

2025:PHHC:062889



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

103

CWP-1516-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 13.05.2025

Pardeep

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Pranshul Dhull, Advocate and
Mr. Punyaveet, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S.Budhwar, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is a renowned shooter in terms of notification dated 12.02.2020 issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs, for which reference is made to Annexure P-3 issued by the National Rifle Association of India, recommending the grant of arms licence to improve his performance for the target practice and participation in shooting competitions and that he is not in possession of any weapon as per his undertaking attached, as also to the ID Card issued by the said authority, Annexure P-1, which was valid till 04.11.2024 and as stated by him was subsequently renewed. Further that, even the Haryana Right to Service Commission had previously, vide letter Annexure P-8, recommended to the District Magistrate, Hisar, to consider

the application of the petitioner. The same has now again been turned down, vide Annexure P-9, on the ground of the public peace and safety, without there being any criminal antecedents of the petitioner, as affirmed by the police department, vide Annexure R-1, appended with reply, wherein it was stated that his conduct is good, though his case was not recommended. He prays his case be re-considered taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and documents in a time bound manner.

, however, the same has now been turned down in view of the public peace and safety, without there being any criminal antecedents of the petitioner, as affirmed by the police department, vide Annexure R-1 that his conduct is good, but still did not recommend and prays his case be re-considered taking into consideration the aforesaid.

2. The aforesaid facts having been brought out, during the course of hearing, learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Satbir, office of DC, Hisar, states that the respondents would not be averse to have a relook at the matter and decide afresh, taking note of the aforesaid submissions, within a period of 3 months, uninfluenced by the order impugned in the present case, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner.

3. The aforesaid satisfies the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. The matter stands disposed of accordingly and if the petitioner is found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to his interest, the same may be passed after granting opportunity of hearing to him and shall contain reasons,

whereupon he shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

13.05.2025

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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