



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD
WRIT PETITION NO. 4148 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

LORRYZONE TECHNOLOGIES PVT. LTD.
A COMPANY INCORPORATED
UNDER COMPANIES ACT 2013
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE
AT A-1, SECTOR 59, NOIDA,
UTTAR PRADESH - 201301
REPRESENTED BY ITS
AUTHORISED SIGNATORY
DHARAM CHAND PATEL



ALSO HAVING OFFICE AT
GROUND FLOOR, FLAT NO.-G- 101,
BUILDING NO. 219, BLOCK -D, SECTOR -63,
NOIDA, GAUTAM BUDDHA NAGAR,
UTTAR PRADESH-201301

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SARVOTHAM NAIK, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. SUSHAL TIWARI N., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
THROUGH NORTH CEN CRIME PS
REPRESENTED BY THE LD
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
HIGH COURT, BENGALURU 560 001
2. PUNYASHREE J
D/O JAYARAM
AGED ABOUT 19 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.49, SRIGANDHANAGARA,
KAREEN SHAB LAYOUT
HEGGANAHALLI,
BANGALORE-560091
3. ICICI BANK
NOIDA SECTOR 62 BRANCH SG-7
AND UBS 1, GF AND BASEMENT,
STELLAR IT PARK, C-25,
SECTOR 62, NOIDA,
GAUTAM BUDDHA NAGAR
UTTAR PRADESH-201301
REPRESENTED BY THE
BANK BRANCH MANAGER

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B. RAVINDRANATH, AGA FOR R1)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH NOTICE DATED 27.11.2025 (ANNEXURE- C) ISSUED BY RESPONDENT POLICE UNDER SECTION 35(3) OF BNSS IN RELATION TO FIR BEARING CRIME NO. 0783/2025 DATED 26.11.2025 AND NOTICE DATED 17.01.2026 ISSUED BY



RESPONDENT NO.1 UNDER SECTION 94 AND 106
OF BNSS (ANNEXURE -D).

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR
PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS
MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner's grievance is with the first respondent's communication to the third respondent, which is in January, 2026. The first respondent, acting upon a complaint by the second respondent dated 26.11.2025, has called upon the third respondent to freeze the petitioner's account. Mr. Sarvotham Naik, the learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the second respondent's complaint with the first respondent relates to a transfer of Rs.2,00,000/- to the petitioner's account on the false assurance of securing admissions in a professional institution and that the second respondent is categorical in mentioning that the amount in dispute is Rs.2,00,000/- but the first



respondent has called upon the third respondent to freeze the entire account.

Mr. B. Ravindranath, a learned Additional Government Advocate, who is called upon to accept notice for the first respondent, is heard on perusal of the second respondent's complaint dated 26.11.2025, which inarguably is the reason for the impugned communication. This Court must frown upon the first respondent's communication to freeze the petitioner's account when, even according to the second respondent the amount alleged to be involved in an online fraud on the false assurance of securing a seat in a professional institution, is confined to Rs.2,00,000/-.

The petition is allowed calling upon the third respondent to permit the petitioner to operate the account subject to a minimum balance of Rs.2,00,000/- observing that the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy under the Bharatiya



Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 as against this
amount of Rs.2,00,000/-

Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

RB