



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.03.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.5871 of 2022

K.C.Shanmugham

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar,
Chennai-South.

2.The Joint Registrar No.1,
Chennai-South.

...Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of second respondent pertaining to the refusal slip in RFL/No.1, Joint Sub Registrar, Saidapet, Chennai South/3/2022 dated 22.02.2022 issued by the 2nd respondent in respect of the registration of Lok Adalat Award dated 08.04.2017 and set aside the same and for directing the 2nd respondent to register the Lok Adalat award dated 08.04.2017.

For Petitioner

: Mr.M.V.Seshachari

For Respondents

:Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan

Special Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this petition to call for the records of second respondent pertaining to the refusal slip in RFL/No.1, Joint Sub Registrar, Saidapet, Chennai South/3/2022, dated 22.02.2022, issued by the 2nd respondent in respect of the registration of Lok Adalat Award dated 08.04.2017 and set aside the same and to direct the 2nd respondent to register the Lok Adalat award dated 08.04.2017.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner filed a suit in O.S.No.47 of 2013, on the file of Subordinate Judge, Poonamallee, seeking for declaration of title in Survey No.0/1, Chettiar Agaram Village, Ambattur Taluk. During the pendency of suit petitioner and 1st defendant entered into



compromise and a memo of compromise dated 27.03.2017 was duly submitted in Lok Adalat. Lok Adalat award passed on 08.04.2017. The petitioner presented the Lok Adalat Award to the Joint Sub-Registrar No.1, Saidapet, Chennai-South, for registration. The same was returned by Refusal Check Slip No.RFL/No.1, Joint Sub Registrar, Saidapet, Chennai South/3/2022, dated 22.02.2022, on the ground that decree was presented for registration with delay of more than 120 days. Hence, the present Writ Petition is filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no time limit is prescribed in the Registration Act with regard to registration of the deed through Court decree. Therefore, citing delay in presenting the document as reason for not registering the same is not sustainable.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would rely on a decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of S.Lingeswaran vs The Sub Registrar in W.P.No.9577 of 2021 dated 23.04.2021, and in the said decision the Division Bench of this Court followed the earlier decisions reported in 2007 (2) TCJ 68 (A.K.Gnanasankar vs. Joint -II Sub Registrar, Cuddalore) and 2019 (3) MLJ 571 (S.Sarvothaman vs. The Sub-Registrar, Oulgarpet), wherein the Court held that, the Court decree is not a compulsorily registrable document and the option lies with the party in such circumstances. He would particularly rely on paragraphs 6 to 9 of the above decision, which are extracted hereunder:

"6. A Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in Padala Satyanarayana Murthy Vs. Padala Gangamma, reported in AIR 1959 AP 626, has held that a decree/order passed by a competent Court is not compulsorily registrable document and the party cannot be compelled to get the document registered when there is no obligation cast upon him to register the same. Subsequently, a Division Bench of this Court in A.K.Gnanasankar Vs. Joint-II Sub Registrar, Cuddalore reported in 2007 (2) TCJ 68, has held that, a decree is a permanent record of Court and the limitation prescribed for presentation of the document under Sections 23 and 25 of the Registration Act, is not applicable to a decree presented for registration.

7. The above judgments have been followed in number of judgments of this Court and recently another Division Bench of this Court in



WEB COPY

S.Sarvothaman Vs. The Sub-Registrar, Oulgaret reported in (2019) 3 MLJ 571 has held that, as the Court decree is not a compulsorily registerable document and the limitation prescribed under the Registration Act would not stand attracted for registering any decree. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as follows:

"21. By applying the decision in the case of Padala Satyanarayana Murthy to the facts of the case, the only conclusion that could be arrived at is that a court decree is not compulsorily registerable and that the option lies with the party. In such circumstances, the law laid down by this Court clearly states that the limitation prescribed under the Act would not stand attracted."

8. The above judgment was followed in Anitha Vs. The Inspector of Registration in W.P.No.24857 of 2014 dated 01.03.2021, wherein it is held that the Registrar cannot refuse registration of a Court decree on the ground of limitation.

9. In view of the above settled position of law, the respondent Sub Registrar cannot refuse to register the decree on the ground that it is presented beyond the period prescribed under Section 23 of the Registration Act. In such circumstances, the impugned refusal check slip issued by the respondent is not sustainable and it is liable to be set aside. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the respondent is set aside and the respondent is directed to register the decree, if it is otherwise in order. No costs."

5. The learned Special Government Advocate appearing for the respondent submitted that the said application was rejected under section 23 of the Registration Act.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is possessed of a Court decree which when presented was not entertained citing delay in submission. It is to be pointed out that this Court in a catena of decisions had held that the Registrar cannot refuse registration of a Court decree on the ground of limitation. That being the case, the facts in the present case are identical to Ligeswaran's case and the ratio laid therein stands squarely attracted. Therefore, the rejection order is



wholly in contravention of the order passed in Lingeswaran's case (supra).

7. Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed and the order passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside and the matter is remanded to the 2nd respondent and the 2nd respondent is directed to register the Lok Adalat Award dated 08.04.2017 without referring the delay. No costs.

s/d-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

psa
To

1.The District Registrar,
Chennai-South.

2.The Joint Registrar No.1,
Chennai-South.

+1 CC to The Special Government Pleader sr 18568.

W.P.No.5871 of 2022

SKM(CO)
SP(31/03/2022)