

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

CIVIL SUIT NO. 12 OF 2010

Plaintiff:

Mr. Lianthangpuia
S/o Kapchhinga (L)
Bungkawn, Aizawl

By Advocates : 1. L.H. Lianhrima
2. Mr. Lalhriatpuia

Versus

Defendants:

1. The State of Mizoram
Represented by Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
2. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Industries Department
3. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Environment and Forests Department
4. The Director
Industries Department
Govt. of Mizoram
5. The Deputy Commissioner
Aizawl District: Aizawl
6. The Director
Geology and Mineral Resources Department
Govt. of Mizoram

By Advocates:

For the defendants Nos. 1,2,4,5&6 : 1. Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
2. Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii, AGA

For the defendant no. 3 : Mr. B. Lalramenga

Date of Arguments : 29-08-2012
Date of Judgment & Order : 01-09-2012

BEFORE

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

JUDGMENT & ORDER**NUCLEUS OF THE CASE**

For the purpose of shell limestone extraction and for construction of Shell Limestone factory, the land of the plaintiff under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 was occupied and developed by the defendant Industries Department, Govt. of Mizoram and occupied the said land since 1995. For that purpose, the defendant Industries Department dug pits at several places for further examination of Shell Limestone, whilst the defendant Industry at the beginning intended to acquire the suit land with adequate compensation, neither compensation was paid nor acquire the suit land although the plaintiff can earn more than Rs. 63,830/- per annum from the suit land. The plaintiff therefore prayed (i) a decree be passed directing the defendants for payment of Rs. 4,42,718/- with interest rate @ 20% per annum for damages of fruit bearing trees, teak trees etc. to the plaintiff (b) a decree be passed directing the defendants for rental compensation at the rate of Rs. 7/- per square feet with effect from the year 1995 (c) a decree be passed directing the defendants for lumpsum payment of Rs. 100/- lakhs for acquisition of the landed area covered by LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 to the plaintiff (d) a decree be passed directing the defendants for payment of Rs. 2 lakhs for damages caused to crops and fruit bearing trees etc. to the plaintiff (e) a decree be passed directing the defendants are liable to pay an amount of Rs. 5 lakhs on account of mental suffering, agony and unnecessary harassment of the plaintiff (f) costs of the suit in favour of the plaintiff (g) any other relief which this court deems fit and proper.

The defendants 1 and 2 in their joint written statements stated that the suit is bad due to non compliance of section 80 of the CPC. Issuance of LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 is also questionable. During 2001, the said area was re-investigated by engaging GIEM Consortium Ltd. Kolkata, on detail investigation, it was found that the shell limestone bed, originally supposed to be of 3 mt thick and exploitable was found to be of 0.8 mt thick for a strike continuity of about 40m having a strike of N7°E to S7°W with a very high dip of 78° westerly, the deposits in the area were calculated at 54.05 and 157.26 cu. m respectively which is very less as captive mine for the factory. During the course of investigation, damage on commercial crops or trees were avoided to the maximum, but proposed damaged on tree plantation for mining for a stretch of 10 ft on both the sides of the shell limestone deposit was not done as previously assessed. The pits/trenches dug during investigation were 5 in number with measurements of about 3' x 5' x 5' approximately by breadth x length x dept and were selected location where no cash crop/planted fruits/teak trees are available. Based on the said scientific finding, the department was not in a position to proceed further for mining the available limestone deposit of the land as proven

reserves is minimal and applied to the government for diversion of the compensation amount. They therefore have no intention of mining the meager reserves of the shell limestone in the suit land which will be unprofitable, uneconomical for the interest of public. Shell limestone factory was established with the funding from North Eastern Council as a pilot project at Tuirial, Muthi, Sesawng etc. As meager reserves, they betrayed the same. Thus, prayed to dismiss of the suit.

