IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27-07-2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WP No.20682 of 2023
And
WMP Nos.20037 and 20038 of 2023

N.Amraram ... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Mylapore,
Chennai-600 004.

2.The District Registrar (Administration),
Chengalpattu District,
Chengalpattu-603 002.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Thiruporur,
No.29, South Mada Street,
Thiruporur-603 110.

4.D.Krishnamurthy

5.D.Manoharan

6.Premium Prosperity Infra Private Limited,
Represented by its Authorised Signatory,
Mr.A.Sundar, No.6, Padmanabanagar
Second Street, Adyar,
Chennai-600 020. ... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records leading to the order bearing No.Na.Ka.No.5647/U2/U1/2023 dated 07.06.2023 passed by the first respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the first respondent to cancel the registration of the Sale Deed dated 16.09.2022 registered as Document No.20692 of 2022 on the file of the Office of the Sub Registrar, Thiruporur under the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.R.Rajagopal,
Senior Counsel for
Mr.C.Vidhusan.

For Respondents-1 to 3 : Mr.D.Ravichander,
Special Government Pleader.

ORDER

The lis on hand has been instituted questioning the validity of the Appellate Order passed by the first respondent in proceedings dated 07.06.2023 confirming the order of the Original Authority passed in proceedings dated 05.01.2023.

2. The petitioner states that the fourth respondent-Mr.D.Krishnamurthy approached him and represented that he is the absolute owner of the property situated at No.10, Navalur Village, Thiruporur Taluk, Kancheepuram District, comprised in Old Survey No.20, New Survey No.20/2A, as per patta No.1220 New Survey No.20/2A1 measuring an extent of 0.58 cent (hereinafter referred as 'subject property').

3. The subject property originally belonged to one Kanniappa Gramani, S/o.Kumarasamy Gramani and the fourth respondent was the subsequent purchaser, who secured the right through Release Deed dated 28.01.2015 registered as document No.1027 of 2015 on the file of the Sub Registrar Office, Thiruporur. The fifth respondent-Mr.D.Manoharan instituted civil suit in OS No.191 of 2017 on the file of the District Munsif, Chengalpattu against the fourth respondent-Mr.D.Krishnamurthy for a declaration that the Release Deed dated 28.01.2015 is null and void. The

suit was dismissed as settled out of the Court at the instance of the fourth respondent. The fourth respondent represented that he is the absolute owner of the subject property. The petitioner entered into a Sale Agreement dated 26.10.2017 registered as Document No.11008 of 2017 in the office of the Sub Registrar, Thiruporur.

4. The fifth respondent raised a claim that one Mr.T.G.Gopalakrishnan purchased some property in Survey No.4/1 in Navalur village in the year 1964 and obtained patta No.56. Subsequently dispute was placed before the Revenue Authorities for decision and the District Revenue Officer, Kancheepuram passed an order on 28.07.2019 cancelling the Patta No.56 granted in favour of Mr.T.G.Gopalakrishnan. Accordingly patta was directed to be granted in favour of the fourth respondent Mr.D.Krishnamurthy.

5. The learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner mainly contended that all litigations filed between the parties were disposed of either as settled out of Court between the parties or withdrawn by the party instituted except the civil suit instituted by the fifth

respondent-Mr.D.Manoharan in OS No.13 of 2018 on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu. The suit was for the relief of declaration and permanent injunction. Since all earlier litigations between the parties except OS No.13 of 2018 has been disposed of, it is unnecessary to go into those details.

6. The dispute raised in this writ petition is regarding cancellation of Agreement for Sale executed between the writ petitioner and the fourth respondent Mr.D.Krishnamurthy and the consequential Sale Deed executed by the respondents 4 and 5 in favour of the sixth respondent i.e., Premium Prosperity Infra Private Limited, Adyar, Chennai-600 020.

7. The validity of the registered Sale Agreement and the consequential Sale Deed executed by the respondents 4 and 5 in favour of the sixth respondent are challenged by the petitioner through his complaint dated 23.09.2022 before the District Registrar holding the jurisdiction under Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908.

