



W.P.(MD) No.1996 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.1996 of 2026

1.Arunachalam

2.Angu Saranya

... Petitioners

Vs

1.The Sub Registrar,
Moolakaraipatti,
Tirunelveli.

2.The Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Venkatachalapaty Temple,
Thirumalapuram,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

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 refusal check slip in RFL/Moolaikaraipatti/1/2005 dated 22.09.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st respondent to assign registration number for the pending Doc.No.P36/2025, dated 04.08.2025 and release the same within the time frame fixed by this Court.



W.P.(MD) No.1996 of 2026

For Petitioners : Mr.V.Karthick Raja
For Respondents : Mr.A.Kannan,
Addl. Govt. Pleader for R1
Mr.K.Balasubramani,
Spl. Govt. Pleader for R2

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed challenging the impugned refusal check slip issued by the 1st respondent dated 22.09.2025.

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

3. The grievance of the petitioners is that when the petitioners presented a sale deed dated 04.08.2025 for registration, the same was refused to be registered on the ground that the subject property belongs to 2nd respondent temple. Challenging the same, the petitioners have filed this Writ Petition.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that without issuing any notice to the petitioners and without



W.P.(MD) No.1996 of 2026

conducting any enquiry, the impugned order was passed. Hence, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

5. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the 1st respondent would fairly submitted that without issuing notice to the petitioners and without conducting any enquiry, the impugned order was passed. Therefore, the impugned order may be set aside and remitted back to the 1st respondent for fresh consideration.

6. This Court heard the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the 1st respondent and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the 2nd respondent and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered view that before issuing any refusal check slip, the 1st respondent has supposed to conduct enquiry with regard to the status of the property and after perusing the available materials, the 1st respondent has supposed to take a decision for registration of any



W.P.(MD) No.1996 of 2026

document. In the present case, the said procedure is not followed.

Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

8. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remitted back to the file of the 1st respondent for fresh consideration. The petitioners are directed to represent the sale deed dated 04.08.2025. Upon representation, 1st the respondent, after issuing notice to the petitioners as well as the other parties concerned and after hearing the parties, is directed to take a decision with regard to the registration of the sale deed dated 04.08.2025.

9. With the above observations, this Writ Petition is allowed.

There shall be no order as to costs.

28.01.2026

vsm

Index : Yes/No

NCC : Yes/No



W.P.(MD) No.1996 of 2026

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Sub Registrar,
Moolakaraipatti,
Tirunelveli.
- 2.The Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Venkatachalapaty Temple,
Thirumalapuram,
Tirunelveli District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.1996 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

vsm

W.P.(MD)No.1996 of 2026

28.01.2026