



\$~88

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

+ W.P.(C) 18954/2025 and CM APPL. 78897/2025

ANIL SONI PROPRIETOR OF
M/S DEEPALI JEWELLER

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Counsel (*appearance not given*).

versus

UNION OF INDIA MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar SPC With Mr.
Sunil, Adv for R-1/ UOI.
Mr. Shashank Manish, Ms. Nidhi
Sahay, Mr. Shubham Ranjan and Mr.
Ritansh Kumar Nand, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

21.01.2026

1. This matter was called out on 05.12.2025 and the Court directed for issuance of notice to the respondents.
2. On 15.01.2026, again the matter was called out and on the request of the respondent no.2, the time was extended to take instructions.
3. Till date, no reply is filed. The respondents have not justified their action of freezing the account of the petitioner. The case of the petitioner is that he operates bank account with respondent no.2-Bank since 12.06.2021. He submits that without any intimation to the petitioner and to its utter shock and surprise, on 11.11.2025, the account was freezed.



4. It appears that on 12.11.2025, an e-mail was triggered to the petitioner stating therein that the some activity was noticed which does not match with the usual transactions, and accordingly, the action was taken.
5. The petitioner was also asked to complete the Know Your Customer (KYC) formalities which are stated to have been complied with. Despite the aforesaid, the steps were not taken by the respondents to de-freeze or to remove the blocking.
6. The Court has considered the aspect of continued freezing of the Bank Account of individual in a writ petition bearing no. W. P. (C) 4198/2025, and the provisions of Section 106 and 107 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 have been considered.
7. In the instant case as well, the Court finds that there is no justification shown by the respondents as to why the petitioner's account should continue to remain blocked. If any Investigating Authority or Enforcement Agency is in possession of any material against the petitioner, the said agency is free to take action strictly in accordance with law.
8. Till date, the petitioner's complicity has not surfaced in any of such pending investigation. The indefinite and unreasoned freezing of the petitioner's account is bound to cause prejudice.
9. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it is directed that the respondent no.2 to immediately revoke the freezing order and to de-freeze the petitioner's account forthwith.
10. It is clarified that if any investigating agency or enforcement agency proposes to initiate or conduct an investigation against the petitioner, it shall be liberty to do so in accordance with the provisions of the relevant statute. The petitioner also undertakes to cooperate.



11. The petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

JANUARY 21, 2026

aks/ap