



CWP-31921-2025 (O&M) 1

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

**CWP-31921-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:09.12.2025**

Pardeep

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

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

Mr. Chirag Wadhwa, DAG, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing respondent No.2 to set aside the impugned orders i.e. order dated 16.07.2025 passed by the District Magistrate, Hisar (Annexure P-9) and order dated 13.12.2022 (Annexure P-7) passed by the District Magistrate, Hisar, whereby application filed by the petitioner for issuance of a new Arms License on 30.06.2023 through the SARAL portal, has been rejected.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is pertaining to an order dated 16.07.2025 passed by the District Magistrate, Hisar, vide Annexure P-9 whereby despite giving undertaking before a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide Annexure P-8 to pass a fresh order uninfluenced by the earlier



order, he passed the order (Annexure P-9) in which the operative part was nothing but a mere copy-paste of the earlier order.

3. Learned counsel further submitted that when a fresh order was to be passed, it was required to be passed with fresh application of mind and by giving proper reasons, however, the same was not done and therefore the present writ petition has been filed.

4. Considering and comparing both the orders passed by the District Magistrate, Hisar, this Court had issued a contempt notice to the District Magistrate, Hisar, vide order dated 26.11.2025, to which a reply in the nature of an affidavit has been filed by the District Magistrate, who is also present in the Court. He submitted that it was a mistake on his part and tendered an unconditional apology. Learned State counsel, on his instructions, submitted that the impugned order (Annexure P-9) was erroneous and respondents have no objections in case the aforesaid order is set aside, so that the District Magistrate, Hisar, may pass a fresh order with a fresh application of mind and after hearing the petitioner.

5. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed. Impugned order dated 16.07.2025 (Annexure P-9) passed by District Magistrate, Hisar, is hereby set aside.

6. The District Magistrate, Hisar, shall pass a fresh order after due application of mind and after hearing the petitioner or his counsel, within a period of three months from today.

7. Considering the unconditional apology tendered by the District Magistrate, Hisar, the same is accepted. The District Magistrate, Hisar, namely Mr. Anish Yadav, is discharged from the contempt proceedings and accordingly, the contempt stands discharged.



8. During the course of proceedings, it has transpired that it is a structural and procedural problem which has cropped up in the present case, whereby the District Magistrate, Hisar, appears to have relied upon the opinion of District Prosecuting Agency and Advocate General's office. This Court makes it very clear that this Court is not making any kind of adverse observations against any officer, either of the administration or of the prosecuting agency or of the Advocate General's office. However, this Court is serious about the structural and procedural lapses which have been there for a few decades, which need to be corrected as reformative measures and which will also have the effect of reducing litigation and ensuring better assistance to the Court.

9. It is, therefore, imperative for the prosecution department of the State Government and the Advocate General's Office to streamline the process of vetting, which is to be done in each and every case with regard to the replies, etc.

10. Similar problem with regard to lack of proper guidelines on vetting etc. in the Advocate General's Office is also there in the State of Punjab.

11. In view of the above, it is directed that the Advocate General of the State of Haryana and the State of Punjab shall apprise this Court as to what steps they propose to take for putting the things in place pertaining to the vetting of the replies and other ancillary procedures.

12. Mr. Raghav Goel, AAG Punjab, who is present in the Court, shall inform the learned Advocate General, Punjab, with regard to the aforesaid order, and similarly, Mr. Chirag Wadhwa, DAG, Haryana, shall

