



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 14240 of 2026

S.Moorthy

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Secretary
Housing and Urban Development
Department, Secretariat, Fort St.
George, Chennai-600 009

2.The Tamil Nadu Housing Board,
Rep. by Managing Director, Pocket 6,
Board office cum commercial complex,
CIT Nagar, 1st Main Road,
Chennai-600 035

3.The Executive Engineer and
Administrative officer
Tamil Nadu Housing Board, Hosur
Housing Unit, Bagalur Road,
Hosur-635 109

4.The Sub Registrar,
M.G.Road. Near Gandhi Statue,
Hamumanthapuram, Anna Nagar,
Hosur-635 109

5.Satheesh Kumar

6.Kumaresan@Madhiazhagan,

7.Murugadoss S/o.Rajarathinam

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, calling for the records, pertaining to the order passed by the 3rd respondent dated 22.04.2025 quash the same and consequently direct the respondents 1 to 3 to allot one Tamil Nadu Housing Board Plot under the category of HIG, in Hosur Town or nearby Hosur Town to the petitioner based on his representation dated 24.02.2025

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.Satheesh Kumar



For Respondent: Mr.A.Selvendran for R1 & R4
Special Government Pleader
Mr.A.M.Ravindranath Jayapaul
for R2 & R3

ORDER

By consent of both parties, this writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself. Since no adverse order is passed against the private respondents, notice to the private respondents is dispensed with.

2. This writ petition has been filed challenging the order of the third respondent dated 24.04.2025, quash the same and direct the respondents 1 to 3 to allot one Tamil Nadu Housing Board Plot under the category of HIG, in Hosur Town or nearby Hosur Town to the petitioner based on his representation dated 25.02.2025.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that petitioner intended to purchase a Housing Board plot, at that time, the fifth respondent acting as a broker, approached the petitioner regarding the sale of a Housing Board plot in hosur, allegedly owned by the 7th respondent was intending to sell the plot and the sixth respondent assured that the said plot was a Housing Board plot with all necessary approvals. The petitioner verified title of the property with the 3rd respondent who confirmed that the 7th respondent is the lawful owner of the third respondent. The petitioner paid the sale consideration and sale deed was registered in his name. After obtaining a sale, revenue records were mutated in



favour of the petitioner and electricity connection was also obtained. However, subsequently, the petitioner was informed that the original allottee of the plot has not yet obtained a sale deed in his favour and thereafter, the petitioner came to know that the sale deed in favour of the seventh respondent is a fraudulent document. It was informed to the petitioner that the petitioner's sale deed was treated as illegal document and the second respondent has recommended action to the District Registrar, pursuant to which the document was declared illegal. The third respondent also stated that the allotment letter and sale deed were legally invalid. It is the grievance of the petitioner that the third respondent involved in fraudulent acts and facilitating its registration by dispensing with his personal appearance. The petitioner lodged police complaint, however, the third respondent complaint was proceeded, shielding him from liability. The petitioner made representation on 25.05.2025 seeking allotment of alternative plot under the HIG category in Hosur which was rejected by the third respondent vide impugned order dated 24.04.2025. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that admittedly, the third respondent is the employee of the respondents 1 and 2, the third respondent colluded together with the 7th respondent prepared bogus document, thereby, the District Registrar has cancelled the sale deeds registered in favour of the petitioner, hence, the petitioner seeks for providing alternative plot on the



mistake being committed by the third respondent. Hence, seeks for a direction.

WEB COPY

5. Per contra, the learned Special Government Pleader submitted that the petitioner as well as the seventh respondent has no valid allotment letter and those documents are bogus documents. The documents are created as if the third respondent has given allotment letter in favour of the seventh respondent and sale deed is also executed in favour of the seventh respondent on 19.05.2023 vide Doc.No.9307 of 2023 and thereafter, they have created sale deeds in favour of the petitioner. The District Registrar upon information has cancelled the sale deeds in favour of the petitioner and the seventh respondent, instead of challenging the order of cancellation by the District Registrar making representation to the respondent Board seeking alternate plot is not proper.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Special Government Pleader for R1 & R4 and the learned counsel for R2 & R3 and perused the materials placed on record.

7. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner had purchased the subject property from the seventh respondent for a valid consideration on the belief that the subject property is Housing Board plots and patta and other revenue records were mutated in favour of the petitioner, however, later on



objection from the original allottee, the petitioner came to know that bogus documents were created in favour of seventh respondent and thereafter, it was created in favour of the petitioner. Subsequently, the District Registrar has cancelled the documents in favour of the petitioner as well as the seventh respondent under relevant provisions of the Registration Act on the ground that the it violates Section 22B of Registration Act. Now, the petitioner seeks for alternate plots from the Housing Board.

8. It is relevant to note that as against the alleged fraudulent acts committed by the persons, a criminal case is also registered at the instance of the third respondent in Cr.No.10 of 2023 on 19.08.2023 against one Murugadoss, Anandh, Venkatachalam, Mohammed Hakkim for the offence under Sections 465, 468, 471, 419 & 420 of IPC. As rightly pointed out by the learned Special Government Pleader, until the outcome of the criminal case as against the accused, the petitioner as a matter of right now cannot seek for alternate plot from the Housing Board. This Court also cannot conduct roving enquiry as to whether the private respondents have committed such fraudulent acts against the petitioner and the Housing Board. It is left open to the petitioner to approach competent civil court seeking appropriate remedy with regard to the alleged fraudulent acts.

9. Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.



WEB COPY

WP No. 14240 of 2026



20-04-2026

dhk

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



To

1.The Secretary
Housing and Urban Development
Department, Secretariat, Fort St.
George, Chennai-600 009

2.The Tamil Nadu Housing Board,
Rep. by Managing Director, Pocket 6,
Board office cum commercial complex,
CIT Nagar, 1st Main Road,
Chennai-600 035

3.The Executive Engineer and
Administrative officer
Tamil Nadu Housing Board, Hosur
Housing Unit, Bagalur Road,
Hosur-635 109

4.The Sub Registrar,
M.G.Road. Near Gandhi Statue,
Hamumanthapuram, Anna Nagar,
Hosur-635 109



WEB COPY

WP No. 14240 of 2026



M.DHANDAPANI J.

dhk

WP No. 14240 of 2026

**20-04-2026
(3/4)**