

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

CIVIL SUIT NO. 11 OF 2006

Plaintiff:

Mr. Hrangmana
S/o Lianbula (L)
Dawrpui Vengthar Gina Mual
Aizawl, Mizoram

By Advocates

: 1. Mr. W. Sam Joseph
2. Mr. Zochhuana
3. Mr. Hranghmingthanga Ralte
4. Mr. F. Lalengiana

Versus

Defendants:

1. The State of Mizoram
Through the Chief Secretary
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 Commissioner/Secretary
Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation Department
Govt. of Mizoram
5. The Director
Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation Department
Govt. of Mizoram
6. The Under Secretary
Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation Department
Govt. of Mizoram
7. The Assistant Settlement Officer-I
Aizawl District, Aizawl
8. The Chairman
BPL Pawl
Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl

9. The President
Village Council
Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl

By Advocates :

For the defendant no. 1-7 : 1. Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA
2. Mr. Joseph Lalfakawma, AGA

For the defendant no. 9 : Smt. Lilyparmawii Hmar

Date of Arguments : 06-12-2012

Date of Judgment & Order : 14-12-2012

BEFORE

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

J U D G M E N T & O R D E R

INTRODUCTORY

Although relief prayed in the plaint is totally Rs. 1.5 lakhs, there is no proper valuation of the suit by the plaintiff even in the plaint. More so, the suit filed before implementation of the Mizoram Civil Courts Act, 2005 later taken up by the court of Senior Civil Judge but filed in accordance with the so called "Rules for the Regulation of the procedure of Officers appointed to administer justice in the Lushai Hills, 1937" as court of Assistant to Deputy Commissioner/Additional District Magistrate (Judicial) is at the last and belated stage when arguments was called for, learned counsels of the lis submitted that the learned court of Civil Judge is the court having pecuniary jurisdiction as the suit value is less than Rs. 2 lakhs. As per the order of Hon'ble District Judge, Aizawl Dt. 6/12/2012 as referred the crux on the court having pecuniary jurisdiction with suffice reasons and viewing the interest and convenience of parties for their long pending cases in the court of Sr. Civil Judge. Inevitably but solely for the interest of justice and for the main purpose of the convenience of parties, this court cannot escape to finalise the case.

Although cause of action was arose on the act of the Local Administration Department, Govt. of Mizoram which were arrayed as defendants 4-6, as the Govt. of Mizoram newly created Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation Department under Notification No. A. 46013/2/2006- GAD/31 Dt. 24th August, 2006 and allocated the subject to the said newly created Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation Department under Notification No. A. 46011/1/2004-GAD Dated Aizawl, the 26th September, 2006, the Department's name arrayed as defendants 4-6 was changed by newly created Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation

Department from the previous Local Administration Department, Govt. of Mizoram as per this court order Dt. 4/10/2012 in Misc J Case No. 248 of 2012 to fructify realization of the lis.

BRIEF STORY

The plaintiff by having landed property under LSC No. 233 of 1974 with an area of 524.60 Sq. m located at Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl allowed his brother in law to construct a building. As per the letter under No. B. 13016/44/2001-02-SJSRY (LAD) Dt. 7th Nov., 2004 issued by the District Project Officer, SJSRY by using sanctioned amount of Rs. 48,000/-, the defendant no. 8 was assigned to construct approach road to Hunruata's House at Dawrpui Vengthar. The plaintiff claimed that for that construction, his land was encroached by 4 meters x 2 meters and the said road proceed along the boundary line between boundary pillar No. 3 and 4 and at a point 11 meters below the boundary pillar no. 4, the said road entered into the land of the plaintiff thereby they have encroached upon a portion of land measuring an area of 11 meters x 2 meters. As the earth was also removed, the building of the plaintiff's brother in law was also left as dangerous position/condition. Although the plaintiff objected the same, it was non est. The plaintiff therefore prayed a decree (i) declaring that the land of the plaintiff was encroached upon causing undue hardship to the plaintiff directing the defendants 4,5,6,8 and 9 to pay a sum of Rs. 1 lakh as compensation (ii) ordering the defendants to make retaining wall to safeguard the building within the land of the plaintiff which the pillars are exposed due to the illegal and forcible removal of the earth from below the said building (iii) directing the defendants to pay a sum of Rs. 50,000/- as compensation for injury caused to the plaintiff (iv) interest rate @ 9% per annum with quarterly rests with effect from 7th Nov., 2004 till date for filing the suit (v) costs of the suit and pendente lite interest @ 9% per annum (vi) any other relief which this court deems fit and proper.

