



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 9430 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

THE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL BANGALORE (TISB)
UNDER THE TRUST OF NATIONAL ACADEMY FOR
LEARNING(N.A.F.L.)
NAFL VALLEY, WHITEFIELD-SARJAPUR ROAD,
NEAR DOMMASANDRA CIRCLE,
BENGALURU - 562125.
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN
DR.K.P. GOPALAKRISHNA.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. AMIT DESHPANDE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STANDARD CHARTERED BANK
RAHEJA TOWERS,
NO.26, M.G.ROAD,
BANGALORE-560001.
BY ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY.
2. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER
CYBER CRIME POLICE STATION,
COMMISSIONERATE,
VARANASI,
UTTAR PRADESH - 221002.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. AVINASH B.C., ADVOCATE FOR R1
NOTICE TO R-2 IS DISPENSED WITH V/O. DATED 27.3.2026)





THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO (A) ALLOW THE WRIT PETITION. (B) BY ISSUING A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI BY QUASHING THE NOTICE DTD 11.03.2026 ARISING OUT OF CRIME NO.50/2024 FOR THE OFFENCES PUNISHABLE U/SEC. 420 OF IPC 1860 AND SEC.66(D) OF I.T.ACT 2000, ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed by an educational institution assailing the notice dated 11.03.2026 issued by second respondent arising out of Crime No. 50/2024, wherein acting on the communication issued by respondent No. 2, respondent No.1/bank has freezed the entire account of the educational institution.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.
Perused the records.



3. The petitioner–institution asserts that it is a reputed international school, widely known for its high standards in imparting quality education not only in and around Bengaluru, India, but also among the global academic community. It is contended that the institution enjoys considerable goodwill and reputation, attracting both national and international students, and is regarded as one of the most sought-after educational institutions. The petitioner further states that its commitment to excellence in education has been recognized by several organizations, which have conferred upon it awards acknowledging its outstanding contribution in the field of education.

4. The petitioner is aggrieved by the issuance of a notice by respondent No.2, styled as a “final notice” alleging non-compliance of Section 41A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, “Cr.P.C.”). By the said notice, the petitioner was called upon to show cause within five days, along with supporting documents, and to furnish



particulars relating to an alleged transaction dated 15.05.2025 bearing Transaction No. IDFB52024051500354220 involving a sum of Rs.5,00,000/-. The grievance of the petitioner is that, notwithstanding the submission of a detailed reply and explanation in response to the said notice, the petitioner's bank account has been frozen in its entirety, thereby causing severe prejudice to its functioning.

5. The principal contention of the petitioner is that the amount of Rs.5,00,000/- in question represents legitimate school fees remitted in respect of one Kum. Anvi Lohia. It is submitted that the said amount was transferred by the parent of the student in the ordinary course of payment of fees. However, respondent No.2 has proceeded on the premise that the said parent is allegedly involved in Crime No.50/2024 registered for offences punishable under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 66(D) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, wherein the alleged proceeds of crime are



stated to be to the tune of Rs.69,08,629/-. On such basis, the transaction received by the petitioner has been treated as part of the alleged crime proceeds.

6. The facts of the present case disclose a peculiar and rather disturbing situation, wherein an educational institution has been drawn into the ambit of a criminal investigation solely on the ground that it received a fee payment through an online transaction from a parent who is allegedly involved in a cyber offence. Acting upon such premise, the first respondent-bank has proceeded to freeze the entire account of the petitioner-institution, which, in the considered view of this Court, constitutes a drastic and disproportionate measure. The material on record further reveals that immediately upon receipt of the notice under Section 41A of Cr.P.C., the petitioner-institution, acting bona fide and without delay, has reversed the said amount of Rs.5,00,000/- to the account from which it was received. The said reversal is duly



substantiated by documentary evidence produced at Annexure–G.

7. Be that as it may, the action of respondent No.2 in directing the freezing of the petitioner’s bank account merely on account of an alleged involvement of a parent of a student in a cybercrime registered in the State of Uttar Pradesh appears to be wholly arbitrary and unreasonable. The petitioner–institution cannot be penalized for having received bona fide fee payments in the ordinary course of its functioning. At the same time, this Court is mindful of the need to safeguard the interests of the investigating agency. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that the ends of justice would be met if a lien is marked to the extent of Rs.5,00,000/-, being the amount in question, pending further clarification from respondent No.2 or conclusion of proceedings in Crime No.50/2024.

8. Simultaneously, it cannot be lost sight of that the petitioner is an educational institution responsible for



the administration of academic activities, including payment of salaries to teaching and non-teaching staff and meeting day-to-day operational expenses. Denial of access to its bank account would seriously impair its functioning and adversely affect the interests of students and staff alike. Therefore, permitting the petitioner to operate the account beyond the said amount of Rs.5,00,000/- would strike a just balance between the rights of the petitioner and the interests of the investigating agency.

9. In the light of the foregoing discussion, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

(i) The writ petition is hereby allowed.

(ii) The notice dated 11.03.2026 issued by respondent No.2 in connection with Crime No.50/2024, for offences punishable under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section



66(D) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, produced at Annexure-A, stands quashed.

(iii) The first respondent-bank is directed to mark a lien on the petitioner's account to the extent of Rs.5,00,000/- only.

(iv) The petitioner-institution shall be permitted to operate its bank account in respect of the amount exceeding Rs.5,00,000/- without any restriction.

(v) The lien so marked to the extent of Rs.5,00,000/- shall be subject to the outcome of the proceedings in Crime No.50/2024.

**SD/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE**

ALB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 83