INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

DIGITALIZATION OF LAND REGISTRATION REGULATIONS IN TAMIL NADU: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

AUTHORED BY - K. KAJENDRABABU
LL.B. Student (Reg. No. 23122156),
School of Law, Vels Institute of Science, Technology & Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Chennai

CO-AUTHOR - MS. SALINI. C
Assistant Professor, Department of Legal Studies, VISTAS, Chennai

ABSTRACT

Land registration fraud and duplicative documentation represent a persistent structural crisis in Tamil Nadu's property administration. Despite the enactment of the Registration Act, 1908, and successive digitization initiatives under the Digital India Land Records Modernization Programme (DILRMP), the land administration system remains fundamentally compromised by a 'presumptive' title regime and a 'Tripartite Disconnect' among the Registration, Revenue, and Survey Departments. This article analytically examines the legislative framework, institutional vulnerabilities, judicial jurisprudence, and comparative international models to argue that Tamil Nadu must urgently transition from mere digitization to a Conclusive Titling System anchored by Blockchain technology, Aadhaar-based biometric authentication, and GIS spatial mapping. Drawing on landmark Madras High Court decisions and comparative frameworks from Singapore, Australia, and the United Kingdom, the article proposes a Unified Land Information System (ULIS) as a legally enforceable and technologically immutable solution to the land mafia-driven fraud epidemic in the state.

Keywords: *Land Registration, Digitalization, Blockchain, Conclusive Title, Tamil Nadu, Forgery, DILRMP, Biometric Authentication, GIS Mapping, Unified Land Information System*

ISSN: 2582-6433

I. INTRODUCTION

The sanctity of land ownership lies at the heart of economic security and constitutional rights in India. Under Article 300A of the Constitution, no person shall be deprived of their property save by authority of law. Yet, in Tamil Nadu—one of India's most urbanized and economically significant states—this fundamental guarantee is routinely violated through a sophisticated ecosystem of land fraud facilitated not by lawlessness but by the very architecture of the state's land administration system.

The central pathology of Tamil Nadu's land records crisis is a phenomenon the research identifies as the 'Tripartite Disconnect.' The Registration Department (responsible for deeds), the Revenue Department (responsible for Patta or ownership certificates), and the Survey and Settlement Department (responsible for spatial maps and FMB data) operate as independent, non-communicating silos. This fragmentation creates legally exploitable vacuums: a fraudster may register a forged sale deed with the Sub-Registrar without triggering any alert in the Revenue database, and vice versa.[1]

The Registration Act, 1908—the cornerstone statute—was conceived in a pre-digital era of manual record-keeping. Its fundamental structural limitation is that it creates only 'presumptive' evidence of a transaction, not conclusive proof of title. The Sub-Registrar acts as a mere recording officer, not a gatekeeping authority. This ministerial role, as distinguished from a judicial or quasi- judicial verification function, is the primary legal basis upon which the entire edifice of land fraud is constructed.[2]

While the Digital India Land Records Modernization Programme (DILRMP) and Tamil Nadu-specific initiatives such as STAR (Simplified and Transparent Administration of Registration) 2.0 and Tamil Nilam have introduced digital efficiency, they have not resolved the underlying structural problem. Digitization without data integrity guarantees, without inter-departmental synchronization, and without biometric anchoring merely converts paper fraud into digital fraud. This article argues that the transition required is not from paper to screen, but from a presumptive to a conclusive title system—a paradigm shift demanding a convergence of legislative reform, blockchain technology, and institutional restructuring.

[1] Subramanian, M., 'The Tripartite Disconnect: Revenue, Registration and Survey in Tamil Nadu', National Law School Journal, Vol. 14, 2019.
[2] Mulla, D.F., The Registration Act, 14th Edition, LexisNexis, 2022, commentary on Sections 17 and 49.

ISSN: 2582-6433

II. HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Tamil Nadu's land administration pathologies are not accidental—they are the direct inheritance of colonial administrative priorities. The British Ryotwari system, introduced in the Madras Presidency, recognized individual cultivators (ryots) as landholders for the narrow purpose of revenue collection, not ownership security. The consequent emphasis on fiscal extraction over title clarity planted the seed of the presumptive title system that persists to this day.[3]

Post-independence, the state enacted the Tamil Nadu Land Reforms (Fixation of Ceiling on Land) Act, 1961, the Tamil Nadu Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923, and the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983 in successive layers, without integrating these regimes into a unified framework.

The result was a multi-departmental bureaucracy with overlapping and conflicting record-keeping mandates.

