



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.18081 of 2025

An application filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India.

Sambit Padhy @ Padhi

.....

Petitioner

Mr. R.K. Mohanty, Senior
Advocate along with
Mr. Debakanta Mohanty,
Advocate

-versus-

***Revenue Divisional
Commissioner (Central
Division), Cuttack & Ors.***

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. Sarbeswar Behera,
A.G.A.

CORAM:

JUSTICE A.K. MOHAPATRA

Date of Hearing : 09.03.2026 | Date of Judgment: 13.03.2026

A.K. Mohapatra, J. :

1. By filing the present writ application under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner has approached this court with a prayer for quashing of the impugned order dated 30.05.2025 at Annexure-1 by the RDC (CD), Cuttack-Opposite Party No.1 in Arms Appeal No.2 of 2023 thereby affirming order



dated 28.03.2023 issued by the Additional District Magistrate, Khordha-Opposite Party No.3, cancelling the arms license of the Petitioner at Annexure-2. The Petitioner has also prayed for a direction to the Opposite Parties to renew the Arms License No.6/2019 issued in his favor by the competent authority under the Arms Act, 1959.

2. The factual background of the present writ application, bereft of all unnecessary details, in short, is that the Petitioner, who is a businessman of repute in the district of Khordha, he had applied for an arms license to the District Magistrate, Khordha in the year 2019, due to his necessity. The A.D.M, Khordha, after following the procedure as prescribed in the Arms Act and the rules framed thereunder, issued the arms license authorizing the Petitioner to keep arms for his personal security. Ever since, the petitioner has never misused his arms against which a license has been issued by the competent authority.

3. After receiving the arms license from the competent authority, the petitioner purchased one Pistol bearing No.19-02-12464 by GSF (IOF) Ashu Tosh Daw and Co., Arms and Ammunition Dealers, Ranihat, Cuttack. After acquiring the arms, the Petitioner produced the same before the Deputy Collector,



Khordha for necessary verification. Since the arms license issued in favor of the Petitioner was valid up to 13.8.2022, the Petitioner applied for the renewal thereof. However, such application of renewal of his arms license was rejected by the A.D.M., Khordha- Opposite Party No.3 by order dated 28.3.2023, at Annexure-2, and, accordingly, the arms license of the petitioner was cancelled.

4. On perusal of order dated 28/3/2023 at Annexure-2, this Court observes that Petitioner's prayer for renewal of the arms license was cancelled by the Opposite Party No.3 on the basis of a report of the S.P, Khordha-Opposite Party No.4, which had stated that the Petitioner is involved in a criminal case bearing Khordha Model P.S Case No.350 of 2022, which was registered for alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 379/411/413/120-B/34 of IPC, read with Section 21 of the OMMDR Act. After cancellation of his license, the Petitioner initially approached this court by filing W.P.(C) No.11815 of 2023 on the ground that before cancelling his license the Petitioner was not provided with any opportunity of hearing in pursuance to the principles of natural justice. The said writ application was disposed of by this Court with liberty to the Petitioner to challenge



the cancellation order at Annexure-2 by filing an appeal under Section 18 of the Arms Act before the RDC (CD), Cuttack.

5. After disposal of the earlier writ application, the Petitioner preferred an appeal before the appellate authority, i.e., RDC (CD), Cuttack which was registered as Arms Appeal Case No.2 of 2023. The appeal preferred by the Petitioner in the year 2023 was disposed of by the appellate authority by virtue of the impugned order dated 30.5.2025 passed by the Opposite Party No.1. Being aggrieved by such rejection of his arms license, the Petitioner has approached this court by filing the present writ petition.

6. The Opposite Party Nos.2 and 3 have jointly filed a counter affidavit defending the conduct of the Opposite Party Nos.1 and 3, rejecting the prayer of the Petitioner for renewal of his arms license and thereby cancelling the license issued in his favor. The Opposite Parties No.2 and 3 did not dispute the fact that an arms license, bearing License No.6/2019, was granted in favor of the Petitioner on 14/08/2019 and that the same was valid up to 13/08/2022. It has also been mentioned that the Petitioner was instructed to purchase 0.32 Bore Pistol/ Revolver from any authorized arms dealer and to produce the same before the O.I.C, Judicial, Collectorate, Khordha within a month for verification. So



far the acquisition of the arms is concerned, the Opposite Parties have not disputed the assertion of the petitioner in the writ application.

