

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 7318/2026
CNR: RJHC010816232026 | URN: CRLMP / 12637U / 2026

Dinesh Solanki S/o Bhagwan, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Rup Raj
Int Bhata Aakeli Road Kushalpura Teh Raipur Dist Beawar
Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Public Prosecutor
2. State Bank Of India, Through Its Branch Manager Jodhpur
Road Nimaj Teh Jaitaran Dist Beawar Raj
3. Deputy Inspector General Of Police, Cyber Crime Police
Headquarters Rajasthan

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Mahendra Kumar Dudi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. P.K. Bhati, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP MATHUR
Order

10/08/2026

1. The instant criminal misc. petition under Section 528 BNSS

has been filed by the petitioner seeking the following reliefs:-

- "a) Issue an appropriate order or direction directing the respondents, particularly Respondent No.2 -State Bank Of India Jodhpur Road Nimaj to forthwith de-freeze/remove the debit freeze/hold/restriction imposed upon the petitioner's Current Bank Account No.43092895006, maintained with State Bank Of India, having IFSC Code: SBIN0031318, and permit the petitioner to operate the said account in accordance with law;*
- b) Direct the respondents not to impose any restriction upon the petitioner's future legitimate deposits/credits in the aforesaid bank account except in accordance with law and pursuant to a valid order passed by the competent authority;*
- c) Pass an order declaring that the continued freezing of the petitioner's entire Savings Bank Account No. 43092895006, maintained with State Bank Of India Jodhpur Road Nimaj having IFSC Code: SBIN0031318, without following the due process of law and despite the alleged disputed amount, if any, being identifiable and separable, is arbitrary, illegal and unsustainable in law....."*

2. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case,
this Court deems it just and proper to dispose of this misc.

petition with a direction to the State Bank of India (respondent No.2) to keep the disputed amount (the amount which was transferred illegally in the bank account of the petitioner) frozen and allow the petitioner to make transactions from his bank account from the remaining balance.

3. It is further made clear that in case, the respondent – Bank has not received the information regarding the exact figure of the disputed amount, which the Investigating Officer/Police alleges to be receipt(s) of the offence, the bank shall send a communication to the concerned Investigating Officer/Police, to indicate the amount to be earmarked for lien, while endorsing a copy of the instant order.

4. Upon receipt of such communication/letter, the concerned Investigating Officer/Police shall be under an obligation to apprise the respondent - Bank about the amount to be kept in lien, within a period of seven days of receiving the communication from the respondent - Bank. The respondent – bank shall thereafter do the needful as directed herein above.

5. It is further made clear that in case, the respondent-Bank does not receive any reply from the concerned Investigating Officer/Police, then it shall be duty bound to act in accordance with the instant order.

6. Stay petition as well as all pending application, if any, stand disposed of.

(KULDEEP MATHUR),J