



W.P.(MD) No.285 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 07.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.285 of 2026

K.Umaramanan

... Petitioner

Vs

The Sub Registrar,
O/o. Sub Registrar Office,
Joint – II Sub Registrar Office,
Tenkasi.

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to the Impugned Refusal Check Slip in Refusal Number RFL/Joint-2 Sub registrar Tenkasi/184/2025 issued by the respondent dated 05.12.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent to register the Sale Deed Document presented by the Petitioner within time frame as fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.S.Haroon Rasheed

For Respondent : Mr.A.Kannan,
Addl. Govt. Pleader



W.P.(MD) No.285 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Writ Petition is filed challenging the impugned refusal check slip issued by the respondent dated 05.12.2025 and also seeking for a consequential direction to the respondent to register a sale deed presented by the petitioner, within the time frame as fixed by this Court.

2. By consent, this Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. It is the grievance of the petitioner that when the petitioner presented a sale deed for registration, the same was refused to be registered on the ground that the Sub Registrar wants to get an DTCP approval from the authorities and also there is a bar under Section 22A of “the Registration Act, 1908” (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”). Challenging the same, the petitioner has filed this Writ Petition.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that in respect of the same subject property, earlier three occasions, registrations have been done in the year 2017 and 2018.



W.P.(MD) No.285 of 2026

Therefore, there is no justification in refusing to register the document presented by the petitioner. Hence, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

5. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondent would submit that there is a bar under Section 22A of the Act. Hence, the respondent has refused to register the document presented by the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the view that subsequent to the invocation of Section 22A of the Act, three registrations have been done in the year 2017 and 2018. If at all the respondent is refused to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner by referring to Section 22A, the respondent had supposed to have taken the same stand in the first registration, which was taken place in the year 2017. Having accepted the first registration in the year 2017 with regard to the same subject property, there is no impediment on the part of the respondent to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner now. Therefore, on this ground the impugned order is liable to be set aside.



W.P.(MD) No.285 of 2026

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the impugned refusal check slip issued by the respondent dated 05.12.2025 is set aside and the Writ Petition is allowed. The petitioner is directed to represent the sale deed and upon representation, the respondent is directed to register the same forthwith. There shall be no order as to costs.

07.01.2026

Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

vsm



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.285 of 2026

To

The Sub Registrar,
O/o. Sub Registrar Office,
Joint – II Sub Registrar Office,
Tenkasi.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.285 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

vsm

W.P.(MD)No.285 of 2026

07.01.2026