



CRM-M-19860-2025

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

229

**CRM-M-19860-2025
Decided on :24.07.2025**

Jai Sharma @ Sukha Amabarsariya alias Jai Kumar

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.118 dated 07.07.2024, under Section 111 of BNS, and under Sections 25(7) of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 111(2)(3)(4)(6) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 54 and 59 of Arms Act were added later on), registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the FIR was registered against the petitioner and other accused, at the instance of Sub-Inspector Dilbagh Singh, who alleged that he received secret information indicating that certain individuals had formed an organized gang of criminals

**CRM-M-19860-2025****2**

already involved in various criminal cases. It was further alleged that the gang procures arms and ammunition at low prices from other states through illegal means and subsequently supplies them to criminal elements in the State of Punjab at higher rates. These weapons are also used to carry out serious organized crimes under the banner of an unregistered criminal organization known as the Sukha Pistol Group Syndicate.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that several co-accused, namely Gobind Sharma, Karan Sharma, Arpit Thakur, Suraj Sharma @ Sucha, Sanjeev Kumar @ Babba, Nikhil Sharma @ Lala, and Mohani @ Mohani, have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide orders dated 08.01.2025 (P-3), 13.01.2025 (P-4), 23.01.2025 (P-5), 03.02.2025 (P-6), 03.02.2025 (P-7), 14.02.2025 (P-8) and 28.02.2025 (P-9), respectively.

It is further submitted that the petitioner, although named in the FIR, stands on an equal footing with co-accused Suraj Sharma @ Sucha and Nikhil Sharma @ Lala, who are also specifically named in the same FIR and have already been enlarged on bail. The role attributed to the petitioner is not distinguishable from that of the said co-accused. There are no allegations of any additional or more serious involvement against the petitioner as compared to those already granted bail. Therefore, on the well-settled principle of parity, the petitioner also deserves to be extended the same relief

4. Learned State Counsel opposes the grant of bail to the petitioner, submitting that the allegations against the petitioner are serious

**CRM-M-19860-2025****3**

in nature, involving organized criminal activity. Counsel further submits that the petitioner, being named in the FIR, is part of a larger conspiracy involving interstate smuggling of weapons. Learned State Counsel further submits that the investigation is still ongoing and the petitioner's release at this stage may hamper the investigation. Therefore, prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the record available before this Court, including the bail orders whereby several co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail, this Court, in light of the principle of parity and after considering the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, finds merit in the prayer of the petitioner.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.



CRM-M-19860-2025

4

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

24.07.2025
Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*