



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON: 08.07.2024

DELIVERED ON : 12.08.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021

and

Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.4370, 4371, 7024, 7025, 10886, 19378 and 19949
2021

W.P.(MD)No.5504 of 2021:

“Kremmer Sandegren Foundation”
Pattukottai, represented by its President,
A.Kamaleshwaran.

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
O/o the Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Foreshore Estate,
Chennai-600 028.

2.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Second Floor,



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

Government multipurpose office complex,
Kajamalai,
Tiruchirappalli – 620 020.

3.The District Registrar (Societies),
District Registrar Office,
Court Campus, Cantonment,
Tiruchirappalli – 620 001.

4.Kremmer Sandegran Foundation Pattukkottai,
No.16, St.John's Church Complex,
Rockins Road,
Trichy – 620 001,
represented by Abrahamdass.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records relating to the Appeal in Na.Ka.No.3278/2020 pending before the first and second respondent and to quash the entire proceedings as illegal and unlawful.

W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021:

“Kremmer Sandegren Foundation”
Pattukottai, represented by its President,
A.Kamaleshwaran.

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
O/o the Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Foreshore Estate,

2/28



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

2.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Second Floor,
Government multipurpose office complex,
Kajamalai,
Tiruchirappalli – 620 020.

3.The District Registrar (Societies),
District Registrar Office,
Court Campus, Cantonment,
Tiruchirappalli – 620 001.

4.Kremmer Sandegran Foundation Pattukkottai,
No.16, St.John's Church Complex,
Rockins Road,
Trichy – 620 001,
represented by Abrahamdass.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records relating to the Appeal in Na.Ka.No.1224/12/2021, dated 21.04.2021 and to quash the entire proceedings as illegal and unlawful.

For Petitioner
in both petitions : Mr.A.Raja
for Mr.S.M.A.Jinnah

For Respondents
in both petitions : Mr.D.Farzana Ghowsia
Special Government Pleader
for R.1 to R.3
: Mr.M.Purusothaman
for R.4



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY **W.P.(MD)No.13942 of 2021:**

“Kremmer Sandegren Foundation”
Pattukottai, represented by its President,
Abrahamdhass.

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar of Societies,
Trichy,
Trichy District.

2.Kremmer Sandegran Foundation Trust,
Registration No.45/2016,
represented by its President,
Kamaleswaran,
No.70-Muduppaiah Colony 4th Street,
Veerakeralam,
Coimbatore-641 007.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the first respondent in his proceedings in Na.Ka.No.4014/AA3/2019, dated 30.10.2019 and quash the same as illegal with regard to the direction to our foundation to approach the civil Court for resolving the dispute with regard to submission of Form VII.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Purusothaman

For Respondents : Mr.D.Farzana Ghowsia
Special Government Pleader
for R.1
: Mr.A.Raja
for R.2

**Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023
in W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021:**

“Kremmer Sandegren Foundation”
Pattukottai, represented by its President,
A.Kamaleshwaran.

... Petitioner

Vs.

Abrahamdass,
S/o Dharmaraj,
Kremmer Sandegran Foundation Pattukkottai,
No.16, St.John's Church Complex,
Rockins Road,
Trichy – 620 001.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to punish the contemnor for his deliberate, wilful and intended disobedience in complying the direction of this Court, dated 29.09.2023, passed in W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Raja

For Respondent : Mr.M.Kannan



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

COMMON ORDER

The Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.5504 of 2021 is directed against the notice sent by the Deputy Inspector General of Registration in Na.Ka.No.3278/௨௮/2020 relating to the appeal in Na.Ka.No. 1224/12/2021 pending on the file of the Inspector General of Registration.

2. The Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021 is directed against the order dated 21.04.2021 passed Appeal in Na.Ka.No. 1224/12/2021 by the Inspector General of Registration.

3. The Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.13942 of 2021 is directed against the order dated 30.10.2019, passed by the Deputy Registrar of Societies, Trichy refusing to record Form VII filed by the rival claimants and directing them to approach the competent civil Court.

