



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1051 OF 2025

Pramod Purushottam Pethe,
aged about 55 years, Occupation – Business,
R/o Lala Oli, Jaganath Subhash Chandra
Bose, Nagar, Kamptee.

.... **PETITIONER**

VERSUS

- 1) HDFC Bank,
through its Branch Manger,
Kamptee, District Nagpur.
- 2) B. Shankarnarayan Reddy,
Aged about 70 years, Occ. - Not Known,
R/o Kothacheruvu, Sri Sathya Sai,
District Andhara Pradesh.
- 3) Ishan Sanjay Khichar,
Aged about 53, Occupation – Business,
R/o Plot No. 200, Bajrang Nagar
Ranala, Kamptee, District Nagpur.
- 4) State of Andhra Pradesh,
through Police Inspector, Kothacheruvu,
Sri Sathya Sai, District Andhra Pradesh.

.... **RESPONDENTS**

Mr. S.S. Rao, Counsel for the petitioner,
Mr. P.G. Newar, Counsel for respondent No.1,
Mr. R.M. Agrawal, Counsel for respondent No.4.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE &
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.

DATE : 07-07-2026

ORAL JUDGMENT : (PER : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)

Heard. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the parties.

Despite service of notices, respondent Nos. 2 and 3 remained absent.

2. As per the case of the petitioner, the petitioner is in the business of jewellery and carried out the business by the firm namely Pramod Jeweller. He is having his Account No. 24521000002873 with the HDFC Bank, Kamptee Branch. He also holds a licence granted by the State Government to the business of selling and purchasing of gold ornaments. On 19-06-2025, respondent No.3 had visited the shop of the petitioner for purchasing golden ornaments such as golden chain 20 grams, golden chain 30 grams and golden pendent 6 grams collectively worth Rs.6,35,572/-. Respondent No.3 was in short of money for the purchase of Rs.6,35,572/-. Therefore, he requested his known person i.e respondent No.2 to remit the amount of Rs.99,901/- to the bank account of the petitioner. That in this way the full payment of the purchase of Rs.6,35,572/- was made by respondent Nos.2 and 3. It is contention of the petitioner that out of Rs.5,70,059/-, an amount of Rs.99,901/- was transferred in the account of the petitioner. It is further contention of the petitioner that he is not involved in any fraudulent dealings. He is not knowing the dealings of respondent Nos.2 and 3. However, respondent No.1 has freezed the account of the petitioner on instructions of respondent No.4. It is submitted that the petitioner was not involved in any illegal activities and, therefore, his account be de-freezed.

3. In response to the notice, learned Counsel for respondent No.1 submitted that by preserving the amount of Rs.1,01,886/- if the petitioner is permitted to use his account by de-freezing the same, respondent No.1 has no objection. As well as it is contention of respondent No.4 also that disputed amount of Rs.1,01,886/- should not be withdrawn by the petitioner and with that he has also no objection to allow the petitioner. Respondent Nos.2 and 3 remained absent despite service.

4. In view of the statements made by the learned Counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 4, which is consented by the petitioner, it would be appropriate to give direction to the petitioner by allowing this petition. Accordingly, we proceed to pass the following order.

(i) Writ Petition is allowed.

(ii) The account of the petitioner is de-freezed on a condition that he shall maintain the amount of Rs.1,01,886/- in the said account and should not be withdrawn the said amount.

5. Rule is made absolute in the above terms.

(Nivedita P. Mehta, J.)

(Urmila Joshi-Phalke, J.)