# Prince Harry escorted from court as he contests security ruling



The Duke of Sussex, Prince Harry, was escorted from a court in London under the protection of bodyguards following an unexpected incident involving a member of the public. The event took place as he attended the Court of Appeal to contest a prior High Court ruling regarding the level of security he receives while in the United Kingdom.

On April 9, 2023, Prince Harry appeared in court to challenge the Home Office's decision related to the Executive Committee for the Protection of Royalty and Public Figures (Ravec). The Duke claims that he should be granted a different degree of protection due to increasing security concerns surrounding him and his family. Such concerns have been underscored by previous incidents, including a reported “dangerous car pursuit with paparazzi” in New York in May of the previous year.

As proceedings continued, which notably included parts being conducted in private, a woman in the audience loudly expressed her support for Prince Harry. She shouted, “I support you, Prince Harry," prompting his bodyguards to draw closer. The situation escalated when she further accused the press, stating, “If you’re members of the press, you’re the reason he’s no longer in England."

The Duke has been without royal protection since stepping down as a senior working member of the royal family in January 2020, a decision he and his wife, Meghan Markle, took in light of perceived inadequacies in the protection provided to them by the royal institution. During the proceedings, barrister Shaheed Fatima KC, representing the Duke, cited a document reportedly published by a terrorist group, which suggested that Harry's assassination would be welcomed by the Muslim community, highlighting the significant risks he faces.

Fatima's written submissions emphasised the importance of safety and security for individuals, particularly for members of the royal family. She stated, "This appeal concerns the most fundamental right: to safety and security of person." In response, the Home Office, represented by barrister Sir James Eadie KC, opposed the appeal. He argued that there was a failure to recognise key elements of the case and clarified that the circumstances surrounding the Duke did not justify a move away from standard security arrangements.

The hearing was scheduled to conclude later that day, with a written decision from the court expected to follow at a later date.
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