



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD  
LUCKNOW**

**CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 4180 of 2026**

S. Vignesh Shishir

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Director Central, Bureau Investigation New Delhi  
And Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : In Person  
Counsel for Respondent(s) : Anurag Kumar Singh, A.S.G.I.,  
Kuldeep Srivastava, Raj Kumar Singh

---

**Court No. - 9**

**HON'BLE RAJESH SINGH CHAUHAN, J.  
HON'BLE ZAFEER AHMAD, J.**

**(Order on CMA/IA No.4 of 2026)**

1. Heard Sri S. Vignesh Shishir, the applicant, who appeared in person. Sri S.B. Pandey learned Senior Advocate-cum- Deputy Solicitor General of India has appeared on behalf of the Union of India, Sri Raj Kumar Singh and Sri Anand Dwivedi have appeared for other officers of the Central Government and Sri Anurag Kumar Singh has appeared on behalf of the CBI.

2. Sri S.B. Pandey has filed a copy of written instructions, the same is taken on record.

3. As per the aforesaid written instructions, though, initially the request of the applicant for providing Z<sup>+</sup> security was not recommended in absence of any specific threat but considering some subsequent developments and the representation of the applicant, the aforesaid grievance/ request of the applicant is being reconsidered and examined afresh by the competent authority and it has been stated that on receipt of report from the Central Security Agency, necessary action will be taken. In the meantime, Ministry of Home Affairs advised State Government of Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala and Delhi Police to suitably address the security concerns of applicant- Sri S. Vignesh Shishir on the basis of local threat perceptions vide Ministry's letters dated 12.02.2026 & 08.05.2026. For

the convenience paragraphs no.7 & 8 of the instructions letter are being reproduced herein below:-

*"7. In this connection, it is stated that the petitioner vide his emails dated 11.01.2026, 17.01.2026, 19.01.2026, 20.01.2026, 23.01.2026, 05.03.2026 and 24.03.2026 has requested to provide 'Z' category CRPF security cover on all India basis for himself. These representations were examined in this Ministry in consultation with Central Security Agency. In absence of any specific threat, graded security was not recommended. Further, MHA advised State Government of Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala and Delhi Police to suitably address the security concerns of Shri Vignesh Shishir on basis of local threat perception vide this Ministry's letters dated 12.02.2026 and 08.05.2026.*

*8. In terms of Hon'ble High Court directions, the representations of the petitioner dated 26.04.2026 and 15.05.2026 (received letter) are being examined afresh in this Ministry in consultation with Central Security Agency. On receipt of the report from Central Security Agency necessary action will be taken. MHA would request additional 4 weeks time from Hon'ble Court in the matter."*

4. Sri Pandey has stated that appropriate order would be passed by the competent authority of the Central Government at the earliest and as soon as such order is passed, the same shall be intimated to the applicant and consequential steps shall be taken.

5. Sri S. Vignesh Shishir, the applicant, has however submitted that as and when he attends the Court proceedings anywhere in India including this Court, he is provided ample security, which is required to save his life as he has shown photocopy of some photographs showing some security personnel with him, but when he does not attend any Court proceedings or remains alone, he is provided only one P.S.O. of C.R.P.F. armed with pistol. Therefore, he has requested that till any appropriate decision is taken by the competent authority of the Central Government, at least such security, which is provided for attending the Court proceedings, may be provided to him in the interest of justice and also in the light of protection so given under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The aforesaid photocopies of photographs shown by applicant- Sri S. Vignesh Shishir are also taken on record.

6. Be that as it may, if the aforesaid fact so intimated by Sri S. Vignesh Shishir, the applicant, is true and he is provided appropriate security while attending the Court proceedings, then the competent agency, which provides such security, would be knowing about the fact that the applicant is facing some threat perceptions and in that case, appropriate measures may be taken before taking final decision on the representation of the petitioner/ applicant inasmuch as every person has got fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and looking to the facts and circumstances of the case in question, *prima facie*, it appears that on such request, any appropriate decision may be taken by the competent authority.

7. Since subject matter is under consideration before the competent authority, therefore, we are refraining ourselves to pass any such direction till any final decision is taken, but we legitimately expect that right to life and personal liberty of a citizen is ensured in its letter and spirit.

8. The application is **disposed of** accordingly.

9. List the petition on the date fixed.

(Zafeer Ahmad,J.) (Rajesh Singh Chauhan,J.)

**May 27, 2026**

RBS/-