



CWP-13471-2026

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Serial No.108/2

CWP-13471-2026

Decided on: 09.07.2026

Harbhajan Singh

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Harpreet S. Multani, Advocate,
Mr. Harmanpreet S. Mander, Advocate,
Mr. Ramaninder S. Jagal, Advocate,
Ms. Kritika, Advocate and
Mr. Amardeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chanchal K. Singla, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
with Mr. Vikas Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab,
Ms. Medha Diwan, Advocate and
Ms. Kavita Joshi, Advocate.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India
(through video conferencing) with
Ms. Saigeeta Srivastava, Senior Panel Counsel
for the respondent/UOI.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J.(ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* setting aside the order dated 25.04.2026, Annexure P-3, whereby the security cover extended to the petitioner has been withdrawn by respondent no.5/Additional Director General of Police, Security, Punjab. Further, a writ of *mandamus* has been sought directing the said respondent to restore the security



since it has been withdrawn without any fresh threat assessment and affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel contended that the petitioner is an elected Member of Parliament, Rajya Sabha, from the State of Punjab and was extended security cover having about twenty-five police personnel while he was a member of the Aam Aadmi Party. Due to political differences, he left the party on 24.04.2026, and the next day the security cover was withdrawn vide the impugned order leaving him vulnerable. There were protests in front of his house at Jalandhar, and posters labelling him *gaddar*/traitor were pasted outside, as apparent from the pictures, Annexure P-5, which show the threat persisted. And there was no justification to withdraw the cover overnight.

3. Learned State counsel, however, submits that withdrawal of security cover was after due threat assessment conducted by the Security Review Committee on 03.03.2026, much prior to the petitioner leaving the ruling party. The details to that effect have been given in the affidavit, dated 20.05.2026, sworn by Assistant Inspector General of Police, Security, Punjab. Paragraph 6 whereof reads as under:

6. That it is respectfully submitted that as per the available security assessment conducted by the Security Review Committee, review of threat perception of all protectees of CP/Jalandhar area was conducted on 03.03.2026, where Joint Commissioner of Police Jalandhar, members of SRC had participated and no specific threat was reported by any of participating wings regarding the petitioner. Further, it is submitted that the engagements of the Petitioner outside Jalandhar within the State of Punjab were found to be very limited, and pertinently, he predominantly stays outside State of Punjab. Therefore, Respondent No. 6 i.e. Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar was



directed to take care of the security of the petitioner through local deployment, the existing security personnel were withdrawn, and the impugned Order No. 10788-98/CRSW/D-2 dated 25.04.2026 was passed by the office of the deponent. It is pertinent to note that, as per the applicable security protocol/guidelines, security deployment beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Punjab can ordinarily be granted only for a 72 hours. The aforesaid circumstances clearly demonstrate that the petitioner was not continuously residing or operating within Punjab, and accordingly, the security arrangement was changed to a local deployment by Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar.

3.1. He further submits that the petitioner has already been extended highly specialised 'Y+' category security cover through the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) vide Ministry of Home Affairs order dated 04.05.2026, as detailed in the same affidavit. His security concerns have accordingly been taken care. *Lastly*, he submits that the petitioner remains outside the State of Punjab and whenever he visits the State his security concerns will be taken care of, depending upon the threat assessment, by local area deployment as may be required.

4. Heard.

5. In view of the facts aforementioned it cannot be said the petitioner's security cover has been withdrawn abruptly due to his leaving the party. The decision to withdraw had been taken by the Review Committee much earlier, which is not denied. The protests outside his residence or his being branded a traitor, would not establish threat to his life and liberty *ipso facto*. The protest was not violent either. Besides, the petitioner has already been provided 'Y+' category security through CRPF by the Ministry of Home

**CWP-13471-2026****-4-**

Affairs and, in addition, the State Government has undertaken to take care of his security through local area deployment whenever he is in the State.

6. In view thereof, no further direction needs to be issued and the petition stands disposed of.

09.07.2026*Mehak***(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No