



WEB COPY



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.07.2024

CORAM :
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD

Writ Petition No.20949 of 2018

U.Deivanayagam

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chief Controlling Revenue Authority-cum-
Inspector General of Registration,
Santhome High Road,
Mylapore,
Chennai – 600 004.

2.The District Registrar,
Registration Department,
Chengalpet.

3.The Joint II Sub-Registrar,
Office of Sub Registrar,
Chengalpet.

4.M/s.Mahindra Residential Developers Ltd.,
a Company registered under the Companies Act
having office at Administrative Block, Central Avenue,
Mahindra World City, Natham Sub (PO),
Chengalpet Taluk,
Kancheepuram – 603 004.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India,
praying for issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 3



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

herein to refund the sum of Rs.2,74,487/- paid towards Stamp Duty for the Lease Deed dated 08.07.2016 and registered as Document No.6943/2016 in the office of the third respondent herein to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Govi Ganesan

For Respondents : Mr.K.Surendran,
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this petition to direct the respondents 1 to 3 herein to refund the sum of Rs.2,74,487/- paid towards Stamp Duty of the Lease Deed dated 08.07.2016 and registered as Document No.6943/2016 in the office of the third respondent herein to the petitioner.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the fourth respondent viz., Mahindra Residential Developers Limited is duly approved as a SEZ Co-Developer vide letter of Approval dated 25.04.2008 issued by the Board of Approval, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Department of Commerce, (SEZ Section) Government of India and is developing residential facilities in the Non-Processing Area of the Special Economic Zone, Mahindra World City, Chengalpet. The authorized activities of the fourth respondent is to



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

develop residential facilities in the notified SEZ lands. As a Co-Developer, the fourth respondent is required to adhere to the terms of the letter of approval issued to them and also the Special Economic Zones Act, 2005 (SEZ Act) and the Special Economic Zones Rules, 2006 (SEZ Rules) and other applicable laws.

2.1. The SEZ comprises of “Processing Area” where the industries are setup/located for activities being the manufacture of goods or services and the area exclusively for trading or warehousing purposes and the “Non-Processing Area” where social, residential and other non-industrial infrastructure are created either by the Developer or a Co-Developer. This being so, the petitioner herein has taken a residential apartment premises in IRIS Court Project bearing Unit No.F415, Unit Type 2BHK, in Fourth Floor in Block Name “F” admeasuring about 685 sq.ft. of Carpet area, corresponding to 761 sq.ft. of built up area, corresponding to 1008 sq.ft. of saleable area together with undivided share of land of 362.88 sq.ft out of total land area 46245.91 square feet at S.F.Nos.98 (Part), 97/3 (Part), 96/2 (Part), 114/2 (Part), 114/1 (Part), 113/1 (Part), 112/1 (part), 116/1 (Part), situate at Paranur Village, Chengalpattu Taluk, Kancheepuram District , on lease basis




W.P.No.20949 of 2018

from the fourth respondent, for which a lease deed dated 08.07.2016 was also executed in favour of the petitioner and the same was duly presented for registration before the third respondent on 08.07.2016. But, the same was not registered and kept in pending, due to audit objections vide AG's (Accountant General) remarks, which refers to non-compliance with instruction No.18 dated 02.07.2009 and instruction No.65 dated 27.10.2010 issued by the Ministry of Commerce.

2.2. Since the lease deed was needed for urgent purpose, the petitioner has paid the Stamp Duty of Rs.2,74,487/- under protest with an express undertaking that he would be entitled to seek refund of stamp duty from the department. Thereafter, the third respondent herein registered the said lease deed as Doc.No.6943/2016 and released the document. At this juncture, this Court in W.P.No.211/2016 dated 20.07.2016, has passed an order holding that an individual is entitled for exemption from paying stamp duty, when the land is not for a sale but only for the purpose of leasing out to the employees of SEZ.

2.3. Citing the above, the petitioner made a representation dated



<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

*The Joint II Sub-Registrar,
Registration Department,
Chengalpattu.*

Dear Sir,

*Sub: Payment of stamp duty under protest for the
residential unit in SEZ Zone.*

*Ref: Lease Deed going to be registered in your office
by Mahindra Integrated Township limited (Lessor-SEZ
Co-Developer) in favour of: Mr.U.Deivanayagam for
the unit No.F415 in Project-IRISCOURT.*

*Mahindra Integrated Township limited (Lessor-SEZ Co-
Developer) is going to register a Lease Deed in favour of
Jmr.U.Deivanayagam for the unit No.F415 in Project-IRIS
Court situated in Special Economic Zone Mahindra World City
Chengalpattu. For the total consideration Rs.34,31,088/-
(including club house & other charges).*

*We understand that our lease deed document is not chargeable
to stamp duty as per the provisions of the Indian Stamp Act as
amended pursuant to Sec.57 of the Special Economic Zones Act
which is evident from the registrations done in the past by the
SEZ Developer in favour of the Lessees.*

*We also understand that of lat lease deed presented for
registration are kept pending in view of certain audit remarks
based on instruction Nos.18 and 65.*

*In this regard, one of our customer (Lessee) filed a Writ Petition
No.211/2016 in High Court, Madras and the said Writ Petition
was admitted on 06.01.2016 and notice has been ordered to the
Registration Department.*

The Co-Developer (MITL) will also be taking steps to file a new



WEB COPY



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

writ petition upon knowing the outcome.

We learn that the orders would be passed in the said writ petition filed by the SEZ Co-Developer only after the counter is filed by the Registration Department and the Writ Petition is fully heard by the High Court. I/We understand that the judicial proceedings will take its own time.

Since we need the lease deed document for certain urgent purposes, we hereby agree to pay the stamp duty of Rs.2,74,487/- under protest with an express understanding that we would be entitled to seek refund of stamp duty from the Department in the event High Court passes favorable orders in the WP No.211/2016 filed by the said customer or in the writ petition proposed to be filed by SEZ Co-Developer seeking stamp duty exemption in respect of lease deeds executed by the SEZ Co-Developer.

We would therefore kindly request you to accept the payment of stamp duty being paid by us under protest and register and release the lease deed.

The receipt of this letter may kindly be acknowledged by your office.

Thanking you,

yours faithfully,

Signature of customers

DD copy of for 8% of total consideration is Rs.2,74,487/-

Rs.2,74,487/- towards stamp duty being paid under protest.

Copy to: Mahindra Integrated Township Limited.



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

5. The lease deed dated 08.07.2016 was registered as Doc.No.6943 of 2016 on the file of the Joint II Sub-Registrar, Office of Sub Registrar, Chengalpet/third respondent and the stamp duty of a sum of Rs.2,74,487/- was paid on the same day i.e.,08.07.2016 under protest.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner further drew the attention of this Court to the order passed in W.P.No.211 of 2016 dated 20.07.2016 and W.A.Nos.1940 & 2058 of 2019, preferred against the aforesaid order dated 20.07.2016 passed in W.P.No.211 of 2016.

7. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

8. At this juncture, it is pertinent to extract the relevant paragraphs of the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.211 of 2016 dated 20.07.2016 and the same reads as follows:

“18. According to the learned Additional Advocate General, as per Rule 11 (10) of SEZ Rules, no vacant land in the non-processing area shall be leased for business and social purposes. As per Rule 11 (10) of SEZ Rules, the developer or