8. The complaint presented by the writ petitioner was adjudicated and he being the Sale Agreement holder, made a complaint that he was kidnapped by the respondents 4 and 5 in collusion with the Sub Registrar and was forced to execute the Cancellation Deed of the Sale Agreement, which was executed in his favour by the fourth respondent. On execution of fraudulent Cancellation Deed at the instance of the respondents 4 and 5, they have executed a Sale Deed in favour of the sixth respondent. At the outset, the respondents 4, 5 and 6 altogether with the collusion of the Sub Registrar had executed two documents, which were sought to be cancelled in the complaint filed by the petitioner on 23.09.2022.

9. The learned Senior Counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioner, mainly contended that on the date of registration itself, the petitioner raised an objection before the Sub Registrar that he was not willing to execute the Cancellation Deed cancelling the Sale Agreement executed between the petitioner and the fourth respondent. However, the Sub Registrar in collusion with the respondents 4 and 5 forcibly obtained signature from the petitioner and executed the said two documents against

the consent of the writ petitioner. It is stated that the petitioner was kidnapped from a particular place and was forced to sign before the Sub Registrar, Thiruporur. Thus the entire transaction was fraudulent and it has to be cancelled.

10. The writ petitioner has immediately registered a criminal complaint before the concerned Police Station, who in turn registered FIR. The criminal case registered was investigated and a final report has already been filed. The trial is yet to commence. Simultaneously the petitioner pursued the complaint filed by him before the District Registrar, who in turn issued summons to the parties concerned and conducted an enquiry through summary proceedings.

11. The District Registrar (Administration), Chengalpattu passed final orders on 05.01.2023, rejecting the complaint given by the writ petitioner to cancel the two documents i.e., cancellation of Sale Agreement and Cancellation Deed cancelling the Sale Agreement and also the Sale Deed executed between the respondents 4, 5 and 6. Challenging the order of District Registrar, an appeal has been preferred before the Inspector General

of Registration on 03.02.2023.

12. The Inspector General of Registration also conducted an enquiry by affording an opportunity to the parties and by recording the statement of the parties and hearing the arguments of the parties passed final orders in proceedings dated 07.06.2023 (impugned order) rejecting the complaint given by the petitioner mainly on the ground that the allegations raised by the petitioner in the complaint, cannot be gone into by the Registering Authority and the Appellate Authority under the provisions of the Act. In other words, the Appellate Authority opined that the allegations are not falling within the ambit of Sections 22-A and 22-B of the Registration Act, 1908.

13. The learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner urged before this Court that there is an allegation of force, coercion and fraud, which is apparent and a criminal case has been registered against the respondents 4 and 5 and that being the factum, the respondents 1 and 2 ought not to have rejected the complaint filed by the petitioner as the case of the petitioner squarely falls under Section 77-A of

the Registration Act, 1908.

14. The fraud committed on the date of registration in the Office of the third respondent-Sub Registrar, Thiruporur has been explicitly established by the petitioner before the Authorities and instead of conducting an enquiry by verification of the records, the Authorities Competent have simply rejected the complaint merely on the ground that they have no authority to entertain and grant the relief in respect of the allegations raised by the petitioner.

15. To substantiate the claim of the petitioner, the learned Senior Counsel drew the attention of this Court with reference to the procedures to be followed under Section 34 of the Registration Act, 1908, which contemplates 'enquiry before registration by the Registering Officer'. Section 34(3)(a) stipulates that the Registering Officer shall thereupon “enquire whether or not such document was executed by the persons by whom it purports to have been executed; and (b) satisfy himself as to the identity of the persons appearing before him and alleging that they have executed the document or they have claimed under the document”. The

mandatory procedures contemplated under Section 34 had not been adhered to by the third respondent on the date of registration as far as the registration of two disputed documents are concerned. The Registering Authority verified the identity of the petitioner, even though he refused to record the objections raised by the petitioner at the time of registration and thus there is no violation of Section 34(3) of the Registration Act and consequently the two disputed documents are liable to be cancelled.

