# 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 a/w Mrs. Ayushi Dangre-Tripathi, Adv. for the Petitioner.*
*Mr. A.B. Badar, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1.*
*Mrs. M.P. Kulkarni, Advocate for Respondent No.2.*
*Mr. R.S. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No.3.*

**CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE & NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**
**DATE : 12th FEBRUARY, 2026.**

The argument is that the petitioner is a business correspondent and facilitates financial and banking services, which are regulated by the Reserve Bank of India. Respondent No. 1 has issued a communication dated 14/08/2023 in favour of respondent No.3 – ICICI Bank, directing it to debit freeze the account of the petitioner. The action is taken on the basis of the complaint made by respondent No.2 against one Aniruddha Hoshing. He has allegedly duped respondent No.2 of Rs. 15.00 lakhs by assuring him of good returns.

02. The Investigating Officer, i.e. respondent No.1, during the course of investigation, found that out of Rs. 15.00 lakhs, Rs. 5.00 lakhs was deposited in the account of the petitioner. It is further revealed that Aniruddha Hoshing has duped many persons and the amounts deposited by these persons have been routed through the petitioner's account. Accordingly, respondent No.1 issued the aforesaid communication to respondent No.3.

03. Mr. Aniruddha Hoshing and the co-accused were tried for the offences under Sections 419, 409, 420, 468, 471, 170, 120-B read with

Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and Section 3 of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors (Financial Establishments) Act, 1999 (MPID Act), and vide judgment dated 17/10/2025, Aniruddha Hoshing (Accused No.1) and Meera Fadnis (Accused No.3) were convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 468, 471, 170, 120-B read with Section 34 of the IPC and under Section 3 of the MPID Act.

04. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that during the trial and from the judgment of the trial Court, there is no evidence that these accused had, with the help of the petitioner, diverted the amount for their personal use or that the petitioner is responsible for the alleged fraud in any manner. In other words, it is argued that there is absolutely no evidence against the petitioner of his involvement in the case. Despite such status, the Investigating Officer, i.e. respondent No.2, continued to debit freeze the account

05. We call upon learned A.P.P. to take instructions as to what transpired during the investigation as regards the involvement of the petitioner and to spell out by filing an affidavit, the exact role played by the petitioner and the reasons for continuing to debit freeze the petitioner's account.

06. List on 5th March, 2026.

**(Nivedita P. Mehta, J.)** **(Anil L. Pansare, J.)**

**sandesh*

Signed by: Mr. Sandesh Waghmare
Designation: PS To Honourable Judge
Date: 12/02/2026 16:49:01