The defendants 1, 2, 3 and 7 in their joint written statements contended that the suit is bad for non-joinder and mis-joinder of necessary parties and is also bad due to non-compliance of section 80 of the CPC. As preferred complaint by the plaintiff, they detailed surveyor to conduct spot verification but none availed from the Village Council concerned and again detailed surveyor for the same on 27/3/2006, as the instant suit is being filed, no such verification cannot be had. Thus, prayed to dismiss of the suit with exemplary costs.

The defendant no. 9 in their written statements also stated that the brother in law of the plaintiff Mr. Thansiamia did not erect concrete structure but constructed Assam type building in the suit land. The land of the plaintiff was not encroached upon to construct the land of the plaintiff. Two pillars of the building of the brother in law of the plaintiff was outside the LSC area of the plaintiff. Due to absence of the plaintiff, spot verification could not be carried out by the Surveyors. Thus, prayed to dismiss of the suit with costs.

ISSUES

Issues were framed on 30/03/2007 and amended towards correct findings as follows-

1. Whether the suit is maintainable in its present form and style.
2. Whether the plaintiff has complied with section 80 of the CPC or not
3. Whether the plaintiff has cause of action and locus standi to file the suit against the defendants or not
4. Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties or not
5. Whether the building of the plaintiff in the suit land encroached upon public road beyond the area of his LSC or not
6. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the reliefs claimed or not. If so, to what extend.

BRIEF ACCOUNT OF EVIDENCE

For the plaintiff:

The plaintiff had produced the following witnesses namely-

1. Mr. Hrangmana S/o Lianbula (L), Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-1)
2. Mr. Lalhriatpuia S/o Zoenga, Ramhlun North, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-2)

The **PW -1** in his examination in chief merely reiterated and affirmed the averments and submissions in his plaint being the plaintiff. He exhibited the following documents-

- Ext. P-1 is a copy of his LSC No. 233 of 1974
- Ext. P-2 is a copy of work order Dt. 7th Nov., 2004
- Ext. P-3 is a letter sent by him to Secretary, LAD
- Ext. P-4 is Order No. 20 of 2005 Dt. 29th March, 2005 issued by LAD
- Ext. P-5 is a copy of letter sent by Asst. Circle Officer, LAD to the DLAO
- Ext. P-6 is a copy of letter sent by Under Secretary to Director, LAD
- Ext. P-7 is a copy of Legal Notice
- Ext. P-8 is a copy of order Dt. 10th May, 2005 passed by the Asst. Director, Revenue Department
- Ext. P-9 is a copy of order Dt. 6th June, 2005 passed by the Asst. Director, Revenue Department
- Ext. P-10 is a copy of order Dt. 25th June, 2005 sent by JE, SJSRY Cell, LAD to the District Project Officer, SJSRY Cell, LAD alongwith detailed estimate and drawing.

In his cross examination, he stated that after he filed a complaint to the LAD, spot verification was conducted in the absence of the Village Council and the VCP did not appear. He admitted that the encroached area

submitted by him was his own measurement. He also admitted that the Revenue Surveyor did not conduct verification.

He also admitted that his brother in law had constructed Assam type building in the bottom area of his land and occupied by them. He also admitted that the Village Council authorities used to give notice stating that the area where he constructed toilet and pig shed were beyond his landed area. He thereby filed a complaint to the Revenue authorities as the Village Council alleged that there was vacant land adjacent to his land but in vain as the Village Council did not cooperate them. He stated that the village council, Dawrpui Vengthar alone were responsible on his disputed land.

