



CNR: KAHC010130672026

NC: 2026:KHC:47541
WP No. 5982 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 5982 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. S SWAMY
S/O SHAMBULINGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
R/O NO 47, KAVERIPURA
10TH CROSS MAGADI MAIN ROAD,
KAMAKSHIPALYA
BENGALURU-560 079

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PARAMESWARAIAH D. C., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE BRANCH MANAGER
BANK OF BARODA
BASAVESHWARANAGAR BRANCH
BENGALURU-560 079
2. THE BRANCH MANAGER
STATE BANK OF INDIA
KAMAKSHIPALYA
BRANCH NO 165, MAGADI ROAD
BENGALURU-560 079

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. DAMODAR N. N., ADVOCATE FOR R1;
V/O DATED 29.06.2026,
SRI VIGNESH SHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SMT. MALINI VINAY, ADVCOATE FOR
SRI C. VINAY SWAMY, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS W.P. IS FIELD UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO DIRECT THE R1 AND 2 TO
DEFREEZE THE BANK ACCOUNT NO. 74690100003653 IN





NC: 2026:KHC:47541
WP No. 5982 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010130672026

BASAVESHWARA NAGARA BRANCH AND SB ACCOUNT NO. 64199840128 IN KAMAKSHIPALYA BRANCH ACCOUNT OF THE PETITIONER FORTHWITH, VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND B RESPECTIVELY.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. Sri.Damodar.N.N., learned counsel has entered appearance for the respondent No.1. Hence, registry is directed to delete the name of Sri.Vignesh Shetty., as that appearing for the respondent No.1.
2. The petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:
 - I. *Issue writ of mandamus directing the respondent No.1 and 2 to defreeze the Bank account No.74690100003653 in Basaveshwara Nagara Branch and S/B Account No.64199840128 in Kamakshipalya Branch account of the petitioner forthwith, vide Annexure-A and B respectively.*
 - II. *Please to issue any writ or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems fit under these circumstances in the interest of justice and equity.*
3. Sri.Damodar.N.N., learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that insofar as the account of the petitioner with respondent No.1 is concerned it was never frozen and the petitioner was always eligible to operate the said account.



4. Insofar as the account of the petitioner with respondent No.2, Sri.Vinay Swamy on behalf of Smt.Malini Vinay submits that Respondent No.2 having received information and/or directions from the Talangana-Varangal Commissionerate has been debit frozen.
5. A perusal of the documents produced by learned counsel for respondent No.2 does not indicate that there is any debit freeze order which has been issued. At the most, the Bank could have marked a lien on the amounts mentioned in the communication.
6. Directing respondent No.2 to lien mark the account of the petitioner and lift the debit freeze of the account of the petitioner maintained with respondent No.2, the petition stands ***disposed***.
7. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to raise grievance by utilizing the Grievous Redressal Module with the Bank as regards the amount which has been lien marked.

Sd/-
(**SURAJ GOVINDARAJ**)
JUDGE