



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.04.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.9583 of 2022

P.Mylsamy Gounder

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Registrar,
Coimbatore.

2. The Sub Registrar, Pollachi,
Coimbatore District.

3.Vijayanand

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the second respondent in refusal check slip no.RL/Pollachi/15/2022 dated 11.03.2022 and further direct the second respondent to register the Civil Court Decree in O.S.No.435 of 2017 dated 16.02.2018 on the file of the District Munsif, Pollachi, on payment of necessary charges.

For petitioner : Mr.A.Muthukumar

For Respondents : Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this petition to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the second respondent in refusal check slip no.RL/Pollachi/15/2022 dated 11.03.2022 and further direct the second respondent to register the Civil Court Decree in O.S.No.435 of 2017 dated 16.02.2018 on the file of the District Munsif, Pollachi, on payment of necessary charges.

2. Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan, learned Special Government Pleader takes notice for the respondents 1 and 2. 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 petitioner had filed a suit in O.S.No.435 of 2017 on the file of the District Munsif, Pollachi, for permanent injunction against the third respondent. Thereafter, there was a compromise in between the petitioner and the third respondent in the said suit and the compromise decree was passed on 16.02.2018. Thereafter, the petitioner presented a document based on the compromise decree for registration before the second respondent. 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 the time stipulated. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner.

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

5. 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.

6. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent submits that the said application was rejected under section 23 of the Registration Act.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances, admittedly, the petitioner and the third respondent obtained compromise decree. When the document was presented, the document 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), ratio 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 decree in O.S.No.435 of 2017 dated 16.02.2018 passed by the District Munsif, Pollachi, if it is otherwise in order, on payment of requisite Stamp Duty and Registration Charges. No costs.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

tri/mn

To

1. The District Munsif, Pollachi,
2. The District Registrar,
Coimbatore.
3. The Sub Registrar, Pollachi,
Coimbatore District.

+1cc to Mr.A.Muthukumar, Advocate, S.R.No.26799
+1cc to the Special Government Pleader, S.R.No.27551

W.P.No.9583 of 2022

SKM(CO)
CT 28/04/2022