IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PULLA KARTHIK

WRIT PETITION NO: 35029 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Kassireddy Venkateshwar Reddy, S/o. K.Nagi Reddy, Aged about 40 years, Occ Business, R/o. H.No.10-10/7 Independent House, Srinivas Gayathri Nagar, Jillelguda, Meerpet, Balapur Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary (Stamps & Registration), Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The District Registrar, Ranga Reddy District.
3. The Sub-Registrar, L.B.Nagar, Ranga Reddy District.

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue a appropriate Writ Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of Respondent No.3 in pass in Refusal Order No.3 of 2025 dated 18-09-2025 in respect of the sale deed executed on 20-08-2025 and presented for registration as Pending Document No.P.133 of 2025, as illegal, arbitrary, unjust, contrary to the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908, violative of Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and contrary to the principles o natural justice and consequently to set aside the said Refusal Order No.3 of 2025 dated 18-09-2025 thereby direct Respondent No.3 to receive process register and release the said sale deed, subject to compliance with the applicable statutory requirements under the Registration Act, 1908 and the Indian Stamp Act, 1899,

without treating the C&IG Endorsement No.CIG.Mail/AR/2008, dated 02-01-2008, as a ground for refusal.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct Respondent No.3 to register and release the sale deed vide Pending Document No.P.133 of 2025 dated 20-08-2025 by suspending the operation of Refusal Order No.3 of 2025 dated 18-09-2025, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI KATIKA RAVINDER REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR STAMPS & REGISTRATION

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE PULLA KARTHIK

WRIT PETITION No.35029 OF 2026

C.N.R.No. HBHC010721962026

15th OCTOBER, 2026.

Between:

Sri Kassireddy Venkateshwar Reddy.

...Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
(Stamps & Registration Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

... Respondents

O R D E R :

With the consent of both the parties, this Writ Petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. This Writ Petition is filed aggrieved by the action of respondent No.3 in refusing to register and release the Sale Deed *vide* pending Document P.No.133/2025 dated 20.08.2026 by issuing Intimation of Refusal No.3 of 2025 dated 18.09.2025 in respect of Plot bearing No.31, admeasuring 267 sq. yards in Sy.Nos.31 and 32 (Parts), situated at Jillelguda village, Balapur

Revenue Mandal, under Meerpet Municipal Corporation, Ranga Reddy District, as illegal and arbitrary.

3. Heard Sri Katika Ravinder Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Stamps and Registration appearing for the respondents.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the absolute owner and possessor of the subject property, having succeeded the same through a validated sale deed vide File No.7909/AR/2022 dated 02.06.2022. It is further submitted that the petitioner have approached respondent No.3 for registration of the Sale Deed. However, the document was initially kept pending *vide* document P.No.133/2025 dated 20.08.2025, respondent No.3 has refused to register the sale deed, which is wholly unsustainable. It is further submitted that the issue involved in this Writ Petition is squarely covered by the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.16310 of 2019 and batch dated 11.01.2023 and also recent Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***K.Gopi v. The Sub-Registrar***[1] and requested to pass similar order in this Writ Petition also.

---

[1]2025 SCC OnLine SC 740

5. Learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents had not disputed the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. A perusal of the impugned refusal order dated 18.09.2025, discloses that the registration of the sale deed presented by the petitioner was refused on the following reasons:

> In terms of C&IG R&S instructions in Cir.No. 13450/2007 dated.21.07.2008 EC particulars are verified and also ascertained the link document details.
> 1. The Party has produced a copy of Notarized Agreement of Sale, dated: 03-03-1986 as link document and the said Agreement of Sale was not registered, which is compulsorily registerable document under Section 17 of Registration Act.
> 2. Through the C & IG mail, dated:02-01-2008 it is clarified that a validated document cannot be accepted as a validly registered document.
> 3.On calling for Certified copy of document No.2488/1989 from the Sub Registrar, Hayathnagar through a letter No.349/2025, dated: 16-09-2025 the details in the pending document not tallied with that of the details in the certified copy furnished by the Sub Registrar, Hayathnagar.
> 4. Thus, the authenticity of the document is highly suspicious. The vendor is not able to state what was he doing. He was not able to declare that he has executed the sale deed. It appears that he is not a genuine executant/vendor. The undersigned is not satisfied with the credentials of the vendor as he was not able to state the contents of the sale deed and also previous mode of acquisition of property.
> The identity of the Vendor is not proved to the satisfaction of the undersigned and the authenticity of the Link documents is not proved to be genuine.
> Hence this document is refused registration Under Section 32, 34 and 82 of Registration Act 1908 read with Registration Rule 58.

7. In this context, it is to extract the relevant portion of the order in W.P.No.16310 of 2019 and batch dated 11.01.2023, which is as under:

> 13. The power of the registering authority to refuse registration is only, if any of the grounds or objections that are enumerated under the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908, and the Rules made thereunder in particular Sections 19, 20, 21, 22-A, 34, 35 and rule 58 of the Telangana Rules under the Registration Act, 1908, are existing in respect of any such document presented for the registration. Except, the grounds or objections that are enumerated under the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908, the registering authorities have no authority to refuse registration of a document on any other ground. As already noted above, the ground on which the impugned refusal orders in all these batch of Writ Petitions are passed is that the link document shown in the respective documents is a validated and an unregistered document. By looking into a validity of the link document, the registering authority is indirectly verifying whether the executants of the respective documents are having valid title or not to execute the documents in question. As held in the above referred judgment in the case of Dr. Yadla Ramesh Naidu (1 supra), the registering authority is not entitled to go into the title of the parties to the document. It is a settled law that the vendee under a document will not get a better title than his vendor and in case if vendor is not having a valid title over the property which is the subject matter of a particular document, the vendee under the said document does not get any title over such property and mere registration of such document will not have an effect on the property which is the subject matter of the said document.
>
> 14. As rightly conceded by the learned Government Pleader for Stamps and Registration, the registering authorities are not entitled to refuse registration of a document on mere ground that the title of the executants of the respective document is based upon the validated document, though the same is compulsorily registerable document cannot be accepted and such a ground is not available to the registering authorities to refuse registration of a document on that ground.
>
> ...
>
> 19. In the light of the above, this Court is unhesitant to hold that the respondent registering authorities are not entitled to refuse registration of a document on the ground that the link document referred to in the respective document is a validated document or to refuse registration of such document by placing reliance on endorsement, dated 02.01.2008, issued by the Commissioner

and Inspector General of Stamps and Registration. Accordingly, the impugned orders in the respective Writ Petitions are set aside and Writ Petitions are allowed with a further direction to the respondent registering authorities to receive the returned documents and to process the same subject to the condition of the said documents complying with the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and the Indian Stamp Act, 1899.

8. In ***K.Gopi's*** case (1 supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

> "The registering officer is not concerned with the title held by the executant. He has no adjudicatory power to decide whether the executant has any title. Even if an executant executes a sale deed or a lease in respect of a land in respect of which he has no title, the registering officer cannot refuse to register the document if all the procedural compliances are made and the necessary stamp duty as well as registration charges/fee are paid. We may note here that under the scheme of the 1908 Act, it is not the function of the Sub-Registrar or Registering Authority to ascertain whether the vendor has title to the property which he is seeking to transfer. Once the registering authority is satisfied that the parties to the document are present before him and the parties admit execution thereof before him, subject to making procedural compliances as narrated above, the document must be registered. The execution and registration of a document have the effect of transferring only those rights, if any, that the executant possesses. If the executant has no right, title, or interest in the property, the registered document cannot effect any transfer.

9. In view of the order in W.P.No.16310 of 2019 and batch dated 11.01.2023; W.A.No.715 of 2009 as well as the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***K. Gopi's*** case (1 supra) and in terms thereof, this Writ Petition is disposed of directing the respondent authorities to receive, register and release the document bearing P.No.133/2025 dated 20.08.2026 presented by the petitioner in respect of the subject property, without

reference to the Intimation of Refusal No. 3 of 2025 dated 18.09.2025, subject to the condition that the said document complies with the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and the Indian Stamp Act, 1899.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

SD/- K.V.O. NARSI BABU
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary, Stamps Registration, Secretariat, Hyderabad, State of Telangana.
2. The District Registrar, Ranga Reddy District.
3. The Sub- Registrar, L B Nagar, Ranga Reddy District.
4. One CC to SRI KATIKA RAVINDER REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CCs to GP FOR STAMPS & REGISTRATION, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
6. Two CD Copies

BSR

TKS

CC TODAY

HIGH COURT

DATED: 15/10/2026



ORDER

WP.No.35029 of 2026

DISPOSING OF THE WRIT PETITION,

WITHOUT COSTS

16/10/26