

  
**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3986/2026

Kartikey Enterprises, Through Its Proprietor Sonu Swami, Aged About 37 Years, R/o First Floor, 51-K-Block, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. AU Small Finance Bank, Through Its Branch Manager, Melody House 21A, Ravinder Path, Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).
2. Station House Officer, Police Station, Maharajganj, Rae Bareli, Uttar Pradesh.

-----Respondents

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Mudit Nagpal

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Naman Mohnot

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP MATHUR**

**Order**

**23/02/2026**

1. The instant writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner seeking the following reliefs:-

*"It is, therefore, humbly and respectfully prayed that this writ petition of the petitioner may kindly be allowed and by an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof thereby:-*

*A. The impugned acknowledgments/notices whereby the Petitioner's Bank Account No.2121228734632997 maintained with the Respondent-Bank has been frozen may kindly be quashed and set aside;*

*B. The Respondents may kindly be directed to defreeze the Petitioner's aforesaid bank account and allow the Petitioner to operate the same without any restriction or hindrance;*

*C. The action of the Respondents in freezing the entire bank account of the Petitioner on the basis of disputed transactions of merely 44,850/-maykindly be declared illegal, arbitrary, disproportionate, and violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution of India;*

*D. Any other appropriate writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also kindly be passed in our of the petitioner."*

2. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it just and proper to dispose of this writ petition with a direction to the AU Small Finance Bank (Respondent No.1) to keep the disputed amount (the amount which was transferred illegally in the bank account of the petitioner) frozen and allow the petitioner to make transactions from its bank account from the remaining balance.

3. It is further made clear that in case, the respondent – Bank has not received the information regarding the exact figure of the disputed amount, which the Investigating Officer/Police alleges to be receipt(s) of the offence, the bank shall send a communication to the concerned Investigating Officer/Police, to indicate the amount to be earmarked for lien, while endorsing a copy of the instant order.

4. Upon receipt of such communication/letter, the concerned Investigating Officer/Police shall be under an obligation to apprise the respondent - Bank about the amount to be kept in lien, within a period of seven days of receiving the communication from the respondent - Bank. The respondent – bank shall thereafter do the needful as directed herein above.

5. It is further made clear that in case, the respondent-Bank does not receive any reply from the concerned Investigating Officer/Police, then it shall be duty bound to act in accordance with the instant order.

6. Stay petition as well as all pending application, if any, stand disposed of.

**(KULDEEP MATHUR),J**