

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

CIVIL SUIT NO. 31 OF 2006

Plaintiff:

Mr. R. Laltawna
S/o Chhingliaia (L)
Electric Veng, Lunglei
Lunglei District

By Advocates

: 1. Mr. C. Lalramzauva, Sr. Adv.
2. Mr. A.R. Malhotra
3. Mr. F. Robert H.T. Sanga

Versus

Defendants:

1. The State of Mizoram
Represented by Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
2. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Revenue Department
3. The Director
Land Revenue and Settlement Department
Govt. of Mizoram
4. The Assistant Settlement Officer-I
Lunglei District: Lunglei
Land Revenue and Settlement Department
Govt. of Mizoram
5. The Union of India
Represented by Defence Secretary
Govt. of India
South Block, New Delhi-I
6. The Director General
Defence Estates
Palam Road, New Delhi
7. The Defence Estate Officer
Guwahati Circle, Silpukhuri
Guwahati
8. Smt. Ngurchhawani (Dead)
W/o F. Biakliana Murray (L)

Chanmari, Lunglei

Represented by:

Mr. Malsawma Murray

S/o Ngurchhawni (L)

Chanmari, Lunglei

By Advocates:

For the defendants Nos. 1-4 : 1. Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
2. Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA

For the defendants 5-7 : Mr. Abul Hussain, Adv.

For the defendant no. 8 : 1. Mr. B. Lalramenga
2. Miss N. Lalzawmliani
3. Mr. Hmingthanpuia Ralte
4. Mr. M.M. Ali

Date of Arguments : 21-08-2012

Date of Judgment & Order : 23-08-2012

BEFORE

Dr. H.T.C. LALRINCHHANA, MJS

Senior Civil Judge- 1

Aizawl District: Aizawl

JUDGMENT & ORDER

NUCLEUS OF THE CASE

The plaintiff in his plaint submitted that he was allotted a land by the erstwhile Village Council of Pukpui at “Kawmzawl Ram Arsi Peng in lam mual” with an area of about 9 bighas for Wet Rice Cultivation before disturbance of Mizoram in 1966, the plaintiff thereby developed the said plot of land as allotted. During MNF insurgency in 1966, the suit land was occupied by the Military force and remains occupied till date, no rental charge was paid to the plaintiff. The plaintiff later came to learnt that the LSC No. 81/G of 1989 of the defendant no. 8 encroached upon his suit land by extending the area when conversion into LSC from P. Patta No. 3/88. The defendants further exclude the plaintiff while apportioning payment of rental compensation to the land owners those lands under military force occupation for the period from 1966 till date. The plaintiff therefore prayed that (i) a decree in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendants declaring that the suit land covered by the VC Pass issued by the VCP of Pukpui Village in favour of the plaintiff belongs to the plaintiff and that the LSC No. 81/G of 1989 issued to the defendant no. 8 by the defendant no. 4 is illegal, invalid and inoperative or null and void in so far as it has encroached upon the land of the plaintiff and for declaration of the order dt. 4/8/2006 issued by the defendant no. 4 as illegal, null and void (ii) a decree

declaring the plaintiff to be the rightful and legal owner of the suit land under VC Pass dt. 30/3/63 issued by the VCP of Pukpui in the name of the plaintiff and the suit land being under the occupation of the Security forces for the period from 1/4/1966 till date, the plaintiff is entitled to payment of land rent/rental compensation for the said period as per the usual rate agreed by the defendants 1-7 (iii) a decree directing the defendants 1-7 to make assessment for the said period of occupation of the plaintiff's land (the suit land) for the period from 1/9/1986 till date in the name of the plaintiff and to direct the defendant no. 8 to return the land rent already received by her for the period prior to 1/9/1986 in respect of the suit land as per the rate assessed and paid to her by the defendants 1-7 (iv) mandatory/temporary injunction directing the defendants 1-7 not to disburse the amount sanctioned by the defendants 5-7 which has not been disbursed to the land owners within Kawmzawl area to the tune of Rs. 10,36,800/- which is the amount entitled to the plaintiff for the said period from 1/1/1998 to 31/12/2005 (v) cost of the suit and for any other relief (s) as the court may deem fit and proper.