4. The Contempt Petition has been filed invoking Section 11 of the



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

Contempt of Courts Act seeking orders to punish the respondent therein for violating the directions of this Court, dated 29.09.2023 passed in W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021.

5. It is not in dispute that the “Kremmer Sandgegren Foundation” was registered under the Societies Registration Act with Registration No. 5/1957. One A.Kamaleshwaran claiming to be the President of “Kremmer Sandgegren Foundation”, Pattukkottai has filed the Writ Petitions in W.P.(MD)Nos.5504 of 2021 and 9303 of 2021 and whereas one Abrahamdhass claiming to be the President of the same “Kremmer Sandgegren Foundation”, has filed the writ petition in W.P.(MD)No. 13942 of 2021. It is evident from the records that there existed several disputes and various litigations between two groups headed by the said Kamaleswaran and Abrahamdhass. Both parties in their affidavits filed in respective writ petitions and counter affidavits have raised pleadings as to how they have become the President of the said foundation and the way in which they were managing the same. Considering the issues now involved in the writ petitions, it is absolutely not necessary to go into the case of both parties, as to how they have been claiming right of



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

management in the foundation.

6. It is also not in dispute that the said Kamaleswaran and Abrahamdass claiming to be the President and are in management of the “Kremmer Sandgegren Foundation” have filed two Form VII declarations as contemplated under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act before the third respondent – District Registrar of Societies at Trichy. Form VII of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act 1975 is a notification of change among the members of a Society or its committee and the same has to be filled out and submitted before the Registrar under sub-sections 1 and 2 of Section 15 of the said Act. The District Registrar (Societies), after considering both Form VII declarations filed by the rival claimants and taking note of the fact that there existed some disputes between them, has passed an order dated 30.10.2019 refusing to record Form VII declarations filed by both parties and directed them to approach the competent civil Court to get their disputes resolved. Challenging the said order passed by the District Registrar (Societies), the said Abrahamdass has filed an appeal petition before the Inspector General of Registration – first respondent in W.P.



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

(MD)Nos.5504 of 2021 and 9303 of 2021.

WEB COPY

7. The first respondent, after taking the said appeal petition on file, directed the second respondent – Deputy Inspector General of Registration to conduct an enquiry. In pursuance of the directions of the first respondent, the second respondent has issued a notice dated 03.03.2021 to the other claimant Kamaleswaran directing him to offer his remarks. The said Kamaleswaran by alleging that the first respondent is not having any appellate jurisdiction over the orders passed by the District Registrar (Societies) under Section 36 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act, has filed the present Writ Petition in W.P. (MD)No.5504 of 2021 challenging the said notice.

8. A learned Judge of this Court, after hearing both parties in the writ petition in W.P.(MD)No.5504 of 2021, has passed an order dated 12.03.2021, dismissing the writ petition by mainly holding that the show cause notice cannot be challenged through writ proceedings. Aggrieved by the order of dismissal, the said Kamaleswaran has preferred an appeal before this Court in W.A.(MD)No.952 of 2021 and the same was



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

pending before the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court. Meanwhile, the first respondent, after receiving enquiry report from the second respondent, has passed an order in the appeal proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 1221/12/2021, dated 21.04.2021 setting aside the order passed by the District Registrar (Societies) and remitted the matter back to the District Registrar (Societies) directing him to take Form VII on file as per the findings of the second respondent and the powers conferred on the respondent under Rule 50 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Rules 1978. Challenging the order passed by the first respondent, dated 21.04.2021, the said Kamaleswaran has filed the second Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021.

