



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

104

CWP-32951-2024

Date of decision: 08.07.2025

Anil Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sunil Goswami, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing of impugned orders dated 09.07.2024 and 15.10.2024, Annexures P-7 and P-9 vide which the application of the petitioner for renewal of arms licence was rejected.

2. The petitioner is stated to be 64 years old, retired as District Sports and Youth Affair Officer and living with his wife as his children are residing in Ambala and Kanpur, thus, requires weapon for his own safety and the Superintendent of Police, Jind has given no objection for renewal of the same. It is on account of he having suffered a spinal injury at an advanced age and advised bed rest, while being treated for the same, reference is made to the medical documents, Annexure P-2. The delay, thus, that has become basis of non-removal of licence was sufficiently explained. The Appellate Authority has not taken this vital aspect into the matter and passed virtually a non-speaking order.

3. A perfunctory, mono-linear disposition, bereft of proper contemplation of facts and circumstances of a case, stands in brazen contravention of principles of natural justice, as eloquently expounded by



Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **M/s Kranti Associates Pvt. Ltd. And Another vs. Masood Ahmed Khan and Others**, 2010(9) SCC 496, wherein it was observed that the face of an order passed by a quasi-judicial or administrative authority affecting the rights of parties, must speak and must not be like the inscrutable face of a Sphinx. The authorities are under a legal obligation to give reasons while passing an order, which are the essence and virtually a part of the due process.

4. Administrative authorities are mandated to articulate the rationale behind their decisions, ensuring transparency and fairness in the decision-making process, which not only assists the Court in scrutinising the case effectively but prevents a revolving door of appeals to the same institution.

5. As a fall out of the above, the order dated 15.10.2024 is set aside and the Appellate Authority is directed to consider the matter afresh, in accordance with law, taking note of the grounds taken in appeal filed by the petitioner and medical documents and pass a reasoned order, within a period of 4 months, after affording an opportunity of hearing to him.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

08.07.2025

Hemant

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