



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.04.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.7889 of 2022

S.Subramani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar,
Tiruppur,
Tiruppur District.

2.The Sub-Registrar,
Kangayam,
Tiruppur District.

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of order dated 09.03.2022 in Refusal Check Slip Number:RFL/Kangayam/38/2022 on the file of 2nd respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to register and release the decree dated 28.03.2013 passed in O.S.No.248 of 2010 on the file of Additional District Judge No.3 at Dharapuram to the petitioner within stipulated time as fixed by this Court.

For petitioner : M/S.K.Myilsamy

For Respondents : Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of order dated 09.03.2022 in Refusal Check Slip Number:RFL/Kangayam/38/2022 on the file of second respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the second respondent to register and release the decree dated 28.03.2013 passed in O.S.No.248 of 2010 on the file of Additional District Judge No.3



at Dharapuram to the petitioner, within a stipulated time as fixed by this Court.

2. Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan, learned Special Government Pleader takes notice for the respondent. In view of the limited relief sought for in this petition and on the consent expressed by the learned counsel appearing on either side, this petition is taken up for final disposal.

3. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner had filed a Suit in O.S.No.248 of 2010 on the file of Additional District Judge No.3 at Dharapuram, seeking partition, separate possession and permanent injunction. Thereafter, the petitioner had obtained a preliminary decree by allotting 1/3rd share in his favour. Further, the petitioner is intended to settle his property in favour of his children. Therefore, the petitioner presented a document before the second respondent for registration based on the decree. However, the said document was refused to be registered by the second respondent on the ground that the decree has not been presented for registration within a stipulated time. Challenging the same, the petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition.

4. Though very many grounds have been raised, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, no time limit is prescribed for registering a document in the Registration Act and citing the reason for delay in presenting the document, by the respondent is not sustainable.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would relied 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. In the said decision, the Division Bench of this Court followed the earlier Division Bench decisions of this Court 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's 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 in W.P.No.9577 of 2021, 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



WEB COPY

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 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."

6. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent submitted that, the application of the petitioner, seeking registering the Civil Court's decree was



rejected under Section 23 of the Registration Act.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances, admittedly, the petitioner obtained a preliminary decree dated 28.03.2013 in O.S.No.248 of 2010. When the said preliminary decree was presented before the 2nd respondent for register the same, it was rejected by citing section 23 of the Registration Act. The rejection order is wholly in contravention of the order passed in Lingeswaran's case (supra), and ratio laid down therein is squarely applicable to the present case.

8. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent is set aside and the second respondent is directed to register the preliminary decree in O.S.No.248 of 2010 dated 28.03.2013 passed by the Additional District Judge No.3, Dharapuram, in accordance with law, if otherwise in order. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

jd/lpp

To

1.The District Registrar,
Tiruppur,
Tiruppur District.

2.The Sub Registrar,
Kangeyam,
Tiruppur District.

+1cc to Government Pleader SR. No. 22980

+1cc to Mr.K.Myilsamy, Advocate SR. No. 22185

W.P.No.7889 of 2022

PL (CO)

PR (27/04/2022)