The defendants 1-4 in their written statements contended that no village council in Mizoram are competent to issue garden passes in accordance with the Mizo District (Agricultural Land) Act, 1963 and the allotment of WRC land by the Village Council to the plaintiff is void ab initio. The name of the plaintiff was not included in the Blue print prepared by the Board of Officers during 1992 to 1993 consisting Representative of the Army, Defence Estate and the Government of Mizoram. As Kawmzawl area was a restricted area, application of the plaintiff for conversion into LSC could not be granted. In the year of 2006, the State Government reconsidered a fresh claim who were not included in the previous lists and the defendant no. 8 was no need to response the same whilst the plaintiff exclaimed that the defendant no. 8 was not present on the spot at the time of assessment. The defendant no. 8 was allotted Temporary Pass under No. RDL/W-8/76/30/1463-83 Dt. 13/2/1976 which was later converted into Farm Pass No. 3/89. Thereafter it was converted into LSC No. 81/G/89 and the area was extended by payment of redemption fee. LSC No. 81/G/89 was made before proclaimed Pukpui-Kawmzawl area as protected area under Notification No. K. 22011/1/92-REV Dt. 17-11-1992. As per instruction of DEO, Guwahati, sanction of rental charge for the period commencing from 1/1/1998 to 31/12/2005 has to be disbursed to persons whose names figured in the Blue print and done accordingly. Thus, prayed to dismiss of the suit with cost.

The defendants 5-7 in their written statements stated that rental charges of land from Sept., 1986 to Dec., 1997 and also for 31st Jan., 1998 to 31st Dec., 2005 has been released to the Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Revenue Department for disbursement to the rightful owner of lands. The plaintiff who are not found in the list prepared by the competent authority have no locus standi to get rental compensation as done joint survey in 1993 and thereby duly prepared a Blue print.

The defendant no. 8 in her written statement also contended that no Village Council pass was issued before 1966. Her land was original under

village council pass issued in 1973. No village council in Mizoram are competent to issue garden passes in accordance with the Mizo District (Agricultural Land) Act, 1963 and the allotment of WRC land by the Village Council to the plaintiff is void ab initio. The name of the plaintiff was not included in the Blue print prepared by the Board of Officers during 1992 to 1993 consisting Representative of the Army, Defence Estate and the Government of Mizoram. As Kawmzawl area was a restricted area, application of the plaintiff for conversion into LSC could not be granted. The defendant no. 8 was allotted Temporary Pass under No. RDL/W-8/76/30/1463-83 Dt. 13/2/1976 which was later converted into Farm Pass No. 3/89. Thereafter it was converted into LSC No. 81/G/89 and the area was extended by payment of redemption fee. LSC No. 81/G/89 was made before proclaimed Pukpui-Kawmzawl area as protected area under Notification No. K. 22011/1/92-REV Dt. 17-11-1992 which were all done legally and rightly. Thus, prayed to dismiss of the suit with costs.

ISSUES

Issues were framed on 30-09-2008 and amended towards correct findings as follows-

1. Whether the suit is maintainable in its present form and style
2. Whether the plaintiff has cause of action against the defendants
3. Whether the land belonging to the plaintiff covered by Village Council Pass Dt. 30/3/1963 is illegally encroached upon by LSC No. 81/G/89 issued in favour of the defendant no. 8
4. Whether issuance of LSC No. 81/G/89 is legally sustainable or not.
5. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to receive rental charges over to the suit land from 1/4/1966 till date due to occupation by the defendants 5-7.
6. Whether the impugned order under No. S. 11011/10/97-LRS (L)/79 Dated Lunglei, the 4/8/2006 issued by the ASO-I, Lunglei is liable to set aside or not
7. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed in his plaint or not. If so, to what extend.

BRIEF ACCOUNT OF EVIDENCE

For the plaintiff:

The plaintiff had produced the following witnesses namely-

1. Mr. R. Laltawna S/o Chhingliaia (L), Electric Veng, Lunglei (Hereinafter referred to as PW-1)
2. Smt. Lawmkimi D/o Darthangpuia, Electric Veng, Lunglei (Hereinafter referred to as PW-2)
3. Mr. H.P. Chalthianga S/o Chalmawia, Pukpui (Hereinafter referred to as PW-3)

The **PW -1** in his examination in chief after affirming his averments in the plaint exhibited the followings

Ext. P-1 is a copy of Village Council Pass Dt. 30/3/1963

Ext. P-2 is Acknowledgement of his village council pass and possession

Ext. P-3 is another Acknowledgement of his village council pass and possession

Ext. P-4 is a copy of letter Dt. 23/1/2001 issued by ASO-I, Lunglei

Ext. P-5 is order dt. 4/8/2006

Ext. P- 6 is a copy of P. Patta No. 3 of 1988

Ext. P-7 is a copy of LSC No. 81/G of 1989

Ext. P-8 is list of persons entitled to receive rental compensation where defendant no. 8 is put as serial no. 9

In his cross examination, he further deposed that as allotted, he cultivated within his VC pass. His land area is about 8 bighas.

The **PW- 2** in her examination in chief deposed that the wife of the plaintiff is her aunt and used to stay in the residence of the plaintiff for her education and also used to work in the garden of the plaintiff in the suit land during holidays.

In her cross examination, she admitted that she knew that Village Council pass was issued to the plaintiff for the purpose of cultivation.

The **PW-3** in his examination in chief deposed that being originated from Pukpui, they knew the suit land as the land of the plaintiff and the Village Council of Pukpui issued village council pass in favour of the plaintiff. The LSC of the defendant no. 8 much wider than the area covered by her P. Patta.

In his cross examination, he deposed that he did not know when the village council issued pass to the plaintiff. He admitted that he did not know the exact area of the land of the plaintiff. He did not see the LSC or the P. Patta of the defendant no. 8.

For the defendant no. 8:

The defendant no. 8 had produced the following witnesses namely-

1. Mr. Malsawma Murray S/o Ngurchhawni (L), Chanmari, Lunglei (Hereinafter referred to as DW-1)
2. Smt. Lalruali Pautu W/o Malsawma Murray, Chanmari, Lunglei (Hereinafter referred to as DW-2)
3. Smt. Zothanmawii W/o Andrew Lallerliana, Luangmual- Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as DW-3)
4. Mr. P. Lalhmangaihzualla S/o Lianbuanga (L), Ramthar- Lunglei (Hereinafter referred to as DW-4)

The **DW-1** in his examination mainly affirmed the contents of their written statements. Ext. D-1 is their written statement, Ext. D- 1 (a) and (b) were the signatures of his late mother.

In his cross examination, he deposed that since the past 10 years, he knew the plaintiff. He admitted that their Village Council pass was converted into Farm Pass No. 3 of 1988 with an area of 10.5 bighas. He also admitted that the extended area of their LSC was about 12.5 bighas. His late mother already received rental compensation amounting to Rs. 18 lakhs (approximately).

The **DW-2** being the wife of the defendant no. 8 also mainly affirmed written statements of the defendant no. 8 in her examination in chief.

In her cross examination, she admitted that before marriage, she knew about the family affairs of the defendant no. 8.

The **DW-3** in her examination in chief deposed that she is the eldest sister of Mr. Malsawma Murray and she further mainly affirmed the contents of written statements of defendant no. 8.

In her cross examination, so far as her knowledge, firstly, her mother was issued village council pass in 1973 over to the suit land.

The **DW-4** in his examination in chief deposed that he is the husband of the one of the daughters of the late defendant no. 8 and he also mainly affirmed their written statements during examination in chief.

In his cross examination, he admitted that he did not know about alteration of the boundary of the land of the defendant no. 8 when making LSC. He further deposed that even after secede the suit land from military occupation, the defendant no. 8 did not develop the suit land.

The other defendants failed to produce any oral evidence.

