

IN THE COURT OF CIVIL JUDGE, AIZAWL : AIZAWL DISTRICT : MIZORAM

Declaratory Suit No 26 of 2011

Ramdingngheti

D/o Laldawnkimi

Represented by Laldawnkimi,

Guardian of Ramdingngheti,

R/o Tuikual North

Aizawl, Mizoram.

.....Plaintiff

Vrs.

Smt. C. Lalthianghlimi,

W/o J. Zirsangliana (L)

R/o Rengdil Hmuntha Veng, Mamit.

.....Defendant

Present: Laldinpuia Tlau

For the plaintiff : Mr. Reuben L. Tochwawng & Mr. C. Lalfakzuala, Advocates

For the defendant : Mrs. Dorothy Lalrinchhane & Mr. Lalfakawma, Advocates

Judgment delivered on : Dt. 16.08.2013

This suit coming for final hearing on 05.07.2013 in presence of Mr. C. Lalfakzuala, Advocate for the plaintiff and Mrs. Dorothy Lalrinchhane & Mr. Lalfakawma, Advocates for the defendant and having stood for consideration of this day, the court delivered the following judgment.

JUDGMENT

1. This is a suit for declaring that the marriage between Shri. J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi to be legal and binding and that the minor children Denghmingliani and Ramdingngheti are entitled to a share of their father's family pension as per the CCS Pension Rules.

2. The brief facts of the Plaintiff's case are that the plaintiff is the daughter of Shri J. Zirsangliana (L) and his second wife Laldawnkimi and the defendant is the third wife of Shri J. Zirsangliana (L). Shri J. Zirsangliana was married to Smt. Lalnuntluangi (L) and they have five children. After the death of Lalnuntluangi, the plaintiff's mother Smt. Laldawnkimi and Shri J. Zirsangliana got married on 18.08.2000 and they had two children namely J. Hmingthansanga (L) and Ramdingngheti. The defendant is the third wife of Shri J. Zirsangliana (L) and they had no children together. After the death of Shri J. Zirsangliana on 1.10.2007, the defendant has been taking the family pension of Shri J. Zirsangliana.

The plaintiff's eldest brother Shri J. Lalchungnunga had applied for equal distribution of the said family pension to the Accounts and Treasuries Department on behalf of the siblings of Ramdingngheti, Denghmingliani and J. Lalmuankima. Since Ramdingngheti is the child of Shri J. Zirsangliana and his second wife Laldawnkimi, it was required that proof of their marriage be provided. Accordingly, the plaintiff had submitted proof of the marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana issued by the Church of God (7th Day), Rengdil.

The defendant with the intention of denying the rightful claim of the plaintiff to her father's family pension, submitted a complaint to the Accounts and Treasuries Department and falsely alleged that there was no legal marriage between Shri J. Zirsangliana and Laldawnkimi. On the basis of her complaint, Accounts and Treasuries Department ordered an enquiry to be conducted and appointed Shri R.U Laskar, SDPO Kawrthah as Enquiry Officer.

Considering the statements of Smt. T.C Kapzingi and Smt. Zarzoliani, who were present for the marriage ceremony and on perusal of the documents like the staff meeting minutes, page of attendance register, as well as the statement of Pastor R. Vanlalsanga and the marriage register, Shri R.U Laskar, SDPO submitted a finding that there was legal marriage between Shri J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi carries more weight than the consideration that there was no legal marriage between them.

Shri J. Zirsangliana and Laldawnkimi had been living together in the same household along with their children and had legalized their union on 18.08.2000 in presence of witnesses, such as R. Lalhmingliana and Tluangzikpuii had given their signatures on the marriage certificate. Hence, based on the documentary evidence and the statements of witnesses examined in the Court, the plaintiff prays for declaring that marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana (L) is legal and valid.

She therefore prays that as per Rule 54(7) (b)(c), (6)(iii) and section 9 CCS Pensions Rules, Ramdingngheti is an eligible child who is entitled to the benefit of family pension of her late father. As the defendant is not her natural or legal guardian as she had already been living separately, she is not entitled to reap the benefits of the family pension all on her own.

