

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN
PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION Nos.38738 and 38748 of 2014

WP.No.38738 of 2014:

BETWEEN

Chintala Nagaraju.

... PETITIONER

AND

State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Home Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

WP.No.38748 of 2014:

BETWEEN

Chintala Yadagiri.

... PETITIONER

AND

State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Home Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR. B. VIJAYSEN REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME (TG)

ADDL. ADVOCATE GENERAL (TG)

The Court made the following:

-
-
-

COMMON ORDER:

Both these writ petitions are in a way connected as petitioner in WP.No.38748 of 2014 is the father of the petitioner in WP.No.38738 of 2014 and they are aggrieved by withdrawal of 2+2 and 1+1 gunmen security respectively provided to them by impugned proceedings dated 18.08.2014 and 17.06.2013 respectively.

2. The affidavits filed in support of the writ petitions mention reasons on account of which security was given to them. It is further stated that they have helped the police in apprehending the accused, who has presently jumped bail and is free, hence, threat perception continues.

3. Counter affidavit, filed in WP.No.38748 of 2014, states that on the basis of assessment of threat perception, the Security Review Committee has decided to withdraw the security provided to the petitioner. It is stated that in terms of G.O.Rt.No.655 dated 13.03.1997, the Security Review Committee meets periodically, assesses threat perception of the protectees and takes appropriate decision.

4. Evidently, the impugned order dated 18.08.2014 in WP.No.38748 of 2014 is based upon the recommendations of the Security Review Committee dated 03.07.2014 and it is not in dispute that the Security Review Committee would meet normally in every six months. In that view of the matter, the next meeting of the Committee is likely to be held in near future. Counter affidavit also states that if the petitioner still feels threat to his life and limb, he may make fresh representation to the competent authority with fresh inputs so that the same will be placed before the Security Review Committee

for fresh consideration.

5. In terms of the said averments, therefore, the respondents are directed to follow the directions of this Court in WP.No.25121 of 2014 and batch dated 30.12.2014. However, each petitioner is at liberty to make a detailed representation giving inputs regarding threat perception existing as on the date of the representation before the competent authority viz. the Superintendent of Police of the District concerned and on receipt of such representation, the Superintendent of Police concerned, shall make appropriate enquiries and make his own recommendations and place the request of the petitioners before the Security Review Committee's next meeting to enable the review committee to take an appropriate decision in the matter.

The writ petitions are disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

March 18, 2015

Note: Office to attach a copy of the order in
WP.No.25121 of 2014 and batch dated 30.12.2104.

(B/o) DSK