

118

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

CWP-15686-2023

Date of decision: 25.07.2023

Puneet Jain

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Kanwarpal Singh Mahey, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Addl. A.G. Punjab
for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 for renewal of Arms License No. DM/HSP/DUP/CTHP/0417/29 (Annexure P-1) of the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given a representation dated 16.06.2023 (Annexure P-8) to respondent No.3 and has stated that the petitioner would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent No.3 is directed to consider the said representation dated 16.06.2023 (Annexure P-8) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief, in

accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

3. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.3 would consider the said representation dated 16.06.2023 (Annexure P-8) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.3 to consider representation dated 16.06.2023 (Annexure P-8) within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.3 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the respondent No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently and in accordance with law.

25.07.2023

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No