



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPCRL/1100/2026</u> Mukesh Sharma --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Jitendra Chaudhary, learned counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Prabhat Kandpal, learned A.G.A. along with Mr. Nikhil Bisht, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Alok Dalakoti, learned counsel for respondent no. 3/Bank. 2. The present Criminal Writ Petition has been preferred by the petitioner with the following prayers: (i) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari, calling for the original record and quashing the impugned letter dated 02.05.2025 issued by the Inspector Incharge, Kotwali Jawalapur, District Haridwar (Respondent No. 2) to Respondent No. 3, i.e., the Branch Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Branch Near Old Ranipur Mod, Haridwar, along with the subsequent impugned letter/freezing order dated 07.05.2025 passed by Respondent No. 3. (ii) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing and commanding Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, i.e., the SHO, Jawalapur and the Branch Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Branch Near Old



			Ranipur Mod, Haridwar, to forthwith defreeze the bank account of the petitioner and permit him to operate his Account No. 1649141987 maintained at Kotak Mahindra Bank, Branch Near Old Ranipur Mod, Haridwar. 3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 be directed to defreeze the bank account of the petitioner forthwith and permit him to operate the same. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that earlier the petitioner's account was frozen, however, after completion of investigation and submission of the charge-sheet, the concerned police authorities informed the bank that since the said account has not been treated as case property, the account in relation to Punjab National Bank was ordered to be defrozed. 5. Learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 3 (Bank) submits that the petitioner's account was frozen on the request made by Respondent No. 2, i.e., the In-charge Police Station, vide letter dated 02.05.2025. 6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge-sheet has already been filed and the trial is underway, and admittedly, the said account has not been made case property; therefore, the police had no authority to request freezing of the petitioner's account. 7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that the freezing of the petitioner's account is wholly illegal, and as such, the instant petition deserves to be allowed. 8. Consequently, the Writ Petition is allowed. A writ of mandamus is issued to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, namely, the
--	--	--	--



			SHO/Inspector In-charge, Kotwali Jawalapur, District Haridwar, and the Branch Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Branch Near Old Ranipur Mod, Haridwar, to forthwith defreeze the bank account of the petitioner and permit him to operate Account No. 1649141987. No order as to costs. (Alok Mahra, J.) 09-07-2026 SB
--	--	--	---