

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

CWP-10075-2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20th March, 2023

Raj Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Mr. Mohd. Arshad, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Samarth Sagar, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

1. This petition is filed seeking directions to respondent No.4 to renew the arms licence of the petitioner.

2. As per the case set up by the petitioner, an application for renewal of Arms Licence was filed in 2013 and thereafter another application for renewal was filed in the year 2016. Respondent has filed reply specifically denying having received any application for renewal. There is no rebuttal to the reply filed by the respondents.

3. From the pleadings of the petition, it is forthcoming that no date is mentioned when the first application for renewal of the arms licence was filed. It would not be out of place to mention that only e-challan of fee deposited has been annexed. On specific query from the Court that copy of the application has not been annexed with the petition, learned counsel for the petitioner argues that application was submitted online and it is very difficult to get the copy.

4. In view of the disputed question of the fact with regard to the submission of the application, no case is made out for interference in writ jurisdiction. Petition is dismissed.
5. Needless to say that petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law.
6. Since the main petition is disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

20th March, 2023
Parveen Sharma

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No