



GAHC030004692025



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

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/116/2025

Engineering Projects (India) Limited (A government of India its Enterprise)
R/b its Executive Director, Kolkata, West Bengal

VERSUS

Sh Lujon Kumar and 462 Ors.
S/o Sogadisap, R/o Nakuksora, Lunglei District 2:Sh Suresh Ranjan

3:Sh Badra Kumar

4:Sh Sughondo Kumar

5:Smt Mowchila

6:Smt Protipa Ranjan

7:Sh Suresh Chandra

8:Sh Suresh Dan

9:Smt Kali Prasad

10:Sh Som Muni

11:Sh Bini Moy



12:Sh Nilo Boron

13:Smt Sunita Ranjan

14:Sh Suganda Kumar

15:SSA School Building

16:Smt Dina Kanti

17:Sh Suresh Chandro

18:Sh Nihar Kanti

19:Sh Nila Baran

20:Sh Lujan Kumar

21:Sh Badra Kumar

22:Sh Daya Kumar

23:Smt Munu Ranjan

24:Smt Nirmal

25:Sh BV.Coy

26:Sh Doye Chakma

27:Smt Gurika



28:Nancy

29:Sh D.Chaya

30:Sh Kalitong

31:Sh A.B.Chakma

32:Smt Niharika

33:Smt Pushparani

34:Sh Uddyo

35:Sh Mehendro Lal

36:Sh Hira Lal

37:Sh Donewswar

38:Sh Natho Muni

39:Sh Ratan

40:Sh Susalla Bikas

41:Sh Natun Chandra

42:Sh Ranju



43:Sh Bharat Ranjan

44:Sh Lamba Sira

45:Sh Durgo Kingkor

46:Sh Bagutyi Ranjan

47:Sh Chandra Gupta

48:Sh Laldungye

49:Sh Poloy

50:Sh Dulal Chandra

51:Sh Lolit Kumar

52:Sh Borikhuddhar

53:Sh Toppa

54:Sh Susil Kanti

55:Sh Susil Kanti

56:Sh Santi Lal

57:Smt Sunila

58:Sh Chandra Kumar



59:Sh Surjo Sen

60:Sh Chandra Sagar

61:Sh Kandra

62:Smt Santi Moy

63:Sh Mangal Kanti

64:Sh Porimal

65:Sh Annyo Sen

66:Sh Ranjit Kumar

67:Sh Abon

68:Smt Lokhona

69:Sh Syama Ratan

70:Sh Anil Kanti

71:Sh Hokkeye

72:Sh Satyajit

73:Sh Doyal Kanti

74:Sh Nigiri Kumar



75:Sh Anando Kumar

76:Sh Subimol

77:Sh Susil Baron

78:Sh Pulin Bayan

79:Sh Suresh Kumar

80:Sh Kina Lal

81:Sh Bajamya

82:Sh Birolal

83:Sh Bana Bihari

84:Sh Sona Kanti

85:Sh Santi Prasad

86:Sh Santi Pradhan

87:Sh Sarat Kumar

88:Sh Purno Bihari

89:Sh Nilo Baran

90:Sh Kina Kumar



91:Sh Maya Kumar

92:Sh Dino Ranjan

93:Sh Anonto Singh

94:Smt Geeta Devi

95:Smt Sita Devi

96:Smt Melabi

97:Sh Monu Jan Jan

98:Sh Bhisani Kanti

99:Sh Satyo Jit

100:Sh Buddho Mandir

101:Sh Chita Muni

102:Sh Bharat Udhar

103:Sh Assy

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Roshan Subedi

Advocate for the Respondent : Ms Zairemsangpuii for R463

Linked Case : WA/9/2025



Engineering Projects (India) Limited
(A government of India its Enterprise) R/b its Executive Director
Kolkata
West Bengal

VERSUS

Sh Chitrosen and 555 Ors.
S/o Puina Muni
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

2:Sh Sudeskor
S/o Surjo Mohan
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

3:Sh Gyano Chon
S/o Priti Kumar
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

4:Sh Prufulla Ronjon
S/o Pheda
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

5:Sh Zoliana
S/o Suresh Chondro
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

6:Smt Mungola Mugi
W/o Boloram
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

7:Sh Bogiroth
S/o Suduna
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

8:Sh Jonako
S/o Bodu Chakma
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District



9:Sh Himonto Moy
S/o Mayan Ronjon
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

10:Sh Notunia
S/o Thena Chakma R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

11:Sh Bodu Chakma
S/o Sidilia
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

12:Sh Nilo Borsoka
S/o Bodu
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

13:Sh Donon Joy
S/o Chandrojit
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

14:Sh Okil Chandro
S/o Laton Chakma
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

15:Sh Bimol Kanti
S/o Kiran Chand
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

16:Smt Bichosorba
S/o Shena Chakma
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

17:Sh Deso Priyo
S/o Tononi Mohan
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

18:Sh Amor Singh
S/o Sarat Chando
R/o Silgur



Lunglei District

19:Sh Purno Kumar
S/o Bisu Ketu
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

20:Sh Amoly Dhon
S/o Pathor Singh
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

21:Sh Pathor Singh
S/o Surot Chondro

22:Sh H.Hrangchhuana
S/o H.Saithankhama
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

23:Sh P.Vanlalaauva
S/o Lakh Prasad
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

24:Sh Mihir Kanti
S/o Lakh Prasad
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

25:Sh Okil Chondro
S/o Lalon
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

26:Smt Monbola Mugi
D/o Boloram
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

27:Sh Boloram
S/o Kripa Dhon
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

28:Sh Purno Behari
S/o Sudorson
R/o Silgur



Lunglei District

29:Sh Mono Ronjon
S/o Rashahori
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

30:Sh Sazola B.
Dey
S/o Sakundu Bikash Dey (L)
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

31:Sh Bijoy Mohon
S/o Sukta Muni
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

32:Sh P.Lalchawimawia
S/o P.Kalkhama (L)
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

33:Sh Boloram
S/o Kripa Dhon
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

34:Sh Luzonia
S/o Nishi Muni
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

35:Sh Hengotia
S/o Pattodria
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

36:Sh Sanjoy
S/o Budan Bijoy
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

37:Sh Demhulua
S/o Sukno Sanju
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District



38:Sh Kulungia
S/o Surua Dhon
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

39:Smt Mongola Mugi
W/o Boloram
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

40:Sh Nironjon
S/o Toroni Mohan
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

41:Smt Omar Mala
W/o Lakhi Prasad
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

42:Sh Soman Bijoy
S/o Bolo Chakma
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

43:Sh Trisuban
S/o Sukro Satzya
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

44:Sh Toroni Mohan
S/o Sudha Chakma
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

45:Sh Zoliana
S/o Suresh Chondro
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

46:Sh Chondro Mohan
S/o Lokhi Chondro
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

47:Sh Okey Singh
S/o Sorot Chondro
R/o Silgur



Lunglei District

48:Smt Milia Soka
D/o Kabolia
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

49:Sh Bodu Chakma
S/o Sidilia
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

50:Sh Udayon Chakma
S/o Rabindranath
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

51:Smt Jonaka
D/o Bodu Chakma
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

52:Sh Akai Muni
S/o Chondro Mohan
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

53:Sh Buban Bijoy
S/o Okil Chondro
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

54:Sh Mono Chakma
S/o Barpeda
R/o Silgur
Lunglei District

55:Sh Gopal Chondro
S/o Nilo Sen
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

56:Sh Joy Kumar
S/o Barotia
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

57:Sh Nottun Kumar



S/o Judho Chandro
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

58:Smt Chondorika
W/o Punya Sen
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

59:Sh Ronjon Kumar
S/o Judho Chondro
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

60:Sh Judho Chondro
S/o Arendro
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

61:Sh Krishna Ronjon
S/o Sabasa
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

62:Sh Lakhmi Prasad
S/o Birendra
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

63:Sh Bangla Joy
S/o Puinia Sen
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

64:Sh Judho Chondro
S/o Surendra
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

65:Sh Gopal Chandro
S/o Nilo Sen
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

66:Sh Lokhi Prasad
S/o Birendro (L)
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District



67:Sh Debonia
S/o Deba Mohan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

68:Sh Somal Kanti
S/o Binonda
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

69:Sh Sunil Boron
S/o Biswosen
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

70:Smt Deva Mugi
W/o Binonda (L)
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

71:Sh Phuino Basu
S/o Lunbua
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

72:Sh Biju Mohan
S/o Biro Sen
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

73:Sh Puni Bushan
S/o Lokhi Prasad
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

74:SSA Primary School
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

75:Sh Porpeda
S/o Boli
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

76:Sh Robi Chand
S/o Porpeda
R/o Nunsury



Lunglei District

77:Sh Jodish
S/o Singhonia
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

78:Smt Gulsoki
W/o Jogot Mohan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

79:Sh Bimal Kanti
S/o Susangko
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

80:Sh Gyano Rotan
S/o Raj Mohan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

81:Sh Bimal Kanti
S/o Susangko
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

82:Sh Kala Chand
S/o Gopal Chandro
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

83:Sh Jotish
S/o Chigonia
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

84:Sh Sunan Dhon
S/o Pada
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

85:Sh Kusum Kumar
S/o Boroitia
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

86:Sh Rabi Chand



S/o Borpeda
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

87:Sh Suresh Kumar
S/o Baratia
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

88:Smt Boloni Bala
W/o Barottia
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

89:Sh Nihar Kanti
S/o Hori Kristo
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

90:Sh Biro Sen
S/o Kala Badi
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

91:Sh Debona
S/o Debo Mohan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

92:Smt Kamaleni
W/o Subahu
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

93:Sh Ronjon Kumar
S/o Judho Chondro
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

94:Sh Saumalia Kanti
S/o Binendra
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

95:Sh Jogoth Joyti
S/o Punya Rotan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District



96:Sh Vanengmawia
S/o Khuanga
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

97:YMA Park
C/o President
YMA Tlabung
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

98:Sh Priyotam Chamka
S/o Kamini Kumar
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

99:Sh Kusum Kumar
S/o Judho Chondro
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

100:Smt Phullo Rani
W/o Biju Mohan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

101:Sh Abik Kumar
S/o Judha Ronjon
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

102:Sh Dinesh
S/o Judho Ronjon
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

103:Sh Dharma Dhaj
S/o Amuttya
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

104:Sh Bijoy Kusum
S/o Bipin Chondra
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

105:Sh Priyo Lila



S/o Satya Thal
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

106:Sh Prem Lal
S/o Sumnath
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

107:Sh Arei Bua
S/o Anonto Singh
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

108:Sh Binoy Jyoti
S/o Rangalal
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

109:Sh Bimal Kanti
S/o Rangalal
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

110:Sh Prodip Chondro
S/o Sumbunath
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

111:Sh Susen Kumar
S/o Diren Chakma
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

112:Smt Mongola Devi
W/o Sundro Kumar
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

113:Sh Subash Chondro
S/o Melia Soga
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

114:Sh Profulla Ronjon
S/o Mella Soga
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District



115:Sh Joy Bijoy
S/o Arjun
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

116:Sh Dononjoy
S/o Tappachia
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

117:Sh Joy Kanti
S/o Prati Moy
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

118:Sh Subash
S/o Gandwa Ram
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

119:Sh T.Mixon
S/o Milorath
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

120:Sh Nihar Kanti
S/o Hori Kristo
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

121:Sh Abik Kumar
S/o Judha Ranjan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

122:Sh Sangte
S/o K.Changa
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

123:Smt Bidika
D/o Mona
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

124:Sh Sotya Kumar
S/o Kalachand



R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

125:Sh Nabo Joti
S/o Santi Bushan
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

126:Sh Protul Kumar
S/o Nilo Chondro
R/o Nunsury
Lunglei District

127:Sh Kanchan Kumar
S/o Phulleswar
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

128:Sh Sukso Satijyo
S/o Sadonnis
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

129:Sh Suboraj
S/o Magura
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

130:Sh Kandar Singh
S/o Boli
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

131:Sh Prem Kumar
S/o Boli
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

132:Sh Sunil Bikash Chakma
S/o Ranjani Kumar
Chakma
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

133:Sh Ram Chandra
S/o Benga
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District



134:Sh Falesowar
S/o Tilokmuni
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

135:Smt Komoleni
W/o Korma
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

136:Sh Arun Kumar
S/o Korma
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

137:Sh Hridoy Burman
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

138:Sh Priyo Ranjan
S/o Kamami Mohan
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

139:Sh Gautam
S/o Priyo Ranjan
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

140:Smt Usha Rani
W/o Priyo Ranjan
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

141:Sh C.Lalkamlova
S/o Vala
R/o Bindasona
Lunglei District

142:Sh Anondo Singh
S/o Nakkaba
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

143:Sh Naion Singh
S/o Nakkaba
R/o Tablabagh



Lunglei District

144:Sh Bijoy Singh
S/o Nakkaba
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

145:Sh Dilip Kumar
S/o Doylia
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

146:Sh Dona Ronjon
S/o Raj Kumar
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

147:Sh Anonda Singh
S/o Nakkaba
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

148:Sh Bihari Lal
S/o Khulo Muni
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

149:Sh Sures Muji

S/o Kina Chandro
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

150:Sh Protimoy
S/o Phoreia
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

151:Sh Chigon Chand
S/o Khiania Ram
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

152:Sh Saralya
S/o Lokhi Muni
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District



153:Sh Druno Mohan
S/o Bam Choran
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

154:Sh Lokhya
S/o Jobo Don
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

155:Sh Raj Chondro
S/o Chandu (L)
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

156:Sh Puro Mohan
S/o Puino Sen
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

157:Sh Bijoy Ronjon
S/o Puro Mohan
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

158:Sh Santi Ronjon
S/o Puro Mohan
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

159:Sh Ronga Chand
S/o Dona Mugi
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

160:Sh Bokul Moni
S/o Promod Bikas
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

161:Sh Bokul Moni
S/o Promod Bikas
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

162:Sh Pureng Ro Lal
S/o Bimol Mohan
R/o Tablabagh



Lunglei District

163:Sh Pritimoy
S/o Dhasma Dhan
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

164:Sh Jotirmoy
S/o Kodachand
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

165:Sh Santimoy
S/o Toniaram
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

166:Sh Probir Kumar
S/o Lushai Mon
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

167:Sh Babunia
S/o Lushai Mohan
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

168:Sh Gyano Roton
S/o Rotnaram
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

169:Sh Por Singh
S/o Puinia Moni
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

170:Sh Rupendra Lal
S/o Tonia Ram
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

171:Sh Lokhonath
S/o Lushai Moni
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

172:Sh Indrakanta



S/o Rajani Mohan
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

173:Sh Rojoni Mohan
S/o Bidiadon
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

174:Sh Doyamoy
S/o Pokeis (L)
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

175:Sh Tonia Ram
S/o Kurolliya (L)
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

176:Sh P.Lalramngheta
S/o P.Lianbuka (L)
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

177:Sh C.N.Rao
S/o P.C.Chhandama
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

178:Sh Biakthanga
S/o Zima (L)
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

