



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT – C No. - 8633 of 2026

Jai Shankar Alias
Bairistar

.....Petitioners(s)

Versus

State of U.P. And 2
Others

.....Respondents(s)

Counsel for Petitioners(s) : Kripa Shankar Shukla, Vikas Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C.

Court No. - 37

HON'BLE VINOD DIWAKAR, J.

1. In compliance with the order dated 11.05.2026, the affidavit dated 20.05.2026 filed by the Joint Secretary (Home) has been taken on record.
2. The affidavit dated 20.05.2026 is self-explanatory and reveals that the District Magistrates and also the Commissioners of Police/Senior Superintendents of Police of all 75 districts have not been adhering to the Government Orders issued from time to time. The provisions of the Arms Act, 1959 and the Rules framed thereunder are also not being followed in their true letter and spirit by the concerned officers. In paragraph 6 of the order dated 23.03.2026, this Court had specifically indicated the requirements to be complied with by the District Magistrates and the S.S.P.s while dealing with applications for grant, renewal, and transfer of arms licences. Paragraph 6 of the order dated 23.03.2026 is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“6. From perusal of record, it transpires that Rule 13 of Arms Rule, 2016 suggests that the licensing authority, after considering the application and on being satisfied that the applicant has fulfilled the eligibility conditions, shall grant or refuse to grant a license for permissible category of arms or ammunition specified in category III of Schedule I, to any person by recording in writing the reasons for

such grant or refusal, by passing a speaking order, within a period of sixty days of the receipt of the police report. Rule 14 states that on receipt of an application for grant of a license under sub-rule (1) of rule 13 or every subsequent renewal thereof under Section 15 of the Arms Act, the licensing authority shall call for a report of the officer-in-charge of the nearest police station on that application, and such officer shall send his report in Form S-4, within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of application by him.”

3. The earlier affidavit filed by the Additional Chief Secretary (Home) discloses that, as on date, 10,08,953 arms licences have been granted. It further indicates that 23,407 applications under different categories are pending consideration; 1,738 appeals against orders passed by the District Magistrates are pending before the Commissioners; 20,960 families possess more than one arms licence; and in 6,062 cases, licences have been granted to persons having criminal history involving two or more criminal cases.

4. Vide order dated 11.03.2026, this Court had granted one week's time to the State Government to revisit its policy relating to grant and review of arms licences, particularly in respect of persons having criminal antecedents. The State was also directed to furnish district-wise, police station-wise, and name-wise details of arms licence holders against whom two or more criminal cases have been registered. It was further directed that the affidavit shall disclose particulars of pending criminal cases against such licence holders, along with details of their family members holding arms licences, if any.

5. During the course of arguments it realized, and also considering similar matters pending before this Court wherein licences have been cancelled in respect of persons engaged in public and political life, it has been found necessary that further information is required for arriving at a logical conclusion. This Court is of the considered view that equity is one of the foundational principles of the rule of law; therefore, in order to ensure good governance and maintain public confidence, the State must not only observe fairness and non-discrimination in policy, but such principles must also be reflected in day-to-day administration.

6. Accordingly, an officer not below the rank of Secretary in the Home Department is directed to furnish the information sought in paragraphs 17,

17.1, 17.2 and 17.3 of the order dated 23.03.2026 and paragraph 10 of the order dated 11.03.2026, in respect of the following residents of the State of Uttar Pradesh. The affidavit shall also specify whether any Government security has been provided to such persons and, if so, the category of security, the number of police personnel deployed, and the ranks of such personnel. The other necessary and incidental thereto information shall be appreciated in this regard.

7. The names are given zone-wise as per the information provided to the Court. The names have been furnished zone-wise only for indicative purposes. It shall be the collective as well as individual responsibility of all concerned officers to verify and furnish the correct addresses and complete particulars of the persons, in whose jurisdiction the persons mentioned below reside and operate.

Noida Commissionerate: 1. Amit Kasana, 2. Anil Bhati, 3. Randeep Bhati, 4. Manoj Aase, 5. Anil Dujana, 6. Sunder Singh Bhati, 7. Shivraj Singh Bhati.

Zone Meerut; 1. Udham Singh, 2. Yogesh Bhadora, 3. Madan Singh Baddo, 4. Haji Yaqub Kuraisi, 5. Sharik, 6. Sunil Rathi, 7. Dharmendra, 8. Yashpal Tomar, 9. Amarपाल Kalu, 10. Anuj Barkha, 11. Vikrant Vikki, 12. Haji Iqbal, 13. Vinod Sharma, 14. Sunil @ Mucch, 15. Sanjeev Maheshwari, 16. Vinay Tyagi @ Tinku.

