



WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 20/01/2026

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

Chandrasekaran K

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Inspector General of Registration,
Department of Registration,
Chennai..

2. The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Ramanathapuram Range,
Ramanathapuram District..

... Respondents

PRAYER :-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to conduct an enquiry in accordance with the communication of the 1st respondent dated 26.02.2024 within a time frame to be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Kumar
For Respondents : Mr.M.Lingadurai
Special Government Pleader



WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

WEB COPY

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed for a mandamus to direct the 2nd respondent to conduct enquiry in accordance with the communication of the 1st respondent dated 26.02.2024 within a time frame to be fixed by this Court.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Special Government Pleader for the official respondents. By consent of both sides, the writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the first respondent has sent a communication on 26.02.2024, the 2nd respondent has not conducted the enquiry and therefore, prays for appropriate direction.

4. The learned Special Government Pleader, on the other hand, would submit that in the present case, the petitioner preferred a complaint against the District Registrar with regard to cancellation of the



WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

documents, which he had already brought to the notice of the first respondent and the first respondent, in turn, directed the 2nd respondent to conduct enquiry and enquiry process is on. The learned counsel would submit that when the first respondent has already taken a decision pursuant to the complaint of the petitioner by directing the 2nd respondent, the petitioner is in the habit of preferring complaints and filed the present writ petition. The learned counsel would further submit that when there is an alternative remedy of filing an appeal against the said rejection order passed by the District Registrar, the petitioner, instead of availing such remedy, has preferred a complaint before the first respondent and hence, prays for dismissal.

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

6. It is seen that the main allegation of the petitioner is only against the District Registrar, namely, Sasikala with regard to cancellation of documents with regard to the ancestral property of the petitioner. The petitioner approached the District Registrar under Section 77A of the



WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

Registration Act, for cancellation of the documents. However, it is seen that the same was refused to be cancelled and the prayer of the petitioner has been rejected by the District Registrar. Therefore, the right course available to the petitioner is only to approach the appellate authority by way of appeal. However, till date, no challenge was made against the refusal order dated 02.06.2023 issued by the District Registrar.

7. At this juncture, it would be pertinent to note that at the time of passing the aforesaid refusal order, the provisions of Section 77A of the Registration Act was in force. Subsequently, the said provision was struck down by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court vide the order dated 02.08.2024 passed in W.P.No.10291 of 2022, etc. batch. When such being the case, if the petitioner really intends to cancel the registration of documents, he should have challenged the refusal order passed by the District Registrar.

8. Further, upon perusal, it appears that the concerned District Registrar discharged her duties in accordance with the provisions of Law while passing the refusal order dated 02.06.2023. In such case, even if



WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

there is any error in the said order, the same could have been challenged in the manner known to law. However, without doing so, the petitioner is taking revenge against the concerned District Registrar by merely filing a complaint before the 1st respondent. The said act of the petitioner is nothing but harassment against her.

9. Now, it was informed by the learned Special Government Pleader that based on the petitioner's complaint, the 1st respondent had initiated enquiry proceedings against the District Registrar.

10. As stated above, this Court has already arrived at a conclusion that there is no fault on the part of the District Registrar, who had discharged her duty in her capacity as an Authority, while passing the refusal order. In such case, the proceedings initiated by the 1st respondent at the instance of petitioner's complaint is liable to be closed. Accordingly, the same stands closed.

11. For all the reasons stated above, this Court is inclined to dismiss this petition as devoid of merits. Accordingly, this writ petition is



WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

dismissed with cost of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only). The petitioner is directed pay the said amount to the Legal Service Authority within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

12. Post this matter on 24.02.2026 for reporting compliance.

20.01.2026

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

RR

To

1. The Inspector General of Registration,
Department of Registration, Chennai..

2. The Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Ramanathapuram Range, Ramanathapuram District..



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.1110 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J

RR

**ORDER
IN
WP(MD) No.1110 of 2026**

Date : 20.01.2026