WEB COPY



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

co-developer shall lease out the completed housing facilities not only for the management and office staff but also for the workers of the special economic zones. According to the learned Additional Advocate General, Rule 11 (10) of SEZ Rules was inserted by virtue of an amendment dated 03.02.2009 so as to clarify the intention of the Government that the land, buildings etc., falling outside the notified SEZ will not be eligible for exemption from stamp duty. Further, sale of SEZ land to units or other persons or entitles is not allowed. This was communicated by way of an executive instruction No.65 dated 27.10.2010 to reiterate the purpose for which the housing units inside the SEZ area are to be used. In other words, according to the learned Additional Advocate General, the Circular No.65 has been issued as an extract and supplement to the amendment brought to the statutory provision and it cannot be said that the Circular has been issued contrary to and in derogation of the SEZ Act and Rules. This submission of the learned Additional Advocate General does not merit acceptance. The petitioner has obtained the lease deed from the fourth respondent only with an intention to lease it out or rent it out to the employees of the SEZ. It is not the petitioner who is intending to enjoy the infrastructural amenity provided within the non-processing area. What is prohibited is that the land or building within the non-processing area should not be sold to outsiders. When it is not a sale and the intention of the petitioner is only to lease out the land situate within the non-processing area, there is no prohibition or embargo for the petitioner to get the lease deed executed in her favour and also to get exemption from payment



WEB COPY



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

of stamp duty.

19. For all the reasons mentioned supra, the impugned order of the first respondent dated 17.11.2015, confirming the order dated 04.06.2015 of the second respondent are set aside. The writ petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently Connected Miscellaneous petitions are closed. The third respondent is directed to register the lease deed dated 06.04.2015 presented by the petitioner within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

9. The relevant paragraphs of the judgment passed by this Court in W.A.Nos.1940 & 2058 of 2019, preferred against the aforesaid order dated 20.07.2016 passed in W.P.No.211 of 2016 are extracted hereunder:

“11. Concedingly, the lessee has not utilised the property for any purposes, contrary to the purposes of the Special Economic Zones Act,2005. It is not even the case of the Appellants-State before us or it was so before the learned Single Judge either. So long as the lease or any other conveyance attracting Stamp Duty is within the specified geographical limits of the Special Economic Zone, we fail to understand as to why Section 3 (3) of the Indian Stamp Act,1899, will not stand attracted. The Stamp Duty is payable on the Conveyance Deed and not on the nature of User, to which the property is sought to be put.

12. In view of the admitted facts before us that the property in question is admittedly located within the Non-processing zone of the Special Economic Zone in question, the



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

learned Single Judge, in our considered opinion, was perfectly justified in upholding the exemption in favour of the writ petitioners. Therefore, we find no merit in these Appeals and they are liable to be dismissed.

10. The above case is squarely applicable to the case and the petitioner is also entitled for exemption from paying the stamp duty in view of the above Division Bench order of this Court.

11. The petitioner is entitled for refund of the stamp duty paid by him in view of the above order passed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.1940 & 2058 of 2019 which has granted exemption from payment of the stamp duty. This apart, the petitioner has paid the stamp duty under protest which is evident from the letter dated 08.07.2016 addressed to the Joint Sub-Registrar II, Registration Department, Chengalpattu and the lease deed was registered on 08.07.2016, after making the payment under protest. On these two grounds, the petitioner is entitled for refund of stamp duty.

12. In view of the ratio laid down by this Court in W.P.No.211 of



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

2016 dated 20.07.2016 and W.A.Nos.1940 & 2058 of 2019 dated 22.07.2019, this Court directs the respondents 1 to 3 to refund a sum of Rs.2,74,487/- paid by the petitioner towards stamp duty for the lease deed vide Doc.No.6943/2016 dated 08.07.2016, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

13. This writ petition is allowed with the aforesaid observation and direction. No costs.

03.07.2024

vm

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD,J.

vm

To:

1.The Chief Controlling Revenue Authority-cum-
Inspector General of Registration,
Santhome High Road,
Mylapore,

Page No.12 of 13



W.P.No.20949 of 2018

Chennai – 600 004.

2. The District Registrar,
Registration Department,
Chengalpet.

3. The Joint II Sub-Registrar,
Office of Sub Registrar,
Chengalpet.

4. M/s. Mahindra Residential Developers Ltd.,
a Company registered under the Companies Act
having office at Administrative Block, Central Avenue,
Mahindra World City, Natham Sub (PO),
Chengalpet Taluk,
Kancheepuram – 603 004.

W.P.No.20949 of 2018

03.07.2024