

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

CIVIL SUIT NO. 80 OF 2009

Plaintiff:

Mr. Zosangliana  
S/o Lianzuala (L)  
Tuikual South, Aizawl

*By Advocates*

: 1. Miss Lalthlamuani  
2. Mr. R. Laltanpuia  
3. Miss Lalrinpuii  
4. Miss Dorothy Lalrinchhani

*Versus*

Defendants:

1. The State of Mizoram  
Represented by Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram  
Revenue Department
2. The Director  
Land Revenue and Settlement Department  
Govt. of Mizoram
3. The Assistant Settlement Officer-II  
Aizawl District: Aizawl  
Land Revenue and Settlement Department  
Govt. of Mizoram
4. Mr. C. Lalrinchhana  
Principal  
Ar-Ells School  
Chaltlang, Aizawl

*By Advocates:*

For the defendants Nos. 1-3 : Mr. R.C. Thanga, Sr. Govt. Adv.  
For the defendants No. 4 : Mr. Francis Vanlalzuala

Date of Arguments : 09-08-2011  
Date of Judgment & Order : 10-08-2012

**BEFORE**

Dr. H.T.C. LALRINCHHANA, MJS  
Senior Civil Judge- 1  
Aizawl District: Aizawl

## **JUDGMENT & ORDER**

---

### **NUCLEUS OF THE CASE**

The plaintiff had purchased the land under LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 located at Edentharr Veng, Aizawl from one Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma S/o Ruma (L), Nursery Veng, Aizawl on 8.1.2005 in consideration of Rs. 3 lakhs and later found through the action of state defendants that the said land was overlapped by LSC No. Azl. 2270 of 1987 belonging to the defendant no. 4. As mutation was also already made in his favour, the plaintiff prayed to direct the defendants 1-3 to pay compensation amounting to Rs. 3 lakhs (Expenditure for purchase of the suit land) plus Rs. 3 lakhs (Expenditure incurred on construction of building in the suit land) plus interest rate @ 9% per annum with effect from Feb., 2005. The plaintiff had also make up deficiency of court fees as directed under section 149 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

The defendant no. 2 in their written statements stated that the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties and is not maintainable in its present form and style. LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was cancelled with the approval of the Government. Even show cause notice is given to the plaintiff, his building remain stood in the suit land. The defendants are not liable for the latent defect in the title of ownership of the original owner of the suit land, the principle of 'buyer beware' applies in the matter of purchase/sale of goods such as the instant case. Thus, prayed to dismiss of the suit.

The defendant no. 4 in his written statements contended that the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties and the plaintiff has no locus standi to file the suit. The plaintiff also knows very well that his LSC was not located at the place where he constructed a building. LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was originated from Huan Pass No. 115 belonging to Mr. Sawithangluaia S/o Kawngsena and the location of the said Village Council Pass was Chaltlang, Aizawl Near Tourist Lodge not at Edentharr. He sum up that it is the fault of the Revenue Department to issue the LSC of the plaintiff over to the suit land, liability will therefore cogently lies to the said Revenue Department.

### **ISSUES**

The following issues were therefore framed on 16/11/2012 and amended towards correct findings namely-

1. Whether the plaintiff has cause of action against the instant defendants to file the instant suit or not.
2. Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties or not.
3. Whether LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was duly issued to Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma. And if so, whether it was validly mutated in the name of the plaintiff.

4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed or not. If so, to what extend and from whom

### **BRIEF ACCOUNT OF EVIDENCE**

For the plaintiff:

The plaintiff had produced the following witnesses namely-

1. Mr. Zosangliana S/o Lianzuala (L), Tuikual South, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-1)
2. Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma S/o Ruma (L), Nursery Veng, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-2)
3. Mr. P.C. Lalrema S/o Haukhuma (L), Luangmual, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-3)

The **PW -1** in his examination in chief after affirming his averments in the plaint deposed that besides his construction of two storied Assam Type building in the suit land during 2005, he cultivated the following fruit bearing trees namely-

- (i) Zawngtah- 2 numbers
- (ii) Kawhte bel- 8 numbers
- (iii) Khanghu- 10 numbers
- (iv) Kawlthei- 2 numbers
- (v) Theihai- 5 numbers
- (vi) Balhla- 1 number
- (vii) Serthlum- 1 number
- (viii) Lamkhuang- 4 numbers
- (ix) Theihmu- 2 numbers

