



\$~83

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(CRL) 939/2026 & CRL.M.A. 8902/2026 & CRL.M.A.  
8903/2026

JUDICIAL SERVICE ASSOCIATION OF DELHI .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kirti Uppal, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Vaibhav Mishra, Mr. Raghav  
Sood, Mr. Aditya Jha, Mr. Utsav  
Madaan, Mr. Satvik Bajaj, Ms. Smriti  
Dua and Mr. Keshav, Advocates

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. ....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, SC (Crl.) with Mr.  
Raghvendre Verma, APP with Mr.  
Abhinav Kumar and Mr. Aryan  
Sachdeva, Advocates along with SI  
Sunit.

Mr. Neeraj, SPC with Mr. Rudra  
Paliwal, GP, Mr. Soumyadip  
Chakraborty, Advocates.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**ORDER**

% **24.03.2026**

1. The severity of the grievance raised in the present petition cannot be undermined, from any angle whatsoever.
2. The present petition has been filed by *Judicial Service Association of Delhi* through its President with the prayer that the members of the petitioner-Association be provided with Personal Security Officers (PSOs) and requisite security arrangements be also made at their respective homes.
3. In this regard, the petitioner-Association also places its reliance upon the observations appearing in order dated 19.07.2024 passed by Division Bench of this Court in W.P.(CRL) 3044/2017. While taking up the concerns

W.P.(CRL) 939/2026

1



of Delhi Prosecutors Welfare Association (DPWA), the Division Bench, *inter alia*, considered the grievance with respect to providing of Special Security Allowance to Public Prosecutors and made following observations in the abovesaid context:-

**“PROVIDING OF SPECIAL SECURITY ALLOWANCE TO PUBLIC PROSECUTORS**

40. Undoubtedly, the Public Prosecutors in Criminal Justice Delivery System are required to handle very sensitive matters and, therefore, there is a prayer that they should be given special security allowance. According to DPWA, such special security allowance is being provided to prosecutors/law officers of CBI, NIA, Enforcement Directorate and the prosecutors attached with Government of Assam.

41. Though, the security aspect can always be gone into and taken up on case-to-case basis as and when there is any perception of threat. We sincerely hope that in any such situation, the concerned authority would look into the matter without any kind of delay and would ensure that wherever so required, adequate security provision is made in terms of the request received from any such prosecutor.

42. However, at the same time, it is the duty of State to ensure about security and safety of all such stakeholders stationed in Court who come into contact with hardened criminals while discharging their official duties.

43. We, therefore, direct GNCTD to consider such request of Public Prosecutors while keeping in mind the fact that similar provision has been made for their colleagues serving in other agencies. Since, the judicial officers are also prone to such threat, GNCTD shall consider whether allowance or any alternate arrangement like providing PSO can be made for them or not.

44. Let a decision in this regard be taken within eight weeks from today.”

*(emphasis supplied)*

4. Petitioner-Association also sent a representation to the worthy Registrar General of this Court and in such representation dated 23.04.2025, it reiterated the abovesaid request.

5. Mr. Kirti Uppal, learned Senior Counsel for petitioner submits that there are numerous incidents involving threats directed towards Judicial Officers. He states that these threats have direct co-relation with discharge of



their official duties and if the security and safety aspect of the Judicial Officers is not answered appropriately, it would not only diminish and weaken the majesty and dignity of the Court but also create fear in their minds. He submits that if there is a specific threat perception to any individual Judicial Officer, requisite security arrangements can always be made but merely, because cases are being evaluated on individual basis, would not be sufficient in itself.

6. It is highlighted that many Judicial Officers of Delhi drive themselves for commuting to their respective Court Complexes and there are several incidents of stalking, abusing and threatening them. At times, these Judicial Officers deal with criminal cases related to gangsters and hardened criminals and in such a situation, when the Judicial Officers, called as “*custodians of justice*”, perform their duty under challenging circumstances, the State is under automatic obligation to take proactive steps and to come forward in providing requisite security and safety to all of them. He states that similar provision has been made in other States.

7. The Court has gone through the contents of said representation dated 23.04.2025. The fate and outcome of said representation is, however, not known to the petitioner.

8. In view of the above, Registrar General of this Court is also impleaded as respondent in the present Writ Petition.

9. Let amended memo of parties be filed.

10. Issue notice.

11. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel (Crl) appears on behalf of respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5 and learned counsel for respondent No.4 i.e. Ministry of Home Affairs appears on advance notice. They accept notice. Let



reply be filed by them.

12. In the interregnum, let a meeting take place amongst the Senior Officers of GNCTD, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India as well as of Delhi Police within two weeks from today and outcome thereof be apprised, on affidavit.

13. List on 21.04.2026 in Supplementary List.

14. Copy of this order be sent to Chief Secretary, GNCTD, Principal Secretary, Department of Law, Justice, and Legislative Affairs, Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Commissioner of Police and Registrar General of this Court for information and necessary action.

15. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

**MANOJ JAIN, J**

**MARCH 24, 2026/sw/js**