



GAHC030005132025



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

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/128/2025

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

VERSUS

Sh C.Lianmawia and 6 Ors.
R/o Saiphai, Kolasib District, Mizoram

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr C Lalfakzuala

Advocate for the Respondent : Addl. AG/GA, Mizoram for R6 & R7

Linked Case : I.A.(Civil)/209/2025

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

VERSUS

Sh C.Lianmawia and 6 Ors.
R/o Saiphai
Kolasib District

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. C Lalfakzuala



Advocate for the Respondent : Addl. AG/GA
Mizoram for R6 & R7

Linked Case : LA.App./7/2025

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

VERSUS

Sh C.Lianmawia and 6 Ors.
R/o Saiphai
Kolasib District
Mizoram

2:Sh L.Rosanga
R/o Saiphai
Kolasib District
Mizoram

3:Sh Ramthanga
R/o Saiphai
Kolasib District
Mizoram

4:Sh Zoram
R/o Saiphai
Kolasib District
Mizoram

5:Sh Zorammuana
R/o Kulikawn
Aizawl

6:The Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Land Revenue and Settlement Department
Aizawl

7:The District Collector
Kolasib
Mizoram

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr C Lalfakzuala



Advocate for the Respondent : Addl. AG/GA
Mizoram for R6 & R7

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

20.11.2025

On the disposal of the I.A. (Civil) No. 128/2025, allowing the condonation of delay, heard Mr. C. Lalfakzuala, learned counsel for the appellant, who submits that there are sufficient grounds for settling aside the impugned Judgment & Award dated 17.12.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Fast Track Court, Kolasib District, in LA. case No. 19/2015, since the learned Trial Court have failed to appreciate the evidence on record in its proper prospective.

Appeal is admitted.

Issue notice to the respondent Nos. 1 & 2 through registered post with A/D card within 3 working days, returnable by three weeks.

Ms. Lalnunhlui, learned Govt. Advocate submits that the State respondent should not have been impleaded as respondent Nos. 6 & 7.

The learned counsel for the applicant further submits that the name of State respondent Nos. 6 & 7 may be struck off since the present applicant is the PWD Department of the State and that the State respondent Nos. 6 & 7 have been



impleaded mistakenly.

In view of the above, respondent Nos. 6 & 7 are to be struck off.

Registry to do the needful.

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

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant