IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

F.A. No. 367 of 2018

Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt., P.O. & P.S.- Danapur Cantt., District- Patna 801503 (Bihar)

… … Respondent/Appellant

Versus

1. Virendra Mahto, Resident of Village + P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, District – Ranchi, Jharkhand.

1(a). The State of Jharkhand through the Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.- G.P.O. Ranchi, P.S.- Kotwali

… … Respondent/Proforma Respondent

2. Baburam Son of Sobhnath Mahto
a. Devlal Son of Sobhnath Mahto
b. Premsagar Mahto Son of Sobhnath Mahto
c. Sahaj Kumar Swapan Son of Sobhnath Mahto
d. Jhari Mahto Son of Meghnath Mahto
e. Most. Malti Devi Wife of Devnath Mahto
~~f. Most. Malti Devi wife of Dharmnath Mahto~~
i. Kamal Kumar
ii. Ashish Kumar
~~iii. Kishore Kumar~~
I. Most. Sandhya Devi (wife of deceased son Kishor Kumar)

3. Aghnu Mahto son of Tikla Gudla Mahto
a. Deepak Mahto son of Tajuwa Mahto
b. Most. Chunnu Devi wife of Charthu Mahto
c. Lalbir Son of Samlal Mahto
d. Soharai Son of Samlal Mahto
e. Babil Son of Samlal Mahto
f. Manoj Mahto Son of Samlal Mahto
g. Moti Lal Son of Mahadev Mahto
h. Laxman Mahto Son of Mahadev Mahto
i. Santosh Mahto Son of Puran Mahto

4. Pairvo Devi daughter of Jainath Mahto

5. Chamu Son of Padya Lohar
a. Karu Lohra Son of Padya Lohar.
b. Most. Tetri Devi wife of Lalu Lohar.
c. Rajendra Lohra Son of Bhadwa Lohar.
d. Arjun Son of Kartik Lohar.
e. Bhim Son of Kartik Lohar.
f. Nakul Lohar Son of Kartik Lohar.
g. Visun Son of Budhu Lohar.
h. Krishna Son of Budhu Lohar.
i. Shankar Son of Budhu Lohar.
j. Sitaram Son of Budhu Lohar..
k. Raju Lohar Son of Budhu Lohar.
l. Lakhan Lohra Son of Gauri Lohra.
m. Dasrath Lohra Son of Kisun Lohra.

n. Asho Devi wife of Kartik Lohar.
6. Bhunu Gope Son of Mogal Mahto.
a. Ramesh Yadav Son of Ramprasad Yadav.
b. (b) Sanjay Yadav Son of Ramprasad Yadav.
7. Mogo Son of Budhu Mahto.
~~a. Sukul Son of Budhu Mahto.~~
i. Dev Kumar Mahto
ii. Narayan Mahto
iii. Pawan Kumar (All Sons)
b. Mukul Mahto Son of Budhu Mahto.
c. Shankar Mahto Son of Devnath Mahto.
d. Bhunu Gope Son of Mogal Mahto.
e. Ramesh Yadav Son of Ramprasad Yadav.
f. Sanjay Yadav Son of Ramprasad Yadav.
8. Bhunu Gope Son of Mogal Mahto.
a. Ramesh Yadav Son of Ramprasad Yadav
b. Sanjay Yadav Son of Ramprasad Yadav
9. Beronika Kerketta daughter of Albis Kerketta
~~a. Karlus Kerketta Son of Fransis Kerketta~~
i. Usha Karketta (Mother)
ii. Selestina Karketta (Sister)
10. Ruswa Son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Domna Pahan Son of Sukra Pahan.
b. Sukra Pahan Son of Bhokara Pahan.
c. Anil Pahan Son of Domna Pahan.
d. Chedi Son of Dobal Pahan.
e. Domna Pahan Son of Dobal Pahan
f. Unit Pahan Son of Rana Pahan.
11.~~Sawna Mahto Son of Mahadev Mahto.~~
i. Sitaram Mahto
ii. Santu Mahto (Both sons)
~~a. Sikari Son of Vasudev Mahto.~~
i. Sanjay Mahto
ii. Manjay Mahto
iii. Ramesh Mahto. (All sons).
~~b. Vishnu Mahto Son of Vasudev Mahto.~~
i. Most. Radhika Devi
c. Most. Sonamati Devi wife of Bhikhari Mahto
12. Tilakdhari Son of Rameshwar Hazam (Thakur).
a. Dilkeshwar Thakur son of Rameshwar Hazam (Thakur).
b. Krishna son of Munna Thakur.
c. Rajendra Son of Munna Thakur
d. Arjun son of Munna Thakur
e. Manoj Thakur son of Munna Thakur
f. Gopal Thakur son of Puniya Devi
13. Surendra Bhogta son of Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari).
a. Shyam Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).
b. Vinod Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).
14. Surendra Bhogta son of Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari).
a. Shyam Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).

b. Vinod Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).
15. Surendra Bhogta son of Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari).
a. Shyam Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).
b. Vinod Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).
16. Surendra Bhogta son of Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari).
a. Shyam Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).
b. Vinod Bhogta son of Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta).
17. Most. Shanti Devi wife of Sewaram Mahto.
a. Most. Basanti Devi wife of Shivnath Mahto.
18. Most. Shanti Devi wife of Sewaram Mahto.
a. Most. Basanti Devi wife of Shivnath Mahto.
19. Most. Shanti wife of Sinu Oraon.
a. Most. Butan Devi wife of Manga Oraon.
b. Arjun Oraon son of Babulal Oraon.
c. Kajinath son of Mangra Oraon.
~~d. Dukhu Oraon son of Mangra Oraon.~~
i. Prakash Gari (only son)
e. Ram Gari son of Maniya Oraon.
f. Shankar Mohan Oraon son of Baijnath Oraon.
g. Subhash Gari son of Baijnath Oraon.
h. Most. Pendo Devi wife of Ropna Oraon.
i. Nilam Gari son of Budhu Oraon.
~~j. Brish Oraon son of Jirku Oraon.~~
i. Died leaving behind no legal heirs
20. Sukhram (Oraon) Kispotta son of Bhouta Oraon.
a. Prakash Kispotta son of Charwa Oraon.
b. Bhouta son of Somra Oraon.
c. Deepak son of Somra Oraon.
d. Kali Kispotta son of Somra Oraon.
e. Suresh son of Sukra (Etwa) Oraon.
~~f. Ganesh son of Sukra (Etwa) Oraon.~~
i. Sony Kispotta (wife)
g. Arjun Kispotta son of Sukra (Etwa) Oraon.
~~h. Somari Kispotta wife of Naresh Kispotta.~~
i. Karan Kispotta (Son)
ii. Arti Kispotta
iii. Deepika Kispotta (Daughters)
i. Somra son of Etwa Oraon.
j. Mangal son of Etwa Oraon.
k. Vijay son of Etwa Oraon.
l. Lalu Kispotta son of Etwa Oraon.
m. Most. Sero Tirki wife of Birsa Kispotta.
21. Lachu Oraon son of Annu Oraon.
a. Hari Toppo son of Lodhar Oraon.
b. Prabhat son of Jhari Oraon.
c. Pradeep son of Jhari Oraon.
d. Prahalad Toppo son of Jhari Oraon.
e. Premkishor Oraon son of Mahadev Oraon.
f. Pankaj (Jawala) Oraon son of Mahadev Oraon.
g. Most. Sita Toppo wife of Prakash Oraon.

22.~~Haria Oraon son of Champa Oraon.~~
a. Subhash Minz
b. Roshan Minz
c. Amit Minz
d. Anmol Minz (All sons)
23. Paulus Gari (Krishtan) son of Naklu Krishtan.
a. Sunil Arun Gari son of Samual Gari.
b. John son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan).
c. Jems son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan).
d. Sukumar Gari son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan).
e. Albert Gari son of Dilip Gari.
f. Niral son of Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan).
g. Sudhir Gari son of Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan).
h. Roshni Gari daughter of Pitter Gari.
24.~~Sobran Mahto son of Fekuwa Mahto.~~
i. Visheshwar Mahto
ii. Suraj Kumar (both Grandsons)
a. Sohrai Mahto son of Laxminath Mahto.
b. Ajay Mahto son of Premnath Mahto.
c. Roshan Mahto son of Tirath Nath Mahto.
~~d. Radhanath Mahto son of Gansa Mahto.~~
i. Bhuneshwar Mahto (son)
~~ii. Muneshwar Mahto (son)~~
I. Most. Sabita Devi
e. Mahesh Mahto son of Rathua Mahto.
25. Pairo Devi daughter of Jainath Mahto.
26. Mogwa son of Karinath Lohar.
a. Kali Lohar son of Karinath Lohar.
b. Bhanu Pratap Lohra son of Karinath Lohar.
c. Sukra Lohar son of Karinath Lohar.
d. Birbal son of Karinath Lohar.
e. Ramu son of Karinath Lohar.
f. Samu Lohra son of Karinath Lohar.
27. Karmu Mahto son of Naga Mahto.
a. Mahabir son of Dharmu Mahto.
b. Shankar Mahto son of Dharmu Mahto.
28.~~Devcharan son of Chedi Mahto.~~
i. Mohan Gope
ii. Sohan Gope
iii. Sidhnath Gope. (All sons)
a. Shivlal Mahto son of Chedi Mahto.
b. Rajendra son of Shivcharan Mahto.
c. Raju son of Shivcharan Mahto.
d. Rajesh Gope son of Shivcharan Mahto.
~~e. Charka Gope son of Baldev Mahto.~~
i. Krishna Gope
ii. Rajkumar Gope.
f. Beni Gope son of Jagdish Gope.
g. Most. Shobha Devi wife of Kapil Gope.
h. Rajendra son of Jaglal Mahto.

i. Kaleshwar Gope son of Jaglal Mahto.
j. Indra Gope son of Antru Gope (Mahto).
k. Most. Karuna Devi wife of Budhu Mahto.

29. Jerka Gope (Mahto) son of Aseshwar Mahto.
a. Koka Mahto son of Bhota Mahto.
b. Chandranath Mahto son of Nimku Mahto.
c. Dinu son of Nimku Mahto.
d. Manoj Gope son of Nimku Mahto.
e. Most. Sita Devi wife of Falindra Gope.
f. Shanti daughter of Santu Gope.
g. Punam daughter of Santu Gope.
h. Soni Devi daughter of Santu Gope.
i. Kalicharan son of Chandra Mahto.
j. Rajendra son of Chandra Mahto.
k. Jageshwar Gope son of Chandra Mahto.
l. Pannalal Gope son of Babulal Gope.
m. Balram son of Somnath Mahto.
n. Krishna Gope son of Somnath Mahto.
o. Brijmohan son of Shaheb Ram Mahto.
p. Parasnath son of Shaheb Ram Mahto.
q. Dhaneshwar Gope son of Shaheb Ram Mahto.

30. Mogo son of Budhu Mahto
~~a. Sukul son of Budhu Mahto.~~
i. Devkumar Mahto
ii. Narayan Mahto
iii. Pawan Kumar. (All sons).
b. Mukul son of Budhu Mahto.
c. Shankar Mahto son of Devnath Mahto.
d. Veero Devi wife of Devnath Mahto.
e. Sukhram (Oraon) Kispotta son of Bhauta Oraon.
f. Prakash Kispotta son of Charwa Oraon.
g. Bhauta son of Somra Oraon.
h. Deepak son of Somra Oraon.
i. Kali Kispotta son of Somra Oraon.
j. Suresh son of Sukra (Etwa) Oraon.
~~k. Ganesh son of Sukra (Etwa) Oraon.~~
i. Sony Kispotta (Wife)
l. Arjun Kispotta son of Sukra (Etwa) Oraon.
~~m. Somari Kispotta wife of Naresh Kispotta.~~
i. Karan Kispotta (Son)
ii. Arti Kispotta
iii. Deepika Kispotta (Daughters).
n. Somra son of Etwa Oraon.
o. Mangal son of Etwa Oraon.
p. Vijay son of Etwa Oraon.
q. Lalu Kispotta son of Etwa Oraon.
r. Most. Shero Tirki wife of Birsa Kispotta.

31. Pahna Oraon son of Kanju Oraon.
~~a. Somra Oraon son of Kanju Oraon.~~
i. Vijay Kachhap (only son)

b. Khuniya Oraon son of Etwa Oraon.
c. Raju son of Kolha Kachhap.
d. Rajesh son of Kolha Kachhap.
e. Nikhil Kachhap son of Kolha Kachhap.
f. Pahna Kachhap son of Polma Kachhap.
g. Jagran son of Thibu (Bhaua Oraon).
h. Binod Kachhap son of Thibu (Bhaua Oraon).
i. Most. Sujata Kachhap wife of Anand Kachhap.
j. Somra son of Mangna Oraon.
k. Raju son of Mangna Oraon.
l. Vijay son of Mangna Oraon.
m. Sanjay son of Mangna Oraon.
n. Niraj Kachhap son of Mangna Oraon.
o. Sumit Kachhap son of Sibu Kachhap.

32. Kushalnath son of Rogha Mahto.
a. Sukhnath son of Rogha Mahto.
~~b. Sitaram son of Rogha Mahto.~~
i. Most. Shanti Devi (wife)
c. Jitlal son of Rogha Mahto.
~~d. Bachan Devi wife of Dashrath Mahto.~~
i. Ritlal Mahto (only son)
e. Dilnath son of Kaila Mahto.
f. Dileshwar son of Kaila Mahto.
g. Gabeshwar son of Kaila Mahto.
h. Rajnayaran son of Premnath Mahto.
i. Jitendra son of Premnath Mahto.

33. Sukra son of Bijla Oraon.
a. Soma son of Bijla Oraon.
b. Sadhu son of Bijla Oraon.
c. Munna Runda son of Bijla Oraon.
d. Most. Goyandi Runda wife of Goyanda Runda.
e. Most. Somari Runda wife of Budhwa Runda.
f. Kunwar son of Nath Oraon.
g. Sukhram Runda son of Nato Oraon.

