



\$~155

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 5296/2026**

ANIL KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

20.04.2026

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:

- “a) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the Respondents to renew the Arms License of the Petitioner bearing No. NESP/9/2004176;*
- b) Quash the impugned Order-cum-Show Cause Notice dated 17.4.2025 issued by Respondent No.2;*
- c) B. Issue a writ, order, or direction in the nature of Mandamus, thereby directing the respondents to restore all the rights and privileges of the petitioner as an arms license holder, as were earlier enjoyed by him since 2004;*
- d) . Pass any other or further orders a this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.”*

2. The petitioner was granted an Arms License in the year 2004, for a 0.32 bore revolver in accordance with the Arms Act, 1959 (**‘Arms Act’**) and the rules made therein.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that in FIR bearing number 199/2012 registered under Sections 20/406/471/120 B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of the Arms Act, he was not arrayed as an accused therein. His name has been entered falsely in Column No.12 of the chargesheet due to



personal enmity.

4. The petitioner's license was last renewed in 2017, which was valid up to 14.09.2020. On seeking further registration, the impugned order dated 17.04.2025 was passed, whereby the license came to be suspended, and a show cause notice was issued.

5. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite submitting a reply to the show cause and pointing out that he was not an accused in any of the crimes, the issue was not taken to its logical conclusion. No final order was passed by the competent authority till date. The petitioner also claims parity with the case of **Jai Parkash v State**¹, who was also a suspect in the same FIR, whose license has been renewed.

6. Having considered the overall facts and circumstances of the instant case, the Court finds that the licensing authority i.e., respondent no.2 herein shall take the issue to its logical conclusion.

7. Let the petitioners' renewal application be decided by the concerned authority in accordance with law. If the concerned authority finds that for any reason the license of the petitioner cannot be renewed, let a speaking order thereon be passed.

8. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to take appropriate recourse in accordance with the law.

9. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 20, 2026/SH

¹ W.P.(C) No. 16296 of 2025