The **PW-2** in his examination in chief deposed that he knows the plaintiff having a plot of land under LSC No. 233 of 1974, the plaintiff allowed his brother in law to construct a concrete building within his land along the boundary pillar no. 3 and 4 and constructed in 2003. On the basis of the work order, the Chairman, BPL Pawl, President, Village Council and others removed the earth in order to construct approach road to Pu Hunruata's site under the supervision of the Local Administration Department which encroached upon the land of the plaintiff causing dangerous of the building of the brother in law of the plaintiff.

In his cross examination, he deposed that he is staying at Ramhlun North, Aizawl and the sister of the plaintiff is his mother in law. He admitted that he did not know the area and boundary of the land of the plaintiff and also did not know whether there was a vacant land in the downside of the land of the plaintiff or not. The brother of the plaintiff Mr. Thansiamia had constructed Assam type building and dwelled upon by family. He admitted that the plaintiff dismantled his pig shed as the Village Council directed that it was beyond the area of the plaintiff. He presumed that as the pillar of the building of the said Mr. Thansiamia was revealed by the said road construction, it encroached the land of the plaintiff.

For the defendants 1, 2, 3 and 7:

The defendants 1, 2, 3 and 7 had produced only one witness namely Mr. K. Lalmuakliana, Assistant Director, Revenue Department (Hereinafter referred to as Revenue Witness). He merely exhibited the followings-

Ext. D-1 is their written statement

Ext. D- 1 (a) is the signature of the then Deputy Secretary, Revenue Department.

For the defendant no. 9:

The defendant no. 9 had produced the following witnesses namely-

1. Mr. Vanlalzuiliana S/o Tawnzauva (L), Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as DW-1 for defendant no. 9)
2. Mr. Lalthlamuana S/o Lalthmingliana, Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as DW-2 for defendant no. 9)

The **DW-1** in his examination in chief deposed that since 1949, they used to stay at Dawrpui Vengthar by a family. He was elected as member of the Village Council, Dawrpui Vengthar in 2000 and later held the post of President, Village Council during 2006 to 2009. During construction of public step in 2004 in the Gina Mual towards Kanan locality under the finance of the LAD done by the BPL Pawl, the plaintiff complaint the said construction as it will encroach upon his land. As preferred the matter to the Village Council, they approached the Revenue Department, Surveyor Mr. P.S. Zodingliana was detailed on 12th May, 2004 and conducted spot verification, as it was beyond the land of the plaintiff, as per the Instruction of the Revenue Department Dt. 8th July, 2004, the work was resumed. They also found that one electric poll was included by the plaintiff in his fencing area. The vacant land was also further fenced by the plaintiff in the bottom of his land which was proposed road since Union Territory period. The Revenue Department further detailed surveyor Mr. C. Lalzamliaana on 21.12.2004, the plaintiff was absent and was non est for spot verification. The plaintiff usually refrained to discuss the disputed with the Village Council authorities.

In his cross examination, he stated that during 2005 when construction of the road below the land of the plaintiff, he was the Vice President of Village Council, Dawrpui Vengthar. He admitted that the road was constructed below the building of the brother in law of the plaintiff. It was beyond his knowledge about revealing the pillar of the house of the brother in law of the plaintiff for construction of the road. He did not know that whether the Surveyed conducted by the Revenue authorities settled that whether the disputed area is within or outside the land of the plaintiff. He admitted that the house building of the brother in law of the plaintiff was dangerous position for landslide due to their road construction.

The **DW-2** in his examination in chief deposed that he stayed at Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl since 1950. During 2003 to 2006, he was elected as the President of Village Council, Dawrpui Vengthar. During construction of public step in 2004 in the Gina Mual towards Kanan locality under the finance of the LAD done by the BPL Pawl, the plaintiff complaint the said construction as it will encroach upon his land. As preferred the matter to the Village Council, they approached the Revenue Department, Surveyor Mr. P.S. Zodingliana was detailed on 12th May, 2004 and conducted spot verification, as it was beyond the land of the plaintiff, as per the Instruction of the Revenue Department Dt. 8th July, 2004, the work was resumed. They also found that one electric poll was included by the plaintiff in his fencing area. The vacant land was also further fenced by the plaintiff in the bottom of his land which was proposed road since Union Territory period. The Revenue Department further detailed surveyor Mr. C. Lalzamliaana on 21.12.2004, the plaintiff was absent and was non est for spot verification. The plaintiff usually refrained to discuss the disputed with the Village Council authorities. He exhibited the following documents-