He further exhibited the following documents-

- Ext. P-1 is a copy of LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003
- Ext. P-2 is a copy of Ramhralhna Lehkha
- Ext. P- 2(a) is his signature
- Ext. P-3 is a copy of Stay Order dt. 8.4.2005
- Ext. P-4 is a copy of Letter Dt. 6.5.2005
- Ext. P-5 is a copy of Lifting of the stay order dt. 18.4.2005
- Ext. P-6 is a copy of order dt. 7.6.2005
- Ext. P-7 is a copy of order dt. 28.6.2005
- Ext. P-8 is a copy of show cause notice dt. 23.11.2005
- Ext. P-9 is a copy of replication dt. 7.12.2005 to the show cause notice
- Ext. P-10 is a copy of order dt. 18/5/2006
- Ext. P-11 is a copy of letter dt. 20.5.2006
- Ext. P-12 is a copy of order dt. 14.8.2006
- Ext. P-13 is a copy of order dt. 26.9.2007
- Ext. P-14 is a copy of order dt. 6.6.2008
- Ext. P-15 is a copy of show cause notice dt. 9/11/2009

In his cross examination by learned counsel for defendant no. 4, he admitted that he claimed title of the disputed land covered under LSC No. Azl. 2270 of 1987 and Azl. 2267 of 1987 belonging to defendant no. 4 and he approached this court for purchasing his land and building located therein.

In his cross examination by learned AGA, he admitted that he did not know how Mr. H. Lachhuanawma obtained LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003. He admitted that the LSC of defendant no. 4 was senior than his LSC. The original copy of LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 remain in his custody.

The **PW-2** in his examination in chief deposed that he was issued LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 in supersession of LSC No. 372 of 1997, he sold the same to the plaintiff for Rs. 3 lakhs in 2005 and mutated in the name of the plaintiff on 10.5.2005. The plaintiff constructed two storied Assam type building in the said land in 2005. The plaintiff also planted fruit bearing trees in the suit land. In 2006, the said LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was cancelled by the Revenue Department. Ext. P-2 (b) is his signature.

In his cross examination by learned counsel for the defendant no. 4, he admitted that LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was cancelled due to overlapped by LSC No. Azl. 2270 of 1987 or Azl. 2267 of 1987 belonging to defendant no. 4. He also admitted that the plaintiff filed the instant suit for payment of compensation from Revenue Department.

In his cross examination by learned counsel for the defendants 1-3, he admitted that he never stayed at Edentharr Veng, he also admitted that after he sold the suit land to the plaintiff, he never visited the same till date.

The **PW-3** in his examination in chief deposed that he is a Mistiry (Carpenter) by profession, he was engaged by the plaintiff sometimes in the month of March, 2005 for construction of Assam type building in the suit land and he done estimate for the said building and witnessed that the plaintiff had collected various materials for the same. In his own estimation, the plaintiff would spent at least Rs. 3 lakhs for the said construction.

In his cross examination, he admitted that he did not see the LSC of the plaintiff to ascertain its genuineness. He denied that he did not construct the Assam type building of the plaintiff in the suit land.

For the defendants 1-3:

The defendants 1-3 had produced only one witness namely Mr. K. Lalmuakliana, Assistant Director, Land Revenue and Settlement Department, Govt. of Mizoram (Hereinafter referred to as DW for defendants 1-3). In his examination in chief, he deposed that-

Ext. D-1 is their written statement

Ext. D-1 (a) is the signature of Director, Land Revenue and Settlement Department

Ext. D-2 is the amended written statement

In his cross examination by learned counsel for the plaintiff, he admitted that the original copy of Ext. D-3 was not produced before the court.

In his cross examination by learned counsel for defendant no. 4, he also admitted that the LSC of the defendant no. 4 is senior than the LSC of the plaintiff. The LSC of the defendant no. 4 was duly issued following all formalities by the Revenue Department

For the defendant no. 4:

The defendant no. 4 himself acted as his witness (Hereinafter referred to as DW for defendant no. 4). In his examination in chief, he deposed that he is the holder of LSC No. Azl. 2270 of 1987 and Azl. 2267 of 1987 located at Edenthur, Aizawl which was adjacent to each other. The plaintiff had constructed Assam type building within his LSC and also preferred a complaint on it. The Revenue Department thereby found that LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 belonging to the plaintiff was falsely issued over to his land. The said LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was therefore cancelled by the Revenue Department. He further deposed that-

Ext. D-1 is a copy of LSC No. Azl. 2270 of 1987

Ext. D-2 is a copy of LSC No. Azl. 2267 of 1987

Ext. D-3 is a copy of tax payee receipt

Ext. D-4 is a copy of Huan Pass No. 115 of 1973

Ext. D-5 is a copy of land dispute/encroachment

Ext. D- 6 is a copy of Settlement Order Dt. 6<sup>th</sup> Feb., 2008

In his cross examination by learned counsel for the plaintiff, he deposed that he bought LSC No. Azl. 2270 of 1987 in the year of 1987 and developed the said land since the date of purchase. He came to learnt that the plaintiff had constructed a building in 2007 and is still standing. LSC No. Azl. 2270 of 1987 is originated from Village Council Pass issued by Chaltlang Village Council.

