



2026:DHC:2048



\$~

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

%

Judgment reserved on: 27.02.2026
Judgment pronounced on: 11.03.2026
Judgment uploaded on: 13.03.2026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 841/2026 & CRL M.A. 6405/2026**

MANOJ YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Kumar Arora, Ms.
Prathana and Ms. Tulika,
Advocates

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

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

CORAM:**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA****JUDGMENT****DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J.**

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 125/2023, registered at Police Station Jaffarpur Kalan, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 448/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC').

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the complaint



2026:DHC:2048



of Smt. Sangeeta Devi, who alleged that during her absence from Delhi on 22.02.2023, the applicant Manoj Yadav @ Mannu, along with his wife Lata Yadav, 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 of the said plots 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 the IPC.

3. As per the status report, during investigation the complainant had 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's wife, Lata Yadav, also produced documents claiming ownership of the same plots. However, the location and boundaries mentioned in those documents did not match the actual site. Discrepancies were further noticed between the photocopies earlier submitted 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, Rajender Kumar Sharma, whose signatures appeared as an attesting witness in the documents relied upon by the accused, joined the investigation and denied having witnessed any



2026:DHC:2048



transaction in favour of Satyapal Singh. He stated that the signatures appearing on the documents were forged. His statement under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. was recorded. The original documents produced by co-accused 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, though no conclusive opinion could be given regarding the signatures of Satyapal Singh for want of sufficient specimen signatures. Further, 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 said water connection were found to be the same as those produced by the complainant during investigation. Some neighbours of the disputed property also informed the I.O. that the plots were in possession of the complainant and her husband, and they denied having seen the applicant or his wife in possession prior to the dispute. Records from BSES showed that co-accused 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 accused. Investigation further revealed discrepancies relating to the notarial seals and stamp papers used in the chain of documents relied upon by the accused, and the stamp papers were found to have



2026:DHC:2048



been issued after the purported date of execution, indicating backdated and fabricated documents. It is stated that Satyapal Singh, from whom the accused claimed to have derived title, was arrested during investigation. He disclosed that he, in connivance with the applicant Manoj Yadav and his wife Lata Yadav, had created a false chain of documents to project Lata Yadav as a *bona fide* purchaser. He further disclosed that he had received ₹5.5 lakh from the account of co-accused Lata Yadav, which amount was subsequently transferred to the account of the applicant Manoj Yadav. It is stated that the applicant has not yet joined the investigation.

4. 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 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's wife Lata Yadav 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 and his wife have no concern with the land in question. It is thus prayed that the



2026:DHC:2048



present applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State argues that the allegations against the applicant are serious 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's wife Lata Yadav, to him, was subsequently transferred by him, to the account of the present applicant Manoj Kumar, which indicates 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 and his wife *qua* the property in question have been found to be forged. It is contended that two separate sets of documents were produced by the applicant's wife during investigation, wherein the photocopies bore only one signature of Satyapal Singh, while the original documents contained four signatures, clearly suggesting post-execution tampering. It is also submitted that several cases of land grabbing are pending against the applicant and he was the actual mastermind in the commission of the offence and the actual beneficiary in the present case. It is further argued that the applicant has not cooperated with the investigation despite repeated notices, and that in view of these facts and circumstances, the present bail application be dismissed.

6. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the



2026:DHC:2048



applicant as well as the State, and has perused the material available on record.

7. 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.

8. The investigation in the case reveals that the original owner of the property was one Ram Babu, whose signatures appearing on the alleged chain of documents have been found to be forged as per the FSL report. The attesting witness, Rajender Kumar Sharma, has also denied his signatures and his role in any such transaction. These forged documents were relied upon by the applicant and his wife to assert ownership over the disputed property, thereby *prima facie* establishing use of false and fabricated documents.

9. 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.



2026:DHC:2048



10. Further, this Court's attention has also been drawn by the learned APP to the fact that the applicant is involved in several other criminal cases and, as per the investigation so far, he is the main conspirator in the present case, which further disentitles him to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

11. This Court also notes that the applicant has not cooperated with the investigation despite repeated notices and non-bailable warrants have been issued against him. In view of the serious allegations, the financial trail, the FSL opinion, and the conduct of the applicant, this Court is not inclined to grant the anticipatory bail to the applicant herein.

12. Accordingly, the present application along with pending application stands dismissed.

13. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed herein above shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

14. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MARCH 11, 2026/A

T.D.