



2026:DHC:2640



\$~33

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI****W.P.(C) 3633/2026 & CM APPL. 17736/2026**Date of Decision: **20.03.2026****IN THE MATTER OF:**

PRASHANT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA &amp; ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Udit Dedhiya, SPC with Ms Neha Mishra GP, Ms Apurva Sachdev &amp; Mr Preyansh Gupta, Advocates for R1.

Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh with Ms. Parul Goyal, &amp; Mr. Siddharth Handa, Advocates for R2.

**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV****JUDGEMENT****PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petition is for setting aside communication dated 27.09.2025 issued by respondent no. 2-Secretary General, National Rifle Association of India, whereby, the petitioner has been informed of the rejection of his application for membership with the National Rifle Association of India (NRAI) by its Governing Body.

2. The petitioner has a license for possession and use of firearms under

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:AMIT KUMAR  
SHARMA  
Signing Date:28.03.2026  
16:06:48

Signature Not Verified

Signed  
By:PURUSHAINDRA  
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:2640



the Arms Act, 1959 and he has participated in State level and National level shooting tournaments. According to him, he had applied for membership of the NRAI in the year 2023. However, since the same had not been decided, the petitioner had filed W.P. (C) 13668/2023, which was disposed of by this Court *vide* order dated 29.07.2025 directing respondent no. 2 to consider the petitioner's application. The impugned communication has been issued by respondent no. 2 in pursuance of the said order.

3. According to the petitioner, the impugned communication is bereft of any reason, and incorrect allegations without any factual basis have been leveled against him.

4. The Court has considered the order dated 27.09.2025 and finds that the Governing Body, upon due consideration of the petitioner's conduct, concluded that he had abused and misbehaved with its office-bearers. Further, he had also not responded to its letter dated 14.03.2024. Therefore, his application for membership has been rejected. For the sake of clarity, the impugned communication is extracted below, for reference:

*"TRG/MISC/99/2025*

*September 27, 2025*

*Mr Prashant*

*Rio H.N. 312, Tower-10*

*Panchsheel, Govindpuram*

*Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh*

**Sub: Delhi High Court order dated 29.7.2025 in the matter of Mr Prashant Vs UOI others**

*Mr Prashant,*

*As per Delhi High Court order dated 29.7.2025, the matter was placed before the Governing Body of the NRAI in its meeting held on 2.8.2025. The Governing Body looked into your conduct, abusive threats, behaviour towards office bearers and non response to our letter dated 14.3.2024.*

*The Governing Body also examined all relevant material, wherein you had made scandalous and scathing comments and life threats against*

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:AMIT KUMAR  
SHARMA  
Signing Date:28.03.2026  
16:06:48

Signature Not Verified

Signed  
By:PURUSHAINDRA  
KUMAR KAURAV



*office bearers and your failure to provide any evidence in support of your allegations. Besides the above, your conduct and in particular lack of discipline and decency on your part has been taken into account for the purpose of deciding your application. Considering these the Governing Body has rejected your membership application. It is further decided that any membership application of yours will not be considered for the next 5 years and your membership amount will be refunded. You are requested to send your bank details so that amount is transferred to your account.*

*Thanking you  
Yours faithfully  
K SULTAN SINGH  
Secretary General”*

5. It be noted that the petitioner does not have any vested right to seek for the membership. The petitioner’s application for membership has been rejected on the ground that he misbehaved with officials of the NRAI, which position is disputed by the petitioner. Therefore, the *lis* involves adjudication of disputed questions of facts, and requires adjudication by a Civil Court. As such, the same is not amenable to be adjudicated by the Court exercising its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Reference may be made to the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Rajendra Diwan v. Pradeep Kumar Ranibala and Ors.***<sup>1</sup> The relevant portion of the decision is extracted below, for reference:

*“86. In exercise of its extraordinary power of superintendence and/or judicial review under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, the High Courts restrict interference to cases of patent error of law which go to the root of the decision; perversity; arbitrariness and/or unreasonableness; violation of principles of natural justice, lack of jurisdiction and usurpation of powers. The High Court does not re-assess or re-analyse the evidence and/or materials on record. Whether the High Court would exercise its writ jurisdiction to test a decision of the Rent Control Tribunal would depend on the facts and circumstances of the case. The writ jurisdiction of the High Court cannot be converted into an alternative appellate forum, just because there is no other provision of*

---

<sup>1</sup> (2019) 20 SCC 143





2026:DHC:2640



*appeal in the eye of the law.”.*

6. In light of the aforesaid enunciation of the legal position, the aspects of the petitioner’s conduct and alleged misbehavior with officials of the NRAI cannot be looked into in this petition.

7. In view thereof, the Court is not inclined to accede to the prayers made herein. Accordingly, the petition fails and is dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**MARCH 20, 2026**

tr/amg

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:AMIT KUMAR  
SHARMA  
Signing Date:28.03.2026  
16:06:48

Signature Not Verified

Signed  
By:PURUSHAINDRA  
KUMAR KAURAV