

A.B.A. NO. - 586 Of 2026

ORDER

Present: Sudhir Sinha

lakh fifty thousand). On 07.12.2023 the accused gave a cheque of Rs. 200000/- (two lakh rupees) to the complainant, cheque bearing number 567107 of State Bank of India, Gidhaur branch. The Complainant deposited the said cheque in his account no. 372802010998956 in Union Bank of India, Jamui branch on 08.12.2023, which was dishonoured on 11/12/2023 due to insufficient funds. The Id. Magistrate has found no offence u/s-420, 467, 468 of IPC against the petitioner. Prior on the similar allegation against the petitioner by another person in another case, the Id. Sessions Court, Jamui had granted bail to the petitioner as he agreed to repay the amount in installments. This time again he promised to return the amount and in furtherance thereof issued a cheque for Rs. 2,00,000/- which on presentation bounced. The petitioner now has refused to return the money. It is thus clear that the petitioner is habitual offender and had the intention to defraud the Complainant from the very inception of this occurrence. He in the opinion does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Therefore in view of the facts and circumstances of this case having regard to the submission tendered by the parties the A.B.P filed on behalf of the petitioner **Jitendra Narayn Sardul is Rejected.**

Dictated & Corrected

District & Addl. S.J- II, Jamui
11.06.2026