7. In the counter affidavit the Opposite Parties have categorically stated that the Petitioner submitted an application for renewal of his license on 24/08/2022 before the Deputy Collector, Khordha, which was forwarded to the S.P., Khordha to enquire and report to the competent authority. In response to such letter dated 08.09.2022, the SP Khurda submitted his inquiry report vide letter dated 17.03.2023. In the inquiry report, the IIC Khurda Model PS informed that the Petitioner was involved in Khurda Model PS Case No.350 of 2022. Therefore, the renewal of arms license in favor of the petitioner was not recommended by the SP Khurda. Taking into consideration such recommendation, Petitioner's application for renewal of arms license bearing No.06 of 2019 was refused by the competent authority and his license stood cancelled.

8. Furthermore, it has been alleged in the counter affidavit that although the license was cancelled by the competent authority vide order dated 28.03.2023 and the Petitioner was directed to surrender the weapon before the IIC Khurda Model PS, he has



neither surrendered the weapon nor submitted the arms license book before the Deputy Collector, Judicial, Collectorate, Khurda. In view of such disobedience on the part of the Petitioner, it has been stated in the counter affidavit that no recommendation was made for renewal of the arms license in favor of the Petitioner. It has been specifically averred that in view of the Petitioner's involvement in a criminal case, as has been referred to hereinabove in the preceding paragraph, the competent authority, by referring to the inquiry report submitted by the SP Khurda and considering the involvement of the petitioner in the criminal case, has rejected the application of the petitioner for renewal of his arms license. Finally, the opposite parties have categorically stated that the Petitioner has no indefeasible right to claim renewal of his arms license.

9. Heard Shri R.K. Mohanty, learned senior counsel for the Petitioner, as well as Mr. S. Behera, learned Additional Government Advocate for the State-Opposite Parties. Perused the pleadings of the respective parties as well as the documents annexed thereto.

10. Mr. R.K. Mohanty, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, at the outset contended that the arms



license No.6 of 2019 was initially issued in favor of the petitioner by observing all statutory formalities. He further submitted that the Opposite Parties No.1 and 3 have committed illegalities by rejecting the prayer of the petitioner for renewal of his arms license which had admittedly expired on 31.08.2022. In course of his argument, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, drawing attention of this Court to the report submitted by the I.I.C., Model P.S., Khordha on 01.03.2023, which has been filed at Annexure-A/2 to the counter affidavit, stated before this Court that the I.I.C has indicated in his report that the Petitioner is involved in Khordha Model P.S Case No.350 of 2022, which was registered for commission of an offense punishable under Section 379, 411, 413, 120-B, 34 of the IPC read with Section 21 of OMMDR Act. Such report also displays other vital information like whether there is valid ground for possession of arms license, and the answer to such question was in the affirmative. The reply to the question that whether the Petitioner is party to any dispute which is likely to cause breach of peace in the locality was in the negative. Similarly, in reply to the question that whether the grant of arms license may result in breach of peace or disturbance in the social equilibrium was also in the negative. Under point No.17 of the report dated



1/3/2023, the IIC Model P.S., Khordha has recommended for renewal of the arms license issued in favor of the petitioner.

11. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that the Petitioner was entangled in Khordha Model P.S. Case No.350 of 2022, as has been indicated in the preceding paragraph. The allegation in the FIR which was lodged before the Model Police Station, Khordha reveals that the Petitioner was allegedly in possession of coal illegally. A copy of the FIR in the aforesaid case has also been annexed to the writ application as Annexure-6. Referring to the FIR in the aforesaid case, learned Senior Counsel further contended that although an allegation has been made against the petitioner and the co-accused persons for possessing Chromite and hard Coke illegally, however, such allegations are baseless and the Petitioner is yet to face trial on allegations. He further contended that, other than the above-noted case, there is no other case pending against the present Petitioner. While taking this Court through the allegation made in the FIR, at Annexure-6 to the present writ application, the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner contended that there is no allegation of commission of any heinous crime or any assault being attempted by the petitioner. There is also no allegation with regard to illegal use of the arms



kept by the petitioner pursuant to the license issued earlier by the competent authority. On such ground, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended that the Opposite Parties have committed an illegality in rejecting the application for renewal of arms license of the Petitioner and consequently cancelling the arms license of the Petitioner.

