



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 23.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

Michel Arokiam

.... Petitioner

Vs

1.Murugesan
2.M.Saravanan
3.M.Vidya
4.M.Deepa
5.M.Muthukumar
6.T.Ganesa Pandian
7.G.Selvarani
8.T.Pichai Pandian
9.P.Chandra

10.The Sub Registrar,
O/o.The Sub Registrar,
Virugambakkam,
Chennai – 600 092.

.... Respondents

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to set aside the order in I.A.No.6 of 2024 in O.S.No.12136 of 2010 dated 14.07.2025 on the file of the I Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.

For Petitioner	: Mr.R.Sankarasubbu
For R1 to R3 & R5	: Mr.M.S.Velusamy
For R4	: No representation
For R6 to R9	: M/s.P.Mariyammal
For R10	: Mr.R.Vigneswaran Government Advocate



C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Trial Court dismissing the application filed by the petitioner seeking production of the original Thumb Impression Book dated 30.04.1984 maintained in the office of the Sub Registrar, Virugambakkam, Chennai.

2. The petitioner herein filed a suit in O.S.No.12136 of 2010 on the file of the I Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai, seeking declaration that the sale deed dated 30.04.1984 executed by the first defendant in the suit in favour of his wife and registered as document No.1317 of 1984 before the Sub Registrar Office, Virugambakkam is null and void and he also sought for possession of the suit land.

3. It is the specific case of the petitioner that he executed a power of attorney deed in favour of the first respondent/first defendant on 28.12.1983. Subsequently, the same was cancelled on 13.01.1993. According to the petitioner, the first defendant, by misusing the said power of attorney, fraudulently executed the sale deed in favour of his wife on 13.01.1993 without any consideration. Therefore, the petitioner has filed the present suit seeking a declaration that the said sale deed is invalid.



C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

4. Pending suit, the petitioner filed instant application seeking production of the original Thumb Impression Book maintained by the Sub Registrar, Virugambakkam. The said application was dismissed by the Trial Court and aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has come before this Court.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that in the sale deed executed by the petitioner's power agent in favour of his wife, he failed to affix his thumb impression in the register maintained by the Sub Registrar, Virugambakkam. Therefore, it is contended that the original Thumb Impression Register is required to be produced before the Court.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that it is an admitted fact that no thumb impression was affixed in the register maintained by the Sub Registrar and therefore, production of the original register is unnecessary. It is further submitted that the original copy of the register maintained by the Sub Registrar, Virugambakkam, was already obtained by the petitioner and the same was also marked before the Trial Court as Ex.A19. In such circumstance, the learned counsel contended that the petitioner has not made out any ground warranting interference with the impugned order.



C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

7. The respondent himself admitted that he has not affixed his thumb impression in the register maintained by the Sub Registrar Office, Virugambakkam. Therefore, there is no necessity for the petitioner to call for the said register and produce the same before this Court. Further, a copy of the relevant register has already been marked by the petitioner as Ex.A19. Hence, absolutely no necessity to grant the relief sought for in the petition. The Trial Court rightly appreciated the facts and dismissed the application. Hence, I do not find any error in the order passed by the Trial Court dismissing the application seeking production of original thumb impression Book dated 30.04.1984 maintained in the office of the Sub Registrar, Virugambakkam, Chennai.

8. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

9. The petitioner is entitled to argue regarding the legal impact of the respondent's failure to affix his thumb impression in the register maintained by the Sub Registrar Office, Virugambakkam.

23.02.2026

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral citation

Lpp



C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

To

1. The I Additional Judge,
City Civil Court,
Chennai.

2. The Sub Registrar,
O/o.The Sub Registrar,
Virugambakkam,
Chennai – 600 092.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

Lpp

C.R.P.No.3870 of 2025

23.02.2026