

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 2733 of 2018

- Maqsood Mahammad S/o Niyaz Mohammad Aged About 61 Years R/o Main Road Devpuri, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department of Home, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. District Magistrate, Office Of The Collector Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

WPC No. 2734 of 2018

- Pradeep Gabhane S/o Dinkar Rao Gabhane Aged About 48 Years R/o Phool Chowk Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department of Home, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. District Magistrate, Office Of The Collector, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

WPC No. 2735 of 2018

- Salam Mohammad S/o Hazi Nisar Mohammad Aged About 52 Years Proprietor - M/s Nisar Mohammad, R/o Trunk Line, Golbazar Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department Of Home, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhavan Naya Raipur, District Raipur

Chhattisgarh

2. District Magistrate, Office Of The Collector, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners

Ms. Fouzia Mirza, Advocate

For Respondent-State

Shri Y. S. Thakur, Addl. AG

Hon'ble Justice Mr. Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

03/10/2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners' application for renewal of explosive license is not even received for consideration by respondent No.2 i.e. the District Magistrate, Raipur, even though the petitioners had already deposited the requisite charges including the license fee. She would refer to the orders passed by this Court in **WPC No.2422 of 2017 (Fataka Vyapari Sangh Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and another)** decided on 5.9.2017 as well as **WPC No.706 of 2016 (Manish Kumar Sahu and others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others)** and other connected petitions, decided on 13.5.2016, to argue that the respondents are obligated in law to consider petitioners' application for renewal of explosive license.
2. Considering the entire facts situation of the case, particularly in view of the orders passed by this Court in the above writ petitions, the present writ petitions are disposed of with a

direction to respondent No.2 to receive the petitioners' application for renewal of explosive license as and when it is presented and thereafter, decide the same by a reasoned order expeditiously, preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of application for renewal of license.

Sd/-
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)
Judge

Nirala