

\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(CRL) 580/2010

MOHD SHAHID SIDDIQUI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aftab Rasheed, Advocate

versus

LT GOVERNOR OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vikas Pahwa, ASC for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.L. MEHTA

ORDER


14.11.2011

%

This is a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr. P.C assailing an order 7.10.2009 passed by the Lt. Governor of Delhi. Vide this order, the appeal filed by the petitioner against the order of Licensing Authority rejecting the application of the petitioner for grant of arms license was dismissed. The petitioner prayed that the arm is required for his own protection. The case of the petitioner was processed by the Licensing Authority and as required the report from the local police was called. It was reported that there was a case against him under Sections 107/150 Cr.P.C pending which was subsequently closed on 20.9.2007 with a warning given to the petitioner to be careful in future. The petitioner has also filed two cases being FIR No.408 of 2006 and FIR No.283 of 2008 Police Station Sakarpur. The accused persons were reported to be his neighbours and known to him. It was also reported by the Licensing Authority that the case of the petitioner was got assessed through Special Cell twice and it was reported that there was no threat being extended to him. The special allegation of his received threats on

12.4.2008 on his mobile from another mobile and landline were got
verified and it was revealed that the calls alleged to have been made from
the mobile number on 12.4.2008 were not made. On enquiry, it was also
revealed that the said mobile phone from which the calls were made
existed in the name of Smt. Meena Devi who had left the place of her
residence about 5 years back. Regarding the landline number, it was
reported that the same was a PCO run by one person who is well known to
the petitioner. The Appellate Authority also got a report from the local
police to verify the same and it came to be revealed that the criminal
cases were registered at the behest of the petitioner and all these were
his personal matters and have resulted on account of personal enmity of
the petitioner.

In view of foregoing facts, I do not find any perversity or illegality in
the impugned order. The petition is hereby dismissed being meritless.



M.L. MEHTA,J

NOVEMBER 14, 2011

rd