

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**  
**WRIT PETITION NO.8411 OF 2025**  
**WITH**  
**WRIT PETITION NO. 8412 OF 2025**

Grand Centrum Realty LLP  
a Limited Liability Partnership registered  
under the provisions of the Limited Liability  
Partnership Act, 2008, and having  
its registered address at Plot No.1,  
Lokmanya Colony Commercial Complex,  
Pandharpur Road, Sangli- 416410,  
Miraj, Maharashtra,  
Through its designated Partner,  
Kishor Prabhakar Patwardhan  
Vs.

.....Petitioner

1. The State of Maharashtra  
Through the Government Pleader,  
High Court, Bombay.
2. The Sub-Registrar of Assurances-1, Jat,  
District – Sangli, having his office at  
New Administrative Building, Tehsil Aavar,  
Jat, Miraj, Sangli – 416410.

.....Respondents

Mr. Prerak Sharma, for the Petitioner in both Petitions.  
Mr. R. S. Pawar, AGP for the Respondents in WP-8411/2025.  
Ms. M. S. Bane, AGP for the Respondents in WP-8412/2025.

**CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE &**  
**DR. NEELA GOKHALE, JJ.**

**RESERVED ON : 2<sup>nd</sup> JULY 2025.**

**PRONOUNCED ON : 4<sup>th</sup> JULY 2025.**

**Judgment :- (Per Dr. Neela Gokhale, J.)**

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. With the consent of all the parties, heard finally. Both the Petitions involve the same question of law on identical facts and hence both the Petitions are being disposed by this Judgment and Order.

2. This Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India assails orders dated 16<sup>th</sup> June 2025 passed by the Respondent No.2- Sub-Registrar of Assurances-I, Jat, District -Sangli, bearing Outward No. Document registration/ 162/2025 & 163/2025 and also seeks a direction to the Respondent No.2 to register **Sale Deed and Agreements for Sale**, both dated 6<sup>th</sup> March 2018 executed by and between the Petitioner and Vidhyarthi Sahayak Mandal, Sangli, under the provisions of the Registration Act of 1908.

3. The Petitioner's case is that a trust namely Vidhyarthi Sahayak Mandal, Sangli desirous of selling its properties sought permission of the Joint Charity Commissioner, Kolhapur Region, Kolhapur to transfer its properties to the Petitioner by making an Application No.103/2017, under the provisions of the Maharashtra

Public Trusts Act, 1950. The Joint Charity Commissioner by its order dated 31<sup>st</sup> January 2018 allowed the Application and granted permission to the trust to alienate its properties to the Petitioner herein.

4. Pursuant to the said order, certain legal proceedings ensued, initiated by parties having adverse interest and a series of Writ Petitions were filed and pending before this Court. By order dated 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018, this Court in one of the Writ Petitions had directed that till the next date, the trust shall not execute any deed of conveyance in favour of the newly impleaded parties in those Petitions. According to the Petitioner, however, the **Sale Deed and** Agreements for Sale was already executed by and between the parties on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2018. Because of the litigation pending before this Court, **the said Sale Deed and Agreement for Sale** were not lodged for registration with the Respondent No.2. On 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025, this Court dismissed the Writ Petitions pending before it and the Ad-interim relief as above was vacated. In these circumstances, the Petitioner presented **the said Sale Deed and Agreement for Sale** for registration, before the Respondent No.2 on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2025. In the meantime, on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2025, the

Petitioner deposited the necessary stamp duty with the Collector of Stamps, Sangli pursuant to the order of adjudication dated 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2019 passed by the Competent Authority. The necessary endorsement under Section 41 of the Maharashtra Stamp Act, 1958 was made by the Collector of Stamps on the said documents.

5. However, the Respondent No.2 refused to register **the said Sale Deed and Agreement for Sale** presented to him for registration on the ground that under Section 23 of the Registration Act of 1908, the statutory time for presenting documents for registration is four months from the date of its execution. Since the documents sought to be registered were executed on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2018 and presented on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2025, the Registrar had no power to register the said documents beyond the prescribed period as mandated by law. It is this order of 16<sup>th</sup> June 2025 which is assailed by the Petitioner in the present Petitions.

6. **Mr. Prerak Sharma**, learned counsel appears for the Petitioner and Ms. M. S. Bane, learned AGP represents the State.

7. Heard both the counsels and perused the records with their assistance.

8. It is not in dispute that **the said Sale Deed and Agreement for Sale** were executed on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2018 and the same were presented on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2025 i.e. after a period of more than seven years after its execution. It is also undisputed that there were proceedings pending before this Court in respect of the Sale of the trust properties which were the subject matter of the **the said Sale Deed and Agreement for Sale**. There was also an interim order in one of the proceedings restraining the trust from alienating the subject properties, even though **the said Sale Deed and Agreement for Sale** were already executed on the date of the interim order. Nevertheless, by orders of this Court the said properties were prohibited from being alienated during the pendency of those proceedings.

9. Mr. Sharma, placed reliance on a decision of this Court in the matter of *Nestor Builders and Developers Private Limited and Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors.*<sup>1</sup> In paragraph Nos. 8 & 9 of the decision in *Nestor Builders (supra)*, this Court has discussed the provisions of Section 23, 23A, 25 and 26 of the Registration Act, 1908 and has concluded that a cumulative reading of the said provisions clearly demonstrates the intention of the legislature that if a document

---

1 2015 SCC Online Bom. 3480

in a given situation cannot be presented for registration within the period of four months prescribed under Section 23 of the Registration Act, 1908 then it can still be accepted for registration beyond the prescribed period. However, this would necessarily be from the delay on the part of the party presenting the document beyond the prescribed period was bonafide and not intentional and was on account of a genuine cause beyond the control of such a party. This Court also observed that a legal right accrued to a party to get a document registered as per the provisions of the Registration Act cannot stand defeated when reasons exists which are beyond the control of the party presenting the document for registration.

10. In the facts of the present case, admittedly the delay was purely attributable to the continued restraint order passed by a Court of law. The stay was vacated only on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025 after which immediately on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2025, the said documents were presented by the Petitioner before the Respondent No.2 for registration. The period between 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018 i.e. the date on which the restraint order was passed by this Court in respect of the said properties and 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025 must be excluded for the purpose of calculation of the period of limitation under the provisions of the Registration Act. Thus, the

entire period available for the Petitioner to present the documents for registration, excluding the period of existence of the restraint order, does not exceed a total period of four months. In these circumstances, the bonafide delay beyond the control of the Petitioner clearly not attributable to any intentional or deliberate act or negligence on the part of the Petitioner, would be required to be excluded in permitting the Petitioner to avail registration of the documents in question.

11. Considering the above discussion, we are of the considered view that the time taken during the pendency of the restraint order must be excluded while computing the period of limitation under the Registration Act. Thus, the orders assailed herein are quashed and set aside. The Respondent No.2 is directed to accept **the said Sale Deed and Agreement for Sale** both dated 6<sup>th</sup> March 2018 for registration under the provisions of Registration Act.

12. Rule is accordingly made absolute. There shall be no order as to costs.

13. All parties to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

(DR. NEELA GOKHALE, J.)

(REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.)