



W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 07.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

Paulpandi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Virudhunagar District.

2.The Sub Registrar,
Sub Register Office,
Sattur,
Virudhunagar District.

3.Abraham

4.Paul Arunachalam

5.Vairamuthu

6.Sundaraj

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the entire relevant records related to the impugned Refusal Check Slip issued by the second respondent in RFL/Sattur/1/2025, dated 07.01.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents to register the sale



W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

deed presented by the petitioner vide Temporary Acknowledgment Receipt No:TP/206457501/2025, dated 07.01.2025, within a stipulated time that may be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Paramasivam

For R1 and R2 : Mr.A.Baskaran
Additional Government Pleader

For R3 and R5 : Mr.T.Selvan

For R4 : No Appearance

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed challenging the impugned refusal check slip dated 07.01.2025.

2. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and upon perusal of the materials available on record, it is the case of the petitioner that the property originally belonged to the third respondent, Abraham. He had sold the property in favour of Mohammed Yusuf Ali by a registered sale deed bearing Document No.2217 of 2008 dated 17.03.2008. Thereafter, the said Mohammed Yusuf Ali sold the property in favour of one Sarfudeen by a registered sale deed bearing Document No.8435 of 2010 dated 21.09.2010. Subsequently, the said Sarfudeen executed a Power of Attorney in favour of one Mujeebur Rahman vide Document No.



W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

219 of 2011 dated 21.02.2011. Acting under the said Power of Attorney, the petitioner's vendor, Samsudeen, purchased the property by a registered sale deed bearing Document No.12268 of 2011 dated 10.11.2011. Thereafter, the said Samsudeen executed another Power of Attorney in favour of Mujeebur Rahman vide Document No.3439 of 2013 dated 02.04.2013. Pursuant to the said Power of Attorney, the petitioner purchased the property and presented the document for registration. The same has been refused by the first respondent / Sub Registrar on the ground that the very same Abraham, after having sold the property to Mohammed Yusuf Ali, had once again dealt with the same property by executing three sale deeds in favour of the respondents 4 to 6 on 12.11.2008, 18.11.2008 and 20.11.2008. Citing such double entries in respect of the same property, the impugned refusal check slip has been issued.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that it is not within the domain of the Sub Registrar to refuse registration on the ground of title dispute. It is further submitted that there is no dispute that Abraham was the original owner and that he had first alienated the property in favour of the petitioner's predecessor-in-title.



W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

4. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents 3 and 5 would submit that in view of the double entries, the document has been rightly refused. It is also submitted that notice to the sixth respondent has been returned with an endorsement that the said respondent is deceased. The particulars of the legal heirs are not known to any of the parties. In any event, it is contended that the petitioner has to work out his remedy before the competent Civil Court.

5. I have considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. It is well settled that registration by itself does not confer title, but at best serves as a notice to the general public regarding the transaction entered into by the parties. When a document is presented for registration, the same cannot be refused by the Sub Registrar on the ground of title dispute.

7. Even with regard to the alleged double entries, it is evident from the very stand of the Sub Registrar that the petitioner's predecessor-in-title, namely, Mohammed Yusuf Ali, was the first purchaser from the third respondent. Therefore, the subsequent alienations made by the third



W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

respondent in favour of the respondents 4 to 6, after the initial sale dated 17.03.2008, *prima facie* lack justification. When the earlier sale deed was already reflected in the encumbrance, no valid defence can be sustained by the respondents 4 and 5 at this stage. There was no objection that was raised before the Sub Registrar either by respondents 4 and 5 or the legal heirs of Sundaraj.

8. In view of the above, and inasmuch as the question of title can always be adjudicated before the competent Civil Court, this Court is of the view that the document cannot be refused registration on such grounds.

9. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is allowed on the following terms:-

(i) The impugned refusal check slip dated 07.01.2025 is set aside.

(ii) The petitioner shall re-present the document within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a web copy of this order without waiting for the certified copy.

(iii) Upon such re-presentation, if the document is



W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

WEB COPY

otherwise in order, the first respondent / Sub Registrar shall register the same in accordance with law.

(iv) It is open to both the petitioner and the private respondents to work out their remedies before the competent Civil Court in the manner known to law.

No costs.

07.04.2026

Neutral Citation : Yes / No
smn2

To

- 1.The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Virudhunagar District.
- 2.The Sub Registrar,
Sub Register Office,
Sattur,
Virudhunagar District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

smn2

W.P.(MD)No.31147 of 2025

07.04.2026