



W.P(MD)No.22389 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.09.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

W.P(MD)No.22389 of 2024

and

W.M.P(MD)No.18970 of 2024

Barathy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.

2.The Sub Registrar,
Valliyoor,
Tirunelveli District.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Parasala,
Neyyattinkarai Taluk,
Thiruvananthapuram District,
Kerala State.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Valliyoor Police Station,
Valliyoor, Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned check slip dated 19.06.2024 and quash the same and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to register the petitioner's



W.P(MD)No.22389 of 2024

settlement deed dated 19.06.2024 which was executed by the petitioner in favour of her son S. Karthick.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Sasi Kumar
For R1 to R3 : Mr.C.Satheesh,
Government Advocate
For R4 : Mr.M.Vaikkam Karunanithi
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

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

2.Challenge has been made to the refusal check slip issued by the 2nd respondent dated 19.06.2024.

3.According to the petitioner, she had purchased the property in Survey No.1783/1 to an extent of 1 acre 30 cents situated at North Valliyoor Village, from one Chellammal through her power agent, namely, Gopal Pillai through a registered sale deed dated 16.04.1994. From the date of purchase she is in possession and enjoyment of the property in question. In such circumstances, she has executed a settlement deed in favour of his son, namely, S.Karthick on 19.06.2024 in respect of the property in question. When she



presented the same for registration, it was refused by the 2nd respondent, vide refusal check slip dated 19.06.2024, on the ground that original document has not been produced. Therefore, challenging the same, the petitioner has filed this Writ Petition.

4.The issue raised in this Writ Petition is no longer *res-integra*, in view of the judgment rendered by this Court in the case of ***Subramani vs. the Sub Registrar and others*** [WP.No.11056 of 2024, dated 26.04.2024], in which it has been held as follows:

“c. With regard to the refusal on the absence of parent document, this Court in the case of K.S. Vijayendran v. The Inspector General of Registration reported in (2011) 2 LW 648, Lakshmi Ammal v. The Sub Registrar, Villivakkam reported in 2015 SCC OnLine Mad 5868 and C. Moorthy v. Sub Registrar Aruppukottai reported in 2018 SCC OnLine Mad 3898, it was held that absence of a parent document is no ground to refuse registration. Pursuant to these judgments, sub-rule XX was introduced in Rule 162 authorizing the Sub-Registrar to refuse registration for non-production of the original title deed as required by Rule 55-A. This Court in the case of Federal Bank v Sub-Registrar, reported in 2023 2 CTC 289 has held that Sub-Rule XX of Rule 162 has no statutory backing. The said order has been followed by a Division Bench of this Court in the case of M. Ariyanatchi v Inspector General made in W.A.(MD).No. 856 of 2023, dated 27.06.2023, wherein, Division Bench of this Court has held that, for instance, the original document is held by one co-owner, the Sub-Registrar can always take an undertaking or a declaration in the form of an affidavit from the vendors to the effect that the original document is with the said person and register the document. Hence, the Sub-Registrar cannot refuse to register a document merely because the original parent deed has not been produced.



W.P(MD)No.22389 of 2024

Considering the above settled position of law, the Registrar cannot refuse to register the document merely on the ground of non production of parent document.”

5.In such view of the matter, the refusal made by the 2nd respondent on the ground that original document has not been produced, cannot be sustained in the eye of law. Therefore, the same is liable to be quashed, accordingly, it is quashed. This Writ Petition is allowed with a direction to the 2nd respondent to register the document presented by the petitioner, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

20.09.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Yuva



W.P(MD)No.22389 of 2024

To

1. The District Registrar,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
2. The Sub Registrar,
Valliyoor,
Tirunelveli District.
3. The Sub Registrar,
Parasala,
Neyyattinkarai Taluk,
Thiruvananthapuram District,
Kerala Strate.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Valliyoor Police Station,
Valliyoor,
Tirunelveli District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.22389 of 2024

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J

Yuva

W.P(MD)No.22389 of 2024

20.09.2024