12. Mr. Mohanty, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner, would further argue that while cancelling the license of the Petitioner, the Opposite Parties have not followed the provisions contained in the Arms Act, 1959 and the rules framed thereunder. While elaborating the violation of statutory provisions, the learned Senior Counsel submitted before this court that the application for renewal of the arms license submitted by the Petitioner has been rejected on a flimsy grounds. He further contended that none of the grounds as mentioned in Section 17 of the Arms Act for cancellation/ suspension of the arms license were available to the Opposite Parties to deny the Petitioner the renewal of his arms license, which was initially issued lawfully by the competent authority. On such grounds, the learned Senior Counsel assailed the impugned orders at Annexures-1 and 2 respectively and prayed for quashing of such orders with a further prayer for a direction to



the Opposite Parties to renew the arms license issued in favor of the Petitioner.

13. Learned Additional Government Advocate on the other hand objected to the prayer made in the present writ application. In course of his argument, the learned A.G.A referring to the counter affidavit filed by the Opposite Parties No.2 and 3 stated before this court that at the time of renewal of the arms license of the Petitioner, an inquiry report was called for from the IIC Model P.S Khurda. In this report, the IIC has for the first time disclosed that the Petitioner is involved in Model PS Khurda Case No.350 of 2022, for commission of the crimes under the sections which have already been narrated hereinabove. He further contended that since the Petitioner is having a criminal antecedent and that there exists a possibility of Petitioner disturbing the law and order situation and the peace and tranquility in the locality, the competent authority, as well as the appellate authority, thought it proper not to renew the arms license of the Petitioner. He further argued that basing upon the information available with the Opposite Parties No.1 and 3, they have taken an informed decision after satisfying themselves on the factual background of the Petitioner's case. He further contended that the provisions contained in the Arms Act,



1959 confer discretion on the authorities either to issue or not to issue any arms license in favor of any applicant. Learned Additional Government Advocate emphatically argued that since the Petitioner is having a criminal antecedent, the Opposite Parties have not committed any illegality in rejecting his application for renewal of the arms license. In such view of the matter, learned Additional Government Advocate contended that the present writ application is devoid of merit and, accordingly, the same should be dismissed.

14. On an analysis of the submissions made by counsels appearing for both sides and on a careful examination of the pleadings of the respective parties as well as the impugned orders annexed to the present writ application, this court observes that in order to adjudicate the present Writ Application it is required to determine as to whether the conduct of the Opposite Party No.1 and 3 in rejecting the prayer of the Petitioner for renewal of his arms license was legal and whether such conduct falls within the scope of the Arms Act, 1959. While deciding the said issue this court is required to bear in mind that initially in the year 2019 the Petitioner was issued with an arms license bearing No.6 of 2019 by following the due procedure of law and after obtaining a report



from the concerned police station. This license expired in the year 2022, where after the Petitioner applied for renewal of the same. Such prayer for renewal having been rejected, the Petitioner has approached this court by filing the present writ application.

15. In support of his contention, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner referred to the judgment dated 03.03.2022 passed in W.P.(C) No.11343 of 2019, (*Pawan Kumar Jain vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors.*), by the Hon'ble Madhya Pradesh High Court. He also relied upon the judgment dated 25.7.2024 passed in W.P.(C) No.19267 of 2024 by the very same High Court and the judgment dated 5.11.2024 passed in W.P.(C) No.13548 of 2021, (*Ravindra Yadav vs. State of U.P. & Ors.*), by the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court. By referring to the aforesaid judgments, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended before this Court that the prayer for renewal of the arms license could not have been rejected by the competent authority as well as the Appellate authority only on the ground that the Petitioner is having criminal antecedent. In other words, pendency of a criminal case against the Petitioner cannot be the sole ground to either suspend or cancel his arms license. Moreover, such pendency of a criminal case cannot be a ground to record satisfaction for