16. The learned Senior Counsel relied on the Circular issued by the Office of the Inspector General of Registration, wherein, instructions are given to the Competent Authorities to consider the allegations of fraud with reference to the definition under Section 470 of the Indian Penal Code. In the context of forgery under Section 463 of the Indian Penal Code and a forged document or electronic record under Section 470 of the Indian Penal Code, the present disputed documents registered against the will and consent of the petitioner is to be gone into, which the Authorities have miserably failed and thus the present writ petition is to be considered.

17. The learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Veena Singh vs. Collector [(2022) 7 SCC 1]**, and reiterated that the meaning of 'execution' has been elaborately considered by the Supreme Court stepwise and therefore, the consent of the presentant of the document is mandatory under the provisions of the Registration Act and such a procedure has been followed and thus the complaint of the writ petitioner is to be allowed by the respondents 1 and 2.

18. The learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3, strenuously objected the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner by stating that the case of the petitioner is not falling under the definition of fraudulent document within the ambit of Section 22-B of the Registration Act. To substantiate the ground raised by the respondents 1 to 3, the learned Special Government Pleader solicited the attention of this Court with reference to the nature of the complaint given by the petitioner before the District Registrar on 23.09.2022.

19. The learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3, relied on paragraph-6 of the complaint, which reads as under:-

> *"6. I submit when myself and Mr.D.Krishnamurthi were defending the title suit filed by Mr.D.Manoharan and others and the Sale Agreement entered between us was still in force. On 15.09.2022, when I was travelling in the Beach Road, I was kidnapped by the henchmen, employed by Mr.D.Manoharan and I was forcibly taken to the Sub Registrar Office, Thiruporur and compelled to cancel the Sale Agreement entered between myself and Mr.D.Krishnamurthi. Later on, I found my proposed vendor Mr.D.Krishnamurthi also colluded with Mr.D.Manoharan. The next day on 16.09.2022, the present Sale Deed in Document No.20692 of 2022 was registered by Mr.D.Manoharan in favour of the third party namely M/s.Premium Prosperity Infra Private Limited. It is strange to note that in the said sale transaction, my proposed vendor namely Mr.D.Krishnamurthi also colluded with Mr.D.Manoharan by giving up his rights in*

the property and executed a Sale Deed in favour of the third party, namely M/s.Premium Prosperity Infra Private Limited. Narrating all these incidents, I have given a complaint to the Inspector of Police, D-5, Marina Police Station on 17.09.2022. After acknowledging the complaint, a CSR No.1033 was issued and the Law Enforcing Agency are already conducing investigation on my complaint."

20. The learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3, drew an inference from and out of the factual contentions made in the complaint and presented that there was a dispute existing between the parties and the earlier litigations instituted between the parties was ended either in compromise or withdrawal except the civil suit admittedly pending in OS No.13 of 2018.

21. It is not in dispute that the petitioner has given a complaint to the Inspector of Police, D-5 Marina Police Station on 17.09.2022. The disputed documents were registered on 16.09.2022 in the Office of the Sub Registrar, Thiruporur. Since the petitioner has given a complaint that he was

kidnapped from Marina Beach Road, a criminal complaint was registered before the Marina Police Station. Therefore, the learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3, made a submission that there was no spontaneous reaction from the petitioner by approaching Jurisdictional Police Station at Thiruporur, wherein the registration occurred in the Office of the Sub Registrar at Thiruporur. In the context of the incident, the learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3, relied on Section 35(3)(a) of the Registration Act, 1908, which stipulates that the procedure on admission and denial of execution respectively. Sub Section (3)(a) denotes that "if any person by whom the document purports to be executed denies its execution". Thus in the event of any such denial by any of the party, present before the Registering Authority, the Registering Authority has no option but to refuse to register the document and in the present case, knowing that sort of incident occurred, therefore, the complaint at the threshold cannot be trusted upon for the purpose of cancelling the documents under Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908.

22. It is contended that the procedures as contemplated under the Registration Act, 1908, has been scrupulously followed in the present case. There was no specific allegation regarding the procedural violations except the personal allegation against the Sub Registrar, who has registered the document. In respect of such allegation of collusion of the Sub Registrar, it is to be established before the Criminal Court in the criminal case, which is already registered by the petitioner or before the Civil Court of Law. However, the remedy under Section 77-A is not available to the writ petitioner, since the procedures contemplated were followed without any violations by the Registering Authority at the time of execution of the documents.

