



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.11.2022

CORAM :
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

Writ Petition No.30323 of 2022

Uma ... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar,
Registration Department,
Salem East, Salem.

2.The Sub Registrar,
Sub-Registrar's Office,
Veerapandi, Salem.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the second respondent in his refusal check slip Refusal Number RFL/Veerapandi/78/2021 dated 24.11.2021 by the second respondent quash the same and direct the second respondent to register the preliminary decree in O.S.No.446 of 1999 on the file of the II Additional Subordinate Judge, Salem dated 20.12.2018 presented by the petitioner for registration.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.P.Yuaraj

For Respondent : Mr.E.Vijay Anand,
Additional Government Pleader

Page No.1 of 9



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this petition for quashment of the proceedings of the respondent dated 24.11.2021 refusing to register the preliminary decree dated 20.12.2018 made in O.S.No.446 of 1999 on the file of the file of the II Additional Subordinate Judge, Salem and for a consequential direction to the respondents to register the same.

2. The case of the petitioner is that, the petitioner has filed a suit in O.S.No.446 of 1999 on the file of the II Additional Subordinate Judge, Salem for declaration of title for consequential injunction against one Ranganathan and four others and the said suit was decreed on 20.12.2018. Thereafter, the petitioner presented the application before the second respondent for registration of the said decree on 20.12.2018, however, the second respondent refused to register the same, vide Refusal Check Slip No.RFL/Veerapandi/78/2021 dated 24.11.2021 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



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

present Writ Petition is filed.

WEB COPY

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 2304.2021, 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 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



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

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 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



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

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)*.

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 respondents and the respondents are directed to entertain the decree in O.S.No.446 of 1999 dated 20.12.2018 passed by the II Additional Subordinate Judge, Salem without referring the delay. No costs.

15.11.2022

vm

Index : Yes/No

Speaking Order : Yes/No



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

Copy To:

- 1.The District Registrar,
Registration Department,
Salem East, Salem.
- 2.The Sub Registrar,
Sub-Registrar's Office,
Veerapandi, Salem.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

M.DHANDAPANI,J.

vm



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30323 of 2022

W.P.No.30323 of 2022

15.11.2022