



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(256)

CRM-M-33620-2026 (O & M)
Date of decision: 02.07.2026

Deepa Kataria

.... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Jay Prakash Jangu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Rani, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Varinder Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 BNSS (Sections 439 Cr.P.C.) is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.51 dated 11.02.2025 under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 324(2), 329, 61, 238 and 351 of BNS, 2023 (Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 427, 448, 120-B, 201 and 506 IPC) registered at Police Station Rajendra Park, Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Yajdev Yadav and reads as under:-

To The Commissioner of Police Police Headquater Sohna Road Gurugram Haryana Sub- Complaint For The Offence Of Fraud, Forgery, Wrongful Loss/Damage To Property, Criminal Breach Of Trust, Criminal Trespass & Criminal Conspiracy Etc



::2::

Against 1. Bhupesh Kumar Gupta 9811596146 2. Satish Kumar Gupta 9873259560 3. Trilok Chand Gupta 9350975091 All R/O RZ 11 Mangal Bazar Chowk, Indra Park Palam Road new delhi-110045 4. Rishi Prakash Swami S/O Sh. Garib Ram Swami R/O SRS 126 Nasirpur Dwarka New Delhi-110045 (Mobile No. 7982821553) 5. Priyanka Lohia W/o Pramod Kumar R/O H. NO 343 Dundanera, Sector 20 Gurugram 6. Deepa Kataria W/o Surjeet Kataria H No. 23, Tekchand Nagar Gali No. 1 Surat Nagar Gurugram (Mob 9718515920) 7. Manisha W/O Neeraj Kumar Janghu, H. No. 10. Bichli Gali, Daultabad Gurugram (Mob 9911129355) 8. Kusum W/O Rampal Janghu, House no. G-69. near Mata Mandir, Rajendra Park Gurugram (Mob9810570460)9. Ombir Singh S/O Raj Singh R/o H. No. 281. Adhkar Gali, near Chatri Wala Kuan. Daultabad, Gurugram 122006 10. Avish Homes (Mob 9911129355, 9810570460, 9990165050) 11. Neeraj Kumar janghu, H. No. 10, Bichli Gall, Daultabad, Gurugram (Mob 9911129355) 12 Rampal Janghu, House no. G 69, near Mata Mandir, Rajendra Park. Gurugram (Mob 9810570460). Dear Sir The present complaint is being filed by Yajdev Yadav father of Shilpa yadav, R/0145/2 New Palam Vihar, Gurgaon, Haryana 122017. (hereinafter referred to as the "Complainant"), who is duly authorized vide Authority letter dated 03.01.2025 to file the present complaint and Initiate other legal actions on her behalf against the above accused persons involved in the crime and you are further requested to take an immediate action against them. A copy of the Authority Letter is annexed herewith as Annexure-1 Brief facts leading to filing of the present complaint- 1. That the Complainant is the owner of the land ie. Plot/House No. 69-70, admeasuring 400 sq yard along with already constructed area of 625 sq feet situated at Tec chandnagar, Mauza Rajendra Park, Tehsil & District Gurugram, vide sale deed bearing Vasika No. 9591 dated



::3::

20.11.2017. There were small boundary walls (DPC) on the said plot. The complainant purchased the said property for total sale consideration of Rs. 63,97,500/- from Rishi Prakash Swami le. Accused No. 4 who acted as owner for 200 sq yards in terms of Sale Deed bearing Vasika No. 28316 dated 06.03.2013 and power of attorney holder in terms of POA bearing Vasika No. 788 dated 13.11.2017 for remaining 200 sq yards. The mutation was also approved in the name of complainant bearing Mutation No 59656. That the said land/property was initially owned by Sh. Omprakash S/o Sh. Sahajram R/o of village Bhimgarh Kheri, Gurugram, which was later sold to Sh. Bhupesh Kumar Gupta (Accused no. 1), Sh. Trilok Chand Gupta (Accused no.3) & Sh. Satish Kumar Gupta (Accused no.2) S/o Sh. Lakshmi Narayan Gupta R/o RZ11, Mangal Bazar Chowk, inder Park, Palam Road, New Delhi 110045 vide Sale Deed having vasika no.5067 dated 18.09.2003. The mutation was also approved bearing Mutation No. 58890. That out of the aforesaid land, 200 sq. yard of land was sold by the Accused No. 1, 2 &3 in the year 2013 to Sh. Rishi Praksh Swami (Accused no.4) S/o late Sh. Garib Ram Swami vide sale deed bearing Vasika No. 12656 dated 01.03.2023. Later on, the Accused No. 1 to 3 further appointed Accused No. 4 as their power of attorney holder for remaining 200 sq. yard out of total 400 sq. yards plot through power of attorney holder in terms of POA bearing Vasika No. 788 dated 13.11.2017 registered in the office of Noida. The mutation was also approved bearing Mutation No. 57604 and 58891 4. That the complainant recently went to inspect the aforesaid land and came to know that Accused No. 7 to 10 has illegally trespassed and illegally possessed our plot and further damaged/demolished certain construction already existing as well as the existing boundary and further carried out their own construction on the aforesaid land. The accused No. 7 to 9 have installed their board in the



