



\$~69

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

+ **W.P.(C) 15312/2025, CM APPL. 70063/2025 & CM APPL. 15161/2026**

BANTU

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr Pradeep Kataria and Mr. Simranjeet Singh Sethi, Adv.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **Ms Shivangi Goel, Adv. for R-2.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

12.03.2026

1. The petition is for directions to the respondents to de-freeze the petitioner's bank account bearing No. 50100387446291 maintained with respondent no. 2-Bank.
2. According to the petitioner, the aforesaid bank account was frozen pursuant to complaint No. 31612240110429 registered in the Hebbal Police Station, Mysuru, Karnataka and complaint bearing No. 21612240065640 registered in Ranebennur Town Police Station, Haveri, Karnataka.
3. It appears from the reply filed by the bank that the disputed amount is Rs.60. It has also received a No Objection Certificate from one of the Police Stations for de-freezing the account.
4. 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.”

5. It is, thus, seen that there cannot be a blanket or disproportionate freezing of bank accounts particularly where the account holder is neither an accused, nor a suspect in the offence under investigation.

6. Till date, the petitioner's complicity has not surfaced in any of the cases. If the investigating agencies so desire, they shall be at liberty to take appropriate steps in accordance with law. However, the freezing of the petitioner's account, as has been done, is wholly uncalled for.

7. The respondent-bank is, therefore, directed to immediately de-freeze the petitioner's account except to the extent of an amount of Rs.60.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 12, 2026/p