FINDINGS

Issue No. 1

Whether the suit is maintainable in its present form and style

Whilst the suit is valued at Rs. 51,84,000/- and advolorem court fees is at Rs. 5000/- as submitted under paragraph no. 18 of the plaint. Court fees at Rs. 1000/- only is paid by the plaintiff which is bad in terms of the provision of the Court Fees (Mizoram Amendment) Act, 1996 (Act No. 5 of 1997). More so, the plaintiff merely affirmed paragraphs 1-17 of his plaint as true to the best of his personal knowledge and belief and was not supported by affidavit. In this lacunae, the provisions of sub-rule (4) of rule 15 under Order VI of the CPC was made effective before institution of the instant suit viz. with effect from 1-7-2002 by Act No. 46 of 1999 which is before filing of the instant suit. The Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in **State of Bombay v. Purushottam Jog Naik**, AIR 1952 SC 317. Vivian Bose, J. speaking for the Court, held:

"We wish, however, to observe that the verification of the affidavits produced here is defective. The body of the affidavit discloses that certain matters were known to the Secretary who made the affidavit personally. The verification however states that everything was true to the best of his information and belief. We point this out as slipshod verifications of this type might well in a given case lead to a rejection of the affidavit. Verification should invariably be modelled on the lines of Order 19, Rule 3, of the Civil Procedure Code, whether the Code applies in terms or not. And when the matter deposed to is not based on personal knowledge the sources of information should be clearly disclosed."

Another Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court again in **A. K. K. Nambiar v. Union of India and another**, AIR 1970 SC 652, held as follows:

"The appellant filed an affidavit in support of the petition. Neither the petition nor the affidavit was verified. The affidavits which were filed in answer to the appellant's petition were also not verified. The reasons for verification of affidavits are to enable the Court to find out which facts can be said to be proved on the affidavit evidence of rival parties. Allegations may be true to knowledge or allegations may be true to information received from persons or allegations may be based on records. The importance of verification is to test the genuineness and authenticity of allegations and also to make the deponent responsible for allegations. In essence verification is required to enable the Court to find out as to whether it will be safe to act on such affidavit evidence. In the present case, the affidavits of all the parties suffer from the mischief of lack of proper verification with the result that the affidavits should not be admissible in evidence."

More so, recently in **Sinnamani & Anr. vs G. Vettivel & Ors.** decided on 9th May, 2012 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 4368 of 2012 @ SLP (Civil) No.11825 of 2008, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that-

"11. A suit can be instituted by presentation of a plaint and Order IV and VII C.P.C. deals with the presentation of the plaint and the contents of the plaint. Chapter I of the Civil Rules of Practice deals with the form of a plaint. When the statutory provision clearly says as to how the suit has to be instituted, it can be instituted only in that manner alone, and no other manner."

Thus, a plaint without supporting verification and affidavit by a paragraph wise irregularities which can vitiate the proceedings like in the instant plaint. The plaint is also arbitrary in terms of the recent observations of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Maria Margarida Sequeria Fernandes and Others v. Erasmo Jack de Sequeria (Dead) through L.Rs.** (2012) 3 SCALE 550.

Issue No. 2

Whether the plaintiff has cause of action against the defendants

Till oral arguments, undisputedly, the plaintiff by holding Village Council Pass Dt. 30/3/1963 as elicited by Ext. P-1 filed the instant suit whilst it was issued for the purpose of Wet Rice Cultivation which is cogently an agricultural land. For that purpose, Section 3 of the Lushai Hills District (House Sites) Act, 1953 reads thus-

“3.Allotment of sites:

- (1) Subject to the provisions of sub-section (2) of this section, a Village Council shall be competent to allot sites within its jurisdiction for residential and other non-agricultural purpose with the exception of shops and stalls which include hotels and other business houses of the same nature.

Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, the Administrator shall have the power to intervene in all cases of disputes over any sites within the village, and the decision of the Administrator shall be final.

Provided that the Administrator may, at any time by notification, declare that any village or a particular locality is a protected area where allotment of sites shall be done by Village Council only with the previous approval of the Administrator.