179:Sh P.C.Lalzama
S/o Hrangkhuma
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

180:Sh Ngaihtea
S/o Chalmawia
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

181:Sh Gopal Mongol
S/o Sunojoy
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District



182:Smt R.Lalchhumi
W/o H.Hrangchhuma (L)
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

183:Sh Ragoni Kumar
S/o Namo
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

184:Sh Binoy
S/o Rupendra Lal
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

185:Sh Kamini Ronjon
S/o Gulsonia
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

186:Sh Toniaram
S/o Kurollya
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

187:Sh Porimal
S/o Nagar Chand
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

188:Smt Lokhi Loda
W/o Erei Singh
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

189:Sh Hyotir Moy
S/o Sugyan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

190:Sh Sugyan
S/o Kala Chand
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

191:Sh Rajana Ranjan
S/o Sobo Sajyi



R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

192:Sh Babunia
S/o Anondo
Anondo
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

193:Sh Khali Roton
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

194:Sh Sanjay Kamti
S/o Rojomi Romjom
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

195:Sh Kali Rotom
S/o Saru Chandro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

196:Sh Kan Chan
S/o Rojoni Ronjom
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

197:Sh Mrinal Kanti
S/o Hriday Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

198:Sh Sayeed Kumar
S/o Battya
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

199:Sh Lushai Kumar
S/o Chondrosen
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

200:Sh Anondo Kumar
S/o Kina Mohon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District



201:Sh Kali Roton
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

202:Sh Dhono
S/o Anoto Singh
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

203:Sh Sanjay Kanti
S/o Rojomi Rojom Ronja
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

204:Sh Hiroto Boron
S/o Sneho Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

205:Sh Subath Lal
S/o Moharaj
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

206:Sh Kanchon
S/o Kojoni Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

207:Sh Gunomuni
S/o Sotish Chandro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

208:Sh Bijoy Lal
S/o Batya
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

209:Sh Susen
S/o Anando Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

210:Sh Manek Lal
S/o Gyano Ranjan



R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

211:Sh Gyano Ranjon
S/o Poran Dhon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

212:Sh Kripa Muni
S/o Sotish Chandra
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

213:Sh Somor Bijoy
S/o Gulsoka
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

214:Smt Alloka
W/o Somor Bijoy
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

215:Sh Somor Bijoy
S/o Gulsoka
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

216:Sh Ranjit Kumar
S/o Batcha Dhon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

217:Sh Budho Kinkor

S/o Batch Dhon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

218:Sh Arun Jyoti
S/o Kalachand
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

219:Sh Nolen Kumar
S/o Budha Kengor
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District



220:Sh Sanjay Kanti
S/o Rojoni Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

221:Sh Ronthu
S/o Sanjay Kanti
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

222:Sh Ratna Sen
S/o Ananta Singh
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

223:Sh Nilo Sangkor
S/o Thoda
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

224:Sh Nagar Chand
S/o Chrish Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

225:Sh Anil Kanti
S/o Ratna Sen
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

226:Sh Jalen Kumar
S/o Lokhi Dhon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

227:Charan Singh
S/o Proja Ranjan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

228:Sh Rosik Boran
S/o Porja Ranjan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

229:Sh Sukro Kumar
S/o Lokhi Kumar



R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

230:Sh Bonjoy Kumar
S/o Mohindro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

231:Smt Subrota
W/o Krhino Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

232:Sh Rojoni Ronjon
S/o Puran Dhon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

233:Sh Mukto Lal
S/o Gyano Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

234:Sh Sanjay Kanti
S/o Rojoni Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

235:Sh Bindhu
S/o Rojoni Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

236:Sh Doyal Chandra
S/o Benga
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

237:Smt Eleena
W/o Dayal Chandra
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

238:Sh Suresh Kanti
S/o Debo Ranjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District



239:Sh Buban Bihari
S/o Sushi Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

240:Sh Sushi Kumar
S/o Rabi Chand
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

241:Sh Binoy Chakma
S/o Buban Bihari
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

242:Sh Polin Bihari
S/o Sushi Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

243:Sh Mukul Kanti
S/o Sushi Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

244:Sh Kadi Ranhan
S/o Lolit Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

245:Sh Prabin Bikash
S/o Judha Ranjan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

246:Sh Ambamath
S/o Paran Dhan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

247:Sh Premlal
S/o Sabunath
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

248:Sh Rotan Kalla
S/o S.P.Denam
R/o Kalapani



Lunglei District

249:Smt Nomita
W/o Birendro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

250:Smt Sulokhona
W/o Dhonon Joy
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

251:Smt Birota
W/o Robindra
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

252:Smt C.Vanlalruati
D/o C.Zasanga (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

253:Smt C.Vanlalruati
D/o C.Zasanga (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

254:Smt C.Vanlalruati
D/o C.Zasanga (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

255:Smt C.Vanlalruati
D/o C.Zasanga (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

256:Sh C.Rammawia
S/o C.Zasanga (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

257:Smt H.Sawithangi
D/o P.Lianbuka
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

258:Sh Onirudro



S/o Notun Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

259:Sh P.Vanngaia
S/o P.Sapzina (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

260:Sh Sapzina
S/o Zahleia
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

261:Sh P.Sangliana
S/o P.Sapzina
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

262:Sh Vanlalngheta
S/o Sh Chawimawia (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

263:Sh Bhushan Kanti
S/o Ananda Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

264:Sh Nama Kesnor
S/o Budhi Pheda
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

265:Smt Maya Devi
W/o Mongol Mon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

266:Sh Maya Ranjan
S/o Desi Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

267:Sh Dormo Kanto
S/o Tribulal
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District



268:Sh Allya
S/o Sonnyaman
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

269:Sh Nolen Mohan
S/o Debo Ranjan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

270:Sh Sobimol
S/o Suryan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

271:Sh Sukomoy
S/o Biso Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

272:Sh Tribolal
S/o Paksha
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

273:Sh Bijoy Lal
S/o Paksha
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

274:Sh Chotta Chakma
S/o Nital Chavan
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

275:Sh Jonesh Kanti
S/o Deno Kesor
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

276:Sh Sudho Dhan
S/o Mareh Ang
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

277:Sh Proti Kanti
Sh Saru Chandra



R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

278:Sh Batya
S/o Lolit Kumar
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

279:Sh Lolit Kumar
S/o Kalachand
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

280:Sh Charu Chondra
S/o Dedo Muni
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

281:Sh Deva Ranjon
S/o Mattya (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

282:Sh Bijoy Kusum
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

283:Sh Bijoy Kusum
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

284:Sh Bharot Kanti
S/o Bijoy Kusum
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

285:Smt Maya Sita
W/o Bijoy Kusum
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

286:Sh Bijoy Kusum
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District



287:Sh Bijoy Kusum
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

288:Sh Bijoy Kusum
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

289:Sh Supon
S/o Bijoy Kusum
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

290:Smt Talagi Mala
D/o Joy Muni (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

291:Sh Budho Muni
S/o Nunby
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

292:Sh Borsaka
S/o Sona Dhor (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

293:Smt Nirola Devi
W/o Priyo Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

294:Sh Bimoj Prosad
S/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

295:Sh Sugon Singh
S/o Batcha Dhon (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

296:Sh Sumoti Ronjon
S/o Matya (L)
R/o Kalapani



Lunglei District

297:Sh Borno Jyati
S/o Nungya (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

298:Sh Uttam Kumar
S/o Proti Kanti
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

299:Sh Sindhu
S/o Rojoni Ronjon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

300:Sh T.Ronaldo
S/o Kalo Roton
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

301:Sh Ratnakor Chakma
S/o Profimoy
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

302:Smt Nirola Devi
W/o Saru Chondro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

303:Sh Dilip Kumar
S/o Matya
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

304:Sh Ajit Kumar
S/o Mattya
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

305:Smt Zothani
D/o V.L.Sanga
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

306:Sh Dawngliana



S/o Pachuanga
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

307:Sh K
Engmawia
S/o Lukanha (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

308:Sh Rivunga
S/o Dengkhuma
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

309:Sh Atul Chandra
S/o Nishi Chandra
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

310:Sh Lalpianga
S/o Ropianga
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

311:Sh Joy Chand
S/o Modhu Mon
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

312:Sh Binjoy Kumar
S/o Moilendro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

313:Sh T.Lalruata
S/o Vunga (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

314:Sh Babunya
S/o Anondo
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

315:Sh Nilo Moni
S/o Ratna Mon
R/o Kalapani



Lunglei District

316:Sh Zokunga
S/o Vuta (L)
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

317:Sh Premo Dhoj
S/o Roj Chand
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

318:Smt F.Zomawii
D/o F.Chaldaia
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

319:Sh Nayan Chakma
S/o Subona
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

320:Sh Keshor
S/o Kali Roton
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

321:Sh Saru Chondro
S/o Debo Mani
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

322:Sh Bimol Prosad
S/o Saru Chandro
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

323:Sh Binod Kumar
S/o Anonto Singh
R/o Kalapani
Lunglei District

324:Sh Inanda Kumar
S/o Ranga Chand
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

325:Sh Santi



S/o Kalaju
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

326:Sh Moja Gala
S/o Juromuni
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

327:Sh Bimol Kanti
S/o Suresh Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

328:Sh Jyoti Lal
S/o Inanda Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

329:Sh Bina Ram
S/o Mereye
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

330:Sh Rippon
S/o Kristi Ranjan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

331:Sh Pattori Kumar
S/o Robi Dhan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

332:Sh Krito Ranjan
S/o Robi Mohan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

333:Sh Krisna Charan
S/o Kala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

334:Sh Nobin Chand
S/o Jogendra
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District



335:Sh Piday Ranjan
S/o Kina Chandra
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

336:Sh Joy Kanti
S/o Nilo Ratan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

337:Sh Lamban
S/o Tula Ram
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

338:Sh Bhola
S/o Barpeda
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

339:Sh Surjo Mohan
S/o Biro Sen
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

340:Sh Budha Ranjan
S/o Anonda Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

341:Sh Samrat Sur
S/o Ragoni Ranjan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

342:Sh Jatish Chandro
S/o Sinta Muni
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

343:Sh Ananda Kumar
S/o Kripa Charan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

344:Sh Kanchina
S/o Chinta Muni



R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

345:Smt Nidur Kala
W/o Krisna Charan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

346:Sh Tapan
S/o Krisna Charan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

347:Sh Amiyo Ranjan
S/o Mereye
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

348:Sh Hridoy Ranjon
S/o Bishnu Ram
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

349:Sh Joy Shanti
S/o Kala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

350:Sh Hema Bindu
S/o Sigonia
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

351:Sh Roshin Dhan
S/o Majag Gala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

352:Sh Tridip Kumar
S/o Biro Sen
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

353:Sh Sunil Jibon
S/o Rupa Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District



354:Sh Suba Kumar
S/o Majag Gala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

355:Sh Chondro Kumar
S/o Majag Gala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

356:Sh Biro Sen
S/o Robi Hangsho
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

357:Sh Sona Ram
S/o Monu Ranjan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

358:Sh Purno Ranjan
S/o Bishnu Ram
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

359:Sh Robi Chandra
S/o Jatis Chandra
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

360:Sh Duja Singh
S/o Majong Gala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

361:Sh Rupa Kumar
S/o Chand Muni
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

362:Sh Surjo Sen
S/o Juro Mohan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

363:Sh Kala
S/o Rojini Mohan
R/o Malsury



Lunglei District

364:Sh Milo Ratan
S/o Joy Kristo
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

365:Sh Monu Ranjan
S/o Nokhon Suka
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

366:Sh Akhai Kumar
S/o Sisu Ram
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

367:Sh Udjal Kanti
S/o Majag Gala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

368:Sh Sarat Chandro
S/o Budha Muni
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

369:Sh Nirot Kumar
S/o Padha Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

370:Sh Majangalla
S/o Balosyse
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

371:Sh Subimal
S/o Suresh kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

372:Sh Udjal Kanti
S/o Majaggala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

373:Sh Niloranjana



S/o Ananda Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

374:Sh Sudir Moy
S/o Doyal Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

375:Sh Biro Lal
S/o Suresh Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

376:Sh Robindra Nath
S/o Snity Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

377:Sh Sunil Kanti
S/o Ananda Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

378:Smt Chitra Lata
D/o Lagara (L)
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

379:Sh Amar Chand
S/o Toroni Sen
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

380:Sh Kina Ram
S/o Lagara
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

381:Indra Sen
S/o Kala Chand
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

382:Sh Shati Charan
S/o Kaka
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District



383:Sh Deva Ranjan
S/o Mereia
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

384:Sh Hema Ranjan
S/o Soma Chandra
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

385:Sh Tuia Ram
S/o Biletye
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

386:Sh Shanti Ranjan
S/o Bishnu Ram
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

387:Sh Bino Moy
S/o Singha Muni
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

388:Sh Bini Moy
S/o Koilash Dhan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

389:Sh Chondra Sen
S/o Suresh Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

390:Sh Bharat Shanti
S/o Jodish Chandra
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

391:Sh Bipin Chandra
S/o Bina Ram
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

392:Sh Bino Lendu
S/o Bishnu Ram



R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

393:Sh Poiayon
S/o Sanjoy
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

394:Sh Prem Ranjan
S/o Kala Sokha
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

395:Smt Nidur Bala
D/o Lila Prito
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

396:Sh Sneha Kumar
S/o Suresh Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

397:Sh B.Diamond
S/o Sneha Lal
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

398:ShSneha Lal
S/o Suresh Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

399:Sh Nilo Moy
S/o Madan Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

400:Sh Bikram Singh
S/o Kamini Ranjan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

401:Sh Babra Sen
S/o Juroman
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District



402:Sh Santijoy
S/o Babra Sen
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

403:Sh Dulal Chandra
S/o Koilash Dhan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

404:Sh Dulal Chandra
S/o Koilash Dhan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

405:Sh Sumit Chandra
S/o Kala
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

406:Sh Hiro Lal
S/o Suresh Kumar
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

407:Sh Nirmal Kanti
S/o Biraj Chandra
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

408:Sh Chhita Ranjan
S/o Lagara
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

409:Sh Bana Bihari
S/o Robi Mohan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

410:Sh Sunil Kanti
S/o Chitta Ranjan
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

411:Primary School
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District



412:Sh Barath Kumar
S/o Jadish Chandra
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

413:Sh Lokhi Mohan
S/o Deva Muni
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

414:Sh Amar Singh
S/o Punyo Sur
R/o Malsury
Lunglei District

415:Sh Dilip Kumar
S/o Matya
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

416:Sh Satya Kumar
S/o Judo Rasiha
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

417:Sh Nagar Chand
S/o Krishna Chandra
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

418:Sh Briso Sen
S/o Brisu Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

419:Sh Nito Ranjan
S/o Chigar Chand
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

420:Sh Sneha Kumar
S/o Juba Rashai
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

421:Sh Manawh
S/o Jonga Ram



R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

422:Sh Nisi Kumar
S/o Taranian
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

423:Sh Punorong Chand
S/o Krishno
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

424:Sh Chondra Kumar
S/o Sisuram
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

