



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31725 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.11.2022

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M. DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.31725 of 2022

A.Thulasi @ Thulasimani

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Sub Registrar,
Villivakkam Registrar Office,
Chennai 600 101.

... Respondent

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the Refusal Check Slip in Refusal Number: RFL/Villivakkam/46/2022 dated 21.11.2022 and to quash the same as illegal and incompetent and consequently direct the respondent to register the sale deed dated 21.11.2022 executed by the petitioner in favour of one B.Ranjitha, wife of K.Balamurugan, without insisting on production of the original parent document in respect of the subject property.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Jayaprakash
For Respondent : Mr.C.Kathiravan
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the Refusal

Check Slip in Refusal Number: RFL/Villivakkam/46/2022 dated 21.11.2022



W.P.No.31725 of 2022

and to quash the same as illegal and incompetent and consequently direct the respondent to register the sale deed dated 21.11.2022 executed by the petitioner in favour of one B.Ranjitha, wife of K.Balamurugan, without insisting on production of the original parent document in respect of the subject property.

2. Mr.C.Kathiravan, 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 executed a Sale Deed, dated 21.11.2022 in favour of one B.Ranjitha, and the same was presented before the respondent for registration. However, the said document was refused to be registered by the respondent on the ground that original parent document was not annexed along with the document which is presented for registration. Challenging the same, the present Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner for the above relief.

4. Though very many grounds have been raised, learned counsel



W.P.No.31725 of 2022

for the petitioner submitted that though the petitioner annexed the certified copy of the parent document, even then the respondent refused to register the document is not sustainable, the issue involved in the present case, is no more res-integra. He further relied upon the decision of this Court in W.P.(MD)No.19745 of 2020, order dated 11.02.2021. The relevant portion of the above said order is extracted hereunder:-

"8.This Court is entirely in agreement with the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner in this regard. The latest decision of the learned Single Judge appears to have not considered the implication of the Circular with reference to the scheme of the relevant Act. On the other hand, the above three decisions cited on behalf of the petitioner would certainly hold the field and in which event, insistence on production of original Title Deeds by the Registering Authority is without any authority of law. The Circular issued by the Inspector General of Registration, Chennai in this regard cannot have any sanctity, unless the power of issuance of such Circular is authorized under the provisions of the Act. This Court has consistently held that no such power can be read into Act, in the absence of any specific provisions and in that view of the matter, as rightly contended by the learned Counsel for the petitioner, the



subject issue is no more res-integra. As far as the latest decision of the learned Single Judge is concerned, being a kind of a contra view, this Court is of the opinion that the order passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.(MD)No.16768 of 2020, dated 26.11.2020 has not appreciated the provisions of the Act, as the reasons of the learned Single Judge are contrary to the well considered earlier Judgments of this Court. The learned Judge has reasoned without any specific reference to the scheme of the Act, which governs the registration."

5. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent submitted that the document presented by the petitioner was rejected by the respondent on the ground that parent document was not annexed along with the document.

6. In view of the decision of this Court in ***W.P.(MD)No.19745 of 2020***, order ***dated 11.02.2021***, makes it clear that, there is no need to present the original parent document, certified copy of the parent document is sufficient to entertain the document for registration.



W.P.No.31725 of 2022

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is allowed, the impugned order is set aside and the respondent is directed to entertain the document presented by the petitioner and pass appropriate orders within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and the petitioner is directed to pay requisite Stamp Duty and Registration Charges. No costs.

28.11.2022

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order: Yes/ No
jd

Note: Registry is directed to issue the original impugned order to the petitioner under due acknowledgment to enable her to work out the remedy.

To

The Sub Registrar,
Villivakkam Registrar Office,
Chennai 600 101.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31725 of 2022

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

jd

W.P.No.31725 of 2022

28.11.2022