



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR**

**Criminal Writ Petition No.1048 of 2025**

*M/s. Soul Communications Pvt. Ltd.*

vs.

*State of Maharashtra, through Officer-In-Charge, Police Station Ranapratap Nagar,  
Nagpur and others*

-----  
*Office notes, Office Memoranda of  
Coram, appearances, Court's orders  
or directions and Registrar's orders.*

*Court's or Judge's Orders*

-----  
*Mr. Abhishek Kumar Tripathi, Advocate for the Petitioner.  
Mrs. Ritu Sharma, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1/State.  
Ms. S.K. Phaltankar, Advocate for Respondent No.2.*

**CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE & NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

**DATE : 27<sup>th</sup> JANUARY, 2026.**

The learned A.P.P. and the learned Counsel appearing for respondent No.2/informant seek time to file reply.

02. Time, as sought, is granted.

03. The learned A.P.P. shall in reply explain as to why the account of the petitioner is not defreezed despite the trial Court having concluded the trial without passing any order against the petitioner. In other words, it appears that the judgment of the trial Court does not speak of the petitioner receiving the sale proceeds of crime.

04. The question is, why the accounts should continue to remain debit-freezed after the trial Court has come to certain conclusion, which in a way exonerate the petitioner of having received the proceeds of crime. The affidavit of the respondents shall speak about the role of the petitioner in the light of the judgment of the trial Court and the reasons for continuing to debit freeze the account. If we find that the account of the petitioner is continued to be debit-freezed for no valid reason, we may consider to compensate the petitioner.

05. List in the week commencing from 9<sup>th</sup> February, 20-26.
06. The Commissioner of Police, Nagpur shall ensure that the petitioner No.3 is duly served.

*\*sandesh*  
(Nivedita P. Mehta, J.)

(Anil L. Pansare, J.)