

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22015 of 2013

=====

Anit Kumar Son Of Deonandan Prasad Resident Of Mohalla- Indira Nagar,
Road No.- 4, Postal Park, Post- G.P.O. Police Station- Jakkanpur, District-
Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Home, Old Secretariat, Patna
2. The Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Home Affairs, New Delhi
3. The District Magistrate, Patna
4. The District Arms Licensing Authority, Patna
5. The Senior Superintendent Of Police, Patna
6. The Sub Divisional Police Officer, Patna Sadar, Patna
7. The Officer-In-Charge, Jakkanpur Police Station, Patna

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ansul, Advocate.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. M. K. Upadhyay, A.C. to G.P.10.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
ORAL ORDER

3 13-10-2015 The petitioner confines his writ application with
reliefs No.(A) (ii), (B) and (C) as he does not press relief (A) (i).

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
the State.

The petitioner is aggrieved by Annexure-4 which is
order dated 1.6.2013 passed by the District Magistrate,
Patna, Licensing Authority, Patna, by which his application for
licence of a rifle and pistol has been rejected.

It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that the
application of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that no

evidence with respect to any specific perception of threat upon the petitioner was there. It is contended that the issue is no *longer res integra* as the same has already been considered and decided by this Court in C.W.J.C. No.18535/11 (Manish Kumar vrs. State of Bihar and other analogous cases) on 11.08.2015. He further submits that the letter written by the Home Ministry of Central Government dated 31.03.2010 has also been considered in the aforesaid decision.

Learned counsel for the state is not in a position to controvert the aforesaid submission raised on behalf of the petitioner.

Accordingly, this writ application stands allowed in terms of the aforesaid judgment. The impugned order contained in Annexure-5 is set aside.

The matter is remitted back to the Licensing authority for fresh consideration in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

AnilKrSinha/-

U			
---	--	--	--