



WP(MD). No.4634 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 19/02/2026

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP(MD). No.4634 of 2026

Satheesh Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Registrar,
District Registrar Office,
Virudhunagar District..

2. The Sub Registrar,
Joint Ii Sub Registrar,
Virudhunagar,
Virudhunagar District..

... Respondents

PRAYER :- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to call for the records and to cancel the impugned refusal check slip bearing refusal number RFL/JOINT II SUB REGISTRAR VIRUDHUNAGAR/5/2026 dated 13.02.2026 issued by the 2nd respondent and also direct to register the petitioners sale deed presented on 13.02.2026.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Viji
For Respondent : Mr.M.Lingadurai
Spl. Government Pleader



WP(MD). No.4634 of 2026

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the refusal check slip dated 13.02.2026 issued by the 2nd respondent and to direct the respondent to register the sale deed dated 13.02.2026 presented by the petitioner for registration.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Special 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.

3. When the petitioner presented the sale deed for registration, the same was refused to be registered by the 2nd respondent on the ground that the land in question to an extent of 37 cents is an unapproved lay-out. It is his case that initially the petitioner's vendor, out of total 3 acres and 85 cents, sold 25.44 cents and now the petitioner purchased 37 cents. Since it is an agricultural land, challenging the said refusal, the petitioner is before this Court.



WP(MD). No.4634 of 2026

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that it is an agricultural land and earlier the petitioner's vendor has not divided the said land into lay-out or plots and now, the petitioner also intends to purchase 37 cents of agricultural land without any subdivision and hence, neither the question of approval nor bar under Section 22A would arise. Hence, the learned counsel prays for interference.

5. Per contra, the learned Special Government Pleader would submit that out of 3 acres 85 cents, the petitioner's vendor earlier sold 25.44 cents of land and in the remaining extent, he sold 37 cents of land to the petitioner herein by way of the present sale deed. Therefore, it came to light that the petitioner's vendor is selling the land by dividing it as plots without there being any approval and in future also, they would sell the land by dividing it as plots and hence, the authorities have rightly rejected the document for registration.

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



WP(MD). No.4634 of 2026

7. It appears that in the present case, the petitioner intends to execute a sale deed for 37 cents of land. However, it is the stand of the 2nd respondent that the petitioner's vendor initially sold 25.44 cents of land out of 3 acres and 85 cents and now the present sale deed is for 37 cents. If the respondent's contention is true, then they have to substantiate whether any lay-out is formed as per the provision under Section 22A of the Registration Act or the land has been divided into plots. However, in the present case, the petitioner's vendor has not divided the land into plots, ie., more than 8 plots as per Section 22A ie., as of now, the petitioner's vendor has sold only two portions of land, ie., 25.44 cents and 37 cents respectively. G.O.No.78 dated 04.05.2017 says that if it is more than eight plots, then it would be considered as lay-out. The said G.O., also clarifies about lay-out. Lay-out means division of land into plots exceeding eight in numbers in Chennai Metropolitan planning area and division of land into plots by introducing a new road or street in areas other than Metropolitan planning area. This Court is inclined to apply the said G.O., to petitioner's case, since no other definition is available for the word 'lay-out' etc. If such is the case, then, in the present case, since the petitioner's vendor is selling only 37 cents



WP(MD). No.4634 of 2026

of land without any sub division to the petitioner, as of now question of forming lay-out or getting approval does not arise. For this reason, the bar under Section 22A of the Registration Act also would not apply to the present case. Without considering this aspect, the impugned order of refusal is issued. Therefore, while setting aside the impugned order, the petitioner is directed to represent the sale deed dated 13.02.2026 and upon such representation, the 2nd 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.

19.02.2026

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

RR

TO

1. The District Registrar,
District Registrar Office,
Virudhunagar District..

2. The Sub Registrar,
Joint II Sub Registrar,
Virudhunagar,
Virudhunagar District..

5/6



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.4634 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J

RR

**ORDER
IN
WP(MD) No.4634 of 2026**

Date : 19/02/2026