425:Sh Doya Moy
S/o Surjo Sen
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

426:Sh Birot
S/o Japan Sen
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

427:Sh Hema Bindu
S/o Cigarta
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

428:Sh Dorbashia
S/o Sisuram
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

429:Sh Pukkai Kumar
S/o Sisuram
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

430:Sh Soneka Ranjan
S/o Japan Sen
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District



431:Sh Erei Singh
S/o Surjo Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

432:Sh Upendra Lal
S/o Roshik Dhar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

433:Sh Sonjimoy
S/o Kali Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

434:Sh Polayon
S/o Bijania
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

435:Sh Bijania
S/o Mojjolla
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

436:Sh Prema Moy
S/o Kali Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

437:Sh CM Lendu
S/o Bibo Baron
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

438:Sh Sodana Buson
S/o Punong Chand
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

439:Sh Surjo Lal
S/o Nila Moy
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

440:Sh Biro Kusum
S/o Birong KR
S/o Nila Moy



R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

441:Sh Priti Moy
S/o Kali Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

442:Sh Manu Ranjan
S/o Cigar Chand
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

443:Sh Rovi Ranjan
S/o Satyo Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

444:Sh Dino Bandhu
S/o Gulsoka
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

445:Sh Mollika Moy
S/o Kali Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

446:Sh Purnjoy
S/o Erei Singh
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

447:Sh Kusala
S/o Japan Sen
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

448:Sh Biro Baron
S/o Sneha Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

449:Sh Puni Buson
S/o Judo Chandra
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District



450:Sh Marea
S/o Borsoka
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

451:Sh Raj Kumar
S/o Lushai Chan
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

452:Smt Rupa Devi
D/o Raj Kumar
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

453:Sh Binoy Kanti
S/o Nagendra Lal
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

454:Sh Nil Kumar
S/o Topan Kanti
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

455:Sh Bhabat Chandra
S/o Nagendra Lal
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

456:Sh Lila Moy
S/o Probat Chandra
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

457:Sh Kusal Kanti
S/o Lila Moy
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

458:Sh Susol Kanti
S/o Lila Moy
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

459:Sh Chitra Kumar
S/o Kala Soka
R/o Lokhisury



Lunglei District

460:Smt Nidur Mala
S/o Lila Priyo
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

461:Sh Krida Chanjo
S/o Mahesh Chondra
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

462:Sh Pratap Singh
S/o Lila Moy
R/o Lokhisury
Lunglei District

463:Smt Anita
D/o M.Chan Chakma
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

464:Sh Mobin Chand
S/o Jugendra
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

465:Sh Godo Ram
S/o Bilettye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

466:Sh Hemo Ronjon
S/o Nilo Chandro
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

467:Sh Buddo Sonkor
S/o Bongo Chandro
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

468:Sh Goda Ram
S/o Billettyo
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

469:Sh Mobin Chand



S/o Jugendra
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

470:Sh Chandro Lal
S/o Songosur
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

471:Sh Pakkai
S/o Songosur
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

472:Sh Bongo Chandra
S/o Bannu Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

473:Sh Mobin Chan
S/o Jugendra
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

474:Sh Mikunjo Kumar
S/o Bakkiya
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

475:Sh Lolit Chandro
S/o Doya Choron
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

476:Sh Sundro Kumar
S/o Kallya
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

477:Sh Mihir Ranjan
S/o Nikum Kumra
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

478:Sh Tapan
S/o K.Charan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District



479:Smt Danobi
D/o Pruti Moy
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

480:Sh Doyal Chondro
S/o Singo Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

481:Sh Nirod Kumar
S/o Poddo
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

482:Sh Durgomon
S/o Mera
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

483:Sh Lalmon
S/o Mera
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

484:Sh Chondro Kumar
S/o Santi Moy
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

485:Sh Sorot Mon
S/o Aro Chondro
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

486:Sh Krishna Kumar
S/o Krisho Ranjan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

487:Sh Modon Kumar
S/o Krisho Ranjan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

488:Sh Anil Soga
S/o Anto



R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

489:Sh Mokundo Lal
S/o Santi Moy
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

490:Sh Kanongo Kumar
S/o Mera
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

491:Sh Surjo Kumar
S/o Kanongo Kumar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

492:Sh Santi Moy
S/o Talchana
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

493:Sh Boddo Mun
S/o Mera
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

494:Sh Suresh Kanti
S/o Buddo Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

495:Sh Nilo Moy
S/o Badi Chan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

496:Sh Probot Chandro
S/o Kalendor
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

497:Sh Sotish Chondro
S/o Kalendor
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District



498:Sh Kandra
S/o Subol Chandra
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

499:Sh Ram
S/o Sona Mohan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

500:Sh Kandra
S/o Chondro Sekhar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

501:Sh Suresh Kumar
S/o Mera
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

502:Sh Hokkana
S/o Lokki Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

503:Sh Bangali Chan
S/o Sona Mohan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

504:Sh Ramoni Mon
S/o Hokkana
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

505:Sh Monu Bodro
S/o Mera
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

506:Sh Lokkon
S/o Sona Mohan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

507:Sh Fulo Raj
S/o Surjo Kumar
R/o Devasora



Lunglei District

508:Sh Bissombor
S/o Bongo Chandra
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

509:Sh Chitro Roth
S/o Poddo Kumar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

510:Sh Amar Singh
S/o Bangu Kumar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

511:Sh Bongu Kumar
S/o Kala
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

512:Sh Priyo Lal
S/o Mereye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

513:Sh Buddo Songa
S/o Pajangye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

514:Sh Doyal Muni
S/o Pajangye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

515:Smt Malabi
D/o Madam Kumar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

516:Smt Bolu
D/o Bongo Chondro
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

517:Sh Battya



S/o Bongo Chondro
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

518:Sh Sundori Muni
S/o Dero Ranjan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

519:Sh Atullye
S/o Singonnyo
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

520:Sh Kali Charan
S/o Songosur
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

521:Sh Sundro Muni
S/o Indro Singh
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

522:Sh Sundro Muni
S/o Basu Buchiye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

523:Sh Santos Kanti
S/o Sukro Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

524:Sh Somor Bindu
S/o Bongo Kumar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

525:Sh Hiro Lal
S/o Bongo Kumar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

526:Sh Banu Kumar
S/o Kala
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District



527:Sh Devorachia
S/o Atullye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

528:Sh Monu Ranjan
S/o Billetye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

529:Sh Bolu
S/o Kala
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

530:Sh Mela Chand
S/o Mirmolia
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

531:Sh Sondia Mala
S/o Mongol Chand
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

532:Sh Lobi Chandro
S/o Mereye
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

533:Sh Indro Minu
S/o Aro Chandra
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

534:Sh Modhu Chondro
S/o Chigonia
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

535:Sh Sodish Chandro
S/o Kalen Dori
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

536:Sh Tonu Chondro
S/o Dero Ranjan



R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

537:Sh Kali Charan
S/o Sngosur
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

538:Sh Lila Moy
S/o Nilogendra Lal
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

539:Sh Kripa Sorjo
S/o Dero Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

540:Sh Lal Bihari
S/o Indro Singh
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

541:Sh Santos Kanti
S/o Sukro Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

542:Sh Surjo Lal Chakma
S/o Shantimoy Chakma
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

543:Sh Indu Kumar
S/o Nogendra Lal
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

544:Sh Santi Moy
S/o Badhi Chand
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

545:Sh Santi Moy
S/o Badhi Chand
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District



546:Sh Gunor Ban
S/o Songchia
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

547:Sh Poranjanti
S/o Sundro Muni
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

548:Sh Sundro Muni
S/o Tal Chan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

549:Smt Doromi
D/o Raj Kumar
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

550:Sh Tapan Kanti
S/o Raj Kingkor
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

551:Smt Tudi
D/o Chitaranjan
R/o Devasora
Lunglei District

552:Synod School
C/o In Charge
Field Secretary
R/o Tablabagh
Lunglei District

553:The State of Mizoram
R/b the Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Aizawl

554:The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
revenue Department
Aizawl

555:The Deputy Commissioner and District Collector
Lunglei District
Lunglei



556:The Union of India
R/b the Secretary to the Govt. of India
Ministry of Home Affairs
Border Management Devision-I
New Delhi-1

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Roshan Subedi
Advocate for the Respondent : Ms Zairemsangpuii

Linked Case : WA/8/2025

Engineer Projects (India) Limited (A government of India its Enterprise)
R/b its Executive Director
Kolkata
West Bengal

VERSUS

Sh Lujon Kumar and 462 Ors.
S/o Sogadisap
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

2:Sh Suresh Ranjan
S/o Luzon Kumar
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

3:Sh Badra Kumar
S/o Soga Disap
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

4:Sh Sughondo Kumar
S/o Bakkye
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

5:Smt Mowchila
D/o Surendra
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

6:Smt Protipa Ranjan
D/o Sughandhar



R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

7:Sh Suresh Chandra
S/o Ananda Kumar
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

8:Sh Suresh Dan
S/o Ananda Kumar
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

9:Smt Kali Prasad
D/o Surendra
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

10:Sh Som Muni
S/o Surendra
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

11:Sh Bini Moy
S/o Surendra
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

12:Sh Nilo Boron
S/o Surendra
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

13:Smt Sunita Ranjan
D/o Lujan Kumar
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

14:Sh Suganda Kumar
S/o Bagkia
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

15:SSA School Building
C/o VCP
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District



16:Smt Dina Kanti
D/o Kalasela
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

17:Sh Suresh Chandro
S/o Anda Kumar
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

18:Sh Nihar Kanti
S/o H.K.Chakma
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

19:Sh Nila Baran
S/o Surendra
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

20:Sh Lujan Kumar
S/o Sugudibap
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

21:Sh Badra Kumar
S/o Sugudibip
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

22:Sh Daya Kumar
S/o Ludungya
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

23:Smt Munu Ranjan
D/o Mochela
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

24:Smt Nirmal
D/o Birajoi
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

25:Sh B.Coy
S/o Bimal Kanti
R/o Nakuksora



Lunglei District

26:Sh Doye Chakma
S/o Robi
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

27:Smt Gurika
D/o Podha Devi
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

28:Nancy
D/o P.Chakma
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

29:Sh D.Chaya
S/o Zoliana
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

30:Sh Kalitong
S/o B.Ram
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

31:Sh A.B.Chakma
S/o B.B.Chakma
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

32:Smt Niharika
D/o H.K.Chakma
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

33:Smt Pushparani
D/o N.K.Chakma
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

34:Sh Uddyo
S/o ML Chakma
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

35:Sh Mehendro Lal



S/o Bharat Udhar
R/o Nakuksora
Lunglei District

36:Sh Hira Lal
S/o Mon Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

37:Sh Donevswar
S/o Sudrasen
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

38:Sh Natho Muni
S/o Badi Bussye
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

39:Sh Ratan
S/o J.Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

40:Sh Susalla Bikas
S/o Natho Muni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

41:Sh Natun Chandra
S/o Natho Muni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

42:Sh Ranju
S/o Sukromuni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

43:Sh Bharat Ranjan
S/o Ganga
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

44:Sh Lamba Sira
S/o Ganga
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District



45:Sh Durgo Kingkor
S/o Karbary
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

46:Sh Baguti Ranjan
S/o Purna Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

47:Sh Chandra Gupta
S/o Susil Baran
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

48:Sh Ladungye
S/o Johey
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

49:Sh Poloy
S/o Nayanmon
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

50:Sh Dulal Chandra
S/o Trigo Dhan
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

51:Sh Lolit Kumar
S/o Ranga Chand
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

52:Sh Borikhuddhar
S/o Krisno Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

53:Sh Toppa
S/o Guatsur
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

54:Sh Susil Kanti
S/o Chinta Moni



R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

55:Sh Susil Kanti
S/o Nanda Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

56:Sh Santi Lal
S/o Lohit Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

57:Smt Sunila
D/o Lokhi Dhan
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

58:Sh Chandra Kumar
S/o Joleya
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

59:Sh Surjo Sen
S/o Siddi
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

60:Sh Chandra Sagar
S/o Susi Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

61:Sh Kandra
S/o Susangha
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

62:Smt Santi Moy
D/o Noram
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

63:Sh Mangal Kanti
S/o Santi Moy
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District



64:Sh Porimai
S/o Lokhi Don
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

65:Sh Annyo Sen
S/o Judendro
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

66:Sh Ranjit Kumar
S/o Gyamo Ranjan
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

67:Sh Abon
Nanda Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

68:Smt Lokhona
D/o Sailus Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

69:Sh Syama Ratan
S/o Sukkia
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

70:Sh Anil Kanti
S/o Nanda Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

71:Sh Hokkeye
S/o Gangha
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

72:Sh Satyajit
S/o Rammuni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

73:Sh Doyal Kanti
S/o Sundra Muni
R/o Barsdiasora



Lunglei District

74:Sh Nigiri Kumar
Ludengya
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

75:Sh Anando Kumar
S/o Joy Mani
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

76:Sh Subimol
S/o Tungoram
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

77:Sh Susil Baron
S/o Sadya Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

78:Sh Pulin Bayan
S/o Ananta Singh
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

79:Sh Surersh Kumar
S/o Kanodhan
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

80:Sh Kina Lal
S/o Surendra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

81:Sh Bajamya
S/o Sukkya
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

82:Sh Birolal
S/o Punyo Rattan
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

83:Sh Bana Bihari



S/o Geeta Devi
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

84:Sh Sona Kanti
S/o Durga Kingkar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

85:Sh Santi Prasad
S/o Punyo Rattan
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

86:Sh Santi Pradan
S/o Nagosye
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

87:Sh Sarat Kumar
S/o Judha Muni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

88:Sh Purno Bihari
S/o Nagosye
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

89:Sh Nilo Baran
S/o Pakksa
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

90:Sh Kina Kumar
S/o Ludungya
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

91:Sh Maya Kumar
S/o Ludungya
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

92:Sh Dino Ranjan
S/o Nolini
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District



93:Sh Anonto Singh
S/o Jubarasye
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

94:Smt Geeta Devi
D/o Raj Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

95:Smt Sita Devi
D/o Raj Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

96:Smt Melabi
D/o Ji Kumar
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

97:Sh Monu Jan Jan
S/o Mawsela
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

98:Sh Bhisani Kanti
S/o Ananda
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

99:Sh Satyo Jit
S/o Ram Muni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

100:Sh Buddhoo Mandir
C/o VCP
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

101:Sh Chita Muni
S/o Jubo Rassya
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

102:Sh Bharat Udhar
S/o Roy Muni



R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

103:Sh Assye
S/o Brisukitu
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

104:Sh Assya
S/o Brisukitu
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

105:Sh Maharassia
S/o Sadonia
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

106:Sh Sodonye
S/o Kina Ram
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

107:Sh Bharat Udhar
S/o Roy Muni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

108:Sh Guatsur
S/o Chintemuni
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

109:Sh Bimol Kanti
S/o Lolit Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

110:Sh Bimal Kanti
S/o Lolit Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

111:Sh Maloti
S/o Alo Rani
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District



