

vai

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (LODGING) NO.2254 OF 2019

M/s.V. Care Informartics	...Petitioner
V/s.	
State of Maharashtra & Ors.	...Respondents

Mr.Kishore V. Tembe for the Petitioner.

Mr.A.L. Patki, Additional Government Pleader for the State –
Respondent No.1.

Mr.Onkar Warange for the Respondent Nos.2 and 3.

CORAM : R.D. DHANUKA, J.
DATE : 2ND AUGUST, 2019.

P.C. :-

1. The petitioner has impugned the attachment order dated 18th July, 2019 passed by the respondent no.2 and in particular to quash and set aside the impugned attachment order as regards seven bank accounts of the respondent nos.4, 5 and 6 are concerned. A perusal of the documents annexed to the petition *prima-facie* indicates that the order of attachment passed by the Recovery Officer on 18th July, 2019 does not include the name of the partners of the petitioner or the petitioner. The respondent no.3 has addressed a letter to the I.C.I.C.I. Bank to freeze the account of the

petitioner on the basis of the directions of Janakalyan Sahakari Bank dated 18th July, 2019. Since in my prima-facie view, the order of attachment dated 18th July, 2019 passed by the Recovery Officer does not include the name of the partners of the petitioner or the petitioner in the order of attachment itself, the respondent no.3 could not have addressed a letter to the I.C.I.C.I. Bank to freeze the accounts of the petitioner.

2. Rule. Mr.Patki, learned Additional Government Pleader waives service for the respondent no.1. Mr.Warange, waives service for the respondent nos.2 and 3. There shall be interim relief in terms of prayer clause (b). The respondent nos.4, 5 and 6 are directed to de-freeze the accounts of the petitioner.

3. It is made clear that if the petitioner fails in this petition at the stage of final hearing, the petitioner would return the amount to the respondent no.3.

4. All parties as well as the Bank to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

(R.D. DHANUKA, J.)