Agra Zone: 1. Anil Chaudhary, 2. Rishi Kumar Sharma.

Bareilly Zone: Ejaj.

Lucknow Zone and Lucknow Commissionerate: 1. Khan Mubarak, 2. Ajay Pratap Singh @ Ajay Sipahi, 3. Sanjay Singh Singhala, 4. Atul Verma, 5. Mohammad Sahim, 6. Sudhakar Singh, 7. Guddu Singh, 8. Anoop Singh, 9. Lallu Yadav, 10. Bachchu Yadav, 11. Jugunu Valiya @ Harvinder.

Prayagraj Zone and Commissionerate: 1. Dabbu Singh @ Pradeep Singh, 2. Bachcha Pasi @ Nihal Singh, 3. Dilip Mishra, 4. Javed, 5. Rajesh Yadav, 6. Ganesh Yadav, 7. Kamrul Hasan, 8. Javir Hussain.

Varanasi Zone and Commissionerate: 1. Tribhuwan Singh @ Pawan Singh, 2. Vijay Mishra, 3. Kuntu Singh @ Dhruv Singh, 4. Akhand Pratap Singh, 5. Ramesh Singh Kaka, 6. Abhishek Singh Honey @ Jahar, 7. Brijesh Kumar Singh, 8. Subhash Singh Thakur, 9. Abbas Ansari, 10. Pintu Singh.

Gorakhpur Zone and Commissionerate: 1. Rajan Tiwari, 2. Sanjeev Dwivedi @ Ramu Dwivedi, 3. Rakesh Yadav, 4. Sudhir Singh, 5. Vinod Upadhyay, 6. Rizwan Jaheer, 7. Devendra Singh.

Kanpur Zone: 1. Anupam Dubey, 2. Saud Akhtar.

8. The affidavit dated 20.05.2026 filed by the Joint Secretary (Home) further records that, with a view to completely eradicating the menace of public display and misuse of firearms and the glorification of criminal culture, the State Government has adopted an extremely strict zero-tolerance policy and has issued Government Order dated 18.02.2016 in continuation of Government Order No. 3017 dated 15.05.1999.

9. It has also been pointed out that the local police authorities have failed to furnish details of certain influential individuals wielding substantial social and political influence, and that relevant particulars concerning such persons have been concealed. In order to bring clarity and remove ambiguity, and without commenting upon the credentials or political and social activities of any individual, this Court deems it appropriate to seek information in respect of the following persons as well: 1. Mr. Raghuraj Pratap Singh, 2. Mr. Dhananjay Singh 3. Mr. Sushil Singh, 4. Mr. Brij Bhushan Singh, 5. Mr. Vineet Singh, 6. Mr. Ajay Marhad, 7. Mr. Sujit Singh Belwa, 8. Mr. Upendra Singh Guddu, 9. Mr. Pappu Bhaukali, 10. Mr. Indradev Singh, 11. Mr. Sunil Yadav, 12. Mr. Farar Azeem, 13. Mr. Badshah Singh, 14. Mr. Sangram Singh, 15. Mr. Sullu Singh, 16. Mr. Chulbul Singh, 17. Mr. Sunny Singh, 18. Mr. Chhunnu Singh, and 19. Dr. Uday Bhan Singh.

10. It is the *prima facie* view of this Court that the public display of weapons may create an illusion of dominance, strength and protection, but it often disrupts social harmony and generates fear and insecurity among ordinary people. Although the open carrying of guns is sometimes justified

in the name of self-defence, weapons that become instruments of intimidation promote fear rather than genuine security. A society in which armed individuals assert dominance through visible force and threats does not become more free or peaceful; rather, it erodes public trust, weakens the sense of safety, and disturbs civic peace. True self-defence is intended to preserve life and maintain order, not to transform public spaces into environments of dominance and fear. For this reason, a culture that glorifies guns and intimidation cannot be regarded as conducive to a peaceful and rule-bound society.

11. The Registrar (Compliance) is directed to send a copy of this order forthwith to the Additional Chief Secretary (Home), all District Magistrates, and the Commissioners of Police/Senior Superintendents of Police of all 75 districts for strict and effective compliance.

12. The concerned S.S.P./Commissioner of Police shall also furnish an undertaking stating that no material information sought by this Court in its previous orders has been concealed and that the information furnished is true and correct as per official records. The officers concerned shall remain personally liable for any intentional suppression or concealment of material facts.

13. Put up this matter as fresh on 26.05.2026 for further consideration and compliance. Any laxity on the part of the concerned officers shall be treated as intentional dereliction of duty and viewed seriously by this Court.

May 20, 2026
Shafique

(Vinod Diwakar, J.)