3. The defendant on the other hand, had contested the suit by filing a written statement. He stated that J. Zirsangliana was never legally married to Smt. Laldawnkimi. She objected the claim that Shri J. Lalchungnunga as eldest brother of the plaintiff as the plaintiff had only one brother J. Hmingthansanga. She also stated that Laldawnkimi has remarried and the plaintiff is currently living with her mother and her new husband.

She states that as far as legal marriages in the State of Mizoram are concerned, the customary laws and rules of the Mizo people prevail. As such, as per the Mizo customary laws, the act of giving "Hmeichhe Man" is the only conclusive evidence of the legal marriage. In absence of "Man inhlanna lehkha", no marriage can be deemed to be legal in the State of Mizoram. A mere alleged religious ceremony in which a marriage certificate has been issued by a church does not in any manner make any marriage legal in the state of Mizoram as the prevailing law is concerned.

The finding of Shri R.U Laskar, SDPO Kawrthah enquiry officer is not conclusive and does not determine the actual position based on supporting documentary evidence. J. Lalchungnunga forcefully dismantled the house which in turn forced the defendant to vacate the house of her late husband only after two months of his death. She therefore prays to dismiss the suit.

4. On the basis of the pleading, the following issues are framed on 4.7.2012.

(1) Whether J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi had entered into marriage as per the customs and practice of the Mizo?

(2) Whether the minor children of Laldawnkimi are entitled to receive a share of family pension of J. Zirsangliana (L) as sons and daughters of J. Zirsangliana?

5. The plaintiff examines four evidences including herself. The defendant examines four evidences including herself. Besides, parties file some documents in their favour.

DECISION AND REASON THEREOF

6. With regard to point issue no 1, the plaintiff nicely produce the story which ultimately establish the marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana legal and binding, in the meantime, the defendant could efficiently object the events in the plaintiff's story.

7. The plaintiff avers that the marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana was solemnized on 18.8.2000 at Rengdil. On the other hand, the defendant contends that this statement is doubtful as there are two versions of actual place of solemnization of marriage. Besides, Laldawnkimi is not sure of the time of marriage.

On perusal of evidence on record, Mr. R. Vanlalsanga in his cross-examination deposed that "Kum 2000 18th Aug-ah Pi Laldawnkimi leh J. Zirsangliana te hi Pu J. Zirsangliana te inah ka inkutsuih tir a ni." Here, the place of marriage is at the residence of Pu J. Zirsangliana, in the meantime, Mr. R. Lalhmingliana, witness for the plaintiff stated in his cross-examination that "I know that J. Zirsangliana (L) was married to Laldawnkimi at the residence of my mother which is adjoining my own house. Also the Pastor who presided over the marriage R. Vanlalsanga is my elder brother and I was also present in the marriage ceremony."

For defendant, this contention makes the alleged marriage doubtful as the depositions of the plaintiff evidences are contradictory regarding the actual place and time. This contradictory regarding place of marriage reveals the Plaintiff's sole intention in filing the instant declaratory suit, which is to mislead the Court and deprive the defendant of what is lawfully entitled to her.

Laldawnkimi, in her examination-in-chief stated that she was married to J. Zirsangliana (L) on 16. 08. 2000. During cross-examination, she stated that "J. Zirsangliana and myself were married for about 2 years, however I'm not sure". She also deposed that she could not recollect the date and year of their marriage. According to the defendant, it is surprising and difficult to believe the statement of Laldawnkimi. It is a well known fact that all girls dream of their special day which is the day of their marriage. Each and every girl dream about the day of their marriage from the time they are children. As such, the fact that Laldawnkimi could not remember not only the date of her alleged marriage with J. Zirsangliana (L) but could not remember even the year of their marriage casts a lot of doubt as to the veracity of her claims and statements.

8. The plaintiff avers that a marriage certificate is duly issued. The plaintiff witness J. Lalchungnunga stated that he discovered that the original marriage certificate of Shri J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi was missing and thereafter he had contacted Pastor R. Vanlalsanga who after checking the marriage register and his diary confirmed that there was record of the marriage.

On the other hand, Lalthianghlimi deposed that Ext.P-2 is an acknowledgement of the marriage between J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi wherein R. Lalhmingliana also stood as witness; however, this document is fabricated after the death of her husband.

