



\$~88

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2039/2026**

VIPIN BATRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rohit Singh and Mr. Jasmine
Kerai, Advocates.

versus

**STATE OF TELANGANA THROUGH SHO JAGTIAL RURAL PS
TELANGANA AND OTHERS**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Akshay Gola for Respondent no.
2/ IndusInd Bank.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **18.03.2026**

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

“a) Kindly issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent No.1 to withdraw the instructions issued for freezing of the Petitioner’s bank account bearing No. 100037753202; b) Kindly direct Respondent No.2 to restore normal debit operations in the Petitioner’s aforesaid bank account; c) Kindly direct the Respondent No.1 to restrict the freeze/lien only to the disputed amount of Rs.11,822/- and permit operation of the remaining balance; d) Kindly pass interim and/or final orders as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit to protect the Petitioner’s right to livelihood and property; e) Kindly pass any other or further order(s) in the interest of justice.”

2. It appears from the reply filed by the respondent no. 2-Bank that on account of one transaction for Rs. 11,822/-, the petitioner’s account has been frozen.

3. Such an action is completely *de hors* the provisions of Bharatiya



Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and the applicable Standard Operating Procedure (SoPs).

4. The respondent no.2-Bank ought not to have freezed the entire account of the petitioner without being oblivious of the fact that the total dispute was with respect to Rs. 11,822/-.

5. The Court in the case of ***Malabar Gold and Diamond Limited & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.*** in W.P.(C) 4198/2025 dated 16.01.2025 has held as under:

“19. In light of these provisions, it is also pertinent to note that any blanket or disproportionate freezing of bank accounts, particularly where the account holder is neither an accused nor even a suspect in the offence under investigation, is manifestly arbitrary, and in the teeth of the fundamental rights under Article 19(1)(g) and 21 and of the Constitution of India, which encompass the right to livelihood and freedom to carry on trade and business. Such indiscriminate debit freezing, without any finding of complicity, has the inevitable effect of paralysing the day-to-day business operations of an otherwise innocent entity, resulting in loss of commercial goodwill and financial consequences, thereby subjecting a non-complicit account holder to punitive consequences.”

6. The Court, therefore, directs the respondent no.2/ Bank to defreeze the petitioner's account except to extent of Rs. 11,822. However, the lien of the said amount of Rs. 11,822/- shall remain subject to further action to be taken by the concerned Police Station.

7. With the aforesaid directions, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 18, 2026

aks