



\$~85

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% **Date of Decision: 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2026**

+ W.P.(CRL) 1230/2026

TANMAY MAINI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Hemant Gulati, Advocate.

versus

STATE, NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC for the  
State with Mr. Arjit Sharma and Ms.  
Sakshi Jha, Advocates.  
SI Divyanshu and H.C. Ramotar.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner seeks directions to the respondent to defreeze his bank account.
2. He is maintaining a savings bank account bearing No. 5647267649 with Kotak Mahindra Bank, Vishal Enclave, Delhi.
3. His account was frozen in relation to some cyber complaint case of Dwarka, Delhi and he was informed by the bank that a *lien* of Rs.21,674/- had been created on his account. Fact, however, remains that his entire account has been frozen and, being a student, he is not even in a position to operate the bank and to meet his day-to-day needs.
4. According to petitioner, even with respect to the credit entry of Rs.21,674/-, the transaction was genuine one as the above amount was received *in lieu* of some decoration work which was carried out by his mother.



5. According to petitioner, he sent a representation to the concerned DCP, Cyber Cell, Dwarka but such representation has yet not been decided.
6. The only grievance, at the moment, is that he may be permitted to operate the abovesaid amount, with *lien* of Rs.21, 674/-. In this regard, he also strongly relies upon observations contained in *Neelkanth Pharma Logistics (P) Ltd. v. Union of India, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 1055* and *Malabar Gold & Diamond Ltd. v. Union of India, 2026 SCC OnLine Del 297*.
7. Learned Standing Counsel (Crl) for the State appears on advance notice and the concerned I.O. is also present and it is informed that FIR No.59/2026 has been registered and the communication to the bank was through the designated portal.
8. As per the abovesaid FIR, one Neelam Sharma (complainant) had reported that she was victim of *online fraud* and was cheated of Rs.1,28,368/- and resultantly prayed for appropriate legal action.
9. Learned Standing Counsel (Crl) for the State submits that, as per investigation, a sum of Rs. 31,796/- was got transferred to one account maintained with Indian Overseas Bank, and from such account, part of the amount i.e. Rs. 21,674/- was transferred to the bank account of the petitioner, held with Kotak Mahindra Bank.
10. During course of the argument, learned Standing Counsel (Crl) for the State also informed that same bank account is under scrutiny in relation to one another cyber crime pending with State of Telangana.
11. He, however, submits that since the cheated amount in question, pertaining to the FIR in question, is only Rs.21,674/-, the I.O. would instruct the concerned bank to put a *lien* with respect to the abovesaid amount only and to permit the petitioner to operate the bank account for the balance. He,



however, submits that, as and when, any communication is received from State of Telangana in relation to any other cyber crime, the bank would be at liberty to take further steps in terms of any such subsequent communication.

12. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the abovesaid assurance given to him, he is, at the moment, left with no grievance in the matter and would raise his other contentions and defence before the appropriate forum at appropriate stage.

13. The petition stands, accordingly, disposed of, in aforesaid terms.

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**APRIL 17, 2026/ss/pb**