



HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
_A_G_A_R_T_A_L_A_
WP(C)No.325 of 2026

1. Uttam Kumar Nandi, S/o Late Ramani Mohan Nandi, resident of Hapania, Sukanta Palli P.O. ONGC, P.S. Amtali Agartala, West Tripura-799014
.....Petitioner

_V_E_R_S_U_S_

1. State Bank of India, a statutory body constituted under the State Bank of India Act, 1955, Having its Branch office at Agartala Bazar Branch, P.O. & P.S. Agartala, District - West Tripura, Tripura-799001, represented by its Branch Manager.
.....Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. K. Deb, Advocate. Mr. S. Das, Advocate.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. J. Chowdhury, Advocate.

HON'BLE JUSTICE DR. T. AMARNATH GOUD
_F_I_N_A_L_O_R_D_E_R_

21.05.2026

Heard.

[2] The present petition has been filed under Article-226 of the Constitution of India against illegal freezing of bank account of the petitioner without following process of law and further discloses the records forming the basis of such action and to restore operation of the said bank account.

[3] The petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:

- “a) Issue a Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned action of freezing the Petitioner's bank account and upon perusal thereof, be pleased to quash and set aside the said action as being arbitrary, illegal, and violative of the Petitioner's fundamental and constitutional rights;
- b) Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the Respondent bank to forthwith disclose and furnish all records, communications, instructions, FIR, complaint, seizure order, or any material received by it from any authority forming the basis of the freezing of the Petitioner's bank account;
- c) Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondent bank to immediately remove the debit freeze imposed on the Petitioner's bank account and restore full and unrestricted operation thereof, thereby enabling the Petitioner to access and utilize the funds lying in the said account;
- d) In the alternative, direct the Respondent Bank to permit the Petitioner to operate the said bank account, at least to the extent of the amount not directly connected with the alleged complaint or investigation, subject to such conditions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper;



e) Pass an interim order, pending disposal of the present writ petition, directing the respondent bank to permit limited operation of the Petitioner's account for meeting essential expenses and financial obligations, or in the alternative, to keep only such amount under lien as may be alleged to be involved in the complaint.”

[4] The facts in brief are that the petition has been preferred by the petitioner before this Court for arbitrary and illegal action of the respondent bank in freezing the petitioner's bank account without notice, reasons or due process of law.

[5] Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that the arbitrary and unexplained freezing of the petitioner's bank account has caused grave prejudice and severe financial hardship, inasmuch as the petitioner has been deprived of access to his own lawful funds, thereby affecting his ability to meet day-to-day expenses, discharge financial obligations, and carry on his normal financial and personal affairs.

[6] The impugned action of freezing the petitioner's bank account, without any prior notice, intimation, or disclosure of lawful authority, is wholly arbitrary, unreasonable, and violative of the petitioner's fundamental and constitutional rights guaranteed under Articles-14 and 21 of the Constitution of India. The said action also amounts to deprivation of property without authority of law, thereby infringing Article-300A of the Constitution of India. The absence of due process and transparency renders the impugned action illegal and unsustainable in law.

[7] No material has been disclosed by the respondent authority to demonstrate that the alleged seizure or freezing of the petitioner's bank account has been reported to the jurisdictional Magistrate, as mandatorily required under law, and in the absence of such compliance, the impugned action is vitiated and liable to be declared illegal. The impugned action is not supported by any recorded satisfaction or "reason to believe" on the part of the competent authority, nor has any such material been disclosed to the petitioner till date, thereby rendering the action arbitrary, unreasoned, and in violation of the requirement of due application of mind as mandated under law.

[8] In view of above and having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and more particularly, today when the case is called the concerned bank manager was also present and has submitted that they will defreeze the account of



the petitioner by tomorrow and the petitioner could utilize his account without any impediment.

[9] In view of above statement made by the bank manager before this Court, the present petition stands allowed and disposed of. As a sequel, miscellaneous application, pending if any, shall stand closed.

DR. T. AMARNATH GOUD, J

A. Ghosh

ANJAN GHOSH Digitally signed by ANJAN GHOSH
Date: 2026.05.21 18:19:41 +05'30'



सत्यमेव जयते