

**In the Court of District & Add. Sessions Judge-II,
Jhanjharpur.**

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.-241/2026

1. Sushil Jha @ Sushil Kumar Jha aged about 65 years S/o Ram Narayan Jha.
R/o Village- Rahua Sangram, PS- Bheja, District- Madhubani.
2. Ful Kant Jha aged about 58 years S/o- Lakshmi Kant Jha.
R/o Village- Prasad, PS- Madhepur, District- Madhubani.

.....Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Bihar through Additional Public Prosecutor.

.....Opposite Party

Anticipatory Bail Petition Under Section 482 B.N.S.S.

For the petitioner/s	:	Shri Bipin Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the O.P. State	:	Shri. Dev Shankar Jha, APP

O R D E R

Dated:18.04.2026

This anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of the above named petitioners **1. Sushil Jha & 2. Ful Kant Jha**, who are apprehending his arrest in connection with **CR Case No.-253/2022** for the offence **under section 406, 417, 420/34 IPC** which is pending in the court of S.D.J.M, Jhanjharpur is being pressed and heard.

This complaint case has been filed by Rajendra Kumar Jha and he stated that the complainant and the accused no 1 were friends and they were involved in monetary transaction with each other. It is alleged that Sushil Kumar Jha took a monetary help of rupee six lakhs on 27.07.2018 in presence of witness no 2 for purchasing land in Dharbhanga and he promised to return the same within 6 months. It is further alleged that after six months when the complainant asked for his money then the accused Sushil Kumar Jha started making excuses but he returned Rs.11,000/- on 02.09.2019 and Rs. 4,39,000/- through bank after panchayati was held while it was agreed that the remaining amount would be return within 6 months. Further it is alleged in paragraph 7 that in connivance with Ashok Jha and Ramakant Jha, Sushil Kumar Jha fraudulently got complainant's land

bearing old khata no 58 (new-289), khesara no from 1824 to 1829 (new- 2026) and rakba 45 decimal transferred in the name of his late uncle Chiranjeev Jha in haal khatian with intent to capture it for which tension developed between complainant and accused no 1. It is also alleged that on 25.04.2022 when the complainant was returning from his village with Brajesh Prasad Singh, then accused Ashok Jha, Ramakant Jha, Santosh Jha and Fulkant Jha, who were sitting at Laxmipur Chauk, advised the complainant to resolve the dispute and asked him to accompany then to house of the Fulkant Jha. When he reached there then he found that they have got two blank Rs 500 non judicial stamp paper purchased in his name on which his photo was also pasted. It is alleged that they made him put his signature on that paper and when he asked to get signature of Sushil Kumar Jha then Ashok Jha told him that Sushil would put signature on next Sunday when the panchayati is going to be held. Believing him, the complainant returned. On 29.04.2022, the complainant got to know that the accused have inked in false story in the said stamp paper and had prepared an agreement. The complainant obtained a copy of the alleged agreement which is part of the compliant petition. Lastly it is alleged that when asked Bolbam Jha, whose signature was on the said agreement, then Bolbam denied to have signed on any such agreement or having any information about the same. Since the police did not register his compliant, he invoked the jurisdiction of the Court. Hence this case.

Learned counsel for the accused petitioner submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is quite innocent and has not committed any offence whatsoever. There is land dispute, and previous enmities between the father of the complainant, and with the petitioner. That no other regular, or anticipatory bail petition is pending before your Hon'ble Court, or Hon'ble High Court, Patna. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Accordingly, it has been prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the accused petitioner.

Learned APP opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail.

Heard the argument and perused the record. Petitioners do not bear any criminal antecedent. It is apparent from case record that complainant do not have any agreement paper for the money transaction made. From the copies of agreement paper filed, legal notices, document of money suit-3/24 etc it comes out that there is two versions of the case, one told by the complainant, and one which is apparent from the legal notice. Also, prior enmity due to land dispute is a

fact from the order passed by Ld. DCLR in case no-31/12. Even if the complainant story is believed, then there is nothing to show cheating from initiation of the occurrence. All the alleged section are punishable either upto 7 years, or less. In view of these circumstances, the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioners named above is **allowed**. It is hereby ordered that in the event of surrender or arrest before the Court below/concerned police within 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, the petitioners shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below/police subject to the condition under the provision of section 482(2) BNSS.

Dictated
Sd/-

**Add. Sessions Judge-II,
Jhanjharpur**

Memo No...../2026, Dated:.....

Copy forwarded to the court of S.D.J.M, Jhanjharpur for information and needful.

**Add. Sessions Judge-II,
Jhanjharpur**