The defendant no. 3 in their written statement stated that as the suit land falls within the Tuirial Riverine Reserved area, without obtaining forest clearance in accordance with the Forest Conservation Act, the LSC of the plaintiff is non est and have no right to claim any compensation. As per the letter issued by Ministry of Environment and Forest, Govt. of India dt. 27.7.1999, the suit land was leased to the Industries Department, Govt. of Mizoram for a period of ten years. The plaintiff therefore have no cause of action and the suit is deserved to dismiss with costs.

As the Department of Geology and Mineral Resources was newly created during pending of the suit which dealt the subject matter of dispute from Industries Department, defendant no. 6 viz. Director of Geology and Mineral Resources Department was impleaded on 6/10/2010 but they failed to file their written statement.

ISSUES

Issues were therefore framed on 28/2/2011 and amended towards correct findings namely-

1. Whether the suit is maintainable in its present form and style or not
2. Whether the plaintiff has *locus standi* and cause of action to file the instant suit against the defendants or not.
3. Whether the defendants 1,2,3 and 6 has caused damaged of the property of the plaintiff covered by LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 or not. If so, to what extend.
4. Whether the defendants 1,2,3 and 6 occupied the area covered by LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 or not. If so, to what extend and which period of time.
5. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief 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. Lianthangpuia S/o Kapchhinga (L), Bungkawn, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-1)
2. Mr. R. Lalchamlia, Upper Republic, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-2)

3. Smt. Remmawii, Electric Veng, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as PW-3)

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

- Ext. P-1 is his plaint
- Ext. P-1 (a) (b) and (c) are his signatures
- Ext. P-2 is a copy of his LSC No. G. 69 of 1989
- Ext. P-3 is a copy of Acknowledgement issued by Mr. Remmawia
- Ext. P-4 is a copy of Acknowledgement issued by Mr. R. Lalchamlia
- Ext. P-5 is a copy of letter issued by Director, Industries Department
- Ext. P-6 is a copy of letter issued by Director, Industries Department to the Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl
- Ext. P-6 (a) is a copy of map showing shell limestone deposit near Tuirial bridge
- Ext. P-7 is a copy of letter Dt. 19th Feb., 1997 issued by Director, Industries Department
- Ext. P-8 is a copy of letter Dt. 21st Feb., 1997 issued by Director, Industries Department
- Ext. P-9 is a copy of letter issued to the Director of Industries from the office of Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl
- Ext. P-9 (a) and (b) are copies of fresh assessment of limestone near Tuirial bridge and the compensation statement
- Ext. P-10 is a copy of letter dt. 20th July, 1998
- Ext. P-11 is a copy of order issued by Superintending Geologist
- Ext. P-12 is a copy of letter dt. 21st August, 1998
- Ext. P-13 is a copy of letter dt. 25th March, 1999
- Ext. P-14 is a copy of letter dt. 10th Aug., 2007
- Ext. P-15 is a copy of letter for re-allocation of fund
- Ext. P-16 is a copy of letter submitted by the plaintiff to the Government of Mizoram
- Ext. P-16 (a) is his signature
- Ext. P- 17 is a copy of Legal Notice
- Ext. P-18 is a copy of Acknowledgement

In his cross examination, he deposed that he did not know whether the suit land can be held by private persons whilst the suit land is near Tuirial river. He admitted that the defendants did not cover all of his landed area for the purpose of their investigation. He denied that he resume to manage the suit land after the Government left the suit land. The defendant constructed a pit in six places and also admitted that for digging the said pit, the whole area of his land was not destroyed. All of the crops mentioned in Ext. P- 9 (a) and (b) are not destroyed by the defendants. Soon he knew that the government intended to pay him Rs. 4,42,718/-, he wrote a letter to disburse the same to the defendant no. 2. He admitted that he did not offer his land to the Government for acquisition. He also admitted that he have other means of livelihood apart from the suit land.

In his re-examination, he further deposed that being aggrieved of the government action, he served legal notice to the government. In respect of his means of livelihood, he have no other land apart from the suit land to manage his family.

During cross examination by learned counsel for the defendant no. 3, he admitted that it is the defendant no. 2 and 4 who caused destruction of and damage of fruit bearing trees and teak trees etc. in the suit land. The defendant no. 3 therefore have no liability in the instant suit.

The **PW-2** in his examination in chief deposed that as he also cultivated in the elaka of Tuirial river with the plaintiff, he witnessed that the plaintiff developed the suit land since 1975 by planting various fruit bearing trees and also witnessed that the plaintiff can earn Rs. 63,830/- per annum from the suit land. Ext. P- 4 (a) is his signature.

In his cross examination, he deposed that he is employed in the Industries department by not merely depends on his agricultural income. He did not know the number of pit dug by defendants in the suit land. He also admitted that as the land of the plaintiff is too vast, digging pit in the land of the plaintiff did not destroy the land of the plaintiff.

The **PW-3** in her examination in chief deposed that as she also cultivated in the elaka of Tuirial river with the plaintiff, she witnessed that the plaintiff developed the suit land since 1975 by planting various fruit bearing trees and also witnessed that the plaintiff can earn Rs. 63,830/- per annum from the suit land. Ext. P- 3 (a) is her signature.

In her cross examination, she admitted that she did not peruse the Pass of the plaintiff over to the suit land and also did not know the exact area of the land of the plaintiff. She admitted that she never visited the suit land for about 10 years.

For the defendants 1,2,4 and 6:

The defendants 1,2,4 and 6 had produced the following witnesses namely-

1. Mr. Lalthazuala, Geologist (Junior), Directorate of Geology and Mineral Resources (Hereinafter referred to as DW-1 for defts 1,2,4 and 6)
2. Smt. Liantluangi, Under Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Industries Department (Hereinafter referred to as DW-2 for defts 1,2,4 and 6)
3. Mr. P. Sanghnuna, Geologist (Junior), Directorate of Geology and Mineral Resources (Hereinafter referred to as DW-3 for defts 1,2,4 and 6)
4. Smt. Laltanpuii W/o Lalropuia, Tuirial, Aizawl (Hereinafter referred to as DW-4 for defts 1,2,4 and 6)

The **DW-1 for defts 1,2,4 and 6** in his examination in chief deposed that he visited the suit land during initial investigation and after re-

investigation was done. After detailed re investigation by GIEM Consortium Ltd., it was found that the shell limestone bed which was originally supposed to be of 3 mt thick and exploitable was found to be of 0.8 mt thick for a strike continuity of about 40 mt upstream from the initial location. As such, the initial location was not even touch. The proposed damage on tree plantation for mining for a stretch of 10 ft on both sides of the shell limestone deposit (thought to have existed) was not done as previously assessed. Five pits/trenches measuring about 3' x 5' x 5' approximately by breadth x length x dept were dug during investigation, that too, were done so in locations where there were no cash crops, fruits or teak trees.

During cross examination, he deposed that the trenches which they dug was different in size like some are only two feet and not so deep and some are 4-5 feet width and their distance was about 10-20 feet as many as five. He did not know the exact time for starting limestone investigation in the suit land and also did not know the time for betraying the said work. He also did not have knowledge on the sanction amount of Rs. 4,42,718/-. Geology and Mineral Resources Department was established in 2010.

The **DW-2 for defts 1,2,4 and 6** in her examination in chief exhibited the followings-

Ext. D-2 is their written statement

Ext. D 2 (a) and (b) are her signatures

In her cross examination, she denied averments and submissions in the plaint like damages of crops and causing inconvenience to the plaintiff.

