



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.5959 of 2



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 05.03.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE D.BHARATHA
CHAKRAVARTHY**

W.P(MD)No.5959 of 2026

S.Prabhu

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
Office of the Inspector General of Registration,
Chennai.

2.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Office of the Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Integrated Registration Office,
Madurai.

3.The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Theni District.

4.The Sub Registrar,
Periyakulam Sub Registrar Office,
Theni District.

...Respondents

Writ Petition is filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents No. 1 to 3 to conduct the enquiry based on the petitioner's representation dated 20.02.2026 and pass a speaking order and conclude the same within the time frame as fixed by this Court.



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.5959 of 2



For Petitioner
For Respondents

:Mr.D.S.Haroon Rasheed
:Mr.A.Baskaran
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition is filed to conduct an inquiry based on the petitioner's representation dated 20.02.2026 and to pass a speaking order.

2.This writ petition is disposed of at the admission stage and as such, this Court is not making any observation on the merits or otherwise of the case of the petitioner.

3.The case of the petitioner is that the land in question was developed into plots and subsequently sold to third parties. Taking advantage of the absence of the purchasers, the original power of attorney holder thought it fit to clandestinely enter into a lease agreement with the persons who illegally quarry and on the strength of the lease, those persons have quarried the earth. Therefore, when the petitioners have already given a complaint and a criminal case is also now registered and is being investigated, in order to wriggle out of the liability, the power of attorney agent has once again gone running to the very same Sub-Registrar's office and has unilaterally executed a cancellation of lease document. The unilateral document ought not to have been registered by the Sub-Registrar. It is the claim of the



petitioner that to aid that person to somehow mitigate the seriousness of the fraud, the sub-Registrar has done an indulgence in the illegal act and therefore, the petitioner prays for conduct of an enquiry.

4.With reference to the same, the learned Government advocate takes notice on behalf of the respondents and submitted that it is true that the document was cancelled by way of a unilateral document. When the Court posed a query whether the registered lease deed can be unilaterally cancelled, the learned Additional Government Pleader would answer in the negative.

5.In view thereof, let the third respondent, the District Registrar, Theni, take up the representation of the petitioner dated 20.02.2026 for enquiry and issue notice to the petitioner as well as the Sub-registrar concerned, and other parties to the document and take further action in accordance with law. The same shall be done as expeditiously as possible, in any event not later than 12 weeks from the date of receipt of the web copy of the order. No costs.

05.03.2026

NCC:Yes/No
Ns



W.P(MD)No.5959 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

Ns

To

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
Office of the Inspector General of Registration,
Chennai.

2.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Office of the Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Integrated Registration Office,
Madurai.

3.The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Theni District.

4.The Sub Registrar,
Periyakulam Sub Registrar Office,
Theni District.

W.P(MD)No.5959 of 2026

05.03.2026