

\$~28

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

+ W.P.(C) 11086/2017

SH. AMIT KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Vijay Kinger and Ms Roopa
Nagpal, Advocates.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) AND
ORS.

..... Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

13.12.2017

CM No. 45332/2017

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 11086/2017

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

“a. to Respondent No. 1 authority to call the records to verify the said sale deed of the said property dated 19.06.2017 registered vide registration no. 2817, in book no. 1 Volume No. 2421, on page no. 172 to 180 and another sale deed registered on 17.06.2017 vide registration no. 2787 in book no. 1, Volume No. 2420 on page no. 117 to 125 before the Office of Sub-Registrar IV-A, Shahdara, Delhi in collusion with the respondents No. 2 to 5 is registered on the basis of forged details i.e. change of Khasra number and area and also initiate the appropriate action against the respondents No. 2 to 5 and

the officer concerned of the sub-registrar office , in the interest of justice.”

4. The petitioner is essentially aggrieved by the registration of the sale deeds dated 19.06.2017 and 17.06.2017. It is the petitioner’s case that the said deeds have been registered on the basis of forged documents. The petitioner submits that by virtue of the said deeds, the parties have sought to transact in property located in Khasra No. 147. The petitioner states that the total area of land in the said Khasra is 36 sq. yards whereas the aggregate lands mentioned in the two sale deeds is 180 sq. yards (110 + 70). The said deeds also mention the property numbers being conveyed by way of the said sale deeds to be property no. 1/4649-A (old property no. 1/A-4649) and the petitioner claims that the same is also incorrect.

5. The petitioner further states that an incorrect Khasra number has been mentioned in the sale deeds in question and the parties to the said deeds would rectify the said deeds to include the property, which belongs to the petitioner. The petitioner submits that registration of such deeds with incorrect description is the modus adopted to reflect the transaction, which is otherwise *ex facie* illegal.

6. It is seen that the petitioner had made a representation to the concerned Sub-Registrar, however, the same was rejected on the ground that Sub-Registrar is not required to examine the title of the land included in the sale deeds.

7. This Court finds no infirmity with the aforesaid view. Plainly, the Sub-Registrar is not required to examine the disputes in relation to the title

of the land. This Court is also informed that the petitioner has also filed a suit challenging the aforesaid sale deeds. In this view, no orders are required to be passed in this petition. Needless to mention that it will be open for the petitioner to agitate his grievance in the proceedings instituted by him.

8. The petition is disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

DECEMBER 13, 2017
RK