The **DW-3 for defts 1,2,4 and 6** in his examination in chief deposed that during 2001, the said area was re-investigated by engaging GIEM Consortium Ltd. Kolkata, on detail investigation, it was found that the shell limestone bed, originally supposed to be of 3 mt thick and exploitable was found to be of 0.8 mt thick for a strike continuity of about 40m having a strike of N7°E to S7°W with a very high dip of 78° westerly, the deposits in the area were calculated at 54.05 and 157.26 cu. m respectively which is very less as captive mine for the factory. The assessment of teak trees and fruit bearing trees to be destroyed on the course of proposed mining shell limestone deposit was done on 24.2.1997 and accorded Government sanction of the amount. However, mining could not be proceeded due to insufficient reserve deposit and as no trees were destroyed, payment of compensation did not arise. No rental compensation arises as there was no rental agreement with the plaintiff and the department. Shell limestone factory was established with the funding from North Eastern Council as a pilot project at Tuirial, Muthi, Sesawng etc. As meager reserves, they betrayed the same. It is the desire of the defendants that there is enough deposit of shell limestone in the suit land and that it be exploited for the benefit of the state. However, all the expectation were in vain on account of meager deposit and therefore no compensation is payable. Ext. D-1 are photographs copies of pit sites. Ext. D-1 (a) is his signature.

In his cross examination, he deposed that with effect from 1st Sept., 2010, a separate Geology and Mineral Resources Department was established from Industries Department. During 2001, he went to the suit land for investigation as directed by their Joint Director. They dug five pits in the suit land some were again filled up but leaving some unfilled pits due to sloppy geo terrain.

The **DW-4 for defts 1,2,4 and 6** in her examination in chief deposed that she was working as a labourer cum caretaker of the site of the limestone deposit and when the pits/trenches were dug during the course of investigation, she knew that the pits/trenches were five in number and selected locations where no cash crops were planted and no fruits or teak trees were available. As such no commercial crops or trees of any sort were touched during the digging of the pits and trenches. She also knew the assessment of teak and fruit bearing trees to be destroyed in the course of proposed mining shell limestone deposit was done. However, mining was not proceeded with as proposed, due to insufficient reserve deposit. As such, she could also not continue her work as labourer at the site.

In her cross examination, she deposed that she engaged for the work as cook and thereby serving tea and meals. She did not know the width and dept of the pits/trenches dug in the suit land.

For the defendant no. 3:

The defendant no. 3 had produced only one witness namely- Mr. Rosiam Vanchhawng, Addl. PCCF (Hereinafter referred to as DW for deft. No. 3). In his examination in chief, he deposed that being a Nodal Officer, Conservator of Forests, Research and Development Circle, Mizoram, he well acquainted with steps taken to acquire the suit land by the Industries Department. He further mainly affirmed the contents of their written statements on the crux of ownership of the suit land. Ext. 10 is a letter sent to the plaintiff under his signature.

During his cross examination, he admitted that a copy of LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 was received by him from the Joint Director of Industries Department

FINDINGS

Issue No. 1

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

Court fees at Rs. 5000/- is paid along with the plaint which is sufficient in terms of the Court Fees (Mizoram Amendment) Act, 1996 (Act No. 5 of 1997). The plaint is accompanied by proper verification supported by affidavit. Ext. P-17 reveals that legal notice as required u/s 80 of the CPC was duly served before institution of the suit, thus this issue is a must to decide affirmative in favour of the plaintiff as no laches which can vitiate the proceeding is found.

Issue No. 2

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

Undisputedly, the defendant Industries Department now newly established with effect from 1st Sept., 2010, a separate Geology and Mineral Resources Department from the said Industries Department as deposed by DW-3 for defts 1,2,4 and 6 intruded in the suit land where the plaintiff holds LSC No. G. 69 of 1989. Evidence of defendants 1,2,4 and 6 clearly admitted that they dug five pits/trenches in the land covered by the said LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 for the purpose of extracting shell limestone. More so, the defendant no. 3 as stated in their written statement and oral evidence disputed the suit land with the plaintiff due to alleged Turial Riverine Reserve area. The plaintiff therefore have a cause of action and locus standi to file the instant suit against the defendants in terms of the observations reached 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.

Issue No. 3

Whether the defendants 1,2,3 and 6 has caused damaged of the property of the plaintiff covered by LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 or not. If so, to what extend.