suspension/ cancellation of the license. The Hon'ble Allahabad High Court, in the case of *Rabindra Kumar Yadav (supra)*, while deciding an issue involving cancellation of the arms license, has categorically held that it is to be seen by the authorities that once an arms license is granted and the same is cancelled, it entails civil consequences. The Opposite Party-authorities are required to follow the provisions contained under Section 17 of the Arms Act to demonstrate that power of cancellation of arms license has been exercised for public peace and safety. Further, it has gone on to hold that a dispute between two individuals for which an FIR has been lodged under section 323 read with 504 of IPC can be said to have been resulted in disturbance of public peace and safety. In the said judgment of the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court, the factual background reveals that there was no use of the firearm by the Petitioner in any criminal activity and that the State was unable to satisfy the Court with regard to the fact that the conduct of the Petitioner in that case has violated the public peace and safety. As such, it has been held that mere pendency of a criminal case by itself cannot be a ground for cancellation of arms license.

16. While answering the issue raised before this court by Mr. Mohanty, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner, this court



examined the relevant provisions contained in the Arms Act, 1959. The said Act provides for issuance of a license for acquisition, possession, manufacture, sale, import, export, and transport of arms and ammunitions. Section 3 of the Act creates an embargo with regard to possession or acquisition of any firearm, or ammunition unless a license is issued by the competent authority under the rules. Since in the present writ application, we are concerned with the acquisition and possession of the firearms, this Court is not required to go into other provisions of Chapter II of the Arms Act. Under Section 13 of Chapter III of the said Act, a provision has been enacted for grant of license. Section 15 provides for the duration and renewal of the license. Section 15(1) provides that if a license is issued, the same shall remain valid for a period of three years (as amended with effect from 14.12.2019). Prior to such amendment, the period of license was for 5 years. Section 15(1) was amended by the Act 48 of 2019 with effect from 14.12.2019. Sub-section 3 of section 15 provides for renewal of the license. For better appreciation, such provision is quoted herein below:-

“(3) Every licence shall, unless the licensing authority for reasons to be recorded in writing otherwise decides in any case, be renewable for the same period for which the licence was originally granted and shall be so renewable



from time to time, and the provisions of sections 13 and 14 shall apply to the renewal of a license as they apply to the grant thereof.”

17. A bare reading of Sub-section 3 of Section 15 gives an impression that once the license is issued by the competent authority, the same is renewable, and that for such renewal, provisions of Sections 13 and 14 shall apply and the licensing authority unless otherwise decides, for reasons are recorded in writing, shall renew the license granted earlier lawfully. It is not disputed by the parties that initially the license was granted in favor of the Petitioner lawfully by following the provisions of the Arms Act and the rules framed thereunder. Thus, a limited right accrues in favor of the Petitioner to seek for renewal of the arms license in terms of Section 15(3) of the Arms Act and the authorities are under a legal obligation to renew of the license, unless for reasons to be recorded in writing, they decide otherwise.

18. On further perusal of the provisions contained in the Arms Act, 1959, this Court found that the authorities are not denuded of the power to cancel or suspend any license in certain exigencies as has been mentioned in Section 17 of the said Act. Once a license is granted by the competent authority lawfully, then the question would arise whether such license can be varied, suspended, or



revoked in the event it is found that the contingencies mentioned in Section 17. For better appreciation of the grounds for variation, suspension, and revocation of the license, the provision contained in Section 17 is quoted herein below for reference:-

“ 17. Variation, suspension and revocation of licences.—(1) *The licensing authority may vary the conditions subject to which a licence has been granted except such of them as have been prescribed and may for that purpose require the licence-holder by notice in writing to deliver-up the licence to it within such time as may specified in the notice.*

(2) *The licensing authority may, on the application of the holder of a licence, also vary the conditions of the licence except such of them as have been prescribed.*

(3) *The licensing authority may by order in writing suspend a licence for such period as it thinks fit or revoke a licence—*

(a) *if the licensing authority is satisfied that the holder of the licence is prohibited by this Act or by any other law for the time being in force, from acquiring, having in his possession or carrying any arms or ammunition, or is of unsound mind, or is for any reason unfit for a licence under this Act; or*

(b) *if the licensing authority deems it necessary for the security of the public peace or for public safety to suspend or revoke the licence; or*

(c) *if the licence was obtained by the suppression of material information or on the basis of wrong information provided by the holder of the licence or any other person on his behalf at the time of applying for it; or*

(d) *if any of the conditions of the licence has been contravened; or*



(e) if the holder of the licence has failed to comply with a notice under sub-section (1) requiring him to deliver-up the licence.

