



WEB COPY



WP.No.34035 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.04.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

WP.No.34035 of 2022

P.Suganthi

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Sub Registrar,
Ponneri Registrar Office
Chennai – 601 204

.. 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 Refusal Check Slip in Refusal Number in RFL/Ponneri/41/2022 dated 06.12.2022 and to quash the same as illegal and incompetent and consequently direct the respondent to register the settlement deed dated 09.11.2022 executed in favour of one D.Prakasam, S/o.Dhanapal without insisting on production of the original parent document in respect of the subject property.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Jayaprakash

For Respondent : Mr.P.Anandha Kumar
Government Advocate

ORDER

This writ petition is filed to quash the Refusal Check Slip in Refusal Number:RFL/Ponneri/41/2022 dated 06.12.2022 and consequently direct the respondent to register the same without insisting for production of original



WP.No.34035 of 2022

parent document.

WEB COPY

2. It is the grievance of the writ petitioner that when the settlement deed was presented for registration, the respondent refused to register the same on the ground that as per the circular of the first respondent, the originals were not produced.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

4. I have perused entire records. This Court in **Federal Bank Vs. Sub Registrar and two others** in **W.P.No.2759 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



WEB COPY

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 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.”

5. Considering the above and also of the fact the circular cannot override the statutory right and substantive provisions of law, the respondent cannot refuse the registration of the document citing non production of original. They can very well verify the certified copies available with them.

6. Such view of the matter, the refusal check slip issued by the respondent is set aside. The respondent is directed to register the settlement deed dated 09.11.2022 without insisting the production of originals within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.



WEB COPY



WP.No.34035 of 2022

N. SATHISH KUMAR, J.

7. With the above directions, this Writ Petition stands allowed. No costs.

18.04.2024

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

To,

The Sub Registrar,
Ponneri Registrar Office
Chennai – 601 204

W.P.No.34035 of 2022