



WP(MD). No.4607 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.4607 of 2026

M.Renuka

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Registrar,
O/o.The District Registrar, Palani,
Dindigul District..

2. The District Registrar(Audit),,
O/o.The District Registrar,
Palani..

3. The Sub Registrar,,
Vadamadurai,
Dindigul 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 refusal check slip issued by the 3rd respondent vide Refusal Number. RFL/Vadamadurai-15/2026 dated 12.02.2026 and quash the same as illegal and consequentially to direct the 3rd respondent to register the sale deed dated 11.12.2026 executed by the Petitioner qua the land to an extent of 12.5 cents comprised in S.No.900/12 (Old S.No.900/3AIA)

1/6



WP(MD). No.4607 of 2026

situate at Ayyalur Village, Vedanchandur Taluk, Dindigul District within the period that may be stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Ms.H.Jasima Yasmin
for M/s.Ajmal Associates
For Respondent : Mr.M.Lingadurai
Spl. Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the refusal check slip dated 12.02.2026 issued by the 3rd respondent and to direct the respondent to register the sale deed dated 11.02.2026 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 3rd respondent on the ground that there was a deficit of stamp duty of Rs.38,123/- to be paid by the vendor at the time of earlier registration. Secondly, as per Section 22(A)



WP(MD). No.4607 of 2026

of the Registration Act, since the petitioner intends to purchase 12.5 cents of land, which according to the respondents, is a plot. Challenging the said refusal, the petitioner is before this Court.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that as far as the first ground is concerned, the petitioner is ready and willing to pay the deficit stamp duty as well as registration charges to the tune of Rs.38,123/- and the second ground is concerned, the land is an agricultural land and if it pertains to plots ie., more than 8 plots alone, 22A will come into force and in the present case, since the petitioner intends to purchase only 12.5 cents of land and it is a single plot purchased from his vendor and that the vendor has not formed any lay-out.

5. Per contra, the learned Special Government Pleader would submit that the property in question is about 12.5 cents of land and is in the form of plot and the petitioner's vendor purchased as plot and the petitioner is also going to purchase the same as plot and therefore, the same could not be registered. That apart, there is a deficit of stamp duty



WP(MD). No.4607 of 2026

by the vendor of the petitioner to the tune of Rs.38,123/-. Therefore, the respondents rightly rejected the sale deed.

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 to an extent of 12.5 cents of land. As far as the rejection made for deficit stamp duty is concerned, since the petitioner is ready and willing to pay the same, the same is directed to be paid. As far as the 2nd ground, ie., there is a bar under Section 22A of the Registration Act is concerned, the petitioner's vendor purchased the said property only as a punja land. Even assuming if it is a plot, it is for the respondents to prove the same whether any lay-out was formed by the petitioner's vendor or vendor's vendor with more than 8 plots and sold it as an unapproved lay-out as mandated as per Section 22A read with the Circular of the Inspector of Registration dated 16.03.2020. In the absence of any proof thereof and when the respondents are unable to substantiate the said land was sold as



WP(MD). No.4607 of 2026

unapproved lay-out with more than eight plots, Section 22A would not arise and there is no bar for registration. Therefore, there is no impediment for the 3rd 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 11.02.2026 and upon such representation, the 3rd 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,
O/o.The District Registrar, Palani,
Dindigul District..

2. The District Registrar(Audit),,
O/o.The District Registrar, Palani..

3. The Sub Registrar,,
Vadamadurai, Dindigul District..

5/6



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.4607 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J

RR

**ORDER
IN
WP(MD) No.4607 of 2026**

Date : 19/02/2026