

**IN THE COURT OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, AIZAWL DISTRICT,
AIZAWL MIZORAM
Title Suit No. 4/1989**

Lalmuankimi
D/o Thansanga (L)
Tlangnuam, Aizawl.

.....Plaintiff.

-Versus-

1. The Chief Engineer, Project Pushpak,
Zemabawk, C/o 99 A.P.O.
 2. The Officer Commanding,
21st Road Maintenance Unit,
GREF, C/o 99 A.P.O.
 3. The Secretary,
Border Roads Development Board,
New Delhi.
 4. The Union of India,
Represented by the Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Ministry of Communication, New Delhi.
 5. The State of Mizoram,
Represented by the Chief Secretary to the
Govt. of Mizoram, Aizawl.
 6. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram,
Land Revenue & Settlement Deptt., Aizawl.
 7. The Director,
Land Revenue & Settlement Deptt., Mizoram, Aizawl.
 8. The Administrative Officer,
Kolasib district, Mizoram, Aizawl.
 9. The Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District,
Mizoram.
- Defendants.

BEFORE

R.VANLALENA, Senior Civil Judge-2

For the Plaintiff : Shri W.Sam Joseph, Advocate.
For the Defendants
No. 1-4 : Shri S.N.Meitei , Advocate
For the Defendants
No.5-9 : Shri R.K.Malsawmkima and Joseph Lalfakawma
Asst. Govt. Advocates.
Date of Hearing : 06.08.2012.
Date of Judgement: 17.08.2012.

JUDGEMENT AND DECREE

The facts of the case leading to the filing of the instant Title Suit No.4 of 1989 as reflected in the plaint may be stated as belows :-

The Plaintiff is a resident of Tlangnuam, Aizawl. She is a daughter of R.Thansanga (L). Her father R.Thansanga (L) was allotted a plot of land for dwelling and garden at Kolasib Hmar veng, Kolasib, Mizoram in the year 1942 by the then Chief (Lal) namely Shri Vankhuma. Her father had planted various kinds of fruit bearing trees within the land. In the year 1963, her father sold portions of the land to Shri J.Manliana (L), Smt.Biakkungi and Shri Lalhlira. In the year 1972, Permit bearing No.10 of 1972 was issued over the land by the Revenew Officer of the erstwhile Mizo District Council. Even though portions of the land was sold to the three persons as early as 1963, the Pas/Permit for the land was in the name of her father (R.Thansanga) till 1985. In the same year 1985, the Land Settlement Certificate (LSC) was issued to her father over the remaining portion of the land measuring an area of 10,880.72 Sq.ft. vide LSC No.KLB 45 of 1985.

In the year 1960, her father was allotted another plot of land by the Mizo District Council vide House Pass No.30 of 1960 and the same was superceded by a fresh Pass issued by the District Council vide Pass No.457 of 1963 over an area of 1 (one) Bigha. Her father planted different kinds of fruit bearing trees on the said land. In the year her father applied to the Director, Land Revenue & Settlement Department, Government of Mizoram for issuing Land Settlement Certificate (LSC) and was issued LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 thus superceeding the Pass No.457 of 1963.

In the month of August 1966, the Defendants No.1-4 (BRTF) personnel occupied her father's land mentioned above and in the process of their occupation, the BRTF destroyed about 85 Orange trees, 105 Assam Lemon trees, 20 Mango trees, and some Zawngtah trees. The BRTF continued the occupation of the land without paying any rent or compensation till date.

Her father (R.Thansanga) approached the BRTF authorities and the Government of Mizoram in person and through written representations for payment of rent by the BRTF authorities on account of the occupation of the said land and for compensation for destruction of the fruit bearing trees, but all in vain and no rental charges nor compensation had been paid to the Plaintiff. In pursuance of the representation submitted by her father, the Defendant no.9 was kind enough to instruct the Sub-Divisional Officer (SDO) Kolasib to conduct joint inspection alongwith the BRTF authorities to assess the rent payable in respect of the said land occupied by the BRTF. The monthly rents fixed by the Defendant no.9 was Rs.453/- (Rupees four hundred and fifty three) only in respect of the land covered by LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and Rs.326.40p in respect of the land covered by LSC No.KLB 45 of 1985 per month. The rent per month for the two lands together is

Rs.779.40p(Rupees seven hundred seventy nine and forty paise) only. The Plaintiff's land had not been acquired by the Government of Mizoram and she is still the legal owner of the said lands. She had been paying tax and has paid till it was collected. Her father through a Lawyer issued Notice u/s 80 CPC 1908 to all Defendants. In reply to the said Notice, the Executive Engineer (EE) Civil on behalf of the Chief Engineer, Pushpak submitted that the BRTF have a Temporary Permit over the suit land. The Plaintiff is not aware of the said Permit issued to the BRTF and even if the said Permit was issued to the BRTF, the issuance of such Permit was illegal and Plaintiff is entitled to compensation, rent and vacant possession of the lands because the BRTF occupied the lands without permission/consent of the Plaintiff or her father.

The cause of action arose in the month of August 1966 and continues till rents for the suit land and compensation for destruction of the fruit trees are paid to the Plaintiff and the land is handed over to the Plaintiff. The subject matter of the suit is situated at Kolasib town and is within the jurisdiction of Aizawl Judicial District. The Plaintiff belonged to Mizo tribe and is house tax payer.

The Plaintiff's father died in the year 1988 and the Plaintiff was declared the Legal heir in respect of the suit lands and by virtue of the Heirship Certificate, the Plaintiff is the legal owner of the lands covered by LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and 45 of 1985 after the death of her father Shri R.Thansanga. The Plaintiff therefore filed the instant Title Suit No. 4 of 1989 and prayed the following reliefs:

- a) Let a decree be passed in favour of the Plaintiff declaring that the Permit issued to the BRTF was null and void.
- b) Let a decree be passed declaring that the Plaintiff is the legal owner of the land covered by LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985 and the Plaintiff has right and title over the land.
- c) By way of permanent/mandatory injunctions, the Defendant be restrained from erecting any structure within the suit land.
- d) Let the rent at the rate of Rs.779.40p per month be decreed in favour of the Plaintiff with effect from August 1966 till vacant possession is given to the Plaintiff. The compensation for the crops destroyed at the rate fixed by the Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District, be also decreed in favour of the Plaintiff.
- e) Let a decree be passed ordering the Defendants to give vacant possession of the land covered by LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985 to the Plaintiff. If the Defendants want to acquire the land for public purposes, the Plaintiff be given adequate compensation calculated as per the provisions of the Land Acquisition Law.

- f) Let the cost of the suit and interest at the rate of 12% per annum over the rent and compensation be decreed in favour of the Plaintiff.
- g) Let a decree be passed in favour of the Plaintiff and against the Defendants for any other and further reliefs to which the Plaintiff is entitled as per law, justice equity and good conscience.

On the other hand, the Defendants No.1-4 and 5-9 submitted their respective written statements contesting the suit.

Defendants no.1-4 through the Officer Commanding, 75 Road Construction Company (GREF) submitted written statement in which they contested the suit that the instant suit is barred by limitation. The suit is not maintainable in its present form and manner and Notice u/s 80 CPC 1908 has not been served. The Plaintiff is estopped by waiver and acquiescence. It is bad for mis-joinder and non-joinder of necessary parties. The Plaintiff has no locus standi to file the instant suit and his Passes are invalid ab initio. The averments made in paragraph 1,2,3,4,5 & 6 of the plaint are strongly denied. The averments made in paragraph 7 of the plaint is denied as the Plaintiff is not the legal owner of the suit land. The averments made in paragraph 8&9 of the plaint are denied. The Kolasib SDO(Civil) and the BRTF personnel might have joint inspection and fixed the rate of rent but that does not necessarily meant that the suit land belonged to the Plaintiff and the ground/land rent is to be paid by the Defendant no.1. Averment in paragraph 10 of the plaint is denied because no tax can be levied from the Plaintiff for the land of the Defendant no.1. Averments in paragraph of the plaint may or may not be true. However, it is a fact that as the Permit for the suit land was issued to the Defendant no.1 by proper authority, it is thus not necessary for Defendant no.1 to obtain any consent from any individual at the time of obtaining the Permit for the vacant land and the Plaintiff is not entitled to any compensation or rent or possession of the vacant land. There is no cause of action in the present suit from the year 1966 and no fruit trees, plants or trees in the land are destroyed by Defendant no.1.