A. Property Rights Theory

Property Rights Theory, as articulated by Hernando de Soto, posits that secure, legible property rights are the precondition for economic participation. Without conclusive title, land remains 'dead capital'—legally encumbered, economically inert, and judicially contested. In Tamil Nadu, the sheer volume of pending land litigation—estimated to constitute a substantial proportion of all civil cases in the Madras High Court—is the empirical manifestation of insecure property rights.

B. Institutional Theory and Information Asymmetry

Institutional Theory explains how the inertia of existing administrative structures perpetuates fraud even against the intent of legal reform. The administrative asymmetry between a sophisticated fraudster equipped with forged documents and a rural landowner relying on a decades-old patta passbook is a textbook instance of information asymmetry. Corrupt intermediaries who understand both the legal gaps and the administrative silos systematically exploit this asymmetry.

[3] Deininger, Klaus, 'Land Administration Systems: Global Standards and the Indian Context', World Bank Economic Review, Vol. 32, 2018.

ISSN: 2582-6433

III. EGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK AND ITS STRUCTURAL GAPS

The legislative framework governing land registration in Tamil Nadu comprises a complex matrix of central and state statutes. Key among them are the Registration Act, 1908; the Transfer of Property Act, 1882; the Indian Stamp Act, 1899; the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983; and the Information Technology Act, 2000. While individually sound, these instruments were never designed to operate as an integrated system.

A. The Registration Act, 1908: A Ministerial Statute in a Digital Era

The Registration Act, 1908, under Sections 17 and 49, mandates registration of certain property transactions and creates legal consequences for non-registration. However, as Mulla's authoritative commentary makes clear, registration creates only a 'presumption' of authenticity. The Sub-Registrar's function is procedural: to receive, scrutinize for formal compliance, and record. The Act confers no power and imposes no duty to verify the seller's actual title or the authenticity of supporting documents.

This is the core structural gap. A fraudster presenting a forged chain of title documents, accompanied by a compliant witness and a fabricated identity, can successfully register a fraudulent deed. The STAR 2.0 system has digitized this process but has not resolved its fundamental limitation: the quality of the output is entirely contingent upon the quality of the input.

B. The Patta Passbook Act and the Revenue-Registration Disconnect

The Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983, requires that a patta (ownership certificate issued by the Revenue Department) be updated to reflect every registered transfer. In practice, this synchronization rarely occurs. Sub-Registrars and Revenue Officials operate on independent timelines, creating windows during which the same property can be registered to multiple buyers. This legislative non-integration is the primary enabler of 'Double Documentation'—the simultaneous existence of multiple registered claims over a single parcel of land.

C. The IT Act, 2000: An Unfulfilled Promise

Sections 3 and 4 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, establish the legal validity of digital signatures and electronic records. This provision theoretically enables a fully digital land registration system. However, the absence of a statutory mandate linking the IT Act's digital authentication framework to the Registration Act's procedures means that the two regimes

ISSN: 2582-6433

exist in parallel without operational integration. This legislative gap—the absence of a bridging statute—is a critical policy failure that this article's proposal for a Digital Land Records Protection Act seeks to address.

IV. ISSUES, CHALLENGES, AND FORMS OF LAND FRAUD

Forgery in Tamil Nadu's land records manifests across a sophisticated taxonomy of fraudulent practices, each exploiting a specific gap in the administrative or legal architecture:

- Fabrication of Title Deeds: Creation of wholly counterfeit sale deeds or the alteration of genuine registered documents through the substitution of parties or survey numbers.
- Duplicate Registration: Exploiting the Revenue-Registration disconnect to register the same property to multiple buyers through parallel transaction chains.
- Encumbrance Certificate Manipulation: Fraudulent omission of prior transactions from the Encumbrance Certificate (EC) to deceive buyers and financers about the encumbrance history of a property.
- Digital Forgery: The most contemporary threat—unauthorized alteration of scanned records in online databases like Tamil Nilam and STAR 2.0, exploiting cybersecurity gaps in government portals.
- Ghost Survey Numbers: Registration of transactions against survey numbers that exist in the registration records but have no corresponding entry in the Revenue or Survey databases.
- The socio-economic consequences of this fraud ecosystem are severe. Rural and marginalized landowners, who lack the legal literacy to detect forged documents or access encumbrance certificates, bear a disproportionate burden. Real estate investment, both domestic and foreign, is demonstrably chilled by the unreliability of title. The judicial system carries an enormous and growing backlog of land dispute litigation, imposing a systemic cost on the administration of justice.

