



\$~40

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

CNR No. DLHC010792752025

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3376/2025**

SATYA PRAKASH SHOKEEN AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Rishi Malhotra, Sr. Advocate
with Ms. Ansuiya, Mr. Shivaansh
Maini & Mr. Satpal Singh,
Advocates.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC along with SI
Chetan Panwar, PS Chhawla.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **25.08.2026**

1. Paragraph no.8 of the status report dated 24.08.2026 is extracted as under:

“8. That the matter was referred to the Special Cell, Delhi Police for fresh Threat Assessment. The latest Threat Assessment has assessed the threat perception qua the petitioners as genuine. Based upon the said assessment, police protection during daytime has been recommended. The matter is presently under review and consideration of the senior officers/ competent authority, and further/ new security arrangements shall be made accordingly, keeping in view the latest threat perception and intelligence inputs. Till finalization of the review, all the petitioners continue to receive police protection as before, as detailed hereunder:

(i) Sh. Sukhbir Shokeen is presently provided 06 PSOs in total, i.e. 04 PSOs during daytime and 02 PSOs during night;



(ii) Sh. Satya Prakash Shokeen is presently provided 02 PSOs in total, i.e. 01 PSO during daytime and 01 PSO during night;

(iii) Sh. Aman Shokeen is presently provided 02 PSOs in total, i.e. 01 PSO during daytime and 01 PSO during night; and

(iv) Sh. Akash Shokeen is presently provided 01 PSO during daytime.

The aforesaid security arrangements shall remain subject to review by the competent authority and shall be modified, if required, in accordance with the latest threat assessment and security requirements.”

2. Mr. Rishi Malhotra, learned Senior Counsel submits that the family members of the petitioner no.3 are provided round the clock PSOs, therefore, there is no reason not to extend the same benefit to petitioner no.3 as well. The Court, however, finds that the security arrangements are subject to the threat perception and the same is a dynamic arrangement.

3. If the respondents find that there are security threats to the petitioner no.3, let appropriate steps be taken accordingly.

4. If the grievance of the petitioner no.3 is not mitigated, he shall be at liberty to take further recourse in accordance with law.

5. At this stage, with these observations, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

AUGUST 25, 2026

tr