



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 17-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.(MD).No.7294 of 2026

Pappathi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Special Officer,
Tamil Nadu Boodan Board and
Director of Rural Development,
Chennai.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Dindigul,
Dindigul District.

3. The Tahsildar,
Natham,
Dindigul District.

4. The Sub-Registrar,
Natham,
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 impugned order passed by the 4th respondent vide Refusal Number RFL/Natham/5/2026 dated 05.02.2026 and quash the same as illegal and consequentially to direct the 4th respondent to register the Sale Deed presented by the petitioner



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

comprising S. No.115/1A2A admeasuring an extent of 12.103 cents, S. No.117/2E1 admeasuring an extent of 43.225 cents, S. No.117/2E3 admeasuring an extent of 3.705 cents, S. No.117/4A1 admeasuring an extent of 50.635 cents situated at Velampatti Village, Natham Taluk, Dindigul District within the time frame stipulated by this Honble Court and pass such further or other orders as this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.P.Rajan
For Respondents : M/s.K.Malathi
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The relief sought for in the present writ petition is to quash the impugned refusal check slip dated 05.02.2026.

2. Heard Mr.V.P.Rajan, learned counsel for the petitioner and M/s.K.Malathi, learned Additional Government Pleader, who takes notice for the respondents.

3. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, the grievance of the petitioner is that the Sale Deed produced by him for registration was refused by the 4th respondent on the ground that the survey numbers mentioned in the Sale Deed are mentioned as 'Bhoodan Board Property'.



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the claim is made on the basis of a document registered in favor of the 'Bhoodan Board' vide Doc.No.742 of 1984. A certified copy of the same can be seen that it is recited in the said document as if these properties were donated by one Andiapillai.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the subject properties originally belonged to the petitioner's husband, namely Ramasamy. He also drew attention to the "A" Register pertaining to the same survey numbers, which stand in the name of the said Ramasamy and not in the name of Andiapillai. It was contended that, in the absence of any right, title, or interest, if a person purports to donate the land in favour of the 'Bhoodan Board' merely for recognition, such an Act would not divest the original owners of their title to the property.

6. He would also rely upon the judgment of this court in the case of ***J.Kasim vs. The District Registrar, Registration Department, Dindigul (W.P(MD).No.20310 of 2021)***, whereby similar questions were considered by this court.



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

7. Per contra, learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents would submit that as on date, the property has been conveyed to the 'Bhoodan Board' through a registered document, and, therefore, the refusal check slip has been issued.

8. I have considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the material records of the case.

9. It is true that if the petitioner is the owner of the property merely because some third party without any title executes a document donating the property in favor of the 'Bhoodan Board', the same by itself will not devolve the title of the petitioner. To that extent earlier orders have also been passed.

10. In this regard, the fact whether the petitioner is the owner of the property and by what document the 'Bhoodan Board' is claiming title ought to be verified by an enquiry as contemplated by the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Sudha Ravi Kumar and another vs. The Special Commissioner (HR & CE) in W.P. (No).30589 of 2012 and etc*** by the sub-register.



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

WEB COPY

11. If it is found that it is the petitioner's property which is wrongfully donated by the said Andiapillai without any title, then accordingly the document has to be registered. Even if the title is held to be against the petitioner, the petitioner is entitled to file an appeal as per the Hon'ble Division Bench in the case of ***Sudha Ravi Kumar case***, referred to supra.

12. In view thereof this writ petition is allowed on the following terms:-

- i. The impugned refusal check slip dated 05.02.2026, shall stand set aside and the matter is remitted back to the file of the 4th respondent for an enquiry;
- ii. The 4th respondent shall issue notice to the petitioner and also to the person in charge of the 'Bhoodan Board', directing them to produce such document in proof of title and thereafter pass orders as directed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the case of ***Sudha Ravi Kumar case***, referred to supra.



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

WEB COPY

iii. Thereafter if any person is aggrieved, it will be open to follow the course as directed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the case of ***Sudha Ravi Kumar case***, referred to supra.

13. The writ petition is disposed of with the above directions and observations. No costs.

17.03.2026

Index: Yes
Speaking Order: Yes
Neutral Citation: No
rgm



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

WEB COPY

- To
1. The Special Officer,
Tamil Nadu Boodan Board and
Director of Rural Development,
Chennai.
 2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Dindigul,
Dindigul District.
 3. The Tahsildar,
Natham,
Dindigul District.
 4. The Sub-Registrar,
Natham,
Dindigul District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).No.7280 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

rgm

W.P.(MD).No.7294 of 2026

17.03.2026