In his cross examination by learned AGA, he deposed that he did not construct any building in the suit land till date.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Issue No. 1**

**Whether the plaintiff has cause of action against the instant defendants to file the instant suit or not.**

Recently in **Church Of Christ Charitable Trust & Educational Charitable Society vs M/S. Ponniamman Educationa Trust** decided on 3 July, 2012 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 4841 of 2012 (Arising out of

SLP (C) No.30632 of 2011), their Lordship of Hon'ble Supreme Court has set forth the ingredients of plaint towards cause of action in the following terms speaking that-

“8) While scrutinizing the plaint averments, it is the bounden duty of the trial Court to ascertain the materials for cause of action. The cause of action is a bundle of facts which taken with the law applicable to them gives the plaintiff the right to relief against the defendant. Every fact which is necessary for the plaintiff to prove to enable him to get a decree should be set out in clear terms. It is worthwhile to find out the meaning of the words “cause of action”. A cause of action must include some act done by the defendant since in the absence of such an act no cause of action can possibly accrue.”

Mr. R.C. Thanga, learned senior advocate for the defendants 1-3 claims that the plaintiff could not have locus standi for filing the suit against the defendants 1-3 as it was the mistake committed by him as it was his duty to prudent on his purchase suit land. The plaintiff rather have cause of action against Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma from whom he had purchased the suit land. On the other hand, Mr. R. Laltanpuia, learned counsel for the plaintiff contended that as the Revenue Department alone issued the said LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 and also mutated in the name of the plaintiff, only because of the act of the defendants 1-3, loss of the plaintiff occurred. Thus, they cannot escape from their liabilities to compensate the plaintiff from huge loss happened upon the plaintiff due to their inaccuracy and fault.

As undisputed during arguments, it is the defendants 1-3, who issued LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 and who later betrayed their action causing loss to the plaintiff. Thus, 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 must have cause of action against the defendants 1-3.

## **Issue No. 2**

### **Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties or not.**

Mr. R.C. Thanga vehemently argued that without impleadment of Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma from whom the plaintiff had purchased the suit land under said LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 and without impleadment of the concerned District Collector, there is non-joinder of necessary parties. In that crux, learned counsel for the plaintiff fairly admitted that their quantum of compensation is Rs. 3 lakhs for expenditure on purchasing the suit land from Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma as unchallenged by evidence of the plaintiff which is corroboratively deposed by PWs 1 and 2 viz. the plaintiff and the said Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma plus Rs. 3 lakhs to meet expenditure

incurred on construction of two storied Assam type building in the disputed land as clearly deposed by PW-3 who was engaged to construct the said building as Carpentry who affirmed the averments and submissions in the plaint. Laws on necessary parties is well settled in **U.P. Awas Evam Vikas Parishad Vs. Gyan Devi (Dead) By Lrs. & Ors.** decided on 20/10/1994 in connection with Appeal (civil) 7067 of 1994 reported in 1995 AIR 724, 1994 (4) Suppl. SCR 646, 1995 (2) SCC 326, 1994 (4) SCALE 755, 1994 (7) JT 304, it was held that-

"The law is well settled that a necessary party is one without whom no order can be made effectively and a proper party is one in whose absence an effective order can be made but whose presence is necessary for a complete and final decision of the question involved in the proceeding. (See: Udit Narain Singh Malpaharia v. Additional Member, Board of Revenue, [1963] Supp. 1 SCR 676, at p. 681."

Whilst, learned counsel for the plaintiff fairly confessed that they have no other claims except expenditure incurred on procurement of the land and expenditure involved on construction of two storied Assam type building in the suit land which will be left by him as the plaintiff admitted that he have no rights to claim title over to the suit land. Thus, no accurate assessment of quantum of compensation is necessary for calling the assistance of the concerned District Collector as well as the said Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma previous holder of LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 stood as PW-2 who was cross examined by learned counsel for the defendants as per their wishes. This issue is also thereby decided in favour of the plaintiff.

