



WEB COPY



W.P.No.23206 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.06.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD

W.P.No.23206 of 2018

Sharada

...Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Sub-Registrar,
Office of the Sub-Registrar,
Periyanaickenpalayam,
SRKV Post,
Coimbatore District – 641 020.

2.The Tamil Nadu Waqf Board,
No.1, Jabber Sirang Street,
Vallalseethakkadhi Nagar,
Chennai – 600 001.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a direction in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, directing the first respondent to register the sale agreement dated 17.07.2018 without insisting on No Objection Certificate from the second respondent in respect of 2432 Sq.ft., in S.F.No.308/2A and 308/2D Thudiyalur Village, Coimbatore Taluk, Coimbatore District and pass such further orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Vivekanandan
for Mr.B.Ravi



W.P.No.23206 of 2018

WEB COPY

3. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner entered into an agreement of Sale with one Udhayshankar on 17/07/2018 in respect of Plot No. 3 measuring 2,432 sq.ft. in S. No. 308/2A, Thudiyalur Village. When the petitioner presented the agreement for registration, it was returned with a note that the property and subject matter of the agreement belong to the second respondent and hence NOC should be obtained from them. The petitioner informed the first respondent that the property is not Wakf property as held by the competent Civil Court. She also submitted copies of the judgments in O.S.No.1009 of 1960 on the file of DMC Coimbatore, A.S.No.95 of 1979 before the Sub Court, Coimbatore and S.A.No.1410 of 1972 of this Court. In spite of the same, the respondents are insisting on obtaining No Objection Certificate from Tamil Nadu Waqf Board. Moreover, the petitioner has purchased the property from Easwara Cooperative Society to whose lands in S.Nos.307/1, 290/2A, 291/1, 307/1A, 65, 66, 308/2, 309/1 of Thudiyalur Revenue Village were assigned to her vendor Society by the Government. Therefore, the present writ petition is filed before this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner drew the attention of this



W.P.No.23206 of 2018

Court to the order passed by this Court in ***W.P.No.34738 of 2022 dated***

18.06.2024, D.Ramesh Vs. The Inspector General of Registration, 100,

Santhome High Road, Raja Annamalaipuram, Chennai – 600 028, which

held as follows:

“8. It is relevant to note that those suits are filed after the advent of the Waqf Act, 1995, and constitution of the Waqf Tribunal. Only in view of the specific bar contained in the Waqf Act, 1995, the suit filed before the Civil Court were transferred to the Waqf Tribunal. Whereas, in the present case, the suit has been filed much before the constitution of the Waqf Tribunal under the Waqf Act, 1995. It is not the case that the Waqf Board was not a party to the proceeding. The Waqf board was a defendant in O.S. No. 1009 of 1960, wherein the Civil Court has declared that the property is not a Waqf property. No contra material has been placed before the Court and to show that judgment has not reached finality. Whereas, other suit in O.S. No. 1346 of 1967 filed in respect of the same property, wherein findings are also recorded that the property is not a Waqf property and that suit has also reached finality upto the second appeal before this Court. Therefore, once the rights of the parties have been conclusively determined by the Civil Court and reached finality, this Court is of the view that mere citing of letter, the concluded matter cannot reopened. If such things are allowed to continue, there will be no end for the conclusiveness reached among the parties. Before this Court also no material has been placed to establish that the



W.P.No.23206 of 2018

property is Waqf property. Whereas, the Civil Court conclusively decided the rights in the year 1967, which is before the constitution of the Waqf Tribunal.

9. It is also relevant to note that before the constitution of the Waqf Tribunal, the dispute were decided before the Civil Court. Such was the scenario, the matter cannot be reopened by mere objection letter before the authorities, who are performing duties relate to registration of documents. It is also to be noted that in the enquiry report dated 27.11.2020 after perusing all the judgments of the Civil Court and documents produced by the parties, the Sub-Registrar has recorded the finding to the effect that the property in Survey Nos. 269/2, 270 and 271/1 is not Waqf property. Having found that fact on the basis of records, the rejection of registration merely citing the objection letter issued by the Waqf Board cannot be sustained in the eye of law. Accordingly, the impugned refusal slip stands quashed and the 3rd respondent is directed to register the document presented by the petitioner in respect of the property within a period of one week.”

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

6. Taking into above factual matrix of the case and the ratio laid down by this Court in *W.P.No.34738 of 2022 dated 18.06.2024*, the



W.P.No.23206 of 2018

first respondent is directed to register the sale agreement dated 17.07.2018, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

In the result, the **writ petition stands disposed of with the above observation and direction.** No costs.

28.06.2024

cda

Index : Yes/No

Speaking / Non-Speaking Order

To

1.The Sub-Registrar,
Office of the Sub-Registrar,
Periyanaickenpalayam,
SRKV Post,
Coimbatore District – 641 020.

2.The Tamil Nadu Waqf Board,
No.1, Jabber Sirang Street,
Vallalseethakkadhi Nagar,
Chennai – 600 001.

W.P.No.23206 of 2018