34. ~~Moti Mahto (Gope) son of Nathu Mahto.~~
a. Shyam Sundar (only son)

35. Soma Oraon (Kachhap) son of Sadhu Oraon.
a. Mangra Kachhap son of Koka (Taji) Oraon.

36. Sanicharwa son of Madru Oraon.
a. Nandu Oraon (Gari) son of Madru Oraon.
b. Mahabir son of Mahadev Oraon.
c. Soma son of Mahadev Oraon.
d. Ranjit Oraon son of Mahadev Oraon.
e. Ramesh Oraon son of Somra Oraon.
f. Sushil Oraon son of Baha Oraon.
g. Binod son of Jhibra Oraon.
h. Chandra Gari son of Jhibra Oraon.

37. Bipta son of Budhu Dom.
a. Mahadev Mirdha son of Budhu Dom.
b. Karma son of Sukra Dom.

c. Sukhlal son of Sukra Dom.
d. Bhokre Mirdha son of Sukra Dom.
38. Most. Bachchan Devi wife of Durga Mirdha (Dom).
a. Most. Dropadi Devi wife of Birsa Mirdha (Dom).
39. Bipta son of Budhu Dom.
a. Mahadev Mirdha son of Budhu Dom.
b. Karma son of Sukra Dom.
c. Sukhlal son of Sukra Dom.
d. Bhokre Mirdha son of Sukra Dom.
e. Most. Bachchan Devi wife of Durga Mirdha (Dom).
f. Most. Dropadi Devi wife of Birsa Mirdha (Dom).
40. ~~Bahadur Singh son of Dillu Singh.~~
i. Jitendra Bhogta
ii. Vishwakarma Bhogta
iii. ~~Shiv Bhogta~~ (All sons)
I. Most. Dudhmati Devi (Wife of deceased son Shiv Bhogta).
a. Jagdish Singh son of Dillu Singh.
41. Most. Parwati Devi wife of Shivlal Singh (Bhogta).
a. Govind Singh Bhogta son of Shivlal Singh (Bhogta).
42. ~~Bahadur Singh son of Dillu Singh.~~
i. Jitendra Bhogta
ii. Vishwakarma Bhogta
iii. ~~Shiv Bhogta~~ (All sons)
I. Most. Dudhmati Devi (Wife of deceased son Shiv Bhogta).
a. Jagdish Singh son of Dillu Singh.
b. Most. Parwati Devi wife of Shivlal Singh.
c. Govind Singh Bhogta son of Shivlal Singh (Bhogta).
43. Khuniya Oraon son of Etwa Oraon.
a. Somra son of Mangna Oraon.
b. Raju son of Mangna Oraon.
c. Sanjay son of Mangna Oraon.
d. Vijay son of Mangna Oraon.
e. Niraj Kachhap son of Mangna Oraon.
f. Sumit Kachhap son of Sibu Kachhap.
44. Paunde son of Sawna Oraon.
a. Birsa Oraon son of Sawna Oraon.
b. Abhinash Oraon son of Rana Oraon.
45. Most. Budhan Devi wife of Rambrish (Donge) Lohar.
a. Lembu Lal son of Kallu Lohar.
b. Bharat Lohar son of Kallu Lohar.
c. Sikendra Lohra son of Subhash Lohra.
d. Marku son of Baban Lohar.
e. Ramdas Lohra son of Baban Lohar
f. Puspa dausghter of Najo Lohar
g. Sita daughter of Najo Lohar
h. Gita Devi daughter of Najo Lohar
i. Nita Kumari daughter of Najo Lohar
46. ~~Etwa Oraon son of Somra Oraon~~.
i. Alias Lakra (Son)
ii. Pradeep Anuj Lakra (Grandson)

a. Most. Sila Lakra wife of Charna Oraon.
47. ~~Indar Son of Lachhu Hazam~~.
i. Mahabir Thakur
ii. Ramesh Thakur (Both sons)
iii. Anuj Thakur (Grandson
a. Ramchandra son of Lachhu Hazam.

b. ~~Bharu Hazam (Thakur) son of Lachhu Hazam~~.
i. Sunil Kumar (only son)
c. Bhagtu Thakur son of Nathuwa Hazam (Thakur)
d. Gopal Thakur son of Sudarshan Hazam
e. Most. Galwa Devi wife of Bisun Hazam
f. Koka Thakur son of Kisun Hazam
g. Most. Dumri Devi wife of Shohar Lal Thakur
h. Rahul Thakur son of Jitu Thakur
i. Dipu Thakur son of Sukhlal Thakur
j. Vishal Thakur son of Bisun Thakur
48. ~~Sawna Mahto son of Mahadev Mahto~~.
i. Sitaram Mahto
ii. Santu Mahto. (Both sons)
a. ~~Sikari son of Basudev Mahto~~.
i. Sanjay Mahto
ii. Manjay Mahto
iii. Ramesh Mahto. (All sons).
b. ~~Vishnu Mahto son of Basudev Mahto~~.
i. Most. Radhika Devi (wife)
c. Most. Sonamani Devi wife of Bhikhari Mahto
49. Matiyash son of Siril Gari
a. Marshal son of Siril Gari
b. Sanjay Gari son of Siril Gari
50. Paulus Gari (Krishtan) son of Naklu Krishtan
a. Sunil Arun Gari son of Samual Gari
b. John son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan)
c. Jems son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan)
d. Sukumar Gari son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan)
e. Albert Gari son of Dilip Gari
f. Niral son of Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan)
g. Sudhir Gari son of Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan)
h. Roshni Gari daughter of Pitter Gari
51. Paulus Gari (Krishtan) son of Naklu Krishtan
a. Sunil Arun Gari son of Samual Gari
b. John son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan)
c. Jems son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan)
d. Sukumar Gari son of Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Krishtan)
e. Albert Gari son of Dilip Gari
f. Niral son of Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan)
g. Sudhir Gari son of Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan)
h. Roshni Gari daughter of Pitter Gari.
52. Mahli Oraon son of Chunda Oraon.
a. Jugnu Tigga son of Bijla Oraon.
53. ~~Tintus Kujur son of Thale Oraon~~.

a. Sanjay Kujur (Son)
b. Christina Kujur (Daughter)

54. Dinesh son of Viswa Oraon.
a. Binesh son of Viswa Oraon.
b. Bandhan Kujur son of Viswa Oraon.
c. Anand Kujur son of Budhu Oraon.
d. Most. Jhalo Kujur wife of Kura Oraon.

55. Shivnath Baitha son of Bhondwa Dhobi (Baitha).
a. Most. Bhagtain Devi wife of Dasrath Dhobi (Baitha).
b. Nanhuha son of Ghamru Dhobi (Baitha).
c. ~~Bhunu Dhobi (Baitha) son of Ghamru Dhobi (Baitha)~~.
i. Most. Sonu Devi (Wife)
d. Hari Baitha son of Baldev Dhobi (Baitha).
e. ~~Laldev son of Sundra Dhobi~~.
i. Jagdish Baitha
ii. Dinesh Baitha (Both sons)
f. ~~Faguwa Dhobi (Baitha) son of Sundra Dhobi~~.
i. Most. Haliya Devi (Wife)

56. Birsa son of Pran Oraon.
a. Vinay Oraon (Toppo) son of Pran Oraon.
b. Sonu Toppo son of Chunda Oraon.
c. Minu son of Bodhan Oraon.
d. Sanjay Toppo son of Bodhan Oraon.
e. ~~Puran Oraon son of Bandhu Oraon~~.
i. Most. Kaushalya Devi (Wife)
f. Birsa son of Eto Oraon.
g. ~~Mahabir son of Eto Oraon~~.
i. Most. Dulia Toppo (wife)
h. Dahru Toppo son of Eto Oraon.
i. ~~Budhwa Oraon (Toppo) son of Bhakre Oraon~~.
i. Most. Etwari Toppo (wife)

57. Bahadur son of Mahadev Oraon.
a. Somra Gari son of Mahadev Oraon.
b. Most. Siwan Gari wife of Bandhu Gari.
c. Most. Birsi Gari wife of Gargi Gari.
d. Most. Nauri Gari wife of Sanicharwa Oraon.

58. ~~Chaitu Gari son of Dane Oraon~~.
i. Most. Mangri Gari (Wife)
a. Bandhan son of Madi Oraon.
b. Sukar Gari son of Madi Oraon.
c. Most. Budo Gari wife of Narayan Gari.
d. ~~Birso Gari wife of Birsa Gari~~.
i. Fanuwa Gari
ii. Rajendra Gari
iii. Manoj Gari
iv. Naveen Gari. (All sons)
e. Baijnath son of Chunda Oraon.
f. Sadna son of Chunda Oraon.
g. Sukra Gari son of Chunda Oraon.

59. Charku Bara son of Chunda Oraon.

a. Sanicharwa Bara son of Mathura Oraon.
i. Kunjlal Bara
ii. Mathura Bara
iii. Champa Bara
iv. Gajju Bara. (All sons)
b. Most. Malti Bara wife of Langra Bara.
c. Kunwar Bara son of Ludhuwa Oraon.
d. Most. Sukro Bara wife of Champa Oraon.
e. Most. Siwan Bara wife of Karma Bara.
f. Dilip Bara son of Tetra Bara.
g. Most. Anita Bara wife of Bhojrai Bara.
h. Most. Fulo Bara wife of Lauwa Bara.
i. ~~Most. Somri Bara wife of Gandu Oraon~~.
i. Bhoukra Bara
ii. Manoj Bara
iii. Sunil Bara
iv. Dasrath Bara. (All sons).
j. Most. Niru Bara wife of Mahesh Oraon.
k. Most. Siwan Bara wife of Birsa Bara.
60. Jaydev Oraon son of Ramnarayan Khalkho.
61. Gaja Kispotta son of Hango Oraon.
62. Karlus son of Andhriyas Krishtan.
a. Kornelius Beck son of Andhriyas Krishtan
b. Most. Anna Beck wife of Vijay Beck.
c. Lorence son of Aloyes Beck.
d. Ignayush Beck son of Aloyes Beck.
e. Alphose Beck son of Karlus Beck.
63. Pran Gari son of Mangra Oraon.
64. Karlus son of Andhriyas Krishtan.
a. Kornelius Beck son of Andhriyas Krishtan
b. Most. Anna Beck wife of Vijay Beck.
c. Lorence son of Aloyes Beck.
d. Ignayush Beck son of Aloyes Beck.
e. Alphose Beck son of Karlus Beck.
65. Martin Linda son of Joakim Krishtan.
a. Agnesh Linda son of Joakim Krishtan.
66. Martin Linda son of Joakim Krishtan.
a. Agnesh Linda son of Joakim Krishtan.
67. Sushil son of Birsa Oraon.
a. Fransis son of Birsa Oraon.
b. Simon Linda son of Birsa oraon.
68. Karamchand Oraon son of Chamru Oraon.
a. Ramesh Oraon son of Nageshwar Oraon.
b. Kishor Oraon son of Bandhana Oraon.
c. Raju son of Mahendra Tigga.
d. Arjun son of Mahendra Tigga.
e. Dilip Tigga son of Mahendra Tigga.
69. Karam Singh Lohra son of Dasrath Lohra
a. ~~Jodhan (Shohrai) son of Chamra Lohra~~.
i. Rajesh Lohra

ii. Munna Lohra
iii. Vinod Lohra. (All sons)
b. Ramu Son of Chamra Lohra.
70. Mahabir son of Bhuneshwar Mahto.
a. Sahabir son of Bhuneshwar Mahto.
b. Dhaneshwar Mahto son of Ropna Mahto.
c. Srinath Mahto son of Upendra Mahto.
d. Puran son of Devnath (Bhondwa) Mahto.
e. Devlal son of Devnath (Bhondwa) Mahto.
f. Sohrai son of Devnath (Bhondwa) Mahto.
g. Mahabir son of Devnath (Bhondwa) Mahto.
h. Karamchand Mahto son of Devnath (Bhondwa) Mahto.
71. ~~Raghuwar Dayal Singh son of Janki Ganjhu~~.
a. Most. Sunila Devi (Wife).
72. ~~Raghuwar Dayal Singh son of Janki Ganjhu~~.
a. Most. Sunila Devi (Wife).
73. Etwa son of Lodha Oraon.
a. Gandura son of Lodha Oraon.
b. Sanjay son of Lodha Oraon.
c. Most. Abha Kujur wife of Sitaram Oraon.
74. Bauka Mahto son of Lalu Mahto.
a. Jagnu Mahto son of Nanku Mahto.
b. ~~Lalku son of Tilak Mahto~~.
i. Jagdish Mahto (Son)
~~ii. Dinesh Mahto~~
I. Most. Meena Mahto (Wife of deceased son Dinesh Mahto)
c. ~~Shivlal son of Tilak Mahto~~.
i. Satish Mahto (only son)
d. ~~Jethuwa Mahto son of Tilak Mahto~~.
i. Krishna Mahto
ii. Ramesh Mahto. (Both sons)
e. Mohit Lal Mahto son of Aghnu Mahto.
75. Jagat Narayan Jaiswal son of Laxminarayan Jaiswal.
76. Jagat Narayan Jaiswal son of Laxminarayan Jaiswal.
77. Ramnaresh Thakur (Hazam) son of Putnu Hazam.
a. Lal Mohan Thakur (Hazam) son of Putnu Hazam.
b. Motilal Thakur son of Narayan Thakur (Hazam).
c. Ashok Thakur son of Narayan Thakur (Hazam).
d. Sanjay Thakur son of Tulsi Thakur (Hazam).
e. Kartik son of Dhannu Hazam (Thakur).
f. Muneshwar Thakur son of Dhannu Hazam (Thakur).
78. Meri Marget Linda wife of Babu Lal Oraon.
79. Bauka Mahto son of Lalu Mahto.
a. Jagnu Mahto son of Nanku Mahto.
b. ~~Lalku son of Tilak Mahto~~.
i. Jagdish Mahto (Son)
ii. Dinesh Mahto
I. Most. Meena Mahto (Wife of deceased son Dinesh Mahto)
c. ~~Shivlal son of Tilak Mahto~~.
i. Satish Mahto (only son)

d. ~~Jethuwa Mahto son of Tilak Mahto~~.
i. Krishna Mahto
ii. Ramesh Mahto. (Both sons)
e. Mohit Lal Mahto son of Aghnu Mahto.
80. Chamu Son of Padya Lohar
a. Karu Lohra Son of Padya Lohar.
b. Most. Tetri Devi wife of Lalu Lohar.
c. Rajendra Lohra Son of Bhadwa Lohar.
d. Arjun Son of Kartik Lohar.
e. Bhim Son of Kartik Lohar.
f. Nakul Lohar Son of Kartik Lohar.
g. Visun Son of Budhu Lohar.
h. Krishna Son of Budhu Lohar.
i. Shankar Son of Budhu Lohar.
j. Sitaram Son of Budhu Lohar..
k. Raju Lohar Son of Budhu Lohar.
l. Lakhan Lohra Son of Gauri Lohra.
m. Dasrath Lohra Son of Kisun Lohra.
81. Asmiya daughter of Birsa Lohar.
a. Jitan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
b. Budhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
c. Sudhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
d. Reshmi Tuti daughter of Birsa Lohar.
e. Sauni daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
f. Kasmi Devi daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
g. Mahadev Ram son of Chedi Kotwar (Lohar).
h. Uday son of Fagu Karmali.
i. Vinay son of Fagu Karmali.
j. Sani Karmali son of Fagu Karmali.
k. Most. Dulari Devi wife of Sukhu Lohar.
l. Sukhchand son of Bhola Lohar.
m. Budhram son of Bhola Lohar.
n. Somra Lohar son of Bhola Lohar.
o. Mogwa son of Sukra Lohar.
p. Kali Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
q. Bhanu Pratap Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
r. Birbal son of Karinath Lohar.
s. Ramu son of Karinath Lohar.
t. Samu Lohra son of Karinath Lohar.
82. Ramsunder son of Budru Lohar.
a. Manda son of Budru Lohar.
b. Bhandu son of Budru Lohar.
c. ~~Ankhu son of Budru Lohar~~.
i. Most. Rupa Devi (Wife)
d. Kuddu Lohra son of Budru Lohar.
e. Rajan son of Chaitan Lohar.
f. Raju son of Chaitan Lohar.
g. Ajay Lohar son of Chaitan Lohar.
83. Arjun son of Jugni.
a. Bharat son of Jugni.

