



WP(MD). No.34515 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 17/12/2025

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP(MD). No.34515 of 2025

Subbammal

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Registrar,
Tirunelveli Registration District,
Tirunelveli..

2. The Sub-Registrar,
Sub-Registrar Office,
Pettai,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER :- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified mandamus calling for the records of the second respondent relating to the Refusal Check Slip bearing RFL/Pettai/53/2025 dated 07.10.2025 and quash the same and direct the second respondent to register the sale deed dated 07.10.2025, presented for registration by the petitioner after completing all the formalities of the registration.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Anandaraj

For Respondents : Mr.A.Kannan

Addl. Government Pleader



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.34515 of 2025

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the refusal check slip bearing RFL/Pettai/53/2025 dated 07.10.2025 and direct the second respondent to register the sale deed dated 07.10.2025, presented for registration by the petitioner after completing all the formalities of the registration.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents. By consent of both sides, the writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

3. When the petitioner presented the document for registration, the same was refused to be registered by the respondents on the ground that there was an objection from one Peer Mohideen and others and OS No. 20/2011 was filed by one Esakkidurai and Subbammal. Challenging the said refusal, the petitioner is before this Court.



WP(MD). No.34515 of 2025

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that when the document was presented for registration, the same was refused to be registered on the ground that since there are some objections raised by one Peer Mohideen and others and also citing the pendency of the civil suit instituted by one Esakkidurai and Subbammal. He would further submit that no enquiry was conducted and without conducting any enquiry, the document was refused to be registered.

5. The learned Additional Government Pleader would submit that admittedly the present order was passed since objections were received from Peer Mohideen and also citing the pendency of civil suit.

6. It is seen that the petitioner has presented the document for registration. However, the respondent,s without conducting any enquiry whatsoever, has refused to register the said document. When the documents are presented for registration, it is the duty of the respondents to conduct an enquiry and after issuing notice to the parties concerned, and pass orders thereon. However, in the present case, the mandatory requirement of opportunity of being heard was not carried out. The said



WP(MD). No.34515 of 2025

refusal was made without following principles of natural justice. On the sole ground, the impugned order is liable to be set side.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of by directing the 2nd respondent to issue notice to not only the petitioner but also the objectors, if any and other parties concerned and thereafter, on giving an opportunity to both the parties, shall take a decision in accordance with law. No costs.

17.12.2025

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

RR

TO

1. The District Registrar,
Tirunelveli Registration District,
Tirunelveli..

2. The Sub-Registrar,
Sub-Registrar Office,
Pettai, Tirunelveli.



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.34515 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J

RR

**ORDER
IN**

WP(MD) No.34515 of 2025

Date : 17/12/2025