Additional Pleas:

When the Defendant no.1 came to the Mizo District of Assam in 1966, all the vacant lands belonged to the State of Assam and even if the compensation if any etc. are to be paid, it is the State of Assam which has to pay the compensation etc. at the rate of 1966 because all the rights, and liabilities in respect of the then Mizo District were belonging to the State of Assam immediately before the North Eastern Areas Re-organisation Act of 1972 vide section 52 of the said Act. Alternatively, even if the compensation etc. are to be paid, it is to be paid by the authority which has issued the permit to the Defendant no.1 and thus Defendant no.1 has no liability whatsoever over and above, the Defendant no.1 came to Mizoram to construct roads and buildings etc. purely for the benefit of the people in general and for the benefit of the local people in particular. Even if the Plaintiff obtained the LSC

No.KLB 44 & 45 of 1985, it is evident that the LSCs were obtained fraudulently by deceiving the authority concerned and as such her LSCs No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.45 of 1985 are invalid ab initio. The Defendants No.1-4 earnestly prayed the court to dismiss the instant suit with heavy costs to be borne by the Plaintiff because it is vexatious and baseless.

On behalf of the Defendants No.5-9, the Under Secretary to the Government of Mizoram, Revenue Department Aizawl submitted the written statement challenging the suit that there is no cause of action in favour of the Plaintiff and the answering defendants. It is not maintainable in its present form and manner and as such the suit is liable to be dismissed. It is bad for defect of parties. It is not properly valued for jurisdiction and court fees. The Plaintiff has not made out any prima facie case against the answering Defendants. The provision of section 80 CPC has not been followed by the Plaintiff. The averment made in paragraph no.1 of the plaint is not wholly admitted. The statement of the Plaintiff that her father sold some portion of the land to Shri J.Manliana (L) Smt. Biakkungi and Shri Lalhlira in the year 1963 and in the year 1972, Permit no.10 of 1972 was issued over the same land in the name of her father by the Revenue Officer of the erstwhile Mizo District Council clearly indicated that the suit land was not occupied and possessed by the Plaintiff's father till he got Permit No.10 of 1972 even though he had transferred a portion of the land to other three persons as back as 1963 which is in clear contravention of the provisions contained under sections 5,6&7 of the Mizo District (agricultural Land) Act 1963. It is an absurd and ridiculous statement that a Pass covering an area of about only 1 (one) Bigha contained 85 Oranges, trees, 105 Assam Lemon trees, 20 Mango trees and some Zawngtah trees. The averment made by the Plaintiff that the joint inspection team had made an assessment of rent on account of occupation of the suit land by the BRTF was not known to the answering Defendants. Hence the Plaintiff be put to strict proof of the same. The averments in paragraph 8-13 are not admitted. Since the Plaintiff could not made out any prima facie case against the answering Defendants, the Plaintiff is not entitled to claim any relief against the answering Defendants. In the circumstances, the suit must fail and the same may be dismissed forthwith.

On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the court framed the following issues on 24.08.2010.

- 1) Whether the present suit is maintainable in its present form and style ?
- 2) Whether the court has jurisdiction ?
- 3) Whether the LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985 are valid or not ? And if valid whether it confers any right to the Plaintiff ?
- 4) Whether the suit is barred by limitation, principle of waiver and acquiescence ?
- 5) Whether the Plaintiff has locus standi to file the suit ?

- 6) Whether the Defendant BRTF is occupying the land and if so whether legal or illegal and since when they occupied the land ?
- 7) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed ?

The Plaintiff examined three witness including herself while the Defendants no.1-4 examined two witnesses. The Defendants no.5-9 examined no witnesses.

Issue no. 1: Whether the present suit is maintainable in its present form and style ? This issue no.1 had been discussed at the time of preliminary hearing on dt.27.04.1998 and had been decided in favour of the Plaintiff. Hence it is not taken up at this stage accordingly as it had already decided infavour of the Plaintiff. I find no reason to raise it again at this stage.

Issue no.2: Whether the court has jurisdiction to try this suit ? The Plaintiff is a resident of Aizawl District Aizawl. The suit land located at Kolasib District but is within the jurisdiction of Aizawl Judicial District. Moreover, at the time of the institution of the present suit, the place where the suit land located is within Aizawl District. The Defendants no.1-4 are temporarily residing within Aizawl Judicial District and the Defendants no.5-9 are having head offices at Aizawl. The Plaintiff, the Defendants no.1-9 and the suit land are within the jurisdiction of this court, hence this court has jurisdiction to try this case. Thus, the issue no.2 is decided in favour of the Plaintiff.