b. Jamuna son of Jugni.
c. ~~Ganga Gope son of Jugni~~.
i. Abhishek Gope
ii. Nitesh Gope. (Both sons)
d. Kali son of Mungia Devi.
e. ~~Ramprasad son of Mungia Devi~~.
i. Maheshwar Prasad Gope
ii. Brajesh Gope. (Both sons)
f. Nandu son of Mungia Devi.
g. Devraj Gope son of Mungia Devi.
84.~~Sawna Mahto son of Mahadev Mahto~~.
i. Sitaram Mahto
ii. Santu Mahto. (Both sons)
a. ~~Sikari son of Basudev Mahto~~.
i. Sanjay Mahto
ii. Manjay Mahto
iii. Ramesh Mahto. (All sons).
~~b. Vishnu Mahto son of Basudev Mahto~~.

i. Most. Radhika Devi (wife)
c. Most. Sonamani Devi wife of Bhikhari Mahto
85. Asmiya daughter of Birsa Lohar.
a. Jitan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
b. Budhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
c. Sudhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
d. Reshmi Tuti daughter of Birsa Lohar.
e. Sauni daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
f. Kasmi Devi daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
g. Mahadev Ram son of Chedi Kotwar (Lohar).
h. Uday son of Fagu Karmali.
i. Vinay son of Fagu Karmali.
j. Sani Karmali son of Fagu Karmali.
k. Most. Dulari Devi wife of Sukhu Lohar.
l. Sukhchand son of Bhola Lohar.
m. Budhram son of Bhola Lohar.
n. Somra Lohar son of Bhola Lohar.
o. Mogwa son of Sukra Lohar.
p. Kali Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
q. Bhanu Pratap Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
r. Birbal son of Karinath Lohar.
s. Ramu son of Karinath Lohar.
t. Samu Lohra son of Karinath Lohar.
86. Ruswa Pahan Son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Domna Pahan Son of Sukra Pahan.
b. Sukra Pahan Son of Bhokara Pahan.
c. Anil Pahan Son of Domna Pahan.
d. Chedi Son of Dobal Pahan.
e. Domna Pahan Son of Dobal Pahan
f. Unit Pahan Son of Rana Pahan.
87. Ruswa Pahan Son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Domna Pahan Son of Sukra Pahan.

b. Sukra Pahan Son of Bhokara Pahan.
c. Anil Pahan Son of Domna Pahan.
d. Chedi Son of Dobal Pahan.
e. Domna Pahan Son of Dobal Pahan
f. Unit Pahan Son of Rana Pahan.
88. Rajendra son of Jageshwar Mahto.
a. Mahendra son of Jageshwar Mahto.
b. ~~Devendra Mahto son of Bahura Mahto~~.
i. Most. Lakshmi Devi (wife)
89. Charku Mahto son of Bahura Mahto.
a. Brijlal Mahto son of Bahura Mahto.
90. Pancham Loharain wife of Ganga Lohar.
91. Asmiya daughter of Birsa Lohar.
a. Jitan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
b. Budhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
c. Sudhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
d. Reshmi Tuti daughter of Birsa Lohar.
e. Sauni daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
f. Kasmi Devi daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
g. Mahadev Ram son of Chedi Kotwar (Lohar).
h. Uday son of Fagu Karmali.
i. Vinay son of Fagu Karmali.
j. Sani Karmali son of Fagu Karmali.
k. Most. Dulari Devi wife of Sukhu Lohar.
l. Sukhchand son of Bhola Lohar.
m. Budhram son of Bhola Lohar.
n. Somra Lohar son of Bhola Lohar.
o. Mogwa son of Sukra Lohar.
p. Kali Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
q. Bhanu Pratap Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
r. Birbal son of Karinath Lohar.
s. Ramu son of Karinath Lohar.
t. Samu Lohra son of Karinath Lohar.
92. Ratiya Toppo son of Birsa Oraon.
a. Muniya Toppo son of Sukhdev Toppo.
93. Siwa Oraon son of Rakesh Oraon.
a. Suraj Oraon son of Cheral Oraon.
b. Most. Sukro Toppo wife of Madho Oraon.
c. Most. Sukro Oraon wife of Chudu Oraon.
94. Asmiya daughter of Birsa Lohar.
a. Jitan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
b. Budhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
c. Sudhan daughter of Birsa Lohar.
d. Reshmi Tuti daughter of Birsa Lohar.
e. Sauni daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
f. Kasmi Devi daughter of Sukhdev Lohar.
g. Mahadev Ram son of Chedi Kotwar (Lohar).
h. Uday son of Fagu Karmali.
i. Vinay son of Fagu Karmali.
j. Sani Karmali son of Fagu Karmali.

k. Most. Dulari Devi wife of Sukhu Lohar.
l. Sukhchand son of Bhola Lohar.
m. Budhram son of Bhola Lohar.
n. Somra Lohar son of Bhola Lohar.
o. Mogwa son of Sukra Lohar.
p. Kali Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
q. Bhanu Pratap Lohra son of Sukra Lohar.
r. Birbal son of Karinath Lohar.
s. Ramu son of Karinath Lohar.
t. Samu Lohra son of Karinath Lohar.

95. ~~Raghuwar Dayal Singh son of Janki Ganjhu~~.

a. Most. Sunila Devi (Wife).

All are resident of Village Gari, P.O. - Hotwar, P.S. - Sadar, District – Ranchi, Jharkhand.

96. Most. Sohri Devi wife of Meghnath Mahto.
a. Most. Mulo Devi wife of Jathlu Mahto.
b. Bablu Mahto son of Meghnath Mahto.

97. Savitri W/o Umashankar Jaysawal. **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
(a) (i) Most. Shashi Jaiswal W/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(a) (ii) Sumit Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(a) (iii) Vineet Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(b) Pradeep S/o Umashankar Jaysawal
(c) Purnima Chaudhari W/o Late Randhir Prasad Choudhary
(d) Pratima Chaudhari W/o Manmohan Choudhary
(e) Kumkum Prasad W/o Ram Kuber Prasad.

98. Savitri W/o Umashankar Jaysawal. **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
(a) (i) Most. Shashi Jaiswal W/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(a) (ii) Sumit Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(a) (iii) Vineet Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(b) Pradeep S/o Umashankar Jaysawal
(c) Purnima Chaudhari W/o Late Randhir Prasad Choudhary
(d) Pratima Chaudhari W/o Manmohan Choudhary
(e) Kumkum Prasad W/o Ram Kuber Prasad.

99. Phul Kumari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
a. Praveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
b. Naveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
c. Amit Priti Jaysawal son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
d. Sippi Chaudhari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.

100. Phul Kumari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
a. Praveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
b. Naveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
c. Amit Priti Jaysawal son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
d. Sippi Chaudhari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.

101. Phul Kumari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
a. Praveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
b. Naveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
c. Amit Priti Jaysawal son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
d. Sippi Chaudhari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.

102. Kasinath son of Sampat Pahan.
a. Rajan son of Kartik Pahan.
b. Jeetan son of Kartik Pahan.
103. Kena son of Chumna Oraon.
a. Jagan son of Chumna Oraon.
b. Luddu son of Chumna Oraon.
c. Kundan son of Chumna Oraon.
104. Birsa son of Karma Oraon.
a. Etwa son of Karma Oraon.
b. Jbara son of Mangara Oraon.
c. Kanu son of Mangara Oraon.
d. Magari wife of Karama Oraon.
e. Mahesh son of Rijhu Oraon.
f. Sonu son of Rijhu Oroan.
105. Bandhni wife of Mangra Oraon.
a. Somri wife of Kali Oraon.
b. Ravi son of Budhuwa Oraon.
106. Birsa son of Karma Oraon.
a. Etwa son of Karma Oraon.
b. Jbara son of Mangara Oraon.
c. Kanu son of Mangara Oraon.
d. Magari wife of Karama Oraon.
e. Mahesh son of Rijhu Oraon.
f. Sonu son of Rijhu Oroan.
107. Pandit son of Birsa Oraon.
a. Dharmnath son of Birsa Oraon.
b. Lalku son of Jhubra Oraon.
108. Lakhimani wife of Daso oraon.
a. Leda Oraon son of Karma Oraon.
109. Jamirudin son of Shekh Muslim.
a. Semarudin son of Sahabudin.
b. Jalij son of Jamirudin Ansari.
c. Samsher son of Sahabudin.
d. Sjjaad son of Sahabudin.
e. Sabirudin son of Mahju.
f. Imam son of Mustafa.
g. Alam son of Mustafa.
h. Islam son of Mustafa.
i. Israphil son of Mustafa.
j. Asaarf Ansari son of Mustafa.
k. Jaibun Nishan daughter of Rasulan.
l. Raguna daughter of Rasulan.
m. Moejul Rahaman daughter of Mahfuja.
110. Most. Lakhmani wife of Daso Oraon.
111. Fagu Mahto son of Bigal Mahto.
a. Mathu Mahto son of Charku Mahto.
b. Mannu Mahto son of Charku Mahto.
112. Most. Fulmaniya wife of Etwa Oraon.
113. Phul Kumari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
a. Praveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.

b. Naveen son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
c. Amit Priti Jaysawal son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
d. Sippi Chaudhari son of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.

114. Anil son of Sadho Oraon.
a. Baya son of Madho Oraon.
b. Bandhu son of Madho Oraon.
c. Kuwari wife of Bicha Oraon.
d. Sohari wife of Balo Oraon.

115. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

116. Jaynath son of Tirath Munda.
a. Deepchandra son of Tirath Munda.
b. Raghunath son of Tirath Munda.
c. Sukhdev son of Rupchan Munda.
d. Sitaram son of Rupchan Munda.
e. Ramiya Devi wife of Rupalal Munda.

117. Jaynath son of Tirath Munda.
a. Deepchandra son of Tirath Munda.
b. Raghunath son of Tirath Munda.
c. Sukhdev son of Rupchan Munda.
d. Sitaram son of Rupchan Munda.
e. Ramiya Devi wife of Rupalal Munda.

118. Jaynath son of Tirath Munda.
a. Deepchandra son of Tirath Munda.
b. Raghunath son of Tirath Munda.
c. Sukhdev son of Rupchan Munda.
d. Sitaram son of Rupchan Munda.
e. Ramiya Devi wife of Rupalal Munda.

119. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.

e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

120. Rakesh son of Mahavir Linda.

121. Somra son of Bunuwa Oraon.
a. Bartu son of Bunuwa Oraon.
b. Soharai son of Kinu Oraon.
c. Chandru son of Kinu Oraon.
d. Bhuktu son of Kinu Oraon.
e. Kartik son of Etwa Oraon.
f. Lalo son Etwa Oraon.
g. Janki wife of Josef Linda.

122. Somra son of Bunwa Oraon.
a. Bartu son of Bunwa Oraon.

123. Sawan son of Mahadev Oraon.
a. Madi son of Ram Oraon.
b. Dadhu son of Ram Oraon.
c. Fagu Oron son of Lachu Oraon.

124. Chottu son of Fagu Oraon.
a. Lalchand Oron son of Puchu Oraon.
b. Somra son of Pachu Oraon.
c. Budhwa son of Siwa Oraon.
d. Punam wife of Vijay Oraon.
e. Dunu son of Somra Oraon.
f. Jagtu son of Somra Oraon.
g. Bhado son of Mangra Oraon.

125. Saraswati wife of Budhwa Oraon.
a. Chamra son of Lurhu Oraon.

126. Rasmati wife of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
a. Rohit son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
b. Rahul Singh son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
c. Rohini Prasad son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
d. Rina Purbe son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).