V. THE ROLE OF THE JUDICIARY: FROM RECORDER TO REFORMER

The Madras High Court has emerged as an active institutional reformer in the domain of land fraud, increasingly refusing to confine the judiciary to a passive role of dispute resolution and

ISSN: 2582-6433

instead engaging in proactive institutional oversight.

In K. Dhanalakshmi v. District Registrar (2010), the Court held that registration authorities bear a duty to verify the authenticity of ownership before registering documents, signaling a judicial push toward a more 'judicial' conception of the Sub-Registrar's function.[4] This line of reasoning was further developed in R. Krishnan v. State of Tamil Nadu (2015), where the Court directed the government to implement digital verification mechanisms to prevent duplicate registrations. The Court's most technologically forward-looking intervention came in S. Rajendran v. Inspector General of Registration (2019), which explicitly called for blockchain-based record maintenance as a tool of transparency.[5]

The Supreme Court's intervention in Suraj Lamp & Industries Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Haryana (2012) [(2012) 1 SCC 656] addressed the systematic abuse of power-of-attorney mechanisms to transfer property while evading registration requirements—a practice directly linked to land fraud networks.

However, the judiciary faces structural limitations in its reform capacity. The absence of digital forensic expertise in the lower courts creates a critical institutional gap: judges adjudicating complex digital forgery cases often lack the technical competence to evaluate blockchain-authenticated evidence or assess the integrity of digital land records. Furthermore, judicial directions, however prescient, are only as effective as the state's administrative will and capacity to implement them—a variable that has historically proven unreliable.

VI. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: INTERNATIONAL MODELS OF SECURE LAND REGISTRATION

A comparative survey of international land registration systems reveals that Tamil Nadu's challenges, while structurally unique, are not without proven solutions.

A. Singapore: The Torrens System with Digital Integration

Singapore's land registration under the Land Titles Act (Cap. 157) operates on the Torrens principle of indefeasibility of registered title. The Singapore Land Authority (SLA) manages

[4] K. Dhanalakshmi v. District Registrar, 2010 (3) CTC 817 (Madras High Court).
[5] S. Rajendran v. Inspector General of Registration, 2019 (6) CTC 760 (Madras High Court).

ISSN: 2582-6433

the Integrated Land Information Service (INLIS), providing real-time access to ownership and transaction data. Crucially, all property transactions require SingPass digital identity verification, eliminating the impersonation-based fraud that plagues Tamil Nadu. In United Overseas Bank Ltd v. Bebe bte Mohammad [2006], the Singapore Court of Appeal reaffirmed that registered title is indefeasible except where obtained through fraud—a principle that functions as a systemic deterrent. Singapore's model demonstrates that digital identity integration and centralized real-time databases are not aspirational—they are operational.

B. Australia: e-Conveyancing and Biometric Verification

Australia's Torrens Title System, pioneered in South Australia, provides government-guaranteed title and has been successfully integrated with electronic conveyancing through the Electronic Conveyancing National Law (ECNL) and the PEXA platform. The case of Breskvar v. Wall (1971) established that the Torrens system's registered title prevails over equitable interests, providing a conclusive legal foundation. Australia's combination of biometric verification, government indemnity, and electronic lodgment represents the most complete implementation of the conclusive title model and offers the most directly applicable lessons for Tamil Nadu's reform agenda.

C. United Kingdom: Indemnity and Blockchain Pilots

The UK Land Registration Act, 2002, establishes HM Land Registry as the central authority with unique title numbers and publicly accessible records. The Act's indemnity scheme—which compensates fraud victims from public funds—provides a systemic risk-mitigation mechanism that Tamil Nadu currently lacks entirely. The UK's ongoing blockchain pilot projects represent the next evolutionary step in land registration security.

VII. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK: TOWARDS A CONCLUSIVE TITLING SYSTEM

The foregoing analysis establishes that Tamil Nadu's land administration crisis cannot be resolved through incremental digitization of a fundamentally flawed presumptive title system. The reform required is systemic and multi-dimensional. This article proposes the establishment of a Unified Land Information System (ULIS) anchored by the following pillars:

ISSN: 2582-6433

A. Blockchain Core Layer

Every land transaction, once registered, should be recorded as an immutable hash on a distributed ledger managed by the proposed Tamil Nadu Land Information and Security Authority (TNLISA). Blockchain's cryptographic immutability ensures that no single official can alter a registered deed—eliminating the most common form of administrative fraud. Kapoor, Esposito, and Anand (2024) have demonstrated that Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT) can serve as a 'Single Source of Truth' bridging the STAR 2.0 and Tamil Nilam databases.[6]

B. Biometric and Aadhaar Authentication Layer

All parties to a land transaction must be authenticated through Aadhaar-linked biometric verification (fingerprint and iris scan) at the point of registration. This single intervention eliminates impersonation—one of the most pervasive forms of land fraud—and creates an immutable identity audit trail linking every transaction to a verified individual.

