



Serial No.27
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 57 of 2026

Date of Decision: 17.06.2026

Shril Precioustone Marwein
S/o. Shri. Biding Hashah
R/o. Nongjri Village, P.S. Ranikor
South West Khasi Hills District
Meghalaya.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. State of Meghalaya,
Represented by the Commissioner & Secretary,
Home Police Department,
Government of Meghalaya.
2. The Superintendent of Police
(Cyber Crime Branch), East Khasi Hills,
Meghalaya.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
(Cyber Crime), M.G.Road,
Chikkaballapura Town – 562101,
Karnataka.
4. Sub Inspector of Police Cyber Crime
Police Station, M.G.Road,
Chikkaballapura Town – 562101,
Karnataka.
5. Branch Manager, HDFC Bank Ltd.,
Police Bazar Branch, Shillong,
Meghalaya.

...Respondents



Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Ms. A.D.Syiem, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Atiar S. Dey, GA for R 1 & 2.
Mr. S.Marpan, Adv. for R 5.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| 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. Mr. S.Marpan, learned counsel for the respondent No. 5 today has fairly submitted that inspite of their best efforts, they could not obtain the exact amount which is in dispute with regard to the petitioner's account. He further submits that as they could not get the exact amount, the Bank is ready to unfreeze the account of the petitioner. Learned counsel in this regard, in addition to his submissions, has referred to paragraph No. 4 of the affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent No. 5. The same for convenience is reproduced below:

“4. That with regard to the statements made in paragraphs 7 and 9 of the writ petition, the Deponent begs to state that the account of the Petitioner was freezed on the basis of the direction by the Respondent No. 4 vide notice dated 07/01/2026 under section 94 and 106 of the BNSS. In the said notice, the Respondent No. 4



has directed to keep lien mark for an amount of Rs. 45,16,900/- (Rupees Forty Five Lakhs Sixteen Thousand Nine Hundred) only amongst the several account numbers including that of the Petitioner. However, in the said notice, it was not specified as to how much amount needs to be kept on lien with regard to the account of the Petitioner. The Deponent vide mail dated 10/04/2026 has also been following up with the Respondent No. 4 with regard to the specific amount that needs to be kept on lien against the Petitioner's account, but till date it has not replied to any of its queries. The bank has frozen the account of the Petitioner in compliance with the directions from Respondent No. 4 which they were duty bound to follow but has no objection for defreezing the account of the Petitioner if directed by this Hon'ble Court. As on the date of freezing (09/01/2026) of the bank account of the Petitioner being Account. No. 59209366443204 with the bank, the balance amount lying therein stands at Rs. 41380/- ”

2. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respondent No. 5, the account of the petitioner being No. 59209366443204 shall be unfrozen within one week.
3. Ms. A.D.Syiem, learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of this development, prays that the matter be closed.
4. Matter accordingly stands closed and disposed of.

Judge