



\$~82

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 2352/2026**

VENUS EDUCATION TRUST& ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. V. K. Pandey with Mr. Abhigyan,
Mr. Murari Tiwari, Mr. Chaitanya
Sharma and Mr. Akash Pandey,
Advocates.

versus

**STATE THROUGH JOINT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE TECH,
CYBER AND LICENSING & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shubhi Gupta, APP for the State
with SI Shankar, P.S.: Dwarka South.
Mr. Jogender Kumar, Advocate for
R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **30.03.2026**

CRL.M.A. 9544/2026

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

CRL.M.C. 2352/2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 ('BNSS'), the petitioners *inter-alia* seek quashing of an *acknowledgment* registered on the Cyber Portal of the Delhi Police.

2. Mr. V. K. Pandey, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits, that the money that is subject matter of the complaint made on the cyber portal, was remitted by the complainant (respondent No.4) voluntarily and willingly to petitioner No. 1, in connection with a memorandum of understanding that the parties were negotiating.



3. Counsel further submits, that having voluntarily remitted money to the bank account of petitioner No.1, respondent No.4 subsequently appears to have had second thoughts, which may, at worst, be the subject matter of a civil dispute between the parties.
4. Mr. Pandey argues however, that by reason of the acknowledgment generated on the cyber portal, communication was sent to petitioner No.1's bank, which has led to the freezing of petitioner No.1's bank account, leading to serious financial and other consequences upon the petitioners.
5. Ms. Shubhi Gupta, learned APP appears on behalf of the State; and Mr. Jogender Kumar, learned counsel appears for respondent No.4, on advance copy.
6. On instructions of the Investigating Officer who is present in court, Ms.Gupta submits that the cyber cell of the Delhi Police has not registered any FIR pursuant to the complaint received on the cyber portal; and considering the complaint made, they have transferred the matter to P.S.: Dwarka, South, Delhi, for necessary action.
7. Learned counsel for the complainant clarifies, that it is not that petitioner No.1's account has been frozen, but a 'debit freeze' to the extent of Rs.05 lacs has been placed on the account, thereby creating a lien on the account to that extent.
8. Learned APP submits, that in fact it was found that petitioner No.1's account did not even have Rs.05 lacs, but only Rs.2 lacs, over which the lien has been placed.
9. Learned APP also informs that court that the petitioners have sought revocation of the debit freeze/lien on their account by way of a separate



application filed before the learned JMFC, which application is still pending in that court and is listed next on 06.05.2026.

10. It is evident therefore, that the petitioners have invoked a remedy before the learned JFMC, where the petitioners' grievance is presently under consideration.
11. In view of the above circumstances, this court is *not inclined* to entertain the present petition in its inherent jurisdiction.
12. The petition is accordingly disposed-of, granting to the petitioners liberty to avail all other remedies, as may be available to them, in accordance with law. It is made clear that this court has not expressed any view on the merits of the matter.
13. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MARCH 30, 2026

ds