



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11875 of 2025

Aniket Kashyap, S/o Ranjeet Kumar Sinha, Resident of - Thana Road,
Jehanabad, P.O.-Jehanabad, District-Jehanabad-804408.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Reserve Bank of India through its Regional Director, South Gandhi Maidan, Patna-800001.
2. The Chief Managing Director, Bandhan Bank, Salt Lake City, Kolkata.
3. The Branch Manager, Bandhan Bank Ltd., Jehanabad Branch, Patna Gaya Road, District-Jehanabad, Bihar-804408.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pulkit Ranjan, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Dayanand Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY
ORAL ORDER

3 14-10-2025 Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following relief(s):-

“a. The issuance of a writ of *Certiorari* for quashing the arbitrary and illegal uncommunicated order of respondent bank in freezing the bank account of the petitioner without any prior notice or opportunity of hearing, being violative of the principles of natural justice and the Petitioner's fundamental rights.

b. The issuance of a writ of *Mandamus* directing respondent bank to unfreeze the bank account of the petitioner and permit him to operate and use the said account without any obstruction or





hindrance, pending the final disposal of this writ application.”

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the respondent-Bank has frozen the Account No. 50180009712270 with Bandhan Bank, Jehanabad Branch, Jehanabad of the petitioner solely on the basis of a communication received from cyber cell.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that the authority has frozen the account of the petitioner without any legal basis and there is absolutely no involvement of the petitioner in any of the cyber crimes. Further, it is stated that the details of the crime has not been shared with the petitioner and the authority has frozen the account of the petitioner. Learned counsel has further stated that the respondent authority till date has not communicated anything related to the progress of the alleged cyber crime. Learned counsel has stated that the bank may be directed to unfreeze the account and the petitioner may be permitted to operate the account.

5. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-Bank has stated that based on the complaint which has been registered in respect of a cyber crime and the petitioner being one of the recipients of an amount of Rs. 15,400/- which was involved in the said crime, the authorities





have frozen the account. Learned counsel has stated that in case the petitioner is so desirous, he can give an indemnity bond indemnifying the respondent-Bank from any future action in case any adverse orders are passed by any competent Court or any direction is received from the Cyber Police.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions states that the petitioner is willing to give a notarized affidavit indemnifying the Bank of any legal action, and income any adverse orders are passed by any competent Court or any direction is issued by the Cyber Police to the petitioner to make good the disputed amount.

7. Having regard to the above mentioned facts and circumstances and also the submissions made by both the counsel, this Court deems it fit to dispose of the present writ petition with a direction to the petitioner to file an affidavit duly notarized indemnifying the Bank of any legal action if any adverse orders are passed by any competent Court or any direction is issued by the Cyber Police. On such filing of notarized affidavit by the petitioner, the Bank shall defreeze the account of the petitioner by putting a lien over an amount of Rs. 15,400/- till any further notice is received from the competent police authority.





8. With the above direction, the present writ petition
stands disposed of.

(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)

Bhardwaj/-

U			
---	--	--	--

