



W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 23.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)No.716 of 2026

Nandhini Nageshwari

... Petitioner

-VS-

- 1.The Inspector General of Registration,
Registration Department,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Chennai - 600 028.
- 2.The District Registrar,
The District Registrar Office,
Trichy to Rameshwaram National Highways,
Karaikudi.
- 3.The Sub Registrar,
Joint II Sub Registrar Office,
Trichy to Rameshwaram National Highways,
Karaikudi.
- 4.S.Ramasamy
- 5.A.T.Sundaram
- 6.S.Allimalar



W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

7.Santhana Lakshmi

... Respondents

PRAYER:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned refusal check slip bearing Refusal No. RFL / 2 Sub Registrar Karaikudi 38/2025 dated on 12.12.2025 passed by the third respondent and quash the same as illegal, consequently, directing the third respondent to register the sale deed dated 04.12.2025 presented by the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mrs.J.Padhmaavathi Devi
For R1 to R3 : Mr.F.Deepak
Special Government Pleader
For R4 and R5 : Mr.C.Senthil Murugan
For R7 : Mr.P.Vinodh

ORDER

The writ petition is filed challenging the impugned refusal check slip dated 12.12.2025.

2. I have heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the material records of the case.



W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

3. The learned counsel for the private respondents requests additional time to file a counter-affidavit. Considering the nature and circumstances of the case, no further time is granted, and the writ petition is taken up for final hearing.

4. When a sale deed dated 04.12.2025 was presented for registration by the petitioner, it was refused on the grounds that, (i) although the petitioner claims title through Document No.3656 of 2021, the fourth respondent later executed Document No.6390 of 2025 conveying the same property to the seventh respondent; (ii) even the civil court decree does not set aside the said document.

5. It can be seen that the matter of dispute regarding the title between the petitioner and the respondents 4 and 5 was before the learned Additional District Judge, Sivagangai, in O.S.No.8 of 2023, where the Registering Authorities were also named as defendants, and the property in question was declared to belong to the petitioner. Considering the sale document executed by the same Ramasamy and the objection he filed, and noting that the civil court has not explicitly set aside the sale deed, the impugned order is issued. Firstly, the title is declared in favour of the petitioner. Secondly, just three days before the judgment, perhaps



W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

anticipating the decree, the document was registered by the fourth respondent. In any case, when the sub-registrar is involved, and a comprehensive decree has been issued, there is no reason to reject the document.

6. In view of the above, this writ petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 12.12.2025 is quashed, and the third respondent is directed to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner dated 04.12.2025, if otherwise the same is in order. The aforementioned exercise shall be completed within three weeks from the date of receipt of a web copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

23.03.2026

Neutral Citation : No
smn2

To:-

- 1.The Inspector General of Registration,
Registration Department,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Chennai - 600 028.
- 2.The District Registrar,
The District Registrar Office,
Trichy to Rameshwaram National Highways,
Karaikudi.



W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

WEB COPY

3.The Sub Registrar,
Joint II Sub Registrar Office,
Trichy to Rameshwaram National Highways,
Karaikudi.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

smn2

W.P.(MD)No.886 of 2026

23.03.2026

Page 6 of 6