



W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE P.T.ASHA

W.P.(MD)No.27341 of 2025

P.R.Ravichandran

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Regional Deputy Registrar (Housing),
Trichy Region,
No.16/3, Samathu School Street,
Khaja Nagar, Tiruchirappalli.

2.The Administrator/ Co-Operative Sub Registrar,
R786 Tiruchirapalli Co-Operative
House Construction Society Ltd.,
No.33, Colony Main Road,
Thillainagar,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 018.

3.The Sub-Registrar,
Thillainagar Sub Registration Office,
Thillainagar, Tiruchirappalli.

4.R.786, Tiruchirappalli Co-Operative
House Construction, Society Limited,
(Makkal Mandram), No.33,
Colony Main Road, Thillainagar,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 018.
Represented Through its Secretary T.Ramar

.. Respondents



W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

WEB COPY

(R4 is impleaded vide Court order, dated 28.10.2025 in W.M.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to execute the conveyance deed in respect of the property situated in Tiruchirappalli District, Tiruchirappalli Taluk, Uraiyur SRO, Old ward 3 block 4, Tiruchirappalli Town, Thillainagar north-east extension, 1st cross T.S.No.58(part) Plot No.B9 measuring an extent of 7236 sq.ft by considering the petitioner's representation dated 28.02.2025 or a deed of no objection confirming the title of the petitioner in respect of the said property within the time period stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.VR.Shanmuganathan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Baskaran
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr.A.Kannan
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for the following relief :

“To direct the 2nd respondent to execute the conveyance deed in respect of the property situated in Tiruchirappalli District, Tiruchirappalli Taluk, Uraiyur SRO, Old ward 3 block



W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

4, Tiruchirappalli Town, Thillainagar north-east extension, 1st cross T.S.No.58(part) Plot No.B9 measuring an extent of 7236 sq.ft by considering the petitioner's representation dated 28.02.2025 or a deed of no objection confirming the title of the petitioner in respect of the said property within the time period stipulated by this Court.”

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the property which is the subject matter of the writ petition was originally allotted by the 4th respondent which was originally known as the Tiruchirappalli Co-operative Housing Board to one A.S.Subramania Ayyar under an allotment letter dated 27.12.1962. The said Subramania Ayyar had paid the entire dues and had obtained clearance certificate, dated 05.04.1975. Thereafter, it appears that the petitioner's father T.Radhakrishnan had purchased the property from the said Subramania Ayyar under a registered sale deed dated 31.07.1975 even before the 4th respondent society had executed a sale deed in favour of Subramania Ayyar.



W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. After his purchase, the petitioner's father had put up a house after obtaining building permission from the appropriate authority and has been in possession and enjoyment of the same since then. Thereafter, the petitioner's father had executed a registered settlement deed dated 27.04.2009 settling the property in favour of the petitioner. The mutation of the revenue records have also taken place in favour of the petitioner.

4. After the settlement in his favour, the petitioner came to learn that the respondent Society had not executed a registered deed in favour of his predecessor-in-title and therefore, he had made a representation dated 28.02.2025 to the respondents to execute a conveyance deed in his favour. The representation dated 28.02.2025 was not considered and therefore, the petitioner has come forward with the writ petition in question.

5. Originally, the 4th respondent society was not made a party and thereafter, they got themselves impleaded.



WEB COPY

6. The learned counsel appearing for the 4th respondent would submit that the alienation in favour of the petitioner's father was erroneous inasmuch as Subramania Ayyar had not obtained the sale deed from the society and consequently, all other deeds would be invalid. The learned counsel for the 4th respondent in support of his argument relied upon the judgment of this Court in W.P(MD)No.8915 of 2020 wherein the son of an original allottee had sold the property to the mother of the petitioner therein without the society executing a sale deed in favour of the original allottee. The 4th respondent society herein is the respondent in that writ petition as well. The learned Judge had disposed of the writ petition by stating that since the predecessor-in-title of the petitioner were no more, the question of the legal heirs approaching the respondent would not arise and as the petitioner has stepped into their shoes, the petitioner therein should be considered as a successor-in-interest and the respondent has to only verify the documents and confirm if the petitioner is the successor-in-interest of the original allottee. Once that exercise is completed, the petitioner's representation for conveyance deed in favour of the original allottee should be granted.



W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. He would also rely upon another judgment of this Court in W.P.(MD)No.12188 of 2024. This was a case where the original allottee had sold a property to one K.S.Sellam, on whose death the property devolved on her daughters. The original allottee had died leaving behind two sons and one of her sons after the demise of the other, had sold the property to respondents 3 to 6 in the said writ petition. The subsequent sale by the original allottee's son was sought to be cancelled in the writ petition and consequently, directing the society to execute a conveyance deed in favour of the petitioners therein. The respondents 3 to 6 conceded to the earlier sale in favour of K.S.Sellam by the original allottee and had also given their no objection for the society to convey the property to the writ petitioners. The learned Judge had opined that in the light of this stand by the respondents, there was no necessity to cancel the sale deed in favour of the respondents 3 to 6 and it would suffice if the Court order is presented for registration.

8. Therefore, in the light of the above referred judgments, it is clear that the 4th respondent society has to confirm that the writ petitioner



W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

is the true successors-in-interest of the original allottee by verifying the documents and once the same is proved, the 4th respondent shall execute the sale deed in favour of the petitioner herein.

9. In view of the above, this Writ Petition stands allowed. No costs.

11.11.2025

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

gbg

To

- 1.The Regional Deputy Registrar (Housing),
Trichy Region,
No.16/3, Samathu School Street,
Khaja Nagar, Tiruchirappalli.
- 2.The Administrator/ Co-Operative Sub Registrar,
R786 Tiruchirapalli Co-Operative
House Construction Society Ltd.,
No.33, Colony Main Road,
Thillainagar,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 018.
- 3.The Sub-Registrar,
Thillainagar Sub Registration Office,
Thillainagar, Tiruchirappalli.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

P.T.ASHA, J.

gbg

4.R.786, Tiruchirappalli Co-Operative
House Construction, Society Limited,
(Makkal Mandram), No.33,
Colony Main Road, Thillainagar,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 018.
Represented Through its Secretary T.Ramar

W.P.(MD) No.27341 of 2025

11.11.2025