112:Sh Sanjoy
S/o Bharat Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

113:Sh Sanjoy
S/o Bharat Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

114:Sh Pidyea
S/o Pradip Chandra
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

115:Sh Lalchawimawia
S/o Kalkhama
R/o Barsdiasora
Lunglei District

116:Sh Nauram
S/o Olha
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

117:Sh Sumuti Ranjan
S/o Olha
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

118:Smt Pajalla
D/o Nanda Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

119:Sh Zallin Bikash
S/o Gayasur
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

120:Smt Khusala
D/o Monu Ranjan
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

121:Sh Dinolal
S/o Noneya
R/o Saisen



Lunglei District

122:Sh Hriday Lal
S/o Mon Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

123:Sh Mukhuja Lal
S/o Mon Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

124:Sh Nanda Kumar
S/o Jay Muni
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

125:Sh Bidadya Sagar
S/o Nanda Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

126:Sh Santi Lal
S/o Santi Madar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

127:Smt Sukrokarlik
S/o Santi Madar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

128:Sh Samar Bijoy
S/o Santi Madar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

129:Sh Santi Madhar
S/o Joy Muni
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

130:Sh Sattiya Baratto
S/o Akhay Chandra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

131:Sh Shiv Barato



S/o Akhay Chandra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

132:Smt Pintu
D/o Reboti Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

133:Sh Topendro
S/o Akhay Chandra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

134:Sh Jubo Raj
S/o Amolendra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

135:Sh Dono Rattan
S/o Setera
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

136:Sh Sodeswar
S/o Noneya
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

137:Sh Medera
S/o Noram
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

138:Sh Siamtea
S/o Noram
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

139:Sh Susil Chandra
S/o Jedong Moni
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

140:Sh Biro Kumar
S/o Chettera
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District



141:Smt Nidur Mukhi
S/o Renoti Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

142:Sh Setera
S/o Brisu Ketu
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

143:Smt Santi Priyo
S/o Mon Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

144:Smt Nidutuk
S/o Reboti Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

145:Sh Promo Mohan
S/o Gayasur
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

146:Sh Lokhi Ranjan
S/o Amolendra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

147:Sh Sappyo
S/o Santi Madhan
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

148:Sh Juddha Ranjan
S/o Santi Madar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

149:Sh Dayal Chandra
S/o Bharat Chandra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

150:Sh Chitronath
S/o Noneya



R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

151:Sh Ohia
S/o Aray Moni
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

152:Smt Budha Mala
S.o Mukka Dhan
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

153:Smt Nanda
D/o Dino Lal
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

154:Sh Hangsa Das
S/o M.Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

155:Sh Bijoy Bikash
S/o Nuaram
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

156:Sh Sadan Bihar
S/o Hangoi
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

157:Sh Ranga Chand
S/o Ratan Muni
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

158:Sh Jokky Kumar
S/o Prisu Ketu
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

159:Sh Pandit Bihari
S/o Hira Lal
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District



160:Sh Joy Kanti
S/o Preti Moy
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

161:Sh Budha Ranjan
S/o Noram
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

162:Sh Nihar Bindu
S/o Bathoa
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

163:Sh Nanda Kumar
S/o Joy Moni
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

164:Sh Redoy Lal
S/o Mon Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

165:Smt Padha Devi
D/o Hriday Lal
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

166:Smt Dipam
D/o Kripa Changyo
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

167:Sh Dino Lal
S/o Nonelia
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

168:Sh Nuaram
S/o Ahola
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

169:Sh Mukta Dhar
S/o Mon Kumar
R/o Saisen



Lunglei District

170:Sh Lokhi Ranjan
S/o Amohundra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

171:Sh Sawmtea
S/o Nuaram
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

172:Sh Santi Lal
S/o Santi Madan
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

173:Sh Vidya Sagar
S/o Nanda Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

174:Sh Sukra Kartik
S/o Santi Madan
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

175:Sh Dono Ratton
S/o Satera
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

176:Sh Badsa
S/o Nidumugi
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

177:Sh Juba Raj
S/o Amalendra
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

178:Sh Pujoko
S/o Ratan Kaliha
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

179:Sh Sappia



S/o Santi Madap
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

180:Sh Ninelya
S/o Darbasia
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

181:Sh Sadeswar
S/o Noneya
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

182:Sh Neduktuk
S/o Rebole Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

183:Sh Pajala
S/o Nanda Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

184:Sh Jatin Bikash
S/o Gayasur
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

185:Sh Doy Chand
S/o Revoli Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

186:Sh Santi Priyo
S/o Mon Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

187:Sh Sumoti Ranjan
S/o Ohla
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

188:Sh Pintu
S/o Rebotilor
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District



189:Smt Jubali
D/o B.K.Chakma
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

190:Sh Amar Joyti
S/o Sneha Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

191:Sh Jatramon
S/o Mera
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

192:Sh Ahwoze
S/o Susan
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

193:Sh E.Alomati
S/o Prem Kumar
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

194:Sh Nilo Ranjan
S/o Dononjoy
R/o Saisen
Lunglei District

195:Smt Maya Devi
S/o Ranjan Chakma
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

196:Smt Binoy Lotta
S/o Purno Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

197:Sh Kala Boron
S/o Ranjabo
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

198:Sh Dharmasal
S/o Purma Singh



R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

199:Sh Mitan Chakma
S/o MB Chakma
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

200:Sh Sant Boran
S/o Biddye Chandro
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

201:Sh Bimal Jyoti
S/o Jogendra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

202:Sh Biju Lokko
S/o Punyo Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

203:Sh Debo Broto
S/o Sammoni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

204:Sh Sanilo
S/o Surosen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

205:Smt Tulu
S/o Ananda Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

206:Smt Sammoni
S/o AK Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

207:Sh Surjyo Ranjan
S/o Sammuni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



208:Sh Purno Kumar
S/o Bitro Sen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

209:Sh Proti Bindu
S/o Lushai Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

210:Sh Ranajit
S/o Biju Lokko
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

211:Sh Nigire Muni
S/o Jarmojoy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

212:Smt Modhunita
S/o Purno Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

213:Sh Surendra
S/o Tono
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

214:Sh Krippa Dhan
S/o Indra Joy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

215:Smt Karma Bimadu
S/o Lushai Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

216:Sh Imran
S/o Rupendra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

217:Sh Doya Dhan
S/o Indra Joy
R/o Mauzam



Lunglei District

218:Sh Samma Chandra
S/o Chokkal
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

219:Sh Shivo Ratton
S/o Sona Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

220:Sh Monu Ranjan
S/o Juboloko
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

221:Sh Dana
S/o Natun Chandra R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

222:Sh Biddye Chandra
S/o Jarmo Joy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

223:Sh Rajo Kumar
S/o Kali Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

224:Sh Suroto Sen
S/o Indra Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

225:Sh LokhiDhon
S/o Girish Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

226:Smt Kobison
D/o Moni Ram
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

227:Sh Godha Dhar
S/o Guno Muni



R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

228:Sh Santi Ranjan
S/o Jubo Lokko
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

229:Sh Battye
S/o Kamani Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

230:Sh Probhat Chandra
S/o Ram Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

231:Sh Peskar
S/o Sudonno Moni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

232:Sh Gyano Rotton
S/o Arbo
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

233:Smt Kala Mile
S/o Rajebdra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

234:Sh Arun Kumar
S/o Angara
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

235:Sh Suniti Ranjan
S/o Sadhon
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

236:Sh Angara
S/o Devendra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



237:Sh Amolio Dhan
S/o Robi Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

238:Sh Lokhi Kumar
S/o Jonmojoy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

239:Sh Bhadra Kumar
S/o Lokkhi Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

240:Sh Jubo Lakkho
S/o Polichiye
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

241:Sh Bijoy Chakma
S/o Banno
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

242:Sh Megobando
S/o Tanak Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

243:Smt Sudil Mala
S/o Kirpacharyo
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

244:Sh Robi Chandra
S/o Sadhon
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

245:Sh Lokkhi Ranjan
S/o Jubo Lokkho
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

246:Sh Somorotton
S/o Suno Dhan
R/o Mauzam



Lunglei District

247:Sh Gyana Rattan
S/o Kamini Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

248:Smt Nirmala Devi
D/o Joron Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

249:Sh Nihar Bindu
S/o Amulya Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

250:Sh Amulya Dhan
S/o Larei Joy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

251:Sh Rattan
S/o Sona Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

252:Sh Probhat Chandra
S/o Kripa Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

253:Sh Karuna Kumar
S/o Mangal Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

254:Sh Monu Ranjan
S/o Hegera
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

255:Sh Purno Kumar
S/o Kali Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

256:Sh Santi Muni



S/o Kamini Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

257:Sh Diswa Karma
S/o Nisi Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

258:Sh Arabindu
S/o Phalguni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

259:Sh Priyo Ranjan
S/o Purno Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

260:Sh Bimbi Rotton
S/o Sona Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

261:Sh Sasadar
S/o Juddo Moni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

262:Smt Rangabo
D/o Chitronkor
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

263:Sh Proful Chandra
S/o Ram Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

264:Sh Jagadish Chandra
S/o Ram Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

265:Sh Premo Kumar
S/o Bitro Sen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



266:Sh Moni Badra
S/o Praful Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

267:Sh Briso Kumar
S/o Probat Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

268:Sh Suresh Chandra
S/o Ram Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

269:Sh Krippa Dhan
S/o Punyo Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

270:Sh Juddho Dhan
S/o Girish Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

271:Sh Bhaja
S/o Punyo Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

272:Sh Amar Badhu
S/o Punyo Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

273:Sh Dhup Dhap
S/o NK Chakma
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

274:Sh Punang Chand
S/o Kina Muni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

275:Sh Krishna Rotton
S/o Sona Dhan



R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

276:Sh Krishna Bahu
S/o Punyo Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

277:Sh Mukho Ranjan
S/o Ananda Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

278:Sh Anil Subho
S/o Non Chan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

279:Sh Dino Kumar
S/o Hari Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

280:Sh Karan
S/o Bimal Bikash
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

281:Smt Hemo Loda
D/o Bimbi Rotton
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

282:Sh Gyana Sangkar
S/o Sona Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

283:Sh Chandra Sen
S/o Chamye
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

284:Sh Genontu
S/o Surosen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



285:Sh TD Budhilal
S/o TD Kukura
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

286:Sh Suchyeng
S/o Arjun
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

287:Sh Dharmosal
S/o Buddho
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

288:Sh Moni Rotton
S/o Arbua
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

289:Sh Barun Kumar
S/o Suro Sen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

290:Sh Shanti Moy
S/o Pechia
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

291:Sh Rabindra
S/o Punong Chan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

292:Sh Borun Sen
S/o Samya
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

293:Sh Kalachan
S/o Karna Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

294:Sh Suro Sen
S/o Suresh Bhan
R/o Mauzam



Lunglei District

295:Sh Lokkhi Muni
S/o Krippa Chhandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

296:Sh Guno Sincu
S/o Arjun
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

297:Sh Ranjit Kumar
S/o Gondasur
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

298:Sh Santi Kumar
S/o Hari Ram
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

299:Sh Arun Santi
S/o Suro Den
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

300:Sh Jaga
Bidra Hulo
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

301:Sh Raj Chandra
S/o Byrat
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

302:Sh Hirendra
S/o Guno Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

303:Sh Juron Dhan
S/o Kripa Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

304:Sh Dhup Boga



S/o Santi Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

305:Sh Krishna Ranjan
S/o Natun Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

306:Sh Sushil Kanti
S/o Krishna Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

307:Sh Sumon Da
S/o Samir
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

308:Sh Sawmliana
S/o Uduap
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

309:Sh Lalnuntluanga
S/o Pu Para
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

310:Sh Bangallya
S/o Omiye
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

311:Sh Amar Chan
S/o Ronjonye
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

312:Sh Chandra Kanto
S/o Lamba Hulo
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

313:Sh Lusei Mohan
S/o Sushi Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



314:Sh Santi Baron
S/o Biddye Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

315:Sh Sobil Baron
S/o Bidye Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

316:Sh Santi Kumar
S/o Gyano Rotton
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

317:Sh Lilon Chakma
S/o Dinesh Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

318:Sh Jugesh
S/o Boloram
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

319:Sh Santi Moy
S/o Sakkol
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

320:Smt Hiron Mala
S/o Gyano Rotton
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

321:Sh Rambol
S/o Lamba
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

322:Sh Ranjan
S/o Lushai Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

323:Sh Nilo Boron
S/o Purno Kumar



R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

324:Sh Singo Muni
S/o Nattun Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

325:Sh Jyotin Priyo
S/o Kobison
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

326:Smt Hiduk Kala
S/o Ashok Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

327:Sh Amar Chan
S/o Gyano Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

328:Sh Arun Moy
S/o Mukto Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

329:Sh Jessika
S/o Sumiti Bijoy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

330:Sh Sunil Rai
S/o Santi Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

331:Smt Phul Mala
S/o Sunil Rai
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

332:Sh Syamol Kanti
S/o Anil Subbho
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



333:Sh Juro Kumar
S/o Ananda Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

334:Sh Nigire Muni
S/o Jon Mojy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

335:Sh Santosh Baron
S/o Bidye Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

336:Sh Probat Kusum
S/o Arbua
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

337:Sh Santi Moy
S/o Girish Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

338:Sh Bibishon
S/o Mono Ram
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

339:Sh Hridoy Ranjoy
S/o Premo Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

340:Smt Sanjorika
S/o Chitto Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

341:Smt Santi Priyo
S/o Amulya Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

342:Sh Biro Lal
S/o Santi Kumar
R/o Mauzam



Lunglei District

343:Sh Poran Dhan
S/o Kripa Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

344:Sh Pattori Mala
S/o Doya Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

345:Sh Lokkhi Ranjan
S/o Surosen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

346:Sh Arun Bikash
S/o Sneho Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

347:Sh Subasbosu
S/o Karmadhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

348:Sh Purna Bikash
S/o Probath Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

349:Sh Dhono Ban
S/o Probath Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

350:Sh Surjo Lal
S/o Sommuni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

351:Smt Monu Mala
D/o Nihar Bindu
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

352:Sh Prem Lal



S/o Chandro Nath
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

353:Sh Gyana Ranjan
S/o Dharmo Joy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

354:Sh Robi Dhon
S/o Assatama
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

355:Sh Rajo Lekkhi
S/o Jobolokho
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

356:Smt Asha
D/o Priyo Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

357:Sh Buddho
S/o Dharma
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

358:Sh Robi Ranjan
S/o Premo Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

359:Sh Buddha Ranjan
S/o Premo Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

360:Smt Chitro Rikha
D/o Nilo Baron
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

361:Smt Pricha
D/o Priyo Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



362:Smt Minakki
D/o Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

363:Sh Santi Kumar
S/o Bitrosen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

364:Sh Sudho Dhan
S/o Purna Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

365:Sh Zinim
S/o Lokhi Ranjon
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

366:Smt Tungpudi
D/o Santosh
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

367:Sh Sureswari
S/o Santi Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

368:Sh Ashok Kumar
S/o Phuleswar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

369:Smt Podha Devi
D/o Kobison
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

370:Smt Monu Mala
D/o Kripa Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

371:Sh Mitro
S/o Biswa Karma



R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

372:Sh Samar Bijoy
S/o Toroni Sen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

