



W.P.(MD)No.9648 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 05.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY


W.P(MD).No.9648 of 2025

G.Boominathan

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The Inspector General of Registration Department,
100, Santhom High Road,
Patinampakkam,
Chennai District.
2. The Assistant General of Registration Department,
Madurai Division,
Rajakamberam,
Y.Othakadai,
Madurai District.
3. The District Registrar (Admn),
Madurai South,
Madurai-district.
4. The Sub Registrar,
Joint No.4 Sub Registrar Office,
Madurai South,
Madurai District.



W.P.(MD)No.9648 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. S.Senthil Kumar,

Sub Registrar Joint No.4,
Joint No.4, Sub Registrar Office,
Madurai South,
Madurai District.

(R5 is impleaded vide Court order dated 12.06.2025 in
W.M.P(MD)No.8357 of 2025 in W.P(MD)No.9648 of 2025
by S.S.Y.J.)

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to direct the 1st to 3rd respondents to take appropriate action against the 4th respondent based on my representation dated 20.02.2025.

For Petitioner	: Mr.M.Vignesh Kumar
For R1 to R4	: Mr.S.Saji Bino Special Government Pleader
For R5	: Mr.J.Jeya Kumaran

ORDER

The present writ petition is filed for a Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 3 to take action against the 4th respondent based on the representation dated 20.02.2025.



W.P.(MD)No.9648 of 2025

WEB COPY 2. The contention of the petitioner is that the 4th respondent is arrayed in his official capacity and the 5th respondent is the same officer arrayed in his personal capacity. There are allegations against the 4th and 5th respondent, wherein he has entertained fraudulent document and registered the same. Therefore, the petitioner is seeking to take action against the 4th and 5th respondent.

3. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the 5th respondent submitted that he has registered the settlement deed based on 19.08.1931 and 03.09.1979 document. Therefore, it is not a fraudulent document.

4. After hearing the rival submissions, this Court is of the considered opinion that even if the 5th respondent has erred, then the official respondents are empowered to take action. Therefore, the present writ petition cannot be entertained. Hence, the same is dismissed. In case, still the petitioner feels the documents are fraudulent, he is at liberty to approach the appropriate Civil Court to prove the same.



W.P.(MD)No.9648 of 2025

WEB COPY 5. With these directions the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

05.08.2025

NCC :yes/No
Index :yes/No
Internet:yes/No
rgm



W.P.(MD)No.9648 of 2025

WEB COPY
To

1. The Inspector General of Registration Department,
100, Santhom High Road,
Patinampakkam,
Chennai District.
2. The Assistant General of Registration Department,
Madurai Division,
Rajakamberam,
Y.Othakadai,
Madurai District.
3. The District Registrar (Admn),
Madurai South,
Madurai-district.
4. The Sub Registrar,
Joint No.4 Sub Registrar Office,
Madurai South,
Madurai District.
- S.Senthil Kumar,
Sub Registrar Joint No.4,
Joint No.4, Sub Registrar Office,
Madurai South,
Madurai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.9648 of 2025

S.SRIMATHY, J.

rgm

W.P(MD).No.9648 of 2025

05.08.2025