

**IN THE COURT OF SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE- 1  
AIZAWL DISTRICT: AIZAWL, MIZORAM**

**DECLARATORY SUIT NO. 17 OF 2008**

*Plaintiff:*

Shri. Laldawngliana  
S/o Biakliana  
R/o Sikulpuikawn, Aizawl

*By Advocate's* : Mr. L.H. Lianhrima

*Versus*

*Defendants:*

1. The State of Mizoram  
Through the Chief Secretary to the  
Govt. of Mizoram
2. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram  
Land Revenue and Settlement Department
3. The Director  
Land Revenue and Settlement Department  
Govt. of Mizoram
4. The Assistant Director  
Land Revenue and Settlement Department  
Govt. of Mizoram
5. The Assistant Settlement Officer- I  
Land Revenue and Settlement Department  
Govt. of Mizoram  
Aizawl District: Aizawl
6. The President  
Village Council  
Sialsuk

*By Advocates:*

For the defendant No. 1-5 : 1. Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA  
2. Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA

**BEFORE**

Dr. H.T.C. LALRINCHHANA, Sr. CJ- 1

Date of Arguments : 05-10-2011  
Date of Judgment & Order : 07-10-2011

**JUDGMENT & ORDER**

---

**GENESIS OF THE CASE**

The plaintiff was allotted a land under Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 located at Sailam Zawl ram, Sialsuk with boundary descriptions of 'Pialtlep Lui' in the north, 'Tuikhur lui' in the south, 'Tuikhur lui leh Pialtlep lui infinna' in the east and 'Ramruak' in the west side and was with an area of 14.94 bighas. The said allotment was made on the basis of the agricultural land allotted by the concerned Village Council to Mr. Lawmthanga, Sialsuk under the Mizoram Intodelhna Project (MIP) as

claimed purchased by the plaintiff on 13.9.2003 in consideration of Rs. 15,000/-. As agitated by the local peoples, the Government of Mizoram decided to re-demarcate the area of the said Periodic Patta in tune with the exact area as purchased from the said Mr. Lawmthanga under Letter No. C. 18016/1/2007- REV/14, Aizawl, the 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2007. The plaintiff therefore prayed a decree (i) declaring the plaintiff has the title of ownership over the landed property covered by Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 and also to set aside and quash the impugned order No. C. 18016/1/2007-REV/14, Aizawl, the 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2007 (ii) immediate acquisition of the plaintiff's land covered by Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 as per the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (iii) costs of the suit in favour of the plaintiff and (iv) any other relief which the plaintiff is entitled for justice, equity and good conscience.

The defendants in their written statements argued that verification of the land for making decision was duly made, being a Periodic Patta, no grounds to invoke the provisions of Land Acquisition Act is found. Only correction is proposed by the defendant but not cancellation of the said Periodic Patta. Thus, prayed to dismiss of the suit.

### **ISSUES**

Upon pleadings and hearing of both parties, issues were framed on 23-04-2009 and amended towards justice, the amended form of issues are as follows-

1. Whether the suit is maintainable or not.
2. Whether the plaintiff has cause of action against the defendants or not.
3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed. If so, to what extend.

### **EVIDENCE**

#### For the plaintiff:

The following witnesses were produced by the plaintiff namely-

1. Mr. Laldawngliana S/o Biakliana, Sikulpuikawn - Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW- 1)
2. Mr. Kapthuama S/o Hranglawma, Sialsuk (Hereinafter referred to as PW- 2)

The **PW- 1** in his examination in chief reiterated the contents of his plaint being the plaintiff, he further deposed that-

*Ext. P- 1 is his plaint*

*Ext. P- 1 (a) and (b) are his true signatures*

*Ext. P- 2 a copy of Sale Deed dt. 13.9.2003*

*Ext. P- 3 is Verification report*

*Ext. P- 4 is a copy of NOC dt. 25.2.2004*

*Ext. P- 5 is a copy of Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005*

*Ext. P- 6 is a copy of MOU dt. 14.10.2004*

*Ext. P-7 is a copy of Power of Attorney dt. 8.4.2005*

*Ext. P-7(a) is his true signature*

*Ext. P-8 and 9 are Treasury Challan*

*Ext. P-10 is Quarry Permit No. 001/1/2005-08 of 2006*

*Ext. P-11 is a copy of Stay Order dt. 8.3.2005*

*Ext. P-12 is a copy of Representation dt. 26/4/2005*

*Ext. P-13 is a copy of letter of explanation*

*Ext. P-14 is a copy of Show cause notice*

*Ext. P-15 is a copy of explanation*

*Ext. P-16 is a copy of letter dt. 12.9.2005*

*Ext. P-17 is a copy of Verification report dt. 7.6.2007*

*Ext. P-18 is a copy of Spot Vrification*

*Ext. P-18 (a) is a copy of Sketch map of P. Patta*

*Ext. P-19 is a copy of letter dt. 10.7.2007*

During his cross examination, he deposed that he did not know that what kind of pass was possessed by Mr. Lawmthanga from where he purchased the suit land. He did not also knows the actual area occupied by the said Mr. Lawmthanga. He denied that the whole area of Mr. Sangthuama's jhum land was not overlapped by his Periodic Patta. He did not present on the spot verification conducted on 26.3.2007.

The **PW- 2** in examination in chief deposed that as he was mediator for purchasing the suit land for the plaintiff, he is well acquainted with the instant case. On the basis of the spot verification conducted by Mr. R. Zarzoliana, Surveyor-III on 25.2.2004, the instant Periodic Patta was issued. Only because of instigation and jealousy, the defendant no. 6 had taken initiative for the instant case.

In his cross examination, he admitted that he was not present at the time when Mr. R. Zarzoliana surveyed the land.

*For the defendants 1-5:*

The defendants 1-5 had produced only one witness namely- Mr. K. Lalhmuakliana, Assistant Director of Land Revenue and Settlement Department (Hereinafter referred to as **DW**). In his examination in chief, he deposed that Ext. D-1 is written statements of defendants 1-5, Ext. D- 1 (a) is the signature of the then Under Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Revenue Department, Ext. D- 2 is the letter to Minister, Revenue Department submitted by the NGO, Sialsuk and Ext. D-3 is the Spot Verification report by Pu. V. Lalduhzuala, Asst. Director of Land Revenue and Settlement Department.

In his cross examination, he admitted that he was not involved in the spot verification of the suit land.

### **TERMS OF RIVALRY**

Mr. L.H. Lianhrima, learned counsel for the plaintiff submitted that the plaintiff father purchased a plot of land located at Sailam Zawl for Rs.15,000/- from Pu.Lawmthanga of Sialsuk before reliable witness on dt 13-9-2003 and his father applied to the Revenue Department for issuance of Revenue Pass in the plaintiff name. As a result the defendant no.3 detailed Shri Zarzoliana Surveyor-II to verify and demarcate the land for issue of formal Revenue pass. And the said Surveyor conducted spot verification and demarcation of the suit land on dt25-2-2004. According to the verification report, there was no any dispute and the area of the land was properly demarcated for an area of 14.94 Bighas or 2.00 Ha. The land so demarcated is bounded by natural boundaries on all sides except in the west. In fact, the western side being a public and vacant land and its extends upto 200 meters from the bottom. That since it is essentially required to obtain for the plaintiff a No Objection from the concern VPC, the defendant No.6 had

