



\$~120

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

+ W.P.(C) 7334/2025

RAMESH KUMAR SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Haraprasad Sahu, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Krishna Kumar, Advocate for R4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

26.05.2025

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking following reliefs:

“A. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction thereby directing the Respondents, particularly Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, to forthwith de-freeze the Petitioner’s Savings Bank Account No. 777701200005, maintained with ICICI Bank, Connaught Place Branch, New Delhi – 110001;

B) Declare that the action of Respondent No. 3 in freezing the aforesaid bank account of the Petitioner without prior notice, judicial order, or due compliance with the provisions of Section 106 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (formerly Section 102 CrPC), is arbitrary, illegal and unconstitutional, being violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g), and 21 of the Constitution of India;

C. Direct the Respondent No.3 to furnish to the Petitioner a copy of the complaint, if any, along with the order or communication under which the said account was frozen, and further disclose whether any report/intimation was made to the jurisdictional Magistrate in compliance with Section 106 BNSS;

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is enrolled with Bar Council of Uttar Pradesh and is a practising



Advocate in High Court of Judicature at Allahabad for the past 22 years.

3. He submits that petitioner is maintaining a saving bank account no. 777701200005 with respondent no.3/ICICI Bank, Connaught Place Branch, New Delhi. The said saving bank account of the petitioner was debit-frozen by respondent no.3 on 25.04.2025, which at the relevant time was having a balance of Rs.6,54,634.25/-.

4. He submits that as per the knowledge gained by the petitioner, the said account has been debit frozen on the instructions of the Cyber Cell Police Station (South-West District). He submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in a cyber crime on the basis of a complaint made by respondent no.4. He submits that petitioner had received professional fee from the respondent no.4 in staggered manner as detailed in Para X of the writ petition.

5. In view of above, issue notice.

6. Mr. Krishna Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.4 accepts notice and submits that an amount of Rs.7,49,500/- has been siphoned off by the petitioner from the respondent no.4 on the pretext of getting some compensation released to the respondent no.4, from the DDA.

7. Let counter-affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed within two weeks thereafter.

8. On petitioner taking steps, issue notice to the other respondents by all permissible modes, returnable on 26.08.2025.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

MAY 26, 2025/jg