

OD - 1

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
ORIGINAL SIDE

WPO/166/2026
M/S. HARI RAM MOHANLAL
VS
UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

BEFORE :
THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA
Date : 10th June, 2026

Appearance :
Mr. Pratip Mukherjee, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Arpit Agarwal, Adv.
..for petitioner.

Mr. Anuj Singh, Adv.
Ms. Trinisha De, Adv.
Ms. Rupal Singh, Adv.
Ms. Anukriti Poddar, Adv.
Mr. Parichay Pathak, Adv.
Mr. Shivam Chaturvedi, Adv.
Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Adv.
...for respondent no.6.

Mr. A. Sarkar, Adv.
...for respondent no.5.

1. Matter is heard in presence of the learned Advocates representing the petitioner and the respondent nos.5 & 6. However, in spite of repeated notices, Inspector of Police, Cyber Crime Police Station, Disha Mahila PS, Yendada, Visakhapatnam City, Andhra Pradesh, is not represented.
2. Grievance of the petitioner is based on an email letter dated 29th November, 2025, which is at page 30 of the writ petition, the bank account

of the petitioner lying with Karur Vysya Bank Limited, N.S. Road Branch, Kolkata was debit frozen. As a result whereof, the petitioner till date has not been able to operate the said bank account. The petitioner prays for direction which would enable the petitioner to operate the account.

3. Finding no representation on behalf of the investigating agency, this Court by passing an order dated 20th May, 2026, directed the bank authority to make communications with the investigating agency to ascertain reasons behind debit freezing account of the petitioner. Pursuant thereto, learned Advocate representing Karur Vysya Bank being respondent no.6 has placed before this Court a letter dated 29th May, 2026 whereby request was made to the concerned investigating agency for disclosing the particulars of amount in petitioner's account linked to alleged fraudulent transaction. It is submitted on behalf of the respondent no.6 that there is no response from the investigating agency. Copy of the letter dated 29th May, 2026 is taken on record.
4. As there is no representation on behalf of the investigating agency, in spite of repeated notices, before this Court and it is found that the petitioner based on email dated 29th November, 2025 has not been able to operate its account, the respondent no.6 is directed to permit the petitioner to operate the account. However, it is made clear that if there is intimation on behalf of the investigating agency disclosing the amount involved in connection

with the account of the petitioner in fraudulent transaction, effort shall be made by the respondent no.6 for keeping the said amount as lien.

5. Writ petition stands disposed of.
6. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties subject to compliance with all requisite formalities.

(SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA, J.)

sd/