

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

WP No. 12756 of 2016

(IN REFERENCE (SUO MOTO) (JUDICIAL OFFICERS OF THE STATE OF M.P.) Vs THE STATE OF MADHYA  
PRADESH AND OTHERS)

**Dated : 09-07-2026**

*Shri Brajesh Nath Mishra - Advocate for the petitioner.*

*Shri Abhijeet Awasthi - Deputy Advocate General for the State.*

*Shri Kailash Chandra Ghildiyal - Senior Advocate with Ms. Warija Ghildiyal -  
Advocate for the intervener/Judges' Association.*

---

This petition is in the nature of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) on the basis of *suo motu* cognizance taken by the then Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice which focuses upon security facility being provided to the Judges in District Courts. At that point of time some incident took place at Mandsaur, which precipitated the cognizance.

2. Vide order dated 1.7.2026 certain directions were given by this Court and in pursuance thereof Director General of Police and Additional Chief Secretary (Home) filed their affidavits. The same are taken on record.

3. Since the matter pertains to security of Judges of district judiciary, who adjudicate criminal trials, family disputes, civil disputes, M.P./M.L.A. court cases and other contentious issues, therefore they are exposed to accused/litigants more. Therefore, ensuring their security is the prime duty of State so as to get fair, transparent and independent adjudication of disputes.

4. First and foremost remedial measure required for giving security to the Judges of district judiciary is to ensure availability of proper Housing Facility to District Judges/ Magistrates. Very large number of Judges are not having official/Government accommodations, they are residing in rented houses in cities.

This exposes them to public at large. They cannot maintain privacy and aloofness, which is required and expected from Judges. Not only this, in absence of any proper residential colonies for Judges, ensuring their privacy and security become a remote possibility.

5. Therefore, here role of State comes into play with prominence. It is the duty of respondents-State to ensure availability of sufficient funds for creation of infrastructure/ housing projects for Judges so that they can maintain aloofness and feel secured with their families. Therefore, Additional Chief Secretary (Home) is required to file affidavit and it should be categorical about the steps likely to be taken by the State to address this issue. If State Government is serious about maintaining security and well-being of Judges of district judiciary, then State will definitely come out with some concrete plan to address the housing problem faced by Judges/Magistrates of district judiciary. This will address most of the problems faced by Judges.

6. Let affidavit be filed by Additional Chief Secretary (Home) with a detailed plan for addressing the infrastructure related predicament of District Judges/Magistrates.

7. Intervener/Judges' Association is at liberty to suggest other remedial measures, if any, available with them on or before next date of hearing. This Court shall consider all such suggestions on next date of hearing.

8. List the case in the week commencing 25.8.2026.

(ANAND PATHAK)  
JUDGE

(B. P. SHARMA)  
JUDGE