



WEB COPY



W.P.No.29254 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 07.11.2022

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI**

W.P.No.29254 of 2022

Kuppusamy

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Sub Registrar  
Uthukuli Sub Registrar Office  
Tiruppur Registration District  
Respondent

..

Prayer:Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ, order or direction in the nature of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for records relating to the impugned order made in Check Slip dated 17.08.2022 in RFL/Uthukuli/6/2022 by the respondent quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to register the decree dated 29.10.1996 made in A.S.No.13 of 1994 passed by the learned Sub-Court, Erode.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Anandhamurthy

For Respondent : Mr.C.Kathiravan  
Special Government Pleader

**ORDER**

The present petition has been filed challenging the impugned order made



W.P.No.29254 of 2022

in Check Slip dated 17.08.2022 in RFL/Uthukuli/6/2022 by the respondent quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to register the decree dated 29.10.1996 made in A.S.No.13 of 1994 passed by the learned Sub-Court, Erode.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner filed a suit in O.S.No.1298 of 1991 seeking permanent injunction restraining the defendants therein not to interfere with the peaceful possession of the suit properties, which was subsequently dismissed on 26.04.1993. Aggrieved over the dismissal of the said suit, petitioner filed an appeal in A.S.No.13 of 1994 on the file of learned Sub-Court, Erode District, wherein, the appeal was allowed vide judgment and decree dated 29.10.1996. Thereby, the petitioner presented the said judgment and decree before the respondent for registration on 26.10.2021, however, the respondent refused to register the same, vide the impugned order on the ground that the decree has not been presented within the stipulated time as contemplated under 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



W.P.No.29254 of 2022

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,*



W.P.No.29254 of 2022

WEB COPY

*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*



W.P.No.29254 of 2022

WEB COPY

*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 respondent 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 *Lingeswaran'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*).



W.P.No.29254 of 2022

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 A.S.No.13 of 1994 dated 29.10.1996 passed by learned Sub-Court, Erode without referring the delay. No costs.

07.11.2022

dhk

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes

Speaking/Non-Speaking order

To

The Sub Registrar

Uthukuli Sub Registrar Office

Tiruppur Registration District



WEB COPY



W.P.No.29254 of 2022

**M.DHANDAPANI, J.**

dhk

W.P.No.29254 of 2022

07.11.2022