

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

CWP-30623-2018

Date of decision: 9.5.2019

Satish Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr.Ashish Naik, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr.Vivek Saini, DAG, Haryana

\*\*\*\*

**JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.**

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for issuance of direction to respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to consider and decide the representations dated 10.5.2018 (Annexure P-6) as well as dated 24.7.2018 (Annexure P-7) submitted by the petitioner for renewal of the arms licence bearing registration No. 128 DM-IV-BWN.

Affidavit of the petitioner in pursuance of order dated 4.12.2018 has been filed in the Court today to the extent that prior to expiry of the arms licence, the petitioner had applied for renewal of the same, however, the concerned police station refused to accept the same. However, due to ensuing Lok Sabha election, on account of the code of conduct, the petitioner had deposited his weapon with the police of Police Station Sadar Bhiwani. The representation of the petitioner dated 24.7.2018 (Annexure P-7) is pending adjudication with respondent No.2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that at this stage, he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 - Deputy Commissioner, Bhiwani to consider and decide the representation dated 24.7.2018 (Annexure P-7 ) expeditiously.

Heard.

A complete set of paper book has been handed over to Mr.Vivek Saini, DAG, Haryana in the Court today.

In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 - Deputy Commissioner, Bhiwani to consider and decide the representation dated 24.7.2018 (Annexure P-7 ) in accordance with law within six weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. 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.

9.5.2019  
gsv

**[ JITENDRA CHAUHAN ]**  
**JUDGE**

**Whether speaking / reasoned?**

**Yes / No**

**Whether reportable?**

**Yes / No**