



\$~123

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 3844/2025**

MANGE PHOOL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Adesh Kumar and Mr. Amit
Kumar, Advocates.

Versus

UNION BANK OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Rout, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Dharna Veragi and Mr. B.N.
Mishra, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **13.05.2025**

CM APPL. 28864/2025

1. The present application has been filed by the applicant/petitioner seeking early hearing of the writ petition.
2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed.
3. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 3844/2025

4. With the consent of the counsel for the parties, present petition is taken up for consideration.
5. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking the following reliefs:

*“a) Pass Writs, Orders And/or directions In the nature of
Mandamus/some other appropriate Writ for directing the*



respondent bank to unfreeze/unblock saving bank account bearing No. 520101244358067 with Union Bank of India in its branch, D-1, Ground Floor, Opp. Balaji Mandir, Vivek Vihar Delhi-110095”

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner had taken a loan of Rs.7 Lacs from HDB Financial Services. The loan was repaid by the petitioner, but there were some periodic defaults.
7. He submits that HDB Financial Services had invoked an arbitration clause and moved an application under Section 17 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The learned Arbitrator *vide* interim order dated 11.11.2024 had passed a direction to the respondent Bank not to permit any withdrawal from the salary account of the petitioner. Accordingly, the respondent Bank debit froze the account of the petitioner.
8. He submits that petitioner thereafter cleared the entire outstanding of the HDB Financial Services. However, the account was not defrozeed. He further submits that even the petitioner moved an application before the learned Arbitrator and he has also directed for the defrozeing of his account.
9. He contends that despite said order of the learned Arbitrator, the respondent Bank is insisting that petitioner should obtain an order of the Court.
10. Mr. Santosh Kumar Rout, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent/Union Bank of India submits that he has instructions to state that the Bank will defroze the account of the petitioner, in case the petitioner furnishes a copy of the order of the learned Arbitrator directing the Bank to defroze the account and further if the petitioner gives an undertaking that there is no restraint order from any other Court.
11. In view of the above, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



petitioner submits that he will furnish the order of the learned Arbitrator as well as give an undertaking. In the event of petitioner doing the needful, as stated, the Bank is directed to defreeze the account of the petitioner within a period of one week.

12. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.
13. The date fixed in the matter i.e. 23.07.2025 stands cancelled.
14. A Copy of this order be given *dasti* under Signature of Court Master.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

MAY 13, 2025/jg