



2026:DHC:1640



\$~6

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

%

*Date of Decision: 24.02.2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1036/2025**

SANGEETA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravindra Kanth, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State  
with SI Krishan, PS Palam Village  
Mr. Yogesh Sharma and Ms. Pratima  
Ravi, Advocates with complainant

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 282/2024 of PS Palam Village for offence under Section 420/468/471/448/380/454/457/34 IPC.

2. This anticipatory bail application got listed before the predecessor bench for the first time on 12.03.2025. Thereafter, the application remained pending before different benches and has been assigned to this bench as a part of 179 old pending bail applications. Today being the first date before me, I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP



2026:DHC:1640



assisted by IO/SI Krishan. I have also heard learned counsel for complainant *de facto*.

3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant is that in connivance with her husband, she forged the title documents of the property owned by the complainant *de facto*. The subject property was originally owned by one Mahavir Singh, who sold the same to Rameshwari. According to the complainant *de facto*, Rameshwari sold the subject property to him. The said sale documents were sent for forensic analysis and the FSL found signatures of Rameshwari on those documents to be genuine. In other words, title of the complainant *de facto* over the subject property is genuine, according to prosecution. Further, the allegation of the prosecution is that the accused/applicant and her husband Indal Kumar forged signatures of Rameshwari, showing transfer of the subject property to Vipin Kumar, who sold it to Baljeet Singh, who in turn sold it to Indal Kumar and Indal Kumar gifted the subject property to the present accused/applicant, who is his wife. The accused/applicant has not been providing the IO, original chain of title deeds or even the sale documents from Rameshwari to Vipin Kumar.

4. Against the above backdrop, learned counsel for accused/applicant contends that she is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is also contended that the original title deeds are not in possession of the accused/applicant. However, in response to a specific query, learned counsel for accused/applicant expresses inability to explain as to why Indal Kumar



2026:DHC:1640



had to transfer the subject property to the accused/applicant by way of gift, though there is no bar to do so.

5. On the other hand, learned prosecutor assisted by learned counsel for complainant *de facto* and the IO strongly opposes the anticipatory bail application on the ground that grant of anticipatory bail in such cases is not appropriate. More so, because the accused/applicant is not providing the original documents of transfer from Rameshwari to Vipin Kumar, which bear forged signatures of Rameshwari. It is further stated that the dates of the alleged transfers clearly establish the dishonest intention; that the subject property from Rameshwari to Vipin Kumar was transferred by way of forged documents dated 06.07.2023 and from Vipin Kumar to Baljeet Singh by way of documents dated 28.08.2003 and from Baljeet Singh to Indal Kumar by way of documents dated 24.11.2003.

6. On the face of it, the dispute would appear to be only a civil dispute of title over the subject property. But there appears to be much more, especially going by the above mentioned dates of unusual transfer of the property. Most significantly, Baljeet Singh has died and Vipin Kumar is not even traceable, in the sense that according to investigation, Vipin Kumar is a fictitious character. Indal Kumar, husband of the accused/applicant, has been declared proclaimed offender.

7. Not only this, it appears that the accused/applicant and her husband



2026:DHC:1640



are deliberately withholding and concealing the documents of the alleged transfer from Rameshwari to Vipin Kumar to Baljeet Singh.

8. Further, it is pointed out by learned prosecutor that the subject property was allegedly transferred by Baljeet Singh to Indal Kumar way back in the year 2003, which transfer was on forged documents according to prosecution, so the complaint was lodged on 20.03.2023 and the gift was executed by Indal Kumar in favour of the accused/applicant on 17.04.2023. This transfer also, according to prosecution, raises suspicion.

9. In order to ascertain the complete picture, request of the IO for custodial interrogation of the accused/applicant does not appear to be unreasonable.

10. Investigation is pending at a crucial stage and in the above backdrop, I do not find it a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the accused/applicant.

11. Therefore, this anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**FEBRUARY 24, 2026**  
**'rs'**