



\$~107

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 17687/2024 & CM APPL. 75289-75290/2024**
S SETHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar, Mr. Dayan Krishnan,
Mr. Mohit Mathur, Mr. Abhijat, Sr.
Advocates along with Mr. Abhimanyu
Mahajan, Ms. Niyati Kohli, Mr. Sukrit
Seth, Mr. Sumeet Seth, Ms.
Neelampreet and Mr. Abhiroop
Rathore, Advocates.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY MINISTRY OF
HOME AFFAIRS & ORS.**Respondent

Through: Mr. Shashank Bajpai, CGSC with Mr.
Jitendra Kumar Tripathi, GP.
Mr. Harsh Sinha with Ms. Ruchika,
Advocates for R-2.
Ms. Nidhi Jaswal with Mr. Rustam
Singh Chauhan, Advocates for R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

% **04.03.2025**

1. Learned Senior Counsel for petitioner submits that, though, the petitioner was earlier aggrieved by action of the respondent Bank whereby the entire savings bank account of the petitioner was *frozen*, however, it was subsequently apprised that, presently, only a lien of Rs. 1,00,000/- has been marked and such savings account is no longer under any kind of restraint.
2. Learned counsel for respondent Bank i.e. Yes Bank, appears and reiterates that, as per the instructions which the bank had received from the concerned Investigating Agency, the lien is with respect to the alleged

W.P.(C) 17687/2024

1



disputed amount of Rs. 1,00,000/-, and the petitioner, leaving aside the sum of Rs. 1,00,000/-, is free to use his above said saving account in any manner whatsoever.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.4/State of Rajasthan also confirms that the lien is only with respect to a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/-

4. Viewed thus, learned Senior Counsel for petitioner, on instructions, submits that the petitioner is left with no further grievance in the matter and the petition may be disposed of. He, however, seeks liberty to approach the Court, in case, need so arises.

5. In view of the aforesaid terms, petition stands disposed of. Liberty, as prayed, is granted.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MARCH 4, 2025/sw/pb