



W.P.No.27943 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos.29986 of 2017 & 5074 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 17.10.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

W.P.No.27943 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos.29986 of 2017 & 5074 of 2018

M.Pandarinathan

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. The District Registrar,
Thiruvannamalai Registration District,
Thiruvannamalai.

2. The Sub-Registrar,
Mangalam Sub-Registrar Office,
Thiruvannamalai District.

3. M.Durai

.. Respondents

(R3 impleaded vide order dated 04.10.2023
in C.M.P.No.32582 of 2017)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the entire records of 1st respondent in connection with the impugned order passed by her in A.P.No.01/2011 dated 13.10.2017 and to quash the same and further direct the first respondents 1 & 2 to furnish the documents requested by the petitioner.



W.P.No.27943 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos.29986 of 2017 & 5074 of 2018

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Venkatraman

For Respondents : Mr.V.Veluchamy,
Additional Govt. Pleader for R1 and R2

Mr.G.Sumitra for Mr.V.Prakash Babu for

R3

ORDER

The writ petitioner has challenged the order passed by the first respondent refusing to furnish the documents sought for by the petitioner.

2 Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, learned Additional Government Pleader for R1 and R2 submitted that now the respondents 1 and 2 are ready to furnish the particulars sought for by the petitioner.

3 It is seen that even in the counter filed by the first respondent, at paragraph no.3, it is stated as follows:

“There is no prohibition to issue the copy of the Sale Deed which is under appeal and hence the impugned order dated 13.10.2017 of the then 1st respondent is not in accordance with any law. The petitioner is entitled to get the copy of Sale Deed



W.P.No.27943 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos.29986 of 2017 & 5074 of 2018

WEB COPY

and this respondent is ready to issue the copy of Sale Deed to the petitioner.”

4 In view of the above, since the first respondent, who passed the impugned order himself admitted that the refusal order is not in accordance with any law, the impugned order is quashed and the respondents are directed to furnish the copy of the documents requested by the petitioner and pass orders in accordance with law after giving opportunity to all the interested parties.

5 In the result, the writ petition stands allowed.
Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

17.10.2023

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
cgi

To

1. The District Registrar,
Thiruvannamalai Registration District, Thiruvannamalai.
2. The Sub-Registrar, Mangalam Sub-Registrar Office,
Thiruvannamalai District.

3/4



WEB COPY



W.P.No.27943 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos.29986 of 2017 & 5074 of 2018

P.VELMURUGAN, J.,

cgi

W.P.No.27943 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos.29986 of 2017 & 5074 of 2018

17.10.2023