127. Shekh Saukat son of Sultan Ali.
a. Shekh Adam son of Sultan Ali.
b. Afjal Hussain son of Shekh Chaman.

c. Kayum Ansari son of Afjal Hussain.
128. Budhwa son of Birsa Oraon.
a. Pyari wife of Koka Oraon.
129. Bhakdu son of Somra Oraon.
a. Garha son of Somra Oraon.
b. Bana son of Bicha Oraon.
c. Munna son of Tulgu Oraon.
d. Kandana son of Sukha Oraon.
e. Jatru son of Puran Oraon.
f. Koyalo son of Puran Oraon.
g. Tulgu son of Puran Oraon.
h. Puran son of Jatru Oraon.
i. Sukha son of Jatru Oraon.
j. Baha son of Jatur oraon.
k. Maghya son of Tugu Oraon.
l. Chamra son of Tugu Oraon.
m. Gabdru son of Tugu Oraon.
130. Bhakdu son of Somra Oraon.
a. Garha son of Somra Oraon.
b. Bana son of Bicha Oraon.
c. Munna son of Tulgu Oraon.
d. Kandana son of Sukha Oraon.
e. Jatru son of Puran Oraon.
f. Koyalo son of Puran Oraon.
g. Tulgu son of Puran Oraon.
h. Puran son of Jatru Oraon.
i. Sukha son of Jatru Oraon.
j. Baha son of Jatur oraon.
k. Maghya son of Tugu Oraon.
l. Chamra son of Tugu Oraon.
m. Gabdru son of Tugu Oraon.
131. Jauni son of Yakush Oraon.
132. Jagatnarayan son of Laxmi Nayrayan Jayaswal.
133. Jagatnarayan son of Laxmi Nayrayan Jayaswal.
134. Lakhan son of Doman Singh Baraik.
a. Fulo son of Sadhu Singh Baraik.
b. Chamna son of Jitwahan Singh Baraik.
c. Mohraiwat wife of Budhu Baraik.
d. Satmewa wife of Shivcharan Singh Baraik.
e. Jhabra son of Kanchan Singh Baraik.
135. Lakhan son of Doman Singh Baraik.
a. Fulo son of Sadhu Singh Baraik.
b. Chamna son of Jitwahan Singh Baraik.
c. Mohraiwat wife of Budhu Baraik.
d. Satmewa wife of Shivcharan Singh Baraik.
e. Jhabra son of Kanchan Singh Baraik.
136. Lakhan son of Doman Singh Baraik.
a. Fulo son of Sadhu Singh Baraik.
b. Chamna son of Jitwahan Singh Baraik.
c. Mohraiwat wife of Budhu Baraik.

d. Satmewa wife of Shivcharan Singh Baraik.
e. Jhabra son of Kanchan Singh Baraik.

137. Jabra son of Mangra Oraon.
a. Kanu son of Mangra oraon.
b. Mangri wife of Karma Oraon.

138. Jimrudin son of Shekh Muslim.
a. Jalil son of Jimrudin.

139. Sahamat son of Rojan.
a. Hamid Ansari son of Rojan.
b. Kyamudin Ansari son of Wali.
c. Most. Sayara wife of Jalaludin.

140. Sahamat son of Rojan.
a. Hamid Ansari son of Rojan.

141. Sahamat son of Rojan.
a. Hamid Ansari son of Rojan.

142. Anilsul Rahman son of Abdul Rauf.
a. Shamiul Rahman son of Abdul Rauf.
b. Gulam Mustafa son of Shekh Alimuddin.
c. Gulam Rasul son of Shekh Alimuddin.
d. Gulam Murtaja son of Shekh Alimuddin.
e. Jimruddin son of Muslim.
f. Jalil Ansari son of Jumruddin Ansari.
g. Shomruddin son of Shabuddin.
h. Sajad Ansari son of Shabuddin.
i. Sabruddin son of Shekh Mahju.
j. Emanan Ansari son of Mustaffa.
k. Alam Ansari son of Mustaffa.
l. Alam Ansari son of Mustaffa.
m. Islam Ansari son of Mustaffa.
n. Israfil Ansari son of Mustaffa.
o. Asraf Ansari son of Mustaffa.

143. Anilsul Rahman son of Abdul Rauf.
a. Shamiul Rahman son of Abdul Rauf.
b. Gulam Mustafa son of Shekh Alimuddin.
c. Gulam Rasul son of Shekh Alimuddin.
d. Gulam Murtaja son of Shekh Alimuddin.
e. Jimruddin son of Muslim.
f. Jalil Ansari son of Jumruddin Ansari.
g. Shomruddin son of Shabuddin.
h. Sajad Ansari son of Shabuddin.
i. Sabruddin son of Shekh Mahju.
j. Emanan Ansari son of Mustaffa.
k. Alam Ansari son of Mustaffa.
l. Alam Ansari son of Mustaffa.
m. Islam Ansari son of Mustaffa.
n. Israfil Ansari son of Mustaffa.
o. Asraf Ansari son of Mustaffa.

144. Rosraj son of Mahadev Munda.
a. Shivnarayan Munda son of Durgacharan Munda.
b. Manoj son of Mannu Munda.

c. Bandhan Munda son of Jagmag Munda.
145. Kachu son of Lado Oraon.
a. Rita wife of Etwa Oraon.
b. Hindu son of Lathe Oraon.
c. Sanicharwa son of Lodo oraon.
d. Sugai wife of Birsa Oraon.
e. Karma son of Bhagat Oraon.
146. Navin Kumar son of Prabhu Shankar Jayaswl.
147. Aghni son of Rameshwar Lohar.
a. Dharu son of Babulal Lohar.
b. Vilas wife of Hirda Lohra.
148. Sanicharwa wife of Shukhlal Oraon.
a. Birsa son of Tipna Oroan.
149. ~~Habil son of Abhiram Oraon~~.
i. Bhanu Kachhap.
ii. Anil Kachhap.
~~a. Birsa son of Matyas Kachhap~~.
iii. Died leaving behind no legal heirs
b. ~~Munna son of Matyas Kachhap~~.
i. Died leaving behind no legal heirs
c. Prakash son of Samel Kachhap.
d. Deepak son of Samel Kachhap.
e. Jiwan son of Junus Kachhap.
f. Habil son of Junus Kachhap.
g. Prabhu Dayal son of Junus Kachhap.
h. Ranjan son of Junus Kachhap.
150. Shivnarayan Jaysawal son of Rai Sahab Laxmi Narayan jaysawal.
151. Mahadev Oraon son of Rupwa Oraon.
a. Somari Devi wife of Rapu oraon.
b. Jethu Oraon son of Birsa Oraon.
152. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
d. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
e. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
f. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
g. Sannu son of Shivnath Mahto.
h. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
i. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
j. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.
153. Fagu Mahto son of Bigal Mahto.
a. Mathu Mahto son of Charku Mahto.
b. Mannu Mahto son of Charku Mahto.
154. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.

e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

155. Kandri wife of Gurucharan Munda.
a. Romni wife of Eto Munda.
b. Bhanu wife of Chattu Munda.
c. Tupal son of Sakhu Munda.
d. Aalomani wife of Charka Munda.
e. Narayan son of Dhanraj Munda.
f. Shankar son of Tupal Munda.

156. Rosraj son of Mahadev Munda.
a. Shivnarayan Munda son of Durgacharan Munda.
b. Manoj son of Mannu Munda.
c. Bandhan Munda son of Jagmag Munda.

157. Suresh Oraon son of Birsa Oraon.

158. Mahadev Oraon son of Gulel Oraon.

159. ~~Manshing Baraik son of Madhusingh baraik~~.
a. Shankar Baraik
b. Shambhu Baraik
c. Shubham baraik

160. Shivnarayan Jaysawal son of Rai Saheb Laxmi Narayan Jaysawal.

161. Shivnarayan Jaysawal son of Rai Saheb Laxmi Narayan Jaysawal.

162. Baya oraon son of Koka Oraon.
a. Budhuwa Oraon son of Sukra Oraon.
b. Sohrai Oraon son of Sukra oraon.

163. Etwa son of Jitu Oraon.
a. Debra son of Jita Oraon.
b. Mannu son of Ratan Oraon.
c. Pandey son of Ratan Oroan.
d. Rajendra son of Ratan Oraon.
e. Thibu son of Ratan Oraon.
f. Sujt son of Bana Kachhap.
g. Baya son of Koka Oraon.
h. Sohrai son of Sukra Oraon.

164. Baya oraon son of Koka Oraon.
a. Budhuwa Oraon son of Sukra Oraon.
b. Sohrai Oraon son of Sukra oraon.

165. Etwa son of Jitu Oraon.
a. Debra son of Jita Oraon.
b. Ratan son of Mannu Kachhap.
c. Pandey son of Ratan Oroan.
d. Rajendra son of Ratan Oraon.
e. Thibu son of Ratan Oraon.
f. Sujt son of Bana Kachhap.
g. Malo wife of Binu Kachhap.
h. Baya son of Koka Oraon.
i. Sohrai son of Sukra Oraon.

166. Birsa son of Karma Oraon.
a. Etwa son of Karma Oraon.
b. Jabra son of Mangra Oraon.
c. Kanu son of Mangra Oraon.
d. Mangari wife of Karma Oraon.
e. Mahesh son of Rijhu Oraon.
f. Sonu son of Rijhu Oraon.

167. Anisul Rahman son of Abdul Rauf.
a. Samiul Rahman son of Abdul Rauf.
b. Gulam Mustaffa son of Shekh Alimuddin.
c. Gulam Murtaja son of Shekh Alimuddin.
d. Gulam Rasul son of Shekh Alimuddin.

168. Lakhan Lohar son of Devman Lohar.
a. Basani Devi son of Devnath Lohar.

169. Sanicharwa Devi wife of Fotinder Linda.
a. Sarwan Linda son of Kailash Oraon.

170. Samu son of Gunga Oraon.
a. Jhirgu son of Gunga Oraon.
b. Eto son of Gunga Oraon.
c. Ravi Oraon son of Budhuwa Oraon.
d. Somari Devi wife of Kali Oraon.
e. Bandhani Devi wife of Mongra Oraon.

171. Lodhi son of Dhaka (Somra) Oraon.
a. Mogo son of Dhaka (Somra) Oraon.
b. Suraj son of Dhaka (Somra) Oraon.
c. Raju son of Pagal Oraon.
d. Manoj son of Pagal Oraon.
e. Sunil son of Pagal Oraon.
f. Birsi son of Dhana Oraon.

172. Latu son of Bodhan Oraon.
a. Dhano son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
b. Somra son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
c. Ratan son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
d. Birsa son of Ropan Oraon.

173. Dalal Oraon son of Mangu Oraon.
a. Jaggu Oraon son of Koka Oraon.

174. Birsi son of Dhana Oraon.
a. Karmi son of Jhahu Oraon.
b. Somari son of Khutia Oraon.
c. Bandhi son of Khutia Oraon.

d. Ravi son of Budhwa Oraon.
e. Latu son of Bodhan Oraon.
f. Dhano son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
g. Somra son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
h. Ratan son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
i. Birsa son of Ropan Oraon.
j. Jaggu son of Koka Oraon.
k. Dalal son of Mangu Oraon.
l. Lodhi son of Dhaka Oraon.
m. Mogo son of Dhaka Oraon.
n. Suraj son of Dhaka Oraon.
o. Raju son of Pagal Oraon.
p. Manoj son of Pagal Oraon.
q. Sunil son of Pagal Oraon.

175. Ratni Devi wife of Mahadev Oraon.
a. Manju Devi wife of Bandhna Oraon.

176. Baha son of Paklu Oraon.
a. Sanicharwa son of Paklu Oraon.
b. Mangra son of Budhu Oraon.
c. Dhana son of Budhu Oraon.
d. Etwa son of Sukra Oraon.
e. Birsa son of Sukra Oraon.
f. Choto son of Sukra Oraon.
g. Ranjit son of Bandhu Oraon.
h. Laxman son of Bandhu Oraon.
i. Nanki wife of Kajru Oraon.

177. Sanicharwa Devi wife of Sukhlal Oraon.
a. Birsa Oraon son of Tipna Oraon.

178. Sanicharwa son of Sukra Munda.
a. Khotlo son of Mangru Munda.
b. Munna son of Budhwa Munda.
c. Rajesh son of Budhwa Munda.

179. Chotu son of Fagu Oraon.
a. Etwa son of Pachu.
b. Somra son of Pachu.
c. Budhwa son of Siba Oraon.
d. Punam wife of Vijay Oraon.
e. Dannu son of Somra Oraon.
f. Jagtu son of Somra Oraon.
g. Bhado son of Mangra Oraon.

180. Saraswati wife of Budhwa Oraon.
a. Chamra son of Lahru Oraon.

181. Chander son of Baku Munda.
a. Aklu son of Baku Munda.
b. Mogo son of Mangal Munda.
c. Guddu son of Billu Munda.

182. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.
a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.

d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.

183. Sugiya wife of Birsa oraon.
a. Kacchu son of Lodo Oraon.
b. Hindu son of Lathe Oraon.
c. Sanicharwa son of Lodo Oraon.
d. Karma son of Bhagat Oraon.
e. Rita wife of Etwa Oraon.

184. Baha son of Paklu Oraon.
a. Sanicharwa son of Paklu Oraon.
b. Mangra son of Budhu Oraon.
c. Dhana son of Budhu Oraon.
d. Etwa son of Sukra Oraon.
e. Birsa son of Sukra Oraon.
f. Choto son of Sukra Oraon.
g. Ranjit son of Bandhu Oraon.
h. Laxman son of Bandhu Oraon.
i. Nanki wife of Kajru Oraon.

185. Lattu son of Bodhan Oraon.
a. Dhano Oraon son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
b. Somra Oraon son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
c. Ratan Oraon son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
d. Birsa Oraon son of Ropan Oraon.

186. Lodhi son of Dhaka (Somra).
a. Mogo son of Dhaka (Somra).
b. Suraj son of Dhaka (Somra).
c. Raju son of Pagal Oraon.
d. Manoj son of Pagal Oraon.
e. Sunil son of Pagal Oraon.
f. Birsi son of Dhana Oraon.

187. Ramu son of Gunga Oraon.
a. Jhirga son of Gunga Oraon.
b. Yato son of Gunga Oraon.

c. Ravi Oraon son of Budhuwa Oraon.
d. Somari Devi wife of Kali Oraon.
e. Bandhani Devi wife of Mangra.

188. Savitri Devi Jaysawal W/o Umashankar Jaysawal. **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
(a) (i) Most. Shashi Jaiswal W/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(ii) Sumit Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(iii) Vineet Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(b) Pradeep S/o Umashankar Jaysawal
(c) Purnima Chaudhari W/o Late Randhir Prasad Choudhary
(d) Pratima Chaudhari W/o Manmohan Choudhary
(e) Kumkum Prasad W/o Ram Kuber Prasad.