(4) The licensing authority may also revoke a licence on the application of the holder thereof.

(5) Where the licensing authority makes an order varying a licence under sub-section (1) or an order suspending or revoking a licence under sub-section (3), it shall record in writing the reasons therefor and furnish to the holder of the licence on demand a brief statement of the same unless in any case the licensing authority is of the opinion that it will not be in the public interest to furnish such statement.

(6) The authority to whom the licensing authority is subordinate may by order in writing suspend or revoke a licence on any ground on which it may be suspended or revoked by the licensing authority; and the foregoing provisions of this section shall, as far as may be, apply in relation to the suspension or revocation of a licence by such authority.

(7) A court convicting the holder of a licence of any offence under this Act or the rules made thereunder may also suspend or revoke the licence:

Provided that if the conviction is set aside on appeal or otherwise, the suspension or revocation shall become void.

(8) An order of suspension or revocation under sub-section (7) may also be made by an appellate court or by the High Court when exercising its powers of revision.

(9) The Central Government may, by order in the Official Gazette, suspend or revoke or direct any licensing authority to suspend or revoke all or any licences granted under this Act throughout India or any part thereof.

(10) On the suspension or revocation of a licence under this section the holder thereof shall without delay surrender the licence to the authority by whom it has



been suspended or revoked or to such other authority as may be specified in this behalf in the order of suspension or revocation.”

19. On a careful analysis of the provision contained in Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959, this Court is of the considered view that although a license is granted to an applicant under Section 13 of the Act, for the duration as has been mentioned therein, the grant of such license is not in any way absolute and that the same is subject to the provision contained in Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959. Thus, it would be wrong to presume that the authorities are denuded of their power to cancel, revoke, or suspend any license once the same is issued to an applicant. However, such power to suspend or revoke the license can only be used only in the event of the exigencies, as has been mentioned under Section 17 of the Act, taking place. Thus, this Court, while testing the validity of the rejection order at Annexures-1 and 2 to the writ application is required to carry out a close scrutiny of such order in the light of the provisions contained in Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959.

20. Before answering the issue involved in the present writ application, i.e., with regard to the validity of the conduct of the Opposite Parties in cancelling the arms license bearing No.6 of 2019 issued in favor of the petitioner, this court would like to



discuss the requirement for grant of such license to the applicant. The necessity to possess a firearm by any of the citizen arises only when it is found that the life of such citizen is in danger. It is well known in law that under the constitutional scheme the State is responsible to protect the life and liberty of every citizen as has been guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. At times it is not possible on the part of the State to provide security to each and every citizen whose life is in danger. Thus, keeping in view the threat perception to a citizen, the legislatures have enacted the Arms Act, 1959, thereunder providing grant of arms license to a citizen for protection of his life and liberty, which is of paramount consideration. Such grant of license, suspension and cancellation thereof are governed by the provisions contained in the Arms Act and the rules framed thereunder. No blanket, unbridled, or arbitrary power has been conferred upon the authorities to either grant such license or to revoke/ suspend/ cancel the same as per their sweet will. Revocation/ cancellation of the license is guided by the provision contained in Section 17 of the Act as well as the relevant provisions of the rules.

21. While testing the validity of the impugned orders at Annexures-1 and 2 passed by the Opposite Party No.1 and 3



respectively, this Court is required to examine as to whether such orders have been passed in conformity with Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959. On a close scrutiny of the order dated 30/5/2025 at Annexure-1 as well as order dated 28/3/2023 at Annexure-2, this Court observes that the prayer for renewal of the license was rejected only on the ground that the Petitioner is involved in Khorda Model P.S Case No.350 of 2022, which was registered for commission of offense under section 379, 411, 413, 120-B/34 of IPC, read with 21 of the OMMDR Act. There neither exists any report nor do the impugned orders reveal that the Petitioner is involved in any other case except the one that has been mentioned in the impugned order. The Opposite Parties have also not stated whether the arms or the license issued in favor of the Petitioner was misused or whether the arms kept in the possession of the Petitioner was ever used in any crime. The allegation against the Petitioner doesn't speak of any assault by the Petitioner on any person. The only case registered against the Petitioner involves illegal possession of Chromite and hard Coke. On a plain reading of the allegation made in the FIR at Annexure-6 to the Writ application, it appears that there is no allegation against the Petitioner of either using the weapon or assaulting any person.