According to the defendant, perusal of Ext P-2 would reveal that the said marriage certificate has neither been signed by any person nor is there any seal or any kind of stamp to signify that the said marriage certificate had indeed been issued appropriately as per the procedures and guidelines of the Church viz. the Church of God, Rengdil.

9. The plaintiff also avers that the alleged marriage is duly entered in the register. Mr. R. R. Vanlalsanga deposed that “inneih tirtu ka nih mai bakah, marriage register leh diary-ah ka chhinchhiah thlap a ni”.

However, as R. Vanlalsanga during his cross-examination, stated that Ext-P3, the marriage register is a document prepared by himself, and stated that “Kan kohhran Seventh day (Church of God) hian a hranpain inneih Register hi kan maintain lo a ni.”, the Id. Counsel for the defendant contends that the so called marriage register which the plaintiff is putting reliance on for the purpose of proving her claim of a valid marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana (L) is based on a document maintained by R. Vanlalsanga in his private and personal capacity and the same is not a document officially maintained by the Church viz. Church of God, Rengdil.

10. The plaintiff also avers that the marriage was solemnized by R. Vanlalsanga, who is pastor of Seventh Day, Church of God. R. Vanlalsanga stated that while he was appointed as Pastor in the Church of God (Seventh Day), he solemnized the marriage of Shri. J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi in presence of two witnesses namely R. Lalhmingliana and Tluangzikpuui. He further mentioned that he had entered the marriage in his personal diary and recorded the same in the Marriage register. On cross examination, he stated that he was ordained by the Church to become a Pastor; he also stated that he did not possess any specific qualification. He further deposed that he was appointed as Mamit Pastor from 5th May 2000.

On the other hand, the defendant point out that whether R. Vanlalsanga was a pastor at that point of time is doubtful. DW Zaitinkhuma deposed that R. Vanlalsanga a person who claim himself as pastor never claimed himself as Pastor while he was at Rengdil, he was ‘tirhkoh’ at Seventh day (Church of God), he began to claim himself as a pastor when he was at Mamit after leaving their village. DW Mr. Lalromawia also stated that during his stay at Rengdil, he never knew that Mr. R. Vanlalsanga was a Pastor with the Church of God. However, DW Tluangzikpuui deposed that when she was a member of church of God, R. Vanlalsanga was functioning as a pastor.

11. According to the plaintiff, the marriage was duly witnessed by R. Lalhmingliana and Tluangzikpuii. R. Vanlalsanga stated that among the witnesses between the marriage of Shri. J. Zirsangliana and Laldawnkimi were R. Lalhmingliana and Tluangzikpuii. R. Lalhmingliana deposed that “thuhretuah kei leh Tluangzikpuii te pawh an awm bawka ni.”

On the other hand, the defendant objects this assertion stating that R. Lalhmingliana and Tluangzikpuii did not witness the marriage.

Tluangzikpuii deposed that “.....Laldawnkimi hian Pu J. Zirsangliana (L) a pasal anga a neih hi ka hre ngai lo a; tin, an inneih mo thianah pawh ka tang lo reng reng a, Laldawnkimi amah hre mah ila kan inkawm ngai lo va, tin kei aia upa fe a nih avangin kan inkawm ngai lo hrim hrim bawka, Laldawnkimi leh J. Zirsangliana (L) Seventh day (Church of God) -a an innei a, monu thian (dinpuitu)a min lo puh hi dawt vek a ni a, eng tik lai mahin kei hian he inneihnaah hian ka din pui lo a ni.” She also stated that she was only 15 years of age at the time of alleged marriage and not competent to witness the marriage as mo thian, besides, the member of Seventh day Church of God is small in number and had the said marriage been solemnized, she should have known the said marriage. She also states that Ex. P-2© belongs to her name, it is not of her signature.

For the defendant, the statement of Tluangzikpuii herself exposed that the claim of the plaintiff that the alleged marriage of Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana (L) took place on 16.08.2000 is nothing more than a make believes and such marriage never took place.

DW Lalromawia, who is the elder brother of Tluangzikpuii deposed that during the alleged solemnization, her sister (Tluangziki) is only 15 years of age. According to the defendant, R. Vanlalsanga, the Pastor who allegedly presided over the marriage ceremony of Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana (L) had stated in his cross-examination that “Mo thiana dinpuitute hi an awm ve ngei ngei a ngai a ni.” However, Tluangzikpuii never attended the wedding of Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana (L) either as a witness or bridesmaid, so the alleged marriage could not have been held to be conducted properly, validly and legally as per the requirements of the Church of God as it is clear and evident that there was no one standing with Laldawnkimi to witness her alleged marriage with J. Zirsangliana (L).

12. The plaintiff also avers that man inhlanna is duly executed. The plaintiff in her plaint has annexed acknowledgements signed by various persons whom the plaintiff claims to have witnessed and had acted as ‘Man Eitu’ of the alleged marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana (L). The acknowledgement relied on by the plaintiff appears to have been executed by one V.L. Thanga (Pu sum eitu), Ramluahpuii (Nau Puak Puan eitu), T.C. Kapthianga (Pusum eitu), F. Vanlallawma (Man tang eitu) and F. Lalthapari (Laizawn). Laldawnkimi stated in her cross-examination that “‘Man-Inhlanna’ was given although I do not have any document to prove the same. some persons had witnessed ‘Man-Inhlanna’, however I do not know who these persons are.”

However, the defendant objects the giving of bride price stating that these acknowledgments signed by the persons are only of xerox copy and not the

original. Further, none of the persons who have allegedly executed the acknowledgments have been called to depose as witnesses. As such, the said acknowledgment documents could not be said to be documents which have been proven and corroborated as required by law. According to them, it is rather surprising and sounds highly unlikely that a Mizo woman would not remember a single person who was present at the "Man-Inhlanna" ceremony, because such customary ceremonies are usually attended by only family members and close friends and relative.

13. The contention of the defendant in a nutshell is that as far as legal marriages in the State of Mizoram are concerned, the customary laws and rules of the Mizo people prevail. As such, as per the Mizo customary laws, the act of giving 'Hmeichhe Man' is the only conclusive evidence of the legal marriage. As such, in absence of 'Man inhlanna lehkha', no marriage can be deemed to be legal in the State of Mizoram.

This contention involves a substantial question of law, particularly Mizo Customary Law. Counsels for parties admit that this contention does not find a place in any of central or state laws. Therefore, effort is made for examining this contention from various sources.

According to Animesh Ray as written in his book Mizoram, *'marriages amongst the Lushais were a civil contract with a bride price which was paid by the groom to the brides' relation. Settlement of the bride price was the first and essential step to marriage.'*

On the other hand, James Dokhuma in his book Hman lai Mizo kalphung, has written that *'there can be a valid marriage between Mizo without a bride price called man boa innei in two conditions such as fan and sumchhuah hnu-a innei.'*

Sec. 20 of Mizo Customary Law 1956 (As amended in 1960) provides that *"in every marriage, according to the Mizo custom, marriage price may or may not be paid according to the mutual agreement reach in the marrying families"*

This court is convinced and is of considered view that whether J. Zirsangliana had given bride price for Laldawnkimi or not is different thing, a marriage between two Mizo could be legally solemnized without a bride price in certain circumstances according to Mizo Customary Law.

Besides, The Special Marriage Act is in force within Mizoram and two Mizo people could marry under this act without giving price.

14. The most important point becomes understanding of knowledge of concept of marriage, especially a valid marriage.

Section 2(a) of the Mizoram Compulsory Registration of Marriage Act, 2007 defines that marriage includes all the marriages contracted by persons belonging to any caste, tribe or religion, and the marriages contracted as per any custom, practices or traditions, and also includes re-marriages.

According to Capital's Medical and Legal Dictionary published by A.D. Raheja for Capital Law House, marriage is defined as below,

Marriage ceremony means religious or civil proceeding to solemnize a marriage. Marriage is a civil and religious contract, whereby a man is joined and united to a woman, for the purposes of civilized society.

Marriage may be valid if it is according to law or custom.

15. It is also pertinent to point out that standard of proof of marriage different from case to case. For example, standard of proof of marriage in proceedings under section 125 Cr.PC is not as strict as is required under section 494, IPC. Where the parties lived together as husband and wife, marriage between them can be presumed as held in *Dwarka v Bidyut*. However, the decision of a criminal court in such matter will not operate as decisive in any civil proceeding between the parties (1999) 7 SCC 675. Pertaining to this case, lenient view is taken as the main purpose of this suit is to ascertain whether Ramdingngheti is entitled to a share of her father's family pension and there is no other purpose to serve. Laldawnkimi has already remarried to another man and J. Zirsangliana already passed away.

16. Now coming to issue no 1, as per the issue framed by this court, the legality of the marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana is to be examined only from the parameter of the customs and practice of the Mizo. As pointed out, the relevant pension rules provides that a daughter is entitled to get family pension of her father, however, the same rule is silent as to the law of marriage of her parents. Therefore, for the sake of justice, to examine the alleged marriage, this court does not confine itself within the four walls of Mizo Customary Law.

17. After careful appreciation of evidence, R. Vanlalsanga claimed to have solemnized the marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana, and R. Lalhmingliana claimed to have witnessed the said marriage. J. Lalchungnunga, son of J. Zirsangliana supported the existence of the said marriage and Ramdingngheti being the daughter of J. Zirsangliana which is relevant u/s 50 of The Indian Evidence Act. Defendant's witness Tluangzikpuii also supported that J. Zirsangliana had altogether three wives namely Lalnuntluangi, Laldawnkimi and C. Lalthianglimi and Ramdingngheti is the daughter of J. Zirsangliana.

The relevant facts such as existence of Church of God at Rengdil village, the presence of R. Vanlalsanga at Rengdil in the year 2000 as worker of Church of God, Laldawnkimi, Tluangzikpuii, J. Zirsangliana and R. Lalhmingliana as church members of Church of God at Rengdil in the year 2000 is not disputed.

The fact that during the period under consideration, J. Zirsangliana was living singly or having a wife other than Laldawnkimi is not known. In short, the defendant could not disprove that the marriage between Shri. J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi was legal and binding, however they do not have personal knowledge of the existence of marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana.

To sum up, the fact that Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana were living together as wife and husband during 2000-2002 at Rengdil village is an established fact and not opposed by the defendant. Tluangzikpuui also presumed the marriage as Pu J. Zirsangliana and Laldawnkimi had lived together as husband and wife. However she does not know the existence of marriage as per the law or giving of man (price).

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gokal Chand v. Parvin Kumari [AIR 1952 SC 231] observed that continuous cohabitation of woman as husband and wife and their treatment as such for a number of years may raise the presumption of marriage.

In Mohabhat Ali v. Md. Ibrahim Khan [AIR 1929 PC 135] their Lordships of the Privy Council once again laid down that, "The law presumes in favour of marriage and against concubinage when a man and woman have cohabited continuously for number of years."

18. In the light of the above discussions, particularly in para 17, considering civil cases are decided on the basis of preponderance of evidence, this court is of considered view that marriage between Shri. J. Zirsangliana (L) and Laldawnkimi is legal and binding.

So, issue no 1 is decided in favor of the plaintiff.

19. Issue no 2 pertains to making of decision of as to whether the minor children of Laldawnkimi are entitled to receive a share of family pension of J. Zirsangliana (L) as sons and daughters of J. Zirsangliana?

Out the said wedlock of J. Zirsangliana and Laldawnkimi, two children J. Hmingthansanga and Ramdingngheti were born. However, the elder one J. Hmingthansanga is already passed away; therefore, only the case of Ramdingngheti is to be examined.

The Id. Defendant's counsels submits that assuming but not admitting that the marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana (L) was valid, it does not still explain or does not throw any light to prove that Ramdingngheti is indeed the daughter of J. Zirsangliana (L).

The first point raised by the defendant is based on the deposition of Laldawnkimi who stated that "Ramdingngheti was born in 2011; I do not know the exact date of her birth." The Id. Counsel for the defendant argues that from plain reading of the statement of Laldawnkimi, it is clear that Ramdingngheti was born four (4) years after the death of her alleged father J. Zirsangliana (L) who passed away in 2007.

However, the year 2011 as birth year of Ramdingngheti as written in the deposition of Laldawnkimi is clearly spelling mistake as could be known from the letter sent to SDEO, Mamit by DD, CCA dated 10th, Feb, 2009 wherein the name of Ramdingngheti was mentioned and the circumstances leading to this case.

The second point raised by the defendant relates to the inability of Laldawnkimi to produce the birth certificate of Ramdingngheti. Reliance was placed by the

defendant upon Section 114 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 wherein it has been provided that:

'The Court may presume the existence of any fact which it thinks likely to have happened, regard being had to the common course of natural events, human conduct and public and private business, in their relation to the facts of the particular case.'

Out of Illustrations,

The Court may presume:

(g) that evidence which could be and is not produced would, if produced, be unfavourable to the person who withholds it;

She contends that from the above illustration (g), under such circumstances, it must be presumed that the reason why Laldawnkimi never submitted the birth certificate of Ramdingngheti is because of the fact that such birth certificate would be unfavourable to her claim and stand. In other words, such birth certificate might show that the father of Ramdingngheti is someone else.

This court is of considered view that non availability of birth certificate does not indicate non-existence of a fact. Experience has shown that Mizo people are not sincere in obtaining their birth certificate. On the other hand, the defendant is right in pointing out that the plaintiff has got a chance to produce the said birth certificate for her favour; however, she fails to do the same. Had the plaintiff been able to produce the said birth certificate, the instant case might not have been filed. This needs to be decided considering the other facts.

As pointed out earlier, J. Lalchungnunga, eldest son of J. Zirsangliana supported that Ramdingngheti is the daughter of J. Zirsangliana which is relevant u/s 50 of The Indian Evidence Act. Out of four defendant's witnesses, two of them are silent regarding this issue. Two defendant's witnesses namely Tluangzikpuii and Lalthianghlimi admit that Ramdingngheti is the daughter of J. Zirsangliana.

This court is therefore considered view that Ramdingngheti is the daughter of J. Zirsangliana and Laldawnkimi.

However, this court makes it clear that this court is not the appropriate authority to examine on entitlement regarding pension benefit. Entitlement on pension is governed by CCS (Pension Rules). Therefore, the question whether Ramdingngheti is entitled to a share of her father's family pension as per the CCS Pension Rules is left to be examined by the appropriate authority.

20. Regarding the prayer relating to DENGHMINGLIANI, this court does not frame an issue to settle as to entitlement of DENGHMINGLIANI to get a family pension of her late father. However, as this prayer is included in the relief portion of the plaint, reflection is made. It is a well settled principle of law that parties cannot go beyond what they have pleaded in their plaint. As such, unless there is a specific pleading to the effect that DENGHMINGLIANI should be declared to be entitled to a share in the pension benefits, the same cannot be entertained by simply praying for the same in the prayer portion. Further, DENGHMINGLIANI is neither a party nor has she appeared as a witness nor has any evidence adduced

in the instant case. Evidence on records reveals that there is no evidence for or against Denghmingliani.

As such, the prayer of the plaintiff to the effect that Denghmingliani should be declared to be entitled to a share in the pension benefits cannot be entertained as the same is against the well settled principle of procedural law.

ORDER

It is therefore order and decreed that the marriage between Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana is legal and binding and Ramdingngheti is the daughter of Laldawnkimi and J. Zirsangliana.

No order as to the cost.

With this, the case is disposed of.

(LALDINPUIA TLAU),
Civil Judge,
Aizawl District : Aizawl

Memo No. _____/CJ-II(A)/2013 : Dated Aizawl, the 29th August, 2013

Copy to :

1. District Judge, Aizawl Judicial District, Aizawl, Mizoram.
2. Trial Judge.
3. Ramdingngheti d/o Laldawnkimi through Mr. Reben L. Toichhawng & Mr. C. Lalfakzuala, Advocates.
4. C. Lalthianghlimi w/o J. Zirsangliana (L) of Rengdil, Hmuntha Veng, Aizawl through Miss Dorothy Lalrinchhani and Mr. Lalfakawma, Advocates.
5. Judicial Branch.
6. Guard File.
7. Case record.

(LALDINPUIA TLAU),
Civil Judge,
Aizawl District : Aizawl