9. In the Writ Appeal in W.A.(MD)No.952 of 2021, the Hon'ble Division Bench, after hearing both parties, has passed a judgment dated 22.06.2021 setting aside the order passed by the learned Single Bench and remitted the matter back to the learned Single Bench and also directed the Registry to tag the matter in W.P.(MD)No.5504 of 2021 along with W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021 and both the writ petitions shall be heard before the learned Single Bench and a specific direction was



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

given to the first respondent – Inspector General of Registration to file counter affidavit in the writ petitions explaining as to how he exercised his power as if he is an appellate authority over the order passed by the District Registrar (Societies). Though the Division Bench has specifically directed the first respondent to file a counter affidavit explaining as to how he exercised his power as if he is the appellate authority over the orders passed by the District Registrar (Societies), the first respondent has filed a lengthy counter affidavit mainly focussing on the merits of the matter and in two or three paragraphs, he has touched the jurisdiction aspect and had taken the shelter under Section 52(1) of the said Act and according to him, the said Section confers general power of superintendence over all the Registrars functioning under the Act and therefore, he is entitled to set right any illegality committed by the District Registrar, by general power of superintendence. Except the above averments with regard to his jurisdiction, he has pleaded only with regard to the merits of the matter.

10. In the meanwhile, the District Registrar (Societies), in



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

pursuance of the directions of the first respondent in his order dated 21.04.2021, has passed an order dated 28.04.2021 recording Form VII declaration submitted by Abrahamdass. Since the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the Writ Appeal, has directed the learned Single Bench to decide about the jurisdiction of the first respondent for deciding the appeal, the said Abrahamdass as a precautionary measure, has filed the writ petition in W.P.(MD)No.13942 of 2021 challenging the earlier order dated 30.10.2019 passed by the District Registrar (Societies), Tiruchirappalli.

11. At this juncture, it is necessary to refer the order passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the Writ Appeal and the relevant passages are extracted hereunder:

“11. Thus considering all these facts, we are of the clear view that the learned Single Bench, ought to have considered as to whether the Deputy Inspector General of Registration has jurisdiction to issue the notice dated 03.03.2021. Incidentally, the Court would have to decide as to whether the Inspector General of Registration was empowered to direct the Deputy Inspector General of Registration to conduct an enquiry. This is so because, unless and until, the Inspector General of



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

Registration can act as an Appellate Authority over the decision of the District Registrar (Societies), he would be incompetent to issue any direction to the Deputy Inspector General of Registration. The answer to all these questions will have a direct impact on the order passed by the first respondent dated 21.04.2021, which is impugned in WP(MD)No.9303 of 2021. Consequently, it will also impact the order passed by the third respondent dated 28.04.2021, which is a consequential order pursuant to the order of the first respondent dated 21.04.2021.

12. Thus, we are of the clear view that the Writ Petition should be heard on merits and the parties should be permitted to file their counter affidavit, especially, the respondents 1 and 2, explaining their jurisdiction and as to how the first respondent can exercise his power as an Appellate Authority.”

12. The learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner in W.P.(MD)No. 5504 of 2021 would mainly contend that there is no appeal provision challenging the orders passed by the District Registrar (Societies) in the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act and that therefore, the appeal petition filed by Abrahamdass ought to have been



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

rejected by the first respondent, but the very entertaining of the appeal and passing orders therein are absolutely without jurisdiction and as such, the order of the first respondent, dated 21.04.2021 can only be considered as nullity.

13. The learned Counsel for the petitioner in W.P.(MD)No.13942 of 2021 would submit that the first respondent has taken the petition on file invoking his powers under Section 52 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act and as such, the entertaining of the petition and passing of orders therein cannot be found fault with.

14. Section 52 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act speaks about the powers of the Inspector General of Registration and as per Section 52(1), the Inspector General of Registration shall have superintendence over all other Registrars functioning under this Act. But the Counsel has not cited any other provisions providing appeal remedy challenging the orders passed by the District Registrar (Societies) under Section 36 of the said Act. More importantly, as rightly observed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the Writ Appeal, the first



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

respondent in his order dated 21.04.2021 itself has specifically observed that there is no appeal provision and the relevant portion is extracted hereunder:

“தமிழ்நாடு சர்க்கள் பதிவுச் சட்டம் 1975ன் கீழ் படிவம் VII ஁கார்வை தோடர்பாக மாவட்டப்பதிவாளரால் பிறப்பிக்கப்படும் ஆணையினை எதிர்த்து ஁மல்முறையீடு அளிக்க வழிவகையில்லை. எனினும் தமிழ்நாடு சர்க்கள் பதிவுச் சட்டம்இ 1975ன் பிரிவு 36(1)ன் கீழ் சர்கத்தின் அனுவல்களை பற்றி சர்கப்பதிவாளரான பதிவுத்துறை தலைவராலா அல்லது பதிவுத்துறை தலைவரின் உத்தரவின்படி அதிகாரமளிக்கப்பட்ட எவரொருவரையும் விசாரணை நடத்துமாறு உத்தரவிட வழிவகையுள்ளது. ஁மலும்இ பிரிவு 52ன் கீழ் சேசட்டத்தின் கீழ் செயல்பட்டு வரும் எல்லா பதிவாளர்களின் செயல்பாடுகளையும் ஁மற்பார்வையிட பதிவுத்துறை தலைவருக்கு அளிக்கப்பட்டுள்ள செயலுரிமைகளின் அடிப்படையில்இ மேமனுவில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ள மாவட்டப்பதிவாளரின் குறிப்பாணை பரிசீலிக்கப்பட்டது. “

15. Considering the above, the first respondent has taken a specific stand that though there is no appeal provisions, he can very well invoke Section 52 of the said Act for deciding about the validity of the orders



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

passed by the District Registrar (Societies) with regard to Form VII declarations.

16. The learned Counsel for the writ petitioner in W.P.(MD)No. 13942 of 2021 would rely on the decision of this Court in the case of ***M/s Nadar Maharaja Sangam, represented by its General Secretary Vs. the Deputy Inspector General of Registration, Madurai and others*** in W.P.(MD)No.11042 of 2022, dated 06.07.2022, wherein a learned Judge of this Court, comparing Section 52(1) of the said Act with Article 227 of the Constitution of India has observed that the expression “superintendence” is employed in both the provisions, that every High Court shall have superintendence over all courts and tribunals throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction and that under Section 52 of the said Act, the Inspector General of Registration can test the correctness of the orders passed by the Registrar functioning under the said Act. The learned Judge has further observed that the said power given to the Inspector General of Registration cannot be exercised by any Subordinate Authority and the order passed by the Deputy Inspector General of Registration in pursuance of the directions of the Inspector



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

General of Registration is without jurisdiction and the same is liable to be quashed.

17. It is pertinent to note that Article 227 of the Constitution of India provides for the power of superintendence over all Courts and Tribunals throughout the territories by the High Courts and the nature of superintendence is administrative as well as judicial. The power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is to be exercised to keep the Subordinate Courts within the bounds of their authority. It is settled law that the High Court's power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is to be used very sparingly and only when inferior Courts act in excess of jurisdiction or fail to exercise jurisdiction vested in them.

18. No doubt, as rightly observed by the learned Judge, the word “superintendence” finds place in both the provisions. But with great respect to the learned Judge, that by itself is not sufficient to equate both the provisions. Even assuming for argumens sake that Section 51 of the said Act confers powers on the Inspector General of Registration to test the correctness of the orders passed by the Registrars functioning under



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

the said Act, whether the Inspector General of Registration can exercise such a power in all the cases which are brought to his notice? Similar to that of Article 227 of the Constitution of India, he has to exercise that powers sparingly and only when Registrars act in excess of jurisdiction or fail to exercise jurisdiction vested in them.

19. Moreover, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M/s Puri Investments Vs. M/s Young Friends and Co.*, in Civil Appeal No.1609 of 2022, dated 23.02.2022, reported in **2022 Live Law (SC) 279**, has specifically held that the High Courts, while exercise its power of supervisory Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, cannot act as an appellate body to re-appreciate the evidence and that the High Courts can interfere with the decisions of a fact finding forum only its findings are perverse or based on impermissible inferences in law.

