

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16348/2025

Deepika Gupta C/o Nikhil Gupta, Aged About 24 Years, 780,
Shanti Nagar, Gopalpura Bye Pass, Durgapura Railway Station Ke
Pass, Jaipur, Rajasthan, 302018.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Bank Of Baroda, Through Its Zonal Officer, Address 5th Floor, Baroda Bhawan, 13 Airport Plaza, Durgapura, Tonk Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302018.
2. Inspector Of Police, Police Station Garoo, Latehar, Jharkhand

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Adarsh Singhal with Mr. Kuldeep Devra
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Ram Naresh Vijay with Mr. Laxmi Kant Sharma

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUROOP SINGHI
Order

23/02/2026

- 1.** The present writ petition has been filed with the following prayers:

"It is therefore, humbly prayed that yours lordships may graciously be pleased to accept and allow this writ petition by calling the entire record and after perusal of the same :-

- (i) *Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the Respondent Bank to immediately unfreeze the current account of the Petitioner bearing Account No.43660100007920, BANK OF BARODA, Rajasthan, Rajasthan.*
- (ii) *Direct the Respondent Bank to provide written reasons for the freezing of the account and any*

communication received from Cyber Crime authorities, if any.

- (iii) Declare that the action of the Respondent Bank is arbitrary, illegal, and violative of Articles 14, 19(1) (g), and 300A of the Constitution of India.*
- (iv) Award costs of this petition in favour of the Petitioner.*
- (v) Pass such further or other orders as may be deemed just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.*
- (vi) Any other appropriate order or direction which is deemed just and proper in the facts and circumstance by this Hon'ble Court may also be passed in favour of the petitioner's committee."*

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has never misused the aforesaid bank account for the purpose of illegal transactions and has not committed any cyber crime and has no relation whatsoever to the alleged fraudulent transaction(s).

3. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the Investigating Agencies and will appear before the Bank Authorities and the Investigating Agencies as and when called upon.

4. Therefore, learned counsel prays that while the disputed amount which has been received in the petitioner's account may be frozen, the amount other than the disputed amount may kindly be allowed to be withdrawn and the petitioner may be allowed to operate and carry out the banking transactions from the said bank account.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent – Bank submits that, as per the information received, the disputed

amount credited in the petitioner's bank account is Rs.1,000/- and the bank account of the petitioner has been frozen due to a cybercrime complaint.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent – Bank further submits that the petitioner may be directed not to discontinue the bank account until the investigation is completed or the criminal case is decided.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees with the submissions made by learned counsel for the respondent – Bank.

8. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

9. In view of the submissions so made, this Court is of the considered view that merely because a certain amount has been transferred to the petitioner's bank account in an alleged fraudulent transaction, the act of freezing the entire bank account and imposing complete restriction on banking transactions at this stage will seriously prejudice the rights of the petitioner. At the most, the Bank can keep a lien on the amount to the extent it relates to the alleged fraudulent transaction(s) credited in the petitioner's bank account.

10. Consequently, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent – Bank to de-freeze the **bank account No.43660100007920** of the petitioner maintained at Bank Of Baroda, Rajasthan and the petitioner may be allowed to operate and carry out banking transactions in the said bank account over and above the disputed amount, in accordance with law. However, the disputed amount i.e., **Rs.1,000/-** which has been credited in the petitioner's bank account in connection with the alleged fraudulent transaction(s) shall remain frozen.

11. It is made clear that the petitioner will co-operate with the Bank Authorities and the Investigating Agencies and will appear before them as and when required. It is also ordered that the petitioner shall not close or discontinue the bank account till the Investigating Agencies and Bank Authorities permit the petitioner to do so.

12. It is further ordered that after investigation, if the involvement of the petitioner is found in any illegal transaction, the petitioner shall be liable to pay amount involved in the aforesaid illegal transaction and will face inquiry/investigation as per law.

13. Needless to say, that this order has been passed only in the context of de-freezing of the bank account of the petitioner and in no manner is to be construed as any determination with respect to the merits of the financial cyber fraud complaint under question.

14. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(ANUROOP SINGHI),J