



\$~79, 80 & 82

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ BAIL APPLN. 307/2025

MANJUR ALI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jagdeep Singh Bakshi, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Lalit Sahu, Mr. Neetej
Kumar, Advs.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Yudhvair Singh Chauhan, APP
SI N. Pramod, SI Sonal Raj,
PS Model Town

80

+ BAIL APPLN. 308/2025

ZAHIRUDDIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jagdeep Singh Bakshi, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Lalit Sahu, Mr. Neetej
Kumar, Advs.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Yudhvair Singh Chauhan, APP
SI N. Pramod, SI Sonal Raj,
PS Model Town

82

+ BAIL APPLN. 315/2025

SHAKEEL AHMAD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jagdeep Singh Bakshi, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Lalit Sahu, Mr. Neetej
Kumar, Advs.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Yudhvair Singh Chauhan, APP
SI N. Pramod, SI Sonal Raj,
PS Model Town



**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH**

ORDER

24.01.2025

%

CRL.M.A. 2189/2025, CRL.M.A. 2190/2025 & CRL.M.A. 2243/2025

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 307/2025, BAIL APPLN. 308/2025 & BAIL APPLN. 315/2025

3. These are petitions seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the event of arrest in FIR No. 0556/2023, dated 26.09.2023, registered at Police Station Model Town under Sections 420/467/468/471 of IPC, 1860.
4. Briefly stating the facts are that the FIR was registered on the complaint of one, namely, Mr. Kanwar Karan Singh/complainant whereby the allegation against the petitioners was that the petitioners claiming themselves to be the owners of the property bearing property no. 16 (measuring 1000 Sq. yds.), Khasra No. 83, Surat Nagar, Nanak Pleo Gurudwara, Near State Bank Colony, Delhi 110033 ("property") executed forged General Power of Attorney, Agreement to Sell, Affidavit and Deed of Will in favour of one, namely, Mr. Vishal (co-accused) for a sale consideration of Rs 1,35,00,000/- on 21.12.2015.
5. Thereafter, Mr. Vishal, sold the property to Ms. Nirmala for a total sum of Rs. 1,40,00,000/-.
6. In addition, it is stated that the forefathers of complainant were the owner of the said property and now the complainant is the owner of the property and the father of the petitioners was a tenant in the property.



7. Mr. Bakshi, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners has stated that the property is a government land and the complainant has no right, title or interest in the said property.

8. He states that the very existence of the General Power of Attorney, Agreement to Sell, Affidavit and Deed of Will are itself denied by the petitioners. Therefore, the petitioners have not forged or fabricated any documents.

9. He further states that in order to attract the provisions of section 420 of IPC, there should be some person who is cheated based on the acts of the petitioners while in the facts of the present case there has been no inducement to the complainant by the petitioners.

10. He states that the ingredients of sections 467, 468 of IPC have also not been met as there is no document of the complainant falsified by the petitioners. Further, nothing is to be recovered from the petitioners and the petitioners have been granted interim protection in the past and have duly cooperated with the investigation.

11. In the present case, neither Mr. Vishal nor Ms. Nirmala has approached the Court.

12. Even though there may be some substance in the submissions of the petitioners that the property is a government land and the complainant may not be the owner of the property, however, the fact remains that the petitioners in the General Power of Attorney and the Agreement to sell have professed themselves to be “owner and in possession” of the property. There is no document placed on record by the petitioners which shows that the petitioners are the “owners” of the property.

13. However, a Khasra Girdawari pertaining to the property is placed on



record which only shows the petitioners to be in cultivation of the property. The Khasra Girdawari of the property does not confer any semblance of title to the petitioners.

14. The fact that the petitioners have made the General Power of Attorney, Agreement to Sell, Affidavit and Deed of Will professing themselves to be the owners of the property, to my mind, attracts the ingredients of Section 463, 464, 468 of IPC.

15. The custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required for the original documents as well as signatures, thumb impressions and to understand the *modus operandi* of usurping the property.

16. For the said reasons, I am not inclined to entertain the petitions.

17. The petitions are dismissed accordingly.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JANUARY 24, 2025/sp

Click here to check corrigendum, if any