



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

WEB CO **BEFORE THE MADURAI BENGH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

DATED: 29.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.453 & 454 of 2026

D.Prabhakaran

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Sub Registrar,
Sub Registrar Office,
Aravakurichi,
Aravakurichi Taluk,
Karur District.

... 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 relating to the impugned order passed by the respondent in Refusal Check Slip No.RFL/Aravakurichi/109/2025 dated 30.12.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently to direct the respondent to register the sale deed dated 30.12.2025



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

when it is presented for registration by the petitioner in respect of document mentioned property.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Mathiyalagan
For Respondent : Mr.M.Lingadurai,
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

Challenge has been made against the refusal check slip issued by the respondent dated 30.12.2025.

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

3.Learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner entered into a sale agreement with his vendors for the subject property in S.No.395/A1 to an extent of 7 acres 74 ¼ cents for a total sale consideration of Rs.47 Lakhs and part of the sale consideration was received by his vendors. However, they failed to execute the sale deed. Hence, the petitioner filed a civil suit in O.S.No.194 of 2025, on the file of the Principal District Judge, Karur. Thereafter, the matter got settled before the Lok Adalat.



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

After the Lok Adalat decree, the petitioner's vendors executed the sale deed in favour of the petitioner on 30.12.2025 and when the same was presented for registration, the respondent refused to register the same and issued the impugned refusal check slip for non-payment of guideline value of the property as residential area. Hence, the present Writ Petition.

4.Learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the property is absolutely an agricultural land and it is not a residential plot. In order to substantiate his claim, the petitioner has produced photographs. He would further submit that in and around the agricultural land, there are some houses constructed in the village and hence, the respondent insists the petitioner to pay the rate which is applicable for plots. The same is not proper because while dividing the plot, the yardstick applied includes developmental charges and profit of the promoter. Therefore, the same yardstick will not be applicable to the petitioner.

5.On the other hand, learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent strongly opposed the petitioner's contention and submitted that already a committee has been



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

formed and the guideline value has been fixed taking into consideration the nearby development and the layout formed by various promoters, though it appears that agricultural activities are carried out in the subject property. Accordingly, he prays for dismissal of this Writ Petition.

6. Heard the learned Counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. In the present case, there is no dispute that the property which the petitioner intends to purchase is an agricultural land. The said land is situated adjacent to the village. Of course, one side of the land is village and there are lot of layout plots promoted by the promoters, where constructions have been made. Even roads have been formed. As far as the petitioner's land is concerned, purely agricultural activities are carried out. Even the State has issued notification to stop promoting the layouts in the agricultural lands. Such being the case, taking into consideration the one side development of the land, when the petitioner intends to purchase the agricultural land, fixing the guideline value which is applicable for the plots which have been promoted by forming layouts is not



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

proper. In the event of sale of a land, which is being utilised as an agricultural land, a separate guideline value is required to be fixed. Without doing so, in this case, the guideline value of the subject land (agricultural land) was fixed by comparing the guideline value fixed for neighbouring commercial plots.

8.If there is any formation of layout, certainly, the petitioner can sell only around 28,000 sq.ft out of the total extent of land of 43,560 sq.ft in an acre of land. Further, in case, where the plot is sold out, the cost of common area will be included in the suitable area of plots. Apart from the developmental charges, the promoter's profit, which would normally not less than 200% of the cost of purchasing the plot, will also be included. All these elements are required to be eliminated in the event of fixing guideline value for an agricultural land.

9.Of course, if the agricultural land is converted into plot and sold, ultimately, the State would get the revenue, which is applicable for plot. However, in the absence of such conversion, the concerned Authorities cannot fix the guideline value for agricultural land by comparing the neighbouring plots.



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

WEB COPY 10.It was submitted by the respondents that the Committee has fixed the guideline value of the subject land. However, it is crystal clear that the Committee had not considered all the above aspects while fixing the guideline value. Therefore, now, the right course available for the respondent is to register the document, to be re-presented by the petitioner. If there is any dispute on the aspect of determination of guideline value, they can refer the matter under Section 47A for re-determination. and the same is against the Constitution. Such being the case, the impugned rejection is liable to be set aside.

11.Accordingly, the impugned refusal check slip dated 30.12.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded back to the respondent for fresh consideration. While setting aside the impugned order, this Court directs the petitioner to re-present the sale deed and in which case, the respondent is directed to register the same. In the event if the valuation mentioned in the document is not acceptable for the authorities, it is open to them to refer the matter under Section 47-A for re-determination, in which case, certainly, as discussed above, the authorities have to take into



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

consideration the nature of the land and treat the same as an agricultural land. Even the committee should re-consider the fixation of the guideline value.

12.With the above observations, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

29.01.2026

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MR



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

To
The Sub Registrar,
Sub Registrar Office,
Aravakurichi,
Aravakurichi Taluk,
Karur District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

MR

W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2026

29.01.2026