



WEB COPY



W.P.No.43532 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 14.11.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.43532 of 2025

Rajamanickam

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Sub Registrar
Rasipuram

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the respondent in RFL/Rasipuram/483/2025 dated 29.10.2025 and quash the same and thereby direct the respondent to accept the settlement deed executed in favour of petitioner dated 29.10.2025 by the father and sister of the petitioner

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Suresh

For Respondent : Mr.Stalin Abhimanyu, AGP



W.P.No.43532 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 29.10.2025 passed by the respondent.

2. Mr.Stalin Abimanyu, learned Additional Government Pleader, takes notice on behalf of the respondent.

3. By consent of the parties, the main writ petitions have been taken up for disposal in the admission stage itself.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that in this case, the settlement deed dated 29.10.2025 was executed in favour of the petitioner by his father and 3 sisters. When the said settlement deed was presented for the purpose of registration, the same was rejected by the respondent since there was some discrepancies in the name of the petitioner's grandfather.



W.P.No.43532 of 2025

5. Further, he would submit that the original name of petitioner's grandfather was “Karuppa Konar, however, people used to call him as Sakkarai Konar” and hence, to avoid any confusion, the petitioner had stated both the names as “Kaurppa Konar @ Sakkarai Konar” in the settlement deed. However, in the Aadhar card of the petitioner's grandfather, the name was mentioned only as “Karuppa Konar”. Under these circumstances, the settlement deed was rejected by the respondent on the aforesaid aspect.

6. In reply, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents would submit that the petitioner's settlement deed was rejected by the respondent by stating that the name of his grandfather mentioned in the settlement deed does not match with the name mentioned in the Aadhar card. Hence, he requests this Court to pass appropriate orders.

7. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents and also



W.P.No.43532 of 2025

perused the entire materials available on record.

WEB COPY

8. In the case on hand, the settlement deed dated 29.10.2025 was executed in favour of the petitioner by his father and 3 sisters. When the said settlement deed was presented for the purpose of registration, the same was rejected by the respondent since there was some discrepancies in the name of the petitioner's grandfather.

9. According to the petitioner, as per the official records, the petitioner's grandfather's name was “Karuppa Konar”, however, people used to call him as “Sakkarai Konar”. In such case, to avoid any confusion, the legal heir certificate was obtained by the petitioner's father, wherein, the grandfather's name was mentioned as “Karuppa Konar @ Sakkarai Konar”. In the settlement deed also, the said name was mentioned in the very same manner, i.e., as “Karuppa Konar @ Sakkarai Konar”. However, in the Aadhar card, the grandfather's name was mentioned only as “Karuppa Konar”. Under these circumstances, the petitioner's settlement deed was rejected by the respondent by stating that the name of his grandfather mentioned in the settlement deed does not



W.P.No.43532 of 2025

match with the name mentioned in the Aadhar card.

WEB COPY

10. In view of the above, it is very clear that Karuppa Konar and Sakkarai Konar are the names of very same person. Further, the original name of the petitioner's grandfather was mentioned in all the documents, viz., Aadhar card, legal heir certificate and settlement deed. When such being the case, reason assigned by the respondent for the rejection of registration on the aspect that no Aadhar Card was issued in the name of “Karuppa Konar @ Sakkarai Konar” is not acceptable. Hence, this Court is of the view that the impugned refusal order is liable to be set aside.

11. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 29.10.2025 is hereby set aside. The respondent is directed to register the settlement deed, executed in favour of the petitioner, immediately upon re-presentation of the same.

12. With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No cost.

14.11.2025

5/7



W.P.No.43532 of 2025

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

To

The Sub Registrar
Rasipuram



WEB COPY



W.P.No.43532 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.No.43532 of 2025

14.11.2025