## भिगां tunjoy ku mar Tu'i ४४५ (देखें अभिलेख, हस्तक 1941 का नियम 129) State of Brikar

| ्राक्षेत्रा महास्य साठ            | रो   | <u></u> तक  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| ીંથી                              | 40-  | सन् 20  |
| 101011                            | Arms Appeal No 232/17                                  | 34  |
| आदेश की फर्म संo<br>ओर तारीख<br>1 | ,<br>आदेश एवं पदाधिकारी का हस्ताक्षर<br>2              | आदेश पर की गई कार्रवाई के बारे<br>में टिप्पणी एवं तारीख के साथ<br>3 |
| 30.08.17                          | put cip before commissioner<br>on 14.09.17.            | 5.5<br>5.5  |
| is                                | Secto Com  |   |
| 119.9.17                          | Secto Com  |   |
|                                   | Heard the learned counsel for the appellant on the po- | int   |

of admission.

The learned counsel for the appellant states that the instant appeal has been filed against the impugned order passed by D.M. Gopalganj on 23.02.16 in Arms case No. 168/2016. He further submitted that the delay caused in filing this appeal may be condoned after considering the facts mentioned in the limitation petition which has been annexed with this appeal petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the appellant and on going through the memo of appeal petition, it is seen that the impugned order has been passed way back on 28.02.16 and the appeal has been filed before this Court on 30.08.17. Obviously there is a delay of about more than one year. The appellant counsel's contention is that delay caused in filing the appeal was not deliberate rather the same was caused due to unavoidable circumstances. In fact this plea of the appellant is not acceptable in view of the fact that the appellant applied for obtaining of certified copy of the order on 04.07.17 after a long gap. This action of the appellant is sufficient to believe that he has got no real need of licence. Had it not been so, he could have acted well in time for obtaining the certified copy of the order so that he could have preferred appeal under the statutory period before Appellate Court.

Moreover, nothing is mentioned in the limitation petition, nor any reasonable and convincing ground set forth therein to Condon the inordinate delay.

For the abovementioned reasons, I am not inclined to admit this appeal. Accordingly, the same is rejected itself a admission stage.

Dictated and Corrected by me.

Commissioner Saran Division, Chapra.

Saran Division, Chapra.