Serial No. 7
Regular Cause List

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR

WP(C) 2668/2026 CM(7306/2026)

MOHAMMAD SALEEM PARAY

……...Petitioner(s)

Through:
Petitioner present in person.

Versus

UNION TERRITORY OF J AND K AND OTHERS

…….Respondent(s)

Through:

***CORAM*:**
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHD YOUSUF WANI, JUDGE

ORDER
27.10.2026

1. Heard the petitioner in person in respect of the matter.
2. The case of the petitioner, in nutshell, is that he is an Advocate by profession and a former elected member of the District Development Council, Anantnag. That he has been actively associated with political and public affairs and has contested the Parliamentary Elections, 2024, from the Anantnag-Rajouri Parliamentary Constituency, as well as the Legislative Assembly Elections, 2024, from Dooru (41) Assembly Constituency, as a candidate of the Democratic Progressive Azad Party. That, having regard to his political engagements and public activities, the competent authorities had earlier provided him with security, including residential security and Personal Security Officers (PSOs).

   That during Shri Amaranthji Yatra, 2025, the residential security guard deployed at his residence was withdrawn and the number of Personal Security Officers (PSOs) assigned to him was also reduced, with an assurance that the withdrawn security personnel would be restored upon conclusion of the Yatra. That, despite the conclusion of the Yatra, the withdrawn security arrangements have not been restored. That no final decision regarding his formal security categorization has been communicated to him, notwithstanding the representation submitted by him on 01.11.2025. That constrained by the continued uncertainty regarding his personal safety

and security, particularly in view of his political engagements and public profile, he has approached this Court seeking appropriate relief.

That he does not claim any vested right to a particular security category or to the deployment of a specified number of security personnel, acknowledging that the assessment of threat perception and the determination of appropriate security arrangements falls within the domain of the competent security agencies That his grievance is that no decision has been communicated to him on his pending representation concerning the sensitive issue of his personal safety and security.

3. The petitioner has accordingly sought for the issuance of following writs/directions in the matter;

   a. "*Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the competent respondents to consider and decide his pending representation dated 01.11.2025 (Annexure-IV) seeking appropriate security categorization and adequate security arrangements, after obtaining or considering such updated threat perception inputs as may be necessary and undertaking the requisite exercise through the competent security authorities, including the Security Review Coordination Committee wherever required under the applicable framework, preferably within a period of two weeks, or such other period as the Court may deem fit and proper, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the petitioner's security requirements;*

   b. *Writ of mandamus for directing the competent respondents to cause an objective and updated assessment of his threat perception through the appropriate security and intelligence agencies and to place his case before the competent Security Review Coordination Committee, if required under the applicable framework, for determining appropriate security categorization and consequent security arrangements, without this Court expressing any opinion on the merits of the assessment;*

   c. *Writ of mandamus for directing the respondents to take into consideration the relevant circumstances, including his former elected public office, previous participation in Parliamentary and Legislative Assembly elections, continuing political engagements, areas of movement, previous deployment of residential security and PSOs, subsequent withdrawal/reduction thereof and such other material as the competent authorities may consider relevant;*

   d. *Writ of mandamus for directing the competent respondents, particularly respondent Nos. 2, 4, 5 and 6, to undertake an urgent examination of the*

petitioner's immediate security requirements and to provide such appropriate interim protective arrangements as may be warranted by the prevailing circumstances and available security inputs, pending final consideration and determination of his representation dated 01.11.2025.

e. *Writ of mandamus for direction upon the Respodnents that they shall in the alternative, provide him with security cover comprising at least two Personal Security Officers (PSOs), inclusive of any PSOs presently deployed with him, until the competent authorities take and give effect to an appropriate decision concerning his security categorization, subject to lawful review of such interim arrangements and without prejudging the final assessment of his threat perception;*

f. *Mandamus to direct the competent respondents to communicate the outcome of the aforesaid consideration him to the extent permissible under the applicable guidelines and security protocols, without requiring disclosure of confidential or classified intelligence material".*

4. The petitioner while reiterating the averments made in his detailed petition, submitted that the security personnel withdrawn from his security cover have not been restored, despite the assurance extended by the respondents. He further submits that, in accordance with the prescribed security protocol, he submitted a formal representation dated 01.11.2025 seeking an appropriate assessment of his threat perception and determination of his security categorization. That however, despite the lapse of nearly one year, no decision has been taken by the respondents in the matter. He contended that, having regard to his political engagements and public profile, he cannot be left without an appropriate assessment of his threat perception and a consequential determination of the security cover warranted in his case. He further contended that after waiting for a reasonable period without any response from the respondents, he has been constrained to approach this Court for the vindication of his constitutional rights.

5. In the facts and circumstances of this case, the Court is of the considered opinion that the matter can be disposed of at this threshold stage by issuing such appropriate directions which are not likely to prejudice the rights and interest of any of the parties.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is disposed of with the direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation dated 01.11.2025 submitted by the petitioner, in accordance with the applicable security protocol, by undertaking an appropriate assessment of his threat perception and determination of the security cover, if any, warranted in his case, having regard to his security categorization. The needful is directed to be done

within a period of eight weeks from the date a copy of this order is served upon the respondents.

7. ***Disposed of***.

(MOHD YOUSUF WANI)
JUDGE

Srinagar
27.10.2026
"Sakeena"

HIGH COURT
JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH