

This translated ruling is provided for information purposes only. Only the Swedish-language versions are the official rulings.

In case no. 7343-24, the **Swedish Police Authority** (Appellant) v. **AA** and **BB** (Respondents), the Supreme Administrative Court delivered the following judgment on 18 December 2025.

RULING OF THE SUPREME ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

The Supreme Administrative Court rejects the appeal.

BACKGROUND

1. A person who is in possession of a firearm is obliged to manage it and to maintain such supervision of it so as to avoid any risk of access to it by an unauthorised person. When the firearm is not in use, it shall be stored in a security cabinet or in some other similarly secure storage area.
2. AA and BB applied to the Swedish Police Authority for a permit to store their firearms at their holiday home in lieu of at their registered address. The reason they provided is that they spend weekends and holidays at the holiday home and it is situated adjacent to their hunting grounds. Storage at that address would thus be more suitable and more secure because, among other things, the firearms would not need to be transported.
3. The Swedish Police Authority rejected the applications explaining that there was no legal support for granting a permit to store firearms at an address other than the registered address. The decisions also stated that the applicants were not deemed to be able to fulfil the requirement of supervision of the firearms if they were not stored at the registered address.
4. AA and BB appealed the decisions to the Administrative Court in Stockholm which rejected the appeals. The administrative court noted that it was apparent from the General Guidelines of the Swedish National Police Board concerning storage of firearms that, in order to fulfil the requirement of supervision, firearms should be stored at the licence holder's residence which, as a rule, means there the licence holder is registered. The court found no reason to deviate from this in the current case.

Case no.
7343-24

5. AA and BB appealed to the Administrative Court of Appeal in Stockholm. After having noted that there are no regulations according to which firearms must be stored at the licence holder's registered address in order to fulfil the supervision requirement, the administrative court of appeal granted the appeals and overturned the decisions of the lower instances regarding storage of the firearms.

CLAIMS, ETC.

6. *The Swedish Police Authority* claims that the Supreme Administrative Court shall modify the judgment of the administrative court of appeal and affirm the decision of the authority and states the following. As a starting point, storage shall occur at the residence at which the holder of the firearm is registered in order to fulfil the supervision and storage requirements. This is appropriate given that it provides sound conditions for control and secure storage of firearms.
7. AA and BB are of the position that the appeal is to be rejected.

REASONS FOR THE RULING

The question in the Supreme Administrative Court

8. The question is, in part, whether there is a requirement that the possessor of a firearm must store his or her firearm at a certain address and, in part, whether the Swedish Police Authority, following an application, may decide that a firearm is to be stored at a certain address.

Legislation, etc.

9. Chapter 5, Section 1 of the Weapons Act (1996:67) states that a person in possession of a firearm is obliged to manage such property and maintain the weapon under such supervision so as to avoid any risk of access to it by an unauthorised person.

Case no.
7343-24

10. When the firearm is not in use, it shall be stored, pursuant to Section 2, first paragraph, in a security cabinet or other similar secure storage area.

The Court's assessment

11. Chapter 5, Section 1 of the Weapons Act states that a person who is in possession of a firearm is obliged to manage it and to maintain such supervision of it so as to avoid any risk of access to it by an unauthorised person. Supervision means that the weapon is subject to the possessor's immediate control (Government Bill 1990/91:130, p. 41). The provision is applicable to all handling of a firearm, i.e., when, for example, it is in use, transported or displayed (*ibid.*, Government Bill, p. 41 and 61 and Government Bill 1999/2000:27, p. 49).
12. When a firearm is not being handled, it shall, pursuant to Chapter 5, Section 2, first paragraph, be stored in a security cabinet or other similar storage area. In the view of the Supreme Administrative Court, the supervision requirement cannot apply during such storage. If such was the case, a possessor of a firearm would not be able to leave the storage location even during short periods.
13. The Supreme Administrative Court further finds that neither the provision in Chapter 5, Section 1 according to which a possessor of a firearm is obliged to manage the weapon or the provision regarding certain storage in Section 2 may be deemed to provide that storage must take place at a certain address, the registered address, when the weapon is not in use or handled in another way. Nor does the legislation otherwise impose any such requirement.
14. Accordingly, there is no requirement according to which weapons are to be stored at a certain address, and no specific permit to store them at any address other than the registered address is thus required. Instead, it is incumbent on the possessor of the firearm to ensure that the weapon is stored in the prescribed manner. The provisions providing the Police Authority the right under certain circumstances to combine a permit to possess a weapon with conditions regarding, among other things, storage (Chapter 2, Section 5 and Chapter 5, Section 5) do not entail that an individual has the possibility to

Case no.
7343-24

apply to have such conditions for storage at a certain address. Accordingly, such an application shall be disallowed.

15. Thus, the appeal is rejected.

Justices Kristina Ståhl, Ulrik von Essen, Martin Nilsson, Mathias Säfsten and Johanna Mihaic have participated in the ruling.

Judge Referee: Karin Olsson.