Issue no.3 : Whether the LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985 are valid ? And if valid whether it confers any right to the Plaintiff? The Plaintiff deposed that in the year 1942 her father was allotted a plot of land at Kolasib Hmar veng, Kolasib by the then Chief namely Vankhuma for dwelling and gardening. Her father planted various fruits crops on the land. In the year 1972, the Revenue Officer of the erstwhile Mizo District issued Permit bearing no.10 of 1972 in respect of the said plot of land and was later converted into LSC No.KLB 45 of 1985 in the year 1985. She added that her father was allotted another plot of land by the Revenue Officer of the erstwhile Mizo District Council located at Kolasib Hmar veng, Kolasib nearby and just adjacent to the land covered by LSC No.45 of 1985 bearing House Pass No.30 of 1960 and was later on converted into LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985. The Plaintiff paid requisite taxes for those lands regularly. On perusal of the materials available on record, it was found that the Plaintiff had paid taxes for the lands to the Government of Mizoram. On the other hand, the Government of Mzioram in its written statement paragraph 4 denied the issuance of such LSCs to the Plaintiff. However, the Government of Mizoram did not examine any witness to rebut the averments of the Plaintiff that her father was issued such LSCs. It is therefore presumed that the claim of the Plaintiff that her father was issued such plots of lands covered by LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985. In the circumstance, the court has to decide that the LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985 are valid. Subsequently, the valid LSCs conferred any right to the

Plaintiff on their being valid LSCs. Hence issue no.3 is decided in favour of the Plaintiff.

Issue no.4 : Whether the suit is barred by limitation, principle of waiver and acquiescence. The Plaintiff alleged that the cause of action arose in the month of August 1966 and continued till date as the Defendants no.1-4 did not pay rental charges for occupation of the lands covered by the two LSCs. She filed the instant suit in the year 1989 which was almost after twenty three years. As per the Limitation Act 1963 any suit for recovery of possession of immovable property should be filed in court within a period of twelve years. However, as the applicability of the Law of Limitation has been barred by the Notification No.TAD/61/12/64 dated 14th March 1966, delay in filing the instant suit can be neglected and overseen. The said Notification runs as follows : **In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-paragraph (1) and subparagraph (2) of the paragraph 12 of the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution of India, the Governor of Assam is pleased to direct that the Limitation Act 1963 (Act No.63 of 1963) shall not apply to the Tribal areas of Assam specified in table appended to paragraph 20 of the Constitution of India with effect from the 1st January 1964. Also in the case of RSA No.11 of 2003 in Ramthlengliana –Vrs- State of Mizoram, Revenue Department, the Hon’ble Gauhati High Court has held that the Limitation Act 1963 is barred in Mizoram.** Hence issue no.4 is decided in favour of the Plaintiff.

Issue no.5: Whether the Plaintiff has locus standi to file the suit ? As has decided in the issue no.3, the LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985 are valid and conferred right to the Plaintiff, the present Plaintiff has locus standi to file the instant suit on her being the daughter of the original legal owner of the said two LSCs. After the death of her father, the present Plaintiff became the legal heir of her late father in respect of the suit lands. Hence this Plaintiff has locus standi to file the suit and the issue no.5 is decided in favour of the Plaintiff.

Issue no.6 : Whether the Defendant BRTF is occupying the suit lands ? If so, whether legally or illegally and since when they occupied the suit lands ? In her deposition before the court, the Plaintiff stated that the BRTF occupied the suit lands in the month of August 1966. On the other hand, DW 1 & 2 namely Shri SM Loganathan and Shri Rajeed Lochan (both Officer Commanding) stated that the BRTF occupied the suit lands in the month of May 1967 and not in August 1966. In cross examination of the Plaintiff, nothing was mentioned about the month and year from which time the suit lands were alleged to had been occupied by the BRTF. On the other hand, in his cross examination, the DW 2 stated that as per the records of the BRTF, the suit lands were occupied by the BRTF in the month of May 1967. Regarding the legality or illegality of the occupation of the suit lands by the BRTF, the evidence on record revealed that the BRTF obtained Temporary pass No.4 of 1970 in respect of the suit land by virtue of which they occupied the lands. In comparison of House Pass No.30 of 1960 (belonging to the Plaintiff) with the Temporary Permit No.4 of 1970, it appeared that the Permit belonging to the Plaintiff

was issued earlier in time than the Permit belonging to the BRTF. And thus the court holds that the original owner of the land was the Plaintiff. As the BRTF occupied the suit lands without consent from the original owner, the occupation of the land was illegal in spite of the fact that the BRTF obtained Temporary (Department) Permit No.4 of 1970 because the authority which issued Permit No.4 of 1970 had issued it to the BRTF in respect of a land which had already been allotted to other person. Hence issue no.6 is decided in favour of the Plaintiff.

