

**GOVERNMENT OF KERALA****Abstract**

Judgement of the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.(C) No. 40000/2023 filed by Sri.S.Kumaresan- Complied with - Orders issued.

HOME(F)DEPARTMENT

G.O.(Rt)No.187/2026/HOME Dated,Thiruvananthapuram, 16-01-2026

- Read: 1. Application submitted by Sri. S. Kumaresan dated 28.11.2022
2. GO(RT)No.3344/2023/Home dated 18.11.2023
3. Judgement dated 17.06.2025 in WP(C) No:40000/2023
4. Letters No. F1/624/2025/Home Dated 19/12/2025& 22.12.2025

ORDER

Sri. S. Kumaresan, the petitioner in WP(C) No. 40000/2023, approached the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala challenging the Government's decision to reject his request for expanding the area validity of his Arms licence No.956/PGT. In the said Writ Petition, the petitioner prayed for the quashing of the previous rejection order read as 2nd paper above and sought a direction to the Government to extend the area of operation of his gun licence to the States of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. The Hon'ble High Court, as per the judgment read as 3rd paper above, observed that the earlier refusal was unsustainable in law and quashed the same. Consequently, the Hon'ble Court directed the Government to reconsider the application read as 1st paper above after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard and allowing him to produce necessary documents, within a period of three months. Sri. Kumaresan later on filed a Con. Case (C) No. 3032/2025 alleging noncompliance of the aforesaid judgment. The Hon'ble Court, taking into account the submission of the Government that hearing was completed, posted the case to a later date.

2. In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, the Additional Chief Secretary (Home & Vigilance) conducted a personal hearing of the petitioner on 05.01.2026 at 4:30 PM. During the hearing, the petitioner reiterated his request for extension, stating that a private security

agency required him to travel to Tamil Nadu and Karnataka as an Armed Guard, specifically for cash van operations between Coimbatore and Hosur. He produced documents (marked Exts. P17 and P18 in the writ petition) from his employer, M/s Shiva Industrial Security Agency (Gujarat) Ltd., to support his claim.

3 . On examination of the records and the submissions made during the hearing, it is seen that the arms licence held by the petitioner was granted solely for self-protection. At the time of submitting the application, the petitioner had stated that he was working as a gunman under SISCO Company. Subsequently, he informed that he had worked as a temporary employee in Bright Accent Transit Pvt. Ltd., and thereafter produced an appointment letter issued by M/s Shiva Industrial Security Agency (Gujarat) Ltd., showing his job location as Central Bank of India, Coimbatore Branch. During the hearing, he submitted that he will get the job in M/s Shiva Industrial Security Agency (Gujarat) Ltd. only if he had a licence with validity extended to Tamil Nadu and Kerala. The petitioner has thus projected different employments and different job purposes through different agencies at different points of time, without establishing continuity or consistency in his claim.

4. The extension of area validity of an arms licence is governed by **Rule 18 of the Arms Rules, 2016**, which states:

"(1) On receipt of an application from a licensee holding a licence in Form III, the licensing authority may extend the area of validity specified in his licence, if he is satisfied about the need of such extension subject to the condition that the licensing authority has the power to grant a licence in relation to the area to which extension is being sought..."

5. His submissions during the hearing do not conclusively establish any compelling or unavoidable necessity for extension of area validity of the arms licence to other States. No material has been produced to show that the petitioner's presence with a firearm outside the State of Kerala is indispensable or mandated under any statutory requirement. Extension of area validity under the Arms Act and the Arms Rules is not automatic and can be granted only upon proof of genuine and specific necessity, which has not been established in the present case. Employment under a private security agency, particularly when the licence itself has been granted for self-protection, cannot be accepted as a valid ground for extension of area validity. It is found that the petitioner has failed to substantiate his claim with credible and consistent evidence. The reasons advanced are shifting in

nature, unsupported by legally sustainable material, and are incompatible with the purpose for which the arms licence was originally granted. No fresh or valid grounds have been made out to warrant extension of area validity to Tamil Nadu and Karnataka.

6. Under the circumstances explained above, the Government, after careful consideration and in strict compliance with the judgment dated 17-06-2025 in WP(C) No. 40000/2023, finds no valid grounds to grant the extension. Accordingly, the request of Shri S. Kumaresan for extension of area validity of his Arms licence to the States of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka is hereby rejected.

7. The judgement of the Honorable High Court in WP(C) No. 40000/2023 Dated 17.06.2025, read as 3rd paper above, is complied with accordingly.

(By order of the Governor)
BISHWANATH SINHA
ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY

To:

Sri.S.Kumaresan, S/o C.Subramaniyan Pillai, 3/161, Railway colony,
Hemambikanagar, Kallekulangara Post, Palakkad District.

The Advocate General, Ernakulam (with Covering Letter)

The District Collector, Palakkad.

~~The Information Officer, Web & New Media Wing, I & PRD.~~

Stock File/Office Copy.

Forwarded /By order
Signed by

Ratheesh G R

Date: 17-01-2026 14:59:40
Section Officer