373:Sh Hredo Mon
S/o Lengti
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

374:Smt Malabi
D/o Amulyo Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

375:Smt Sona Mala
D/o Garadish Chand
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

376:Sh Manglajoy
S/o Sawmliana
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

377:Sh Nundanga
S/o Biah Muni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

378:Sh Ranga Songa
S/o Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

379:Sh Anil Ranjan
S/o Kando Muni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

380:Sh Kala Songha
S/o Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



381:Sh Bishnu Muni
S/o Tanu Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

382:Sh Mijangye
S/o Kisto Mohan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

383:Sh Abotar
S/o Birechye
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

384:Sh Engpuia
S/o Rambol
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

385:Sh Protap
S/o Tanak Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

386:Sh Lushai Mon
S/o Robiram
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

387:Sh Borondo Kumar
S/o Meregye
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

388:Sh Nalini Kumar
S/o Bakkye
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

389:Sh Biro Losko
S/o Blash Muni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

390:Sh Dhanan Joy
S/o Birro Lokko
R/o Mauzam



Lunglei District

391:Sh Subolosko
S/o Blash Muni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

392:Sh Robi Lal
S/o Goirango
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

393:Sh Sumiti Lal
S/o Goirango
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

394:Sh Brondi Kumar
S/o Amilo Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

395:Sh Lokki Kanto
S/o Nagardhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

396:Sh Sumiti Ranjan
S/o Lokkhi Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

397:Sh Hridy Ranjan
S/o Lushai Mon
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

398:Sh Premo Ranjan
S/o Lokhi Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

399:Sh Hitton
S/o Lokhi Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

400:Sh Suresh Chandra



S/o Rajo Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

401:Smt Mirgo Lokhi
S/o Preo Tap
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

402:Sh Lokhiman
S/o Allya
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

403:Sh Nobin Kanto
S/o Jubo Raj
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

404:Sh Sushil Kanti
S/o Arun Chandro
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

405:Sh Santi Moy
S/o Gayto Muni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

406:Smt Rijep Pudi
S/o Phulukkia
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

407:Sh Punong Chand
S/o Nundanga
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

408:Sh James Clinton
S/o Nundanga
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

409:Smt Nitya Rani
S/o Boloram
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



410:Smt Maharani
D/o Nundanga
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

411:Smt Kalabi
D/o Birolosko
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

412:Smt Lokhi Rani
S/o Nolinosko
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

413:Sh Rahul
S/o Nolinosko
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

414:Smt Santi Rani
D/o Nita Rani
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

415:Sh Boloram
S/o Ereisingh
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

416:Sh Moti Lal
S/o Ramoni Lal
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei
District

417:Smt Sona Devi
D/o Anondo Lal
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

418:Sh Amrito
S/o Sen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

419:Smt Nancy



D/o Nundanga
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

420:Sh Sona
S/o Nundanga
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

421:Sh Lokhi Kumar
S/o Magbadi
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

422:Smt Tolosi Mala
D/o Nabi Pudi
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

423:Sh Meye Dhan
S/o Soronya
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

424:Sh Arun
S/o Egonya
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

425:Sh Monu Ranjan
S/o Tung San
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

426:Sh Meddolya
S/o Gulsoga
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

427:Sh Priti Sabjon
S/o Puleypedra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

428:Sh Bona Kumar
S/o Goidom Muni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



429:Sh Lalremruata
S/o Annuamuni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

430:Sh Hal Puia
S/o Hum Dagoni
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

431:Sh Thong
S/o Phor Chand
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

432:Sh Probin
S/o Malak Hana
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

433:Sh Krisno Kumar
S/o Bitro Sen
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

434:Sh Debbo Makka
S/o Tanak Chandra
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

435:Sh Nghaktea
S/o Chalzawna
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

436:Sh F.Lalchhuanawma
S/o F.Lianthangpuia
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

437:Sh Buddho Moni
S/o Karna Dhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

438:Smt Kalabi
D/o Moni Raton



R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

439:Sh Turon Dhan
S/o Natun Chandro
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

440:Sh Sureshdhan
S/o Brisoketu
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

441:Smt Ranga Bogi
D/o Ranjon
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

442:Sh Nayon
S/o Gayano Chakma
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

443:Sh Pring
S/o Karanadhan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

444:Sh Kadambolodha
S/o Lokki Mon
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

445:Sh Ranjit Kumar
S/o Sudhir
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

446:Sh Ramani Kanto
S/o Suresh Bikash
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

447:Sh Ramani Ranjan
S/o Budha Sankar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District



448:Sh Buddha Ranjan
S/o Durga Sur
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

449:Sh Milan
S/o Nibaran
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

450:Sh Natun Chand
S/o Shanti Moy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

451:Sh Arun
S/o Sankar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

452:Sh Madhu Sudhan
S/o Tridip
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

453:Sh Sushil
S/o Prabu Ranjan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

454:Sh Natun Joy
S/o Kali Kumar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

455:Sh Suresh Bihari
S/o Sunil Mar
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

456:Sh Shul Kamal
S/o Narayan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

457:Sh Nil Kamal
S/o Jaroni
R/o Mauzam



Lunglei District

458:Sh Nirod
S/o Poni Bushan
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

459:Sh Tapan
S/o Surojoy
R/o Mauzam
Lunglei District

460:The State of Mizoram
R/b the Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Aizawl

461:The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Revenue Department
Aizawl

462:The Deputy Commissioner and District Collector
Lunglei District
Lunglei

463:The Union of India
R/b the Secretary to the Govt. of India
Ministry of Home Affairs
Border Management Division-I
New Delhi-1

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Roshan Subedi
Advocate for the Respondent : Ms Zairemsangpuii for R463

Linked Case : I.A.(Civil)/117/2025

Engineering Projects (India) Limited
(A government of India is Enterprise) R/b its Executive Director
Kolkata
West Bengal

VERSUS

Sh Chitrosen and 555 Ors.
S/o Puina Muni
R/o Silgur



Lunglei District

For the Applicant/Appellant(s) : Mr. P. Goswami, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/Respondent(s): Mr. C. Lalramzauva, Senior Counsel.
Mr. Stephen Lalbuatsaiha, Adv.
Mr. Samuel Vanlalhriata Chhangte,
Addl. AG
Ms. Zairemsangpui, Adv.

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJAN MONI KALITA**

Date(s) of Hearing :- 24.06.2026

Date on which judgment is reserved :- 24.06.2026

Date of pronouncement of judgment : - 11.08.2026

**Whether the pronouncement is of the
operative part of the judgment? :- N/A**

**Whether the full judgment has been
pronounced :- Yes**

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (CAV)

(A.M. Kalita, J)

Heard Mr. Priyanshu Goswami, the learned counsel, appearing for the Applicant. Also heard Mr. C. Lalramzauva, learned Senior Counsel, assisted by Mr. Stephen Lalbuatsaiha, the learned counsel for the opposite party nos. 1 to 459, as well as Mr. Samuel Vanlalhriata Chhangte, the learned Additional Advocate



General for the Opposite Party nos. 460 to 462 and Ms. Zairemsangpuii, the learned counsel for the Opposite Party no. 463.

2. The instant Application, under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, has been filed by the Applicant praying for condonation of delay of 135 days in filing the connected appeal, i.e., Writ Appeal No. 8 of 2025, assailing the common Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) No. 75/2019 and W.P.(C) No. 76/2019.

3. The summary of facts leading to filing of the instant Application is outlined herein below: -

3.1. The private Respondents herein, as writ petitioners, preferred a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India before this Court, which was registered as W.P.(C) No. 75/2019.

3.2. The case of the petitioners therein is that the Draft Award No. 3 of 2009 was issued by the Deputy Commissioner and District Collector, Lunglei District, Mizoram for construction of Indo-Bangla Border Road-cum-Fencing for an amount of Rs. 3,28,26,674/- (Rupees Three Crore Twenty-Eight Lakh Twenty-Six Thousand Six Hundred and Seventy-four) only, which includes compensation payable amounting to Rs. 3,28,05,674/- (Rupees Three Crore Twenty-Eight Lakh Five Thousand Six Hundred and Seventy-Four) only, plus an amount of Rs. 21,000/- (Rupees Twenty-One Thousand) only as administrative cost and stationeries. The entire amount was already paid by the Applicant.

3.3. However, the writ petitioners, who are the villagers, were not aware that as per Section 23(1A) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short, L.A. Act, 1894), they are entitled to payment of interest calculated at the rate of 12% per annum on the market value of the land for the period commencing on and from the date of publication of the notification under Section 4(1) of the L.A. Act, 1894 in



respect of such lands to the date of award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier; and as per Section 23(2) of the L.A. Act, 1894, in addition to the market value of the land, a solatium of 30% on such market value in consideration of the compulsory nature of acquisition.

3.4. Therefore, the non-payment of solatium and interest to the petitioners is arbitrary and in violation of Article 14 and 300A of the Constitution of India, as it amounts to non-compliance of Section 23(1A) and (2) of the L.A. Act, 1894; and the payment of solatium and interest cannot be denied to the petitioners on the ground of limitation because there can be no limitation against statutory benefits. Accordingly, the writ petitioners prayed for setting aside and quashing of the order dated 18.09.2014, passed by the District & Sessions Judge, Lunglei in L.A. Case No. 1 of 2014 and also prayed for directing the respondents in the writ petition to give solatium at the rate of 30% and interest at the rate of 12% per annum in accordance with Section 23(1A) and (2) of L.A. Act, 1894 for acquiring the lands of the petitioners by way of Draft Award No. 3 of 2009.

3.5. It is the contention of the Applicant that although the Respondent no. 4 in the writ petition, i.e., Department of Border Management, Ministry of Home Affairs, Union of India, represented by its Under Secretary, as well as the Respondent no. 5 in the writ petition, i.e., Engineering Projects (India) Limited, had contested the aforesaid contentions of the writ petitioners by filing their respective affidavits-in-opposition, vide the common Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025, the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) No. 75/2019 and W.P.(C) No. 76/2019 allowed the aforesaid writ petitions.

3.6. Being highly aggrieved by the aforesaid common Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025, passed in W.P.(C) No. 75/2019 and W.P.(C) No. 76/2019, the Applicant has preferred the connected Writ Appeal No. 8/2025, before this



Hon'ble Court. The instant I.A. is connected to Writ Appeal No. 8 of 2025.

3.7. The Applicant herein has contended that though the Applicant ought to have filed the connected writ appeal on or before 09.03.2025, i.e., within the 30 days prescribed period of limitation, the same could not be filed within the prescribed limitation period for reasons beyond its control and the same has been filed on 22.07.2025; and as a consequence, there has been a delay of 135 days in preferring the connected appeal. It is contended that the Applicant was prevented from preferring the connected appeal within the limitation period by "sufficient cause" and therefore, the instant Application has been preferred explaining the "sufficient cause" with a prayer for condonation of delay in filing the connected appeal.

3.8. It is contended by the Applicant that upon delivery of the common Judgment & Order on 06.02.2025, it procured the copy of the Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025 and the same was duly forwarded to the concerned officials of the Applicant in the 2nd week of February, 2025 at its Head Office in Delhi, along with the entire record of W.P.(C) No. 75/2019 for their perusal and opinion. It is contended that the whole process took some time as the Brief of W.P.(C) No. 75/2019 and other associated documents are voluminous in nature and also due to the fact that there is no proper office and staff of the Applicant in Aizawl, Mizoram, and the same has to be done from Guwahati, which took some more time.

3.9. It is contended that the Applicant had disbursed the amount in respect of acquisition proceeding; however, the same amount was being received by the Applicant from the Ministry of Home Affairs and as such, the views of the Ministry of Home Affairs are very essential for the instant case. This is due to the fact that in the event the Applicant is required to provide any additional amount



in terms of the Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025, passed in W.P.(C) No. 75/2019, the same is needed to be first released from the Ministry of Home Affairs and only then the additional amount, if any, can be paid by the Applicant to the private respondents.

3.10. It is contended by the Applicant that after passing of the common Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025 in W.P.(C) No. 75/2019, the Deputy Commissioner & District Collector, Lunglei District, Lunglei, vide memo number L-11020/140(CRT)/2019-LRS(L)/69 dated 10.03.2025, had fixed the land value in respect of Award No. 3 of 2009. A perusal of the aforesaid letter dated 10.03.2025 would show that the said letter was issued in contradiction to the award, inasmuch as, the same stated that LSCs and Periodic Pattas were issued by the Land Revenue and Settlement Department, Government of Mizoram, and passes in respect of houses were issued by Village Council Authorities as provided under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Lushai Hills (Village Councils) Act, 1953. It is contended that the aforesaid statement is in contrary to what is mentioned in the award—that passes were issued by Village Council Authorities as provided under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Lushai Hills (House Sites) Act, 1953. More so, there is no LSC holders under Award No. 3/2009 based on the order issued by the then Deputy Commissioner, Lunglei District, Lunglei, vide letter number L-11020/1/2000-LRS(L) dated 19.03.2007 pertaining to fixation of rates of compensation of lands, buildings, crops, plants, properties, etc., in respect of Indo-Bangladesh border area. The market value of the lands of the private respondents under VC House Passes who have prevailed at the time of making assessment of Award No. 3 of 2009, was fixed at Rs. 6/- per sq. ft. It is contended that confirming the value of Rs. 6/- per sq. ft. is fixed on the basis of the aforesaid letter dated 19.03.2007 issued by the Deputy Commissioner, Lunglei. The letter dated 10.03.2025 from Deputy Commissioner, Lunglei further



stated that solatium and interest in respect of Award No. 3 of 2009 shall be calculated on the basis of the value of land as fixed. Therefore, the financial involvement and the basis of calculation were not quantified to the said date of letter to take an appropriate action.

3.11. It is contended by the Applicant that thereafter, vide letter number EPI/NE/PMD-I/DC-MIZ/001/2391 dated 10.06.2025, the Applicant herein requested the Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Collector, Lunglei District, Lunglei to furnish the following documents so that further steps could be taken: -

(i) Letter number L-11020/1/2000-LRS(L) dated 19.03.2007 issued by the then DC, Lunglei referred in letter memo number L-11020/140(CRT)/2019-LRS(L)/69 dated 10.03.2025 issued by DC, Lunglei fixing the land value.

(ii) Assessment sheet for calculation of solatium and interest showing the land area acquired from the petitioners (private respondents herein) in Award No. 3 of 2009 and also showing the total area of land in the passes of the petitioners (private respondents herein).

(iii) Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for Award No. 3 of 2009.

(iv) Declaration under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for Award No. 3 of 2009.

3.12. It is contended by the Applicant that, as the Ministry of Home Affairs is also an interested party and a party respondent in W.P.(C) No. 75/2019, the Ministry of Home Affairs also independently assessed the correctness of the Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025. Thereafter, vide letter bearing No. DoBM/UO No. 11017/41/2023-BM.III dated 08.05.2025, intimated the Applicant to prefer an appeal against the Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025 passed in



W.P.(C) No. 75/2019.

