



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 04.09.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022
and W.M.P.(MD)Nos.18664 & 18666 of 2022

Soosai Hentris Mary @ Hentris

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar (Administration),
Deputy Inspector General Rank, Tirunelveli.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Cheranmahadevi, Tirunelveli District.

3.The Tahsildar,
Radhapuram Taluk,
Tirunelveli District.

4.The Sub Registrar,
Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District.

5.Pandidurai

.... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order issued by the 1st respondent by his proceedings dated 09.08.2021 in Na.Ka.No. 6480/E2/ 2020 and quash the same.



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Kannan
For Respondents : Mr.P.Subbaraj,
Spl. Govt. Pleader for R1 to R4
Mr.T.Selvan for R5

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order issued by the 1st respondent by his proceedings dated 09.08.2021 in Na.Ka.No. 6480/E2/ 2020 and quash the same.

2. It is the case of the Writ Petitioner that the subject property belonged to the petitioner's sister and she executed a settlement deed in favour of the petitioner on 29.01.2018. While so, the 5th respondent has given a complaint stating that the petitioner's sister fraudulently obtained patta and sold out the property to the petitioner and hence, sought for deletion of the said entry from the encumbrance certificate. Based on the said complaint, the impugned order has been passed holding that the document executed in favour of the writ petitioner was impersonated. Challenging the same, the petitioner has filed this Writ Petition.



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the 5th respondent has not sought for any declaration that the document executed in favour of the writ petitioner was impersonated. However, the first respondent has passed the impugned order holding that the document executed in favour of the petitioner was impersonated. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be quashed.

4. The respondents have not filed their counter affidavit.

5. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 to 4 submitted that after perusing the title deed, the first respondent has given such a finding and therefore, there is no interference is required in the impugned order.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 to 4 and the learned counsel appearing for the fifth respondent and perused the materials available on record.



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

7. On a perusal of the impugned order, it is seen that the very order itself is clear non-application of mind and without any evidence of forgery, the first respondent has passed the impugned order holding that the document executed in favour of the petitioner was impersonated. The first respondent, just comparing two title deeds, has given a finding that subsequent title deed has been forged and he has not even understood what is for forgery and imperfect. Merely if a document is produced later for the same survey number, the said document cannot be construed as a forged one and the forgery will come into effect when there is a creation of false records. In such view of the matter, as a matter of right, the document cannot be cancelled. Further, the registering authorities have no power to go into all the transactions. 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 the power conferred on 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



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

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 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 YanalaMalleswari v. AnanthulaSayamma, reported in AIR 2007 AP 57. However, the three bench of Hon'ble Apex Court in the



WEB COPY

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 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



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

powers cannot be conferred by the Inspector General of Registration by taking aid of 68(2) of the Registration Act, 1908.”

WEB COPY

8. In view of the above settled position of law, this Court is of the view that all these facts cannot be looked into by authorities and the same has to be agitated before the civil Court. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be quashed.

9. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 09.08.2021 passed by the first respondent stands quashed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

04.09.2024

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
vsm



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The District Registrar (Administration),
Deputy Inspector General Rank, Tirunelveli.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Cheranmahadevi, Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Radhapuram Taluk,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Sub Registrar,
Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

vsm

W.P.(MD)No.24591 of 2022

04.09.2024