



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 15.12.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

Rev.Aplw.(MD)No.218 of 2023

in

W.P.(MD)No.692 of 2015

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.22565 to 22567 of 2023

Shanmugavel

...Petitioner/3rd Party

Vs

1. K.Chandrasekar

...1st Respondent/Petitioner

2. The Inspector General of Registration,
100, Santhome High Road,
Pattinapakkam,
Chennai - 600 028.

3. The District Registrar,
Thoothukudi Registration District,
Thoothukudi.

4. The Sub Registrar,
Kovilpatti Taluk, Thoothukudi District.

...Respondents 2 to 4/Respondents

PRAYER: Review Application is filed under Order 47 Rule 1 & 2 r/w Section 114 of C.P.C., to review the order in W.P.(MD)No.692 of 2015 dated 08.11.2022 on the file of this Court.

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,



to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, by calling for the records, pertaining to the order, with no reference number passed by the 3rd respondent, dated 28.02.2014 and quash the same as void and illegal and thereby directing the respondents, to return the document dated 03.02.2014 executed by Kandasamy in favour of this petitioner, presented and registered on 03.02.2014, as per the statutory provisions of the Registration Act and Rules.

For Petitioner : Mr.Selva Adhithya
for M/s.G.Prabhu Rajadurai

For Respondents : Mr.F.X.Eugene for R1
Mr.M.Lingadurai
Special Government Pleader
for R2 to R4

* * * * *

ORDER

The present review application has been filed seeking to review the order dated 08.11.2022 passed in W.P(MD)No.692 of 2015.

2. The above said writ petition was filed by one K.Chandrasekar, seeking to quash the order passed by the Sub Registrar, Kovilpatti, on 28.12.2014 and to direct him to return the documents dated 03.02.2014 executed by one Kandsamy in favour of the writ petitioner which was presented and registered on 03.02.2014.

3. A perusal of the order impugned in the writ petition dated 28.02.2014



reveals that the documents presented by the writ petitioner were kept pending primarily on the ground that O.S.No.41 of 2014 relating to the property is pending on the file of the District Munsif Court, Kovilpatti. It was further pointed out that proper stamp duty has not been paid.

4. This Court by an order dated 08.11.2022 had allowed the writ petition on the ground that O.S.No.41 of 2014 has been disposed of and the objection raised by one Geetha does not relate to the suit schedule property. This Court had directed the Sub Registrar, Kovilpatti, to register the documents, if the deficit stamp fee is paid. Seeking to review the said order, a third party to the writ petition, namely, Shanmugavel, has filed the present review application.

5. According to the learned counsel appearing for the review applicant, the writ petitioner had preferred O.S.No.15 of 2015, before the District Munsif Court, Kovilpattai, for the same prayer of registering the documents dated 03.02.2014 as against the Sub Registrar, Kovilpatti, and other officials respondents. The said suit was decreed by the trial Court on 20.04.2015. Challenging the same, the present review applicant has preferred A.S.No.40 of 2015, before the Sub Court, Kovilpatti, and the appeal was allowed on 25.03.2019. The allowing of the appeal relating to the above said document was



not brought to the notice of the Court when the writ petition was disposed of on 08.11.2022.

6. The learned Counsel appearing for the review applicant further submits that the review applicant had filed O.S.No.41 of 2014, before the District Munsif Court, Kovilpatti, for the relief of declaration that the document No.346 of 2014, which is a unilateral cancellation of settlement deed is null and void. The said suit was decreed as prayed for on 10.10.2014. This judgment and decree have attained finality.

7. In view of the above said facts, it is made clear that when this Court has passed an order in W.P(MD)No.692 of 2015 dated 08.12.2022, the civil dispute between the parties has not been brought to the notice of the Court. Now the judgment and decree of the civil Court, which has been brought to the notice of the Court, clearly reveals that the review applicant's title has been upheld by the Courts, especially in relation to the document which is sought to be registered in W.P(MD)No.692 of 2015.

8. In view of the above said facts, this review application stands allowed and W.P.(MD)No.692 of 2015 stands dismissed. It is for the review applicant to



workout his remedy before the authorities concerned for deletion of the documents that were registered pursuant to the order of this Court. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

15.12.2025

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

To

1. The Inspector General of Registration,
100, Santhome High Road,
Pattinapakkam,
Chennai - 600 028.

2. The District Registrar,
Thoothukudi Registration District,
Thoothukudi.

3. The Sub Registrar,
Kovilpatti Taluk,
Thoothukudi District.



WEB COPY



R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

RJR

Rev.Aplw.(MD)No.218 of 2023
in
W.P.(MD)No.692 of 2015

15.12.2025