Ext. D-1 is Order Dt. 10/5/2004 issued by Asst. Director of Survey (T), Revenue Department

Ext. D-2 is Order Dt. 16/12/2004 issued by Asst. Director of Survey (T), Revenue Department

Ext. D-3 is his order issued against the plaintiff during he was the President of Village Council

Ext. D- 3 (a) is his signature

Ext. D-4 is Order Dt. 10/5/2005 issued by the Asst. Director, Revenue Department

Ext. D-5 is Order Dt. 25/5/2005 issued by the Asst. Director, Revenue Department

Ext. D-6 is Order Dt. 6/6/2005 issued by the Asst. Director, Revenue Department

In his cross examination, he deposed that he was the President of Village Council when disputes had arisen. The disputed road was 3 to 4 ft width. He admitted that the pillar of the house of the brother in law of the plaintiff was revealed for the said road construction but which was beyond the landed area of the plaintiff.

FINDINGS

Issue No. 1

Whether the suit is maintainable in its present form and style or not

Although the suit is not properly valued, court fees at Rs. 4339/- is paid by the plaintiff. The plaint is supported by verification with paragraph wise affidavit.

Howsoever, valuation of the suit is not only for the purpose of paying the Court Fees but it also plays an important role for determining the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Civil Court in the light of S. 15 of the CPC held in the case of **Ratan Sen alias Ratan Lal Vs. Suraj Bhan & Ors.** AIR 1944 All 1. Furthermore, in **Sri Rathnavarmaraja Vs. Smt. Vimla**, AIR 1961 SC 1299, the Supreme Court held that whether proper court fee has been paid or not, is an issue between the plaintiff and the state and that the defendant has no right to question it in any manner. The said judgment of the Apex Court was re-considered and approved in **Shamsher Singh Vs. Rajinder Prashad & Ors.** AIR 1973 SC 2384, observing as under:-

“The ratio of that decision was that no revision on a question of court fee lay where no question of jurisdiction was involved”

Due to improper valuation of the instant suit, as introduced of the judgment, hazy on the court having pecuniary jurisdiction whilst the total claimed compensation amount is at Rs. 1,50,000/-, construction of retaining wall is also prayed but not specified the value of the said propose retaining wall which enmeshed and created hazy of the suit on the question of jurisdiction which is not tenable in law to adjudicate the lis in the appropriate and proper forum having competent jurisdiction, although introduced the judgment on question of pecuniary jurisdiction, if include the quantum/value of claimed retaining wall, it will be the jurisdiction of this court to finalise the case but which all are vague in the case at hand.

Issue No. 2

Whether the plaintiff has complied with section 80 of the CPC or not

As revealed by Ext. P-7, legal notice Dt. 22/11/2005 was duly served to all state defendants by the plaintiff through his learned Advocates.

Issue No. 3

Whether the plaintiff has cause of action and locus standi to file the suit against the defendants or not

As evidence of both parties disclosed that spot verification of the disputed area by the expert authorities like the Revenue Department could not be carried out alleging that concerned Village Council or the parties failed to cooperate the detailed Surveyor. Meanwhile, as per Annexure- 8 of the defendant no. 9, the Assistant Director of Survey (A), Land Revenue and Settlement Department under his letter No. D. 11013/1/97-Tech/DTE(REV) Dated Aizawl, the 28th June, 2004 refused to allow extension of the LSC of the plaintiff as the Village Council concerned could not agreed.

