



\$~81 & 82

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 1285/2025 and CM APPL.6335/2025

(81) JAYAPRADA NAHATAPetitioner

Through: Advocate (appearance not given)
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Syed Abdul Haseeb (CGSC), Ms.
Mahamaya Chatterjee (GP)

+ W.P.(C) 1286/2025

(82) ANIRUDH PRASAD YADAVPetitioner

Through: Advocate (appearance not given)
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Ishkaran Singh Bhandari (CGSC)
along with Mr. Rajat Mohan Dwivedi,
Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

03.02.2025

%

1. These petitions have been filed by the petitioners, seeking intervention of this Court for providing adequate security to the petitioners.
2. It is submitted that there are persistent and credible threats to the life of the petitioners. It is further stated that the petitioners are engaged in active public life as a result of which, they are susceptible to significant risk on account of political rivalry, etc.
3. Accordingly, it is submitted that the petitioners require protection from a Central Security Agency, preferably the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) or the Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) in the form of Y category security.
4. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the providing



security is based on an elaborate process of assessment of threat by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

5. It is further submitted that in terms of the applicable rules, it is only on the basis of a comprehensive threat assessment conducted by specialised agencies that a decision is taken whether or not to provide any security and if so, to what extent.

6. It has been held by this Court in numerous judgments¹ that the assessment of threat perception and as to whether there is any threat to security of the petitioner is an aspect that has to be decided by the concerned authority of the State or Centre, including the Intelligence Bureau or any other authority concerned, which is equipped to do so. It is not within the domain of this Court to embark upon such an exercise in proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. In view of the aforesaid position, after some hearing, respective counsel for the parties are in agreement that the present petition would be treated as a representation by the respondent no.1 and a decision as regards provision of security to these petitioners shall be taken after duly considering the threat assessment. The respondent/s shall also consider whether any interim security is to be provided to the petitioners during the pendency of the said exercise.

8. The petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

FEBRUARY 3, 2025/uk

SACHIN DATTA, J

¹ *Parveen Kumar Beniwal v. Govt. of NCD of Delhi & Anr.*, 2015 SCC OnLine Del 9079, *J.K. Mittal v. Government of NCD of Delhi & Ors.*, 2015 SCC OnLine 11925 and *Rajkumar Pandey v. Additional Commissioner of Police & Anr.*, 2015 SCC OnLine Del 12895