



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 267/2015
CNR: RJHC020511612015 | URN: CRLMA / 967U / 2015

In

S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 4393/2015



Vikram Singh Shekhawat S/o Late Shri Narayan Singh Shekhawat, aged about 65 years, R/o Dujod House, Deraur Nagar South, Near Keshav Vidyapeeth, Jamdoli, Police Station Kanota, Jaipur (At present in Central Jail, Jaipur)

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan Through PP

----Respondent-Applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Siddharth Sharma, Mr. Samee Khan for Mr. Bhunesh Sharma, AAG
For Non applicant	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Mr. Virenda Godara, Jitendra Sharma Mr. Prakash Chand Mr. Rajeev Sogarwal Mr. Virendra Singh Mr. Ankur Singh Tomar Mr. Gaurav Tanwar Mr. Amrendra Kumar, Mr. Lekhpal Singh Mr. Vipin Kumar, Mr. Prabal Pratap Singh

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR

Order

29/09/2026

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the State seeking vacation of the order dated 18.08.2015 and 20.08.2015 whereby security protection was provided to the then Public Prosecutor, Shri R.S. Raghav. The said security was extended on



account of the security threat received by him in connection with the discharge of his professional duties.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the State submitted that the statement of the protected person, Mr. R.S. Raghav, has already been recorded before the concerned Criminal Court. It was further submitted that, in view of the statement of Mr. Raghav and the report of the Intelligence, there is no sufficient justification for continuation of the security provided to him in the year 2015. It was, therefore, submitted that the order dated 18.08.2015 and 20.08.2015 may be recalled and the security provided to Mr. R.S. Raghav may be withdrawn.

4. On the contrary, learned counsel appearing for Mr. R.S. Raghav submitted that although the statement of the petitioner has been recorded, the trial is yet to be concluded. It was further submitted that the threat perception which was considered sufficiently serious by this Court in the year 2015 cannot, merely because the statement of the protected person has been recorded, be presumed to have ceased. Therefore, the application be rejected.

5. I have given my earnest consideration to the rival submissions made at the Bar.

6. It is an admitted position that the criminal trial in question has not yet been concluded and that the final adjudication is still awaited. The fact that the then Public Prosecutor has already been examined may be a relevant consideration while assessing the





threat perception, but by itself, it cannot constitute a ground for withdrawal of the security.

7. In the present case, though the police report records that no direct or indirect threat has been received by the protected person from Navneet after the year 2015, however the concerned criminal proceedings have not yet culminated in final adjudication and the final decision is still awaited. Though the statement of the protected person has already been recorded, this circumstance alone, in peculiar facts of the case, does not warrant immediate withdrawal of the security arrangement provided to the protected person.

8. Accordingly, the application filed by State Public Prosecutor for vacating the order dated 18.08.2015 and 20.08.2015 is hereby rejected.

(PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR),J

90/BRIJ MOHAN GANDHI

