



\$~75

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 118/2026**

LATA YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sehgal, Ms. Sunita Choubey, Ms. Himanshi Chauhan, Mr. Vivek Kumar Aurora, Ms. Prathana & Ms. Rani Thakur, Advs.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.
Mr. Mohit Dagar & Ms. Maya Dagar,
Advocates for the complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

27.02.2026

%

10. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No.125/2023, registered at Police Station Jafarpur Kalan, Delhi for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 420/448/468/471/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter '*IPC*').

11. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the complaint of Smt. Sangeeta Devi, who alleged that during her absence from Delhi on 22.02.2023, the applicant Lata Yadav and her husband Manoj Yadav @ Mannu illegally took possession of her plots bearing Nos. 381 and 382, Khasra No. 15/2, situated at Hans Nagar Colony, Pandwala Kalan, New



Delhi. It was alleged that the accused persons claimed ownership on the basis of false and fabricated documents, demanded money to vacate the plots, and extended threats. Initially, the case was registered under Sections 448 and 506 of IPC.

12. As per status report placed on record, during investigation, the complainant produced documents showing a chain of title tracing the property from the original owner Tara Chand to Rambabu, thereafter to Narender Kumar Sharma, and finally to the complainant Sangeeta Devi. The location and boundaries mentioned in her documents were found to tally with the actual site, and the plot on the southern side was found to be Plot No. 380. It is stated that the applicant Lata Yadav also produced original documents claiming ownership of the same plots. However, the location and boundaries mentioned in her documents did not match the actual site. Further, discrepancies were noticed between the photocopies earlier submitted by her and the original documents later produced, particularly with respect to the number of signatures of one Satyapal Singh appearing on the documents. During further investigation, one Rajender Kumar Sharma, whose signatures appeared as an attesting witness in the documents relied upon by the applicant, had joined the investigation and denied having witnessed any transaction in favour of Satyapal Singh. He stated that the signatures appearing on the documents produced by the applicant were forged. His statement under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C. was recorded. The original documents produced by the applicant Lata Yadav were seized and sent to FSL. As per the FSL report, the signatures attributed to Rambabu and Rajender Kumar Sharma on those documents were opined to be forged; however, no conclusive opinion could be given regarding the signatures of



Satyapal Singh due to lack of sufficient specimen signatures. Moreover, the records obtained from Delhi Jal Board revealed that the water connection at the disputed plots stood in the name of the complainant and had been installed prior to the alleged date of illegal possession. The documents used for obtaining the water connection were found to be the same as those produced by the complainant during investigation. Furthermore, some neighbours of the disputed property informed the I.O. that the plots in question were in possession of the complainant and her husband, and they denied having seen the applicant or her husband in possession prior to the dispute. Records from BSES showed that the applicant Lata Yadav had applied for a new electricity connection on 21.02.2023, which was later cancelled. During site inspection, an existing electricity meter was found installed at the site. The documents supplied to BSES were also found to be inconsistent with the original documents later produced by the applicant. Investigation further revealed discrepancies relating to the notarial seals and stamp papers used in the chain of documents relied upon by the applicant. The stamp papers were found to have been issued after the purported date of execution, indicating backdated and fabricated documents. It is stated that Satyapal Singh, from whom the applicant claimed to have derived title, was arrested during investigation. He disclosed that he, in connivance with Manoj Yadav and the applicant Lata Yadav, had created a false chain of documents to project the applicant as a bona fide purchaser, and that he had received ₹5.5 lakh from the applicant's account as part of the said arrangement. As per status report, notices under Section 41A of Cr.P.C. were issued to the applicant on multiple occasions. Though she joined the investigation on one occasion, it is alleged that she did not cooperate and



thereafter failed to join despite further notices. Non-bailable warrants were subsequently issued against her.

13. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the present FIR arises out of a purely civil dispute concerning ownership and possession of immovable property, which has been given a criminal colour with mala fide intent. It is contended that the applicant is only the wife of the co-accused and, except for this matrimonial relationship, no independent role, overt act, or criminal intent is attributed to her in the FIR or the complaint. The learned counsel further submits that the complainant has already instituted Civil Suit No. 475 of 2025 before the learned District Judge, South-West District, Dwarka Courts, seeking possession and injunction, which itself demonstrates the civil nature of the dispute and renders the criminal proceedings an abuse of process. It is argued that the land on which the boundary wall and gate are alleged to have been raised does not belong to the complainant but falls in Khasra No. 14/9/1, which was lawfully purchased by the applicant from Satyapal Singh on 14.02.2023. The complainant's claim relates to a different land bearing Khasra No. 15/2, and therefore the applicant has no concern with the land in question. It is thus prayed that the present applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

14. The learned APP for the State argues that the allegations against the applicant are grave in nature, that the investigation is still in progress, and that custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary to unearth the conspiracy relating to the creation of forged documents. It is argued that the co-accused Satyapal Singh has already been arrested and that the alleged sale consideration paid by the applicant was subsequently transferred by Satyapal to the account of the applicant's husband, Manoj Kumar, indicating



a concerted conspiracy. The learned APP further submits that as per the FSL report, the signatures of Rajender Kumar Sharma and Ram Babu appearing on the documents relied upon by the applicant have been found to be forged, and that the applicant was the presenter and beneficiary of the said documents. It is contended that two separate sets of documents were produced by the applicant, wherein the photocopies bore only one signature of Satyapal Singh, while the original documents contained four signatures, clearly suggesting post-execution tampering. It is further argued that the complainant had installed water and electricity connections at the property prior to the alleged incident, that the applicant has not cooperated with the investigation despite repeated notices, and that in view of the criminal antecedents of her husband, the possibility of influencing the investigation cannot be ruled out. Accordingly, it is prayed that the present anticipatory bail application be dismissed.

15. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the applicant as well as the State, and has pursued the record.

16. The case of the complainant, in brief, is that she was in possession of plots bearing Nos. 381 and 382, Khasra No. 15/2, and during her absence, the applicant and her husband took over the said property and thereafter attempted to assert ownership on the basis of forged documents. It is alleged that prior to the dispute, the complainant had already installed water and electricity connections at the site and that the applicant, in connivance with her husband and co-accused, created a false chain of title to project herself as a bona fide purchaser.

17. On consideration of the material placed on record at this stage, this Court finds that the FSL report has opined that the signatures of Ram Babu



and Rajender Kumar Sharma appearing on the documents relied upon by the applicant are forged. Rajender Kumar Sharma has also denied having signed or witnessed any such transaction. Further, material discrepancies have been noticed between the photocopies of documents earlier furnished by the applicant and the original documents later produced by her, particularly with respect to the number of signatures of co-accused Satyapal Singh, which *prima facie* indicates tampering of the same

18. The investigation has also revealed that the alleged sale consideration of ₹5.5 lakh transferred by the applicant to co-accused Satyapal Singh was subsequently transferred to the account of the applicant's husband, Manoj Kumar, which also *prima facie* supports the allegation of conspiracy. This Court further notes that the applicant has also not cooperated with the investigation despite repeated notices, and custodial interrogation has been sought to unearth the manner in which the forged documents were created and used.

19. In view of the serious allegations, the material collected during investigation, the FSL opinion, and the conduct of the applicant, this Court is not inclined to grant the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

20. The application is accordingly dismissed.

21. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2026/TD