



W.P.No.27652 of 2021

W.P.No.27652 of 2021
and W.M.P.No.29196 of 2021

WEB CO **M.DHANDAPANI.J.**

This petition is listed today under the caption “For Clarification”.

2.The learned counsel for the parties submits that though the petitioner was permitted to withdraw the petition, however, similar issue has already been decided by this Court in W.P.No.33892 of 2012, etc. batch dated 06.04.2022 and therefore, recording the findings in the said order, the petitioner may be permitted to withdraw this Writ Petition, by granting necessary liberty.

3.This Court vide order dated 06.04.2022 had dismissed the petitions therein and this petition standing on similar footing it is submitted that the aforesaid order may be passed.

4.Accordingly, this Court modifies the said order by replacing paragraph No.2 and adding paragraph No-3 to the order in W.P.No.27652 of 2021 dated 13.04.2022 with the following paragraphs:



W.P.No.27652 of 2021

2. This Court, vide order dated 06.04.2022 in W.P. No.33892/2012, etc., Batch, while considering an identical issue, held as under :-

“64. Upon careful perusal of the decisions of the Hon’ble Apex Court and the Full Bench, which have been relied upon by the learned counsel in support of their respective submissions, this Court is of the considered view that held that though both the decision in Satya Pal’s case and Latif’s case (supra) relate to unilateral cancellation of a sale deed, however, the issue covered in the present batch of petitions relate to unilateral cancellation of settlement deed. Further, the decision in Satya Pal’s case (supra) spells out the correct ratio in which the relevant provisions of the Act has to be interpreted and, in fact, to a limited extent the decision of the Full Bench also tags with the decision in Satya Pal’s case (supra) and upon such interpretation on the basis of the ratio laid down in Satya Pal’s case (supra), this Court answers the questions formulated in the following manner :-

Question Nos.1 & 2 :

i) Whether the Registering Authority can desist from registering a cancellation deed submitted before him by the



settlor alone for cancelling the registered Settlement Deed in the absence or consent of the settlee?

ii) Whether the Registering Authority has the power to cancel a document vide the cancellation deed, and insist the settlor and settlee to appear at the time of registration of the document, in the absence of any provision of law?

Answer :

The registering authority has no power to desist from registering a document, once it is submitted to him along with the necessary documents, which are mandated under the Act and once the document is properly registered, the registering authority, in the absence of any express provision under the Act or the Rules, is not competent to cancel the registered document.

Question Nos.3 & 4 :

iii) Whether a writ petition is maintainable questioning such registration?

iv) What is the remedy available to the parties in the event of registration of a cancellation deed unilaterally by the settlor?

Answer :

The writ petitions, at the instance of the petitioners are wholly misconceived and the writ jurisdiction cannot be



invoked seeking cancellation of the respective cancellation deeds and this Court, sitting under Article 226 of the Constitution, cannot issue a writ directing the registering authority to cancel the registered document, when it involves disputed questions of fact between the parties. Further, the remedy open to the petitioners/aggrieved party is only to file a civil suit before the appropriate jurisdictional court and a writ petition is not maintainable.

65.For the reasons aforesaid, the writ petitions filed by the petitioners praying for a direction to the registering authority/respondent herein to cancel the unilaterally executed cancellation deeds in and by which the respective settlement deeds have been cancelled, cannot be entertained and, accordingly, the writ petitions are dismissed. It is further made clear that this Court has not entered into the realm of adjudicating the legality or validity of the cancellation deed, but has only decided the power of the registering authority to entertain the document for registration and its subsequent cancellation and, therefore, it is open to the petitioners to file appropriate suit before the jurisdictional civil court or to avail any other remedy available to them under law, where all the points raised herein could be canvassed by the petitioners and if such



legal recourse is taken by the petitioners, the concerned court/authority shall take up the same on its own merits and adjudicate the dispute without in any way being influenced by any observation made by this Court in the decision supra. It is also made clear that the benefit of this order shall not operate with regard to matters, which have already been decided by this Court one way or the other and the doctrine of res judicata would stand attracted.”

3.The present petition being on the identical issue, the order passed in the aforesaid case is squarely attracted to the present petition as well. For the reasons aforesaid as prayed for by the petitioner, this writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. However, it is open to the petitioner to file appropriate suit before the jurisdictional civil court or to avail any other remedy available to them under law, where all the points raised herein could be canvassed by the petitioner, if so advised, and if such legal recourse is taken by the petitioner, the concerned court/authority shall take up the same on its own merits and adjudicate the dispute without in any way being influenced by any observation made by this Court in the decision supra. There shall be no order as to costs.”



W.P.No.27652 of 2021

5.Registry is directed to carry out the aforesaid corrections and issue

fresh order copy to the parties.

27.06.2022

ep

Index : Yes / No

Speaking order : Yes / No

M.DHANDAPANI.J,

ep

W.P.No.27652 of 2021

and W.M.P.No.29196 of 2021



WEB COPY



W.P.No.27652 of 2021

27.06.2022