



WEB COPY

WP No. 12001 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

WP No. 12001 of 2026

D.Ramalingam

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Inspector General of Registration
No 100 Santhome High Road,
Mullima Nagar,
Mandavellipakkam,
Raja Annamalaipuram,
Chennai
2. The sub Registrar
Veppanapalli,
Krishnagiri district
3. M.Mubarak Ahamed
4. Aalamgeer

..Respondent(s)

Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking for issuance of a writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the records of the impugned Refusal Check Slip vide Refusal Number RFL/ Veppanapalli/ 12/ 2026 issued by the 2nd respondent Sub Registrar , Veppanapalli Krishnagiri district dated 26.02.2026 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to register the document presented or to be presented with regard to land comprised in New Survey No. 60/6 , 0.03.0 Hectares measuring a total extent of 0.10 Acre 0.07 cents situated at Thalipalli Village, Krishnagiri district within a time frame fixed by this court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Bhagavath Sing Raja

For Respondent(s): Mr.P.Harish, GA (R1 & R2)



ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned refusal check slip dated 26.02.2026 issued by the second respondent refusing to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner for registration on the ground that the subject land falls in an unapproved layout.

2. Mr.P.Harish, learned Government Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents 1 and 2. Since no adverse orders are passed against the respondents 3 and 4, notice to them in this writ petition is dispensed with by this Court.

3. The petitioner contends that the schedule mentioned land in the sale deed is an agricultural land. Hence, according to the petitioner, arbitrarily and by total non-application of mind, the impugned refusal check slip has been issued by the second respondent. The petitioner also contends that the impugned refusal check slip has been issued in violation of the principles of natural justice as the petitioner was not afforded any opportunity of hearing by the second respondent before issuing the impugned refusal check slip.

4. As seen from the impugned refusal check slip, the reasoning given by the second respondent for refusing to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner for registration is that the land which is the subject matter of the sale



deed falls in an unapproved layout. The said reasoning is disputed by the petitioner. The petitioner has also filed supporting documents in support of his case. This Court is not expressing any opinion on the merits of the same.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner was not afforded of any opportunity of hearing prior to the passing of the impugned order. Neither the petitioner's contentions nor the supporting documents produced by him were considered in the impugned order. Being a non-speaking order with regard to the petitioner's contentions and the supporting documents produced by him, and an order passed in violation of the principles of natural justice, this Court is of the considered view that the impugned refusal check slip dated 26.02.2026 issued by the second respondent has to be quashed and the matter remanded back to the respondent for fresh consideration on merits and in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of in the following manner:-

- (a) The impugned refusal check slip dated 26.02.2026 is quashed by this Court and the matter is remanded back to the second respondent for fresh consideration on merits and in accordance with law.
- (b) The petitioner shall submit a written explanation to the second respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, as to why the



WEB COPY



second respondent has to accept the registration of the sale deed presented by the petitioner for registration, along with supporting documents.

(c) On receipt of the same within the time stipulated, the second respondent, after giving due consideration to the written explanation submitted by the petitioner along with supporting documents, shall take a final decision with regard to registration of the sale deed presented by the petitioner, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks thereafter.

(d) If the second respondent decides to refuse to register the sale deed, the second respondent shall pass a speaking order, after giving due consideration to the contentions of the petitioner and the supporting documents produced by him.

No Costs.

06-04-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
RKM



WEB COPY

To

1. The Inspector General of Registration
No 100 Santhome High Road,
Mullima Nagar,
Mandavellipakkam,
Raja Annamalaipuram,
Chennai
2. The sub Registrar
Veppanapalli,
Krishnagiri district



WEB COPY

WP No. 12001 of 2



ABDUL QUDDHOSE, J.

RKM

WP No. 12001 of 2026

06-04-2026