- (2) The Administrator or any other person or body authorized in that behalf by the Administrator shall allot sites for residential and other non-agricultural purposes in Aizawl, Lunglei, Demagiri, Sairang, Kolasib, Champhai and Vanlaiphai and also sites for shops and stalls which may include hotels and other business houses of the like nature in places other than the said stations.
- (3) The Village Council, when site is allotted under sub-section (1) and the Administrator or any other person or body, authorized in that behalf by the Administrator when the site is allotted under sub-section (2) shall issue a patta and may incorporate therein in writing such conditions as may be reasonable in the interest of general public or of a Scheduled Tribe.
- (4) The authority issuing the patta on being satisfied on proof that any such condition or conditions incorporated in the Patta have been violated may cancel the Patta.

Provided that such authority instead of cancelling the Patta may impose a fine, when such authority is a Village Council, not exceeding Rs. 50/- and when the authority is the Administrator or any other person or body authorized in that behalf by the Administrator, not exceeding Rs. 100/-

- (5) No person shall occupy any site without obtaining a Patta from a competent authority as prescribed in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) as the case may be.
- (6) The Village Council when the site is allotted under sub-section (1) the Administrator or any other person or body authorized in that behalf by the Administrator when it is allotted under sub-section (2) may evict any person having in occupation of

unauthorized site after service on such unauthorized occupant of a notice to vacate the site within a period of not less than 7 days.

- (7) On failure of such unauthorized occupant to vacate the site within the time fixed in the notice the Village Council or Administrator or any other person or body authorized by the Administrator in that behalf, may order for demolition of the building or impose a fine not exceeding Rs. 5/- per day for the unauthorized occupation after the service of the notice.
- (8) The order of the Administrator or a Village Council as the case may be, passed under clauses (6) and (7) above shall be deemed to be a decree of a competent civil court for the purpose of evicting an unauthorized occupant from a site to which this Act applies."

The Government of Mizoram reiterated that all the Village Councils in the then Aizawl and Lunglei Districts under the Lushai Hills District (House Sites) Act, 1953 are not competent to make allotment of land for agricultural purposes. Such Passes issued by the Village Councils cannot be honoured and regularized by the Government. Purchase of such Garden Passes and later applied for regularization is strictly prohibited by the Government.

It was further notified that such illegal allotment of Agricultural lands by the Village Councils is seriously viewed by the Government. The Local Administration Department had been requested to collect information on such unauthorized issue of the Garden Passes for the last three years and to take appropriate action against those Village Councils who failed to comply with the Acts mentioned above under Notification No. K-53011/28/92- REV/7 (A), the 31st August, 1992 published in the Mizoram Gazette, Extra Ordinary, Vol. XXI, 8.9.1992, Issue No. 163. The provision of the Mizo District (Agricultural Land) Act, 1963 and the rules made thereunder were also silent about authority of the Village Council over to the agricultural land.

So is the clear and un-vague legal position on the entity of Village Council land pass over to agriculture land as examined within the law settled in **S.P. Gupta Vs. President Of India And Ors.** decided on 30/12/1981 reported in AIR 1982 SC 149, (1981) Supp (1) SCC 87, (1982) 2 SCR 365 and in **Swamy Atmananda & Ors.Vs. Sri Ramakrishna Tapovanam & Ors.** decided on 13/04/2005 in connection with Appeal (Civil) 2395 of 2000 and reported in 2005 AIR 2392, 2005 (3) SCR 556, 2005 (10) SCC 51, 2005 (4) SCALE 117, 2005 (4) JT 472, the plaintiff filed the instant suit without having locus standi and cause of action against the defendants. In **Swamy Atmananda & Ors.Vs. Sri Ramakrishna Tapovanam & Ors. (supra.)**, it was held that-

"A cause of action, thus, means every fact, which, if traversed, it would be necessary for the plaintiff to prove in order to support his right to a judgment of the Court. In other words, it is a bundle of facts which taken with the law

applicable to them gives the plaintiff a right to relief against the defendant. It must include some act done by the defendant since in the absence of such an act no cause of action can possibly accrue. It is not limited to the actual infringement of the right sued on but includes all the material facts on which it is founded.”

