



\$~99

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(CRL) 3376/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30703/2025, CRL.M.A. 34188/2025

SATYA PRAKASH SHOKEEN AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Romy Chacko, Sr. Advocate and
Mr. Satpal Singh, Advocate.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, ASC for the
State with Arijit Sharma and Ms.
Sakshi Jha, Advocates.
SI Sapna Sharma, P.S.: Chhawla.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

21.01.2026

%

Mr. Romy Chacko, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners submits, that as recorded in order dated 15.10.2025, by reason of the threats received by the petitioners at the hands of certain gangster as detailed in the petition, the ASC had submitted before the court that appropriate security as per their threat assessment is being provided to the petitioners; and a permanent police picket has been stationed outside their residence.

2. Mr. Chacko submits however, that subsequently, an incident occurred on the night of 17.01.2026, whereupon a complaint was made by one of the PSOs on duty to say that petitioner No.2 had had a physical engagement with the PSO assigned to him, by reason whereof the local police have withdrawn the PSOs assigned both to petitioners Nos. 1 and 2.



3. Learned senior counsel submits, that it is the petitioners' contention that petitioner No.2 did not any assault the PSO but there was only a verbal altercation, since the PSO was not permitting certain relatives of petitioner No.2 to enter the premises where the petitioners were hosting a party.
4. Mr. Chacko argues, that regardless of what might have happened on the night of 17.01.2026, by withdrawing the PSOs assigned to petitioners Nos. 1 *and* 2, the petitioners are presently exposed to serious threat to their life and limb at the hands of a certain gangster.
5. S.I. Sapna Sharma is present from P.S.: Chhawla, as the deputed I.O., and submits that the PSOs assigned to petitioners Nos. 1 and 2 have indeed been withdrawn by reason of petitioner No.2's conduct; but a police picket continues to be posted outside the petitioners' residence.
6. In the circumstances, the learned ASC is directed to take instructions on their assessment of the altercation between petitioner No.2 and the PSO; and file a status report in that regard.
7. However as requested by Mr. Chacko, the SHO P.S.: Chhawla is directed to re-depute PSOs insofar as petitioners Nos. 1 and 3 are concerned.
8. Re-notify for further consideration on 27th February 2026.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 21, 2026

SS