

6 Cr Rev / 62/2026

Axis Bank Limited Vs. The state of Delhi

00000/0

(Cyber Cell)

06.07.2026

Present: Sh. Dhruv Godara, Ld. Counsel for revisionist.
Ms. Parul Singh, Ld. Addl. PP for the State/respondent.

Record perused.

This is a revision petition filed by the revisionist Bank assailing the impugned order dated 12.09.2025 passed by Ld. Link CJM Court, NE, KKD Courts, whereby an application filed on behalf of the applicant in miscellaneous Crl. 1056/25 titled as “State (Punish Kumar) Vs. Unknown” Cyber Police Station, North East, seeking directions to the IO to release the seized amount of Rs. 5 lacs to the applicant of the said case was allowed by the Ld. Trial Court and consequently directions were also issued to multiple Banks including revision petitioner to release an amount of Rs. 1 lac from one account number 922020050959975 to Bank account number 26400100028751 maintained with Bank of Baroda pertaining to the applicant/victim of the abovesaid case.

The revision petition is also accompanied with an application u/s 5 of the Limitation Act, seeking condonation of delay in filing the present criminal revision petition as there is stated to be delay of 240 days in filing of the present revision petition.

At the on set it is relevant to mention that the application of the revisionist filed u/s 5 of Limitation Act does not discloses the single justifiable reason for the delay in the filing of the present revision

petition. In fact, there is no averments on this aspect as to what prevented the revisionist from filing the revision petition after it came to the knowledge of passing of the impugned order. From the averments of made in the application it appears that the revisionist had come to the knowledge of passing of the impugned order on the day of the order itself, however, no efforts were taken to immediately file the revision petition within the limitation period.

It is also relevant to note here that during the course of inquiry when it was inquired from the Ld. Counsel for the revisionist that when as per the own averments of the revisionist that though there is a lien amount of Rs. 23,79,67,750.1/- against total balance amount of Rs. 17,44,15,200.7/- in the concerned bank account no. 922020050959975 maintained with the revisionist Bank and the release orders passed for the release of sums against the said bank accounts have also been received only upto Rs. 11,25,533/-, what is the difficulty with the revisionist bank to release the amount of Rs. 1 lac as was directed by the Ld. Trial Court vide the impugned order in favour of the victim, the Ld. Counsel for revisionist is unable to provide any satisfactory reply and simply asserted that the impugned order is bad in law for non joinder of the revisionist bank as a party.

Hence, considering the abovesaid, since the revision petition of the petitioner is itself time barred and no valid or justifiable ground is shown in the application filed alongwith the revision petition u/s 5 of the Limitation Act for delay in the filing of the revision petition, the court is not inclined to condone the delay and also does deem it fit to issue notice of the said application to the opposite party.

Accordingly, the application of the revisionist seeking

condonation of delay being devoid of any merits stands dismissed.

Consequently, the main revision petition of the revisionist also stands dismissed being barred by limitation.

Copy of order be given Dasti on request.

File be consigned to record room.

(BALWINDER SINGH)
ASJ (FTC)/North-
East/KKD Courts/
Delhi/06.07.2026