WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : **04.06.2024**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

WP.No.14137 of 2024 & WMP.No.15324 of 2024

Latha .. Petitioner

Versus

The Sub Registrar,
Veerapandi Sub Register Office, Salem District. .. Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the Impugned Refusal Check Slip No.RFL/Veerapandi/162/2023 dated 26.09.2023 of the respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to register the settlement deed dated 26.09.2023 which was presented by the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vijayaragavan

For Respondent : Mr.B.Vijay
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

With the consent of both sides, this Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

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

WEB COPY

2. This writ petition is filed to quash the impugned refusal Check Slip in No.RFL/Veerapandi/162/2023 dated 26.09.2023 of the respondent and consequently direct the respondent to register the settlement deed dated 26.09.2023 which was presented by the petitioner.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

3. The case of the writ petitioner is that at the time when the settlement deed dated 26.09.2023 executed in favour of the petitioner has been presented for registration, the same has not been registered on the ground that the parent document has not been produced at the time of registration. Hence, the present Writ Petition.

4. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondent would submit that the document has not been registered since neither the parent document nor any other document has been produced.

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

WEB COPY

5. I have perused entire records. This Court in **Federal Bank Vs. Sub Registrar and two others** in **W.P.No.2758 of 2023 dated 08.02.2023**, has held as follows :

> "22. Similarly, the second proviso requires the executant to produce a revenue record to show his "right over the subject property" where the property is ancestral in character and there is no original deed available. Even a tax receipt can be produced under this proviso which is opposed to the fundamental principle of law that revenue records are not documents of title [State of A.P. v Star Bone Mill and Fertilizer Company, 2013 9 SCC 319]. Production of revenue documents to verify the source of title only demonstrates complete ignorance of the settled position of law.
>
> 23. Similarly, the third proviso also defies logic. If the original is lost, it is not understood as to why a certified copy of that document obtained from the file of the concerned SRO cannot be produced. When the best evidence is not available, the best course is to produce a certified copy which is the next best available alternative. Instead, the third proviso requires the

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

WEB COPY

executant to obtain a non-traceable certificate and effect paper publication.

24. It is also well settled by the decision of the Supreme Court in J.K. Industries Ltd. v. Union of India, (2007) 13 SCC 673 that a subordinate legislation may be struck down as arbitrary or contrary to statute if it fails to take into account vital facts which expressly or by necessary implication are required to be taken into account by the statute or the Constitution. Furthermore, Rule 55-A is a delegated legislation which cannot go beyond the scope of the Parent Act viz., the Registration Act as well the Transfer of Property Act which is the substantive law governing the transfer of immovable properties. Hence, the first proviso is clearly ultra vires and unconstitutional.

25. In the case at hand, provisional attachment was passed by the G.S.T. authorities. The registration of the Sale Certificate was rejected for this reason. It is relevant to note that the petitioner was a prior mortgagee in the year 2017, whereas the provisional attachment was passed by the G.S.T. authorities on 18.12.2021. This order has already lapsed by operation of

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

WEB COPY

law. In this regard, it is useful to extract Sec.83 of The Central Goods and Service Tax Act, 2017 which reads as follows:

"83. Provisional attachment to protect revenue in certain cases:

(i) Where during the pendency of any proceedings under section 62 or section 63 or section 64 or section 67 or section 73 or section 74, the Commissioner is of the opinion that for the purpose of protecting the interest of the Government revenue, it is necessary so to do, he may, by order in writing attach provisionally any property, including bank account, belonging to the tax able person in such manner as may be prescribed.

(ii) Every such provisional attachment shall cease to have effect after the expiry of a period of one year from the date of the order made under subsection (1)."

26. In view of the above, as this Court has held that the first proviso to Rule 55-A has been found to be invalid and ultra vires, the respondent cannot refuse to register the document placing reliance on the aforesaid proviso.

27. Sec.83(2)of G.S.T.Rule makes it clear that every

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

WEB COPY

> such provisional attachment shall cease to have effect after the expiry of a period of one year from the date of the order made under sub-section (1). Therefore, provisional attachment made by the second respondent vide order dated 18.12.2021 has ceased to have effect, after expiry of a period of one year. There is no material to show any final order of attachment, or any subsequent order passed by the second respondent pursuant to the aforesaid order. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the impugned order dated 17.10.2022 is liable to be quashed."

Despite the above settled position of law, the settlement deed presented for registration has not been registered on the ground that parent document has not been produced. In view of the above the substantive provision of law, the respondent cannot refuse to register the document citing non production of parent document. They can very well verify the certified copies available with them.

7. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is allowed and the refusal check slip dated 26.09.2023 issued by the respondent is quashed. The second

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

WEB COPY

respondent is directed to register the Settlement Deed dated 26.09.2023 without insisting parent document within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

04.06.2024

vrc
Index :Yes/No
Internet :Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No

To,

The Sub Registrar,
Veerapandi Sub Register Office, Salem District.

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

WEB COPY

N. SATHISH KUMAR, J.

vrc

W.P.No.14137 of 2024

04.06.2024

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