



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.10159 of 2026



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 15.04.2026

CORAM

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

**W.P(MD)No.10159 of 2026
and
W.M.P(MD)No.8005 of 2026**

G.Karpagaselvi

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Sub Registrar
Sattur,
Virudhunagar District.

...Respondent

Writ Petition is filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the respondent herein in his proceedings in Refusal Check Slip in RFL/Sattur/11/2026 dated 16.03.2026 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent herein to register the sale deed dated 13.03.2026 presented by the petitioner in respect of the property in S.No.23/6E to an extent of 2.250 Hectares (5.56 Acres) in Kalangaperi Village, Virudhunagar Taluk and District.

For Petitioner
For Respondent

:Mr.K.Hemakarthiskeyan
:Mr.M.Gangatharan
Government Advocate

**ORDER**

This writ petition is filed challenging the impugned refusal check slip dated 16.03.2026.

2.Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, the case of the petitioner is that one Varadharajan, S/o.Elango Iyengar was the owner of the property Patta No.90 also stands in his name. From the said person, the petitioner's vendor had purchased the property on 02.06.2010 vide document registered as Document No.4902 of 2010. When the said vendor is now selling to the petitioner, the same is now refused for registration on the ground that the very same property is also dealt with by yet another document, namely document No.1060 of 2010. By the said document, yet another person purchased from Varadharajan.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the executant of the document No.1060 of 2010 is Varadharajan, who is unconnected to the property and that purchaser had purchased, by way of creating false document and the same will not bind the original owner of the property. When the original owner of the property has sold the property only to the petitioner's vendor by document bearing No.4902 of 2010, the same shall



not be rejected on the ground of double entry. This is not a case of double entry in the sense that the same person selling the property twice. But the question of identity and title, the same cannot be gone into by the Sub Registrar.

4.Per contra, the learned Government Advocate would submit that earlier when the property is dealt with by way of a previous sale deed than that of the vendor of the petitioner, the Sub Registrar has rejected the same on the ground of double entry.

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

6.As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, if two different Varadharajans have sold the property, then it may not be a case of double entry, but however, a question has to title and identity of the person to execute the sale deed. Such contested question of title need not be gone into by the Sub-Registrar and the aggrieved person can approach the Civil Court.



7.In view thereof, this writ petition is allowed on the following terms:

(i)The impugned refusal check slip dated 16.03.2026 shall stand quashed and the matter shall stands remanded back to the respondent.

(ii)The respondent shall issue notice to the petitioner as well as to the vendor and purchaser in the earlier document bearing No.1060 of 2010 and conduct an enquiry and if the question involves the identity and question of title, then the respondent shall register the document leaving open the aggrieved parties to approach the civil Court.

(iii)No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

15.04.2026

NCC:Yes/No
Ns

To
The Sub Registrar
Sattur,
Virudhunagar District.



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.10159 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

Ns

W.P(MD)No.10159 of 2026
and
W.M.P(MD)No.8005 of 2026

15.04.2026