



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 24.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025
and
W.M.P.(MD)No.15219 of 2025

K.Soundararajan

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Trichy District,
Trichy.

2.The District Registrar,
Office of District Registrar,
Trichy District,
Trichy.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Office of Sub Registrar,
Thiruverumbur,
Trichy District.

4.Kaethai @ T.Veeramani

5.S.Latha

6.A.M.Ashokan

7.S.V.S.Saravanan



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

8.S.S.Ravanan

... Respondents

PRAYER:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the third respondent's impugned communication of refusal of registration of pending Document Nos.88 and 89/2025 dated 08.07.2025 and quash the same as devoid of merits and directing the second respondent to direct the third respondent to register and release the registered sale agreements dated 30.06.2025 in pending Document Nos.88 and 89/2025 in respect of property in Survey No.310/5 an extent of 2469.69 sq. mt. and 11935.618 sq.mt. in Navalpattu Village, Thiruverumbur Taluk, Trichy District, within the period as stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Haja Mohideen
For R1 to R3 : Mrs.K.Malathi
Additional Government Pleader
For R4 to R8 : Mr.S.Vikram

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records on the file of the third respondent relating to the impugned refusal check slip dated 08.07.2025, quash the same, and consequently direct the third respondent to register the sale agreements dated 30.06.2025,



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

which are now pending as Document Nos.88 and 89 of 2025, in respect of the property comprised in Survey No.310/5, admeasuring 2469.69 square meters and 11,935.618 square meters, situated at Navalpattu Village, Tiruverumbur Taluk, Tiruchirappalli District.

2. The factual background, in brief, is that the petitioner presented the aforesaid sale agreements dated 30.06.2025 for registration. The petitioner claims that, by virtue of the decree passed by the Civil Court in O.S.No.362 of 2021, he has acquired the right to execute the sale agreements. It is further stated that an Execution Petition has been filed to execute the said decree and that the subject property has been divided into plots. According to the petitioner, unless the property is consolidated, it would not be possible to secure prospective purchasers in the execution proceedings. In view thereof, the petitioner executed the sale agreements. Objections were raised by the private respondents with regard to the registration of any document relating to the said survey number. Their contention is that they are the true owners of the property and that, by collusively instituting a suit and obtaining a Lok Adalat Award, the petitioner is attempting to deal with the property. It is stated that they have filed O.S.No.1019



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

of 2022 on the file of the learned II Additional Subordinate Judge, Tiruchirappalli, which is pending. The relief sought in the said suit is for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants therein from interfering with the possession and enjoyment of the private respondents in respect of the very same property, and they have also asserted title therein. Further, they have filed another suit in O.S.No.67 of 2026 seeking to declare the decree passed in O.S.No.362 of 2021 as null and void, which is also pending.

3. It is also seen that the objectors had earlier filed C.R.P.(MD)No.2132 of 2025 under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the Lok Adalat Award. The same was dismissed, granting liberty to them to establish their rights before the competent Civil Court. Pursuant thereto, the aforesaid civil suit has been filed.

4. Considering the aforesaid facts, the Sub-Registrar passed the impugned order refusing to register the sale agreements. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner is before this Court.



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, when this Court had earlier held in the Civil Revision Petition that the parties must establish their rights before the Civil Court, the Sub-Registrar ought not to have gone into the question of title. It is further submitted that, since the sale agreements were presented pursuant to a decree passed by the Civil Court based on a Lok Adalat Award, the Sub-Registrar was bound to register the same. It is contended that the refusal to register the documents would cause grave prejudice to the petitioner, particularly, in the pending execution proceedings, as the decree amount cannot otherwise be realized.

6. Per contra, the learned counsel for the private respondents submitted that the Lok Adalat Award itself is vitiated by fraud and collusion. According to them, in the absence of any valid title document, a suit was collusively filed and a decree was obtained to create a non-existent right. It is further contended that the title is vested only with the private respondents.

7. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the material records of the case.



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

WEB COPY

8. There can be no dispute with regard to the proposition that the Sub-Registrar cannot adjudicate upon questions of title. However, in the present case, the very basis on which the sale agreements have been presented is that the petitioner, as the decree-holder in O.S.No.362 of 2021, has acquired a right to sell the property.

9. On a perusal of the Lok Adalat Award, it is seen that the defendant submitted to a decree for payment of money with interest. A reading of the plaint would show that it is a mortgage suit and in default of payment of the money within the stipulated time, the mortgaged property is liable to be brought for sale. Therefore, the decree does not confer any independent right upon the petitioner/decreed-holder to sell the property by executing sale agreements.

10. In such circumstances, the very basis on which the documents have been presented for registration cannot be sustained, particularly, when civil suits are already pending between the parties, including a suit challenging the Lok Adalat Award as null and void.



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

WEB COPY

11. Accordingly, I am not inclined to interfere with the order of the Sub-Registrar refusing to register the documents.

12. For all the above reasons, the writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs. It is made clear that, even as per the Award, it is for the petitioner to execute the decree in the manner known to law by proceeding with the Execution Petition and bringing the property for sale. As and when such steps are taken, it is open to the private respondents to work out their remedies by seeking appropriate interim orders in the pending suits or by raising objections in the execution proceedings. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

24.03.2026

Neutral Citation : No
smn2

To:-

1.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Trichy District,
Trichy.



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

2.The District Registrar,
Office of District Registrar,
Trichy District,
Trichy.

3.The Sub Registrar,
Office of Sub Registrar,
Thiruverumbur,
Trichy District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

smn2

W.P.(MD)No.19768 of 2025

24.03.2026

Page 9 of 9