

19-09-2023
Court No.3
Sh/14

**In The High Court At Calcutta
Jalpaiguri Circuit Bench**

WPA 2139 of 2023

**Ramu Rajak.
Vs.
State Bank of India & Ors..**

Mr. Deborshi Dhar.
For the Petitioner.
Mr. Milindo Paul,
Mr. Nabankur Paul,
Mr. Subham Das,
Mr. Abhishek Sarkar.
For the State.

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the action of the respondent bank in freezing the bank account without any prior intimation.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that on enquiry from the bank officials he came to know that the account has been freezed in respect of a complaint lodged by one Shiv Shankar Kumar. It is stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the complainant has withdrawn his complaint and yet the respondents have not defreezed his account.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent bank enters appearance and states that there was a complaint registered by the Cyber Crime Central Portal from the police department on the basis of which the bank had freezed the account of the petitioner.
4. Since the petitioner's account is still lying frozen despite the complaint being withdrawn by one Mr.

Shiv Shankar Kumar the petitioner will be satisfied if his representation in the form of a legal notice is considered.

5. Learned counsel for the bank states that they are ready and willing to give him a personal hearing and pass a speaking order on the legal representation, contents of which shall be treated as a representation, within a period of two weeks from today and the petitioner shall be granted a personal hearing before passing a speaking order.
6. In view of the statement made by the learned counsel appearing for the bank the present writ petition is disposed of in terms of the above directions.
7. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties expeditiously subject to compliance of all requisite formalities.

(GAURANG KANTH,J.)

