

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE T. MADHAVI DEVI

WRIT PETITION NO.22636 OF 2026

DATED : 16.07.2026

Between:

Jalagam Prasad Rao

... Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana rep by Principal
Secretary (Home), Secretariat, Hyderabad
and others

... Respondents

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed seeking a direction in the nature of Mandamus by duly declaring the impugned notice-cum-order *vide* C.No.170/CSB-KMM/2026 dt.09.07.2026 withdrawing the personal security arrangement of the petitioner without any enquiry or prior intimation, as illegal, arbitrary and against the principles of natural justice and consequently to set aside the same and to direct the

respondents to reinstate/provide the security cover of 1+1 PSOs (Personal Security Officers) and to provide any additional security to the petitioner in the interest of justice and to pass such other order or orders.

2. Brief facts leading to the filing of the present Writ Petition are that the petitioner is the son of late Sri Jalagam Vengal Rao, former Chief Minister of United Andhra Pradesh and Home Minister and Union Minister and the petitioner himself was a Minister in the erstwhile State of Andhra Pradesh from 1990 to 1994 twice elected as MLA from Sathupalli Constituency officiating the portfolios of Small Scale Industries and Panchayat Raj. The petitioner claims that as the Chief Minister of United Andhra Pradesh and Home Minister and Industries Minister and Union Minister, his father, and as Minister in the former Government of Andhra Pradesh, the petitioner, have taken several measures to curb the extremist activities in the State due to which, the petitioner's family has remained under constant threat of extremists and in view thereof, he was provided with security by the Government. He submits that during the year 2024, when the police protection was withdrawn, the petitioner filed W.P.No.4427 of 2024 before this Court and the said protection was restored on the directions of this Court in the said Writ Petition *vide* order dt.20.02.2024 and ultimately, the Writ

Petition was closed confirming the interim orders since the same was implemented by the respondents. It is submitted that in January, 2024 after withdrawal of the security cover, the petitioner had received WhatsApps calls from a mobile number +91 7816035966 where the caller spoke in a harsh and threatening manner and the said caller sent a message on 18.02.2024 at 12.59 PM demanding Rs.1.00 crore and stating that “this is in the interest of your safety”, indicating threat to his life and safety. It is submitted that thereafter, the petitioner’s security has been restored and again, *vide* orders dt.27.06.2026, the 6th respondent has withdrawn the security as per G.O.Rt.No.644 dt.13.03.1997, aggrieved by which, the petitioner filed W.P.No.20775 of 2026, wherein this Court has directed the 6th respondent to afford him an opportunity to submit his explanation and of being heard. It is submitted that the petitioner submitted a detailed memorandum on 06.07.2026 explaining the necessity of security to him and also appeared before the 6th respondent on 08.07.2026 to explain his threat perception, but the 6th respondent, without considering the same, has passed the impugned order. Therefore, this Writ Petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner also placed reliance upon the decision of the Allahabad High Court in the case of **Abhishek Tiwari**

Vs. State of U.P. Thru Addl. Chief Secy. Home Lko. And ors.¹,

wherein it was observed that a person or political personality cannot claim security on the ground that he faces threats from his enemies because of some private dispute with them, but where the political personalities hold public office and might have real threat from the terrorists/militants/fundamentalists outfits and organized criminal gangs for the work done or being done in the interest of nation by such political personality, they are entitled to be given security at State expense and if they were to be harmed by such elements, it would affect the prestige of the Government and authority of the State and it would adversely create an impression in the minds of the people that if, the Government cannot protect high dignitaries and, the people who work for nation and society, how would it ever protect the common men and this would lead to the insecurity in the minds of the public in general and diminish the State Authority. The learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court to the representation of the petitioner, wherein the petitioner has clearly stated that he goes to interior rural tribal areas of his Constituency and he daily engages with koyas, konda reddy and other tribals and helps them with various

¹ 2021 Supreme(All) 450 : 2022 AIR(All)(NOC) 190

facilities and therefore, there is a threat from anti-social elements as he represents marginalised sections of tribal community. He therefore sought setting aside of the impugned order and restoration of personal security i.e., 1+1 of personal security officers.

