



CWP-27348-2023 (O&M) 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-27348-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:09.03.2026

Narinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. G.S. Nahel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raghav Goel, AAG Punjab.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the impugned order dated 24.10.2019 (Annexure P-5) whereby the Arms Licence of the petitioner was suspended by respondent No.3 as well as the impugned order dated 18.05.2022 (Annexure P-7) whereby the appeal filed by the petitioner was dismissed by respondent No.2.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that Additional District Magistrate, Mansa, who is the licensing authority, had suspended the licence of the petitioner on 24.10.2019 only on the ground that Senior Superintendent of Police, Mansa had reported that 09 cases were pending against the petitioner which were under



CWP-27348-2023 (O&M) 2

investigation.

3. He submitted that a perusal of the order would show that no satisfaction has been recorded by Additional District Magistrate, Mansa, as to how a ground is made out for suspension of arms licence of the petitioner. He further submitted that even otherwise also the petitioner has already been acquitted in 7 out of 10 cases pending against him. Learned counsel further contended that the cases pending against the petitioner do not relate to misuse of arms or causing of any injury, and rather arise out of financial disputes between the parties. He further submitted that the weapon held by the petitioner was purely for the purpose of self-defence and therefore the exercise of powers by Additional District Magistrate, Mansa, was not in accordance with law. He also submitted that even otherwise it is a settled principle of law that mere pendency of FIRs, particularly those arising out of commercial disputes, cannot by itself constitute a valid ground for suspension or cancellation of an arms licence.

4. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner preferred an appeal against the said order, however, the Appellate Authority dismissed the appeal vide impugned order dated 18.05.2022 (Annexure P-7) and a perusal of the same reveals that the same is cryptic and non-speaking in nature as no reason has been assigned, therefore, both the impugned orders are liable to be set aside.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel could not controvert the aforesaid submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to the fact that mere pendency of FIRs especially of commercial



CWP-27348-2023 (O&M) 3

nature cannot become a ground for suspension or cancellation of the licence. He also could not controvert the submission that the impugned order passed by the Appellate Authority is cryptic and a non-speaking order, as no reason has been assigned therein.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that the present petition deserves to be allowed. A perusal of the order passed by Additional District Magistrate, Mansa, would show that it was only because of the pendency of some FIRs against the petitioner, which as per learned counsel for the petitioner pertain to financial disputes between the parties, that arms licence of the petitioner has been suspended. It is a settled law that mere pendency of FIR(s), especially pertaining to commercial disputes, cannot by itself become a ground for cancellation or suspension of an arms licence unless a satisfaction is recorded by the licensing authority in accordance with law that the case falls within any of the parameters contained under Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959. Apart from the above, a perusal of the order passed by the Appellate Authority would also show that not even a single reason has been assigned by the Appellate Authority in this regard.

7. In view of the above, the present writ petition is hereby allowed and order dated 24.10.2019 passed by Additional District Magistrate, Mansa (Licensing Authority) and order dated 18.05.2022 passed by the learned Commissioner, Faridkot Division, Faridkot (Appellate Authority) are hereby set aside and the matter is remitted to learned District Magistrate, Mansa, to have a fresh look into the grievances



CWP-27348-2023 (O&M) 4

of the petitioner and to pass a fresh order in accordance with law.

8. The fresh order shall be passed within a period of two months from today, with a fresh application of mind and uninfluenced by the orders dated 24.10.2019 passed by Additional District Magistrate, Mansa and 18.05.2022 passed by Commissioner, Faridkot Division, Faridkot and the present order passed by this Court as no observation has been made by this Court on the merits of the case.

9. Needless to say, a speaking order shall be passed in accordance with law and after giving adequate opportunity of hearing to petitioner or his counsel.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

09.03.2026

shweta

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