189. Sawan Toppo son of Mahadev Oraon.
a. Madi Toppo son of Ram Oraon.
b. Dhadu Toppo son of Ram Oraon.
c. Sukar Toppo son of Lachu Oraon.

190. Sawan Toppo son of Mahadev Oraon.
a. Madi Toppo son of Ram Oraon.
b. Dhadu Toppo son of Ram Oraon.
c. Sukar Toppo son of Lachu Oraon.

191. Sawan Toppo son of Mahadev Oraon.
a. Madi Toppo son of Ram Oraon.
b. Dhadu Toppo son of Ram Oraon.
c. Sukar Toppo son of Lachu Oraon.

192. Chuter wife of Fagu Sahu.
a. Sukra son of Hasraj Sahu.
b. Ratho Sahu son of Hasraj Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hasraj Sahu.
d. Birju son of Mahadev Sahu.
e. Niraso wife of Dhuran Sahu.
f. Lalkishwar son of Mahadev Sahu.

193. Most. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
a. ~~Most. Jhalo wife of Ramjit Sahu~~.
i. ~~Mahabir Sahu~~.
I. Most. Jayanti Devi.
ii. Sahabir Sahu.
b. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
c. ~~Gokhul Kumar Prasad son of Sartho Sahu~~.
i. Most. Rukmani Devi (Wife).
d. Most. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
e. ~~Kandan son of Madhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Dashmin Devi (Wife).
f. Most. Mina wife of Vijay Sahu.

194. Md. Afjal (Chedi) son of Shekh Chaman.
a. Shekh Kyum son of Shekh Afjal (Chedi).

195. ~~Liluwa Devi wife of Lal Hazam~~.
i. Jageshwar Thakur (son).
ii. Sanjeev Thakur (son).
a. ~~Jhalku Thakur son of Devnarayan Hazam~~.
i. Most. Mangla Devi (wife).

196. Most. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
a. ~~Most. Jhalo wife of Ramjit Sahu~~.
i. ~~Mahabir Sahu~~ (son).
I. Most. Jayanti Devi (wife).
ii. Sahabir Sahu (son).
b. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
c. ~~Gokhul Kumar Prasad son of Sartho Sahu~~.
i. Most. Rukmani Devi (wife).
d. Most. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
e. ~~Kandan son of Madhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Dashmin Devi (wife).
f. Most. Mina wife of Vijay Sahu.
197. Shekh Saukat son of Sultan Ali.
a. Shekh Adam son of Sultan Ali
198. Shekh Saukat son of Sultan Ali.
a. Shekh Adam son of Sultan Ali
199. Srimati Ful Kumari Jayswal wife of Prabhu Shankar Jaysawal.
200. Sitaram son of Fagu Mahto.
a. Sarwan son of Shikhar Mahto.
b. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
c. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
d. Surendra son of Ramnath Mahto.
e. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
f. Pyrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
g. Sikandar Kumar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.
201. Most. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
a. ~~Most. Jhalo wife of Ramjit Sahu~~.
i. ~~Mahabir Sahu~~ (son).
I. Most. Jayanti Devi (wife).
ii. Sahabir Sahu (son).
b. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
c. ~~Gokhul Kumar Prasad son of Sartho Sahu~~.
i. Most. Rukmani Devi (wife).
d. Most. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
e. ~~Kandan son of Madhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Dashmin Devi (wife).
f. Most. Mina wife of Vijay Sahu.
202. Birju son of Mahadev Sahu.
a. Lalkiswar son of Mahadev Sahu.
b. Niraso Devi wife of Dhuran Sahu.
c. Tetri Devi wife of Tetenga Sahu.
d. Madu Sahu son of Ballu Sahu.
203. Baya Oraon son of Koka Oraon.
a. Budhwa Oraon son of Sukra Oraon.
b. Soharai Oraon son of Sukra Oraon.
204. Sundra son of Fatusingh Munda.
a. Radha son of Fatusingh Munda.
b. Bhola son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.

e. Rungta son of Gangadhar Munda.

205. Jagat Narayan Jayasawal son of Rai Saheb Laxmi Narayan Jaysawal.

206. Mukund son of Hari Singh Munda.

a. Shankar son of Hari Singh Munda.
b. Guddu son of Khedu Munda.
c. Dasiy son of Sadhu Munda.
d. Ramdhan son of Jhirsingh Munda.
e. Mukesh son of Birbal Munda.
f. Sudama son of Birbal Munda.

207. Dhaneshwar Hazam son of Matok Hazam.

a. Bhodo Hazam son of Santosh Hazam.

208. Kandri wife of Gurucharan Munda.

a. Romni wife of Eto Munda.
b. ~~Bahano wife of Chattu Munda~~.
i. Naresh Munda (son).
ii. Phulendra Munda (son).
c. ~~Tupal son of Sakhu Munda~~.
i. Sukhram Munda (son).
ii. Shankar Munda (son).
d. Shankar son of Tupal Munda.

209. Jaynath Munda son of Tirath Munda.

a. Deepchandra Munda son of Tirath Munda.
b. Raghunath Munda son of Tirath Munda.
c. Sukhdev Munda son of Rupchan Munda.
d. Sita Ram Munda son of Rupchan Munda.
e. Ramiya Devi wife of Rupalal Munda.

210. Karmi son of Ropna Mahto.

a. Bajo son of Ropna Mahto.
b. Gudai son of Ropna Mahto.
c. Koka son of Gondla Mahto.
d. Muleshwar son of Gondla Mahto.
e. Sohrai son of Lajher Mahto.
f. Baijnath son of Lajher Mahto.

211. Sohari Mahto son of Lajher Mahto.

a. Baijnath Mahto son of Lajher Mahto.

212. Shekh Saukhat son of Shek Sultan.

a. Shek Adam son of Shek Sultan.
b. Mo. Afjal son of Shekh Chaman.
c. Shekh Kyum son of Mo. Afjal.

213. Shekh Saukhat son of Shek Sultan.

a. Shek Adam son of Shek Sultan.
b. Mo. Afjal son of Shekh Chaman.
c. Shekh Kyum son of Mo. Afjal.

214. Chander Munda son of Baku Munda.

a. Aklu Munda son of Baku Munda.
b. Mogo Munda son of Manjal Munda.
c. Guddu Munda son of Billu Munda.

215. Doman Kurmi son of Charku Kurmi.

a. Sarulla Kurmi son of Charku Kurmi.

216. Doman Kurmi son of Charku Kurmi.
a. Sarulla Kurmi son of Charku Kurmi.
217. ~~Jagnath Matho son of Charku Matho~~.
i. Akhilesh Kumar (son).
ii. Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (son).
iii. Rajiv Kumar (son).
a.Virender Matho son of Charku Matho.
b. Yogendra Mahto son of Charku Matho.
c. Surender Matho son of Charku Matho.
218. Shamat Ansari son of Rojen.
a. Hamid Ansari son of Rojen.
b. Mo. Kyamudin Ansari son of Bali.
c. Mo. Sayara son of Bali.
d. Jiyaul Ansari son of Jlalludin.
219. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.
a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.
d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.
220. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.

m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

221. Jugla Kurmi son of Tikua Kurmi.
a. Afkari Kurmi son of Tikua Kurmi.
b. Nanka Kurmi son of Pusapa Kurmi.
c. Manku Kurmi son of Pusapa Kurmi.
d. ~~Pakku Kurmi son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Ropan Dev (wife).
e. ~~Chotaka Kurmi son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Rashmi Devi (wife).
f. ~~Sagwa Devi daughter of Magala Mahto~~.
i. Akhilesh Kumar (son).
ii. Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (son).
iii. Rajiv Kumar (son).

222. Amin Mahto son of Jhallu Mahto.

223. Most. Kesri Devi wife of Kasinath Mahto.

224. ~~Lilwa Devi wife of Lala Hazam~~.
a. Jageshwar Thakur (son).
b. Sanjeev Thakur (son).

225. Lattu Oraon son of Bodhan Oraon.
a. Birsa Oraon son of Ropan Oraon.
b. Dhano Oraon son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
c. Somra Oraon son of Sanicharwa Oraon.
d. Ratan Oraon son of Sanicharwa Oraon.

226. Sundra Munda son of Fatusingh Munda.
a. Radha Munda son of Fatusingh Munda.
b. Bhola Munda son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga Munda son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan Munda son of Gangadhar Munda.
e. Rungtu Munda son of Gangadhar Munda.

227. ~~Pairo wife of Jhuthan Mahto~~.
i. Jaggu Mahto (son)
ii. Jaglal Mahto (son)
iii. ~~Babulal Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Vimla Devi
a.Moharai son of Jhubla Mahto.
b. ~~Tetri wife of Balku Mahto~~.
i. Most. Bilaso Devi (wife).
c. Lalo wife of Jogiya Mahto.
d. ~~Muter wife of Sudra Mahto~~.
i. ~~Surendra Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Bilaso Devi (wife).
e. Mohan son of Vasudev Mahto.
f. Sohan son of Vasudev Mahto.
g. Rohan son of Vasudev Mahto.

228. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.

a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

229. Sanicharwa son of Sukra Munda.
a. Khotlo son of Mangru Munda.
b. Munna son of Budhuwa Munda.
c. Rajesh son of Budhuwa Munda.

230. Dalal Oraon son of Mangu Oraon.
a. Jaggu Oraon son of Koka Oraon.

231. Krishna Munda son of Lakhiram Munda.

232. Baha son of Paklu Oraon.
a. Sanicharwa son of Paklu Oraon.
b. Mangra son of Budhu Oraon.
c. Dhana son of Budhu Oraon.
d. Etwa son of Sukra Oraon.
e. Birsa son of Sukra Oraon.
f. Choto son of Sukra Oraon.
g. Ranjit son of Bandhu Oraon.
h. Laxman son of Bandhu Oraon.
i. Nanki wife of Kajru Oraon.

233. Sekh Saukat son of Sultan Ali.
a. Shekh Adam son of Sultan Ali.
b. Shekh Afjal (Chedi) son of Chaman.

234. Jaynath son of Tirath Munda.
a. Deepchandra son of Tirath Munda.
b. Raghunath son of Tirath Munda.
c. Sukhdev son of Rupchan Munda.
d. Sitaram son of Rupchan Munda.
e. Ramiya Devi wife of Rupalal Munda.

235. Jaynath son of Tirath Munda.
a. Deepchandra son of Tirath Munda.
b. Raghunath son of Tirath Munda.
c. Sukhdev son of Rupchan Munda.
d. Sitaram son of Rupchan Munda.
e. Ramiya Devi wife of Rupalal Munda.

236. Shekh Afjal (Chedi) son of Shekh Chaman.
a. Kyun Ansari son of Shekh Afjal (Chedi).
237. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.
a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.
d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.
238. Mo. Afjal son of Shekh Chaman.
a. Shekh Kyum son of Afjal.
239. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.
a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.
d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.

240. Paribo Devi wife of Ketra Mahto.
a. Lattu Mahto son of Budnath Mahto.
241. ~~Fulmyin Devi (Hirmain Devi) son of Chedi Kurmi~~.
i. Chamak Lal Mahto (son).
ii. Shyam Lal Mahto (son).
iii. Brij Lal Mahto (son).
a. Pirtu Mahto son of Chedi Kurmi.
b. ~~Lalit Mahto son of Chedi Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Riban Devi (wife).
c. Ramnath Mahto son of Chedi Kurmi.
242. Baha son of Paklu Oraon.
a. Sanicharwa son of Paklu Oraon.
b. Mangra son of Budhu Oraon.
c. Dhana son of Budhu Oraon.
d. Etwa son of Sukra Oraon.
e. Birsa son of Sukra Oraon.
f. Choto son of Sukra Oraon.
g. Ranjit son of Bandhu Oraon.
h. Laxman son of Bandhu Oraon.
i. Nanki wife of Kajru Oraon.
243. Budhwa Oraon son of Bisuwa Oraon.
a. Pyari Devi wife of Koka Oraon.
244. Bhakdu son of Somra Oraon.
a. Gadha son of Somra Oraon.
b. Bana son of Bicha Oraon.
c. Munna son of Tulgu Oraon.
d. Kandana son of Sukha Oraon.
e. Jatru son of Puran Oraon.
f. Koyele son of Puran Oraon.
g. Tugu son of Puran Oraon.
h. Puran Sukha son of Jatru Oraon.
i. Baha son of Jatur oraon.
j. Maghya son of Tugu Oraon.
k. Chamra son of Tugu Oraon.
l. Gabdru son of Tugu Oraon.
245. Manju Devi wife of Bandhana Oraon.
a. Ratni Devi wife of Mahadev Oraon.
246. Jugla son of Tikua Kurmi.
a. Afkari son of Tikua Kurmi.
b. Nanka son of Pusapa Kurmi.
c. Manku son of Pusapa Kurmi.
d. ~~Pakku son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Ropan Devi (wife).
e. ~~Chotaka son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Rashmi Devi (wife).
f. ~~Sagwa Devi daughter of Magala Mahto~~.
i. Akhilesh Kumar (son).
ii. Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (son).
iii. Rajiv Kumar (son).
247. Sanicharwa son of Sukra Munda.

a. Khotlo son of Mangru Munda.
b. Munna son of Budhuwa Munda.
c. Rajesh son of Budhuwa Munda.

248. Samu son of Gunga Oraon.
a. Jhirgu son of Gunga Oraon.
b. Eto son of Gunga Oraon.
c. Mahadev Oraon son of Budhuwa.
d. Ravi Oraon son of Budhuwa Oraon.
e. Somari Devi wife of Kali Oraon.
f. Bandhani Devi wife of Mongra Oraon.

249. Mukund son of Hari Singh Munda.
a. Shankar son of Hari Singh Munda.
b. Guddu son of Khedu Munda.
c. Dasiy son of Sadhu Munda.
d. Ramdhan son of Jhirsingh Munda.
e. Mukesh son of Birbal Munda.
f. Sudama son of Birbal Munda.

250. Mukund son of Hari Singh Munda.
a. Shankar son of Hari Singh Munda.
b. Guddu son of Khedu Munda.
c. Dasiy son of Sadhu Munda.
d. Ramdhan son of Jhirsingh Munda.
e. Mukesh son of Birbal Munda.
f. Sudama son of Birbal Munda.

251. Lodhi son of Dhaka Oraon.
a. Mogo son of Dhaka Oraon.
b. Surju son of Dhaka Oraon.
c. Raju son of Pagal Oraon.
d. Manoj son of Pagal Oraon.
e. Sunil son of Pagal Oraon.
f. Birsi son of Dhaniya Oraon.

252. Savitri W/o Umashankar Jaysawal. **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
(a) (i) Most. Shashi Jaiswal W/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(ii) Sumit Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(iii) Vineet Jaiswal S/o Late Chitranjan Jaiswal
(b) Pradeep S/o Umashankar Jaysawal
(c) Purnima Chaudhari W/o Late Randhir Prasad Choudhary
(d) Pratima Chaudhari W/o Manmohan Choudhary
(e) Kumkum Prasad W/o Ram Kuber Prasad.

253. Chander Munda son of Baku Munda.
a. Aklu Munda son of Baku Munda.
b. Mogo Munda son of Manjal Munda.
c. Guddu Munda son of Billu Munda.

254. Most. Lakhimani Devi wife of Daso Oraon.

255. Mukund son of Hari Singh Munda.
a. Shankar son of Hari Singh Munda.
b. Guddu son of Khedu Munda.
c. Dasiy son of Sadhu Munda.
d. Ramdhan son of Jhirsingh Munda.

e. Mukesh son of Birbal Munda.
f. Sudama son of Birbal Munda.

256. Sanicharwa son of Sukra Munda.
a. Khotlo son of Mangru Munda.
b. Munna son of Budhuwa Munda.
c. Rajesh son of Budhuwa Munda.

257. Mangra Oraon son of Birsa Oraon.
a. Etwa Oraon son of Mangra Oraon.

258. Most. Fulmani wife of Etwa Oraon.

259. Anil son of Sadho Oraon.
a. Baya son of Madho Oraon.
b. Bandhu son of Madho Oraon.
c. Kuwari wife of Bicha Oraon.
d. Sohari wife of Balo Oraon.

260. Most. Fulmani wife of Etwa Oraon.

261. Baha son of Paklu Oraon.
a. Sanicharwa son of Paklu Oraon.
b. Mangra son of Budhu Oraon.
c. Dhana son of Budhu Oraon.
d. Etwa son of Sukra Oraon.
e. Birsa son of Sukra Oraon.
f. Choto son of Sukra Oraon.
g. Ranjit son of Bandhu Oraon.
h. Laxman son of Bandhu Oraon.
i. Nanki wife of Kajru Oraon.

262. Leda Oraon son of Karma Oraon.

263. Chander Munda son of Baku Munda.
a. Aklu Munda son of Baku Munda.
b. Mogo Munda son of Manjal Munda.
c. Guddu Munda son of Billu Munda.

264. Mukund son of Hari Singh Munda.
a. Shankar son of Hari Singh Munda.
b. Guddu son of Khedu Munda.
c. Dasiy son of Sadhu Munda.
d. Ramdhan son of Jhirsingh Munda.
e. Mukesh son of Birbal Munda.
f. Sudama son of Birbal Munda.

265. Faghu Mahto son of Bigal Mahto.
a. Mathu Mahto son of Charku Mahto.
b. Munna Mahto son of Charku Mahto.

266. Shivnarayan Jaysawal son of Raj Saheb Laxmi Narayan Jaysawal.

267. Lodhi son of Dhaka Oraon.
a. Mogo son of Dhaka Oraon.
b. Suraj son of Dhaka Oraon.
c. Raju son of Pagal Oraon.
d. Manoj son of Pagal Oraon.
e. Sunil son of Pagal Oraon.
f. Birsi son of Dhana Oraon.

268. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.

a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

269. Niranjan son of Dashin Singh Baraik.
a. Fagu son of Hardayal Baraik.
b. Jagarnath son of Sohan Baraik.
c. Shankar son of Sohan Baraik.
d. Shambhu son Sohan Baraik.

270. Sawana Baraik son of Ram Charan Singh Baraik.

271. Sahamat Ansari son of Rojen.
a. Hamid Ansari son of Rojen.
b. Most. Kyamuddin Ansari son of Wali.
c. Most. Sayara wife of Jalaluddin.

272. Kashinath Pahan son of Sampat Pahan.
a. Rajan Pahan son of Kartik Pahan.
b. Jiten Pahan son of Kartik Pahan.

273. Rashmi Jaysawal wife of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
a. Rohit Jaysawal son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
b. Rahul Singh Jaysawal son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal).
c. Rohini Prasad son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
d. Rina Purbey son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).

274. Krishna Munda son of Lakhiram Munda.

275. Mukund son of Hari Singh Munda.
a. Shankar son of Hari Singh Munda.
b. Guddu son of Khedu Munda.
c. Dasiy son of Sadhu Munda.
d. Ramdhan son of Jhirsingh Munda.
e. Mukesh son of Birbal Munda.
f. Sudama son of Birbal Munda.

276. Rashmi Jaysawal wife of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
a. Rohit Jaysawal son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
b. Rahul Singh Jaysawal son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal).
c. Rohini Prasad son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).
d. Rina Purbey son of Ranjit Kumar Jaysawal (Ranjit Singh Jaysawal).

277. Kistto Munda son Sukra Munda.
a. Manoj Munda son of Sukra Munda.
b. Mogo Munda son of Dharu Munda.
c. Nandu Munda son of Shikhar.

278. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

279. Navin Kumar Jaysawal son of Prabhu Shankar Jayasawal.

280. Kistto Munda son Sukra Munda.
a. Manoj Munda son of Sukra Munda.
b. Mogo Munda son of Dharu Munda.
c. Nandu Munda son of Shikhar.

281. Lakhan son of Doman Singh Baraik.
a. Fulo son of Sadhu Singh Baraik.
b. Chamna son of Jitwahan Singh Baraik.
c. Mohraiwat wife of Budhu Baraik.
d. Satmewawife of Shivcharan Singh Baraik.
e. Jhabra son of Kanchan Singh Baraik.

282. Lakhan son of Doman Singh Baraik.
a. Fulo son of Sadhu Singh Baraik.
b. Chamna son of Jitwahan Singh Baraik.
c. Mohraiwat wife of Budhu Baraik.
d. Satmewawife of Shivcharan Singh Baraik.
e. Jhabra son of Kanchan Singh Baraik.

283. Lakhan son of Doman Singh Baraik.
a. Fulo son of Sadhu Singh Baraik.
b. Chamna son of Jitwahan Singh Baraik.
c. Mohraiwat wife of Budhu Baraik.
d. Satmewawife of Shivcharan Singh Baraik.
e. Jhabra son of Kanchan Singh Baraik.
284. Sundra son of Fatusingh Munda.
a. Radha son of Fatusingh Munda.
b. Bhola son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.
e. Rungtu son of Gangadhar Munda.
f. Krishna son of Lakhiram Munda.
g. Sanpat son of Ramtahal Pahan.
285. Ganesh son of Mahadev Oraon.
a. Kartik son of Mahadev Oraon.
b. Mahavir son of Mahadev Oraon.
286. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.
287. Chander Munda son of Baku Munda.
a. Aklu Munda son of Baku Munda.
b. Mogo Munda son of Manjal Munda.
c. Guddu Munda son of Billu Munda.
288. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.

j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.

289. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.
a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.
d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.

290. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.

r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.
291. Faghu Mahto son of Bigal Mahto.
a. Nithu son of Charku Mahto.
b. Manu Mahto son of Charku Mahto.
292. Lagan wife of Bharat Mahto.
a. Bhupnath son of Sobhnath Mahto.
b. Nanaku son of Sobhanath Mahto.
c. Sita Ram son of Fagu Mahto.
d. Nandu son of Aguwa Mahto.
e. Sarwan son of Shekhar Mahto.
f. Sannu son of Chattu Mahto.
g. Satrudhan son of Ghasi Mahto.
h. Surender son of Ramnath Mahto.
i. Sawan son of Ramnath Mahto.
j. Payrelal son of Ramnath Mahto.
k. Baleshwar son of Shivnath Mahto.
l. Ramesh son of Shivnath Mahto.
m. Suresh son of Shivnath Mahto.
n. Jhalo son of Badas Mahto.
o. Birju son of Mangan Mahto.
p. Jitlal son of Mangan Mahto.
q. Sabi wife of Ganesh Mahto.
r. Sikandar son of Jaleshwar Mahto.
293. Baha son of Paklu Oraon.
a. Sanicharwa son of Paklu Oraon.
b. Mangra son of Budhu Oraon.
c. Dhana son of Budhu Oraon.
d. Etwa son of Sukra Oraon.
e. Birsa son of Sukra Oraon.
f. Choto son of Sukra Oraon.
g. Ranjit son of Bandhu Oraon.
h. Laxman son of Bandhu Oraon.
i. Nanki wife of Kajru Oraon.
294. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.
a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.
d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.

q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.

295. Jagat Narayan Jaysawal son of Raisahab Laxmi Narayan Jaysawal.
a. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
b. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.
c. Rungtu son of Gangadhar Munda.
d. Sundra son of Fatu Singh Munda.
e. Radha son of Fatu Singh Munda.
f. Chand Mani Sasur son of Fatu Singh Munda.

296. Sundra son of Fatusingh Munda.
a. Radha son of Fatusingh Munda.
b. Bhola son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.
e. Rungtu son of Gangadhar Munda.
f. Maklina wife of Buida Munda.

297. Sundra son of Fatusingh Munda.
a. Radha son of Fatusingh Munda.
b. Bhola son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.
e. Rungtu son of Gangadhar Munda.
f. Maklina wife of Buida Munda.

298. Sundra son of Fatusingh Munda.
a. Radha son of Fatusingh Munda.
b. Bhola son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.
e. Rungtu son of Gangadhar Munda.
f. Maklina wife of Buida Munda.

299. Sundra son of Fatusingh Munda.
a. Radha son of Fatusingh Munda.
b. Bhola son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.
e. Rungtu son of Gangadhar Munda.
f. Maklina wife of Buida Munda.

300. Faghu Mahto son of Bigal Mahto.
a. Mathu Mahto son of Charku Mahto.
b. Munna Mahto son of Charku Mahto.

301. Jagarnath Munda son of Goverdhan Munda.
a. Natwar Munda son of Goverdhan Munda.

302. Sanichariya Devi wife of Fotinder Linda.
a. Sharwan Linda son of Kailash Oraon.

303. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.

a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.
d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.

304. Prakash son of Romal Khalkho.

a. Jasman son of Sahay.
b. Ashish son of Yedo Khalkho.
c. Bhusila wife of Komal Khalkho.
d. Josef son of Johan Khalkho.
e. Herman son of Johan Khalkho.
f. Vinni son of Johan Khalkho.
g. Tersa wife of Daniel Khalkho.
h. Prabhu son of Daud Khalkho.
i. Sushma wife of Prem Khalkho.
j. Polus son of Daud Khalkho.
k. Klyan son of Daud Khalkho.
l. Jaymasih son of Kunwar Khalkho.
m. Edward son of Kunwar Khalkho.
n. Prabhu son of Nirmal Khalkho.
o. Nirmal son of Siril Khalkho.
p. Amrit son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
q. Eliyajar son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
r. Nirmal son of Anand Mashi Khalkho.
s. Kunwar son of Nate Khalkho.
t. Ishwar Das son of Nate Khalkho.
u. Fransis son of Nate Khalkho.
v. Abraham son of Vimal Khalkho.

305. Budhwa son of Luduwa Oraon.

a. Durga son of Bhonduwa Oraon.
b. Ludu son of Bhonduwa Oraon.

306. Sundra son of Fatusingh Munda.

a. Radha son of Fatusingh Munda.

b. Bhola son of Fatusingh Munda.
c. Ganga son of Arjun Munda.
d. Mohan son of Gangadhar Munda.
e. Rungtu son of Gangadhar Munda.
f. Maklina wife of Buida Munda.

307. Lakhan son of Doman Singh Baraik.
a. Fulo son of Sadhu Singh Baraik.
b. Chamna son of Jitwahan Singh Baraik.
c. Mohraiwat wife of Budhu Baraik.
d. Satmewawife of Shivcharan Singh Baraik.
e. Jhabra son of Kanchan Singh Baraik.
All are residents of Village Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, District – Ranchi.

308. Sanicharwara son of Sukra Munda.
a. Khotlo son of Mangru Munda.
b. Munna son of Budhuwa Munda.
c. Rajesh son of Budhuwa Munda.

309. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
a. ~~Jhalo wife of Ramjit~~.
i. ~~Mahabir Sahu~~ (son).
I. Most. Jayanti Devi (wife).
ii. Sahabir Sahu (son)
b. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
c. ~~Gokul son of Sartho Sahu~~.
i. Most. Rukmani Devi (wife).
d. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
e. ~~Kandan son of Madhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Dashmin Devi (wife).
f. Meena wife of Vijay Sahu.

310. Dhaneshwar son of Manrakhan Sahu.
a. Mahendra son of Sardhu Sahu.
b. ~~Gorkhnath son of Sardhu Sahu~~.
i. Surendra Mahto (son).
c. Rusan wife of Goberdhan Sahu.
d. Jitu son of Thask Ram Sahu.
e. Bandhu son of Thask Ram Sahu.
f. Kameshwar Prasad son of Sardhu Sahu.

311. Kaushalya Devi wife of Sadhu Sahu.
a. Samu son of Ghasi Sahu.

312. Radhanath son of Nocho Mahto.
a. Rameshwar son of Nocho Mahto.
b. Jaleshwar son of Nocho Mahto.
c. Kaleswar son of Nocho Mahto.

313. Jitram son of Anand Mahto.
a. Jitu son of Anand Mahto.
b. Budhram son of Mani.
c. ~~Bishu son of Mani~~.
i. Birendra Kumar Mahto (son).
d. ~~Babulal son of Mani~~.
i. Most. Rita Devi (wife).

e. Niranjan son of Mukund Mahto.
314. ~~Meghnath son of Bishram Mahto~~.
i. Ramnath Mahto (son).
ii. ~~Jainath Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Surnti Devi (wife).
a. ~~Kolha son of Bishram Mahto~~.
i. TirathNath Mahto (son).
b. Madhu son of Bishram Mahto.
c. Savitiri wife of Laldeo Mahto.
315. Motilal son of Nand Sahu.
a. Andhru son of Nand Sahu.
b. Salik son of Nand Sahu.
c. Ratho son of Lalu Sahu.
d. Paltu son of Bigal Sahu.
e. Binand son of Bigal Sahu.
316. Bhatain Devi wife of Mahru Sahu.
a. Sulwa Devi wife of Soharai Teli.
317. Aghnu Sahu son of Sahdeo Sahu.
a. Sadanand Sahu son of Sahdeo Sahu.
318. Koyali wife of Bigna Kumhar.
a. Sitaram son of Reghunath Kumhar.
b. Sumitira wife of Bhola Kumhar.
c. Ram son of Langra Kumhar.
d. Kaushalya wife of Sahdeo Kumhar.
e. Jodhanram son of Langra Kumhar.
f. Dukhuram son of Langra Kumhar.
g. Shankarram son of Maru Ram Kumhar.
319. Koyali wife of Bigna Kumhar.
a. Sitaram son of Reghunath Kumhar.
b. Sumitira wife of Bhola Kumhar.
c. Ram son of Langra Kumhar.
d. Kaushalya wife of Sahdeo Kumhar.
e. Jodhanram son of Langra Kumhar.
f. Dukhuram son of Langra Kumhar.
g. Shankarram son of Maru Ram Kumhar.
320. ~~Liluwa wife of Lala Hazam~~.
i. Jageshwar Thakur (son).
ii. Sanjeev Thakur (son).
a. ~~Jhalku son of Devnarayan Thakur~~.
i. Most. Mangla Devi (wife).
321. Balkishun son of Ghasiya Munda.
a. Mangri Pahnai daughter of Natu Munda **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
322. Balkishun son of Ghasiya Munda.
a. Mangri Pahnai daughter of Natu Munda**(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
323. Lilmohan son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Nandkishor son of Sukra Pahan.
b. Gunjir wife of Jagnath Pahan.
c. Jhubra son of Charku Pahan.

d. Balak son of Charku Pahan.
e. Dhodhro son of Harku Pahan.
f. Baleshwar son of Sajha Pahan.
g. Kaleshwar son of Sajha Pahan.
h. Koka son of Sajha Pahan.
i. Bishram son of Mahaj Pahan.
j. Asharam son of Mahaj Pahan.
k. Sukhram son of Mahaj Pahan.
l. Rusa son of Girdhari Pahan.
m. Devnath son of Girdhari Pahan.
n. Hari son of Getu Pahan.
o. Reshmi wife of Koka Pahan.
p. Birsa son of Pandey Pahan.
q. Charka son of Pandey Pahan.
r. Bindu son of Dobraj Pahan.
s. Sumitra wife of Devendra Pahan.

324. Bilaso Devi son of Chamru Kurmi.

325. Soharai Mahto son of Lajher Kurmi.
a. Baijnath Mahto son of Lajher Kurmi.

326. Karmi wife of Dharma Mahto.
a. Bajo wife of Sita Gudai.
b. Ropna Mahto son of Dashrath Mahto.
c. Balram son of Dashrath Mahto.
d. Koka son of Gondla Mahto.
e. Sohrai son of Lajher Mahto.
f. Baijnath son of Lajher Mahto.
g. Bilaso Devi wife of Chamru Mahto.

327. Karmi wife of Dharma Mahto.
a. Bajo wife of Sita Gudai.
b. Ropna Mahto son of Dashrath Mahto.
c. Balram son of Dashrath Mahto.
d. Koka son of Gondla Mahto.
e. Sohrai son of Lajher Mahto.
f. Baijnath son of Lajher Mahto.
g. Bilaso Devi wife of Chamru Mahto.

328. Tirthnath Mahto son of Puran Kurmi.
a. Balak Mahto son of Puran Kurmi.

329. ~~Fulmani wife of Dutiya Kurmi~~.
i. Chamak Lal Mahto (son).
ii. Shyam Lal Mahto (son).
iii. Brij Lal Mahto (son).
a. Pirtu son of Chedi Kumari.
b. ~~Lalit son of Chedi Kumari~~.
i. Most. Riban Devi (wife).
c. Ramnath son of Chedi Kumari.

330. Sohrai Munda son of Dubka Munda.

331. Sukra son of Jhluwa Munda.
a. Shankar son of Jhluwa Munda.
b. Shohari wife of Sadhuwa Munda.

332. Sawna son of Birsa Munda.

a. Rajendar son of Pusuwa Munda.
b. Deepak son of Pusuwa Munda.
c. Lalti son of Chamna Munda.
333. Pusan daughter of Shohar.
a. Bulku daughter of Shohar.
b. Chedi son of Bhukhla Sahu.
334. Jhubra Baitha son of Sohar Baitha.
335. Lalmohan Mahto son of Milku Mahto.
336. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
a. ~~Jhalo wife of Ramjit~~.
i. ~~Mahabir Sahu~~ (son)
I. Most. Jayanti Devi (wife).
ii. Sahabir Sahu (son)
b. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
c. ~~Gokhul son of Sartho Sahu~~.
i. Most. Rukmani Devi (wife).
d. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
e. ~~Kandan son of Madhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Dashmin Devi (wife).
f. Meena Devi, wife of Vijay Sahu.
337. Barju son of Mahadev Sahu.
a. Niraso wife of Ghuran Sahu.
b. Lalkishwar son of Mahadev Sahu.
c. Samkuwair wife of Tetenga Sahu.
d. Madu Sahu son of Balu Sahu.
338. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
a. ~~Jhalo wife of Ramjit~~.
i. ~~Mahabir Sahu~~ (son)
I. Most. Jayanti Devi (wife).
ii. Sahabir Sahu (son)
b. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
c. ~~Gokul son of Sartho Sahu~~.
i. Most. Rukmani Devi (wife)
d. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
~~e. Kandan son of Madhu Sahu.~~
i. Most. Dashmin Devi (wife)
f. Meena wife of Vijay Sahu.
339. Kamal Ram Prajapati son of Raghunath Ram Prajapati.
340. Jodhan Ram Kumhar son of Langra Ram Kumhar.
341. Parwati Devi wife of Kapil Mahto.
342. Teju son of Mahadev Mahto.
a. Amit son of Balwa Mahto.
343. ~~Meghnath son of Bishram Mahto~~.
i. Ramnath Mahto (son).
ii. ~~Jainath Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Surnti Devi (wife).
a. Savitri wife of Laldeo Mahto.
b. ~~Kolha son of Bishram Mahto~~.
i. Tirath Nath Mahto (son).
c. Madhu son of Bishram Mahto.

d. Bandhu son of Ropna Mahto.
e. Jhollo son of Ropna Mahto.
f. Faguram son of Khodhi Mahto.
344. ~~Jagnath son of Charku Mahto~~.
i. Akhilesh Kumar (son).
ii. Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (son).
iii. Rajiv Kumar (son).
a. Birendra son of Charku Mahto.
b. Yogendra son of Charku Mahto.
c. Surendra son of Charku Mahto.
345. Ledwa Kurmi son of Sukhlal Mahto.
a. Jaddu Kurmi son of Sukhlal Mahto.
346. Jitu Mahto son of Ghasiya Mahto.
347. Bindu Pahan son of Dubraj Pahan.
a. Sumitra wife of Devendra Pahan.
348. Meena Devi son of Vijay Kumar Sahu.
349. Balwa son of Bhagwan Mahli.
a. Charka son of Bhagan Mahli.
b. Jitwahan son of Bhagan Mahli.
c. Merhi son of Bhagan Mahli.
d. Jitu son of Ghasiya Mahto.
350. Sohri Devi wife of Chamna Mahli.
a. Bigal son of Dhoga Mahli.
b. Jaleshwar son of Lurku Mahli.
c. Radheshyam son of Lurku Mahli.
351. Bigal Mahli son of Dhonga Mahli.
352. Balwa Mahli son of Bhagan Mahli.
353. Gopal Sahu son of Hirdaylal Sahu.
354. Aghnu Sahu son of Dashrath Sahu.
355. Pannu son of Budu Lohar.
a. Devnath son of Budu Lohar.
b. Kari Devi wife of Hariya Lohar.
356. Pannu son of Budu Lohar.
a. Devnath son of Budu Lohar.
b. Kari Devi wife of Hariya Lohar.
c. Gopi son of Chander Lohar.
d. Kumna son of Chander Lohar.
e. Sibu son of Mohan Lohar.
357. Radha Kisan son of Parasnath Sahu.
a. Mani son of Parasnath Sahu.
b. Ras Bihari son of Parasnath Sahu.
c. Kunj Bihari son of Parasnath Sahu.
358. Chuter wife of Tirtu Sahu.
a. Sukar son of Hasraj Sahu.
b. Ratho son of Hasraj Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hasraj Sahu.
359. Shanti wife of Bisamber Lohar.
a. Putul wife of Ganga Lohar.
b. Kamli wife of Guddan Lohar.
360. Barju son of Mahadev Sahu.

a. Lalkishwar Sahu son of Mahadev Sahu.
b. Niraso Devi wife of Ghuran.

361. Sonalal son of Shivcharan Lohar.
a. Hiralal son of Shivcharan Lohar.
b. Devraj son of Mannalal Lohar.
c. Sagar son of Jagat Lohar.
d. Mannu son of Jagat Lohar.
e. Ghannu son of Jagat Lohar.
f. Rungtu son of Lachan Lohar.

362. Chuter wife of Tirtu Sahu.
a. Sukra son of Hasraj Sahi.
b. Ratho son of Hasraj Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hasraj Sahu.
d. Runiya wife of Raman Sahu.
e. Sukhchand son of Dolwa Sahu.
f. Karichand son of Dolwa Sahu.
g. Shyam son of Dolwa Sahu.
h. Aghnu son of Dasrath.
i. Bhuneshwar son of Gorakh Sahu.
j. Fagu son od Basmati Devi.
k. Baldev son of Basmati Devi.
l. Likhiya Devi daughter of Basmati Devi.

363. Lilmohan Pahan son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Gunjar son of Sukra Pahan.
b. Nand Kishor Pahan son of Sukra Pahan.

364. Lilmohan Pahan son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Gunjar daughter of Sukra Pahan.
b. Nand Kishor son of Sukra Pahan.
c. Jhubra son of Charku Pahan.
d. Balak son of Charku Pahan.
e. Dodhro son of Harkhu Pahan.

365. Sadhu Devi daughter of Gondura Sahu.
a. Tijo Devi daughter of Gondura Sahu.
b. Manju Devi daughter of Gondura Sahu.
c. Panchu Sahu son of Kandru Sahu.
d. Rajendra Sahu son of Khedu Sahu.

366. Gauri Shankar son of Darwari Sahu.
a. Tirath son of Darwari Sahu.
b. Kailash son of Gopi Sahu.
c. Bhola son of Gopi Sahu.
d. Kashinath son of Dharmnath.
e. Baijnath son of Dharmnath.

367. Gauri Shankar son of Darwari Sahu.
a. Tirath son of Darwari Sahu.
b. Kailash son of Gopi Sahu.
c. Bhola son of Gopi Sahu.

368. Motilal son of Nanda Sao.
a. Andhru son of Nanda Sao.
b. Salik son of Nanda Sao.
c. Jaleshwar son of Kaliya Sahu.

d. Lakhan son of Kaliya Sahu.
e. Kamal son of Kaliya Sahu.
f. Jitlal son of Kaliya Sahu.

369. Agamlal Sahu son of Nanku Sahu.
a. Babulal Sahu son of Nanku Sahu.

370. Samkunwar Devi wife of Ramnu Sahu.
a. Ghuran Sahu son of Baliya Sahu.

371. Fagu Mahli son of Matan Mahli.
a. Randh wife of Kalicharan Mahli.

372. Bhunnu son of Malti Munda.
a. Munna son of Malti Munda.
b. Lacho Ram son of Ropna Munda.
c. Charka son of Birsa Munda.
d. Ganga son of Birsa Munda.
e. Kaila son of Anduwa.

373. Ropni wife of Ganpat Sahu.
a. Butan wife of Charku.
b. Aghnu son of Sahdev Sahu.
c. Sadanand son of Sahdev Sahu.
d. Chando wife of Sunuwa Sahu.
e. Ratho son of Kandru Sahu.

374. Birju Mahto son of Matnu Mahto.

375. Agamlal Sahu son of Nanku Sahu.
a. Babulal Sahu son of Nanku Sahu.

376. Agamlal son of Nanku Sahu.
a. Babu Lal son of Nanku Sahu.
b. Babulal son of Nand Sahu.
c. Motilal son of Nand Sahu.
d. Andhru son of Nand Sahu.
e. Salik son of Nand Sahu.
f. Jaleshwar son of Kaliya Sahu.
g. Lakhan son of Kaliya Sahu.
h. Kamal son of Kaliya Sahu.
i. Jitlal son of Kaliya Sahu.

377. Agamlal son of Nanku Sahu.
a. Babulal son of Nanku Sahu.
b. Motilal son of Nanda Sahu.
c. Andhru son of Nanda Sahu.
d. Salik son of Nanda Sahu.
e. Jaleshwar son of Kaliya Sahu.
f. Lakhan son of Kaliya Sahu.
g. Kamal son of Kaliya Sahu.
h. Jitlal son of Kaliya Sahu.
i. Balo wife of Rameshwar.
j. Ghuran son of Baliya.
k. Samkunwar wife of Ramnu.

378. Kalicharan Sahu son of Birsa Teli.
a. Kishor Sahu son of Mangu Sahu.

379. Agamlal son of Nanku Sahu.
a. Babulal son of Nanku Sahu.

b. Motilal son of Nanda Sahu.
c. Andhru son of Nanda Sahu.
d. Salik son of Nanda Sahu.
e. Jaleshwar son of Kaliya Sahu.
f. Lakhan son of Kaliya Sahu.
g. Kamal son of Kaliya Sahu.
h. Jitlal son of Kaliya Sahu.
i. Balo wife of Rameshwar.
j. Ghuran son of Baliya.
k. Samkunwar wife of Ramnu.

