

K.Indrani Vs The Inspector General of Registration

K.Indrani Vs The Inspector General of Registration

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1413516

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Jan-29-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice Senthilkumar Ramamoorthy

Appeal No. : WP/1005/2026

Appellant : K.Indrani

Respondent : The Inspector General of Registration

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY
and W.M.P. No.1193 of 2026 K.Indrani .. Petitioner vs 3.Lakshmi ..
Respondents Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India
praying for the issuance of a writ of mandamus to direct the first
respondent to take action against the respondents 2 and 3 by disposing
the written representation made by the petitioner on 09.12.2025 within a
stipulated time. For Petitioner : Ms.P.Dhaarani for Mr.C.Prakasam For
Respondents : Mr.U.Baranidharan, Special Government Pleader for R1

and R2

ORDER

By asserting that a settlement deed was executed in respect of the properties described in paragraph No.2 of the affidavit in favour of the petitioners husband on 22.08.2011, the petitioner complains of the subsequent registration of a settlement deed by the third respondent in favour of her husband on 28.10.2025 under Document No.4726 of 2025. After submitting a representation to the first respondent to take action against the second and third respondents in relation thereto, the present writ petition has been filed.

2. Mr.U.Baranidharan, learned Special Government Pleader,

accepts notice for respondents 1 and 2. By referring to the petitioners representation dated 09.12.2025, he submits that the said representation reveals that the petitioner has not approached this Court bona fide. He points out that there are contradictions in the said representation.

3. In effect, the petitioner seeks cancellation of Document

No.4726 of 2025 which was allegedly executed by suppressing the earlier conveyance in favour of the petitioners husband. Thus, there appears to be a title dispute between the petitioner and the third respondent. The appropriate remedy for the petitioner is to approach the jurisdictional Civil Court.

4. For reasons aforesaid, this writ petition is disposed of by

leaving it open to the petitioner to approach the jurisdictional Civil Court. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs. Index:Yes/No mmi To

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY,J.

mmi

