

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

CWP-10643-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 21.05.2019

Gurdarshan Singh

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

None for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, DAG, Haryana,
for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By way of filing the instant petition, the petitioner has sought quashing of impugned letter dated 07..04.2016 (Annexure P-1), whereby, the request for issuance of Prohibited Bore Arms Licence under Family Heirloom Basis, was rejected.

Heard.

Prayer of the petitioner for issuance of of Prohibited Bore Arms Licence under Family Heirloom basis, which earlier stood in the name of his father has been rejected vide impugned letter/order dated 07.04.2016 (Annexure P-1), without citing any reason.

The rejection of request of the petitioner for grant of arms licence in question vide impugned letter/order dated 07.04.2016, without citing any reason, is hereby quashed and respondent No.1 is directed to re-

consider the case of the petitioner as per law, in the light of the policy (Annexure P-3) and the judgment passed by this Court in ***Darshan Singh Vs. State of Haryana and others (P&H), 2014(2) R.C.R. (Civil) 96***. In case, on reconsideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the prayer made by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter. The needful be done within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this judgment.

Disposed of.

21.05.2019

atulsethi

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes No

Whether Reportable : Yes No