duly subscribed his hand on the NOC on 25-2-2004 before the said surveyor who demarcated the land with his full knowledge and consent. In pursuance with the verification report submitted by the said surveyor, the proposal for issuance of Periodic Patta in the name of the plaintiff was duly approved by the Govt of Mizoram under L.No.K53011/97 REV/Vol-I Dt.4.11.2004. Accordingly, periodic Patta Pass no under No 105301/10/42 of 2005 with an area of 14.94 Bighas was allotted to the plaintiff under section 4(2) of the Mizo District (Agriculture Land) Act 1963. After sometime the rock within the landed area of the plaintiff was tested by expert and found that the rock is suitable and acceptable on the part of the authority for use in the road construction works of Aizawl to Thenzawl-Buangpui Road. Therefore, Memorandum of Understanding was signed by Shri. V. Sapchhunga on behalf of Pass Holder /Plaintiff on the strength of power of Attorney duly executed by the plaintiff with that of the M/S Bhagheeratha Engineering LTD. Accordingly, extraction of stones was started and the narrow road was properly maintained and upgraded for Truckable Road and the people of Sialsuk had actually benefited the good road to the great extent. That as provided under the Mizoram Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2000, Rs 500/- was deposited under Treasury challan No.20/A dt.4.4.2005 for quarry registration fee. Thereafter, Quarry permit No. 001/1/2005-08 of 2005 dt.4.10.2005. In fact, Rs. 36,000/- was deposited in order to continue extraction of stone vide Treasury Challan No. 524/B dt 13-4-2005. That when the road construction of Aizawl-Thenzawl-Buangpui was in good progress by using the stones duly extracted from the suit land, the defendant no 6 had, with malafide intention issued stay order dt.8-3-2005 without having any jurisdiction and that too without reasonable ground or cause. As a result, the Bagheeratha Engineering Ltd had stopped taking stones from the said quarry and the progress of the construction works also began to slow down due to non availability of required materials for the same. Needless to add, the stay order to stop quarry operation was issued by the defendant no 6 on account of his jealousy with the plaintiff or his father. That the then VCP, Sialsuk Shri. Remsiana instigated all Non Governmental Organisation with Sialsuk Village and submitted a joint representation to the Minister i/c Revenue for cancellation of the said Periodic Patta of the plaintiff which was allotted to the plaintiff without any objection from the Village Council Authorities who had actually issued NOC for allotment of the Revenue Pass. The then VCP alleged that he put his signature on a blank paper and the same was misused by the plaintiff. That a show cause notice was issued to the Surveyor concerned, Shri. Zarzoliana to explain the allegation made by the then VCP of Sialsuk to the effect that a blank NOC was signed by him which was misused for other purpose than issue of the said Periodic Patta. In reply the said Surveyor clearly stated Pu Remsiana, the then VCP of Sialsuk had signed the said NOC in his residence in the presence of Shri Biakliana, the father of the plaintiff and Shri Zorammawia, the then Vice president of Sialsuk V.C.. In the meantime the show cause notice was issued to the plaintiff to explain as to why his Periodic Patta should not be cancelled within 20 days from the date of letter dt.19.4.2005 and the plaintiff had duly submitted his explanation to the concern authority on 6-5-2005. After thorough examination of the explanation submitted by the surveyor concerned and the plaintiff, the defendant no.3 submitted his finding to the defendant no.2 stating amongst others that the allegation made by the NGO's of Sialsuk was baseless and proved to be false as no false practice was found for issuance of the said Periodic Patta under L.No.C.13016/A-7/95-DISP/DTE(REV) dt 12-9-2005. That being elected from the Sateek constituency and due to political motivation, the Minister i/c Revenue was dissatisfied with the finding and directed the defendant no.3 to re-verify the allegation and demand of the NGO's for cancellation of Periodic Patta belonging to the plaintiff. Hence re-