::4::

name of accused no. 10 and constructed their office as well in the premises and they have placed their own people in the premises for illegal occupation. 5. That the complainant confronted the accused to vacate the property but the accused persons threatened the complainant with dire consequences and claimed ownership of the plot. When the complainant informed the accused that he has all the original chain of title documents and he is the rightful owner but the accused failed to provide the ownership proof and previous title documents as they don't have any such document. They have created forged document to unlawfully usurp the property in illegal manner During the meeting Accused No. 9, 11 and 12 informed the complainant that after digging the plot/boundary wall, they waited for 2/3 months for objection from someone, but when no one came, they constructed the plot as per their liking which clearly established the fact that they were aware that they were not owners and waiting for someone objection to their illegal possession and when no one including complainant came to object for their legal design, they occupied the plot and illegally damaged already constructed portion and further constructed the plot and illegally occupied the same. 6. That the complainant on Inspecting from sale deed provided by accused persons came to know that Accused no. 1 to 3 through GPA holder Smt. Priyanka Lohia (Accused no.5) wife of Mr. Pramod Kumar R/o H.No.343, Dundahera, Sector 20, Gurugram, Haryana (vide GPA vasika No. 9251 dated 15.01.2013 registered in the office of sub registrar-Sadar-II, Gaziabad, UP) has created third party rights by selling the aforesaid to Smt. Deepa Kataria Accused no.6) wife of Sh. Surjeet Kataria R/o H.No.23, Tek Raji Chand Nagar, Gall no.1, Surat Nagar Gurugram, Haryana-122001 vide sale deed bearing Vasika No. 14506 dated 04.03.2024. However the accused no. 4 is claiming no such GPA was executed by them in favour of Priyanka



::5::

Lohia. 7. Further out of the aforesaid lana, 80 sq. yard was sold by the accused no.6 to Smt. Manisha (Accused no.7) wife of Sh. Neeraj Kumar R/o H. No. 10, Bichli Gali, Daultabad, Gurugram and Smt. Kusum(Accused no.8) wife of Sh. Rampal R/o H.No.G-69, near Mata Mandir, Rajendra Park, Gurugram, Haryana vide sale deed having Vasika No. 1000 dated 26.04.2024. Also another land admeasuring 84.5 sq. yard was also sold to Sh. Ombirsingh Accused no.9), S/o Sh. Raj Singh R/o H. No. 281, Adhkar Gali, near Chatri Wala Kuan, Daultabad, Gurugram 122006 vide sale deed having Vasika NO.1977 dated 20.05.2024. However the accused have failed to produce the previous title chain of said property including GPA and further threatened the complainant father and his brother to not to come near by failing which he will be beaten to death along with family. The accused 5 to 9 claimed to have backing of criminals and asked the complainant and his family to keep silent. 8. That the complainant has been cheated in the present case. The complainant purchased the property after paying huge consideration but the accused persons acted in conspiracy and planning on basis of false, forged and fabricated sale deeds and POA claimed ownership on the said plot and illegal possession and further selling the same. The accused persons acted in conspiracy and created these false and forged documents to usurp the property of the complainant and to cause unlawful loss to the complainant and with intent to cheat the complainant. They crated this it is clear that all the accused are involved in the offences of fraud, forgery, criminal breach of trust, criminal trespass & criminal conspiracy. That the actions of the accused persons have caused wrongful loss to the complainant and wrongful gain to the accused persons. That the complainant paid the sale consideration on the representation of Accused No. 4 that he was absolute owner and in possession of suit property and handed over the sale



::6::

consideration on the representation that the property is free from any dispute and encumbrance and title dispute. 9. There is commission of offences of forgery, cheating, breach of trust, fraud and criminal conspiracy, trespass etc. done by the Accused persons and we, therefore we request the authorities to investigate the present matter by registering the FIR in the matter and to remove illegal encroachment and trespass of the accused and to handover the possession of property legally owned by the complainant. In light of the above, it is, therefore, requested to initiate the necessary investigation and further to arrest the Accused persons at the earliest after registration of FIR against them. SD. Yours sincerely Mr Yajdev Yadav father of Shilpa Yadav Mobile No.: Mob: 9958322044.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. In fact, the petitioner has purchased the property from one Priyanka Lohia who claimed to be the Power of Attorney holder of the owner of the land in question. Though, the sale deed was executed for an amount of Rs. 1 Crore 08 lacs, the actual amount paid was less as there was discrepancy regarding the size of the property. Being a *bona fide* purchaser for consideration, the petitioner has sold the property vide 03 registered sale deeds in favour of Kusum & Manisha, Ombir Singh and Surender Kumar Jhangu. No civil proceedings/criminal cases have been initiated by any of these purchasers against the petitioner. Priyanka Lohia has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 17.06.2025 (Annexure P-2). As the petitioner is in custody since 18.06.2025 but none of the 21 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case



is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, she is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, while referring to the status report dated 23.06.2026 which is on record, contends that during the investigation, it has been found that GPA No.9251 dated 15.01.2013 through which co-accused/Priyanka Lohia claimed to be the owner of the plot in question is a forgery as no such GPA was found to be registered in the office of the Sub Registrar, Ghaziabad. Though, based on the said GPA a sale deed has been executed in favour of the petitioner, the bank accounts of the petitioner would show that no payment of Rs.01 Crore 08 lacs has been made to Priyanka Lohia which goes on to show that the said two accused are in connivance with each other and the sale deed is nothing but a sham transaction. The petitioner is an accused in 05 other cases, some of which are of a similar nature. There is every possibility that she would abscond from justice and tamper with evidence in case she is granted the concession of bail. It is, therefore, prayed that the present petition seeking the grant of regular bail be dismissed.