### **Issue No. 3**

**Whether LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was duly issued to Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma. And if so, whether it was validly mutated in the name of the plaintiff.**

The validity of issuance of LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 in favour of Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma was not challenged as the oral and documentary evidence of the defendants were silent on it. Although Mr. R. Laltanpuia, learned counsel for the plaintiff claimed that as LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 was already mutated in the name of the plaintiff, the plaintiff have ownership rights, law on that crux is convincingly settled in the case of **State of U. P. v. Amar Singh & Ors.** reported in 1997 (1) SCC 734 at 738, the Supreme Court opined that-

"It is settled law that mutation entries are only for the purpose of enabling the State to collect the land revenue from the person in possession, but it does not confer any title to the land. The title would be derived from an instrument executed by the owner in favour of an alienee as per the Stamp Act and registered under the Registration Act."

Also vide, **Sawarni (Smt.) v. Inder Kaur (Smt.) & Ors.** decided on 23 August, 1996 and reported in 1996 (6) SCC 223 at 227, 1996 SCALE (6) 333: **Sankatchan Jaychandbhai Palet & Ors. v. Vithalbhai Jaychandbhai**

**Patel & Ors.** decided on 13 September, 1996 and reported in 1996 (6) SCC 433 at 435.

Since no evidence which can vitiate the process for issuance of LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 marked as Ext. P-1 in favour of Mr. H. Lalchhuanawma was adduced during the course of proceedings of the case, this issue is again decided in favour of the plaintiff.

#### **Issue No. 4**

**Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed or not. If so, to what extend and from whom**

Mr. R.C. Thanga, learned Senior Government Advocate also further claimed that the suit is premature in nature as before the plaintiff reply Ext. P-15 viz. Show cause notice to the plaintiff as to why forcefully dismantle of his building in the suit issued on 9<sup>th</sup> Nov., 2009, the suit was filed. In this catena, In **Vithalbai (P) Ltd. v. Union Bank of India**, reported in (2005) 4 SCC 315, the Supreme Court has prudent on premature suit that-

“However, the court shall not exercise its discretion in favour of decreeing a premature suit in the following cases : (i) when there is a mandatory bar created by a statute which disables the plaintiff from filing the suit on or before a particular date or the occurrence of a particular event; (ii) when the institution of the suit before the lapse of a particular time or occurrence of a particular event would have the effect of defeating a public policy or public purpose; (iii) if such premature institution renders the presentation itself patently void and the invalidity is incurable such as when it goes to the root of the court's jurisdiction; and (iv) where the lis is not confined to parties alone and affects and involves persons other than those arrayed as parties, such as in an election petition which affects and involves the entire constituency. (See *Samar Singh v. Kedar Nath*.) One more category of suits which may be added to the above, is: where leave of the court or some authority is mandatorily required to be obtained before the institution of the suit and was not so obtained.”

In the case at hand, as elicited by Ext. P-10 viz. cancellation order of the LSC of the plaintiff namely- LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 on Dt. 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2006, the instant suit cannot be termed as premature in nature as freeing from cautious laid down in **Vithalbai (P) Ltd. v. Union Bank of India** (supra.).

The well recognized legal principles viz. *Ubi Jus Ibi remedium* must therefore be applied where there is cause of action leading loss to a person in a civil capacity still recognized by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Fertilizer Corporation Kamgar Union (Regd.), Sindri & Ors. vs Union Of India And Others** decided on 13 November, 1980 and reported in 1981 AIR 344, 1981 SCR (2) 52. For that purpose, Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Bachhaj Nahar vs. Nilima Mandal and Anr** (2008) 17 SCC 491 has already settled



the mode for granting of relief. It is relevant to extract the principles enunciated in para 23 of the said judgment which is as follows.

"23. It is fundamental that in a civil suit, relief to be granted can be only with reference to the prayers made in the pleadings. That apart, in civil suits, grant of relief is circumscribed by various factors like court fee, limitation, parties to the suits, as also grounds barring relief, like res judicata, estoppel, acquiescence, non-joinder of causes of action or parties, etc., which require pleading and proof. Therefore, it would be hazardous to hold that in a civil suit whatever be the relief that is prayed, the court can on examination of facts grant any relief as it thinks fit. In a suit for recovery of rupees one lakh, the court cannot grant a decree for rupees ten lakhs. In a suit for recovery possession of property 'A', court cannot grant possession of property 'B'. In a suit praying for permanent injunction, court cannot grant a relief of declaration or possession. The jurisdiction to grant relief in a civil suit necessarily depends on the pleadings, prayer, court fee paid, evidence let in, etc."

Only because of the recklessness and inaccurate act of defendants 1-3 like issuance of LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 and later mutated in the name of the plaintiff leading huge lavish expenditure of the plaintiff, the said loss of the plaintiff occurred must resulting liability to the defaulters in the civil capacity is the well settled law like embarking liability to defendants 1-3. Thus, the defendants 1-3 will certainly liable to pay compensation to the plaintiff where causing loss due to their own recklessness and negligent act. However, the plaintiff prayed an interest rate @ 9% per annum with effect from Feb., 2005 which is no basis as settled the law in **Secretary/General Manager Chennai Central Cooperative Bank Ltd. & Anr. Vs. S. Kamalaveni Sundaram** decided on 4 January, 2011 and in connection with Civil Appeal No. 14 of 2011 (Arising out of SLP (Civil) No. 19305 of 2010), the Supreme Court has held that-

"11. Section 34 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) empowers the court to award interest for the period from the date of the suit to the date of the decree and from the date of the decree to the date of payment where the decree is for payment of money. Section 34 of the CPC does not empower the court to award pre-suit interest. The pre-suit interest would ordinarily depend on the contract (express or implied) between the parties or some statutory provisions or the mercantile usage."

Thus, interest can be imposed with effect from 16-12-2009 viz. the date of institution of the suit like in the instant case where parties did not enter into agreement for payment of interest due to loss occurred in any case.

The fair admission of the plaintiff and his learned counsel is tenable in law by not claiming title over to the disputed landed area 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, the 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.”

In the written statement of defendant no. 2 and evidence of defendants 1-3 did not deny the quantum of compensation amount claimed in the plaint, the plaintiff will therefore be entitled to receive the following relief/monetary compensation from defendants 1-3 namely-

1. Rs. 3,00,000/- (Rupees three lakhs) to compensate the plaintiff on his expenditure on purchasing the suit land under LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003
2. Rs. 3,00,000/- (Rupees three lakhs) to compensate the plaintiff on his expenditure incurred on construction of two storied Assam type buildings

Whilst learned counsel for the plaintiff fairly rescind their claimed relief on their planted fruit bearing trees and in lieu of costs of the suit, the plaintiff will also entitle to dismantle his two storied Assam Type building in the suit land and collect all the materials within one month from the date of this order by leaving vacant land to the defendant no. 4. The plaintiff will be liable to return original copy of his LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 to the defendants 1-3 within one month from the date of this order as it remains in his custody as deposed by PW-1 during cross examination.

### **ORDER**

In view of the afore findings and elaborations, it is hereby ORDERED and DECREED that the defendants 1-3 are directed to pay the following monetary compensation to the plaintiff within six months from the date of this order namely -

1. Rs. 3,00,000/- (Rupees three lakhs) with an interest rate @ 9% per annum with effect from 16-12-2009 till realization in full meant to compensate the plaintiff on his expenditure on purchasing the suit land under LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003
2. Rs. 3,00,000/- (Rupees three lakhs) with an interest rate @ 9% per annum with effect from 16-12-2009 till realization in full meant to compensate the plaintiff on his expenditure incurred on construction of two storied Assam type buildings

Meanwhile, the plaintiff is directed to dismantle his two storied Assam Type building in the suit land and collect all the materials within one month from the date of this order by leaving vacant land to the defendant no. 4. The plaintiff is further directed to return original copy of his LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 to the defendants 1-3 within one month from the date of this order. If the plaintiff may fail to comply with this order within the above stipulated period of time like dismantling of his two storied Assam Type building in the suit land and return of original copy of his LSC No. 103103/01/863 of 2003 to the defendants 1-3, six months stipulated period for payment of monetary compensation by defendants 1-3 to the plaintiff will be reckoned from the date of his compliance of the said order. Parties are directed to bear their own costs.

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 10<sup>th</sup> 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/80/2009, Sr. CJ (A)/

Dated Aizawl, the 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2012

Copy to:

1. Mr. Zosangliana S/o Lianzuala (L), Tuikual South, Aizawl through Mr. R. Laltanpuia, Adv.
2. The State of Mizoram Represented by the Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Revenue Department through Mr. R.C. Thanga, Adv.
3. The Director, Land Revenue & Settlement Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R.C. Thanga, Adv.
4. The Assistant Settlement Officer- II, Aizawl District: Aizawl through Mr. R.C. Thanga, Adv.
5. Mr. C. Lalrinchhana, Principal- Ar-Ells School, Chaltlang- Aizawl through Mr. Francis Vanlalzuala, Adv.
6. P.A. to Hon'ble District & Sessions Judge, Aizawl Judicial District: Aizawl
7. Case record

PESKAR