

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7724/2026
URN: CW / 16889U / 2026

Parmar Urvashiben Yogendra Sinh W/o Parmar Yogendra Sinh,
Aged About 51 Years, Resident of 51, Rajput Faliyu, Dabholi
Gam, Surat City, Surat Gujarat 395004

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Hdfc Bank Ltd., Through Its Branch Manager, Singanpore Branch, Situated At Ground Floor, E-1, E-2, Radhye Shyam Society, Singanpore, Surat-395004, Gujarat.
3. Deputy Inspector General, Cyber Crime, Police Headquarters, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Manan Purohit
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Naman Yadav Ms. Devakriti Vashishtha for Mr. Bhuwadesh Sharma, AAG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

10/07/2026

1. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents, at the outset, raised an objection that the account sought to be unfreezed by the petitioner is maintained by the petitioner at the bank situated at Surat, Gujarat. Hence, no cause of action whatsoever has accrued to the petitioner to approach this Court by way of filing this writ petition.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner opposed the objection and submitted that since FIR has been registered at

Jaipur, which is the basic cause for freezing the bank account of the petitioner, hence, petitioner part cause of action, in view of the Article 226(2) of the Constitution of India, has accrued in Jaipur and therefore, petitioner can maintain writ petition before this Court.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

4. It is undisputed that the petitioner's bank account is in a bank situated at Surat (Gujarat), and the prayers made by the petitioner is to direct the respondents to immediately unfreeze the petitioner's bank account maintained by him in Surat.

5. As regards, lodging of FIR at Jaipur is concerned in the instant writ petition, petitioner has not assailed the FIR and no prayer for quashing the FIR has been made, therefore, it cannot be said that part of cause of action, if any, has accrued within the jurisdiction of this Court, therefore, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction.

6. It is made clear that mere dismissal of the instant writ petition for want of jurisdiction would not curtail the rights of the petitioner to file fresh writ petition before the Court having jurisdiction.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(ANAND SHARMA),J