23. It is further contended that undue influence, coercion or corrupt activities of the officials of the Registration Department at the time of registration would not fall under the scope of Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908 and in respect of all those allegations, the immediate remedy available to the petitioner is before the Competent Court of Law. Thus, the orders passed by the Original Authority and the Appellate

Authority are in consonance with the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and consequently, the present writ petition is to be rejected.

24. Considering the arguments as advanced between the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3, the question to be considered by this Court is that, (1) whether the allegations of coercion, undue influence or collusion of the Authorities would fall under the ambit of Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908, for the purpose of cancelling the document, which is otherwise registered by following the procedures.

25. The consequential question would be (2) whether the procedures contemplated under the Registration Act, 1908 has been followed by the Registering Authority in the present case at the time of registration and execution of the two disputed documents, which are the subject matter of the complaint filed by the petitioner on 23.09.2022.

26. With reference to the first issue, let us consider the scope of Section 22-B, which was inserted by Tamil Nadu Act No.41 of 2022 with effect from 16.08.2022.

27. The Registering Officer shall refuse to register the following documents, namely, (1) forged document; (2) document relating to transaction, which is prohibited by any Central Act or State Act for the time being in force; (3) document relating to transfer of immovable property by way of sale, gift, lease or otherwise, which is attached permanently or provisionally by a Competent Authority under any Central Act or State Act for the time being in force or any Court or Tribunal and (4) any other document as the State Government may, by notification, specify.

28. Section 22-B was inserted through an amendment in Tamil Nadu Act No.41 of 2022 in order to prevent the forged documents and to prevent the transfer of property when the particular property is under attachment either permanently or provisionally under the Central Act or the State Act or any Court or Tribunal. Therefore, the Registering Authority is

empowered to refuse the registration of forged document when he is of the opinion that the document presented by the presentant is found to be forged.

29. 'Forged' document has been defined through the very same Amendment inserted by Tamil Nadu Act No.41 of 2022 in Section (5-A) of the Registration Act, 1908, which stipulates that "forged document shall have the same meaning assigned to it in Section 470 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860".

30. Section 470 of the Indian Penal Code reads as under:-

> *"470. Forged document or electronic record – A false document or electronic record made wholly or in part by forgery is designated 'a forged document or electronic record".*

31. Therefore, a false document or a false electronic record made wholly or in part by forgery is designated as forged document or electronic record. In this context, circular issued by the Inspector General of Registration on 27.09.2022 indicates that aid of Section 463 of the Indian Penal Code also can be taken by the Registering Authority while identifying

the forged document. Section 463 of the Indian Penal Code enumerates 'Forgery' as follows:-

> *“'Forgery' - whoever makes any false document or false electronic record or part of a document or electronic record with intent to cause damage or injury to the public or to any person or to support any claim or title or to cause any person to part with property, or to enter into any express or implied contract, or with intent to commit fraud or that fraud may be committed, commits forgery”.*

32. It is necessary to consider Rule 55-A of the Registration Rules, which was inserted through G.O.Ms.No.129, Commercial Taxes and Registration (J2) Department, dated 05.09.2022 enabling the Registering Authority to identify the forged document within the definition of Section 22-B (1) of the Registration Act, 1908.

33. Rule 55-A of the Registration Rules and its spirit should be considered in the context of Section 22-B of the Registration Act, 1908 under Rule 55-A of the Registration Rules. The Registering Authority is

empowered to ask the presentant to produce the previous original deed by which the executant acquired right over the subject property and the encumbrance certificate pertaining to the property obtained within ten days from the date of registration. A conjoint reading of Section 22-B of the Act and Rule 55-A of the Registration Rules, would imply that the Registering Authority on receipt of a document from the presentant shall ask him to produce the Original Deed by which the executant secured the right over the subject property and the encumbrance certificate pertaining to the subject property. On verification of such details, the Registering Authority shall proceed for registration by following the procedures as contemplated under Sections 32 to 35 of the Registration Act, which deals with presenting forged documents for registration.

