



WEB COPY



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 17.10.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.39531 of 2025

K.C.Dharman

...

Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Inspector General of
Registration,
100, Santhome High Road,
Chennai-600028.

2. The Sub Registrar,
Officer of Sub-Registrar,
Arcot.

...

Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus to direct the 2nd respondent to register the bilateral revocation of settlement deed dated 04.10.2025 bearing T.P.No/235343461/2025 within the time stipulated by this Court.



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.Jagadheesan M

For Respondents : Mr.Abishek Murthy (R1 and R2)
Government Advocate
Mr.M.Vijayan
for M/s.King and Patrige
(for objector)

ORDER

Mr.Abishek Murthy, learned Government Advocate takes notice for the respondents. With consent, the main writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission.

2. This Writ Petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the 2nd respondent to register the bilateral revocation of Settlement Deed dated 04.10.2025 bearing T.P.No/235343461/2025 within the time stipulated by this Court.

3. The facts giving rise to the writ petition, in a nutshell are as follows:

(i) The petitioner submits that the lands comprised in S.No.355/1B1 measuring to an extent of 83 cents and 355/1A measuring to an extent of 6 cents situated at Keelminnal Village, Walajah Taluk,



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

WEB COPY

Kancheepuram Taluk was originally owned and possessed by his mother viz., Mrs.Valliammal by virtue of registered sale deed dated 02.02.1975 vide Doc.No.306 of 1975, registered on the file of the 2nd respondent. The Petitioner father namely Chinnaraju Gounder had predeceased his mother. The said Valliammal had sold the subject property in favour of one Mrs.Padma vide registered Sale Deed dated 21.02.2014. While so, without noticing the sale made by his mother, the petitioner executed a Settlement Deed in favour of his son on 23.01.2014. The subsequent purchaser has sold the property to and in favour of Priya Lakshmi and Preethi Lakshmi vide Sale Deed dated 27.03.2025. Thereupon, the subsequent purchaser has called upon the petitioner to initiate steps to revoke Settlement Deed dated 23.01.2014 which was registered without any valid title. Thereafter, the petitioner presented a bilateral revocation of Settlement Deed dated 04.10.2025 before the 2nd respondent, by clearly stating that earlier Settlement Deed has been registered without possessing any valid rights. But the said Authority refused to entertain the bilateral revocation of Settlement Deed for registration by adducing untenable reasons. Hence, this petition.



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that since the petitioner himself voluntarily sought for revocation of Settlement Deed dated 04.10.2025, bilaterally not unilaterally there is no impediment for the 2nd to register the bilateral revocation of Settlement Deed dated 04.10.2025.

5. Mr.Vijayan, learned counsel appearing for the objector would submit that partition suit has been filed by the petitioner with respect to the subject property and the same is pending. Further, he would submit that in the said partition suit, the petitioner has taken a stand that Sale Deed executed by his mother on 21.02.2014 is null and void as the subject properties were purchased out of the proceeds of the joint family income. On the other hand, he filed this Writ Petition for revocation of the Settlement Deed executed by him and therefore any order passed in this Writ Petition, will have the bearing in the Partition Suit. Therefore, he would submit that in case this Court is inclined to direct the 2nd respondent to register the revocation of Settlement Deed,



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

the same can be subject to the outcome of the partition suit.

WEB COPY

6. In reply, the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that since the objector is a party to the suit, he has every right to raise all the issues in the partition suit including the validity of Sale Deed executed by the petitioner's mother dated 21.02.2014 and therefore the same is always be subject to the outcome of the Partition Suit.

7. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, on instructions would submit that in case the petitioner presents the revocation of the Settlement Deed executed by the Settlor and Settlee bilaterally before the 2nd respondent, the 2nd respondent has no objection to register the same, if it is otherwise in order.

8. Heard both sides. Perused the records.

9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and upon



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

the submissions made, this Court directs the 2nd respondent to register the Bilateral Revocation of Settlement Deed dated 04.10.2025, if it is presented for registration both by the Settlor and the Settlee, forthwith, if it is otherwise in order. It is made clear that if any transaction with respect to the subject property is under challenge in the partition suit, it will be always subject to the outcome of the said suit.

10. With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

17.10.2025

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



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

WEB COPY To

1. The Inspector General of
Registration,
100, Santhome High Road,
Chennai-600028.
2. The Sub Registrar,
Officer of Sub-Registrar,
Arcot.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.39531 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

arr

W.P.No.39531 of 2025

17.10.2025



WEB COPY



W.P.No.39531 of 2025