JUDGMENT SHEET

IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD

(JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT)

W.P. No.46/2026

Dr. Fazeela Abbasi

Versus

FOP, etc

Petitioner by:	M/S Naeem Bukhari, Nasir Mehmood & Abbas Bukhari Advocates.
Respondents by:	Mr. Sarfraz Rauf, AAG, Shahid Ilyas & M. Riaz, A.D (Law), FIA Zara Lodhi, Inspector CBC
Date of Hearing:	18.02.2026

KHADIM HUSSAIN SOOMRO, J: Through this writ petition, the petitioner seeks the following relief:-

> " a. The freezing of the petitioner's bank accounts be deemed illegal, unlawful, without lawful authority, and void ab initio.
>
> b. Direct the respondents and all concerned banks to forthwith defreeze and restore full operation of all bank accounts of the petitioner,
>
> C. Hold that the impugned action constitutes harassment in violation of the subsisting order of this Hon'ble High Court,
>
> d. Restrain the respondents from taking any further coercive action or punitive action against the petitioner without due process of law and with prior permission of this Hon'ble Court.
>
> e. Grant any other relief deemed just and proper in the circumstances."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner next contends that the impugned action of freezing the petitioner's bank accounts has been taken without disclosing the legal basis or the statutory provision under which such drastic measure has been invoked. It is submitted that the petitioner was never served with any formal order specifying the authority under which the accounts were rendered inoperative, nor was any opportunity of hearing afforded to her prior to taking the impugned action. Learned counsel further submits that subsequently, the petitioner received a notice

Uncertified copy

under Section 160 Cr.P.C. directing her appearance on 05.02.2026 in connection with Inquiry No.178/2025. However, due to the subsisting stay order passed by this Court in relation to the FIR proceedings, the matter was adjourned. It is contended that thereafter, at about 08:30 PM on 06.01.2026, another notice bearing No. FIA/DD/CBC/ZL/RE-225/2025/43 was served upon the petitioner in connection with Inquiry No.225/2025, the details of which were never disclosed to the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that the said notice has also been challenged by the petitioner through a separate constitutional petition before this Court. It is further argued that despite the existence of interim orders passed by this Court, the petitioner was subjected to undue pressure by the investigating authorities which ultimately resulted in freezing of her bank accounts. According to the learned counsel, no duration or time frame for such freezing has been communicated to the petitioner, thereby rendering the impugned action arbitrary and without lawful authority. The learned counsel submits that the freezing of all bank accounts has caused serious prejudice to the petitioner, as her personal and household expenses have been completely blocked while her professional engagements both within Pakistan and abroad have been adversely affected, resulting in irreparable damage to her professional reputation and financial standing. Learned counsel finally contends that the impugned action of freezing the petitioner's accounts constitutes a colourable and mala fide exercise of authority aimed at coercing and pressurizing the petitioner. It is argued that freezing of all accounts of a practicing professional, without any adjudication, inquiry, or determination by a competent forum, is grossly disproportionate and punitive in nature. According to the learned counsel, such action is not supported by any statutory mandate and therefore amounts to misuse of investigative powers.

3. Conversely, the Investigation Agency submits that the impugned action has been taken strictly in accordance with law during the course of an ongoing investigation relating to alleged offences under the Anti-Money Laundering Act,

Uncertified copy

2010, and the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1947. It is contended that during the course of inquiry, a detailed financial analysis of the petitioner's multiple bank accounts revealed substantial financial transactions, structured deposits, and outward remittances which appeared grossly disproportionate to the petitioner's declared income and financial profile. Learned counsel submits that the freezing of the bank accounts was a preventive measure adopted to preserve the alleged proceeds of crime and to prevent dissipation or transfer of funds during the course of investigation. According to the respondents, such measures are recognized investigative tools in financial crime investigations and are necessary to ensure effective inquiry into allegations of money laundering and illicit cross-border remittances. It is further contended that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and involve complex financial transactions routed through numerous bank accounts maintained in both local and foreign currencies. The learned counsel argues that at this preliminary stage, the investigating agency is required to trace the flow of funds, ascertain the source of deposits, and determine whether the financial transactions constitute proceeds of crime. Interference by this Court at this stage would impede the investigation and frustrate the statutory mandate of the investigating agency. The learned counsel for the respondents, therefore, submits that the impugned action is neither arbitrary nor mala fide but is a lawful step taken during investigation. It is contended that the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution should not be exercised in a manner that may stifle a lawful investigation into alleged financial crimes. Accordingly, it is prayed that the petition being devoid of merit may be dismissed.

4. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties and perused the material available on the record.

5. The controversy raised in the instant petition is intrinsically connected with the subject matter of W.P. No. 219/2026, wherein the petitioner has challenged the very initiation of inquiry/FIR relating to alleged offences under the Anti-Money

Uncertified copy

Laundering Act, 2010 and the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1947. In the said petition, after examining the allegations and the material placed before the Court, it has been observed that the allegations pertaining to unauthorized foreign currency transactions, unexplained financial flows and outward remittances through multiple bank accounts prima facie require thorough investigation by the competent authorities. The constitutional jurisdiction of this Court cannot be invoked at the threshold to stifle a lawful investigation where the allegations disclose the commission of cognizable offences requiring probe.

6. The freezing of the petitioner's bank accounts, which is the subject matter of the present petition, appears to be a consequential step taken by the investigating agency in connection with the ongoing investigation relating to the alleged financial transactions and suspected laundering of proceeds of crime. Since the legality of the underlying investigation has already been examined in W.P. No. 219/2026 and it has been held that the matter requires investigation in accordance with law, the fate of the present petition necessarily rests upon the outcome of the said proceedings. In such circumstances, interference by this Court in respect of the freezing of accounts at this stage would amount to indirectly frustrating the investigation which this Court has already held to be lawful and permissible.

7. In view of the foregoing discussion and keeping in view the observations rendered in W.P. No. 219/2026, wherein it has been held that the allegations relating to alleged money laundering require investigation by the competent authorities, the present petition is ***disposed of*** with the observation that the freezing of the petitioner's bank accounts appears to be a consequential step taken during the course of such investigation. However, the investigating agency shall remain at liberty to review the necessity of continuation of the freezing orders and, if it is satisfied that retention of the said measure is no longer required for the purposes of investigation, it may defreeze the accounts in accordance with law. It is further observed that in case the proceedings arising out of W.P. No. 219/2026

Uncertified copy

ultimately culminate in favour of the petitioner, or the investigation does not substantiate the allegations, the concerned authorities shall proceed to defreeze the accounts forthwith. The investigating agency shall ensure that the investigation is conducted strictly in accordance with law and within the bounds of fairness and transparency.

(KHADIM HUSSAIN SOOMRO)
JUDGE

Announced in open court on 6th of March, 2026.

JUDGE

S Akhtar

Uncertified copy