



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 19.08.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

W.P.(MD) No.21715 2022

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.15879, 15880, 17466 and 22375 of 2022

B.Baskaran

...Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Sub Collector/Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

2.The District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

3.The Joint Sub Registrar II,
District Registrar Office,
Vadikarar Street, Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

4.Ramachandran
5.Ganesa Moorthy
6.Indirani

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned forgery deed of

1/10



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

relinquishment deed in Document No. 1867/1970 dated 06.07.1970 on the file of the 3rd respondent based on the purported order issued by the R1 in R.Dis.DKT.315/78 dated 14.07.1969, executed between Kasinathan and Sethuraja, the parents of R4, R5 and R6 respectively and all other connected subsequent documents registered pertaining to S.Nos. 204/4 to an extent of 2 Acres and 8 Cents and quash the same as illegal, improper, unconstitutional and arbitrary and consequently direct the 2nd and 3rd respondents not to entertain any document for registration in respect of the property comprised in S.No.204/4A and 204/4B situated at Soorankottai Village, Ramanathapuram Taluk and District.

For Petitioner	: Mr.R.Murugan
For R1 to R3	: Mr.P.Subbaraj Special Government Pleader
For R5	: Mr.M.S.Jeyakarthick

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the relinquishment deed in Document No. 1867/1970 dated 06.07.1970 on the file of the 3rd respondent and all other connected subsequent documents registered pertaining to S.Nos. 204/4 to an extent of 2 Acres and 8 Cents and to direct the 2nd and 3rd respondents not to entertain any document for registration in respect of that property.



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 to 3, learned counsel for the fifth respondent and perused the materials available on record.

3. The contention of the petitioner is that the property comprised in S.No.204/4 to an extent of 1 acre and 77 cents was originally belonged to the Government under the Abolition of Zamindari System and the same was converted as private property illegally to one Sethuraja. Based on the same, the said Sethuraja had executed a relinquishment deed on 06.07.1970 in favour of his brother. Thereafter, several transactions were made by virtue of the forged relinquishment deed. Hence, the petitioner made a representation to the authorities concerned to cancel the said forged documents. Since the same was not considered, the petitioner has filed this writ petition.

4. At the outset, this Court is of the view that the relief sought for by the petitioner for cancellation of documents, is not at all maintainable for the simple reason that the Registering Authority has no



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

power to cancel any registered document. The question whether there is any forgery or fraud, has to be seen only in a proper manner before the competent civil Court by adducing evidence. Merely on presumption and assumption, the document cannot be assailed.

5.It is the contention of the petitioner that the title of the property relating to the year claimed by the petitioner is not available with the revenue department. Therefore, according to him, the documents based on which the private respondents are claiming right over the property are forged. It is to be noted that removing of a document in the revenue department is not new. Missing of records can happen at any time, according to the convenience of the authorities.

6.Such view of the matter, whether there is forgery of title or not, is a matter of evidence that has to be seen by the competent civil Court and not by the Registrar and the Registering Authority has no power to go into all these transactions. In this regard, in *Satya Pal Anand vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and others* reported in (2016) 10 SCC 767, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that power conferred on



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

the Registrar by virtue of Section 68 cannot be invoked to cancel the registration of the document already registered. Sections 22-A and 22-B were inserted by Tamil Nadu Act 28 of 2022 and Act 41 of 2022 respectively to prevent registration of certain category of the documents. Thereafter, Section 77-A has been brought by Act 41 of 2022 to cancel the document registered in contravention of Sections 22-A and 22-B not beyond it. Now Section 77-A of the Registration Act, 1908 also is struck down by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in W.P.No.10291 of 2022 batch as unconditional. Such being the position, this Court is of the definite view that the title cannot be decided by the Registering Authorities. These facts have been discussed by this Court in **W.P.No. 29706 of 2022 [G.Rajasulochana Vs. Inspector General of Registration and others]** and the Order in the writ petition is as follows:

“... 3. It is relevant to note that the object of the law of registration is to provide public notice of the transaction embodied therein. The execution of documents and its validity, the right created or extinguished is governed by the substantive law namely the Transfer of Property Act, 1882. The provisions contained in the Registration Act, 1908 relates to the factum of registration alone. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of State of Rajasthan v. Basant Nahata, (2005) 12 SCC 77 has held



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

as follows:

“The Act only strikes at the documents and not at the transactions. The whole aim of the Act is to govern documents and not the transactions embodied therein. Thereby only the notice of the public is drawn.”

