



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED : 07.06.2018
CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

W.P. (MD) No.8425 of 2018
and
W.M.P (MD) .Nos.7964 and 7965 of 2018

Tmt.Ramalakshmi : Petitioner
Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.

2. The Tahsildar,
Ottapidaram Taluk,
Thoothukudi District.

3. The Sub Registrar,
Registration Department,
Ottapidaram,
Thoothukudi District.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned order Na.Ka.No. A2/196/2013 dated 27.08.2013 passed by the second respondent and consequently impugned order in RFL/OTTAPIDARAM/2/2018 dated 08.03.2018 passed by the third respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently to direct the third respondent to register a settlement deed dated 05.03.2018 presented by the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Nirmal Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.V.Anand
Government Advocate

ORDER

The petition has been filed to quash the impugned order of the second respondent, dated 27.08.2013 made in Na.Ka.No.A2/196/2013, and the impugned order in RFL/OTTAPIDARAM/2/2018 dated 08.03.2018 passed by the third respondent, and consequently, to direct the third respondent to register the petitioner's settlement deed dated 05.03.2018.

2.The main point raised by the petitioner is that through the impugned order, the Tahsildar cannot direct the authority concerned to stop the registration and as long as the documents are properly valued and presented, the Registrar cannot refuse registration of the same.



3. In a catena of judgments, this Court has categorically held that the Sub-Registrar is not empowered to insist for the production of the original title deeds of the parties at the time of registration and that they are bound to consider the objections only on the grounds, which are set forth in Rule 55 and Rule 162 of the Tamil Nadu Registration Rules. One such judgment in the case of T.Sundar Vs. Sub Registrar, Office of the Sub Registrar, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli and another reported in 2010(1)MLJ 1286 reads as follows:-

"10. Thus, in view of the law laid down by this Court in the above referred decision, which has referred to various decisions of this Court in the earlier case, the principle which can be culled out is that the action of the respondents in refusing to release the document on the ground that the sale deed was executed by the person was not the real owner is not legally sustainable. It has been further held that it is not for the registering authority to verify as to whether the vendor in the sale deed has a right to convey the property mentioned therein. Hence, the said judgment squarely applies to the facts and circumstances of the case, and on this ground alone, the petitioners are entitled to succeed.

11. Next, it was pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioners that a communication has been sent by the second respondent to the first respondent not to entertain any sale deed in respect of the said survey numbers. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court had decided the scope of such direction in the nature of prohibition and whether the same could be issued by either the Government or any other body to the said registration of assurance directing him not to entertain any document. In *Thiyagavalli Panchayathai Serntha Nochikkadu Grama Vivasayigal Pathukappu Matrum Makkal Pothunala Sangam's* case, the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court held that there is no provision under the statute where the State Government or the respondents therein can validly issue any directions refusing to register any document for which registration is permissible under the provisions of the Act.

12. Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, the direction issued by the second respondent to the first respondent is also to be held as unsustainable. In fact, the learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the release of the document is always subject to the right which has already accrued in favour of the Tamil Nadu Housing Board by ~~the Board~~ to release the document by the Board is not justifiable.



13. In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court as stated supra, all the writ petitions are allowed as prayed for. The first respondent is directed to return the sale deeds to the petitioners. It is made clear that merely because the sale deeds have been released, the same does not mean that the petitioners have title over the said properties and that apart the release of such sale deeds would in any manner affect or impeach the title of the Tamil Nadu Housing Board, or its allottees. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed."

4. In the light of the aforesaid judgment, the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court had an occasion to deal with this aspect in a judgment in the case of V.K. Amalraj Vs. Inspector General (Registrations), The Appellate Authority, Government of Tamil Nadu, 120, Santhome High Road, Chennai and 4 others reported in 2011 (1) CWC 283, in which the following observation was made:-

"10. It is the main grievance of the petitioner that registering authorities are indiscriminately registering the documents without making proper enquiry with regard to the rights and ownership of the seller. Therefore, Mandamus has to be issued to the respondents to stop all unlawful registration through out the State of Tamil Nadu by considering his representation, dated 09.10.2009. According to the respondents 1 to 3, the Registering Officer is expected to enquire into the document brought before him and he can make enquiry only within the frame of provisions of the Registration Act and the Rules framed thereunder, particularly with reference to Rule 55 relating to enquiry before the registration speaks about what is not the duty of the Registering Officer. Rule 55 is extracted hereunder: "55. It forms no part of a registering officer's duty to enquire into the validity of a document brought to him for registration or to attend to any written or verbal protest against the registration of a document based on the ground that the executing party had no right to execute the document; but he is bound to consider objections raised on any of the grounds stated below:-

(a) that the parties appearing or about to appear before him are not the persons they profess to be;

(b) that the document is forged;

(c) that the person appearing as a representative, assign or agent, has no right to appear in that capacity;

(d) that the executing party is not really dead, as alleged by the party applying for registration; or

(e) that the executing party is a minor or an idiot or a lunatic".



11. A close reading of the said Rule would show the registering authority is bound to consider the objection only on the ground which is stated in the said Rule. Rule 55 does not provide enquiry by the Registering Officer with regard to the right and ownership of the seller. Thus, the authorities concerned are bound to act only in accordance with the Act and Rules framed thereunder. The authorities cannot be directed to act contrary to the provisions of the statute. We also find that the writ petition is filed only to settle the family dispute between the petitioner and the respondents 4 and 5. Hence, we do not find any merit in the writ petition."

5. In the instant case, by the impugned order dated 08.03.2018, the third respondent refused to register the petitioner's settlement deed dated 05.03.2018, on the ground that as per the impugned order dated 27.08.2013 passed by the second respondent/Thasildhar Ottapidaram, there is no No Objection Certificate to sell properties mentioned in the sale deed.

6. In view of the well settled provisions of law that the registering authority is not empowered to insist upon the parties to prove the title or to verify the title over the property, which is subject matter of the deed of conveyance and that the consideration could be only within the scope of Rules 55 and 162 of the Tamil Nadu Registration Rules, the respondent may not be justified going into the title of the property.

7. In the light of the above observations, the impugned order passed by the second and third respondents are against the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Registration Act and its corresponding Rules. Consequently, the impugned order, dated 27.08.2013 made in Na.Ka.No.A2/196/2013 and impugned order in RFL/OTTAPIDARAM/2/2018 dated 08.03.2018 are stand quashed and the third respondent herein is directed to register the petitioner's settlement deed, dated 05.03.2018, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, if it is otherwise in order and consequently return the settlement deed to the petitioner forthwith. No costs.

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CO)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.



2. The Tahsildar,
Ottapidaram Taluk,
Thoothukudi District.

3. The Sub Registrar,
Registration Department,
Ottapidaram,
Thoothukudi District.

+1CC to Mr.V.Nirmal Kumar, Advocate, SR.No.67689
+1CC to the Special Government Pleader SR.No.67357

W.P. (MD) No.8425 of 2018
and
W.M.P (MD) .Nos.7964 and 7965 of 2018
07.06.2018

RMK
ES/SV/SAR 2/11.07.2018/5P/6C