



W.P.(MD) No.3961 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.3961 of 2025
and W.M.P.(MD)No.2871 of 2025

Bright Ebenezer

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Sub Registrar
Kottaram,
Kanyakumari District.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned Refusal Check slip issued by the respondent herein in Refusal Number: RFL/Kottaram/15/2025 dated 04.02.2025, quash the same and consequently direct the respondent herein to register the sale deed dated 04.02.2025 presented by the petitioner without insisting production of original title document.



W.P.(MD) No.3961 of 2025

WEB COPY


For Petitioner : Mr.N.S.Ramakrishna Dass
For Respondent : Mr.R.Suresh Kumar
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition is filed seeking to quash the Refusal Check slip issued by the respondent in Refusal Number: RFL/Kottaram/15/2025 dated 04.02.2025 and consequently, to direct the respondent to register the sale deed dated 04.02.2025 presented by the petitioner without insisting production of original title document.

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.

3. I heard Mr.N.S.Ramakrishna Dass for the petitioner and learned



W.P.(MD) No.3961 of 2025

Advocate General for Mr.R.Suresh Kumar Additional Government
Pleader for the respondent.

WEB COPY

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.3961 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 the same having been confirmed by the Supreme Court, the writ petition



W.P.(MD) No.3961 of 2025

WEB COPY

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. Consequently, connected writ miscellaneous petition is closed.

20.02.2025
1/2

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

MAC

To

The Sub Registrar
Kottaram,
Kanyakumari District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.3961 of 2025

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

MAC

W.P.(MD)No.3961 of 2025
and W.M.P.(MD)No.2871 of 2025

Dated : 20.02.2025
1/2