However, the main crux in the case at hand is that whether the plaintiff has a right to sue over to the disputed area against the defendants. Meanwhile, the plaintiff fails to prove that the disputed area where the adjacent area of the house of the brother in law of the plaintiff is within the area covered by the LSC of the plaintiff as although attempt was paid by detailing surveyor, spot verification to ascertain the truth could not be carried out which this court is not competent to determine unless some vital reliance to be placed by the plaintiff. In other words, the well settled law is that If a party has committed a wrong, he cannot be permitted to take the benefit of his own wrong base on the legal maxim '*allegans suam turpitudinem non est audiendus*' as beautifully dealt in **Bhartiya Seva Samaj Trust Tr. Pres. & Anr. vs Yogeshbhai Ambalal Patel & Anr** decided on 14 September, 2012 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 6463 of 2012, wherein, the Supreme Court has held thus-

“21. A person alleging his own infamy cannot be heard at any forum, what to talk of a Writ Court, as explained by the legal maxim '*allegans suam turpitudinem non est audiendus*'. If a party has committed a wrong, he cannot be permitted to take the benefit of his own wrong. (Vide: G. S. Lamba & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors., AIR 1985 SC 1019; Narender Chadha & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors., AIR 1986 SC 638; Molly Joseph @ Nish v. George Sebastian @ Joy, AIR 1997 SC 109; Jose v. Alice & Anr., (1996) 6 SCC 342; and T. Srinivasan v. T. Varalakshmi (Mrs.), AIR 1999 SC 595).

This concept is also explained by the legal maxims '*Commodum ex injuria sua nemo habere debet*'; and '*nullus commodum capere potest de injuria sua propria*'. (See also: Eureka Forbes Ltd. v. Allahabad Bank & Ors., (2010) 6 SCC 193; and Inderjit Singh Grewal v. State of Punjab & Anr., (2011) 12 SCC 588).”

In a nutshell, the plaintiff must firstly clear that he is freeing from allegation on encroachment of public land accused by the defendant no. 9 followed by Annexure- 8 of the defendant no. 9, wherein, the Assistant Director of Survey (A), Land Revenue and Settlement Department under his letter No. D. 11013/1/97-Tech/DTE (REV) Dated Aizawl, the 28th June, 2004 refused to allow extension of the LSC of the plaintiff as the Village Council concerned could not agreed. On failing the same, the ratio laid down in **Bhartiya Seva Samaj Trust Tr. Pres. & Anr. vs Yogeshbhai Ambalal Patel & Anr** is attracted.

Since the main prayer/relief sought of the plaintiff is to remove the disputed approach road, unless he elicited that it is within his LSC area, he should not have cause of action and locus standi to file the suit on that point.

Moreover, although the plaint and examination in chief of PWs 1 and 2 exclaimed that the disputed house building of the brother in law of the plaintiff is concrete building. During cross examination of PWs 1 and 2, they admitted that it was Assam type building. Whatever the case, as deposed by PWs, the house building of the brother in law of the plaintiff was constructed during 2003. Whether the mandatory provision under the then in force Mizoram Urban and Regional Development Act, 1990 and the Rules 1998 was complied with by the brother in law of the plaintiff is another task. If not complied with, then how exonerate such breach of law for decreeing relief is the moot point whilst also praying compensation and direction to remove the disputed road from the adjacent area of the said house building.

Thus, in terms of the well settled law in **M/s. Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. Vs. Union of India and Anr.** decided on 28/04/2004 in connection with Appeal (civil) 9159 of 2003 reported in 2004 AIR 2321, 2004 (1) Suppl. SCR 841, 2004 (6) SCC 254, 2004 (5) SCALE 304, 2004 (1) Suppl. JT 475, I failed to see cause of action in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendants.

Issue No. 4

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

Law is well settled in **Iswar Bhai C. Patel & Bachu Bhai Patel Vs. Harihar Behera & Anr.** decided on 16/03/1999 reported in 1999 AIR 1341, 1999 (1) SCR 1097, 1999 (3) SCC 457, 1999 (2) SCALE 108, 1999 (2) JT 250 and in the following terms that-

“These two provisions, namely, Order 1 Rule 3 and Order 2 Rule 3 if read together indicate that the question of joinder of parties also involves the joinder of causes of action. The simple principle is that a person is made a party in a suit because there is a cause of action against him and when causes of action are joined, the parties are also joined.”

In this catena, undisputedly, it is the house building of the brother in law of the plaintiff namely- Mr. Thansiamas as deposed by PWs and admitted by DWs of defendant no. 9 which appears in dangerous position/condition due to the disputed road construction and also claiming compensation for the same. Meanwhile, the said owner of the suit building is not arrayed as plaintiff and the instant plaintiff also did not represent him as per the recent well settled law by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **A.C. Muthiah vs Bd. Of Control For Cricket In India and Anr.** decided on 28 April, 2011 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 3753 of 2011 (Arising out of SLP (C) No. 12181 of 2010).

More so, the said brother in law of the plaintiff was not posed as witness in the proceedings, who is a material witness like in the instant cause. Failing to implead as plaintiff and failure to produce as witness in the proceeding of the brother in law of the plaintiff will certainly vitiate the proceeding. Otherwise, how the plaintiff may get compensation in respect of the property of his brother in law without at least as representative capacity in accordance with law.

Issue No. 5

Whether the building of the plaintiff in the suit land encroached upon public road beyond the area of his LSC or not

Undisputedly, the suit building is not owned by the plaintiff but the property of his brother in law. Although stated in the plaint that the suit building is cement concrete but later claimed by the PWs 1 and 2 that it is Assam type building. Which alone also deviate the credibility of the plaintiff's case. As already discussed under issue no. 3, the plaintiff failed to prove that the house building of his brother in law is exactly within his LSC boundary description. It is therefore not feasible to adjudicate this issue in favour of the plaintiff.

Whilst the society is alarming on unauthorised building construction against public interest also lending giant effort by Hon'ble Apex Court for the same Vide, in **Dipak Kumar Mukherjee vs Kolkata Municipal Corporation & Ors.** decided on 8 October, 2012 in connection with Civil Appeal No. 7356 of 2012 (Arising out of SLP (C) No. 23780/2011): K. Ramadas Shenoy v. Chief Officers, Town Municipal Council (1974) 2 SCC 506; Virender Gaur v. State of Haryana (1995) 2 SCC 577; Pleasant Stay Hotel v. Palani Hills Conservation Council (1995) 6 SCC 127; Cantonment Board, Jabalpur v. S.N. Awasthi 1995 Supp.(4) SCC 595; Pratibha Coop. Housing Society Ltd. v. State of Maharashtra (1991) 3 SCC 341; G.N. Khajuria (Dr) v. Delhi Development Authority (1995) 5 SCC 762; Manju Bhatia v. New Delhi Municipal Council (1997) 6 SCC 370; M.I. Builders Pvt. Ltd. v. Radhey Shyam Sahu (1999) 6 SCC 464; Friends Colony Development Committee v. State of Orissa (2004) 8 SCC 733; Shanti Sports Club v. Union of India (2009) 15 SCC 705 and Priyanka Estates International Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Assam (2010) 2 SCC 27. Failure to ascertain that the house building of the brother in law of the plaintiff is within the ambit of the mandatory provision under the then in force Mizoram Urban and Regional Development Act, 1990 and the Rules 1998 is inimical to law and is

endanger for public interest and safety.

Issue No. 6

Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the reliefs claimed or not. If so, to what extend.

As already discussed above, improper valuation of the suit, lack of cause of action, failure to prove the case causing devoid of merits resulted empty findings on entitlement in favour of the plaintiff.

ORDER

UPON hearing of parties and on the basis of the afore findings in various issues, the suit lack of merits is hereby dismissed but no order as to costs.

With this order, the case shall stand disposed of.

Give this copy to all concerned.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this 14th Dec., 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/11/2006, Sr. CJ (A)/

Dated Aizawl, the 14th Dec., 2012

Copy to:

1. Mr. Hrangmana S/o Lianbula (L), Dawrpui Vengthar Gina Mual, Aizawl, Mizoram through Mr. W. Sam Joseph, Adv.
2. The State of Mizoram Through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Mizoram through Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA
3. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Revenue Department through Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA
4. The Director, Land Revenue and Settlement Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA
5. The Commissioner/Secretary, Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA
6. The Director, Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA
7. The Under Secretary, Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation

Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii,
AGA

8. The Assistant Settlement Officer-I, Aizawl District, Aizawl through
Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA
9. The Chairman, BPL Pawl, Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl
10. The President, Village Council, Dawrpui Vengthar, Aizawl
through Smt. Lilyparmawii Hmar, Adv.
11. P.A to Hon'ble District Judge, Aizawl Judicial District- Aizawl
12. Case record

PESKAR