



W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 23.09.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

**W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023
and
W.M.P(MD).No.24411 of 2023**

Jannath thaha

... Petitioner

Vs.,

- 1.The Inspector General of Registration,
O/o.The Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhom Highway,
Chennai 600 028.
- 2.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
O/o.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Madurai, Madurai District.
- 3.The District Registrar,
O/o.The District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District.
- 4.The Sub Registrar,
Joint II Sub Registrar Office,
Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District.
- 5.Kathijathul Sabura Banu

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned



W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023

letter No.23824/44/2023 dated 27.07.2023 of the first respondent to quash the same as unconstitutional and consequently direct to the first respondent to entertain the appeal filed by the petitioner on 23.06.2023 by challenging order of the second respondent in Na.Ka.No.8682/44/2022 dated 28.09.2022 in accordance with law, within time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balamurugapandi

For Respondents : Mr.M.Siddharthan(for R1 to R4)
Additional Government Pleader
Mr.J.Barathan (for R5)

ORDER

Challenge has been made against the order restraining further encumbrance of the subject property based on the Doc.No.152 of 2016.

2. The petitioner is the wife of one Mohamed Dawood, who has executed a settlement deed during his lifetime in favour of his son, namely, Mohamed Yaseen on 25.01.2016 in Doc.No.152/2016. After the death of said Mohamed Dawood, the fifth respondent, who is the second wife of Mohamed Dawood, gave a complaint before the District Registrar seeking cancellation of the said settlement deed. The District Registrar has declined to pass any order cancelling the document. Against which, appeal has been preferred before the Deputy



W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023

Inspector General of Registration. The said appeal was allowed vide order dated 28.09.2022 in Na.Ka.No.8682/ஆ4/2022 restraining the further alienation of the subject property based on the Doc.No.152/2016. Challenging the same, this writ petition has been filed.

3. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

4. A perusal of the impugned order it shows that there is no foundation facts are established and merely on the sake of allegation raised by some of the parties, such order has been passed. Hence, the said order cannot be sustained in the eye of law. That apart, the registering authority has no power to go into title issue and also cancelled the document already registered. This aspect has been elaborately dealt in the case of **Satya Pal Anand vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and others** reported in (2016) 10 SCC 767, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that 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



W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023

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 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



WEB COPY

based on the judgment of the Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in the case of YanalaMalleshwari v. AnanthulaSayamma, 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



WEB COPY

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



W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023

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.”

5. In view of the above, the impugned order passed by the second respondent in Na.Ka.No.8682/௮4/2022 dated 28.09.2022 is hereby quashed.

6. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is allowed. The parties are at liberty to workout their remedy before the competent civil Court. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

23.09.2024

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Rmk



WEB COPY



W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

Rmk

To

- 1.The Inspector General of Registration,
O/o.The Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhom Highway,
Chennai 600 028.
- 2.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
O/o.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Madurai, Madurai District.
- 3.The District Registrar,
O/o.The District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District.
- 4.The Sub Registrar,
Joint II Sub Registrar Office,
Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District.

W.P(MD).No.28349 of 2023

23.09.2024