



\$~104

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 427/2026 & CRL.M.A. 3930/2026**

NIKHIL NANDA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhijat Bal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Devanshu Chauhan, Mr.
Harishwardhan Gupta, Mr. Sidharth
Bansal, Advocates.

versus

NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC for the State
with Ms. Priya Rai, Mr. Sangeet
Sibou, Mr. Shubham Goyal and Mr.
Priyansh Raj Singh, Advocates
alongwith SI Niranker Nagar, P.S.-
Defence colony

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **05.02.2026**

1. By way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioner seeks a direction upon the respondents to provide adequate police protection to him and his family.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Rahul Tyagi, learned Additional Standing Counsel, accepts notice on behalf of the State.
3. It is stated in the petition that the petitioner is the complainant in FIR No. 191/2024, dated 21.12.2024, registered at Police Station Defence Colony under Section 308(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. In the said FIR he has made an allegation that he has received serious threats from a gang named therein.
4. I am informed that the petitioner was provided security of 2 PSOs round the clock under the witness protection scheme in connection with a



different FIR [FIR No. 129/2021]. He assails a decision of the Security Review Committee dated 20.08.2024, by which his security has been downgraded to 1 PSO during the day time.

5. Mr. Abhijat Bal, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, submits that no fresh threat perception has been conducted in the wake of the recent FIR [FIR No. 191/2024].

6. Mr. Tyagi, on the other hand, submits that any decision of the Security Review Committee under the Witness Protection Scheme 2018 [“the Scheme”], is susceptible to review in terms of Clause 15 of the Scheme.

7. There is some dispute as to whether the decision of the Security Review Committee taken in August 2024 was in fact implemented at that time. Mr. Bal submits, upon instructions, that the security has been downgraded to 1 PSO only ten days ago, whereas Mr. Tyagi submits, upon instructions, that the security was downgraded on 21.08.2024.

8. Having regard to the submission of Mr. Tyagi that the matter, in any event, can be reviewed under the terms of the Scheme itself, the respondent is directed to treat the present petition as a representation for review and pass a decision thereupon, in light of all the facts and circumstances of the case, within a period of four weeks from today.

9. The petition, alongwith pending application, is disposed of with these directions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 5, 2026/“Bhupi”/AD/