



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 10686 OF 2023

TANAJI TUKARAM SHEJUL

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND
OTHERS

...

Mr. Mahesh P. Kale, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. V. S. Badakh, AGP for Respondent/State

...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.

DATE : 19th DECEMBER, 2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned AGP for respondents – State.
2. Petitioner assails the order dated 04/01/2023, passed by the District Collector, Parbhani and the order dated 30/06/2023 passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Aurangabad, thereby rejecting the application filed by petitioner before District Collector for getting arms license. The said decision was confirmed by the Divisional Commissioner.
3. Learned counsel Mr. Kale appearing for the petitioner submits that petitioner filed application seeking arms license on the ground that petitioner is doing jaggery business and to sell his material he needs to travel through out the State. Therefore, for self protection he requires arms license. After filing application the District Collector had called report from the Superintendent of

Police, wherein the Superintendent of Police has submitted adverse report and on that ground the District Collector has refused to issue license to the petitioner. Considering the adverse report the District Collector recorded finding that the petitioner does not require arms license. Those findings are confirmed by the Divisional Commissioner.

4. In support of his submissions, learned counsel for petitioner relies upon the law laid down by this Court in ***Writ Petition No.9914/2016 (Pawan s/o Ashok Bora Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Others)***, more particularly in paragraph Nos.7, 8 and 9 of the said judgment.

5. After going through the judgment cited above, it reveals that the same is not applicable to the facts of the present case. In the application filed by petitioner herein, the grounds on which arms licenses was sought do not suggest any threat to the life of petitioner. Only by stating that there is threat to life as petitioner is doing business, permission for arms license cannot be sought. Therefore, both the authorities have rightly rejected the application of the petitioner. There is no substance in the arguments advanced by learned counsel Mr. Kale.

6. Writ petition is, therefore, dismissed. No order as to costs.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)