



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

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 23 OF 2025**

( Manish S/o Ratanlal Agrawal

**Vs.**

The State of Maharashtra, Thr. Its Secretary, Home Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32 & Ors. )

|                                                                                                           |                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders | Court's or Judge's orders |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|

Mr. S.A. Bramhe, Advocate for the Petitioner.  
Mr. M.J. Khan, APP for the Respondents/State.

**CORAM:** URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.

**DATED** : 12<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 2025

1. Heard.
2. By this Writ Petition, the Petitioner has challenged the impugned order dated 13.12.2024 passed by the Respondent No.2/Commissioner of Police rejecting the application for renewal of the arms licence of the Petitioner.
3. Learned APP for the Respondents/State, pointed out that as efficacious remedy under Section 18 of the Arms Act is available which can be availed by the Petitioner and as efficacious remedy is available, the Writ Petition is not maintainable.
4. While advancing the submissions, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, has also submitted that if directions are

given to the concerned authority to dispose of the appeal at the earliest, the Petitioner would seek the said remedy under Section 18 of the Arms Act.

5. In view of the statement made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, the Petitioner is at liberty to file an appeal under Section 18 of the Arms Act before the appropriate Appellate Authority and that appropriate Appellate Authority shall consider the appeal on its own merits and shall decide the same within a period of two months after its filing.

6. The appropriate authority (Appellate Authority) shall consider the application for condonation of delay as the time was consumed in preferring the Writ Petition and deciding the same.

7. The Writ Petition is **disposed** off with the above said directions.

8. Pending application/s, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)