



W.P.(MD) No.3458 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.02.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

W.P.(MD)No.3458 of 2025

T.Rajan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Madurai District.

2. The Sub Registrar,
Sub Register Office,
Karuppayurani,
Madurai East,
Madurai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings issued by the 2nd respondent in refusal check slip Number:RFL/Karuppayurani/15/2025 dated 30.01.2025, quash the same and further direct the 2nd respondent to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner without insisting the original parental deed in Document No: 242/1999 dated 19.02.1999 and Document No: 372/1999 dated 01.03.1999 within a stipulated time that may be fixed by this Hon'ble Court.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.3458 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Bharathi

For Respondent 1 & 2 : Mr.R.Suresh Kumar

Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition is filed seeking to quash the impugned proceedings issued by the 2nd respondent in refusal check slip Number:RFL/Karuppayurani/15/2025 dated 30.01.2025 and consequently, to direct the 2nd respondent to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner without insisting the original parental deed in Document No: 242/1999 dated 19.02.1999 and Document No: 372/1999 dated 01.03.1999.

2. The petitioner claims that he is the owner of the property. Pursuant to the exercise of ownership, a document was presented to the Sub Registrar for the purpose of registration. The Sub Registrar invoking Rule 55 A(i) of the Tamil Nadu Registration Rules sought the production of the original / parent deeds and consequently refused to register the document. Hence, this writ petition.



W.P.(MD) No.3458 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. I heard Mr.K.Bharathi for the petitioner and learned Advocate General for Mr.R.Suresh Kumar, Additional Government Pleader for the respondents.

4. I pointed out to the learned Additional Government Pleader that a learned Single Judge of this Court in *Federal Bank Ltd. vs. Sub Registrar, Pollachi and others* [2023 (2) CTC 289] as well as the Division Bench of this Court in *P.Pappu Vs. Sub Registrar, Rasipuram* [2024 (5) CTC 575], have given directions to the Sub Registrars not to insist upon the production of the original as a condition precedent for registration of the documents.

5. Despite these verdicts, every day this Court is flooded with writs seeking for directions to the Sub Registrars not to insist on production of originals. Hence, I requested the assistance of the learned Advocate General on 05.02.2025, to instruct the State of Tamil Nadu to circulate an instruction informing the Sub Registrars that, production of the original of the sale deed is not an essential requirement in terms of the Registration Act.




W.P.(MD) No.3458 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. The learned Advocate General brought to my notice that the State had preferred an appeal by way of Special Leave Petition to the Supreme Court against the order passed in *P.Pappu's case* in S.L.P (Civil) No.2344 of 2025 and that the same had been dismissed by the Supreme Court on 03.02.2025. He informed this Court that he will give suitable directions to the Secretary, Commercial Taxes and Registration Department in this regard.

7. When I took up the matter for hearing today (20.02.2025), the learned Advocate General brought to my notice that the Constitutional validity of Rule 55 A(i) is a subject matter of consideration before the Supreme Court in S.LP.No.12167 of 2024 and that the matter is listed for hearing on 18.03.2025. He fairly submitted that without prejudice to the contentions of State of Tamil Nadu in the said Special Leave Petition, a direction can be given in the writ petition to register the document and to return the same.

8. The position of law having been settled in *P.Pappu's case* and



W.P.(MD) No.3458 of 2025

WEB COPY

the same having been confirmed by the Supreme Court, the writ petition stands allowed. The Sub Registrar shall register the document, which he has refused to do so under the impugned order.

9. The request of the learned Advocate General is accepted. Needless to add, this order will not stand in the way of the Government in respect of the Constitutional validity of Rule 55 A(i) in the pending proceedings before the Supreme Court. No costs.

20.02.2025

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

MAC



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.3458 of 2025

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

MAC

To

1. The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Madurai District.

2. The Sub Registrar,
Sub Register Office,
Karuppayurani,
Madurai East,
Madurai District.

W.P.(MD)No.3458 of 2025

Dated : 20.02.2025