



W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 11.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY**

W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

Ravichandran

...Petitioner

vs.

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
Cathedral Road,
Santhome,
Chennai.

2.The District Registrar,
District Registrar Office,
Pudukottai,
Pudukottai District.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Thirumayam,
Pudhukkottai District.

...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 relating to the impugned refusal check slip No.RFL/Thirumayam/70/2025, dated 01.09.2025 and quash the same as illegal and without jurisdiction and further direct the third respondent to register the sale deed dated 01.09.2025 presented by the petitioner on 01.09.2025 in respect of S.No.10/11 to an extent of 0.89.5 acres (2 acre 21 cents) Thirumayam Revenue Village, Thirumayam Taluk & Pudukkottai District and return the same in accordance with law.



W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Parisuthanathan

For Respondents : Mr.K.S.Selvaganesan,
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the the impugned refusal check slip No.RFL/Thirumayam/70/2025, dated 01.09.2025 issued by the third respondent and further direct the third respondent to register the sale deed dated 01.09.2025 presented by the petitioner on 01.09.2025 in respect of S.No.10/11, to an extent of 0.89.5 acres (2 acre 21 cents), Thirumayam Revenue Village, Thirumayam Taluk & Pudukkottai District and return the same.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that initially the subject property was assigned by the Special Tahsildar to one Viswanathan by virtue of Assignment Order dated 16.11.1970. Thereafter, Viswanathan sold the property to one Raj by virtue of sale deed dated 24.09.2010. In pursuance thereof, Raj sold the same to one Krishnaveni by virtue of sale deed dated 03.08.2011. Now, the petitioner intends to purchase the property. When Krishnaveni along with the petitioner presented the sale deed dated 01.09.2025 for registration, the Sub Registrar, Thirumayam refused to register the same by stating that there are two owners



W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

for the same property. The learned counsel would submit that one Ramamoorthy, who is no way connected to the subject property, fraudulently executed a sale deed dated 09.05.2012 in favour of one Sivakumar. According to him, when the property stands in the name of Krishnaveni, the question of Ramamoorthy selling the same does not arise. Unnecessarily, third parties have created the entires and the same will not have any legal sanctity. Therefore, he prayed for allowing the Writ Petition.

3. *Per contra*, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents would submit that since there was double entry in respect of the same property, the third respondent refused to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner. However, after perusing the comparative table submitted by the petitioner counsel, he would submit that the sale deed dated 09.05.2012 executed by Ramamoorthy in favour of Sivakumar appears to be fabricated. Hence, he prays that appropriate orders may be passed.

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

5. It appears that one Ramamoorthy has executed a sale deed dated 09.05.2012 in favour of one Sivakumar in respect of the subject property.



W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

However, it appears the said Ramamoorthy was not the owner of the property as on the date of execution of the sale deed, which shows that the sale deed was a bogus one, executed with an intention to create encumbrance in the property. Krishnaveni purchased the subject property from one Raj by virtue of sale deed dated 03.08.2011 and she is possession of the property. Now she intends to sell the property to the petitioner by way of sale deed dated 01.09.2025. Such being the case, this Court does not find any impediment for the third respondent to register the same as the sale deed dated 09.05.2012 executed by Ramamoorthy in favour of Sivakumar is clearly a forged one. Therefore, the impugned refusal check slip No.RFL/Thirumayam/70/2025, dated 01.09.2025 is set aside. The petitioner is directed to re-present the sale deed dated 01.09.2025 and upon re-presentation, the third respondent is directed to register the same, if it is in accordance with law.

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

11.12.2025

Speaking / Non-speaking order

Index : Yes/No

NCC : Yes/No

mbi



W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

To

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
Cathedral Road,
Santhome,
Chennai.

2.The District Registrar,
District Registrar Office,
Pudukottai,
Pudukottai District.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Thirumayan,
Pudhukkottai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

mbi

W.P.(MD)No.35160 of 2025

11.12.2025