



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.11.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

and

W.M.P.(MD)No.22831 of 2024

R.Muthukumaravel

... Petitioner

/Vs./

1. The District Registrar
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar.

2. The Sub Registrar
Sattur Sub Registration Office,
Virudhunagar District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned Refusal Check Slip issued by the 2nd respondent in RFL/Sattur/20/2024 dated 23.10.2024 and quash the same as illegal and unconstitutional and consequently directing the respondents to forthwith register the power deed dated 23.10.2024 presented by the petitioner in respect of 38 plots in Survey Nos. 98/1, 98/2A1, 98/3A and 105/1A situated at O.Mettupatti Village. Sattur Taluk. Virudhunagar District.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vinothkumar

For Respondents : Mr.D.Sadiq Raja

Additional Government Pleader



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed for challenging the order passed by the second respondent dated 23.10.2024, thereby refused to register the power of attorney document, dated 23.10.2024 in respect of 38 plots in Survey Nos. 98/1, 98/2A1, 98/3A and 105/1A situated at O.Mettupatti Village, Sattur Taluk, Virudhunagar District, on the ground that the petitioner failed to produce settlement title deed.

2. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

3. The petitioner's father owned in Survey Nos.56/5,98/2, 591, 851, 587 and house property in Door No.2-57C situated at O.Mettupatti Village, Sattur Taluk. Thereafter, the petitioner's mother purchased various properties comprised in Survey Nos.98/3A1, 105/1A3 and 105/1A1 situated at O.Mettupatti Village, Sattur Taluk, dated 11.09.1973 registered sale deed vide document No.2512/1973. After demise of his parents, the petitioner and his sisters have derived all the properties.



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

Thereafter, they had partitioned the properties by way of registered partition deed. Thereafter, the petitioner's sisters by name, Mahalakshmi and Tamilarasi had jointly executed a release deed in favour of the petitioner vide registered document No.6270/2009 dated 08.07.2009. Subsequently, the petitioner had plotted the subject property into 38 house plots as per the approved layout. Thereafter, the petitioner in order to develop the subject property had executed a power of attorney in favour of one Jaiganesh and presented for registered. However, it was refused to register the power deed on the ground that the petitioner failed to produce original partition deed executed in favour of the petitioner's father vide document No.2310/1966 and the original sale deed stand in the name of the petitioner's mother registered document No.2512/1973 and the release deed executed in favour of the petitioner dated 08.07.2009.

4. However, the petitioner produced the certified copy of the document. On the other hand, the second respondent is refused to register the power of attorney document.



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

WEB COPY

5. This issue has been dealt with by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court recently in **WA.No.1160 of 2024** by judgment dated **27.09.2024**. The relevant portion of the judgment is extracted hereunder:-

“7. The law relating to transfer of immovable property is governed by the substantial enactment namely, The Transfer of Property Act, 1882. The right to hold property and the right to be not deprived of property without reasonable compensation is a constitutional right ensured under Article 300A of the Constitution of India. Being a constitutional right, it is one step superior to even the fundamental rights, as there cannot be a reasonable restriction on the said right and no one can be deprived of the property without reasonable compensation. The right to hold the property also takes in its fold the right to deal with the property. No doubt, the second proviso to rule 55-A of the Tamil Nadu Registration Rules mandates that the original of the antecedent document should be produced to enable registration of a subsequent instrument. Of course, a way-out is provided namely, the production of non traceability certificate from the police department. We should also be conscious of the fact that any certificate from any Government department, as of today, comes only at a price for an ordinary citizen. An elaborate procedure has also been fixed for issuance of non traceability certificate. We have come across several instances where,



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

because of the high pricing of and the complicated procedure involved in obtaining a non traceability certificate, instances of people obtaining non traceability certificate from the neighbouring States has increased.

8. The fundamental principle of law relating to transfer of immovable property is caveat emptor. A buyer of the property is required to be careful in not purchasing certain properties which are already encumbered or from person who does not have title. Even if a person sells a property that does not belong to him, there is no provision in the Registration Act, 1908, to enable the Registrar to refuse registration except Section 22-A and Section 22-B, which have been introduced recently in the year 2022 by the State Legislature insofar as Tamil Nadu is concerned. Even Section 22-A and Section 22-B do not authorise refusal of registration on the ground that the original of the prior's title deed has not been produced. We are unable to resist observing that Rule 55-A has been stealthily introduced as a subordinate legislation only to enable Registrars refuse to register instruments indiscriminately. Neither Section 22-A nor Section 22-B authorise a Registrar to refuse to register instruments on the grounds specified under Rule 55-A. No doubt, Mr.Ramanlaal falls back on the power of Superintendence conferred on the Chief Controlling Revenue Authority and the District Registrars under Section 68 of the Registration Act, 1908. Section 68 reads as follows:



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

“68. Power of Registrar to superintend and control Sub-Registrars.

(1) Every Sub-Registrar shall 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.”

9. The power conferred under Section 68 of the Registration Act, 1908, is only a supervisory jurisdiction and it invests the power in the Registrars to issue any order consistent with the Act. As we already observed, the provision of Section 55-A inserted in the rules has no statutory authority. Section 69 of the Registration Act 1908, enables the Inspector General to make rules providing for the matters that are set out in Clauses (a) to (h). The provision namely, Section 69 further provides that the rule so framed shall be consistent with the provisions of the Act. Therefore, the rules made by the Inspector General of Registration exercising the power under Section 69 cannot override the provisions of the Act. Rule 162 of the Registration Rules prescribes the circumstances under which a Registrar can refuse to register an instrument. Clause 20 has been added to Rule 162 to enable the Registrar to refuse registration, if the presentant does not produce the original deed or record specified in Rule 55A. We do not propose to delve into the validity or otherwise



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

of the rule, but we must record that prima facie, the rule overreaches the legislation and it is beyond the powers of the Inspector General of Registration under Section 69.

10. Adverting to the facts on hand, the document that is sought to be registered is a release deed executed by the sister in favour of the brother. The document recites that the property belonged to the father. The parties are not strangers to each other. They have produced registration copies of the antecedent documents which are registered in the very same office. Unless the Registrar has a doubt regarding the genuineness of the copies issued by his own office, insistence on production of originals is a superfluous exercise. As we had already stated, it is a common knowledge and accepted phenomena today that one cannot secure a certificate from a Government office without the price. In such situation, driving executant of documents to obtain a non traceability certificate in case of lost document in every case, will result only in encouraging under hand dealings. When certified copies have been produced and it is not impossible for the Sub Registrar to have it verified with the original record that is available in his own office, insisting upon a non traceability certificate appears to be rather a wasteful exercise. Even in Punithavathy's case referred to supra, we have observed that the Registrars will not refuse registration particularly, when the parties to the documents are relatives and they take the risk of obtaining the document without examining the title. The copies of the documents have already



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

been produced. The Sub Registrar could have verified the same with the original records in his office and register the instrument without dogmatically refusing registration.”

6. In view of the above, the case is squarely applicable in the case on hand. Hence, the check slip issued by the second respondent in RFL/Sattur/20/2024, dated 23.10.2024, is liable to be quashed and accordingly, quashed. The petitioner is directed to re-present the power of attorney document for registration. On receipt of the same, the second respondent is directed to register the document and release the same forthwith.

7. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

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

12.11.2024



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

TO:-

1. The District Registrar
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar.
2. The Sub Registrar
Sattur Sub Registration Office,
Virudhunagar District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

LS

Order made in
W.P.(MD)No.26953 of 2024

Dated:
12.11.2024