verification was conducted on 26-3-2007 with malafide intention to cancel the said Periodic Patta and verification report was submitted to the defendant no.2 on dt 7-6-2007. As per the said re verification report submitted by the defendant no.4 he alleged that the Period Patta of the plaintiff had overlapped the entire jhum control area of Shri.Sangthuama. It is respectfully submitted that Shri Sangthuama had never developed but abandoned his said jhum control area for almost 20 years and the scheme of the jhum control was discontinued by the government and many villagers of Sialsuk had actually abandoned the land selected under these schemes long time ago. The allotment of Periodic Patta to the plaintiff have no adverse impact to Shri. Sangthuama at all as the land was never developed to carry out Jhum Control Scheme till today. During this period, none of the villagers for allotment of pass as the land is barren for agricultural purpose and the villagers having nothing to lose if the Periodic Patta of the plaintiff is upheld. It is humbly submitted that the sketch map attached to the verification report regarding the boundary is not matched with that of the boundary in the sale document. According to the Periodic Patta, the description of the boundary in the southern side is Tuikhur Lui. In the same Sketch map, the location of Tuikhur Lui is shown in the middle between the two Pialtlep Lui. However there is no Tuikhur Lui inside the plaintiff land. As such the re-verification report submitted by the defendant no.4 is totally false, physically motivated and absolutely baseless. The defendant government is now proposing to reduce the area of the Periodic Patta no.42 of 2005 purely on the basis of the politically motivated re-verification report alleging that the periodic patta no 42 of 2005 overlapped some portion of the neighbouring land vide No. C. 18016/1/2007 – REV/14 dt 10-7-2007. It may be pertinent to mention that the so called owner of the adjoining area of the land never lodged a complained to the concerned authority nor possess any valid pass nor develop the land as the jhum control scheme has already been discontinued by the government long time ago. As can be seen from the re verification report, Shri.Sangthuama, the so called land owner had no longer developed the land once he selected to carry out the scheme of Jhum control but no longer select again under MIP. This being the case, there is absolutely no question overlapping the neighbouring land by Periodic Patta no.42 of 2005. That in view of the fact and circumstance of the case the defendant do not have any reasonable or valid ground or legal right to correct or reduce the area of the plaintiff land cover by Periodic Patta no 42 of 2005.

That the Plaintiff examined two (2) witnesses namely Shri.Laldawngliana and Shri Kapthuama on oath. On cross examination of the PW No.1 Shri. Laldawngliana, the credibility of the P/W No.1 could not be shaken as the P/W No.1 did not change his stand throughout the proceeding and has firmly stood by his stand in the examination in chief. The Plaintiff/PW.NO-1 exhibited 19 documents without any objection from the defendants. Hence, all the exhibited documents are to be admitted as the defendants have failed to rebut the same.

That the credibility of the PW No.2 also could not be shaken as he has not changed his stand even after he was cross examined by the Ld AGA thoroughly. In the cross examination, the PW No 2 re-affirmed that he introduced Pu. Lawmthanga to the plaintiff and that Pu Lawmthanga has a land at “Sailam Zawl” and the sale deed in respect of the suit land was executed between Pu Lawmthanga and the plaintiff in his presence and witnessed by him. He denied that the boundary of Pu Lawmthanga’s land was false and made up by him and the pass was issued to the plaintiff without the approval of the VC, Sialsuk.

That the Defendant also produced only one witness namely Shri.K.Lalhmuaqliana Assistant Director of Land Revenue & Settlement Department and exhibited three documents which were objected to by the plaintiff's counsel.

He concluded his arguments that taking into account all the evidences duly adduced by the witness of the rival parties and the materials available on record, it is crystal clear that the plaintiff is entitled to the reliefs claimed by them.

Mr. R. Lalremruata, learned AGA for the state defendants argued that from the plaint, written statement and depositions of witnesses, it is clear-

- (a) That the Sale Deed executed between the Plaintiff's father and the then owner, Shri. Lawmthanga is not valid in the eyes of Law as the same is not registered before the concerned authority.
- (b) That Lawmthanga did not possess any Pass in respect of the suit land at the time the Sale Deed was executed.
- (c) That none of the Plaintiff's witnesses were present at the time of spot verification in respect of the suit land.
- (d) That none of the Plaintiff's witnesses were present at the time the NOC was allegedly signed by the VCP, Sialsuk.
- (e) That the Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 was not issued for the purpose of quarry activity.
- (f) That no crops or fruit bearing trees were planted within the area of the said Periodic Patta by the Plaintiff and as such, was not used for the purpose for which the Revenue Deptt. had issued the Pass to the Plaintiff.
- (g) That the area covered by the Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 is not smaller than what was allegedly sold to him by Lawmthanga, the fact of which is admitted by the Plaintiff. Also, Lawmthanga himself indicated on the spot a portion of his land which he had sold to the Plaintiff which shows a much smaller area than the land claimed by the Plaintiff. It is pertinent to note that on the day the spot verification was re-conducted on 26/03/08, the Plaintiff's father Shri. Biakliana was also present as reflected in the 'Spot Verification Report' annexed to the Written Statement as Annexure-II.