34. Section 32 of the Registration Act, 1908, defines the persons who can present the documents for registration, but Section 32-A states about registration by electronic mode and Section 32-AA deals about compulsory affixing of photograph etc. Section 33 deals with the Power of Attorney recognisable for the purpose of Section 32 and Section 34 stipulates enquiry before registration before the Registering Officer.

35. Section 34(3) enumerates that the Registering Officer shall enquire whether or not such document was executed by the person by whom it purports to have been executed and after getting himself satisfied as to the identity of the person appearing before the Registering Authority, the Registering Officer shall proceed further to complete the process of registration. Section 34-A stipulates person claiming under the document for sale of property and to sign the document. Section 35 deals with the procedure on admission and denial of execution respectively. Section 35(3)(a) states the procedure to be followed when any person by whom the document purports to be executed denies its execution.

36. The question to be considered in the present case is whether denial by the petitioner can be accepted for the purpose of cancelling the documents, which was otherwise executed by the petitioner by presenting himself before the Registering Authority ?

37. The fact remains that the petitioner was present before the Registering Officer and admittedly had signed the registration, allowed the Registering Authority to take photograph and had completed the procedures as contemplated under Sections 32 to 35 of the Registration Act, 1908 and to that extent, this Court can form an opinion that there was no restraint on the part of the petitioner for completion of registration in all respects. The verbal objection, if any, has not been established.

38. Admittedly, the petitioner filed police complaint not on the date of registration and before the jurisdictional Police Station at Thiruporur, but on the next day in Marina Police Station and registered a complaint against the respondents 4 and 5. Though there is no much delay in registering criminal complaint, there was no procedural irregularity noticeable in respect of the process of registration completed by the Registering Authority on the date of registration. Therefore, the High Court in a writ proceeding cannot form an opinion, whether there was a verbal objection by the petitioner on the date of registration or coercion or undue influence or force at the instance of the respondents 4 and 5. On the date of

registration, the collusion of the Sub Registrar with the respondents 4 and 5 though can be overruled in the context of Registration Act, but cannot be decided either by the District Registrar or by the High Court in a writ proceeding. The petitioner has to establish those allegations either before the Criminal Court of Law, wherein trial is pending or before the Civil Court of Law, if any suit for declaration has been instituted for the purpose of declaring the documents as null and void.

39. Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908, was inserted by the Tamil Nadu Act No.41 of 2022 with effect from 16.08.2022 conferring the power on the Registrar/Registering Authority to cancel the documents made in contravention of Section 22-A or Section 22-B of the Registration Act, 1908. In order to cancel the document under Section 77-A of the Act, the Authority Competent has to conduct summary proceedings and such summary proceedings are to be conducted within the ambit and scope of the Registration Act, 1908 and the Authorities under the Registration Act, is not empowered to travel beyond the scope of the Act or usurp the power of the Civil Court of Law or Criminal Court of Law for the purpose of determining the allegations regarding fraud, coercion, force etc.

40. Fraud apparent, if any, found is to be considered by the Authority under Section 77-A of the Act. The fraud apparent means procedural violations or fraud in the context of Sections 32 to 35 of the Act, alone are to be considered. The procedures under the Act are comprehensive in nature and in the event of any impersonation or fraud in the matter of registration during the process of registering of a document, the Authority is empowered to cancel the document by invoking Section 77-A of the Act.

41. Fraud in common parlance cannot be brought within the meaning of Section 77-A of the Act. Adopting the principles of purposive interpretation, fraud in the context of the provisions of the Registration Act, is to be narrowed down by having regard to the intention of Legislature for inserting Section 77-A of the Act, for cancellation of registered documents in certain cases.

42. In the event of expanding the scope of Section 77-A of the Act or conferring the power to cancel the documents on wider perspective, the Registering Authority and the Appellate Authority would be exercising

the powers of the Civil Court and Criminal Court, which is impermissible and not intended by the Legislature while inserting Section 77-A of the Act or Sections 22-A and 22-B of the Act.

