



WEB COPY



W.A.No.475 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.03.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR**

W.A.No.475 of 2026

D.Dhamodharan

... Appellant

-Vs-

1. The Inspector General of Registration,
Registration Department,
Santhome High Road,
Chennai – 600 004.

2. The Sub Registrar,
Joint-I Sub Registrar Office of Saidapet,
South Chennai Registration District,
Chennai – 600 015.

3. Sathiyaraj

4. Soundarya

5. Sumithra

6. Minor Arjun

7. K.Nagarajan

... Respondents

PRAYER : Appeal filed under Clause XV of Letters Patent, against the order dated 29.01.2026 in W.P.No.1070 of 2026.



W.A.No.475 of 2026

For Appellant : Mr.T.Muthukumar
For Respondents : Mr.P.Harish
Government Advocate for R1 & 2

J U D G M E N T

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by **R.SURESH KUMAR, J.**)

This intra-Court appeal has been directed against the order dated 29.01.2026 made in W.P.No.1070 of 2026.

2. The present appellant was the writ petitioner who approached the writ Court seeking for a writ of mandamus to consider the representation made by him dated 15.2.2025 before the Inspector General of Registration to conduct an enquiry against the second respondent therein, who is the Sub Registrar with regard to the sale deed executed and registered in Document No.7634 of 2025.

3. It is his case that the mother of the private respondents 3 to 6 approached the appellant / petitioner and availed a loan, against which a document pertaining to the immovable property, namely, settlement deed bearing Document No.4925 of 2013 dated 20.05.2013 was given as collateral security, despite the same, the property in question has been sold by the mother



W.A.No.475 of 2026

of the private respondents 3 to 6 to 7th respondent, viz., Nagarajan, that was Document No.7634 of 2025, therefore, the said sale is an illegal one, according to the appellant / petitioner.

4. Hence, in order to conduct an enquiry with regard to the registration of the said sale in Document No.7634 of 2025, a representation dated 15.12.2025 given to the first respondent, i.e., Inspector General of Registration was required to be enquired or acted upon, therefore, seeking mandamus only, the writ petition was filed.

5. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the writ Court had rejected the said writ petition on the ground that if at all any loan has been given to the mother of the private respondents, in order to recover the same, it is open to the petitioner to approach the civil Court for recovery of money. In this context, if he is having a collateral security by way of deposit of title deed against which also the remedy can be sought for under the civil procedure, by citing these reasons, the learned Judge rejected the writ petition through the impugned order dated 29.01.2026.



W.A.No.475 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. Absolutely, we do not find any good reason to interfere with the said approach and conclusion reached by the writ Court through the impugned order, as a result of which, this Writ Appeal fails and hence, it is liable to be dismissed and accordingly it is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

(R.S.K., J.) (N.S., J.)
03.03.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Speaking Order : Yes / No

vji

To

1. The Inspector General of Registration,
Registration Department,
Santhome High Road,
Chennai – 600 004.
2. The Sub Registrar,
Joint-I Sub Registrar Office of Saidapet,
South Chennai Registration District,
Chennai – 600 015.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.475 of 2026

**R.SURESH KUMAR, J.
and
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.**

vji

W.A.No.475 of 2026

03.03.2026