

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

CWP-13035-2020

Date of decision:-28.8.2020

Ram Bhul

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.MADAAN**

Present: Mr.Parminder Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**H.S. MADAAN, J.**

Case taken up through video conferencing.

By way of filing the present writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner Ram Bhul aged 55 years, craves for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents – State of Haryana through its Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Home Affairs and Justice, District Magistrate – cum – Deputy Commissioner, Karnal, Sub Divisional Magistrate, Assandh, District Karnal, Superintendent of Police, Karnal and Station House Officer, Police Station Assandh, District Karnal to consider the representation Annexure P9 of the petitioner for renewal of the gun license of the petitioner, who was though involved as an accused in case FIR No.242 dated 6.7.2012 for the offences under Sections 148, 149, 323,

324, 325, 307, 506 IPC and 25 of Arms Act, registered with Police Station Assandh but he stands acquitted of the charge vide judgment dated 6.10.2014 passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Karnal. He had approached the concerned authorities for renewal of his arms license and had even submitted written representation but to no effect. As such, the petitioner has knocked at the door of this Court by way of filing the instant petition.

According to the petitioner, after his acquittal in the criminal case, there was no reason to deny the renewal of gun license to him since he requires the same for his protection and safety.

Notice of motion.

Mr.Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent – State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 – District Magistrate – cum – Deputy Commissioner, Karnal to decide the representation(Annexure P-9) within a fixed time frame.

Learned State counsel submits that the respondents would do so as per the directions issued by this Court.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of such request of learned counsel for the petitioners and response given by the State counsel and further to avoid any unnecessary litigation between the parties, the present petition is disposed of directing the respondent No.2 – District Magistrate – cum – Deputy Commissioner, Karnal to decide the representation (Annexure P-9) in accordance with law, by way of a speaking order within a period of two months from

today.

However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved even after passing of the order, he may seek his legal remedy including approaching this Court as per law.

28.8.2020  
Brij

**(H.S.MADAAN)**  
**JUDGE**

**Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No**

**Whether reportable : Yes/No**