5. The learned counsel for the complainant while referring to the reply dated 22.06.2026 which is on record, contends that the petitioner is a land grabber and is involved in other cases of a similar nature where an identical *modus operandi* has been adopted to usurp property. In addition to the present FIR, she is also an accused in FIR No.296/2025 regarding plot No.71, FIR No.528/2024 and FIR No.217 date unknown. The petitioner's claim of being an innocent *bona fide* purchaser stands shattered by the testimony of co-accused/Priyanka Lohia recorded before the Civil Court on



::8::

13.11.2025 in a case titled as 'Shilpa versus Priyanka Lohia (CS/719/2025) where she (Priyanka Lohia) has testified that she is completely illiterate and was working as a cleaner in the petitioner's beauty parlor/SPA. In fact, the petitioner had deceitfully taken her signatures on blank papers under the false pretext of Government welfare schemes. Priyanka Lohia admitted that she had never owned the property, never met any buyer and never received a single rupee of consideration. In fact, there is no transaction of Rs.01 Crore 08 Lacs from the account of the petitioner into the account of Priyanka Lohia. The petitioner has also burnt the original forged GPA document, destroyed her mobile phones and SIM cards to obstruct the investigation. There is every likelihood that the petitioner would abscond from justice in case she is granted the concession of bail as she is a serial offender.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

7. The role of the petitioner as enumerated in the status report dated 23.06.2026 filed by the State by way of an affidavit of Kapil Ahlawat, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, West, Gurugram, is as under:-

13. That role of the petitioner Deepa Kataria in the present case is that she along with co-accused Priyanka Lohia fraudulently prepared the fake GPA No. 9251 dated 15.01.2013 on the basis of which the petitioner also fraudulently got executed the fake sale deed vasika no. 14506 dated 04.03.2024 by virtue of which the petitioner showed herself as owner of the plot in question. On the basis of the said sale deed, the petitioner sold the small portions of the land in question to Ombir, Krishan Kumar, Surender Kumar, Manisha, Kusum, Akash @ Monu, Aman Bhardwaj, Rishi Prakash Swami and Deepak Malik through various sale deeds. The petitioner has got recovered one gold chain weighing 33 grams purchased by her from the fraud



amount. Further, the petitioner has been found to have kept more gild (purchased by her from the fraud amount) mortgaged with Muthoot Finance. The petitioner is the main perpetrator of the present fraud as after obtaining fake GPA in her favour from accused Priyanka Lohia, the petitioner had sold the plot in question in three parts after getting the registry done in the Gurugram Court.

8. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a *bona fide* purchaser of the property in question for consideration from Priyanka Lohia is belied from the fact that the amount of Rs.01 Crore 08 Lacs has not been paid by the petitioner to Priyanka Lohia for the purchase of the land. Apparently, it is a sham transaction so as to usurp the land in question. On the contrary, Priyanka Lohia claims herself to be a Sweeper in the petitioner’s beauty parlor and has stated on Oath that the petitioner had taken her signatures on blank papers on the false pretext of Government welfare schemes and that she never owned the property, never met the owner of the property or any buyer and has never received any consideration for the sale of the land.

9. The petitioner is a habitual offender with multiple other cases registered against her including some of a similar nature. The details of the same are as under:-

Sr. No.	FIR Nos. and date	Under Sections	Police Station	Status
1.	313/2009 dated 28.12.2009	25/54/59 of the Arms Act	P.S. City Narnaul, Mahendra Garh	Under Trial
2.	237/2008 dated 20/07/2008	223, 224, 120B IPC	P.S. City Narnaul, Mahendra Garh	Under Trial



3.	642/2016 dated 16/07/2016	392, 302, 120-B, 34 IPC and 25/54/59 Arms Act	P.S. City Gurgaon, Gurugram	Under Trial
4.	528/2024 dated N/A	318(4), 336(3) and 325(4) BNS	P.S. Palam Vihar, Gurugram	Discharged
5.	296/2025 dated 08.08.2025	420, 467, 471, 419 and 120-B IPC	P.S. Rajendra Park, Gurugram	Under Trial

10. Keeping in view the allegations levelled against the petitioner and her criminal antecedents, I do not deem it appropriate to grant her the concession of bail and therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

11. However, the Trial Court is requested to conclude the Trial as expeditiously as possible but in any case, not later than 06 months from the next date of hearing fixed before it.

12. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

July 02, 2026
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No