

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CWP 8178 of 2017

Date of Decision: May 17, 2017

Paramjit

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI.

-. -

**Present:- Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.**

-. -

M.M.S. BEDI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has been denied the licence under Heirloom Policy despite the fact that police had reported that it had no objection to the grant of licence. The order dated July 17, 2015- annexure P-11 challenged in the writ petition is apparently an appealable order under Section 18 of the Arms Act.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that since the order dated July 17, 2015 was never communicated to the petitioner as such the petitioner could not get an opportunity to file appeal.

The petitioner cannot be permitted to approach this Court when there is alternative efficacious remedy available to the petitioner under the

statute. So far as delay in filing the appeal is concerned, the circumstances can always be explained to condone the delay. Since the petitioner seeks licence of weapon which was owned by his father, the interests of justice would be adequately met in case the petitioner is given a fair opportunity to avail the statutory legal remedy.

At this stage, counsel for the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the writ petition, the petitioner has filed an appeal taking the advantage from the interim order dated April 21, 2017.

This petition is disposed as not maintainable and that the appeal of the petitioner will be considered on merits by the concerned competent authority and decide the same expeditiously by passing a speaking order. The order passed by the Appellate Authority would be supplied to the petitioner.

May 17, 2017
sanjay

(M.M.S.BEDI)
JUDGE

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