

2025:PHHC:074743



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

108

CWP-16707-2025 (O & M)

Date of decision: 29.05.2025

Ravinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Pratap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Learned counsel submits that the primary reason for the District Magistrate to reject the request for grant of licence of permissible category of weapon sought on the ground that he was facing threat to his life and property and there were certain FIRs that were registered, Annexures P-11, P-13 and P-16, with regard to theft and threat to life, against which appeal was also preferred wherein though it has been recorded that FIR No.370 dated 22.06.2024 has also been lodged, however, the same was dismissed on the ground that Rule 12 of the Arms Rules has been relied upon by the District Magistrate, which, he submits, relates to prohibitory arms/automatic weapons, however, his application was not for the licence of the same. The absence of any specific security threat or imminent danger to the petitioner cannot be the sole ground for rejection of his application for arms licence, as held in **Manpreet Singh**

**vs. State of Punjab and others, 2022(4) RCR (Civil) 475 and Ranjan Kumar Mandal vs. State of Bihar and others, 2025 (1) PLJR 23.** He, thus, prays for reconsideration of the matter.

2. The aforesaid facts having been brought out, during the course of hearing, learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the Appellate Authority would not be averse to having a relook at the matter and decide afresh, taking note of the aforesaid submissions and judgments, within a period of 8 weeks, uninfluenced by the order(s) impugned in the present case, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner.

3. The aforesaid satisfies the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. The matter stands disposed of accordingly and if the petitioner is found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to his interest, the same may be passed after granting opportunity of hearing to him and shall contain reasons, whereupon he shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

29.05.2025

parveen kumar

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No  
Whether reportable : Yes / No