20. In the case on hand, as already pointed out, the District Registrar (Societies), after taking note of the rival claimants filing Form VII declarations, has directed them to approach the competent civil Court and get their disputes resolved. At this juncture, it is necessary to refer



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

the judgment of the Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in the case of ***C.M.S.Evangelical Suvi David Memorial Vs. The District Registrar and Others*** reported in ***(2005)2 MLJ 335***, wherein the Hon'ble Full Bench while answering the reference with regard to the powers of the Registrar under Section 36 of the said Act, has observed as follows:

“17. A conspicuous reading of the above mentioned provisions show that the Act is intended to regulate the affairs of the society in accordance with the provisions contained therein and the rules made thereunder and that the registration is made compulsory on certain contingency and for its enforcement the provisions confer only the administrative power of the Registrar to ensure that the registered society to function strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Act or the Rules made thereunder, more particularly for maintenance of accounts for audit purpose; framing of bye-laws in conformity with the object of the society for which it is formed and registered; in respect of application of funds of the registered society, conduct of annual General Meetings and extraordinary general meeting and amalgamation and division of registered societies. The Registrar has power to direct the registered society to furnish in writing such information or explanation in respect of any



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

document which the registered society is required to file with him.

18. The power of the Registrar to enquire into the affairs of the society is only to hold a summary inquiry for his own satisfaction. The said power cannot be construed as the power of appeal. Under [Section 36](#), the Registrar has not been empowered to adjudicate upon the conflicting claims to represent the society based upon question of fact. A plain reading of [section 36](#) shows that the Registrar could look only the provisions of the Act and the Rules and prima facie materials to arrive at a conclusion either to believe or not to believe Form No. VII in order to effect change in the register. The power of the Registrar to call for information and explanation under [Section 34](#) does not contemplate any power to examine witnesses or to allow opportunity for cross examination of witnesses. The power in our view is incidental and it is only for the purpose of maintaining correct records. As the power to conduct inquiry is only limited in order to find out whether constitution of members are valid, the inquiry is limited only for the purpose of making entries in the register. However, the exercise of power must not be arbitrary as the orders passed or directions issued by the Registrar is amenable to challenge in the Writ Jurisdiction.”



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

21. The Hon'ble Full Bench while concluding, has specifically observed that even Registrar satisfies himself as to the particulars furnished in Form VII as correct, he should enter the names in the register maintained for that purpose and in the event if he does not satisfy as to the particulars and thereby does not accept Form VII, he has to issue a direction relegating the parties to approach the civil Court for appropriate orders and thereafter shall act as per the orders of the civil Court.

22. In the case on hand, as already pointed out, the District Registrar (Societies) has rightly directed the parties to approach the competent civil Court and as such, the orders passed by the District Registrar (Societies) is perfectly in order and in accordance with law. Hence, it cannot be stated that the District Registrar has exceeded his jurisdiction or failed to exercise the jurisdiction vested with him or that his order is perverse. In that scenerio, the Inspector General of Registration cannot invoke supervisory power under Section 52(1) of the Act to test the validity or the legality of the order passed by the District Registrar. Consequently, this Court concludes that the order passed by



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

the Inspector General of Registration dated 21.04.2021 cannot legally be sustained.

23. Viewing from another angle applying the decision of the learned Single Judge in the case of *M/s Nadar Maharaja Sangam, represented by its General Secretary Vs. the Deputy Inspector General of Registration, Madurai and others* above referred, that since Section 52(1) of the said Act confers powers only on the Inspector General of Registration, the second respondent Deputy Inspector General of Registration has absolutely no power or jurisdiction to test the validity of the order of the District Registrar (Societies). In the present case also, the first respondent has directed the second respondent to conduct enquiry and only on the basis of the enquiry report submitted by the second respondent, the impugned order dated 21.04.2021 came to be passed by the first respondent. It is not the case of the first respondent that he has conducted any separate enquiry or conducted any separate proceedings for testing the validity of the order passed by the District Registrar (Societies). Hence, even on that account, the order of the first respondent cannot be sustained.



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

24. As already pointed out, in pursuance of the orders passed by the first respondent, the District Registrar (Societies) has passed an order dated 21.12.2022 rejecting Form VII filed by the said Kamaleswaran accepting Form VII filed by Abrahamdass. It is pertinent to note that the third respondent has not conducted any sort of preliminary enquiry, but only on the basis of the order passed by the first respondent, which came to be passed on the basis of the report of the second respondent, has passed the said order. Moreover, since the order of the first respondent itself is legally unsustainable, the consequential order passed by the third respondent cannot also be sustained.