Moreover, the case is still pending for trial and, as such, it would be premature to presume that the Petitioner would be convicted of the alleged offenses.

22. No doubt the competent authority is required to keep in mind the grounds mentioned in Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959. However, they are not expected to close their eyes with regard to the nature and gravity of the allegation made against the petitioner. Furthermore, the competent authority is under a legal obligation, in view of Section 13 of the Act, to grant a license in genuine cases, which would be in furtherance of the constitutional guarantee to every citizen, under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, of the right to protect their life and property. Moreover, the ground indicated in both the impugned orders doesn't fall within the grounds indicated in Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959. Thus, this Court has no hesitation in holding that mere registration of an FIR would in itself be insufficient to either cancel or revoke the license issued in favor of a person. For cancellation of a licence, mere registration of an FIR is not sufficient. The competent authority must be satisfied that the licensee was involved in or participated in the alleged offence, or that the licensed weapon was used in the commission of such offence. Further, the allegation must prima



facie demonstrate that the conduct in question is capable of disturbing public peace in the locality and poses a threat to the law and order situation. In the absence of such material on record, rejection of an application for renewal of once valid arms license would be manifestly unfair and would not be in consonance with Section 17 of the Act.

23. Reverting to the facts of the present case, as has been stated in the preceding paragraph, the document annexed to the counter affidavit by the Opposite Party Nos.2 & 3 reveals that the IIC of the Model PS, Khordha, submitted a report to the Superintendent of Police, Khordha, on 1/3/2023, which is in reply to letter dated 16/9/2022. On perusal of the said report, it appears that the Petitioner was found to be involved in one case, i.e., Model PS Case No.350 of 2022. There are no other criminal antecedents against the present Petitioner. The IIC, upon an inquiry, has indicated that there are valid grounds for possession of the arms license and that the Petitioner is not a party to any dispute which is likely to cause breach and peace in the locality. Accordingly, the IIC, Model PS, has submitted a report recommending grant of arms license in favour of the Petitioner. The impugned orders at Annexures-1 and 2 indicate that the



competent authority, as well as the Appellate authority. have both simply brushed aside the report of the IIC, Model PS, dated 1/3/2023. No doubt, such report is not final and that it is well within the authority of the Opposite Party No.1 and 3 to take a different view. However, such different view can only be taken by recording sound reasons in writing,

24. In view of the aforesaid analysis of legal as well as factual position, this Court is of the considered view that the Opposite Parties No.1 and 3, while passing the impugned orders at Annexures-1 and 2 respectively, have not proceeded in the manner as has been prescribed under Section 17 of the Arms Act, 1959, and that they have also not taken into consideration the report of the IIC, Model PS, Khordha, dated 1/3/2023, which is based on his ground inspection. Moreover, this Court is also of the considered view that merely because of pendency of a criminal case, without assessing the gravity of the crime and without concluding that the Petitioner is a hardened criminal and that the grant of an arms license in favor of the Petitioner would disturb the peace in the locality, and that the same would disturb the social equilibrium, the Opposite Parties could not have rejected the application of the Petitioner for renewal of arms license. In such view of the matter,



this Court has no hesitation in setting aside both the impugned orders dated 30/05/2025 passed by the Opposite Party No.1, at Annexure-1 and the order dated 28/03/2023 passed by Opposite Party No.3, at Annexure-2. Accordingly, both the orders are hereby set aside. Further, the matter is remanded back to the Opposite Party No.3, the competent authority to reconsider the application of the Petitioner for renewal of his arms license in terms of the observations made hereinabove and strictly in accordance with Section 13, 14, and 17 of the Arms Act, 1959. Let the Petitioner approach the Opposite Party No.3 along with a copy of this judgment within 2 weeks from today. In such eventuality, the Opposite Party No.3 shall reconsider the application of the Petitioner for renewal of his arms license within 4 weeks thereafter and dispose of the same by passing a speaking and reasoned order.

25. Accordingly, the writ application stands allowed to the extent indicated hereinabove. However, there shall be no order as to cost.

(A.K. Mohapatra)
Judge

Orissa High Court, Cuttack
The 13th March, 2026/ Anil/ Jr. Steno