43. Legislative intention behind the insertion of Sections 77-A, 22-A and 22-B of the Registration Act, 1908, is to ensure that the fraud or impersonation committed in the context of the Registration Act has to be eliminated. The District Registrar is empowered to cancel the document by conducting summary proceeding. Such a proceeding is not comparable with the trial proceeding. Thus the legislative intention can be called out to understand that the summary proceedings are contemplated only to identify fraud or impersonation within the ambit of the Registration Act and certainly not in common parlance. Thus, a distinction is to be drawn between cancellation of a registered document under Section 77-A of the Registration Act and to declare the registered document as null and void through Competent Civil Court of Law.

44. Understanding the difference between summary proceedings and trial natured proceedings for the relief of cancellation of

document and declaration of the document as null and void, this Court is of the considered opinion that even if the documents are cancelled under Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908, the parties may approach the Civil Court of Law for the purpose of establishing their civil rights with reference to the transfer of property title or otherwise. Thus the cancellation of documents under the Registration Act, will not preclude a person from approaching the Civil Court for the purpose of establishing their grievances, if any exists in respect of certain transactions relating to the documents registered.

45. In the case of **Veena Singh vs. Collector [(2022) 7 SCC 1]**, Three Judges Bench of the Apex Court of India elaborately considered the meaning of the word 'Execution'. The expressions 'Registration' and 'Execution' have been distinguished by the Apex Court through definitions and based on the judicial pronouncements.

46. In the present case, registration has been admittedly completed between the parties. In respect of the execution, the Apex Court in the case of **Veena Singh** (cited supra), considered the meaning as

'Execution' of a document is something different from mere signing of the document. The term 'Execution' is not defined. The ordinary meaning of executing a document is signing it as a consenting party thereto. Execution of the document means that the executant must have signed or put his thumb mark/impression, only after the contents stated in the document have been fully read by the executant before he put his signature thereon. Mere admission of the initial by the executant would not tantamount to an admission of execution of the document.

47. In the present case, the parties to the disputed document had allowed the Registering Authority to complete the process of registration. Presuming that the petitioner has not admitted execution of the document verbally and registered a police complaint on the next day of registration, the coercion, force, undue influence or otherwise must be established in the manner known to law either before the Competent Civil Court of Law or the Criminal Court of Law, as the case may be. Contrarily, the Registering Authority cannot be allowed to cancel the registered document on such allegations, which all are to be adjudicated through trial natured proceedings. In other words, the District Registrar has not been

vested with the power of the Civil Court of Law, so as to conduct an elaborate adjudication on these allegations.

48. The difference between summary proceedings and trial proceedings, fraud and impersonation in the context of Registration Act and in common parlance must be understood in the right perspective and with reference to the legislative intention. The District Registrars are not expected to exceed their powers conferred under Section 77-A of the Act for limited purpose of cancelling the documents, if the allegations of fraud or impersonation are found in the context of Sections 32 to 35 of the Registration Act, 1908.

49. In respect of the case on hand, it is unambiguous that the petitioner herein allowed the Registering Authority to complete the process of registration in all respects. He has registered criminal complaint on the next day by stating that he was kidnapped and forcibly taken to the Office of the Sub Registrar at Thiruporur and made to sign the Cancellation Deed to cancel the Sale Agreement. Such an allegation raised by the writ petitioner is undoubtedly beyond the scope of the process of registration made by the

Sub Registrar under the provisions of the Act. The criminal case registered by the petitioner is pending and he has to pursue his remedy before the Competent Criminal Court of Law.

50. The impugned orders are passed well within the ambit of Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908. The Authorities have rightly exercised restraint from interfering with the registered document, which is otherwise registered by following the procedures as contemplated. Thus, this Court has to arrive an inevitable conclusion that the order impugned is in consonance with the provisions of the Act.

51. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also dismissed.

27-07-2023

Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Speaking order/Non-Speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
Svn

To

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Mylapore,
Chennai-600 004.

2.The District Registrar (Administration),
Chengalpattu District,
Chengalpattu-603 002.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Thiruporur,
No.29, South Mada Street,
Thiruporur-603 110.

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Svn

WP 20682 of 2023

27-07-2023