



\$~49

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1727/2025**

DR UDIT RAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shahid Ali, Mr. Mohd. Salman
Mr. Sameer Tayyeb, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Priyam Aggarwal, Mr.
Abhinav Kumar Arya, Mr Aryan
Sachdeva, Advs.
Mr. Himanshu Pathak, SPC with Mr.
Amit Singh, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **23.05.2025**

**CRL.M.A. 16094/2025 EXEMPTION FROM FILING CERTIFIED
COPIES**

Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 1727/2025

1. This is a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 BNS for issuance of directions to the respondents to provide adequate security to the petitioner.
2. Ld. Counsel appearing for the petitioner states that petitioner is Ex-Member of Parliament and is currently the National Spokesperson of a political party. He submits that petitioner made a statement during a press conference in Lucknow about former U.P. Chief Minister on 17.02.2025.



Following the press conference, the petitioner received multiple threatening calls with explicit threats of physical harm and some threats were also circulated widely on social media and a You Tube Channel even announced a reward for slitting the petitioner's neck.

3. Issue notice to respondent nos. 2 and 3. Mr. Sanjay Lao, Ld. Standing Counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent nos. 2 & 3.

4. Learned counsel appearing on advance notice on behalf of respondent No. 1, states that respondent has no role, and therefore, respondent No. 1 be deleted from the array of parties.

5. The security is to be provided by the police. Respondents No. 2 & 3 are already arraigned as respondents for the said purpose. There being no role of Union of India, it is deleted from the array of parties.

6. Mr. Lao, learned Standing Counsel, appearing for respondents No. 2 & 3 submits that the matter is in the knowledge of Special Commissioner of Police and that the complaint made by the petitioner is being investigated and further action would be taken as per law. He further states that directions be given to SHO, PS North Avenue and the Beat Officer of the area to keep proper vigil.

7. It is the responsibility of the State to ensure safety and security of all the citizens and this Court being the Constitutional Court is expected to protect the constitutional rights of the citizens.

8. Respondent no. 3 is directed to make an assessment of the security threat and take adequate measures for the safety and security of the petitioner. In the meanwhile, the local area SHO PS North Avenue as also the beat officer of the area where the petitioner is residing be issued suitable instructions to keep a strict vigil. Their contact details be also shared with



the petitioner. Directions be issued to the beat officer to make call to the petitioner every day before 7:00 PM at least for the next two months.

9. With these directions, the petition stands disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

MAY 23, 2025/GS