# Prince Harry's legal challenge over police protection concluded



The Duke of Sussex, Prince Harry, recently concluded a two-day hearing at the Royal Courts of Justice in central London, as part of his legal challenge against the Home Office regarding the withdrawal of his police protection. This ongoing legal battle centres around the ruling made by the Executive Committee for the Protection of Royalty and Public Figures (Ravec), which determined that the Duke should receive a different level of protection while in the UK.

Leaving the court on Wednesday, the Duke expressed concerns about the nature of the evidence presented in private during the hearing, stating that his “worst fears” had been confirmed. “People would be shocked by what’s being held back,” he said, highlighting his distress over the legal proceedings. He added that the situation was particularly disheartening, suggesting that the decisions made by Ravec were intended to discourage him and his wife, the Duchess of Sussex, from relinquishing their roles as working royals and relocating abroad. This claim has been vehemently denied by sources within Buckingham Palace.

The legal discourse follows a ruling last year by retired High Court judge Sir Peter Lane, which deemed Ravec’s decision to be lawful. The Home Office, which oversees the committee’s decisions, has opposed Harry’s appeal, with legal representatives asserting that all decisions are made on a case-by-case basis, reflecting the context of each individual's situation.

In an interview with the Telegraph after the hearing, Harry admitted to feeling “exhausted” and “overwhelmed” by the ongoing legal struggle, adding that he considers the current case of heightened significance compared to his other legal engagements with tabloids, remarking that “this one always mattered the most”.

The appeal hearing was presided over by Judge Sir Geoffrey Vos alongside Lord Justice Bean and Lord Justice Edis. They indicated that a decision from the Court of Appeal would be delivered in writing at a later date, likely not before Easter. Sir Geoffrey noted, “Plainly we will take our time to consider our judgments,” reflecting the complexity of the case.

The controversy over the Duke's police protection began after he and Meghan Markle chose to step back from their roles as senior working royals, a decision that they announced on January 8, 2020. During a follow-up meeting known as the ‘Sandringham summit’, they were informed that they would not be granted the full-time police protection typically afforded to members of the royal family. Following their departure, Ravec concluded that the metropolitan police protection would no longer be warranted and that the couple would instead receive a “bespoke” security service. This arrangement stipulates that they must provide 30 days' notice before travelling to the UK, allowing authorities to assess the threat levels and determine the necessity for protection.

Harry's legal representation, Shaheed Fatima KC, argued during the appeal that the Duke had been “singled out for different, unjustified and inferior treatment”, asserting that the term ‘bespoke’ did not imply superior protection. The Home Office reacted to the allegations, contending that the challenge represented a persistent inability to view the broader context of the issues at hand, suggesting that the Duke’s legal arguments misrepresented aspects of the evidence and the ruling.

As the case continues, the intricacies of the legal battle and the implications of the decisions made regarding royal protection are poised to attract significant public and media attention.
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