



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.10.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE **MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI**

W.P.No.37738 of 2025

C.Balachandran

... petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Additional Chief Secretary cum Commissioner
of Revenue Administration,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.

2. The District Collector cum District Executive Magistrate,
Dharmapuri District, Dharmapuri.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of Writs of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of the second respondent in passing the impugned order dated 30.07.2025 in Pa.Mu.21622/2024/C4 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the second respondent to renew the gun license of the petitioner in respect of his SBBL Gun License No.DD 42.

For petitioner : Ms.N.Gayathri for M/s.S.Thiruvengadam

For Respondent : Mr.A.M.Ayyadurai, GA



WEB COPY

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned order passed by the second respondent dated 30.07.2025 in Pa.Mu.21622/2024/C4 and and consequently, direct the second respondent to renew the gun license of the petitioner in respect of his SBBL Gun License No.DD 42.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that he was granted Gun License for protection from wildlife and emergencies. On expiry, the petitioner applied for renewal of the gun license on 27.11.2018, but the second respondent rejected the same on 29.01.2022 under Section 14(1)(b)(i) and 14(3) of the Arms Act. Challenging the said order, the petitioner filed an appeal before the first respondent and the first respondent has remanded the matter back to the second respondent. However, without considering the merits, the second respondent again rejected the renewal application. Challenging the said order, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. The learned respondents have filed counter and the relevant portion is extracted hereunder:

"8.I respectfully submit that, following this a fresh report has been



called from the Superintendent of police, District Forest Officer and Revenue Divisional Officer Dharmapuri. District Forest Officer Dharmapuri in his report stated that in connection with the request made by the Petitioner for the renewal of an SBBL (Single Barrel Breech Loading) firearm license, no forest-related criminal cases have been registered against the petitioner. Furthermore, the petitioner's residence is located at a distance of 1.38 km from the Vellolai Reserved Land and 4.46 km from the Noolahalli-Reddihalli Reserve Forest. However, since the petitioner's residence is situated close to reserved lands and forests, and due to the high presence of wild animals (such as deer, wild boars, and peacocks) in the area, which raises the possibility of hunting wild animals, the request for renewal of the firearm license for his personal protection was not recommended. Revenue Divisional Officer Dharmapuri in her report stated that, the petitioner has held and used a firearm license for the past 40 years for self-protection and crop protection. He also mentioned that a theft had occurred at his house in 1990, and no incidents have occurred since then. She further stated that he and his wife currently reside in Annasagaram village, and they stay at the agricultural land only during the harvest season. However, since no supporting documents or police complaints have been submitted to prove any past incidents that posed a threat to his property or life, the report concluded that there is no



basis to recommend the renewal of the firearm license requested by the petitioner. Personal hearing was also conducted on 29.07.2025. Therefore, based on the inquiry reports, and after careful consideration of the statements and findings from the reports of Superintendent of Police, Dharmapuri District, the District Forest Officer, the Revenue Divisional Officer of Dharmapuri, and the petitioner's own deposition, it has been found that there have been no prior incidents indicating any threat to the life or property of the petitioner or his family to the extent that would justify the use of a firearm. Furthermore, no supporting documents or police complaints have been submitted to establish any past incidents posing a threat to his life or property. Hence, the reasons cited by the petitioner for the renewal of his firearm (SBBL) license bearing DA 42 are not acceptable. There are no grounds to renew the said firearm license, and the request for renewal was rejected."

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner obtained SBBL gun license before 40 years and he is owning lands and doing agriculture, situated in Kolli Hills which is adjacent to Forest Area. Apart from that, the petitioner is also running a cable



operating business. During the license period, there was no untoward incident happened. The second respondent has rejected the renewal application on the ground that the petitioner has not used the gun so far and there is no threat on him, without considering Sections 13 & 14 of the Arms Act. This Court has already dealt with the similar issue in W.P.No.2508 of 2023 dated 25.06.2025.

The relevant paragraphs are extracted hereunder:

"8.Both the 1st and 2nd respondents lost sight of the crucial fact that Section 14 of the Act only deals with grant of license. It is Section 15 of the Act which deals with renewal of license. While renewing the license, the 1st and 2nd respondents cannot strictly apply the reasons provided under Section 14, since those reasons will apply when a person seeks for license for the first time. The 1st and 2nd respondents ought to have considered Section 15 of the Act which deals with renewal of license. Section 15(3) states that while dealing with the renewal of license, the provisions of Section 13 and 14 will have relevance. That does not mean that the authority will deal with the renewal application as if he is dealing with an application for fresh license.

9.The reasoning that has been assigned by the 2nd respondent and which was conformed by the 1st respondent is also unsustainable. The 2nd respondent has stated that the petitioner never had an occasion to use the gun for the last twenty nine years and he has also become old and there are no materials to show that any housebreaking had taken place or there was any destruction of



crops by wild animals and therefore, the 2nd respondent has denied the renewal of the gun license. Those, reasons that have been stated by the 2nd respondent are perverse and is completely irrelevant for the purpose of dealing with the application submitted by the petitioner for renewal of gun license. The order passed by the 2nd respondent and which was confirmed by the 1st respondent suffers from patent illegality and it warrants the interference of this Court."

6. Now coming to the facts of the case in hand and keeping the factors in mind and also applying the ratio laid down by this Court in the above said case, this Court sets aside the impugned order passed by the second respondent and directs the second respondent to deal with the application for renewal by the petitioner and pass orders within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above observation and directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

22.10.2025

rli



To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary cum Commissioner
of Revenue Administration,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.

2. The District Collector cum District Executive Magistrate,
Dharmapuri District, Dharmapuri.



WEB COPY



M.DHANDAPANI, J.

rli

W.P.No.37738 of 2025

22.10.2025