



WP(MD). No.4258 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 17/02/2026

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP(MD). No.4258 of 2026

Sanjay

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Sub Registrar,
Sub Registrar Office,
Kayathar, Thoothukudi District.

2. Ramachandran,,
S/o.Ramasamy,
No.34/87, Sattanathan Street,
Kazhugamalai, Thoothukudi District.

3. Dhayalan,,
S/o.Ramasamy,
No.34/87, Sattanathan Street,
Kazhugamalai, Thoothukudi District.

... Respondents

PRAYER :- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the impugned refusal Slip No.RFL/Kayathar/9/2025 dated 17.10.2025 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the 1st respondent to register the Sale Deed presented by the petitioner in respect of the land



WP(MD). No.4258 of 2026

in S.F.No.115/1B to an extent of 2.24.50 hectares situated in Kayathar Taluk, Thoothukudi District, within stipulated time frame fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Prabu
For Respondent : Mr.A.Kannan for R1
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the refusal check slip dated 17.10.2025 issued by the 1st respondent and to direct the respondent to accept the sale deed dated 17.10.2025 presented by the petitioner for registration.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader for the official respondent. By consent of both sides, the writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself. Since no adverse orders are going to be passed against the respondents 2 and 3, notice is dispensed with.

3. When the petitioner presented the sale deed for registration, the same was refused to be registered by the 1st respondent on the ground that the land in question was already registered in favour of one Cape



WP(MD). No.4258 of 2026

Infrastructure in the year 2010 by the vendor of the petitioner and since several registrations in respect of the subject property, they refused to register the sale deed. Challenging the said refusal, the petitioner is before this Court.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner intends to execute a sale deed now. However, the same came to be refused to be registered citing the reason that the same land was registered in favour of one Cape Infrastructure in the year 2010.

5. The learned Additional Government Pleader, on instructions, would submit that since the subject property was registered in favour of Cape Infrastructure in the year 2010 by the vendor of the petitioner, the sale deed came to be refused to be registered.

6. I have considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record.

7. It appears that in the present case, as rightly contended by both sides, the petitioner intends to execute a sale deed in favour of one



WP(MD). No.4258 of 2026

Kaliya on 17.10.2025 to an extent of 2.24.50 Hectares at Kayathar Taluk, Thoothukudi District, which was originally belonged to the vendor of the petitioner, who, by virtue of the sale deed dated 13.10.1996 sold the same to the petitioner herein and since then, the petitioner is in possession and enjoyment of the same and records were also mutated in the name of the petitioner's company. While so, when the petitioner intends to sell the subject land and presented the document for registration, the same came to be refused on the ground that in the year 2010, the very same subject property was registered in the name of one Cape Infrastructure through a power deed by one Kalyanapandi in Doc. No.2599/2010 and the power deed has also been cancelled in the year 2025. When the petitioner purchased the property as early as in the year 1996, the petitioner's vendor sold the same property to one Cape Infrastructure again on 10.12.2010. When the property was sold in favour of the petitioner, the subsequent sale will not have any legal sanctity in the eye of law and that will not bind the petitioner any more. In such circumstances, the petitioner is entitled to sell the said property. As such, as the rightful owner of the property, the sale deed was presented, however, without any authority, the vendor has once again sold the property to some third



WP(MD). No.4258 of 2026

parties in the year 2010 through a power deed. When the subsequent sale will not have any legal sanctity and will not bind the petitioner, there is no impediment for the 1st respondent to register the sale deed presented by the petitioner. Therefore, while setting aside the impugned order, the petitioner is directed to represent the sale deed dated 17.10.2025 and upon such representation, the 1st respondent shall register the same forthwith, if the same is otherwise in order.

8. The writ petition is disposed of with the above direction. No costs.

17.02.2026

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

RR

TO

1. The Sub Registrar,
Sub Registrar Office,
Kayathar,
Thoothukudi District.



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.4258 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J

RR

**ORDER
IN
WP(MD) No.4258 of 2026**

Date : 17/02/2026