



Suchitra

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.441/2025

HAIMISH REALTY PVT.
LTD. REP BY ITS AUTH
SIGNATORY MR ASHISH
DNYANESHWAR MAHAJAN

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THROUGH
ITS SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

... RESPONDENTS

Mr V. A. Lawande with Mr P. Redkar, Advocates for the Petitioner.
Ms Sapna Mordekar, AGA for the State.

**CORAM: SARANG V. KOTWAL &
ASHISH S. CHAVAN, JJ.**

DATED: 27th NOVEMBER 2025

P.C.:

1. The Petitioner is aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the Civil Registrar cum Sub-Registrar, Bardez in not registering the Petitioner's sale deed in respect of Survey No.237/7 of Village Assagao, which is described in detail at page 60 of the present petition.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner is entitled to get the sale deed registered. The Petitioner had taken all the steps by submitting the necessary documents online in the month of May, 2025 itself. He was given Token No.202500026082 and appointment was given for

26.05.2025. When the Petitioner approached the office of the Sub-Registrar, the authority declined to register the sale deed. Learned counsel for the Petitioner invited our attention to one of the exhibits annexed to this Petition, which is the pre-registration docket, printed on 26.05.2025 at 3.04 p.m. There is a handwritten endorsement on the top mentioning “*prohibit found*”. Below that there is another endorsement “*reverted*”. The Petitioner was told that his sale deed could not be registered because there was a “*prohibit*” found and therefore the endorsement was put that it was reverted and the same was required to be clarified. The Petitioner is aggrieved by this inaction and refusal on the part of the Sub-Registrar.

3. The learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for Respondent No.1 – State of Goa and Respondent No.2 – Civil Registrar cum Sub-Registrar submitted that the Sub-Registrar had not refused to register the sale deed but the Petitioner was asked to come after some time because the Sub-Registrar wanted to verify the position in respect of the information received by him regarding the “*prohibit*”. She further submitted that the validity of the uploaded document is four months from the date of approval of the draft. That period is already over.

4. In response to this submission, learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner has again uploaded the documents today at 1.30 p.m. and he has been given Token No.202500062241. On the said token number the sale deed is re-uploaded.

5. Learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2 makes a statement on instructions that on this occasion, the Sub-Registrar shall process the Petitioner's request for registration of the sale deed by ignoring the previous endorsement "*prohibit found*". The statement is recorded and accepted. In view of this statement, no further orders need be passed in the present petition. It is expected that the process of approval is completed by the Sub-Registrar as expeditiously as possible and not later than ten days from today. If there is further ground for either of the parties to approach the Court or take out appropriate proceedings, they are at liberty to do so.

6. With the above observations, the Petition is disposed of.

ASHISH S. CHAVAN, J.

SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.