

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 23.04.2018

Coram: The Honourable Mr. Justice K. KALYANASUNDARAM

W.P.No.42767 of 2002

A.Subramani

...Petitioner

Versus

1. The Block Development Officer,
(Panchayat Union) Pudupalayam,
Tiruvannamalai District.
2. The President, Nayambadi Panchayat,
Chengam Taluk, Tiruvannamalai District.
3. The Sub-Registrar, Chengam Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai District.

...Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records on the file of the first respondent in proceeding ROC A4/4717/2002 dated 19.11.2002 and quash the same as illegal, incompetent and without jurisdiction and further direct the third respondent to receive the document of sale in favour of Tmt.Malikka and register it in accordance with law.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Raghavachari

For Respondent - 1 : Mr.A.Ansar,
Government Advocate

Respondent - 2 : No Appearance

Respondent - 3 : Mr.T.M.Pappiah,
Special Government Pleader

WEB COPY
O R D E R

1. Heard Mr.V.Raghavachari, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.A.Ansar, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the first respondent and Mr.T.M.Pappiah, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the third respondent.

2. The petitioner has come forward before this Court seeking for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to quash the order of the first respondent dated 19.11.2002 in his proceedings in R.O.C.No.A4/4717/2002 as illegal, incompetent and without jurisdiction and for directing the third respondent to receive the document of sale made in favour of one Mrs.Mallika and register the same.

3. The case of the petitioner is that he is the absolute owner of the property comprised in Survey No.20/1c and 20/5 of Nayambadi Village in Chengam Taluk. He sold the property to one Mrs.Mallika for a valuable consideration of Rs.2,97,600/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Ninety Seven Thousand and Six Hundred). However, the third respondent have not received the sale deed and insisted upon the petitioner to get No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Panchayat. Challenging the order of the first respondent in proceeding ROC A4/4717/2002 dated 19.11.2002, the petitioner has come before this Court.

5. Mr.A.Ansar, the learned Government Advocate submitted that the sale deed presented by the petitioner was registered by the third respondent.

6. In the light of the above submissions, no further adjudication is required in this matter and therefore, this Writ Petition is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS VII)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

mrr

To

1. The Block Development Officer,
(Panchayat Union) Pudupalayam,
Tiruvannamalai District.

2. The Sub-Registrar, Chengam Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai District.

+1cc to the Government Pleader,sr.no.30708, 30319

+1cc to Mr.V.Raghavachari, Advocate, sr.no.29918

W.P.No.42767 of 2002

PA (CO)
RRK (04/06/18)