



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 24.07.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P(MD)Nos.18677 to 18680 of 2025
and W.M.P(MD)Nos. 14319, 14328, 14323 &14324

Axelin Thiraviyam

... Petitioner in all
the Writ Petitions

Vs

1. The District Registrar,
Trichy District,
Trichy.
2. The Sub Registrar,
Manapparai,
Trichy District.
3. The Tahsildar,
Manapparai Taluk,
Trichy District.
4. The Village Administrative Officer,
No.21, Sevalur Village,
Manapparai Taluk,
Trichy District.



WEB COPY

5. The Firka Surveyor,
Manapparai Taluk,
Trichy District.

6. Danial Albert

7. S.Padmapriya

... Respondents in all
the Writ Petitions

COMMON PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a *Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus*, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent bearing Refusal Nos.RFL/Manapparai/276, 275, 278 & 277/2024 dated 30.07.2024, quash the same as arbitrary, illegal and unconstitutional and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to register the sale deed presented by the Petitioner for registration of Plot Nos.34, 37, 36 & 38 bearing Temporary Registration Nos. TP/189554121/2024, TP/189078366/2024, TP/189079994/2024 & TP/189079960/2024 within a time frame as may be fixed by this Court.

In all the writ petitions:

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Kevinkaran

For Respondents : Mr.G.Suriya Ananth
Additional Government Pleader, for R-1 to R-5

Mr.Shangar Murali, for R-6

Mr.T.M.Madasamy, for R-7



WEB COPY

COMMON ORDER

Since the issue involved in all the writ petitions is one and the same the common order is passed.

2. These writ petitions are filed for issuance of a *Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus*, to quash the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent bearing Refusal Nos.RFL/Manaparai/276, 275, 278 & 277/2024 dated 30.07.2024, and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to register the sale deed presented by the Petitioner.

3. The contention of the petitioner is that the petitioner's grand father namely; Durairaja has executed a Will, dated 31.10.2005, under I schedule of property. The said Durairaja left the property as life estate interest to his wife. After her demise, the said property devolved around the petitionr and the 6th respondent equally.



WEB COPY

4. The contention of the petitioner and the 6th respondent is that after the demise of the grand father, the property was equally divided and laid out plots. Some of the plots are allotted to the petitioner. Now, the petitioner is intended to sell the Plot no.34 but the respondents are refusing to register the same stating that the plot has already been sold.

5. According to the petitioner, the said Plot No.34 does not belong to the 6th respondent at all. The 6th respondent is having some other plots. The respondents have passed the impugned order monotonously without identifying the correct plot which is total non application of mind. Even if it is sold, it can be considered as double entry. Further, in order to clarify the doubt raised by the respondents, the petitioner has sought a certificate from the VAO and the same is submitted before the Sub Registrar. Thus it is clarified that all these plot numbers belong to the petitioner. Therefore, the respondents cannot raise any doubt or apprehension.



WEB COPY

6. The learned counsel appearing for the 6th respondent vehemently objected to the registration of the said properties. He further submitted that he has already filed a protest petition before the Registrar regarding Plot No. 34. He has already sold the said plot. If registered the same would amount to double entry.

7. This Court has already considered the issue of double entry and has held that the Sub-Registrar or the District Registrar cannot act as a civil court and cannot adjudicate disputes relating to title. Therefore, if any party is aggrieved, they are at liberty to approach the competent civil court.

8. The revenue authorities have already clarified that certain plots belong to the petitioner and others to the 6th respondent. However, the learned counsel for the 6th respondent submitted that the revenue records will not determine the title. The said submission is recorded.

9. Therefore, the impugned orders passed by the 2nd respondent, dated 30.07.2024 are hereby quashed. The 2nd respondent is directed to register the



WEB COPY

sale deed presented by the petitioner within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

10. With the above observations, these Writ Petitions are disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

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

24.07.2025

KSA



WEB COPY

To

1. The District Registrar,
Trichy District,
Trichy.
2. The Sub Registrar,
Manaparai,
Trichy District.
3. The Tahsildar,
Manapparai Taluk,
Trichy District.
4. The Village Administrative Officer,
No.21, Sevalur Village,
Manapparai Taluk,
Trichy District.
5. The Firka Surveyor,
Manapparai Taluk,
Trichy District



WEB COPY



S.SRIMATHY, J.

KSA

**COMMON ORDER MADE IN
W.P(MD)Nos.18677 to
18680 of 2025**

DATED : 24.07.2025