

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF JULY 2015/25TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 16120 of 2015 (L)

PETITIONER :

**GOVINDANKUTTY
AGED 47 YEARS, S/O.KARUNAKARAN NAIR,
KURUVATH HOUSE, PADDY P.O.,
THRISSUR DISTRICT.**

**BY SENIOR ADVOCATE SRI.RENJITH THAMPAN
BY ADV. SMT.P.RREENA**

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF REGISTRATION
O/O.INSPECTOR GENERAL OF REGISTRATION
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001**
- 2. DISTRICT REGISTRAR
O/O.DISTRICT REGISTRAR, THRISSUR,
PIN – 680 003.**
- 3. SUB REGISTRAR
KODALY SUB REGISTRY, PADDY P.O.,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN – 680 699.**

R1 TO R3 BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI. S. JAMAL

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 16-07-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

WP(C).No. 16120 of 2015 (L)

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

- EXT. P1: TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT
DATED 13.09.2012.**
- EXT. P2: TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION REPORTED IN 2002(1) KLT PAGE 330.**
- EXT. P3: TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT REPORTED IN 2010(1)KHC 581.**
- EXT. P4: TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED DATED 21.05.2015 TO BE EXECUTED
BY ONE VASU IN FAVOUR OF PRASANNAN.**
- EXT. P5: TRUE COPY OF THE MEMO DATED 22.05.2015 ISSUED BY THE 3RD
RESPONDENT.**
- EXT. P6: TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN WPC.NO.10468/2012 DATED
14.08.2014.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

Mn

K. Vinod Chandran, J

W.P.(C).No.16120 of 2015-L

Dated this the 16th day of July, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner, a document writer, challenges Exhibit P5 objection, which was taken by the official respondents when Exhibit P4 document was presented. The contention of the petitioner is that, Exhibit P5 objection is not maintainable especially in view of Exhibit P1 Circular issued under the Registration Act, 1908 and the Rules framed thereunder.

2. The learned Government Pleader, on instruction, submits that Exhibit P4 document has been registered.

3. In the above circumstance, there is no reason why this Court should pass a blanket order that no such objection shall be raised in future. The issue now projected before this Court, on the basis that the petitioner is a document writer, is merely academic. Since the document which was refused to be registered, the cause of action for the above writ petition, has been registered, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

Sd/-

K.Vinod Chandran
Judge.

vkul/-

[true copy]