

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.1564 of 2026.

Dhiraj @ Dhiraj Kumar **Petitioner.**

Versus

The State of Bihar

**Order
No.**

Date

O R D E R

11 30-05-2026

1. The **petitioner, Dhiraj @ Dhiraj Kumar**, seeks anticipatory bail in connection with ***Gandhi Maidan P.S. Case No. 52 of 2026***, registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 338 read with 3(5) of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS)*.
2. Heard Sri Baijnath Sah, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Rajesh Kumar, learned Public Prosecutor for the State.
3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informants **Nitin Ranjan, Kumar Ujjwal, Jai Vardhan Srivastava, Nishit Kumar, and Jyoti Mishra**, all residents of Patna, were induced by co-accused **Rahul Kalra**, Managing Director of *Rondella Laundromat Pvt. Ltd.* (operating under the brand "*Washing Xpress*"), along with his associates including **Achin Kalra, Anil Kalra, Ruchika Prakash Kalra, Ranjit Kumar Jha, Prem Kumar Singh, Rakesh Upadhyay, Kamal Kishore Prasad, Usha Prasad, petitioner Dheeraj Kumar (new director)**, and others. The accused allegedly persuaded the informants to invest in the franchise and expansion of *Washing Xpress* by making false assurances of profitable returns. Relying on these representations, the informants entered into agreements and collectively paid approximately **Rs. 1,85,76,000/-**. It is alleged that the accused, acting in conspiracy, misappropriated the funds and subsequently sold the business to **Dheeraj Kumar** without informing the investors. When the informants demanded repayment, the accused avoided them, gave false assurances, switched off their phones, and absconded from their office. The informants firmly believe that the accused have committed cheating and criminal breach of trust with no intention of returning the money.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the primary

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.1564 of 2026.

**Contd...
30-05-2026**

allegations are directed against co-accused Rahul Kalra, who is said to have received the funds. It is next submitted that the petitioner is the New Managing Director of the company and he has been falsely implicated. Moreover, the petitioner has clean criminal antecedent.

5. The Learned Public Prosecutor opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail, contending that the offence was committed in an organized manner and that the petitioner, along with other co-accused, defrauded several persons. It is further submitted that witnesses have corroborated the prosecution's case, the investigation is going on, and the charge sheet has yet to be filed. Hence, the petitioner does not merit the grant of anticipatory bail.
6. Considering the above facts and circumstances; the nature and gravity of the offence, the severity of punishment upon conviction; the organized manner in which the offence was allegedly committed; and the fact that the investigation is still in progress with the charge sheet pending, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the application stands ***rejected***.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Rupesh Deo)

Sessions Judge, Patna

Date of Order	30-05-2026
Date of Reserving Order	26-05-2026
Uploading Date	30-05-2026
Uploaded by	Amjad/-