

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

UMESH
SHRINIWAS
MALANI

Digitally signed by
UMESH
SHRINIWAS
MALANI
Date: 2022.03.23
16:10:46 +0530

WRIT PETITION NO. 737 OF 2022

Raju Laxman Pachapure

...Petitioner

Versus

The Sub-Divisional Magistrate
and Ors

...Respondents

- Ms. Shubhada D. Khot for the Petitioner
- Mr. K.V. Saste, APP, for the Respondent – State.

CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
S. M. MODAK, JJ.

DATE : MARCH 22, 2022.

PER COURT :

1. Considering the nature of grievance raised in the Petition, the Petition is taken up for hearing and disposal at the threshold.

2. The Petitioner, resident of Ichalkaranji, Hatkanangale, Kolhapur, possessing a arm under a valid license issued by the competent Authority. The license issued in favour of the Petitioner was renewed from time to time. The Petitioner followed the necessary procedure for such renewal by submitting necessary applications to the competent authorities. In series of

such renewal, the Petitioner submitted his application for renewal to the competent Authority on 09th December, 2021. Certain orders passed by High Court of Karnataka at Dharwad Bench are placed on record in support of the submission of Petitioner.

3. Learned Counsel by inviting our attention to the copy of application submitted that the Petitioner had provided all necessary details along with application namely, original license with the photocopy of the license, an affidavit as well as police clearance certificate issued by the police authorities at Ichalkaranji Police Station. An order passed by the District Magistrate, Kolhapur dated 22.08.2019 is also annexed to the application and copies of these documents are also placed on record in the present Petition.

4. Considering the limited grievance raised in the Petition, the Petition is disposed of with direction to Respondent No. 1 to decide the application submitted by the Petitioner to him on 09th December, 2021 as expeditiously as possible and not later than 10 weeks from the date of receipt of order of this Court.

5. We further make it very clear that this Court has not made any observations on the merit of the application and the Respondent No. 1 to consider the merit of the application as well as relevant provisions of the rules and then to pass appropriate orders.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)