25. As already pointed out, Abrahamdass has challenged the earlier order passed by the third respondent dated 30.10.2019 in W.P. (MD)No.13942 of 2021. Since this Court has already decided that the said order of the third respondent is perfectly in order, this Court has no hesitation to hold that the writ petition in W.P.(MD)No.13942 of 2021 is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed. Since the first



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

respondent has passed the impugned order in the alleged appeal petition, the first writ petition in W.P.(MD)No.5504 of 2021 challenging the enquiry notice, has become infructuous.

26. Now turning to the Contempt Petition, the said Kamaleswaran by alleging that Abrahamdass, despite the directions issued by this Court in W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021, dated 29.09.2023, has entered into mortgage deed and the power of attorney deed and that therefore, he was constrained to file the above Contempt Petition. It is necessary to refer the interim order passed by this Court dated 29.09.2023, which is as follows:

“The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court has already granted Status-quo order. There is an allegation that the Status-quo is violated.

2. Therefore, this Court strictly directing the rival parties not to encumber their property, which will affect the rights of either parties.”



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

27. It is further evident from the records that when the matter was taken up on 18.01.2021, this Court by observing that after interim order passed, the contemnor has cancelled the Power of Attorney and can only be taken as a contempt and also made it clear that the petitioner should also abide the order of this Court and he cannot complicate the things. It is pertinent to note that the Hon'ble Division Bench while deciding the writ appeal, has directed that the status quo which was remaining on the file of the third respondent – District Registrar (Societies) has to be maintained and the fourth respondent – Abrahamdass shall not take any advantage merely because the District Registrar (Societies) has accepted their Form VII declaration and shall abide by the result of the writ petitions in W.P.(MD)Nos.5504 and 9303 of 2021.

28. As already pointed out, the Writ Appeal was allowed on 22.06.2021. The learned Counsel appearing for the contemnor would submit that after the status quo order passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, the petitioner has also executed some documents which includes mortgage deed dated 13.05.2023, as if he is the President and Dean of “Kremmer Sandegren Foundation” Pattukkottai. As rightly



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

contended by the learned Counsel for the contemnor, the petitioner by executing some documents, has made complaint against the contemnor for entering into some transactions. Since the petitioner is also at fault, this Court is not inclined to proceed with the contempt. But at the same time, both parties are at liberty to challenge the validity and legality of the documents alleged to have been executed by both parties. It is evident from the records that civil suits are pending between the parties. Hence, both parties are at liberty to canvass all the pleas now raised before this Court before the civil Court and get their disputes resolved and then to approach the District Registrar (Societies), subject to the result of the civil proceedings.

29. In the result, the Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.5504 of 2021 is dismissed as infructuous. The Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.9303 of 2021 is allowed and the order passed by the first respondent, dated 21.04.2021 is hereby quashed. The Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.13942 of 2021 is dismissed. The Contempt Petition in Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023 is dismissed. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs. Both parties are directed



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

WEB COPY

to approach the competent civil Court and get their disputes resolved and
then to approach the District Registrar (Societies), subject to the decision
of the civil Courts.

12.08.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

SSL

To

- 1.The Inspector General of Registration,
O/o the Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Foreshore Estate,
Chennai-600 028.
- 2.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Second Floor,
Government multipurpose office complex,
Kajamalai,
Tiruchirappalli – 620 020.
- 3.The District Registrar (Societies),
District Registrar Office,
Court Campus, Cantonment,
Tiruchirappalli – 620 001.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021 and
Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

SSL

PRE-DELIVERY ORDER MADE IN

W.P.(MD)Nos.5504, 9303 and 13942 of 2021

and

Cont.P.(MD)No.2568 of 2023

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.4370, 4371, 7024, 7025, 10886, 19378 and
19949 of 2021

12.08.2024