

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4290/2026

Raju Ram S/o Shri Jairum Ram, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Patelo
Ka Bas, Nandwan, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Union Of India, Through Its Secretary, Ministry Of Home Affairs Having Its Office At North Block Cabinet Secretary, New Delhi.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs Having Its Office At Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Reserve Bank Of India, Through Its Regional Director, Having Its Office At Rambagh Circle, Tonk Road, Jaipur.
4. The Branch Manager, Bank of Baroda, Branch Boranada, District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Vishal Singh Shekhawat

For Respondent(s) : --

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 most respectfully prayed before this Hon'ble Court that the present writ petition may kindly be allowed by calling the record of the case and by an appropriate writ, order or direction this Hon'ble Court may be pleased:-

(i) To direct the respondents to immediately lift the freeze/debit freeze imposed on the petitioner's saving bank account No. 31730100006080 held with respondent No.4 Branch - Boranada, District Jodhpur.

(ii) To award the Petitioner adequate compensation for the financial losses suffered due to the arbitrary and unlawful freezing of his accounts.

(iii) Cost the litigation may kindly be passed in favour 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 Bank of Baroda (Respondent No.4) 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 his 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