



WEB COPY



C.R.P. (PD) No.2600 of 2025

**THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

DATED: 28.08.2025

CORAM:

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI**

C.R.P. (PD) No.2600 of 2025

and

C.M.P. No.14739 of 2025

Jayanthi

... Petitioner

vs.

Pichapillai

... Respondent

**Prayer** : C.R.P. filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the fair and decretal order of the Principal District Munsif Court at Ariyalur, dated 28.10.2024 in I.A. No.2 of 2024 in O.S. No.83 of 2014.

For Petitioner : Mr.T. Deeraj

For Respondent : No appearance

-----  
**ORDER**

Heard Mr.T. Deeraj, learned counsel for the petitioner. Despite service of notice on the respondent, the respondent has neither appeared in person, nor through a counsel.

2. The petitioner is the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant in O.S. No.83 of 2014. An application in I.A. No.2 of 2020 was taken out to mark an unregistered



Sale Deed, dated 31.10.1988. The trial Court finding that the petitioner is attempting to establish title through the said document, proceeded to dismiss the application. Aggrieved by the said order, the present revision has been filed.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the said unregistered Sale Deed is sought to be marked as a document only in order to establish the factum of possession, more specifically the commencement of possession being with the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and subsequently with the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant. It is therefore the contention of Mr.T. Deeraj, learned counsel for the petitioner that the purpose for which the unregistered document is sought to be marked is only for collateral purpose. However, the trial Court has dismissed the application finding that admittedly the document is not a registered one as required under Section 17 of the Registration Act, and therefore, the petitioner cannot be permitted to mark the said unregistered Sale Deed.

4. The learned counsel also relies on the following decisions :

i) ***Bondar Singh and others vs. Nihal Singh and others reported in (2003) 4 SCC 161.***

ii) ***Ramamoorthy vs. 1. M.Shanmugam and 2 others reported in (2009) 6 CTC 609.***



iii) *Mayilu Ammal and another vs. Renganathan reported in*

WEB CO (2005) 5 CTC 424.


5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Bondar Singh's* case has categorically held that an unregistered Sale Deed can be looked into for ascertaining the nature of possession.

6. In *Ramamoorthy's* case also, this Court held that an unregistered conveyance deed can be looked into for ascertaining the nature of possession and also boundaries of property.

7. In *Mayilu Ammal's* case, as well, this Court relying on ratio laid down in *Bondar Singh's* case held that an unregistered and unstamped document can be looked into for collateral purpose viz., for finding out nature of possession of the suit property.

8. I have carefully considered the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner and I have also gone through the decisions on which reliance is placed on by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also taken me through the written statement filed in the said suit as well the application filed in



C.R.P. (PD) No.2600 of 2025

I.A. No.2 of 2020, wherein, it is specifically contended that the purpose

WEB COPY

of marking the said unregistered document is only to establish the date of commencement of possession with the defendants viz., the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant, father and subsequently with the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant. The trial Court without adverting its attention to the request made by the petitioner has merely proceeded to hold that Section 54 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 read with Section 17 of the Registration Act, 1908 requires the Sale Deed to be registered and duly stamped and in the instant case, the Sale Deed being unregistered as well as unstamped, cannot be permitted to be received as document.

10. The trial Court has lost sight of the fact that Section 49 permits a party to rely on even an unregistered document, as long as no right is sought to be established under the said document. Here, the specific case on which the application came to be filed was that the petitioner wanted to establish the commencement of possession being with the revision petitioner and incidentally the factum of possession being with the revision petitioner. It is certainly for a collateral purpose as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court. However at the same time, the document being unstamped, if at all the petitioner intends to rely on the same, he has to be prepared to pay necessary deficit stamp duty along



C.R.P. (PD) No.2600 of 2025

with penalty as applicable and subject to the same, the document shall be received and shall be looked into by the trial Court only for ascertaining the factum of the date on which, the possession came to be with the revision petitioner and not for any other purpose.

11. In the light of the above, the C.R.P. is allowed and order in I.A. No.2 of 2024, dated 28.10.2024 is set aside. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

28.08.2025

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

To  
The Principal District Munsif Court  
Ariyalur.

**P.B. BALAJI, J.**

vsi2



WEB COPY



C.R.P. (PD) No.2600 of 2025

C.R.P. (PD) No.2600 of 2025  
and  
C.M.P. No.14739 of 2025

28.08.2025