



2026:DHC:4786



\$~18

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **W.P.(C) 4597/2026 and CM APPL. 22451/2026**

Date of decision: **21.05.2026**

**IN THE MATTER OF:-**

**KAILASH CHAND SONDHI**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Manoj Kumar Pathy, Advocate

versus

**NATIONAL CYBER CRIME CO-ORDINATION CENTER & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vedansh Anand, SPC with  
Mr.Kush Garg, Adv. for R-1 to 3.  
Mr.Harsheet Dhir, Advocate for R-4.  
Mr. Abhishek Baid, Advocate, Mr.  
Mohit Kumar Bafna, Mr. Anup Jain,  
Advocates for R-6.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV**

**J U D G E M E N T**

**PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)**

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:-

*“a. direct the Cyber Crime Police Station, Tiruchirapalli to withdraw the order/letter whereby two bank accounts i.e. Bank Account bearing no.2240110190055070 having IFSC CODE UJVNO002240, Ujivan Small Finance Bank Uttam Nagar, New Delhi and Bank Account bearing no. 158920523393 in IndusInd Bank, Krishna Nagar, New Delhi were got frozen in COMPLT -32907250044664 27-07-2025 registered at National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal, New Delhi;*

*b. direct the branch managers of UJJIVAN SMALL FINANCE BANK*



2026:DHC:4786



*UTTAM NAGAR NEW DELHI and INDUSLND BANK, KRISHNA NAGAR, NEW DELHI to unfreeze the respective bank accounts belonging to the petitioner.”*

2. Counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent nos. 4 and 5.
3. Upon consideration of the averments made in the counter affidavit filed on behalf of Respondent No. 4, it is clear that the petitioner, had received an amount of Rs.20,000/- from Mr. Danabalan in relation to visa-related services. Pursuant to this, a complaint regarding the same transaction was registered as NCCP Complaint No. COMPLT- 329072500044664-27-2025. Thereafter, while acting on said complaint respondent no.3 wrote a letter to respondent no.4 to freeze the bank accounts of the petitioner.
4. The petitioner submits that even though, two of his bank accounts had been frozen, and six months had elapsed; respondent no.3 had not registered any case in relation to any offence against him. Neither was he summoned to appear before respondent no.3 for the purposes of investigation. In such circumstances, the petitioner submits that the accounts of the petitioner ought not to have been frozen.
5. The position taken by respondent no.3 in its affidavit *vide* paragraph no.13 is extracted as under:-

*“13) That the petitioner himself has categorically admitted in the writ petition that he received an amount of Rs. 20,000/- from one Mr. Danabalan in relation to visa related services and that disputes subsequently arose regarding the said transaction. The petitioner has further admitted that the complainant lodged a complaint before the National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal. Thus, the existence of the disputed transaction itself stands admitted by the petitioner.”*

6. The Court, thus, finds that this indefinite freezing of the petitioners' Bank Accounts, without contemplating any inquiry, or investigation is not permissible in law. This position has been taken by the Court in the case of



2026:DHC:4786



***Malabar Gold and Diamond Limited & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors***<sup>1</sup>,  
wherein the Court has held as under:

*“19. In light of these provisions, it is also pertinent to note that any blanket or disproportionate freezing of bank accounts, particularly where the account holder is neither an accused nor even a suspect in the offence under investigation, is manifestly arbitrary, and in the teeth of the fundamental rights under Article 19(1)(g) and 21 and of the Constitution of India, which encompass the right to livelihood and freedom to carry on trade and business. Such indiscriminate debit freezing, without any finding of complicity, has the inevitable effect of paralysing the day-to-day business operations of an otherwise innocent entity, resulting in loss of commercial goodwill and financial consequences, thereby subjecting a non-complicit account holder to punitive consequences.*

7. It is, thus, seen that there cannot be a blanket or disproportionate freezing of bank accounts particularly where the account holder is neither an accused, nor a suspect in the offence under investigation. Till date, the petitioner’s complicity has not surfaced in any of the cases.

8. For all the aforesaid reasons, the freezing of the petitioner’s Bank Accounts bearing no. 2240110190055070 having IFSC CODE UJVNO002240, Ujivan Small Finance Bank Uttam Nagar, New Delhi and No. 158920523393 in IndusInd Bank, Krishna Nagar, New Delhi, are directed to be lifted, immediately except for a lien of Rs.20,000/- in the respondent no.4-Bank.

9. If the Investigating Agency finds any material against the petitioner, the investigation is permitted to be carried out.

10. The respondents shall also be at liberty to take the fresh decision for freezing of the petitioner’s accounts, if the same is permissible in law. The petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the Investigating Agency, if any investigation is carried out.

---

<sup>1</sup> W.P.(C) 4198/2025 dated 16.01.2025



2026:DHC:4786



11. With the aforesaid directions, the petition, along with pending application, stands disposed of.

**(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)**  
**JUDGE**

**MAY 21, 2026**

*Nc*