



GAHC030005122025



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

**Case No. : LA.App./6/2025**

State of Mizoram  
R/b the Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Public Works Department, Aizawl

VERSUS

Sh C.Lianmawia and 4 Ors.  
R/o Saiphai, Kolasinb District, Mizoram

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : Mr C Lalfakzuala

**Advocate for the Respondent** : Addl. AG/GA, Mizoram for R4 & R5

State of Mizoram  
R/b the Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram  
PWD Department  
Aizawl  
Mizoram

VERSUS

Sh C.Lianmawia and 2 Ors.  
R/o Saiphai  
Kolasib District  
Mizoram

2:Sh Remliana  
R/o Vairengte  
Kolasib District

3:Sh RS Lalhlengliana  
R/o Saiphai



Kolasib District

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr C Lalfakzuala

Advocate for the Respondent :

**B E F O R E**  
**HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MARLI VANKUNG**  
**ORDER**

**18.11.2025**

On the disposal of I.A.(Civil) No 127/2025 allowing the condonation of the delay, this court has heard the learned counsel for the appellant, Mr. C.Lalfakzuala, learned counsel who submits that there are sufficient grounds for setting aside the Judgment & Order dated 17.12.2024 passed by the learned Fast Track Court, Kolasib District in LA Case No.16/2025.

The learned counsel submits that the learned reference court had passed the award based on a superseded award, whereas, the learned Reference court should have passed an award based on the revised award dated 07.08.2018.

Appeal is admitted.

Issue notice to the respondents through registered post with A/D within 3 working days, returnable by 3 weeks.

Ms. Lalnunhlui, learned Govt. Advocate submits that the appellant has



made the Land Revenue & Settlement Department and the District Collector, Kolasib as respondent Nos. 4 & 5. However, these State department cannot be made the respondents in the instant appeal. She therefore, prayed that their names may be struck off from being arrayed as respondents Nos. 4 & 5 in the instant LA Appeal.

Mr. C. Lalfakzuala, learned counsel for the appellant has also prayed that the names of respondents Nos. 4 & 5 have been mistakenly included in the said LA. Appeal and prayed that respondent Nos. 4 & 5 may be struck off.

In view of the above submission, this court finds it appropriate to strike out the names of the respondent Nos. 4 & 5.

Registry to do the needful.

List the matter **after 3 (three) weeks.**

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**