



W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 10.03.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

M.Manthaikalai

.. Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Sub-Registrar,
Melur East Sub-Registrar Office,
Madurai District.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned proceedings issued by the 2nd respondent in Refusal Number RFL/Melur East/46/2024, dated 23.12.2024 and quash the same as arbitrary, illegal and without any legal basis and consequently directing the 2nd respondent to entertain the Sale Deed, dated 23.12.2024 presented by the petitioner for registration in TP/203828023/2024 and register the same in the light of the order made by the High Court of Madras in D.Rajamanickam Vs The Sub Registrar in W.P.No.426 of 2022, dated 01.07.2024 forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Shakulhameed



W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Respondents : Mr.R.Suresh Kumar
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner had decided to purchase the property situated in Survey No.259/10B1B at Ambalakaranpatti Village, Melur Taluk, Madurai District from one M.Kannaththal. He presented the document for registration on 23.12.2024. The 2nd respondent refused to receive the document on the ground that the property had been unauthorizedly converted into plots in contravention of Section 22 A(2) of the Registration Act. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition.

2. Heard Mr.M.Shakulhameed, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.R.Suresh Kumar, learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents.

3. Mr.M.Shakulhameed, for the petitioner states that even prior to the sale deed through which the property has been purchased by the petitioner, the property had already been dealt with as a plot in Document No.3890/2022, dated 04.06.2022. He points out that his predecessor in title, namely, one Senthil



W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

Kumar had purchased a large extent of property and had divided it as plots and sold it to several persons, one of whom is Devika, the petitioner's vendor's vendor. He states that since the property has already been dealt with as a housing plot, he is entitled to the benefit of Section 22 A(2) proviso to the Registration Act. He relies upon the judgment of **D.Rajamanickam Vs. Sub Registrar** in **W.P.No.426 of 2022, dated 01.07.2024.**

4. Per contra, Mr.R.Suresh Kumar, states that the Sub Registrar is duty bound to verify if the property has been sold as housing plot and if sold as housing plot, whether it has 'in-principle' approval from DTCP and plot approval from the appropriate local planning authority. He states in case it is not so done, then the Sub-Registrar is duty bound to issue refusal check slip in terms of Section 22 A. He further points out that in case the Sub-Registrar contravenes the said provision, she or he is liable to be prosecuted under Section 81 A of the Registration Act. Therefore, he pleads the impugned order does not deserve any interference.

5. At this stage, Mr.Shakulhameed, for the petitioner draws my attention to the undertaking affidavit filed by the petitioner as well as his vendors to the effect that they will use the lands only for agricultural purposes and that they



W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

will not put up any superstructure over the same.


WEB COPY

6. I have carefully considered the submissions on both sides.

7. If an agricultural plot is converted into a housing site, then the second respondent is statutorily bound under Section 22 A(2) of the Registration Act to reject the same. However, if an agricultural land is sold as an agricultural land, Section 22 A(2) is not attracted. Apart from that, even if an agricultural plot has already been converted as a housing plot and has been sold and registered, the bar under Section 22 A(2) will not operate on a new document being presented for the very same property. In the facts of the present case, as pointed out by Mr. Shakulhameed, the very same plot had earlier been dealt with as a housing plot in Document No.3890/2022, dated 04.06.2022. Hence, the proviso would come to his rescue.

8. In addition, he has filed an undertaking affidavit of the vendor and vendee, which is extracted as hereunder:

“5. I hereby undertake that I would not and never construct any building or house in the land which I am proposed to purchase from its lawful owner. I further undertake that I would only carry on my agricultural operations and eak out my livelihood by raising various



W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

timely and seasonal crops.

WEB COPY

6. I further undertake that if at all in the future, if I venture to construct any building in the said property, I undertake that such a building would be constructed only after getting all necessary plan approvals and other permissions from the concerned Governmental authorities.”

9. Since the petitioner, in addition, undertakes to maintain the plot, as it is and also states he will move the appropriate authority and secure permission and only thereafter, put up a construction, the impugned order, dated 23.12.2024 is quashed. There shall be a direction to the respondents to receive the document presented on 23.12.2024 and register the same.

10. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is ordered. No costs.

10.03.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

gbg



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN,J.

gbg

To

- 1.The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Madurai District.
- 2.The Sub-Registrar,
Melur East Sub-Registrar Office,
Madurai District.

W.P.(MD).No.4803 of 2025

10.03.2025