Whilst the burden of proof lies to the plaintiff, the plaintiff as PW-1 during his cross examination admitted that the whole area of his suit land and all properties in the said land under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 were not damaged by the defendants. More so, the PW- 1 admitted that Ext. P-3 and 4 viz. acknowledgement of the annual income of the plaintiff from the suit land is based on the whole terrain of the suit land from various crops available in different parts of the suit land whilst the suit land is mentioned as 21 bighas. Meanwhile, Ext. P-2 viz. a copy of LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 elicited that the area covered by the said LSC is at 20.92 bighas.

However, from the documentary and oral evidence of the plaintiff, there was no proper calculation of damaged crops and plants caused by the defendants in the suit land. In the meantime, evidence of defendants 1,2,4 and 6 were corroborate each other by mentioning that there were only five pits/trenches varying their width and dept from 2 ft to 5 ft and their respective distance is about 5 to 10 ft as specified by their DW-1. Corroboratively, all witnesses of the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 deposed that their selection of pits/trenches were vacant area where no cash/commercial crops stood/available. To overcome this parallax, the plaintiff fails to discern the ground realities of quantum of damage crops in the suit land whilst the defendants in their witness deposition deposed that some pits were filled up again by resuming the previous status. Their DW-3 specified the crux that "They dug five pits in the suit land some were again filled up but leaving some unfilled pits due to sloppy geo terrain." The plaintiff

therefore fails to adduce sufficient evidence to resolve this issue in his favour is the inevitable finding.

Issue No. 4

Whether the defendants 1,2,3 and 6 occupied the area covered by LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 or not. If so, to what extend and which period of time.

Although the plaintiff submitted that since the year of 1995, the defendants started occupation of the suit land till date, at the time of oral arguments, parties are not disputed that the defendants has already left the suit land due to meager deposit of shell limestone which is not good to extract for public interest as deposed by DWs 1 and 2 for defendants 1,2,4 and 6 corroborative. If so, the plaintiff also failed to ascertain the exact period of occupation of the suit land covered under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 by the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 viz. date, month and year of occupation and date, month and year of leaving the suit land by the said defendants. If so, how rental compensation can be granted. Undisputed facts germinated by evidence of both parties and at the time of arguments is that the defendants by digging five pits/trenched in the suit land for doing investigation of exploration of shell limestone entered in the suit land. And also found establishment of shell limestone factory building as funded by the North Eastern Council but the plaintiff failed to adduce any unvague evidence on the manner and area occupied by the defendants. Thus, as the plaintiff failed to accurate on such issue, no entitlement can be granted.

Issue No. 5

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

The crux on rental compensation is already settled under issue no. 4. As per Ext. P-6, the defendant no. 4 asked the District Collector, Aizawl to make assessment for compensation to be paid to the plaintiff in order to exploit shell limestone deposit on the basis of the Mines and Mineral Act, 1957. In connection with the same, the Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl submitted fresh assessment of limestone near Tuirial Bridge viz. compensation of statement for the building/crops etc Tuirial in respect of the plaintiff land under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989, the assessed amount thereby falls Rs. 4,42,718.00 as per Ext. P-9, Ext. P- 9 (a) and Ext. P- 9 (b). The said amount was sanctioned by the defendant no. 2 on 25th March, 1999 with the concurrence of the Finance Department as revealed by Ext. P- 13. However, as clarified by DWs 1 and 3 of defendants 1,2,4 and 6, as the said amount was made for extraction of shell limestone in the suit land and as the defendants betrayed the work as suggested/found by GIEM Consortium Ltd. Kolkata when re-investigation was done during 2001, the said amount was not disbursed to the plaintiff which is justifiable for public interest as the suit land is not needed for public interest, lavish expenditure of public money is immaterial. In this task, the submission of Miss Bobita Lalhmingmawii learned AGA at the time of oral arguments that the quantum of assessment is not made by the Deputy Commissioner is baseless simply answered by the said Ext. P-9, Ext. P- 9 (a) and Ext. P- 9

(b). The said Ext. P-9, Ext. P- 9 (a) and Ext. P- 9 reveals that huge number of crops and fruit bearing trees in the suit land will be destroyed if proceed with extraction of shell limestone in the suit land which deserved to compensate @ Rs. 4,42,718.00. Howsoever, as the work for shell limestone extract was stopped sine die and as deposition of PWs corroboratively stated that all the crops in the suit land of the plaintiff was not destroyed by the defendants for their investigation of shell limestone and cannot be figured the exact extend of destruction of crops in the suit land, there is no reason to award Rs. 4,42,718.00 to the plaintiff as he prayed.