3.13. It is contended by the Applicant that, upon receipt of requisite instructions, the Applicant approached its counsel in the last week of May, 2025 and handed over the aforesaid documents, requesting the counsel to start preparing for the appeal. It is contended that the drafting of the writ appeal and the present Application also took some time. Upon preparing the connected appeal, the same was duly forwarded to the concerned officials of the Applicant for vetting, for which some further time was spent. It is also contended that the authorized signatory is based out of Aizawl and finally, upon completion of the entire procedure, the connected writ appeal could be filed on 22.07.2025.

3.14. It is contended by the Applicant that although the Applicant sought certain documents from the Deputy Commissioner, Lunglei, however, till date, the Applicant is yet to receive the same. It is contended that the connected appeal could not be filed within the prescribed period of limitation due to the non-availability of certain documents and necessary instructions, which were essential for the preparation of the connected appeal.

3.15. It is contended by the Applicant that the circumstances, as explained in the instant application, would show that the delay has been caused not because of any deliberate negligence or laches on the part of the Applicant, but for causes beyond its control.

3.16. In view of the aforesaid facts as narrated hereinabove, the present Application has been filed by the Applicant for condonation of delay in filing the connected writ appeal by 135 days.

I.A. (Civil) No. 117/2025 in W.A. No. 9/2025

4. In this Application also, the Applicant is the same, i.e., Engineering Projects (India) Limited and the connected writ appeal, i.e., W.A. No. 9 of 2025, has been



filed by the Applicant/Appellant assailing the same common Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025 in W.P.(C) No. 76/2019 and W.P.(C) No. 75/2019. In both the aforesaid writ petitions, Draft Award No. 3 of 2009, issued by the Deputy Commissioner & District Collector, Lunglei District, Mizoram, was in issue.

5. The facts in both writ petitions are almost the same and the issues involved are also identical. However, the compensation amounts involved in both the writ petitions are different and the claims of the respective petitioners in the aforesaid two writ petitions are also distinct. However, since the facts are similar and both the aforesaid writ petitions were disposed of by the common Judgment & Order dated 06.02.2025 and the reasons for the delays as explained in both I.A.s, namely, I.A. No. 116/2025 and I.A. No. 117/2025 are identical, the facts and explanations provided in I.A. No. 117/2025 are not repeated again.

6. Learned Counsel, Mr. P. Goswami, has represented the Applicant, i.e., Engineering Projects (India) Limited in both I.A.s. Mr. C. Lalramzauva, learned Senior Counsel, has represented the private respondents in both I.A.s. Mr. Samuel Vanlalhriata Chhange, learned Additional Advocate General, has represented the State Opposite Parties. Ms. Zairemsangpuui, learned counsel, has appeared for the Respondent, Union of India.

7. Mr. P. Goswami, learned counsel appearing for the Applicants, submits that the delay that has occurred in filing the connected writ appeals is not due to any deliberate negligence or laches on the part of the Applicants, but for reasons beyond their control. He submits that the Applicants have been pursuing the matters with due diligence and utmost sincerity all along and at no stage was there any intentional lapse on the part of the Applicants. He submits that the Applicant, being a Government entity and owing to the fact that it's Head Office is located in Delhi, some time was consumed in transmitting the voluminous



documents along with the writ petitions. He submits that "sufficient cause" (as contemplated under the Limitation Act) is present in the instant Applications and such "sufficient cause" has been adequately explained in the both the Applications.

8. Mr. Goswami, submits that in both the connected writ appeals, the Appellants have enough merits to succeed in their appeals. He submits that, being a government entity, there are several layers whereby the brief has to pass through for ultimate opinion and approval of the authority. He submits that, in addition to the aforesaid, since Ministry of Home Affairs is also an interested party and if the appeals fail, the money has to come from the Ministry of Home Affairs and therefore, the consent of the Ministry of Home Affairs for filing the writ appeals are necessary and the same also took some time. Therefore, he submits that the delay which has been caused is not intentional and there was no negligence on the part of the Applicants in filing the connected writ appeals.

9. In support of his submission that when there is sufficient merit in the case, a delay in filing the case should not be a bar for the court to condone the delay, he has referred to the case of ***Collector, Land Acquisition, Anantnag and Another v. Mst. Katiji and Others***, reported in ***1987 (2) SCC 107***. He has also referred to the case of ***Sheo Raj Singh (deceased) through legal representatives and Others versus Union of India and Another***, reported in ***(2023) 10 SCC 531***, submitting that the principle laid down in the case of ***Mst. Katiji (supra)*** still holds the field and has been referred in the case of ***Sheo Raj Singh (supra)***.

10. ***Per contra***, Mr. Lalramzauva, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the private respondents in both the I.A.s, submits that the instant applications praying for condoning delay of 135 days cannot be condoned due to the fact that no "sufficient cause" has been shown by the Applicants in delayed preference of



the connected writ appeals. He submits that every day's delay has to be properly explained and it is a settled law that to consider the explanation of delay to be sufficient, detailed explanation of delay and that the same is unintentional and not due to negligence has to be properly demonstrated before the court. He submits that as far as the instant applications are concerned, though the common Judgment and Order was passed on 06.02.2025 in presence of the counsel appearing for the Applicants as well as Ministry of Home Affairs, the Applicants took enormous time in filing the connected writ appeals. He submits that the delays in filing the connected writ appeals have caused enormous suffering to the private respondents as they have been denied of their legitimate dues in terms of the Judgment and Order dated 06.02.2025. He submits that in the recent years, the law of limitation has undergone some vital changes and the laxity given to the government authorities in filing cases in a delayed manner and condoning such delays, have been changed. He submits that in earlier times, the courts used to be lenient and used to condone delays in filing petition by the government authorities with ease. However, in recent times, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed in many of the cases that the laxity given to the government authorities in filing petitions before the court beyond the time of limitation as prescribed under the Limitation Act, 1963 cannot be provided as a matter of right. He submits that in recent times, the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that the government authorities and private parties should be put on the same platform while filing petitions in courts and if there are any delays in filing such petitions, the delays have to be condoned after due consideration of the "sufficient cause" as provided by the government authorities, but not only due to the fact that the petitions are filed by government authorities. The learned Senior Counsel further submits that the cases of *Katiji (supra)* and *Sheo Raj Singh (supra)* are no longer holding the field wherein lenient views were taken by the Hon'ble Apex



Court where the government authorities are the petitioners or applicants. He submits that merit in the connected petition/appeal may not be the only criterion in deciding a petition/application for condoning the delays. He submits that priority of consideration should be given to the explanation of “sufficient cause” in the petition/ application for condonation of delays.

11. In support of his submission, the learned Senior Counsel has heavily relied upon the case of ***Shivamma (dead) by Lrs. versus Karnataka Housing Board and Others***, reported in ***2025 SCC OnLine SC 1969***. The learned Senior Counsel submits that the shift in jurisprudence on condonation of delay after the decision of ***Postmaster General versus Living Media India Limited, (2012) 3 SCC 563*** is apparent. While referring to paragraph 196 of the aforesaid judgment of ***Shivamma (supra)***, he submits that any delay as a result of unavailability of documents or the process of arranging for those through bureaucratic process works, is no longer an acceptable reason or exercise to condone such delay. He further submits, while referring to paragraph 197 of the aforesaid case, that the Hon’ble Apex Court has cautioned that where any public authority persists in approaching the courts for condonation of delays on such feeble and untenable grounds, would not only be denied the indulgence of condonation, but would also be imposed with cost for wastage of judicial time. He submits that the explanation provided by the Applicants in the instant cases are typically of bureaucratic nature without giving proper explanation which is required to be given under an application for condonation of delay. The Applications should also meet the same fate as observed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in paragraphs 196 and 197 of the case of ***Shivamma (supra)***. He submits that, as held by the Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of ***Shivamma (supra)***, government litigants, no less than private parties, must demonstrate bona fide, sufficient and cogent cause of delay; and in absence of such justification, the delay cannot be condoned



merely on the ground of the identity of the applicants, i.e., government authorities or agencies. He submits that the instant Applications should be negated or rejected by this court, as has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Shivamma (supra)***.

12. Before getting into the issue involved in the instant cases in hand as to whether there was "sufficient cause" for the Applicants to file the connected writ appeals beyond the limitation period of 30 days, it may be relevant to consider the statutory provision of the Limitation Act, 1963 which is extracted hereinbelow: -

"5. Extension of prescribed period in certain cases — Any appeal or any application, other than an application under any of the provisions of Order XXI of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (5 of 1908), may be admitted after the prescribed period, if the appellant or the applicant satisfies the court that he had sufficient cause for not preferring the appeal or making the application within such period.

Explanation — The fact that the appellant or the applicant was misled by any order, practice or judgment of the High Court in ascertaining or computing the prescribed period, may be sufficient cause within the meaning of this section."

13. From the above provision, it is clear that Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 provides discretionary power to the courts to admit any appeal or application (except that under Order XXI of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908) if filed after the expiry of the prescribed period of limitation. However, the party failing to file within the prescribed period has to show to the court a "sufficient cause" for not filing the same within such prescribed period of limitation and such explanation is satisfactory to the court with sufficiency of such cause. Therefore, "sufficient cause" for the resultant delay in filing the appeal or application is a precondition for the defaulting party and the court must be satisfied with the explanation and sufficiency of cause and then only recourse to



Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 may be taken by the courts and exercise its discretion, thereby condoning the delay and admitting the appeal or application.

14. Interestingly, in the case of ***Shivamma (Dead) (supra)***, the meaning and scope of expression "*within such period*" used in Section 5 of the Limitation Act has been discussed.

15. The Hon'ble Apex Court delved into a serious and detailed discussion about the meaning and scope of expression "*within such period*" as used in Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 by considering various cases decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court.

16. It is seen from the aforesaid judgment of ***Shivamma (supra)*** that there were contradictory views on the subject and after a detailed discussion taking into account those contradictory views, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforesaid case of ***Shivamma (supra)*** held as follows: -

"114. We may, with a view to obviate any confusion, clarify that observations made by this Court in Raj Kumar Choudhary (supra), particularly that 'what events occurred after 91st day till the last is of no consequence' should not be construed devoid of its context. When this Court in Raj Kumar Choudhary (supra) said that events after the expiry of limitation till the date of actual filing would be of no consequence, the same was made in view of the well-established rule that 'sufficient cause must be established that because some of the event or circumstance arising before the limitation expired'. The aforesaid observations of 'what events occurred after the 91st day till the last is of no consequence' in Raj Kumar Choudhary (supra) were made in the peculiar facts of that case, where the appellant had failed to assign any sufficient cause 'occasioning during the period of limitation', which rendered the events occurring after the expiry of limitation as irrelevant.

115. However, as is manifest from the entire discussion above, for the purpose of condonation of delay in terms of Section 5 of the Limitation Act, the delay has to be



explained by establishing existence of 'sufficient cause' for the entirety of the period from when the limitation began till the actual date of filing. In other words, if the period of limitation is 90 days, and the appeal is filed belatedly on the 100th day, then explanation has to be given for the entire 100 days."

17. In the instant case in hand, it is seen that the impugned Judgment and Order was passed on 06.02.2025, against which the connected writ appeals have been filed by the Applicants. It is seen that the connected appeals as well as the I.A.s have been filed on 22.07.2025. In the instant I.A.s, prayers have been made for condonation of delays of 135 days, which show that the Applicants have excluded the limitation period of 30 days while counting the period of delays. However, since the instant I.A.s along with the appeals have been filed before the pronouncement of the Judgment in ***Shivamma (Dead) (supra)***, which was delivered on September 12, 2025, the instant I.A.s along with the appeals cannot be construed to have failed to provide the period of delays wrongly. In other words, the Applicants have counted the period of delays as per the law holding the field at that point of time.

18. Another important issue, which was also discussed in the case of ***Shivamma (supra)***, is about the discretionary power of the courts after the applicant or appellant provides sufficient explanation for "sufficient cause" within the meaning of Section 5 of the Limitation Act. In this connection, paragraph 108 of the aforesaid case of ***Shivamma (supra)***, being relevant, is quoted hereinbelow: -

"108. However, Section 5 of the Limitation Act does not say that once 'sufficient cause' is established and the court is also satisfied about the same, then the appeal or application has to be mandatorily be admitted. On the contrary, the provision, by use of the word 'may', lays emphasis that even after the court is satisfied about the existence of a 'sufficient cause', it has the discretion to decide whether to admit the appeal or application, as the case may be, or not. A catena of decisions of this



Court including Rewa Coalfields (supra) hold that 'even after sufficient cause has been shown a party is not entitled to condonation of delay in question as a matter of right if sufficient cause is shown then the Court has to enquire whether in its discretion it should condone the delay'."

19. From the above, what is discernible is that even though an applicant or appellant is successful in providing "sufficient cause", the court still shall have the discretion whether to condone the delay or not.

20. Keeping in mind the aforesaid principles, we may now examine whether in the instant applications "sufficient cause" have been explained by the Applicants for condoning the delays that have occurred in filing the connected writ appeals.

21. However, before going to the facts of the instant cases, it may be relevant to discuss some of the relevant decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the issue of "sufficient cause" in terms of Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 due to the fact that there has been a perceptible change in the issue of condonation of delay in filing a petition/appeal wherein the appellant/applicant is a government authority or entity or agency.

22. In this connection, the first case which comes to the mind of a court is that of **Mst. Katiji (supra)**. In fact, this case has been laboriously relied upon by the learned counsel appearing for the Applicants. The relevant paragraphs of **Mst. Katiji (supra)** are extracted hereinbelow: -

"3. The legislature has conferred the power to condone delay by enacting Section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act of 1963 in order to enable the courts to do substantial justice to parties by disposing of matters on 'merits'. The expression 'sufficient cause' employed by the legislature is adequately elastic to enable the courts to apply the law in a meaningful manner which subserves the ends of justice — that being the life-purpose for existence of the institution of courts. It is common knowledge that this Court has been making a justifiably liberal approach in



matters instituted in this Court. But the message does not appear to have percolated down to all the other courts in the hierarchy. And such a liberal approach is adopted on principle as it is realized that:

- 1. Ordinarily a litigant does not stand to benefit by lodging an appeal late.*
- 2. Refusing to condone delay can result in a meritorious matter being thrown out at the very threshold and cause of justice being defeated. As against this when delay is condoned the highest that can happen is that a cause would be decided on merits after hearing the parties.*
- 3. 'Every day's delay must be explained' does not mean that a pedantic approach should be made. Why not every hour's delay, every minute's delay? The doctrine must be applied in a rational common sense pragmatic manner.*
- 4. When substantial justice and technical considerations are pitted against each other, cause of substantial justice deserves to be preferred for the other side cannot claim to have a vested right in injustice being done because of a non-deliberate delay.*
- 5. There is no presumption that delay is occasioned deliberately, or on account of culpable negligence, or on account of mala fides. A litigant does not stand to benefit by resorting to delay. In fact he runs a serious risk.*
- 6. It must be grasped that judiciary is respected not on account of its power to legalize injustice on technical grounds but because it operates as a equalizer to destroy injustice.*

Making a justice-oriented approach from this perspective, there was sufficient cause for condoning the delay in the institution of the appeal. The fact that it was the 'State' which was seeking condonation and not a private party was altogether irrelevant. The doctrine of equality before law demands that all litigants, including the State as a litigant, are accorded the same treatment and the law is administered in an even-handed manner. There is no warrant for according a step-motherly treatment when the 'State' is the applicant praying for



condonation of delay. In fact experience shows that on account of an impersonal machinery (no one in charge of the matter is directed hit or hurt by the judgment sought to be subjected to appeal) and the inherited bureaucratic methodology imbued with the note-making, file-pushing, and passing-on-the-buck ethos, delay on its part is less difficult to understand though more difficult to approve. In any event, the State which represents the collective cause of the community, does not deserve a litigant-non-grata status. The courts therefore have to be informed with the spirit and philosophy of the provision in the course of the interpretation of the expression "sufficient cause". So also the same approach has to be evidenced in its application to matters at hand with the end in view to do even-handed justice on merits in preference to the approach which scuttles a decision on merits. Turning to the facts of the matter giving rise to the present appeal, we are satisfied that sufficient cause exists for the delay. The order of the High Court dismissing the appeal before it as time-barred, is therefore, set aside. Delay is condoned. And the matter is remitted to the High Court. The High Court will now dispose of the appeal on merits after affording reasonable opportunity of hearing to both the sides.

