



WEB COPY



W.P. No.9616 of 2019

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. DHANDAPANI

W.P. No.9616 of 2019

Ganesh

Petitioner

Vs

1. The Inspector General Registration
Mylapore, Chennai.

2.The District Registrar
Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District.

3.The Sub Registrar
Shoolagiri, Krishnagiri District

4.Krishnaveni

5.Vanaja

6.Sivarani

Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to consider the petitioner representation dated 07.01.2019 to cancel the documents such as Release Deed executed by the 4th respondent dated 07.12.2018 bearing Document No.5908/2018 in favour of 5th and 6th respondent and Sale



W.P. No.9616 of 2019

Agreement dated 10.12.2018 in favour one Ramamurthy and others registered as Document No.5951/2018 on the file of 3rd respondent executed by the respondents 5 and 6 with regard lands in Survey Nos.55/1, 55/3, 55/4 56/2B2, 57/1D, 57/1C1, 57/1C2, 57/1A2, 57/2B, 57/2C1, 57/2A and 4/2 of Thiagarasanapalli Village, Shoolagiri Taluk.

For petitioner : Mr.K. Thiruvengadam

For respondents : Mr. R. Sasikumar

Govt. Advocate for R1 to R3

Mr. V. Nicholas for R4 to R6

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents 1 to 3 to consider the petitioner's representation dated 07.01.2019 to cancel the documents such as Release Deed executed by the 4th respondent dated 07.12.2018 bearing Document No.5908/2018 in favour of 5th and 6th respondent and Sale Agreement dated 10.12.2018 in favour of one Ramamurthy and others registered as Document No.5951/2018 on the file of 3rd respondent executed by the respondents 5 and 6 with regard lands in Survey Nos.55/1, 55/3, 55/4 56/2B2, 57/1D, 57/1C1, 57/1C2, 57/1A2, 57/2B, 57/2C1, 57/2A and 4/2 of Thiagarasanapalli Village, Shoolagiri Taluk.

2. Short facts :-

The properties comprised in the survey numbers mentioned supra are ancestral properties of the petitioner's grandfather, which subsequently devolved upon the petitioner's father, who thereafter executed a settlement



W.P. No.9616 of 2019

deed dated 04.09.2013 registered as document No.3418 of 2013 on the file of

SRO, Shoolagiri in favour of the petitioner and his brother. Thereafter, they obtained individual patta and as such they are in possession and enjoyment of the same. When that be so, the respondents 4 to 6 without any rights intended to grab the petitioner's properties and they have created encumbrances over the petitioner's land in collusion with the 3rd respondent. In turn, the 3rd respondent had registered a Release Deed executed by the 4th respondent dated 07.12.2018 bearing document No.5908 of 2018 in favour of the 5th and 6th respondents. It is the grievance of the petitioner that the 3rd respondent without application of mind and verifying the revenue records and without any proper documents mechanically in collusion with the respondents 4 to 6 created and registered bogus documents with an intention to grab the petitioner's properties. Under such circumstances, the petitioner has submitted a representation to the respondents 1 to 3 to cancel the above two documents executed by the respondents 4 to 6 as per the relevant provisions of Registration Act. But till date, neither any action taken nor his representation was considered. Therefore, this writ petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner commenced his arguments by submitting that the writ petition contains two limbs of prayer, one relating to the validity of the impugned document and the other seeking consequential reliefs.



W.P. No.9616 of 2019

4. When, this Court posed a query as to the provision of law under which the 3rd respondent was empowered to cancel the document in question, learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submitted that liberty may be granted to the petitioner to work out the remedy before the competent Civil Court seeking cancellation of the document executed by the 4th respondent in favour of the 5th and 6th respondents, in the manner known to law and directions may be issued in that regard.

5. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that the relief sought for cancellation of the document executed by the 4th respondent in favour of the 5th and 6th respondents involves disputed questions of fact, which cannot be gone into under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent Civil Court for appropriate relief in accordance with law. No costs.

19.11.2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
vsi2

4/6



W.P. No.9616 of 2019

To

1. The Inspector General Registration
Mylapore, Chennai.

2. The District Registrar
Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District.

3. The Sub Registrar
Shoolagiri, Krishnagiri District



WEB COPY



W.P. No.9616 of 2019

M. DHANDAPANI, J.

vsi2

W.P. No.9616 of 2019

19.11.2025