

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**CWP No. 18129 of 2026****Date of Decision: October 9, 2026**

Dr. Sanjay Sharma (Vishudhhanand Swami) Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.Whether approved for reporting? ¹**For the Petitioner:** Mr. Peeyush Verma, Senior Advocate with Mr. Anuj Bali, Advocate.**For the Respondents:** Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocate General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for respondents No. 1 to 4.

Mr. Balram Sharma, Deputy Solicitor General of India with Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 5.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral)

By way of present petition filed under Art. 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought following main relief(s):

- “i) Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the Respondents No. 1 to 5 to immediately provide round-the-clock Personal Security Officer (PSO) to the Petitioner at State expenses.
- ii) Direct Respondent No. 3 & 4 to deploy continuous police guard/ security personnel at the Maa Rajrajeshwari Tripura Sundari Ashram, Village Ajga, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh.
- iii) Direct Respondent No. 1 & 5 to establish an interstate security protocol to ensure the Petitioner's safety during his mandatory religious tours across state boundaries.
- iv) Direct Respondent Nos.1-4 to expedite the investigation in FIR No. 0060/2026, apprehend the cyber perpetrators (Annexure P-11), and submit a status report before this Hon'ble Court. ”

¹Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

2. Before cognizance of averments contained in petition, could be taken, Mr. Peeyush Verma, learned senior counsel duly assisted by Mr. Anuj Bali, Advocate, for the petitioner stated that the petitioner would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to respondent No.3/Superintendent of Police, Sirmaur at Nahan to treat the present petition as a representation and decide the same in a time bound manner.

3. Having regard to the nature of order proposed to be passed in the instant proceedings, this Court sees no necessity to call for reply from the respondents, who are duly represented by the office of learned Advocate General and Mr. Balram Sharma, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India.

4. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for respondents Nos. 1 to 4/State, states that otherwise, as per averments contained in the petition, FIR at the behest of petitioner has already been registered against the accused, named in the FIR and in case, the petitioner is able to establish on record that he is under any threat perception, appropriate action, in accordance with law, shall be taken upon the request of the petitioner.

5. Having carefully perused the averments contained in the petition, which is duly supported by an affidavit, this Court finds that the petitioner who claims himself to a preacher of *Sanatan Dharma*, has apprehension of his being harmed by some unknown person(s), who have been repeatedly sending him threats and on two occasions, he has been physically harmed.

6. Careful perusal of communication dated Nil, issued under the signatures of Station House Officer, Police Station Pachhad, District Sirmaur suggests that afore authority, after having investigated the

complaint of the petitioner, has found that the petitioner has a threat perception.

7. Be that as it may, this Court, in view of innocuous prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No.3 to treat the present petition as a representation and decide the same, expeditiously, preferably within a period of one week from today. Ordered accordingly.

8. Needless to say, afore authority, while doing the needful in terms of this order, shall afford opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereupon. Before parting, this Court wishes to observe that it is the duty of the State to provide adequate protection to its citizens, as such, this Court hopes and trusts that in the event of threat, if any, to the life of the petitioner, necessary steps shall be taken by respondent No.3 to provide adequate security, if required.

In view of above, petition is disposed of. All pending applications stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

October 9, 2026
(vikrant)