



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3521]

MONDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 7387/2026

Between:

VELUGURI PRAVEEN KUMAR, S/O. VENKATESWARULU, AGED
ABOUT 26 YEARS, R/O. D.NO. 7-132, GANDHI BAZAR, MARKAPUR
TOWN AND MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT, AP-523316.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPLE SECRETARY, HOME
DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, AP-
522238.
2. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, APSP BATTALIAN ROAD,
MANGALAGIRI, ANDHRA PRADESH- 522503.
3. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, MARKAPUR POLICE STATION,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT, AP-523316.
4. ICICI BANK, REP. BY ITS MANAGER, 309B, LAKSHMI NIVASAM,
OPP. LIC OFFICE, CUMBUM ROAD, PRAKASAM TOWN MANDAL,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT, AP-523001.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

YANAGUNURU SHASHANK

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR HOME
2. KUNUKU RAJA SEKHAR

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:-

“...to issue any writ or order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in declaring the action of the respondents in freezing the petitioners bank vide Account No 395101002144 in ICICI Bank of Markapur Branch Prakasam District maintained with the 4THrespondent bank without registration of any crime and without following due process of law as illegal and arbitrary and consequently direct the respondents to defreeze the said bank account vide Account No 395101002144 in ICICI Bank of Markapur Branch Prakasam District and pass...”

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home, and the learned counsel for Respondent No.4. Perused the record.

3. The Respondent No.4/Bank is present.

4. Mr. Yanagunuru Shashank, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that without any express orders from the jurisdictional Magistrate, the account of the petitioner bearing No. 395101002144 in ICICI Bank, Markapur Branch, Prakasam District, has been frozen.

5. Sri Kunuku Raja Sekhar, learned counsel for Respondent No.4, submits that as per the NCRP Portal and the instructions given by the Station House Officer, Ranchi, the account of the petitioner was frozen, as certain suspicious transactions were noticed in the account. At present, an amount of Rs.4,85,480/- has been identified as suspicious,

and therefore, instructions were issued to freeze the account and place a lien on the said amount.

6. Sri P. Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on instructions, submits that the account of the petitioner was frozen based on the instructions received through the NCRP Portal and Ranchi Police, and that the local police have no role in the said transactions or the freezing of the account.

7. Be that as it may, even the police, under Section 94 of 'the BNSS', or by mere communication, cannot direct the freezing or defreezing of the petitioner's account. However, the police are at liberty to approach the jurisdictional Magistrate by filing an appropriate application under Section 106 of 'the BNSS' seeking orders with regard to the account, if there are any suspicious transactions.

8. This Court has analyzed this issue in detail in **Blue Sea Ventures LLP., v. State of A.P.**,¹ while referring to the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Shento Varghese v. Julfikar Husen**², **Headstar Global (P) Ltd. v. State of Kerala**³, **Malabar Gold & Diamond Ltd. v. Union of India**⁴, **State of Maharashtra v. Tapas D. Neogy**⁵, and **Radha Krishan**

¹ W.P.No.5034 of 2026, dated 31.03.2026

²(2024) 7 SCC 23

³2025 SCC OnLine Ker 3546

⁴2026 SCC OnLine Del 297

⁵(1999) 7 SCC 685

Industries v. State of H.P⁶, and held that the police have no jurisdiction to request or direct the bank to freeze the account of any person merely on the ground of suspicious transactions under Section 94 of 'the BNSS'.

9. Having regard to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, and in view of the law laid down, this Writ Petition is disposed of directing the Respondent No.4 to defreeze the petitioner's account, enabling the petitioner to operate the same. However, Respondent No.4 shall maintain a lien on the amount of Rs.4,85,480/- until appropriate orders are passed by the learned jurisdictional Magistrate in accordance with law.

10. With the above observations and directions, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

Dr.Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J.

Date: 27.04.2026
RSI

⁶(2021) 6 SCC 771

115

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 7387 of 2026

Date: 27.04.2026
RSI