Serial No.09
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 178 of 2026

Date of Decision: 15.09.2026

Shri. Nitu Mollick
S/o Nikhil Mollick
R/o Rynku Bazar, Mawsynram,
East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya.

…Petitioner

-Versus-

1. State of Meghalaya, through the
Director General of Police (DGP),
State Cyber Crime Cell,
Police Headquarters, Secretariat Hills,
Shillong-793001, Meghalaya.

2. State (NCT of Delhi), through the
Director General of Police, Delhi
North East Cyber Police Station,
District-North East, Delhi.

3. State of Jharkhand, through the
Director General of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Raniya, Khunti District,
Jharkhand- 834004.

4. State Bank of India, Mawsynram Branch,
Through its Branch Manager,
Meghalaya – 793021.

…Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.S.Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s)	:	Mr. S.A.Majaw, Adv.
For the Respondent(s)	:	Mrs. T.Yangi B, AAG with Ms. Z.E.Nongkynrih, GA for R 1. Mr. P.Ghosh, Adv. for R 4.

i)	Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc:	Yes/No
ii)	Whether approved for publication in press:	Yes/No

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. The petitioner being aggrieved with the freezing of his State Bank of India Account No. 30406713474 at Mawsynram Branch without any notice is before this Court praying for defreezing of the said account.

2. Mr. S.A.Majaw, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a businessman engaged in selling of goods and had transacted sale of betelnut wherein an amount of ₹7,00,000/- was transferred into the petitioner's account. However, he submits that on complaints that have been received by the Bank with regard to doubtful transaction from two Police

Stations, namely from Delhi North East Cyber Police Station for ₹45,000/- and from the Cyber Crime Police Station, Raniya, Khunti District, Jharkhand, for an amount of ₹5,60,000/- his entire account had been frozen. Learned counsel further submits that with regard to the amount of ₹45,000/- which is disputed as per the status report furnished by the respondent No. 2, the same may be kept in lien. However, he submits the respondent No. 3 inspite of service of notice, has not come forward with any status report as to why the transaction of the remaining amount has been termed as a doubtful and fraudulent. He therefore prays that as he has been incapacitated to operate the account, and the amount lying in the Bank in his account presently is far less that the amount stated to be fraudulent, the account may be defrozen and he be allowed to operate the account by furnishing an indemnity bond.

3. From the side of the State respondent No. 1, Mrs. T.Yangi B, learned AAG assisted by Ms. Z.E.Nongkynrih, learned GA submits that in this matter, the issue concerns only the petitioner, the Banks and the Police Stations concerned, and the State respondent has no instructions in the matter.

4. From the side of the respondent No. 2, a status report had been filed on 14-05-2026, wherein it has clearly been stated that an amount of ₹45,000/- had been illegally transacted from a Canara Bank account of the

complainant one Mr. Narender Singh. This status report was also noted by this Court and as such, this amount shall be treated as disputed and be kept in lien.

5. On behalf of the respondent No. 3, as there is no further communication with regard to the remaining amount inspite of service of notice, the status is not known nor the identity of the complainant apart from the only fact that an amount of ₹5,60,000/- had been treated as fraudulent.

6. On behalf of the respondent No. 4 Bank, Mr. P.Ghosh, learned counsel submits that in the facts as they pertain, the Bank has no objection if the account of the petitioner be defrozen subject to furnishing of an indemnity bond incase there are any further developments in the matter. The same is also noted.

7. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on considering the materials as placed, as submitted it is noted that the disputed amount that is clearly apparent before this Court is ₹45,000/- which is on the basis of the status report filed by the respondent No. 2. However, with regard to the other amount as no details are forthcoming and the amount also is not stated as disputed except that it is stated to be fraudulent, the same is disregarded in view of the added fact that respondent No. 3, inspite of service of notice has not filed any status report or any other materials.

8. Accordingly, in these circumstances, the respondent no. 4 is directed to defreeze the account of the petitioner who shall furnish an indemnity bond of the remaining amount which is present in the account of the petitioner or as determined by the respondent No. 4 Bank.

9. As per the directions contained hereinabove, the writ petition is accordingly closed and disposed of.

Judge