Issue no.7 : Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed ? All the foregoing issues have been decided in favour of the Plaintiff. The reliefs claimed by the Plaintiff are mentioned in the plaint. In support of her claim the Plaintiff exhibited the following documents :-

- 1) Ext-P-1 & 2 are the photo copies of LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB No.45 of 1985 respectively.
- 2) Ext-P-3 is the Gift Deed dated 14.10.'42 executed by the then Chief Vankhuma.
- 3) Ext-P- 4 true copy of Gift Deed dated 14.10.1942 executed by Vankhuma.
- 4) Ext-P-5 is House Pass No.45 of 1963.
- 5) Ext-P-6 is Heirship Certificate.
- 6) Ext-P-7 is the copy of letter sent to the Chief Engineer, Project Pushpak, Zemabawk, Aizawl by Shri Lalthlengliana, Asstt. to the Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District, Aizawl.
- 7) Ext-P-8 is photo copy of Notice u/s 80 CPC.
- 8) Ext-P-9 is photo copy of letter sent to D.C. Revenue Aizawl in respect of claim for land under LSC No.KLB No.44 of 1985.
- 9) Ext-P-10 is photo copy of letter sent to D.C.Revenue, Aizawl in respect of claim for land under LSC No.KLB 45 of 1985.
- 10) Ext-P-11 is a copy of House Tax Payee Certificate issued to Shri R.Thansanga (L) dated 15.12.1989.
- 11) Ext-P-12 is a photo copy of letter sent to SDO (Civil) Kolasib by Shri C.Hmingthanzuala EAC, Aizawl.

On the other hand, DW 2 namely Shri Rajeeb Lochan, the Commanding officer, 107 RCC, BRTF at Aizawl, Zemabawk deposed that he gave the evidence on behalf of the BRTF on the basis of the records and other knowledge he gathered on his own because those officers of the Project Pushpak who were directly involved with this case at the first arising of the cause of action cannot be called now as witnesses as their whereabouts is even difficult to be found as they have retired long time now. He stated that the report submitted by One-Man Commission was strongly opposed by the BRTF as the said commission submitted its report without proper demarcation and measurement etc. The said officer who headed the Commission came with the Plaintiff and his party without doing actual survey and simply taken down some points and has perhaps prepared the report. He added that the Plaintiff is

not entitled to the relief claimed as the LSCs had been obtained when the Permit No.4 of 1970 is still in force and when the LSC was issued there was no verification nor demarcation done by the issuing authority which clearly indicated that the LSC were issued in violation of the law. In support of his statements, DW 2 exhibited the following documents :-

- 1) Ext-D-1 is the Departmental Pass No.4 of 1970.
- 2) Ext-D-2 is the extension order dated 25th April 1977 extending Departmental Pass No.4 of 1970.
- 3) Ext-D-3 is the copy of Order dated 6th January 1975 further extending the pass No.4 of 1970.
- 4) Ext-D-4 is the boundary description of BRTF Camp site at Kolasib under Pass No.4 of 1970.
- 5) Ext-D-5 is the Order dated 11th Sept 1985 further extending the Departmental Pass No.4 of 1970.
- 6) Ext-D-6 is the letter dated 3rd March 1986 written by the Chief Engineer, Project Pushpak to the Deputy Commission, Aizawl District, informing him that AAO (Area Administrative Officer) has certified the land under occupation as being free from any encumbrances.
- 7) Ext-D-7 is the letter dated 19.02.1986 written by the SDO Kolasib to DC Aizawl District stating that the claims of compensation by Shri F.Manliana & others are unjustified. (All exhibits are objected to as they are compared only with certified true copies and not with original copies).

