

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT****DATED : 07.06.2023****CORAM:****THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE P.T.ASHA**W.P.(MD) No.5969 of 2020

A.Yasmin

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector General of Registration,  
Chennai-600 028.

2.The District Registrar,  
Dindigul.

3.The Sub Registrar,  
Nagalnayakanpatti,  
Dindigul District.

... Respondents

Prayer :- Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents herein to conduct an enquiry pursuant to the representations by the petitioner and the letter dated 05.06.2018 of the first respondent to the second respondent in respect of Document No.507 of 2018 and Document No.188 of 2018 on the file of the Sub Registrar, Nagalnayakanpatti, Dindigul District.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Mahadevan

For Respondents : Mr.T.Amjadkhan  
Government Advocate

**ORDER**

The above writ petition is filed seeking the issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondent to conduct an enquiry pursuant to the representation of the petitioner and the letter dated 05.06.2018 of the first respondent to the second respondent in respect of the document Nos.507 of 2018 and 188 of 2018 on the file of the Sub Registrar, Nagalnayakanpatti, Dindigul District.

2.The facts in brief are as follows:-

Several properties in Dindigul District belonged to the petitioner's parents and on their demise, the petitioner and her



siblings had entered into a partition deed on 12.01.2018, which was registered as document No.507 of 2018 on the file of the respondent herein. Under the deed, the properties belonging to the parents had been partitioned between the parties and each of the schedule of properties were described clearly by extent and boundaries. The document did not contain any addition or corrections. However, it is the case of the petitioner that after registration, when she obtained the copy of the document, she found that several corrections and addition have been made with pen in the document on several pages, which have not been countersigned by the parties. In the document itself, it was mentioned that there was no corrections. Therefore, the petitioner had made a representation asking the respondents to enquire into the same. There was, however, no response to her request. Therefore, the petitioner through a counsel, had made the representations on 09.04.2018, 13.06.2018 and 18.06.2018. On receipt of the said representations, the first respondent had, by the proceedings, dated 05.06.2018, calling upon the second respondent to consider the representations and take suitable action and file a report. This direction has, however, not been followed. While so, the third respondent vide letter, dated 11.06.2018 calling upon the petitioner and others to submit the rectification deed and get the same registered. However, no explanation has been called for or enquiry conducted. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court.

3. When the matter had come up on 27.04.2023, on the direction of this Court, the Assistant Sub Registrar, Nagalnayakkanpatti, Dindigul District had submitted the files along with the counter. The files contain the scanned copy of two documents, namely, the Family Partition deed bearing document No.507/2018 and the settlement deed bearing Registration No.188/2018. The scan has been done immediately after registration of the documents. It appears that even at the time of registration, there is an addition, which has been reflected in the pages. The small corrections have also been made in various other places in the documents. These corrections are also taken note of at foot of the document. Therefore, it is clear that the corrections have been made even before the registration.

4. That apart, it is informed by the learned Government Advocate that pursuant to the direction of the first respondent, the petitioner has herself submitted the Rectification Deed on 05.07.2018, which has been registered as Document No.3447/2020. It is also seen that the document in question is the partition deed, which has been signed not only by the petitioner, but by others as well. However, none siblings of the petitioner has raised dispute with regard to the above. Therefore, it is crystal clear that the petitioner has come forward with an absolutely false and baseless case. Therefore, writ petitioner is not



WEB COPY

WP(MD)



20

entitled to mandamus and accordingly, this Writ Pet: is  
dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS III)

// True Copy //

/07/2023

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

cp

To

1.The Inspector General of Registration,  
Chennai-600 028.

2.The District Registrar,  
Dindigul.

3.The Sub Registrar,  
Nagalnayakkanpatti,  
Dindigul District.

+1 CC to M/s.C.MAHADEVAN, Advocate ( SR-26749[F] dated  
08/06/2023 )

W.P. (MD) No.5969 of 2020

Dated: 07.06.2023

MK/08.07.2023 3P 5C