



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

113

CWP-33761-2025

Date of Decision: 02.04.2026

KULDEEP

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent No.3 to provide him security which was withdrawn on 17.02.2025 without prior notice and assigning cogent reasons.

2. The petitioner claims that he applied for security and licence of arms in October' 2018. He has lodged FIR No.75 dated 07.04.2017, FIR No.33 dated 17.02.2020 and FIR No.163 dated 06.06.2020 at Police Station Uklana, District Hisar. He has lodged aforesaid FIR(s) against different persons. They are on bail. He was extended security by State Government in view of registration of aforesaid FIRs. The State Government on 17.02.2025 without assigning any reason withdrew his security. He was not granted any opportunity to put forth his stand. There is danger to his life.



3. The respondent in its reply has pointed out that petitioner has not given any complaint since 2020 and there is no immediate threat to his life warranting restoration of police security. Para 11 of the reply reads as:-

“1. to 10. XXX XXX XXX XXX

11. That as regard with the contents of para No. 11 of the petition it is submitted that from the year 2020 till 01.09.2025, the petitioner has not lodged any complaint alleging fresh threats or intimidation before the police authorities. This clearly reflects that there is no subsisting or immediate threat to the petitioner warranting restoration of armed police security. It is further submitted that as and when the petitioner appears before the Ld. Trial Court for recording his evidence, appropriate security, as per the prevailing rules and policies, shall be provided to him. Outside the context of court attendance, there exists no credible ground requiring deployment of a police gunman at State expense.”

4. Faced with aforesaid statement, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be granted liberty to move an appropriate application, if at any stage petitioner gets threat perception.

5. In the wake of statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the petition stands disposed of with aforesaid liberty.

6. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

02.04.2026
SDK

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No