



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR.**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 31 OF 2026

LALAN KISHOR SINGH

Vs.

*THE UNION OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, THRU. ITS SECRETARY,
N.DELHI AND OTHERS*

Mr. A. R. Ingole, Advocate for petitioner.
Mr. K. N. Shukul, D.S.G.I. for respondent no.1
Mr. D. V. Chauhan, G.P with Mr. N.S. Rao, A.G.P for respondent no.4

**CORAM :- SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, C. J. &
ANIL S. KILOR, J.**

DATE : 20th APRIL, 2026.

P C.

Heard.

2. Except stating that he is the citizen of India, the petitioner does not disclose any details about himself. However, he is concerned about Z+ VVIP Security provided to 3rd respondent – Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) thru. its Sar Sanghchalak Shri Mohan Bhagwat.

3. The petitioner seeks the following directions :

“(i) by an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction, direct the respondent nos.1, 2 and 4 authority to forthwith recover the security charges from the respondent no.3-Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh through its Sar Sanghchalak Shri Mohan Bhagwat towards Z+VVIP Security;

(ii) direct the respondent nos.1, 2 and 4 authority to comply the mandate of Judgment delivered by the Hon'ble Apex Court dated 27.02.2023 Union of India Vs. Bikash Saha and others (Annexure-B);

(iii) direct the respondent nos.1, 2 and 4 authority to forthwith decide the representations/request letter made by the petitioner (Annexure-C) dated 12.02.2026 27.02.2026;

(iv) grant any other relief, which may be deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the present case and in the interest of justice.”

4. Mr. A.R. Ingole, learned counsel for the petitioner refers to a decision in the case of *Union of India Vs. Bikash Saha and others*¹ and submits that Z+ Security cover provided to any person must have a reasonable basis of security threat to that person. Moreover, the public money cannot be wasted on the expenses incurred for providing security cover to an organization like 3rd respondent.

5. We do not find any public interest involved in this writ petition marked as Public Interest Litigation. The petitioner does not disclose the source of information. He also does not state that he conducted sufficient research as required under the relevant Rules and seems to have rushed to the Court on the basis of a newspaper report at Annexure-A (page 19) of the paperbook. Quite apparently this Public Interest Litigation is a motivated petition and amounts to an abuse of the process of law.

6. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)

Diwale.