On the other hand, PW3 namely Shri Bazi Rama stated that he was posted at Kolasib as Asst. Settlement Officer –II and he knew that the land belonging to Shri R.Thansanga (Plaintiff's father) was occupied by the BRTF alongwith the lands belonging to Shri V.L.Muana, Manliana and Smt.Biakkungi PW 1 namely Smt. Lalmuankimi (Plaintiff) deposed that the Defendant no.9 i.e. the Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District, Aizawl had fixed the rents for the lands at a rate of Rs.453/- per month and Rs.326.40p per month in respect of the lands covered under LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and No.KLB 45 of 1985. However, the Defendants have not paid the rent and compensation till date. Issue no. 7 does not seem to pose obstacle in granting relief to the Plaintiff as all the foregoing issues have been decided in favour of the Plaintiff. On careful perusal of all the evidences on record, it has been revealed that the Plaintiff's father was given a land by the then Chief of Kolasib namely Vankhuma. Later the same land was converted into LSC No.KLB No.45 of 1985. Besides this, the Plaintiff's father was allotted another land by the Revenue Officer of the erstwhile Mizo District Council which was later converted into LSC No.KLB No.44 of 1985.

The said lands were occupied by the BRTF in the month of May 1967 on the strength of Departmental Pass No.4 of 1970 and was extended from time to time till vacation of the land. The Government of Mizoram through the Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District Aizawl had made fixation of rents payable to the Plaintiff by the BRTF at a rate of Rs.453/- and Rs.326.40p per month for LSC NO.KLB No.44 of 1985 and No.KLB No.45 of 1985 respectively. The court has come to conclusion to grant relief to the Plaintiff. However, the relief granted would be confined only to (a) (b) (d) and (e) of the prayer in the plaint.

Having finally decided as above, the instant suit is thus decreed accordingly as below :-

- a) It is hereby declared that the Permit No.4 of 1970 issued to the BRTF was null and void.
- b) It is hereby declared that the Plaintiff is the legal owner of the suit lands covered by LSC No.KLB No.44 of 1985 and LSC No.KLB 45 of 1985 has title and rights over the lands.
- c) The Defendants no.1-4 are hereby directed to pay land rental charges at a rate of Rs.453/- per month in respect of the land covered by LSC No.KLB 44 of 1985 and Rs.326.40p per month in respect of the land covered by LSC No.KLB 45 of 1985 to the Plaintiff w.e.f. the month of May 1967 till full realization of the amount with interest @ at a rate of Rs.6% per annum within a period of three months with further sum amounting to Rs.10,000/- as compensation for damaged crops.
- d) The Defendants no.1-4 are directed to give vacant possession of the suit lands to the Plaintiff within the period of three months.

Parties shall bear their own costs.

The suit is thus disposed of.

Pronounced in open court on this day 17th August, 2001

R.VANLALENA
Senior Civil Judge – II
Aizawl District : Aizawl.

Memo No. /SCJ-II(A)/2012: Dated Aizawl the, 17th August, 2012.

Copy to:

1. The District and Sessions Judge, Aizawl District, Aizawl, Mizoram for information.
2. Lalmuankimi D/o Thansanga (L) Tlangnuam, Aizawl through Shri W.Sam Joseph & Ors, Advocates.
3. The Chief Engineer, Project Pushpak, Zemabawk, C/o 99 A.P.O. through counsel Shri S.N.Meitei.
4. The Officer Commanding, 21st Road Maintenance Unit, GREF, C/o 99 A.P.O. through counsel Shri S.N.Meitei.
5. The Secretary, Border Roads Development Board, New Delhi through counsel Shri S.N.Meitei.
6. The Union of India, Represented by the Secretary to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Communication, New Delhi through counsel Shri S.N.Meitei.
7. The State of Mizoram, Represented by the Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Aizawl through Asst. Govt. Advocates.
8. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Land Revenue & Settlement Deptt., Aizawl through Asst. Govt. Advocates.
9. The Director, Land Revenue & Settlement Deptt., Mizoram, Aizawl through Asst. Govt. Advocates.
10. The Administrative Officer, Kolasib district, Mizoram, Aizawl through Asst. Govt. Advocates.
11. The Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District, Mizoram through Asst. Govt. Advocates.
12. Shri R.K.Malsawmkima and Joseph Lalfakawma, Asst. Govt. Advocates.
13. Registry Section.
14. Case record.

PESHKAR