4. The practice has been developed in the recent past in Tamil Nadu to entertain the applications given by the so-called affected parties to cancel all the documents under the pretext of either forgery or fraudulent transactions. The Inspector General of Registration, Government of Tamil Nadu has brought out Circular No.67 dated 03.11.2021 to deal with the fraudulent registrations through impersonation. The said circular is mainly based on the judgment of the Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in the case of Yanala Malleshwari v. Ananthula Sayamma, reported in AIR 2007 AP 57. However, the three bench of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Satya Pal Anand v. State of M.P., reported in (2016) 10 SCC 767 has held that the power of the Registrar, under the Registration Act, is purely administrative and not quasi-judicial. The same is extracted hereunder:

“34. The role of the Sub-Registrar (Registration) stands discharged, once the document is registered (see Raja Mohammad Amir Ahmad Khan [State of U.P. v. Raja Mohammad Amir Ahmad Khan, AIR 1961 SC 787]). Section 17 of the 1908 Act deals with documents which require compulsory registration. Extinguishment deed is one such document referred to in Section 17(1)(b). Section 18 of the same Act deals with documents,



registration whereof is optional. Section 20 of the Act deals with documents containing interlineations, blanks, erasures or alterations. Section 21 provides for description of property and maps or plans and Section 22 deals with the description of houses and land by reference to government maps and surveys. There is no express provision in the 1908 Act which empowers the Registrar to recall such registration. The fact whether the document was properly presented for registration cannot be reopened by the Registrar after its registration. The power to cancel the registration is a substantive matter. In absence of any express provision in that behalf, it is not open to assume that the Sub-Registrar (Registration) would be competent to cancel the registration of the documents in question. Similarly, the power of the Inspector General is limited to do superintendence of Registration Offices and make rules in that behalf. Even the Inspector General has no power to cancel the registration of any document which has already been registered.”

5. In fact, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that and in the absence of any express power to cancel the registered document, the Registrar has no power to cancel the document. Section 68(2) of the Registration Act, 1908 relied upon by the Registration Department to substantiate the circular in this regard, when carefully seen. Section 68(2) of the Registration Act, 1908 reads as follows:

“68. Power of Registration to superintend and control Sub Registrars.

(1) every Sub Registrar perform the duties of his office under the



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

superintendence and control of the Registrar in whose district the office of such Sub Registrar is situate.

(2) Every Registrar shall have authority to issue (Whether on complaint or otherwise) any order consistent with this Act which he considers necessary in respect of any act or omission of any Sub Registrar subordinate to him or in respect of the rectification of any error regarding the book or the office in which any document has been registered.”

6. The above provision makes it clear that the said section confers power upon the Registrar to supervise and control all the acts of the Sub-Registrar. Sub-Section 2 empowers the Registrar to issue any order consistent with the Act, which he considers necessary in respect of any act or omission of any Sub-Registrar subordinate to him. Similarly, the Registrar shall also have power in respect of the rectification of any error regarding the book or the office in which any document has been registered. The above power empowering the Registrar to issue any order is a power of superintendence and supervision and not a power vested to cancel the registration of the document. Therefore, relying upon Section 68(2) of the Registration Act, 1908 and issuing such circular cannot be valid in the eye of law. Unless a specific power and express provision is made in the Act empowering the Registrar to cancel the document, such powers cannot be conferred by the Inspector General of Registration by taking aid of 68(2) of the Registration Act, 1908.”



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

7. In view of the above settled position of law, there cannot be any direction to take action on the complaint of the petitioner and to cancel the registered documents. All these facts cannot be looked into by this Court and the same has to be agitated before the civil Court.

8. With the above observations, this Writ Petition is dismissed. It is for the petitioner to work out his remedy before the competent civil Court. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

19.08.2024

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

ta

To:

1.The Sub Collector/Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram District, Ramanathapuram.

2.The District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

3.The Joint Sub Registrar II,
District Registrar Office,
Vadikarar Street, Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

9/10



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

ta

W.P.(MD) No.21715 of 2022

19.08.2024