



Serial No. 14
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 219 of 2026

Date of Decision: 23.09.2026

Smti Ham-E-Lad Ramut,
S/o Shri Redeem Stone Dann,
R/o House No. 48, Moosalynghat, Jowai
West Jaintia Hills District, Meghalaya

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Meghalaya
Represented by the Director General of Police,
Meghalaya, Shillong
2. The Cyber Crime Police Station,
Secretariat Hills, Shillong, Meghalaya
Through its In-Charge (SP Cyber)
3. The Gujarat Ahmedabad City Cyber Crime Police Station,
Ahmedabad, Gujarat, through its Prosecuting Inspector (P.I.)
4. The State Bank of India, Ladthalboh Branch, Jowai
West Jaintia Hills District, Meghalaya through its
Branch Manager

.... Respondent(s)

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. S. Deb, Adv.
For the Respondent(s) : Mrs. N.G. Shylla, AAG with
Ms. Z.E. Nongkynrih, GA (For R 1&2)



-
- | | | |
|------|--|--------|
| 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. Deb, learned counsel for the petitioner has produced a receipt notice showing that the respondent No. 4, was served on 21.09.2026, by dasti/personal service, however there is no appearance on behalf of the said respondent today. This Court also notes in the order dated 10.09.2026, that the factum of earlier service was recorded, but there was no appearance, then also.

2. Mrs. N.G. Shylla, learned AAG assisted by Ms. Z.E. Nongkynrih, learned GA representing the respondents Nos. 1 & 2, has submitted that no further instructions have been received, apart from the earlier communication from the State Police Department that the freezing was done on account of a Cyber Crime complaint registered in the State of Gujarat.

3. As per the petitioner, the disputed amount of Rs. 9,337/- was credited to his bank account through a UPI transaction on an App which the petitioner had earlier been using. He further submits that as the said App was under scrutiny, the account was may be therefore frozen. It is



further submitted that the petitioner's account has been frozen since June, 2024, and as there has been no resolution, the petitioner has been put to hardship. He therefore, prays that at this stage the account be defrozen, and he be allowed to operate the same.

4. As there is no representation from the side of the respondents Nos. 3 & 4, and in view of the facts as portrayed, in the considered view of this Court for the ends of justice the petitioner is entitled to the relief claimed. Accordingly, it is directed that the respondent No. 4, shall defreeze the account of the petitioner being A/C No. 30861364169, but however with regard to the disputed amount of Rs. 9,337/-, the same shall be kept on lien, by the bank.

5. A copy of this order be served upon to the respondent No. 4, by the petitioner, for compliance.

6. As ordered above, this writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
23.09.2026
"V. Lyndem-AR-PS"