4. Appeal is allowed accordingly. No costs."

23. In a similar manner, in the case of ***Special Tehsildar, Land Acquisition v. K.V. Ayisumma***, reported in ***(1996) 10 SCC 634***, the Hon'ble Apex Court emphasized that since the State represents the collective cause of the public, any delay on its part ought not to be viewed through the same lens as that of a private party. In this case, the Hon'ble Apex Court, taking a pragmatic view, observed as follows: -

"2. It is now settled law that when the delay was occasioned at the behest of the Government, it would be very difficult to explain the day-to-day delay. The transaction of the business of the Government was being done leisurely by the officers who had no or evince no personal interest at different levels. No one takes personal responsibility in processing the matters expeditiously. As a fact at several stages, they take their own time to reach a decision. Even in spite of pointing at the delay, they do not take expeditious action for ultimate decision in filing the appeal.



This case is one of such instances. It is true that Section 5 of the Limitation Act envisages explanation of the delay to the satisfaction of the court and in matters of Limitation Act made no distinction between the State and citizen. Nonetheless adoption of strict standard of proof leads to grave miscarriage of public justice. It would result in public mischief by skillful management of delay in the process of filing the appeal. The approach of the Court should be pragmatic but not pedantic. Under those circumstances, the Subordinate Judge has rightly adopted correct approach and had condoned the delay without insisting upon explaining every day's delay in filing the review application in the light of the law laid down by this Court. The High Court was not right in setting aside the order. Delay was rightly condoned."

24. Taking a similar view, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Pundlik Jalam Patil (Dead) by Lrs. v. Exe. Eng, Jalgaon Medium Project & Another***, reported in (2008) 17 SCC 448, observed as follows: -

"29. It needs no restatement at our hands that the object for fixing time-limit for litigation is based on public policy fixing a lifespan for legal remedy for the purpose of general welfare. They are meant to see that the parties do not resort to dilatory tactics but avail their legal remedies promptly. Salmond in his Jurisprudence states that the laws come to the assistance of the vigilant and not of the sleepy.

30. Public interest undoubtedly is a paramount consideration in exercising the courts' discretion wherever conferred upon it by the relevant statutes. Pursuing stale claims and multiplicity proceedings in no manner subserves public interest. Prompt and timely payment of compensation to the landlosers facilitating their rehabilitation/resettlement is equally an integral part of public policy. Public interest demands that the State or the beneficiary of acquisition, as the case may be, should not be allowed to indulge in any act to unsettle the settled legal rights accrued in law by resorting to avoidable litigation unless the claimants are guilty of deriving benefit to which they are otherwise not entitled, in any fraudulent manner. One should not forget the basic fact that what is acquired is not the land



but the livelihood of the landlosers. These public interest parameters ought to be kept in mind by the courts while exercising the discretion dealing with the application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act. Dragging the landlosers to courts of law years after the termination of legal proceedings would not serve any public interest. Settled rights cannot be lightly interfered with by condoning inordinate delay without there being any proper explanation of such delay on the ground of involvement of public revenue. It serves no public interest.

31. It is true that when the State and its instrumentalities are the applicants seeking condonation of delay they may be entitled to certain amount of latitude but the law of limitation is same for citizen and for governmental authorities. The Limitation Act does not provide for a different period to the Government in filing appeals applications as such. It would be a different matter where the Government makes out a case where public interest was shown to have suffered owing to acts of fraud or collusion on the part of its officers or agents and where the officers were clearly at cross purposes with it. In a given case if any such facts are pleaded or proved they cannot be excluded from consideration and those factors may go into the judicial verdict. In the present case, no such facts are pleaded and proved though a feeble attempt by the learned counsel for the respondent was made to suggest collusion and fraud but without any basis. We cannot entertain the submission made across the Bar without there being any proper foundation in the pleadings."

25. With the same view, the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the case of ***State of Haryana v. Chandra Mani***, reported in (1996) 3 SCC 132, observed as follows: -

"11. It is notorious and common knowledge that delay in more than 60 per cent of the cases filed in this Court—be it by a private party or the State—are barred by limitation and this Court generally adopts liberal approach in condonation of delay finding somewhat sufficient cause to decide the appeal on merits. It is equally common knowledge that litigants including State are accorded the same treatment and the law is administered in an even-handed manner. When the State is an applicant, praying for condonation of delay, it is common knowledge that on



account of impersonal machinery and the inherited bureaucratic methodology imbued with the note-making, file-pushing, and passing-on-the-buck ethos, delay on the part of the State is less difficult to understand though more difficult to approve, but the State represents collective cause of the community. It is axiomatic that decisions officers/agencies proverbially at slow pace and encumbered process of pushing the files from table to table and keeping it on table for considerable time causing delay - intentional or otherwise - is a routine. Considerable delay of procedural red-tape in the process of their making decision is a common feature. Therefore, certain amount of latitude is not impermissible. If the appeals brought by the State are lost for such default no person is individually affected but what in the ultimate analysis suffers, is public interest. The expression "sufficient cause" should, therefore, be considered with pragmatism in justice-oriented approach rather than the technical detection of sufficient cause for explaining every day's delay. The factors which are peculiar to and characteristic of the functioning of the governmental conditions would be cognizant to and requires adoption of pragmatic approach in justice-oriented process. The court should decide the matters on merits unless the case is hopelessly without merit. No separate standards to determine the cause laid by the State vis-à-vis private litigant could be laid to prove strict standards of sufficient cause. The Government at appropriate level should constitute legal cells to examine the cases whether any legal principles are involved for decision by the courts or whether cases require adjustment and should authorise the officers to take a decision or give appropriate permission for settlement. In the event of decision to file appeal needed prompt action should be pursued by the officer responsible to file the appeal and he should be made personally responsible for lapses, if any. Equally, the State cannot be put on the same footing as an individual. The individual would always be quick in taking the decision whether he would pursue the remedy by way of an appeal or application since he is a person legally injured while State is an impersonal machinery working through its officers or servants. Considered from this perspective, it must be held that the delay of 109 days in this case has been explained and that it is a fit case for condonation of the delay."



26. In *G. Ramegowda, Major vs. Special Land Acquisition Officer*, reported in (1988) 2 SCC 142, following a similar view, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as follows: -

"15. In litigations to which Government is a party there is yet another aspect which, perhaps, cannot be ignored. If appeals brought by Government are lost for such defaults, no person is individually affected; but what, in the ultimate analysis, suffers is public interest. The decisions of Government are collective and institutional decisions and do not share the characteristics of decisions of private individuals.

16. The law of limitation is, no doubt, the same for a private citizen as for governmental authorities. Government, like any other litigant must take responsibility for the acts or omissions of its officers. But a somewhat different complexion is imparted to the matter where Government makes out a case where public interest was shown to have suffered owing to acts of fraud or bad faith on the part of its officers or agents and where the officers were clearly at cross-purposes with it.

17. Therefore, in assessing what, in a particular case, constitutes "sufficient cause" for purposes of Section 5, it might, perhaps, be somewhat unrealistic to exclude from the considerations that go into the judicial verdict, these factors which are peculiar to and characteristic of the functioning of the government. Governmental decisions are proverbially slow encumbered, as they are, by a considerable degree of procedural red tape in the process of their making. A certain amount of latitude is, therefore, impermissible. It is rightly said that those who bear responsibility of Government must have "a little play at the joints", Due recognition of these limitations on governmental functioning of course, within reasonable limits - is necessary if the judicial approach is not to be rendered unrealistic. It would, perhaps, be unfair and unrealistic to put government and private parties on the same footing in all respects in such matters. [...]"

27. From the above observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court, it is very clear that



in the aforesaid cases, the Hon'ble Apex Court has been consistently taking a pragmatic view regarding delays committed by government entities, organizations or agencies in filing petitions or appeals. Such views were, obviously, due to the reason that the government, being the representative of the public and involving public interest by representing the cause of the public, the courts should be practical in considering the delays. This was also due to the fact that in a government agency, authority or entity, there are various layers through which a brief of a case has to pass through for approval for filing of a petition or appeal. It has also been discussed in the above cases that there are instances of "everybody's responsibility is nobody's responsibility" syndrome. Therefore, taking into account those practical issues common in government departments, agencies or entities, the courts are bit lenient in condoning the delays committed by government entities, agencies or authorities. However, the aforesaid approach has come under scrutiny in various subsequent cases by the Hon'ble Apex Court, and there have been some noticeable changes in the approach of the Hon'ble Apex Court in such cases, wherein the government is a party. In those subsequent cases (which will be discussed later on), the Hon'ble Apex Court tried to make a balance between a government litigant and a private litigant. This is due to the fact that once a government entity is given some leniency, the private party suffers from the aforesaid leniency. There are other factors also which were considered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in subsequent cases, amongst others, the lethargic and clumsy attitude of the government officials in handling certain important cases, the advancement in communication and technology in these days and digitalization of documentation, etc.

28. A major shift in jurisprudence on condonation of delay involving government departments, authorities, agencies or entities could be noticed in the observation of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Postmaster General***



(supra), wherein, the Hon'ble Apex Court has deviated from the earlier practice of extending unwarranted leniency to government authorities, agencies, entities or departments and emphasized the fact that the law of limitation is equal for the State as well as other private entities. It observed that Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 does not differentiate among different litigants. The applicability of the provisions of Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 is equal for all litigants, though the discretion is still with the courts. It observed that the so-called inherited bureaucratic methodology can neither be accepted as an excuse for the delays, nor its claim of being impersonal machinery can be accepted anymore. The Hon'ble Apex Court, in the aforesaid case, observed as follows: -

“27. It is not in dispute that the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issues involved including the prescribed period of limitation for taking up the matter by way of filing a special leave petition in this Court. They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings. In the absence of plausible and acceptable explanation, we are posing a question why the delay is to be condoned mechanically merely because the Government or a wing of the Government is a party before us.

28. Though we are conscious of the fact that in a matter of condonation of delay when there was no gross negligence or deliberate inaction or lack of bona fides, a liberal concession has to be adopted to advance substantial justice, we are of the view that in the facts and circumstances, the Department cannot take advantage of various earlier decisions. The claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody, including the Government.

29. In our view, it is the right time to inform all the government bodies, their agencies and instrumentalities that unless they have reasonable and acceptable explanation for the delay and there was bona fide effort, there is no need to accept



the usual explanation that the file was kept pending for several months/years due to considerable degree of procedural red tape in the process. The government departments are under a special obligation to ensure that they perform their duties with diligence and commitment. Condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for the government departments. The law shelters everyone under the same light and should not be swirled for the benefit of a few."

29. The Hon'ble Apex Court, while observing that in certain occasions a liberal approach can be adopted in matters of condonation of delay, however, such liberal approach cannot be automatically extended to the cases where a government entity or agency is involved and found to be in default of serious lapses and negligence. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Amalendu Kumar Bera Vs State of West Bengal, reported in (2013) 4SCC 52*** has observed as follows: -

"9. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the appellant and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent State. There is no dispute that the expression "sufficient cause" should be considered with pragmatism in justice-oriented approach rather than the technical detection of "sufficient cause" for explaining every day's delay. However, it is equally well settled that the courts albeit liberally considered the prayer for condonation of delay but in some cases the court may refuse to condone the delay inasmuch as the Government is not accepted to keep watch whether the contesting respondent further put the matter in motion. The delay in official business requires its pedantic approach from public justice perspective. In a recent decision in Union of India v. Nripen Sarma [(2013) 4 SCC 57: AIR 2011 SC 1237] the matter came up against the order passed by the High Court condoning the delay in filing the appeal by the appellant Union of India. The High Court refused to condone the delay on the ground that the appellant Union of India took their own sweet time to reach the conclusion whether the judgment should be appealed or not. The High Court also expressed its anguish and distress with the way the State conducts the cases regularly in filing the appeal after the same



became operational and barred by limitation.

10. In the instant case as noticed above, admittedly earlier objection filed by the respondent State under Section 47 of the Code was dismissed on 17-8-2010. Instead of challenging the said order the respondent State after about one year filed another objection on 15-9-2011 under Section 47 of the Code which was finally rejected by the executing court. It was only after a writ of attachment was issued by the executing court that the respondent preferred a civil revision against the first order dated 17-8-2010 along with a petition for condonation of delay. Curiously enough in the application for condonation of delay no sufficient cause has been shown which would entitle the respondent to get a favourable order for condonation of delay. True it is, that courts should always take liberal approach in the matter of condonation of delay, particularly when the appellant is the State but, in a case where there are serious laches and negligence on the part of the State in challenging the decree passed in the suit and affirmed in appeal, the State cannot be allowed to wait to file objection under Section 47 till the decree-holder puts the decree in execution. As noticed above, the decree passed in the year 1967 was in respect of declaration of title and permanent injunction restraining the respondent State from interfering with the possession of the suit property of the appellant-plaintiff. It is evident that when the State tried to interfere with possession the decree-holder had no alternative but to levy the execution case for execution of the decree with regard to interference with possession. In our opinion their delay in filing the execution case cannot be a ground to condone the delay in filing the revision against the order refusing to entertain objection under Section 47 CPC. This aspect of the matter has not been considered by the High Court while deciding the petition for condoning the delay. Merely because the respondent is the State, delay in filing the appeal or revision cannot and shall not be mechanically considered and in the absence of "sufficient cause" delay shall not be condoned."