Whilst the plaintiff urged to acquire the suit land by the defendants as per law, deposition of DW 3 of defendants 1,2,4 and 6 supporting their written statement answered the same saying that *"It is the desire of the defendants that there is enough deposit of shell limestone in the suit land and that it be exploited for the benefit of the state."* Law is very clear that solely for public interest, the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 can be invoked as the Preamble speaks itself unlike in the instant case. Thus, prayer of the plaintiff for acquisition of his land under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 is irrelevant, otherwise, purposeless waste of public money.

In the prayer/relief portion of the plaint, the plaintiff sought relief of Rs. 4,42,718.00, rental compensation, lumpsum payment of Rs. 100 lakhs for acquisition of land, payment of Rs. 2 lakhs for damages of crops and fruit bearing trees, payment of Rs. 5 lakhs on mental suffering, agony etc. How can such double compensation in the same cause of action can be given to the plaintiff is a big question. In a nutshell, the relief sought in the plaint is not proper and is not in order of meritorious.

As already discussed above, only compensation in respect of (i) entry of the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 in the suit land of the plaintiff for investigation of limestone (ii) digging of five pits/trenches which are varying in size and dept of 2 ft square to 5 feet square but some were already filled up by the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 whilst the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 took caution to avoid damage of crops and fruit bearing trees for the said digging can be considered in the instant case. For that purpose, direction to the Deputy Commissioner or Revenue Department as per law will unduly delay justice to the needy and no accurate assessment can be reached except on evidence adduced in the civil proceedings like in the instant proceedings. However, unfortunately, the plaintiff fails to adduce any accurate number and size of crops/fruit bearing trees alleged destroy by the defendants 1,2,4 and 6. For this crux, as no cogent material circumstance is not produce in the course of proceedings, compensation amounting to Rs. 20,000/- for entry into the suit land of the plaintiff by the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 and Rs. 30,000/- in respect of digging five pits/trenches in the suit land will meet justice viewing public interest for less expenditure on un-succeed planning and programme. Thus, the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 are liable to pay Rs. 50,000/- (Fifty thousand rupees) to the plaintiff due to their entry into the land of the plaintiff under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 and digging of five trenches/pits in the said land.

Pertinently, crux on ownership of the suit land under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 whether by the plaintiff or the Environment & Forest Department is out of issue in the instant case and therefore unsettled in the instant proceeding.

ORDER

In view of the afore findings and elaborations, the defendants 1,2,4 and 6 are directed to pay Rs. 50,000/- (Fifty thousand rupees) to the plaintiff due to their entry into the land of the plaintiff under LSC No. G. 69 of 1989 and digging of five trenches/pits in the said land. The said amount will be paid within sixty days from the date of this 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 1st September, 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/12/2010, Sr. CJ (A)/

Dated Aizawl, the 1st Sept., 2012

Copy to:

1. Mr. Lianthangpuia S/o Kapchhinga (L), Bungkawn, Aizawl through Mr. L.H. Lianhrima, Adv.
2. The State of Mizoram Represented by Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
3. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Industries Department through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
4. The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Environment and Forests Department through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
5. The Director, Industries Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District: Aizawl through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
7. The Director, Geology and Mineral Resources Department, Govt. of Mizoram through Mr. R. Lalremruata, AGA
8. P.A. to Hon'ble District & Sessions Judge, Aizawl Judicial District- Aizawl
9. Case record

PESKAR