

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2691 of 2025

=====

Taushif Alam Son of Murtza Hussain, Resident of Bharatpura, P.O. and Police Station- Dulhin Bazar, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar.
2. The Director General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Arms Magistrate, Patna.
6. The SHO, Paliganj, Patna.
7. The S.H.O., Dulhin Bazar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Syed Alamdar Hussain, Advocate Mr. Shashi Bhushan Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Standing Counsel (09)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 16-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Standing Counsel for the State.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed for the

following relief(s):-

(i.) For issuance of writ of mandamus commanding respondents to reconsider the case of the petitioner for grant of N.P. Bore revolver pistol license in the changed circumstances and also on the ground that petitioner is continuously receiving threat of his life and also on the ground that so many occurrence of snatching has took place recently and petitioner also registered F.I.R. for the same.

(ii.) For the other reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled in the facts and



circumstances of the case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the District Magistrate, Patna, without considering the plight and constant threat upon the petitioner, who is said to be a businessman and running medical shop in Paliganj Bazar and returns home with cash in late night everyday, have rejected the claim of the petitioner. It is also submitted that the petitioner is receiving threat of life & property regularly from the criminals asking ransom and locality being naxal affected, for which the petitioner is said to have registered an F.I.R. being Paliganj P.S. Case No. 255/2024, and such threats which the petitioner is said to have put forth by way of representation does not find any consideration in the impugned order except by incorporating the provisions under Arms Act, 1959, Section 13(3) (b) and Section 14 (1) (b) (ii) of Arms Rules 2016, the claim is rejected, and therefore, has sought consideration in the impugned order.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that since the F.I.R, for the incident which is said to have been occurred, has been registered by the petitioner after the passing of the impugned order dated 02.11.2023, the request of this petitioner for grant of Arms license requires to be reviewed by the competent authority, to adjudicate the same by passing an



appropriate order in accordance with law.

5. In view of the submissions made on behalf of the parties and admittedly the case having been registered by the petitioner subsequent to the impugned order, which is contained in Memo No. 3718 dated 02.11.2023, having been passed by the Licensing Authority being District Magistrate, Patna, this Court is of the considered view that this matter is required to be remanded for allowing the District Magistrate, Patna, to revisit the impugned order dated 02.11.2023 in light of the subsequent events which are put forth by the petitioner in the writ petition for which a detailed representation shall be filed within a period of four weeks with all supportive materials to get his grievances ventilated at the level of District Magistrate, Patna. It is made clear that a final decision on the petitioner's representation for grant of an arms license shall be taken within a period of eight weeks from today. The order so passed shall also be communicated to the petitioner within the said period.

6. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the instant writ application stands disposed.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

surya/-

U			
---	--	--	--

