# Prince Harry contests withdrawal of police protection in court hearing



Prince Harry was in London this week for a two-day appeal hearing at the Royal Courts of Justice, where he contested the withdrawal of publicly funded police protection for him and his wife, Meghan Markle. The Duke of Sussex claims that the decision to remove this security measure in 2020 was a tactic to dissuade the couple from stepping away from their royal duties and relocating to the United States.

During the proceedings, Harry expressed that he has felt "overwhelmed" and "exhausted" throughout his three-year legal battle regarding this matter. He described the lack of police protection as "difficult to swallow," underscoring the significance of this case in the context of his ongoing legal challenges. Speaking to The Telegraph, he noted, "We were trying to create this happy house," and added, "People would be shocked by what’s being held back."

In response to Harry's assertions, Dai Davies, a former head of Scotland Yard's Royal Protection, dismissed the claims as "complete nonsense." In comments made to the Mail Online, Davies stated, "The idea that he needs 24/7 armed protection is ridiculous - so too is the idea that Britain is unsafe for him." He elaborated that Harry is assigned a liaison officer who has access to updated intelligence reports and collaborates with Harry's personal security team, which he described as "extremely capable."

Davies indicated that the decision regarding Harry's police protection was made by the Royal and VIP Executive Committee (RAVEC) based on a professional risk assessment conducted after Harry and Markle stepped back from their senior royal roles. He remarked that the reasoning for the decision was independent of the Royal Family's influence, asserting that it was purely a governmental decision.

Additionally, a source close to Priti Patel, who served as Home Secretary during the time of the protection review, indicated that the decision-making process adhered strictly to a risk assessment framework. Davies said, "It would be beneath [the Queen] not to allow Ravec to do their job professionally, or make leanings against them."

As the hearing concluded, the discussions surrounding Prince Harry’s security issues continue to attract media attention, particularly given the implications these claims have for royal protocols and personal safety.
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