



WEB COPY

WP CrI. No. 1769 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-01-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

WP CrI. No.1769 of 2025

S.Rossammal

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Deputy Inspector
General of Registration,
Chennai – 35.
2. The Sub Registrar,
Ambattur Sub-Registrar Office,
Chennai – 53.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Anti Land Grabbing Cell,
Avadi, Chennai – 54.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This writ petition (CrI.) has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking to direct the third respondent to implement the order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 21.06.2023 in proceedings K.No.910 of 2023 and letter No.820/2025 dated 28.06.2025.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.K.S.Karthik Raja

For Respondent(s) : Mr.S.Santhosh

Govt. Advocate (CrI.Side) for R1 to R3



ORDER

This writ petition (Crl.) has been filed seeking to direct the third respondent to implement the order passed by the second respondent dated 21.06.2023 viz. proceedings dated 28.06.2025 in K.No.910 of 2023 and letter No.820/2025.

2. When the matter was taken up for hearing today, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the communication issued by the second respondent-Registrar has not been received by the third respondent. However, the petitioner had given a similar complaint to the Commissioner of Police, Avadi Commissionerate, which was thereafter referred to the third respondent for enquiry and taken on file as a current paper in C.No.2477/COP-AVD/Grievance/APC/2024.

3. He further submitted that the counter parties had approached this Court in W.P.No.26535 of 2024, and by order dated 06.02.2025, this Court, relying upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in ***M.Katirvel vs. The Inspector General of Registration***, reported in **2024 (4) CTC 769**, held that the Sub-Registrar has no such power and accordingly set aside the order passed by the Sub-Registrar. In view of the same, the respondents closed the petitioner's complaint, directing her to approach the jurisdictional Civil Court.



4. He further submitted that the complaint has since been closed and the closure report has also been duly served on the petitioner.

5. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there are sufficient materials to *prima facie* establish that the accused have committed forgery and, therefore sought liberty to the petitioner to challenge the closure report in the manner known to law.

6. In view of the above submission made by the learned counsel on either side, this writ petition (criminal) stands dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the closure report in the manner known to law.

12-01-2026

rap

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB COPY

WP CrI. No. 1769 of 2



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

RAP

To

1. The Deputy Inspector
General of Registration,
Chennai – 35.
2. The Sub Registrar,
Ambattur Sub-Registrar Office,
Chennai – 53.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Anti Land Grabbing Cell,
Avadi, Chennai – 54.

WP CrI. No. 1769 of 2025

12-01-2026