And in **S.P. Gupta Vs. President Of India And Ors.** (supra.), the Constitution Bench of Hon’ble Supreme Court has held that-

“14. The traditional rule in regard to *locus standi* is that judicial redress is available only to a person who has suffered a legal injury by reason of violation of his legal right or legal protected interest by the impugned action of the State or a public authority or any other person or who is likely to suffer a legal injury by reason of threatened violation of his legal right or legally protected interest by any such action.”

Issue No. 3

Whether the land belonging to the plaintiff covered by Village Council Pass Dt. 30/3/1963 is illegally encroached upon by LSC No. 81/G/89 issued in favour of the defendant no. 8.

As per the findings under issue no. 2, this issue is inevitably decided in favour of the defendants.

Issue No. 4

Whether issuance of LSC No. 81/G/89 is legally sustainable or not.

As undisputed during oral arguments, extension of the area covered by LSC No. 81/G/89 from where originated was made with payment of requisite redemption fee to the government within the ambit of existing law, whilst the plaintiff is adjudicated as have no cause of action, this issue is held affirmative in favour of defendant no. 8.

Issue No. 5

Whether the plaintiff is entitled to receive rental charges/compensation over to the suit land from 1/4/1966 till date due to occupation by the defendants 5-7.

As filed the case without cause of action by the plaintiff and is not maintainable, no entitlement of the plaintiff as sought in his plaint can be found as no right to property is involved as held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Anand Singh & Anr. vs State Of U.P. & Ors.** decided on 28 July, 2010 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 2523 of 2008.

Issue No. 6

Whether the impugned order under No. S. 11011/10/97-LRS (L)/79 Dated Lunglei, the 4/8/2006 issued by the ASO-I, Lunglei is liable to set aside or not

The impugned order under No. S. 11011/10/97-LRS (L)/79 Dated Lunglei, the 4/8/2006 issued by the ASO-I, Lunglei is marked as Ext. P- 5 which upheld the validity of LSC No. 81/G/89 as the plaintiff was only with Village Council which itself was void in the rigour of existing land laws, no interference is therefore called upon as recently held in the case of **Mig Cricket Club vs Abhinav Sahakar Edn. Society & Ors.** decided on 5 September, 2011 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 2047 of 2007, wherein, their Lordship of Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that-

“14. It is well settled that the user of the land is to be decided by the authority empowered to take such a decision and this Court in exercise of its power of judicial review would not interfere with the same unless the change in the user is found to be arbitrary. The process involves consideration of competing claims and requirements of the inhabitants in present and future so as to make their lives happy, healthy and comfortable.”

This issue is also therefore decided in favour of the defendants.

Issue No. 7

Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed in his plaint or not. If so, to what extend.

As filed the case without cause of action by the plaintiff and is not maintainable, no entitlement of the plaintiff as sought in his plaint can be found.

ORDER

In view of the afore findings and elaborations, the suit due to lack of maintainability, and is without cause of action against defendants and is also lack of requisite court fees is hereby dismissed. Parties are directed to bear their own costs due to peculiarities of the case.

With this order, the case shall stand disposed of.

Give this order copy to all concerned.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this 23rd August, 2012 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. CS/31/2006, Sr. CJ (A)/

Dated Aizawl, the 23rd August, 2012

Copy to:

1. Mr. R. Laltawna S/o Chhingliaia (L), Electric Veng, Lunglei, Lunglei District through Mr. C. Lalramzauva, Sr. Adv.
2. The State of Mizoram Represented by the Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
3. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Revenue Department through Mr. Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
4. The Director, Land Revenue & Settlement Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
5. The Assistant Settlement Officer- I, Lunglei District: Lunglei through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
6. The Union of India Represented by Defence Secretary, Govt. of India, South Block, New Delhi-I through Mr. Abul Hussain, Adv.
7. The Director General, Defence Estates, Palam Road, New Delhi through Mr. Abul Hussain, Adv.
8. The Defence Estate Officer, Guwahati Circle, Silpukhuri, Guwahati through Mr. Abul Hussain, Adv.
9. Mr. Malsawma Murray S/o Ngurchhawni (L), Chanmari, Lunglei through Mr. B. Lalramenga, Adv.
10. P.A. to Hon'ble District & Sessions Judge, Aizawl Judicial District: Aizawl
11. Case record

PESKAR