Thus, Mr. R. Lalremruata prayed to dismiss of the suit with cost.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Issue No. 1**

#### **Whether the suit is maintainable or not.**

The suit is stamped at Rs. 30/- of court fees as termed as merely declaratory suit. It is therefore attracted the provisions of Section 17 (iii) of the Court Fees (Mizoram Amendment) Act, 1996 (Act No. 5 of 1997) vis. '*Consequential relief*'. Meanwhile, the plaintiff in the instant suit also sought consequential relief like invoking of Land Acquisition Act and setting aside and quashing of the impugned order No. C. 18016/1/2007- REV/14, Aizawl, the 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2007 etc. However, only looking seeking declaration

can be dealt in the instant case. The principle is anyway already settled by the Apex Court in the case of **M.S. Grewal v. Deep Chand Sood** reported in (2001) 8 SCC 151, held as under:

"Law Courts will lose their efficacy if they cannot possibly respond to the need of the society-technicalities there might be many but the justice-oriented approach ought not to be thwarted on the basis of such technicality since technicality cannot and ought not to outweigh the course of justice."

Thus, the instant irregularities as discussed above would not vitiate the proceedings.

### **Issue No. 2**

**Whether the plaintiff has cause of action against the defendants or not.**

Although the Village Council Pass as admitted is not transferable as per the existing land laws from one Mr. Lawmthanga to the plaintiff, the defendants had issued Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 located at Sailam Zawl ram, Sialsuk with boundary descriptions of 'Pialtlep Lui' in the north, 'Tuikhur lui' in the south, 'Tuikhur lui leh Pialtlep lui infinna' in the east and 'Ramruak' in the west side and was with an area of 14.94 bighas in favour of the plaintiff. Meanwhile, by submitting representation submitted to the concerned Revenue Minister, Govt. of Mizoram on 26/4/2005 by the various local authorities like Village Council and other NGOs as Ext. D-2, the Government/defendants 1-5 relook the matter which can detriment to the plaintiff. Therefore, the plaintiff must have cause of action against the defendants.

### **Issue No. 3**

**Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed. If so, to what extend.**

Before going through merit of the case, I must look into the entity of Periodic Patta, the Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 is issued to the plaintiff under section 4 (3) of the Mizo District (Agricultural Land) Act, 1963 which is temporary in nature as the name itself indicates as put under Terms and Conditions no. 1 in the back side of the disputed Periodic Patta. Paragraph No. 9 of the conditions of issuance speaks that-

"9. This Periodic Patta may be cancelled without compensation at any time even before the expiry of period of allotment, if the same is required for the public purposes but sufficient time shall be given to the holder for collection of the agriculture products in it"

Section 4 (3) of the said Mizo District (Agricultural Land) Act, 1963 reads thus-

"4. (3) The Administrator of Mizoram may, by rules, impose such conditions as it may deem reasonable on all allotments of lands made under sub-section (1) of this section in the interest to general public or of Scheduled Tribe."

The above legal entity determines that the defendants 1-5 acted within their lawful domain but whether it is arbitrary/capricious or not is another task. More so, no point of invoking Land Acquisition Act is found being Periodic Patta with stringent and clear conditions for its issuance.

It is a well settled law that duly enacted statutory law is having giant binding force as held in **Orissa Public Service Commission & Anr vs Rupashree Chowdhary & Anr.** decided on 2 August, 2011 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 6201 of 2011 [Arising out of SLP(C) No. 6751 of 2010], the Supreme Court has observed thus-

“13. When the words of a statute are clear, plain or unambiguous, i.e., they are reasonably susceptible to only one meaning, the courts are bound to give effect to that meaning irrespective of consequences, for the Act speaks for itself....”

On close look of Ext. P-13, the defendant no. 6 also appended his signature in the No-Objection Certificate for issuance of the disputed Periodic Patta. By complying natural justice viz. Audi Alteram Partem, Ext. P-14 elicited that the defendants 1-5 had given ample time for hearing of the aggrieved plaintiff in the instant cause of action. Ext. P- 15 is the reply letter of the plaintiff to the defendants 1-5. As per Ext. P-16, which is issued by the Director of Land Revenue and Settlement Department disclosed that the allegation made by the NGOs of Sialsuk was proved to be false. Ext. P-18 which is the joint verification report embodied that-

“(i) Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 is in contravention of the area, dimension and boundary covered by the previous land belonging to Mr. Lawmthanga where the plaintiff had purchased by preparing sketch map.

