



W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)No.4524 of 2026

Desinguraja

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Sub Registrar,
Sub Registrar Office,
Sayalkudi,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order issued by the second respondent in pending Document No.27/2025 dated 04.12.2025



W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the second respondent to register the Sale Deed dated 21.11.2025 presented by the petitioner for registration.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Mathan Kumar
For Respondents : Mr.V.Om Prakash
Government Advocate

ORDER

Challenge has been made against the refusal check slip issued by the second respondent dated 04.12.2025.

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

3.The learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that the subject property is the petitioner's vendors' ancestral property. The petitioner's vendors inherited the property through Joint Patta and they are in possession and enjoyment of the same jointly. While that being so, now the petitioner's vendors intending to sell the property in favour of the petitioner, presented the sale deed dated 21.11.2025 for registration before the second respondent.



W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

However, the second respondent refused to register the same vide impugned order dated 04.12.2025, citing the reason that the property has not been partitioned though joint patta exists, death and legal heir certificates are not produced properly. Hence, the present Writ Petition.

4.Per contra, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents submits that since the relevant documents were not produced, they are not in a position to register the sale deed.

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

6.Upon perusal of the documents produced, this Court is of the opinion that these documents are sufficient to establish the petitioner's vendors' right over the property. Such being the case, I am unable to understand as to why the second respondent without scrutinizing the documents has passed the impugned order, though it is well within the scope of the said Sub-Registrar.



W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

WEB COPY

7.Hence, the impugned order has been passed with total non-application of mind. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands disposed of, by setting aside the impugned order dated 04.12.2025, passed by the respondent. While setting aside the impugned order, this Court directs the petitioner to re-present the sale deed dated 21.11.2025 to the second respondent, who shall register the same forthwith. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

26.02.2026

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MR



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

To

1.The District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Sub Registrar,
Sub Registrar Office,
Sayalkudi,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

MR

W.P.(MD)No.5402 of 2026

26.02.2026