IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P. (C) No. 4692 of 2015

Bharat Prasad Singh, son of Late Sukhdeo Singh, resident of Village Manjhupur, P.O. Bara Nathu, P.S.- Karpi, District- Arwal (Bihar), presently residing at Mohalla-Rajiv Nagar, Road No.24, near S.V.M. School, P.O.- Keshrinagar, P.S. Rajivnagar, Town and District- Patna (Bihar)

.... …. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Secretary/Principal Secretary, Department of Home, Government of Jharkhand, having office at Project Building, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, Town & District Ranchi
2. The Secretary/Principal Secretary, Department of Home, Government of Jharkhand, having office at Project Building, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, Town & District- Ranchi
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Santhal Pargana, Dumka, having office at P.O., P.S. & District-Dumka
4. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-Licensing Authority, Sahibganj, having office at P.O., P.S. & District-Sahibganj
5. The Arms Magistrate, Sahibganj, having office at P.O., P.S. & District-Sahibganj .... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Manoj Tandon, Advocate
Ms. Neha Bhardwaj, Advocate
Ms. Shivani Bhardwaj, Advocate
Mr. Shubham Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Karamjit S. Chhabra, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ankit Kumar, A.C. to G.P. IV

08/05.10.2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents-State.

2. This writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for direction to allow all India license relating to Non-Prohibited Bore Pistol License No.16/2012 of the petitioner granted by the licensing authority, who is respondent no.4.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was working as a District Commandant, Jharkhand Home Guard and retired from that post on 31.07.2013 while he was posted in the District of Sahibganj in the State of Jharkhand. He next submits that during the period when the petitioner was serving in the State of Jharkhand, he applied for issuance of Non-Prohibited Bore pistol license. He further submits that the licensing authority, Sahibganj considered the application of the petitioner for grant of such license and finally the petitioner was granted the license of NPB pistol license being License No.16/12 contained in Annexure-1. He next

submits that after retirement, the petitioner has made application for making it all India validity as the petitioner has settled in the State of Bihar. He further submits that in terms of Rules 17(3) and 19(3) of Arms Rule, 2016, petitioner has preferred the application before the Deputy Commissioner, Sahibganj and Deputy Commissioner, Sahibganj has recommended to the State Government to do so. He next submits that however, the State Government in his turn again returned the same to the Deputy Commissioner, Sahibganj saying that the petitioner is required to move before the State of Bihar in the light of Rules 17(3) and 19(3) of Arms Rule, 2016. He also submits that pursuant to that District Magistrate, Arwal has wrote to the Deputy Commissioner, Sahibganj saying that the said requirement is required to be done by the Deputy Commissioner, Sahibganj as the license has been issued from that District and he has further stated in the said communication that once that will be done by the Deputy Commissioner, Sahibganj, District Magistrate, Arwal will take care of publishing the same on the NDAL portal. He submits that all these documents have been made annexures in the rejoinder filed by the petitioner as Annexure- 7 onwards respectively.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the authorities have rightly passed the said orders.

5. In view of above and considering Rules 17(3) and 19(3) of Arms Rule, 2016 particularly Rule 19(3) and further looking into the Rule 5 of Arms Rule, 2016, it transpires that the said power is there to the concerned State wherefrom license is issued and as such this writ petition is disposed of directing the petitioner to file fresh representation before the respondent no.2 within a period of two weeks and the respondent no.2 in his turn will re-examine the issue in question particularly taking into consideration Rule 19(3) of Arms Rule, 2016 along with the Schedule II of Rule 5 of Arms Rules, 2016 and will take a decision within a period of six weeks further thereafter.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and disposed of in the above terms and conditions. Pending Interlocutory Application, if any, is also disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 05.10.2026
Anit

Uploaded
08.10.2026