(ii) The stone quarry manned by the plaintiff in the suit land overlapped almost all the area of the jhum control belonging to Mr. Sangthuama.

(iii) The local leaders were in consensus in the crux to revert back the area of jhum control belonging to Mr. Sangthuama as previously government land.

(iv) The boundary description of Periodic Patta No. 105301/10/42 of 2005 covers the whole area of jhum control deserted by Mr. Sangthuama”

On the basis of the above spot verification report, the Government of Mizoram conveyed decisions to the defendant no. 3 under Letter No. C. 18016/1/2007- REV/14, Aizawl, the 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2007 stating that *“Since Periodic Patta No. 42/2005 issued to Mr. Laldawngliana as he purchased from Mr. Lawmthanga overlapped the neighbouring land, it is decided to make correction of the area of the said Periodic Patta in tune with the area previously belonging to Mr. Lawmthanga and the remaining be kept as status quo”*

Pertinently, the very doctrine of arbitrariness is already settled in **State Of Orissa & Anr. vs Mamata Mohanty** decided on 9 February, 2011 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 1272 of 2011, the Supreme Court has held that-

“38. The rule of law inhibits arbitrary action and also makes it liable to be invalidated. Every action of the State or its instrumentalities should not only be fair, legitimate and above-board but should be without any affection or aversion. It should neither be suggestive of discrimination nor even give an impression of bias, favouritism and nepotism. Procedural fairness is an implied mandatory requirement to protect against arbitrary action where Statute confers wide power coupled with wide discretion on an authority. If the procedure adopted by an authority offends the fundamental fairness or established ethos or shocks the conscience, the order stands vitiated.

The decision making process remains bad. (Vide Haji T.M. Hassan Rawther v. Kerala Financial Corporation, AIR 1988 SC 157; Dr. Rash Lal Yadav v. State of Bihar & Ors., (1994) 5 SCC 267; and Tata Cellular v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 651).”



So is the factum, as the decisions of the defendants 1-5 is solely meant for the interest of the general public dwelled in that area. It is a well settled law that public interest is precedent to the private interest. No arbitrariness in the proceedings for making decisions is found in the instant case as it is also within the ambit of the power of the defendants 1-5 with due care and by complying substantive due process by enquiring the spot and hearing of the aggrieved persons. In otherwords, the plaintiff do not have any legal rights as Periodic Patta holder to challenge the said due process held by the defendants. The interference of this court is not called for to set aside the decisions of the Government of Mizoram conveyed to the defendant no. 3 under Letter No. C. 18016/1/2007- REV/14, Aizawl, the 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2007 as Ext. P- 19.

### **ORDER**

With the above inevitable but paradoxical findings, the suit is dismissed as devoid of merit.

The case shall stand disposed of and no order as to costs of the suit due to peculiarities of the case.

Give this order copy to all concerned.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this 7<sup>th</sup> Oct., 2011 Anno Domini within the premises and during the working hours of this court and is pronounced in an open court.

**Dr. H.T.C. LALRINCHHANA**

Senior Civil Judge- 1  
Aizawl District: Aizawl

Memo No. DS/17/2008, Sr. CJ (A)/

Dated Aizawl, the 7<sup>th</sup> Oct., 2011

Copy to:

1. Shri. Laldawngliana S/o Biakliana R/o Sikulpuikawn, Aizawl c/o Mr. L.H. Lianhrima, Adv.
2. The State of Mizoram Through the Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
3. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Land Revenue and Settlement Department through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
4. The Director, Land Revenue and Settlement Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
5. The Assistant Director, Land Revenue and Settlement Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
6. The Assistant Settlement Officer- I, Land Revenue and Settlement Department, Govt. of Mizoram, Aizawl District: Aizawl through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
7. The President, Village Council, Sialsuk through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
8. P.A to Hon'ble District & Sessions Judge, Aizawl Judicial District, Aizawl
9. Case record

PESKAR