



W.P.(MD).No.11086 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 22.04.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

W.P.(MD).No.11086 of 2025

S.Ramar

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Sub Registrar,
Virudhunagar Sub Registrar Office-II,
Virudhunagar District.

2.Sriman Narayanasamy

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to consider and pass order in the petitioner's representation dated 07.04.2025 in regard to not to register any deed based on power of attorney in Doc.No.4853/2023 dated 14.07.2023 in the name of 2nd respondent without his presence and consent within the time limit that may be stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sankar

For R-1 : Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam
Government Advocate

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed for Mandamus to direct the first respondent to consider and pass order in the petitioner's representation dated 07.04.2025 in regard to not to register any deed based on power of attorney in Doc.No.



W.P.(MD).No.11086 of 2025

4853/2023 dated 14.07.2023 in the name of second respondent without the petitioner's presence and consent within the time limit that may be stipulated by this Court.

2. The petitioner claims he is the owner of the property situated at Survey Nos.317/2, 317/3 of Amathur Village, Virudhunagar Taluk and District. He had executed a deed of power of attorney in favour of the second respondent in Document No.4853/2023 on 14.07.2023. The plea of the petitioner is that the second respondent is attempting to alienate the property without his consent. Hence, he submitted an online protest petition on 07.04.2025 and has come forward with the present Writ Petition.

3. I heard Mr.K.Sankar for the petitioner and Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam, learned Government Advocate for the first respondent.

4. There seems to be a civil dispute between the petitioner and the second respondent. The first respondent neither has the powers of a Civil Court nor does he possess any quasi-judicial power to decide on the validity or otherwise of the power of attorney. A perusal of the power of attorney deed found in Page No.9 of the typed set of papers reveals that the petitioner has authorized the second respondent to alienate the property. That being the position, the demand of the petitioner that the second respondent must not



W.P.(MD).No.11086 of 2025

alienate the property goes beyond the powers of the first respondent. In case the petitioner and the second respondent have any dispute, it is up to them to work out their rights before the jurisdictional Civil Court.

5. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

22.04.2025

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

To
The Sub Registrar,
Virudhunagar Sub Registrar Office-II,
Virudhunagar District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).No.11086 of 2025

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN,J.

Lm

W.P.(MD).No.11086 of 2025

22.04.2025