30. Another important case which comes to our notice is the case of *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Bherulal*, reported in (2020) 10 SCC 654, wherein the



Hon'ble Apex Court, following the ratio laid down in the case of ***Postmaster General (supra)***, took strong exception over the routine manner in which the State and its instrumentalities continue to seek condonation of delay citing reasons which are vague including delays due to official formalities and processes. The relevant observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case are extracted hereinbelow: -

"2. We are constrained to pen down a detailed order as it appears that all our counselling to the Government and government authorities has fallen on deaf ears i.e. the Supreme Court of India cannot be a place for the Governments to walk in when they choose ignoring the period of limitation prescribed. We have raised the issue that if the government machinery is so inefficient and incapable of filing appeals/petitions in time, the solution may lie in requesting the legislature to expand the time period for filing limitation for government authorities because of their gross incompetence. That is not so. Till the statute subsists, the appeals/petitions have to be filed as per the statutes prescribed.

3. No doubt, some leeway is given for the government inefficiencies but the sad part is that the authorities keep on relying on judicial pronouncements for a period of time when technology had not advanced and a greater leeway was given to the Government [LAO v. Katiji]. This position is more than elucidated by the Judgment of this Court in Postmaster General v. Living Media (India) Ltd. (...)

4. A reading of the aforesaid application shows that the reason for such an inordinate delay is stated to be only "due to unavailability of the documents and the process of arranging the documents". In para 4, a reference has been made to "bureaucratic process works, it is inadvertent that delay occurs".

6. We are also of the view that the aforesaid approach is being adopted in what we have categorized earlier as "certificate cases". The object appears to be to obtain a certificate of dismissal from the Supreme Court to put a quietus to the issue and thus, say that nothing could be done because the highest Court has dismissed the



appeal. It is to complete this formality and save the skin of officers who may be at default that such a process is followed. We have on earlier occasions also strongly deprecated such a practice and process. There seems to be no improvement. The purpose of coming to this Court is not to obtain such certificates and if the Government suffers losses, it is time when the officer concerned responsible for the same bears the consequences. The irony is that in none of the cases any action is taken against the officers, who sit on the files and do nothing. It is presumed that this Court will condone the delay and even in making submissions, straightaway the counsel appear to address on merits without referring even to the aspect of limitation as happened in this case till we pointed out to the counsel that he must first address us on the question of limitation.

7. We are thus, constrained to send a signal and we propose to do in all matters today, where there are such inordinate delays that the Government or State authorities coming before us must pay for wastage of judicial time which has its own value. Such costs can be recovered from the officers responsible."

31. In fact, in the recent judgment of ***Shivamma (supra)***, the Hon'ble Apex Court has considered all the above-discussed aspects and many of the cases referred above, wherein some leniencies were shown towards delays by the government entities. In paragraph 204 of the case of ***Shivamma (supra)***, the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as follows: -

"204. We are conscious of a few decisions of this Court, particularly in Inder Singh v. State of M.P., 2020 SCC OnLine SC 600, Sheo Raj Singh v. Union of India, (2023) 10 SCC 531 and State of Manipur v. Koting Lamkang, (2019) 10 SCC 408, wherein the decision of Postmaster General (supra) was distinguished or not followed, and the delay on account of the government entity therein was condoned. We shall briefly take a look at these decisions."

32. After discussing the aforementioned cases, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Shivamma (supra)***, at paragraph no. 212, has observed as follows: -



"212. The law as it presently stands, post the decision of Postmaster General (supra), is unambiguous and clear. Condonation of delay is to remain an exception, not the rule. The governmental litigants, no less than private parties, must demonstrate bona fide, sufficient, and cogent cause for delay. Absent such justification, delay cannot be condoned merely on the ground of the identity of the applicant."

33. The Hon'ble Apex Court further expressed its agreement by observing at paragraph no. 214 as follows: -

"214. What has been conveyed in so many words, by the decision of Postmaster General (supra), is that while excuses premised solely on bureaucratic lethargy cannot, by themselves, constitute sufficient cause, there may nonetheless be circumstances where explanation offered, though involving bureaucratic procedures, reflects a genuine and bona fide cause for the delay. In such instances, the true test is whether the explanation demonstrates that the State acted with reasonable diligence and whether delay occurred despite efforts to act within time. Where such bona fides are established, the court retains the discretion to condone the delay."

34. Therefore, it is clear that the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforementioned case (**Shivamma**) has clearly observed that in case where the explanation is bona fide, though there are instances of bureaucratic delay, the same can be condoned with due consideration and discretion by the court.

35. The observations by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Shivamma (supra)** at paragraphs 218 and 219, being relevant, the same are extracted hereinbelow: -

"218. However, equally important to note is that wherever, any explanation is sought to be given on account of bureaucratic lethargy and inherent complexities of governmental decision-making, the same more often than not would invariably always is an "excuse", as experience has shown us, depicted from a long line of decisions of this Court. It is at this stage, where the decision of Postmaster General



(supra) assumes significance. It seeks to convey the messages, that court should not be agnostic, to how the State or its instrumentalities, often tend to take the recourse of condonation of delay in a casual manner.

219. Which is why, as per the ratio of Postmaster General (supra) and a plethora of other subsequent decision, the ordinary approach of the courts, in cases where delay is sought to be condoned by offering the explanation of bureaucratic lethargy or red-tapism, must be one of circumspection and reluctance. The courts ought to loathe in accepting such explanations as "sufficient cause". They should apply their minds carefully, be slow in condoning delays on such reasons, and exceptional instances, where the explanation is found to be genuine, reflective of reasonable vigilance and promptitude in conduct, and free from gross negligence, deliberate inaction, lack of bona fides, or casual indifference, should such an explanation be accepted."

36. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Shivamma (supra)*, in its conclusion, has observed as follows: -

"261. Thus, for the reasons aforesaid, the impugned order of the High Court deserves to be set aside. Before we proceed to close this abundantly clear that Judgment, we deem it appropriate to make administrative lethargy and laxity can never stand as a sufficient ground for condonation of delay, and we want to convey an emphatic message to all the High Courts that delays shall not be condoned on frivolous and superficial grounds, until a proper case of sufficient cause is made out, wherein the State-machinery is able to establish that it acted with bona fides and remained vigilant all throughout. Procedure is a handmaid to justice, as is famously said. But courts, and more particularly the constitutional courts, ought not to obviate the procedure for a litigating State agency, who also equally suffer the bars of limitation from pursuing litigations due to its own lackadaisical attitude.

262. The High Courts ought not give a legitimizing effect to such callous attitude of State authorities or its instrumentalities, and should remain extra cautious, if the party seeking condonation of delay is a State-authority. They should not become



surrogates for State laxity and lethargy. The constitutional courts ought to be cognizant of the apathy and pangs of a private litigant. Litigants cannot be placed in situations of perpetual litigations, wherein the fruits of their decrees or favourable orders are frustrated at later stages. We are at pains to reiterate this everlasting trend, and put all the High Courts to notice, not to reopen matters with inordinate delay, until sufficient cause exists, as by doing so the courts only add insult to the injury, more particularly in appeals under Section 100 of the CPC, wherein its jurisdiction is already limited to questions of law.

263. Limitation periods are prescribed to maintain a sweeping scope for the lis to attain for finality. More than the importance of judicial time, what worries us is the plight of a litigant with limited means, who is to contest against an enormous State, and its elaborate and never-exhausting paraphernalia. Such litigations deserve to be disposed of at the very threshold, because, say if a party litigating against the State, for whatever reason, is unable to contest the condonation of delay in appeal, unlike the present case, it reopens the lis for another round of litigation, and leaves such litigant listless yet again. As courts of conscience, it is our obligation that we assure that a litigant is not sent from pillar to post to seek justice.

264. No litigant should be permitted to be so lethargic and apathetic, much less be permitted by the courts to misuse the process of law."

37. From the above discussion and the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court from time to time till the case of ***Shivamma (supra)***, it is discernible that no undue leniency can be given to any government department or entity or agency if no "sufficient cause" could be justifiably placed before a court by such entities. The court has to treat a government entity or department at par and on the same platform as that of a private litigant. The court is required to do justice to both the litigants, i.e., the government entity or department and the private party. The court cannot ignore the fact that giving a leeway and leniency to a government department can do irreparable harm and loss to the private litigants who may have a favorable order in their hands and they have



been waiting for years for the same to be executed. The provisions of Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 is a statutory provision and the same needs to be complied with in its soul and spirit, without denying the fact that an exception can always be made under the provisions of Section 5 and the discretion has been given to the court so that no party suffers due to certain genuine and bona fide reasons. It is also a fact that due to the result flowing from a statutory provision, the same can, be at times, harsh to one party, but the same cannot save the party and a court does not possess any power to ignore such statutory provision if it results in a hard decision which is not favorable to one party. Moreover, the Hon'ble Apex Court is quite clear in its observations that changing time and technology is also a factor to be considered in the present cases. The leniency provided to the government agencies or departments or entities may not be possible to be given at the present stage if the explanations of "sufficient cause" are only due to certain typical bureaucratic inefficiencies or procedural aspects. This is due to the reason that due to the evolution of modern technology, the communication and transmission of information have become much easier than the earlier days when the transmission and communication were not so easy. Due to such disability, a swift action from the part of the government entity or agency or department may not have been possible, but in modern times, things have changed and the same has become much easier. Therefore, though the courts must adhere to a liberal, pragmatic, and justice-oriented approach, the same has to be done with caution and the courts should always stick to its one principle, i.e., substantial justice.

38. Having discussed the aforesaid principles which are relevant for the proper adjudication of the instant applications, we venture into the factual matrix in the instant Applications.

39. In the instant Applications, it has already been mentioned that the prayers



have been made for condoning delays of 135 days in both the Applications and the explanations as provided in the applications have also been mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. The primary reasons for delay that have been cited by the Applicants are: -

1. The Applicants' Head Office is located in Delhi, whereas the litigation was going on in Aizawl, Mizoram. Bulky and voluminous documents were required to be sent to Delhi for perusal and consideration of filing the appeals. The aforesaid took a reasonable time. It was also mentioned that since the Applicants do not have a proper office in Aizawl, Mizoram, the documents had to be routed through Guwahati, which also took some more time.

2. Ministry of Home Affairs is also a party in the writ petitions and it is the concerned authority which has to pay the additional amount in case the writ appeals are decided against the Applicants/Appellants. Therefore, consideration of filing the appeals and their consent and approval, is necessary, which took further time after the approval of the Head Office of the Applicants.

3. Certain important documents which have been mentioned in the Applications were to be received from the District Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Collector, Lunglei. In spite of request for such documents, the same could not be received, which took time.

40. On perusal of the Applications filed by the Applicants/Appellants, it is seen that the explanation for "sufficient cause" are not date-specific. There is no mention of any date of their respective actions. The explanations are typically bureaucratic in nature, meaning thereby no day-to-day explanation of any delay has been provided which are not in terms of the settled judicial pronouncements.



41. Following the principles as have been laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court from time to time, especially in respect of the litigant been a government entity, department, or agency, we find the explanations are bereft of any "sufficient cause". We do not find any reason to show any leniency in the instant case to the Applicants. This is also due to the fact that the private respondents involved herein are villagers who have been fighting for their dues against acquisition of their lands to be used by the state. Therefore, in our considered view, the explanations for "sufficient cause" in the instant applications are not sustainable and cannot be accepted taking into account the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the cases discussed above.

42. We have also considered the cases referred to by the learned counsel appearing for the Applicants. The case of **Mst. Katiji (supra)** has already been discussed and we don't think any more discussion is required in the aforesaid case.

43. As far as the case of **Sheo Raj Singh (supra)** is concerned, which has been referred to by the learned counsel for the Applicants, the same has also been discussed and considered in the case of **Shivamma (supra)** by the Hon'ble Apex Court, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as follows: -

“208. This Court in Sheo Raj Singh (supra) exhaustively examined all the decisions of this Court, prior to and after the decision of Postmaster General (supra). It observed that although, the subsequent decisions of this Court have not accepted governmental lethargy, tardiness and indolence in presenting appeals as sufficient cause for condonation of delay, yet, because the High Court had condoned the delay by accepting such explanation before the decision of Postmaster General (supra) was rendered, the exercise of discretion by the High Court has to be tested on the anvil of the liberal and justice oriented approach as expounded in the decisions which earlier



occupied the field. It was in light of the aforesaid that this Court, refused to interfere with the exercise of discretion by the High Court therein. The relevant observations read as under: -

"33. Be that as it may, it is important to bear in mind that we are not hearing an application for condonation of delay but sitting in appeal over a discretionary order of the High Court granting the prayer for condonation of delay. In the case of the former, whether to condone or not would be the only question whereas in the latter, whether there has been proper exercise of discretion in favour of grant of the prayer for condonation would be the question. Law is fairly well-settled that "a court of appeal should not ordinarily interfere with the discretion exercised by the courts below". If any authority is required, we can profitably refer to the decision in Manjunath Anandappa v. Tammanasa, which in turn relied on the decision in Gujarat Steel Tubes Ltd. v. Gujarat Steel Tubes Mazdoor Sabha where it has been held that:

"an appellate power interferes not when the order appealed is not right but only when it is clearly wrong".

34. The order under challenge in this appeal is dated 21-12-2011. It was rendered at a point of time when the decisions in Katiji. Ramegowda. Chandra Mani. K.V. Ayisumma and Lipok AO were holding the field. It is not that the said decisions do not hold the field now, having been overruled by any subsequent decision. Although there have been some decisions in the recent past [State of M.P. v. Bherulal is one such decision apart from University of Delhi which have not accepted governmental lethargy, tardiness and indolence in presenting appeals within time as sufficient cause for condonation of delay, yet, the exercise of discretion by the High Court has to be tested



on the anvil of the liberal and justice oriented approach expounded in the aforesaid decisions which have been referred to above.

41. Having bestowed serious consideration to the rival contentions, we feel that the High Court's decision to condone the delay on account of the first respondent's inability to present the appeal within time, for the reasons assigned therein, does not suffer from any error warranting interference. As the aforementioned judgments have shown, such an exercise of discretion does, at times, call for a liberal and justice-oriented approach by the courts, where certain leeway could be provided to the State. The hidden forces that are at work in preventing an appeal by the State being presented within the prescribed period of limitation so as not to allow a higher court to pronounce upon the legality and validity of an order of a lower court and thereby secure unholy gains, can hardly be ignored. Impediments in the working of the grand scheme of governmental functions have to be removed by taking a pragmatic view on balancing of the competing interests."

44. From the above, it is clear that ultimately what is required is a balancing act between a government authority vis-à-vis a private party. Discretion of satisfaction as to the "sufficient cause" remains with the courts.

45. Based on the aforesaid discussions and analysis of judicial pronouncements of the Hon'ble Apex Court holding the field of law of limitation at present, we are of the considered opinion that the cases relied on by the learned counsel appearing for the Applicants may not be of much help to put forward his cases in explaining the "sufficient cause", the Applicants being a government agency.

46. Taking into account the entire spectrum of facts as well as the principles



laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, we are not inclined to give any relief to the Applicants by condoning the delay of 135 days in filing the connected writ appeals and allowing the instant I.A.s. Therefore, the two I.A.s, i.e., I.A. (Civil) No. 116/2025 and I.A. (Civil) No. 117/2025 (in W.A. No. 8/2025 and W.A. No. 9/2025) are dismissed.

47. Both the Interlocutory Applications are hereby disposed of by this common order.

48. No order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant