

GAHC030001022024



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/5/2024

Smt. Biakkungi and Anr.
D/o Thanga (L)
R/o Tukhuahtlang, Aizawl, Mizoram2: Smt. Saitluangpuii
C/o R Unionthanga

R/o Chanmari
Aizawl
Mizora

VERSUS

State of Mizoram and 4 Ors.
r/b the Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Mizoram New Capital Complex
(MINECO), Khatla, Aizawl, PIN - 796001 2:Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Land Revenue and Settlement Dept.
Mizoram New Capital Complex (MINECO)
Khatla
Aizawl
PIN - 796001

3:Director
Land Revenue and Settlement Dept.
Govt. of Mizoram
Khatla
Aizawl
PIN - 796001

4:Smt. B. Sangkhumi
W/o Tamhluna Khiangte (L)
R/o Dingdi Veng
Chaltlang
Aizawl

5:Smt. Lianchhungi

R/o Bawngkawn Chhimveng
Bawngkawn
Aizaw

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr J C Lalnunsanga

Advocate for the Respondent : Addl. AG/GA, Mizoram for R1 - 3

B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MRIDUL KUMAR KALITA
ORDER

12.02.2026

1. Heard Mr. J.C. Lalnunsanga, learned counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Ms. Lalnunhlui, learned Govt. Advocate, appearing for respondent Nos. 1 to 3, as well as Mr. Jordan Rohmingthanga, learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 5.

2. During the course of submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, it was contended that in this writ petition, one of the grievance of the petitioners is that the impugned Order dated 06.09.2023, bearing Memo No. K 15011/141/2018-REV, passed by the Commissioner & Secretary to the Government of Mizoram, as well as the another impugned Order dated 20.09.2023, bearing Memo No. D 28016/10/17-DTE (REV)/LSC passed by the Director, Land Revenue & Settlement, Mizoram, whereby the LSC No. 204 of 1989, as well as 203 of 1989 of the present petitioners were

cancelled without affording any opportunity of hearing to them. Hence, a query was post to the learned Govt. Advocate, Ms. Lalnunhlui, that in what prompted the respondent No. 2 to pass the impugned order. It is also not clear that who initiated the proceedings before the aforesaid authorities which culminated in passing of the impugned orders as in their affidavit-in-opposition, the State Respondent have not clarified this aspect. It is also not clear as to whether petitioners, whose land passes were cancelled, were heard by the said authorities before passing the impugned orders.

3. On this, the learned Govt. Advocate, submits that presently, she does not have any instructions in regard to the query post by this Court. Hence, she has sought some time for clarification.

4. The State Respondent is directed to produce the relevant file in which the impugned order has been passed by the respondent authorities before this Court and if necessary, to also file an additional affidavit in that regard.

5. Let this matter be listed again on **26.02.2026**.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant