



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :30.03.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.7415 of 2022

A.R.Ramesh

...Petitioner

Vs.

The Sub Registrar, Joint-I,
Registering Officer,
Coimbatore & District.

...Respondent

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus Calling for the entire records connected with the impugned Refusal Check Slip in Refusal Number RFL/ Coimbatore Joint II/ 3/ 2022 dated 28.02.2022 passed by the respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to register the Award dated 08.04.2017 made in Lok Adalat in O.S.No.1600 of 2016 on the file of the I Addl. District Munsif Coimbatore passed under the Legal Services Authorities Act 1987.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sathia Chandran

For Respondents : Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this petition to call for the entire records connected with the impugned Refusal Check Slip in Refusal Number RFL/ Coimbatore Joint II/ 3/ 2022 dated 28.02.2022 passed by the respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to register the Award dated 08.04.2017 made in Lok Adalat in O.S.No.1600 of 2016 on the file of the I Addl. District Munsif Coimbatore passed under the Legal Services Authorities Act 1987.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner's mother has purchased the property from one G.Natarajan, in survey Nos.3/1157, 3/11518, 3/1159 and New Town Survey No.561/2, to an extent of 1093 ½ Sq.ft., situated in Selvapuram Road, Kumarapalayam Village, Coimbatore District. Thereafter, the



petitioner and his family members are in possession and enjoyment of the said property. While so, on 05.09.2016, one Rajan attempted to disturb the peaceful possession of the petitioner's property by claiming that he was the legal heir of the said Natarajan. Thereafter, the petitioner and his mother filed a Partition Suit in O.S.No.1600 of 2016, on the file of the I Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore and the said suit was decreed in favour of the petitioner, on 08.04.2017. Thereafter, the petitioner's mother died on 19.08.2021. Hence, the petitioner approached the respondent to register the decree dated 08.04.2017, however, the respondent refused to register the same, vide Refusal Check Slip No.RFL/ Coimbatore Joint II/ 3/ 2022 dated 28.02.2022 on the ground that the decree has been presented for registration after 8 months, which is contrary to the period stipulated in Section 23 & 25 of the Registration Act, 1908. 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



WEB COPY

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 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 Pleader appearing for the respondents submitted that the said application was rejected under section 23 and 25 of the Registration Act, 1908.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is in possession 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 Ligewaran'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 impugned order passed by the respondent is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent and the respondent is directed to register the decree in O.S.No.1600 of 2016, dated 08.04.2017 passed by I Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore without referring the delay. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-II)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Psa

To

The Sub Registrar, Joint-I,
Registering Officer,
Coimbatore & District.

Copy To

The I Additional District Munsif,
Coimbatore.

+1cc to Mr.S.Sathia Chandran, Advocate SR.No.21286

+1cc to Special Government Pleader SR.No.22264

W.P.No.7415 of 2022

SKM(CO)
GMY(12/04/2022)