



WEB COPY

WP No. 36893 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

WP No. 36893 of 2025

HDSR Holding LLP

Represented by its Partner and Authorised
Signatory

Mr.Xavier Andhonisamy, having its Registered
Office at SF.No.887/1, Royakotta Road,
Hosur Taluk, Krishnagiri District – 635 109.

..Petitioner

Vs

1. The Inspector General of Registration
No.100, Santhome High Road, Chennai 28.
2. The District Registrar
Krishnagiri District.
3. The Sub Registrar,
Veppanapalli, Krishnagiri District.

..Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records



relating to the order of refusal dated 28.08.2025 made in refusal No. RFL/Veppanapalli/ 93/ 2025 issued by the Sub Registrar, Veppanapalli, the third respondent herein, quash the same and consequently direct the third respondent herein to register the sale deed dated 28.08.2025 with respect to the property comprised in Plot Nos.1 to 11, 14, 18 to 20, 24 to 29, 33 to 67, 70, 71, 74 to 77, 79 to 92 totalling to an extent of 1,15,260 sq.ft. comprised in S.Nos.45/10, 45/11 & 45/1A2A situated at Kurubarapalli Village, Veppanapalli Taluk, Krishnagiri District.

For Petitioner:

Mr.E.Om Prakash, Senior Counsel
for Ms. N.Sureka

For Respondents:

Mr. Stalin Abhimanyu, AGP

ORDER

Asserting title under three sale deeds dated 19.12.2022, 19.12.2022 & 19.07.2023 bearing document nos.4726/2022, 4734/2022 & 2408/2023, respectively, the petitioner executed sale deed dated 28.08.2025 in favour of one Mr.Kannan in respect of the property in S.Nos.45/10, 45/11 & 45/1A2A of the extent of 1,15,260 sq.ft. and presented the same for registration. The request for registration was declined under impugned refusal check slip dated 28.08.2025. Hence, this writ petition.



2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the request for registration was rejected on the basis of judgment and decree dated 11.07.2017 in O.S.No.7 of 2008 before the Court in Krishnagiri. By referring to said judgment and decree, learned senior counsel points out that the suit was filed on 17.09.2007 against the vendors under sale deeds dated 15.12.1997, 05.09.2002 & 26.02.2004. Therefore, he points out that the defendants in the suit had transferred the property to M.Damodaran, Mrs.Muniyammal & N.Samudi and Mrs.Kantha almost ten years prior to the date of institution of the suit. Thereafter, they conveyed the property to the petitioner on 19.12.2022, 19.12.2022 & 19.07.2023. At the time of registration of the sale deeds in favour of the petitioner, learned senior counsel points out that no objection on the basis of the decree in O.S.No.7/2008 was raised. Given that the decree is only binding on the defendants in the suit, learned senior counsel submits that it cannot stand in the way of the petitioner registering the sale deed.

3. Mr. Stalin Abhimanyu, learned Additional Government Pleader, appears on behalf of the respondents. Referring to the decree and to the impugned order, he submits that the request for registration was refused on account of the order of injunction restraining the sale of suit properties to the third parties until a partition is effected.



4. A decree in a suit is only binding as between the parties thereto. On perusal of the judgment and decree in O.S.No.7 of 2008, it is evident that the defendants in the said suit are T.M.Thirupathi and 11 others. The said T.M.Thirupathi and three others (defendants 1 to 4 in the suit) had executed sale deeds dated 15.12.1997, 05.09.2002 & 26.02.2004 in favour of M.Damodaran, Mrs.Muniyammal & N.Samudi and Mrs.Kantha. In view thereof, the purchasers under sale deed dated 15.12.1997, 05.09.2002 & 26.02.2004 should have been joined as parties to the suit. In any event, upon registering the property under the above mentioned sale deeds, the purchasers conveyed the property to the petitioner under sale deeds dated 19.12.2022, 19.12.2022 & 19.07.2023. The decree *inter alia* restrains the defendants from alienating the property, which, however, had been earlier alienated, to third parties. In these circumstances, the judgment and decree dated 11.07.2017 in O.S.No.7 of 2008 does not bind the petitioner and cannot be cited as reason to refuse to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner.

5. For reasons aforesaid, the impugned refusal check slip is unsustainable and is hereby set aside. Consequently, the petitioner is permitted to re-present the sale deed for registration within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Upon such re-presentation, subject to fulfilment of other requirements relating to registration, the registering officer shall register the document within two weeks therefrom.



6. The writ petition stands disposed of on the above terms without any order as to costs.

17-02-2026
(2/2)

Index : Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

kj

To

1.The Inspector General of Registration
No.100, Santhome High Road, Chennai 28.

2.The District Registrar
Krishnagiri District.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Veppanapalli, Krishnagiri District.



WEB COPY

WP No. 36893 of 2



SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

KJ

WP No. 36893 of 2025

17-02-2026
(2/2)