



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-06-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

**WP No. 1362 of 2024
and WMP No. 37190 of 2024**

TRI ESERV

Rep. By Its Proprietor,
Anandu S.Nair,
No.22/97, Veda Ranga Nivas,
Dr.Ambedkar Road,
4th Avenue Ashok Nagar, Chennai 24.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Of Tamilnadu Rep. By Its
Inspector Of Police,
Kodambakkam Police Station,
Kodambakkam, Chennai.

2.Reserve Bank Of India
16th Floor, Central Office Building,
Shahid Bhagat Singh Marg,
Mumbai 400001.

3.ICICI Bank
Rep. By Its Branch Manager,
Kodambakkam Branch,
Kodambakkam, Chennai.

Respondent(s)



PRAYER Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, directing the 3rd respondent to De Freeze the Account and allow the petitioner herein to operate the Account.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Muthu Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam
Government Advocate (Criminal
Side) for R1
Mr.C.Mohan
Ms.A.Rexy Josephine Mary for
M/s.King and Partridge for R2
Mr.Akash Srinanda for R3

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for a direction to the 3rd respondent to defreeze the bank account of the petitioner and allow the petitioner to operate the account.

2.Heard Mr.S.Muthukumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing on behalf of the 1st respondent, Mr.C.Mohan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 2nd respondent and Mr.Akash Srinanda, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 3rd respondent.



3. The writ petition has been filed on the premise that the 3rd respondent Bank has frozen the bank account based on the directions given by the 1st respondent.

4. The learned Government Advocate appearing on behalf of the 1st respondent submitted that the 1st respondent did not issue any directions to the 3rd respondent to freeze the bank account of the petitioner. However, in order to understand the source based on which such freezing of bank account was done by the 3rd respondent, a communication was made to the 3rd respondent Bank. The 3rd respondent Bank in their letter dated 14.02.2025, informed the 1st respondent that nearly five complaints were received from various States based on which such freezing of bank account was done.

5. On receipt of the communication from the 3rd respondent Bank, the 1st respondent took efforts to see the source from which such complaints emanated. The particulars collected by the 1st respondent shows that the complaints have emanated from Andhra Pradesh, Punjab and Chhattisgarh and it seems that



various complaints have been given against the petitioner which resulted in such freezing of the Bank account in the 3rd respondent Bank.

6.In the light of the above details that were furnished before this Court, the relief as sought for by the petitioner cannot be granted by this Court, since the 1st respondent was not responsible for the freezing of the Bank account before the 3rd respondent. There is a wider ramification in this case which has not been explained in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition.

7.Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed. No Costs.
Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

03-06-2025

Index:Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet:Yes
Neutral Citation:Yes/No
ssr



To
WEB COPY

1. The Inspector Of Police
Kodambakkam Police Station,
Kodambakkam, Chennai.
2. Reserve Bank Of India
16th Floor, Central Office Building,
Shahid Bhagat Singh Marg,
Mumbai 400001.
3. The Branch Manager,
ICICI Bank
Kodambakkam Branch,
Kodambakkam, Chennai.



WEB COPY

6/6

WP No. 1362 of 2



N.ANAND VENKATESH J.

SSR

WP No. 1362 of 2024

03-06-2025