



*W.P.(MD)No.31032 of 2025*

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **12.12.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY**

W.P.(MD)No.31032 of 2025

1.Revathi  
2.Anandhavalli

...Petitioners

vs.

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

2.Dharmalingam

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of the impugned order issued by the first respondent dated 03.10.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st respondent to register and release the settlement deed presented by the petitioners bearing pending document No.P/2 in respect of the property bearing Survey No.66/1 in Sivagnana Puram Village, Virudhunagar Taluk, Virudhunagar District.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Gnana Guru Nathan

For Respondents : Mr.V.Omprakash,  
Government Advocate for R1  
No appearance for R2



W.P.(MD)No.31032 of 2025

WEB COPY

### **ORDER**

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the impugned order of the first respondent dated 03.10.2025 and consequently to direct the first respondent to register and release the settlement deed presented by the petitioners bearing pending document No.P/2, in respect of the property bearing Survey No.66/1, Sivagnana Puram Village, Virudhunagar Taluk, Virudhunagar District.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are the owners of the subject property. The first petitioner is the daughter-in-law of the second petitioner. They executed a settlement deed dated 13.09.2025 in favour of the first petitioner's children. However, the first respondent refused to register the same stating that the second respondent has made an objection to the effect that the first petitioner's husband's brother and the first petitioner's son had executed an unregistered sale agreement with the second respondent. According to the learned counsel, no enquiry was conducted by the first respondent and the document presented by the petitioners has been simply kept pending *vide* the impugned order. Hence, the present Writ Petition.



W.P.(MD)No.31032 of 2025

3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the first respondent would submit that since the second respondent made an objection on the basis of an unregistered sale agreement, the first respondent is not in a position to register the settlement deed presented by the petitioners. He would concede that no enquiry was conducted by the first respondent in this regard.

4. I have given due consideration to the submissions made on either sides.

5. When the second respondent has made an objection for registration of the settlement deed presented by the petitioners, the first respondent ought to have conducted enquiry to verify the genuinity of the objection in accordance with law. However, without doing so, the document presented by the petitioners is just kept pending *vide* the impugned order, which is clearly in violation of principles of natural justice. Such an order is liable to be set aside and accordingly, the impugned order of the first respondent dated 03.10.2025 is set aside. The first respondent is directed to conduct enquiry, after issuing due notice to the petitioners and the second respondent and verify the sanctity of the sale agreement. If the sale agreement is found to be unregistered, I do not find any impediment for the first respondent to



*W.P.(MD)No.31032 of 2025*

register the settlement deed dated 13.09.2025 presented by the petitioners in favour of the first petitioner's son and daughter.

6. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

**12.12.2025**  
**(2/2)**

Speaking / Non-speaking order  
Index : Yes/No  
NCC : Yes/No

*mbi*

To

The Joint Sub Registrar-II,  
Virudhunagar,  
Virudhunagar District.



WEB COPY



*W.P.(MD)No.31032 of 2025*

**KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.**

*mbi*

**W.P.(MD)No.31032 of 2025**

**12.12.2025  
(2/2)**