C. GIS Spatial Integration Layer

Every registered deed must be linked to a GIS coordinate-anchored parcel boundary, eliminating the possibility of registering transactions against 'ghost' survey numbers. The physical land must exist and have a confirmed boundary in the Survey database before any transaction upon it can be registered. This creates a mandatory three-way cross-verification—identity, title chain, and physical parcel—before any registration is completed.

D. Legislative Reform

The proposed framework requires two primary legislative interventions: (1) amendment of the Registration Act, 1908, to impose mandatory digital verification duties on Sub-Registrars and to recognize blockchain records as conclusive evidence of title; and (2) enactment of a Digital Land Records Protection Act establishing criminal penalties for digital forgery and creating a state- guaranteed indemnity scheme for victims of fraudulent registration.[6]

VIII. CONCLUSION

Tamil Nadu's land registration crisis is not a technology problem with a technology solution—it is a structural governance failure with a structural governance response. The persistent

[6] Kapoor, A., Esposito, M. & Anand, M., 'Land Record Management in India and Adoption of DLTs', 2024.

ISSN: 2582-6433

epidemic of forgery, duplicate registration, and encumbrance manipulation is the predictable consequence of a system in which three independent administrative departments maintain overlapping records without communication, a century-old statute confers only presumptive title, and digital tools have been layered over an unreformed institutional foundation.

The research and analysis presented in this article support two principal conclusions. First, the current digitization trajectory, absent the fundamental shift to conclusive titling, is insufficient. STAR

2.0 and Tamil Nilam are necessary but not sufficient conditions for a secure land administration system. Second, the international comparative evidence—particularly from Singapore and Australia— demonstrates that conclusive, digitally integrated, biometrically authenticated title systems are not theoretical constructs but operational realities. Tamil Nadu possesses the institutional and technical capacity to implement such a system; what is required is the political and legislative will to do so.

The proposed Unified Land Information System, supported by a legislative framework that mandates blockchain verification and provides an indemnity guarantee, offers a credible and constitutionally grounded pathway. The Madras High Court's judicial momentum toward institutional accountability, as evidenced in the cases analyzed, provides the legal impetus. The task that remains is to translate judicial aspiration into administrative reality—and to ensure that the constitutional promise of Article 300A is backed not merely by law, but by an inviolable, technologically immutable record.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

The Registration Act, 1908 (Act No. 16 of 1908).

The Transfer of Property Act, 1882

(Act No. 4 of 1882). The Tamil

Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983.

The Information Technology Act, 2000 (Act No. 21 of 2000).

K. Dhanalakshmi v. District Registrar, 2010 (3) CTC 817; 2015 (5) CTC 175; 2018 (3) MWN (Civil) 657. Suraj Lamp & Industries Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Haryana, (2012) 1 SCC 656.

S. Rajendran v. Inspector General of

Registration, 2019 (6) CTC 760. State of Tamil

ISSN: 2582-6433

Nadu v. K. Shyam Sunder, 2020 (3) MLJ 433.

Secondary Sources

Mulla, D.F., The Registration Act, 14th Edition, LexisNexis, 2022.

Kapoor, A., Esposito, M. & Anand, M., 'Land Record Management in India and Adoption of DLTs', 2024.

Subramanian, M., 'The Tripartite Disconnect: Revenue, Registration and Survey in Tamil Nadu', National Law School Journal, Vol. 14, 2019.

Deininger, Klaus, 'Land Administration Systems: Global Standards and the Indian Context', World Bank Economic Review, Vol. 32, 2018.

Karthik, S. & Ramasamy, V., 'A Study on the Impact of STAR 2.0 in Tamil Nadu Registration Department', Journal of Legal Studies and Research, Vol. 6, Issue 4, 2021.

Bratcher, Lee, 'Blockchain Land Registry Best Practices: The Political and Technical Feasibility', 2024.

Zheng, Z. et al., 'An Overview of Blockchain Technology: Architecture, Consensus, and Future Trends', IEEE International Congress on Big Data, 2017.