4. On the other hand, learned Government Pleader for Home has furnished a copy of the written instructions received by him, according to which, it is stated that the petitioner herein is a former Minister and therefore 1+1 personal security officers have been provided only during his visits to his native village namely, Bayannagudem Village, Penuballi Mandal, Khammam District and there was no present and specific threat perception to the petitioner and no criminal cases or other circumstances indicating any security risk are pending against him and accordingly, the continuation of security cover was not recommended by the Security Review Committee after an objective assessment of the petitioner's threat perception. It is submitted that pursuant to the directions of this Court, the ACP, CSB, Khammam was directed to submit threat perception report and taking the same into consideration, the impugned order has been passed. It is submitted that the petitioner has no vested or enforceable legal right to claim continuation of personal security arrangements irrespective of the prevailing threat perception and the

provision of security cover is purely an administrative measure based on periodic threat assessment and is always subject to review by the competent authorities in accordance with the applicable government guidelines. It is submitted that the Director General, Intelligence, Telangana State, *vide* Fax/TSPMS Message dt.01.10.2025 had requested the Commissioner of Police, Khammam to furnish the latest threat perception reports in respect of all protectees within the Khammam Police Commissionerate together with details of the security arrangements provided, for consideration by the Security Review committee-2025 and accordingly, a report was submitted on all protectees including the petitioner and the same was forwarded to the competent authority and it was only after considering the same that a decision was taken by the Security Review Committee in its meeting held on 01.06.2026 to withdraw the security arrangements of the protectees including the petitioner and therefore, there is no selective withdrawal but it is only after considering all the aspects of threat perception to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner is presently residing in Hyderabad and visits Khammam only occasionally and there are no public declarations, coercive texts or clandestine documents indicating intent to cause physical harm or assassination of

the petitioner and the protectee has not lodged any complaints, representations or informal notifications with local police regarding perceived vulnerabilities or threatening behaviour from any individual or group. It is further submitted that at present there is no activity of all the armed cadres of CPI (Maoist) in Telangana and our neighbouring States of Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh and as per the latest intelligence inputs, there is no specific threat to the petitioner's life from CPI (Maoist) party or any other LWE outfits. In respect of the WhatsApp messages received from a suspect mobile number 7816035966 from which, the petitioner claims to have received threat calls, it is stated that it is registered in the name of one Madhela Mani, S/p Madhela Guravaiah, Venkateswarapuram, Nellore and he working as a tailor and he has no connection whatsoever with Maoists or any other person. It is submitted that there is no violation of principles of natural justice as his representation dt.06.07.2026 has been considered and after obtaining the inputs about the threat perception only, the decision has been taken. The details of a number of persons to whom security provided earlier was withdrawn, are also given in the written instructions. A copy of the threat perception report in respect of the

petitioner herein submitted the Assistant Commissioner of Police ACP), CSB, Khammam is also filed before this Court in a sealed cover.

5. Having regard to the rival contentions and also the threat perception report submitted by the ACP, this Court finds that the Security Review Committee and thereafter, the Commissioner of Police, i.e., 6th respondent, have considered the threat perception reports of the officials as well as of the petitioner's own inputs and thereafter have come to the conclusion that there is no threat to the life of the petitioner and therefore the security cover has been withdrawn. As submitted the learned Government Pleader for Home, no person has any vested or enforceable legal right to claim continuation of personal security arrangement irrespective of the prevailing threat perception. Admittedly, the petitioner was a Minister during the years 1990 to 1994 and thereafter, he has remained inactive in politics for the past 32 years and he is not active in politics as of now and the petitioner also appears to be residing in Hyderabad and visiting his native village occasionally. It is an administrative decision taken by the Government after considering all the aspects of the issue and after considering the petitioner's representation as well giving him a personal hearing. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order.

6. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.
7. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, in this Writ Petition shall also stand dismissed.

JUSTICE T. MADHAVI DEVI

Date: 16.07.2026

Svv