

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4418/2026

Manoj Kumar S/o Shrawan Lal, Aged About 37 Years, R/o
Khatiyo Ka Mohalla Chhoti Khatu Khatu Khurd, Nagaur Raj

----Petitioner

Versus

1. NSDL Payments Bank Limited, Through Its Branch
Manager 4014 4Th Floor Tower 3 One International Center,
Senapati Bapat Marg Prabhadevi Mumbai 4000013
2. RBI, Regional Manager RBI Jaipur Rajasthan

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Harendra Kumar

For Respondent(s) : --

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP MATHUR

Order

25/02/2026

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 prayed that the present Writ Petition may kindly be allowed and by an appropriate, order or direction-

I. Issue a writ of mandamus or any appropriate writ, order, or direction directing the respondent bank to immediately defreeze the petitioner's Account No. 501050271131 Maintained with NSDL Payments Bank Limited, Prabhadevi Branch, Dist-Mumbai, (Annexure-2)

II. By an appropriate writ, order, or direction, the respondent may kindly be directed to not freeze the bank account of the petitioner in the future without prior notice.

III. Quash and set aside any internal or external communication purporting to freeze the said account as illegal, void and without jurisdiction;

IV. Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper may kindly be passed in favour of the petitioner.

V. Cost of the writ petition may kindly be awarded to 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 NSDL Payments Bank Limited (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 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