

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No.8407/2021

Jagram Jatav S/o Dayaram Jatav, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village And Post Berru, Tehsil Nagar, District Bharatpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs, And Justice, Secretariat Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Superintendent Of Police, Bharatpur.
3. Station House Officer Police Station Sikri, District Bharatpur
4. Harmesh S/o Nanduram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village And Post Berru, Tehsil Nagar, District Bharatpur.
5. Vikas S/o Pratap, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village And Post Berru, Tehsil Nagar, District Bharatpur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : None present

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Jitendra Singh Rathore, PP

JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND

Order

02/05/2026

1. By way of filing the instant criminal misc. petition, a prayer has been made for issuing directions to the official-respondents for providing protection to the petitioner because he apprehends a threat to his life and liberty.

2. Perusal of the contents of the instant criminal misc. petition indicates that the petitioner has filed a Criminal Complaint before the Court of ACJM No.2, Nagar, District Bharatpur and the same was sent for investigation under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. to Police Station Sikri, District Bharatpur, wherein FIR No.291/2021 has

been registered under Section 376 IPC, Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) & 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act and Section 3/4 of POCSO Act.

3. It has been alleged in the misc. petition that the accused-respondents threatened the petitioner and his family members, hence, under these circumstances, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the instant misc. petition seeking appropriate directions for his protection.

4. This Court vide order dated 20.12.2021 while passing an interim order directed the SHO, Police Station Sikri, District Bharatpur to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioner by the respondent Nos.4 & 5. More than five years have been passed thereafter. The perceived threat might have been over now.

5. Even if the petitioner still apprehends any kind of threat to his life and liberty, he would be at liberty to submit a representation before the concerned Nodal Officer/Superintendent of Police in light of the judgment passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Suman Meena vs. State of Rajasthan** while deciding **S.B. Criminal Writ Petition No.792/2024**.

6. It is well settled legal position as expounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **Lata Singh Vs. State of UP**, reported in **AIR 2006 SC 2522**, **S. Khushboo Vs. Kanniammal**, reported in **(2010) 5 SCC 600**, **Indra Sarma Vs. VKV Sarma** reported in **(2013) 15 SCC 755** and **Shafin Jahan Vs. Asokan KM** reported in **(2018) 16 SCC 368** that the life and personal liberty of the individual has to be protected except according to procedure established by law, as mandated by Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Further, as per Section 29 of the Rajasthan

Police Act, 2007, every police officer is duty bound to protect the life and liberty of the citizens.

7. In case such representation is submitted by the petitioner, it is expected from the officers concerned to look into the matter in terms of the directions issued by this Court in the case of **Suman Meena** (supra) and ensure that after analyzing the threat perceptions, if necessitated, necessary steps may be taken to provide adequate security and protection to the petitioner.

8. With the aforesaid observations, the instant criminal writ petition stands disposed of. Stay application as well as all pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J