



\$~81

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(CRL) 1639/2025 & CRL.M.A. 15347/2025

RAJO DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ranbir Singh Kunchu
and Ms. Kirti Aggarwal,
Advts.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI
AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari,
ASC for the State with Mr.
Alok Sharma and Ms.
Pragya Sharma, Advts.
with SI Dharamveer, PS
Chhawla.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

11.07.2025

%

1. By the present petition, the petitioner seeks continuance of the security provided to her by order dated 25.11.2024, passed by this Court in W.P. (CRL) 2192/2024. The petitioner is challenging the notice dated 02.05.2025 whereby she had been intimated that the security officer deployed for her personal security will be withdrawn.
2. By order dated 24.07.2024, this Court in W.P. (CRL) 2192/2024 had directed the respondents to conduct an audit of threat perception to the petitioner and her family. Further, by order dated 25.11.2024, this Court provided security to the petitioner while specifically noting that in the event that the respondents propose to withdraw the protection, they ought to give a 15-day prior written notice to the petitioner in order to



enable her to avail a remedy in accordance with law.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the threat perception of the petitioner is real since the petitioner's husband Ballu Pahalwan @ Suraj Bhan, who was a witness in a murder case, was murdered on 30.01.2024 outside a gym in Faridabad, Haryana. He submits that the threat still persists and prays that the arrangement as directed in the order dated 25.11.2024 passed in W.P. (CRL) 2192/2024 be continued.

4. The learned ASC submits that the threat assessment was carried out and the authorities opined that the petitioner no longer required any protection. He submits that the complaint was given since the petitioner was receiving threat calls from certain numbers. He submits that the petitioner has not received any threat calls for the last many months.

5. The relevant file and notes, considering the case of the petitioner, have been produced before this Court. This Court has considered the submission of the counsel and perused the record. It is borne out that the security was provided to the petitioner by the State noting that the writ petition is pending and since a threat assessment is being carried out, it would be appropriate to provide security. The Police then carried out a threat assessment and came to the conclusion that the petitioner no longer required protection. The notings have been made by the State that the petitioner has not been receiving threat calls from past many months.

6. The assessment in regard to a person requiring security is essentially an executive exercise, which the record indicates, has been carried out. The assessment carried out by the State cannot be substituted by the opinion of this Court on the basis of the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner.



7. Considering the aforesaid, this Court does not find any reason to extend the protection granted to the petitioner *vide* order dated 25.11.2024 in W.P. (CRL) 2192/2024.

8. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner apprehends a threat on her visit to the Sessions Court in Faridabad for deposing in the FIR, which was registered for the murder of her husband.

9. The State is directed to make appropriate arrangement for the security of the petitioner on the day when she is to depose before the concerned Court in Faridabad.

10. The present petition is accordingly disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

11. Needless to say, the petitioner is at liberty to make any complaint or approach the police officials in the case the need so arises in the future.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 11, 2025