380. Chuter wife of Tirtu Sahu.
a. Sukra son of Hasraj Sahi.
b. Ratho son of Hasraj Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hasraj Sahu.
d. Runiya wife of Raman Sahu.
e. Sukhchand son of Dolwa Sahu.
f. Karichand son of Dolwa Sahu.
g. Shyam son of Dolwa Sahu.
h. Aghnu son of Dasrath.
i. Bhuneshwar son of Gorakh Sahu.
j. Fagu son of Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
k. Baldev son of Basmati Devi**(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
l. Likhiya Devi daughter of Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**

381. Chuter wife of Tirtu Sahu.
a. Sukra son of Hasraj Sahi.
b. Ratho son of Hasraj Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hasraj Sahu.
d. Runiya wife of Raman Sahu.
e. Sukhchand son of Dolwa Sahu.
f. Karichand son of Dolwa Sahu.
g. Shyam son of Dolwa Sahu.
h. Aghnu son of Dasrath.
i. Bhuneshwar son of Gorakh Sahu.
j. Fagu son od Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
k. Baldev son of Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
l. Likhiya Devi daughter of Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**

382. Chuter wife of Tirtu Sahu.
a. Sukra son of Hasraj Sahi.
b. Ratho son of Hasraj Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hasraj Sahu.
d. Runiya wife of Raman Sahu.
e. Sukhchand son of Dolwa Sahu.
f. Karichand son of Dolwa Sahu.
g. Shyam son of Dolwa Sahu.
h. Aghnu son of Dasrath.
i. Bhuneshwar son of Gorakh Sahu.
j. Fagu son od Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**
k. Baldev son of Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**

l. Likhiya Devi daughter of Basmati Devi **(Deleted v/o dated 31.10.2025)**

383. Keshwari Devi wife of Kashinath Mahto.

384. Amin Mahto son of Jhallu Mahto.

385. Ranth Devi wife of Kalicharan Mahli.

386. Pahlad Mahto son of Situwa Mahto.

a. Aahlad Mahto son of Situwa Mahto.

387. ~~Meghnath son of Bishram Mahto~~.

i. Ramnath Mahto (son).

ii. ~~Jainath Mahto~~ (son).

iii. Most. Surnti Devi (wife).

a. ~~Kolha son of Bishram Mahto~~.

i. Tirath Nath Mahto (son).

b. Savitri wife of Laldeo Mahto.

c. Madhu son of Bishram Mahto.

d. Fagu Ram son of Korchi Mahto.

e. Jhallu son of Ropna Mahto.

f. Bandhu son of Ropna Mahto.

388. Aklu Sahu son of Galuwa Sahu.

389. Pusan son of Sohar.

a. Balku son of Sohar.

b. Chedi son of Bhukhal Sahu.

390. Laxman son of Birsa Teli.

a. Prenchand son of Birsa Teli.

b. Savitri wife of Raju Sahu.

c. Sulwa wife of Sohari Teli.

d. Baghtaiin wife of Murhu.

391. Laxman Sahu son of Birsa Teli.

a. Prenchand Sahu son of Birsa Teli.

b. Savitri Devi wife of Raju Sahu.

392. Bisun son of Khedan Teli.

a. Bilas wife of Shohrai Teli.

b. Siwan daughter of Jagatpal.

c. Dipan daughter of Jagatpal.

d. Jitan daughter of Jagatpal.

e. Ritu daughter of Jagatpal.

393. Buglu son of Ganesh Sahu.

a. Jugal son of Ganesh Sahu.

b. Ugan son of Ganesh Sahu.

c. Sita son of Ganesh Sahu.

d. Ganga son of Ganesh Sahu.

e. Manna son of Ganesh Sahu.

f. Jaynath son of Ganesh Sahu.

394. Fulchand son of Mahadev Sahu.

a. Chunnu son of Mahadev Sahu.

b. Bartu son of Mahadev Sahu.

c. Kalicharan son of Mahadev Sahu.

d. Raju son of Mahadev Sahu.

395. Chedi son of Jhubba Teli.

a. Aklu son of Jhubba Teli.

b. Charku son of Jhubba Teli.
c. Etwa son of Jhubba Teli.
d. Fagua son of Bahuran.
e. Raimuni wife of Jaggu Sahu.

396. Buglu son of Ganesh Sahu.
a. Jugal son of Ganesh Sahu.
b. Ugan son of Ganesh Sahu.
c. Sita son of Ganesh Sahu.
d. Ganga son of Ganesh Sahu.
e. Manna son of Ganesh Sahu.
f. Jaynath son of Ganesh Sahu.

397. Most. Sadho Devi wife of Ugna Sahu.

398. Chedi son of Jhubba Teli.
a. Aklu son of Jhubba Teli.
b. Charku son of Jhubba Teli.
c. Etwa son of Jhubba Teli.
d. Fagua son of Bahuran.
e. Raimuni wife of Jaggu Sahu.

399. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
a. ~~Jhalo wife of Ramjit~~.
i. ~~Mahabir Sahu~~ (son)
I. Most. Jayanti Devi (wife).
ii. Sahabir Sahu (son)
b. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
c. ~~Gokul son of Sartho Sahu~~.
i. Most. Rukmani Devi (wife).
d. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
e. ~~Kandan son of Madhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Dashmin Devi (wife).
f. Mina Devi, wife of Vijay Sahu.

400. Barjul son of Mahadev.
a. Niraso wife of Ghuran Sahu.
b. Lalkishwar son of Mahadev Sahu.
c. Samkuwar wife of Tetanga Sahu.
d. Maru son of Ballu Kumar.

401. Koyali wife of Bigna.
a. Sitaram son of Raghunath.
b. Sumitira wife of Bhola.
c. Ram son of Langra Kumhar.
d. Kaushalya wife of Sahdeo Kumhar.
e. Jodhanram son of Langra Kumhar.
f. Dukhuram son of Langra Kumhar.
g. Shankarram son of Maru Ram Kumhar.

402. Jageshwar son of Surendra Munda.
a. Mithu son of Surendra Munda.

403. Jageshwar son of Surendra Munda.
a. Mithu son of Surendra Munda.

404. Jageshwar son of Surendra Munda.
a. Mithu son of Surendra Munda.

405. Sagar son of Jagat Lohar.

a. Manu son of Jagat Lohar.
b. Dhanu Lohar son of Jagat Lohar.
c. Rungtu son of Lachan Lohar.

406. Jageshwar son of Surendra Munda.
a. Mithu Munda, son of Surendra Munda.

407. Jugla son of Tikua Kurmi.
a. Afkari son of Tikua Kurmi.
b. Nanka son of Pusapa Kurmi.
c. Manku son of Pusapa Kurmi.
d. ~~Pakku son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Ropan Devi (wife).
e. ~~Chotaka son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Rashmi Devi (wife).
f. ~~Sagwa Devi daughter of Magala Mahto~~.
i. Akhilesh Kumar (son).
ii. Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (son).
iii. Rajiv Kumar (son).

408. Jugla son of Tikua Kurmi.
a. Afkari son of Tikua Kurmi.
b. Nanka son of Pusapa Kurmi.
c. Manku son of Pusapa Kurmi.
d. ~~Pakku son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Ropan Devi (wife).
e. ~~Chotaka son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Rashmi Devi (wife).
f. ~~Sagwa Devi daughter of Magala Mahto~~.
i. Akhilesh Kumar (son).
ii. Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (son).
iii. Rajiv Kumar (son).

409. Jugla son of Tikua Kurmi.
a. Afkari son of Tikua Kurmi.
b. Nanka son of Pusapa Kurmi.
c. Manku son of Pusapa Kurmi.
d. ~~Pakku son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Ropan Devi (wife).
e. ~~Chotaka son of Pusapa Kurmi~~.
i. Most. Rashmi Devi (wife).
f. ~~Sagwa Devi daughter of Magala Mahto~~.
i. Akhilesh Kumar (son).
ii. Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (son).
iii. Rajiv Kumar (son).

410. Bhola son of Tulsi Sahu.
a. Kashinath son of Tulsi Sahu.
b. Vasudev son of Hullas Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hullas Sahu.
d. Sahabir son of Hullas Sahu.

411. Radhanath son of Nocho Mahto.
a. Rameshwar son of Nocho Mahto.
b. Jaleshwar son of Nocho Mahto.
c. Baleshwar son of Nocho Mahto.

d. Kaleshwar son of Nocho Mahto.
412. ~~Meghnath son of Bishram Mahto.~~
i. Ramnath Mahto (son).
ii. ~~Jainath Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Surnti Devi (wife).
a. ~~Kolha son of Bishram Mahto~~.
i. Tirath Nath Mishra (son).
b. Madhu son of Bishram Mahto.
c. Fagu Ram son of Korhi Mahto.
d. Jhollo son of Ropna Mahto.
e. Bandhu son of Ropna Mahto.
f. Savitri wife of Laldeo Mahto.
413. Santosh Kurmi son of Mahadev Kurmi.
414. Raghu Sahu son of Bhaura Sahu.
a. Raghunath Sahu son of Bhaura Sahu.
b. Sanicharwa Sahu son of Bhaura Sahu.
c. Faghu Sahu son of Bhaura Sahu.
415. Siwan Devi wife of Tilak Sahu.
a. ~~Kandan Sahu son of Madhu Sahu~~.
i. Dashmin Devi (wife).
416. Arti daughter of Jageshwar.
a. Gunuwa son of Jhubla Sahu.
b. Shankar son of Bandhu Sahu.
417. Mo. Sadho Devi wife of Ugna Sahu.
418. Mungia wife of Hariya Teli.
a. Kaushalya wife of Sadhu Sahu.
b. Samu son of Ghasni Sahu.
419. Fulchand son of Mahadev Sahu.
a. Chunnu son of Mahadev Sahu.
b. Bartu son of Mahadev Sahu.
c. Kalicharan son of Mahadev Sahu.
d. Raju son of Mahadev Sahu.
e. Malab son of Langra Sahu.
f. Mahabir son of Panchu Sahu.
g. Shabir son of Panchu Sahu.
h. Nanki wife of Chhotwa Sahu.
i. Bhadir son of Somra Sahu.
j. Charku son of Ratho Sahu.
k. Pano wife of Puswa Sahu.
l. Nanho son of Gedhya Sahu.
m. Akli wife of Latu Sahu.
420. Lalmohan Mahto son of Milku Mahto.
421. Motilal son of Nand Sao.
a. Andhru son of Nand Sao.
b. Salik son of Nand Sao.
c. Balo wife of Rameshwar Sahu.
d. Jaleshwar son of Kaliya Sahu.
e. Lakhan son of Kaliya Sahu.
f. Kamal son of Kaliya Sahu.
g. Jitlal son of Kaliya Sahu.

h. Mankunwar wife of Ramnu Sahu.
i. Ghuran son of Baliya Teli.
j. Kishor son of Mangu Sahu.
k. Kalicharan son of Birsa Teli.

422. Motilal son of Nand Sao.
a. Andhru son of Nand Sao.
b. Salik son of Nand Sao.
c. Balo wife of Rameshwar Sahu.
d. Jaleshwar son of Kaliya Sahu.
e. Lakhan son of Kaliya Sahu.
f. Kamal son of Kaliya Sahu.
g. Jitlal son of Kaliya Sahu.
h. Mankunwar wife of Ramnu Sahu.
i. Ghuran son of Baliya Teli.
j. Kishor son of Mangu Sahu.

423. Ram Sahu son of Mahli Teli.
a. Laxman Sahu son of Mahli Teli.
b. Bharat Sahu son of Mahli Teli.
c. Chatur Sahu son of Mahli Teli.

424. Dhaneshwar son of Manrakhan Sahu.
a. Mahendra son of Sardhu Sahu.
b. ~~Gorakhnath son of Sardhu Sahu~~.
i. Surendra Mahto (son).
c. Rusan wife of Gobardhan Sahu.
d. Jitu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
e. Bandhu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
f. Kameshwar son of Thasak Ram Sahu.

425. Dhaneshwar son of Manrakhan Sahu.
a. Mahendra son of Sardhu Sahu.
b. Gorakhnath son of Sardhu Sahu.
c. Rusan wife of Gobardhan Sahu.
d. Jitu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
e. Bandhu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
f. Kameshwar son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
g. Parwati wife of Teju Sahu.
h. Jhalo wife of Ramjit Sahu.
i. Sukhlal son of Sartho Sahu.
j. Gokul son of Sartho Sahu.
k. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
l. Kandan son of Madhu Saha.
m. Meena son of Vijay Sahu.

426. Lagnu son of Situ Sahu.
a. Kushal son of Situ Sahu.
b. Rajendra son of Khoyana Sahu.
c. Sikendra son of Khoyana Sahu.
d. Vijayendra son of Khoyana Sahu.
e. Lukhri wife of Binoo Sahu.
f. Shanti wife of Mahesh Sahu.
g. Leedi wife of Bansi Sahu.
h. Dhaneshwar son of Manrakhan Sahu.

i. Mahendra son of Gobardhan Sahu.
j. Gorakhnath son of Gobardhan Sahu.
k. Rusan wife of Gobardhan Sahu.
l. Jitu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
m. Bandhu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
n. Kameshwar son of Thasak Ram Sahu.

427. Lugnu son of Situ Sahu.
a. Kaushal son of Situ Sahu.
b. Rajendra son of Khauna Sahu.
c. Sikendra son of Khauna Sahu.
d. Vijayendra son of Khauna Sahu.
e. Lukhri wife of Binoo Shanti
f. Mahesh Sahu son of Bansi Sahu.
g. Leedi wife of Bansi Sahu.
h. Somari wife of Jagdish Teli.
i. Radhe Kisan son of Parasnath Sahu.
j. Mani son of Parasnath Sahu.
k. Kunj Bihari son Parasnath Sahu.
l. Ras Bihari son of Parasnath Sahu.

428. ~~Meghnath son of Bishram Mahto~~.
i. Ramnath Mahto (son).
ii. ~~Jainath Mahto~~ (son).
iii. Most. Surnti Devi (wife).
a. ~~Kolha son of Bishram Mahto~~.
i. Tirath Nath Mishra (son).
b. Madhu son of Bishram Mahto.
c. Fagu Ram son of Korhi Mahto.
d. Jhollo son of Ropna Mahto.
e. Bandhu son of Ropna Mahto.
f. Savitri wife of Laldeo Mahto.

429. Fagu Ram son of Kodhi Mahto.
a. Faghu Mahli son of Tuna Mahli.
b. Rath Devi wife of Kalicharan Mahli.

430. Lakhan son of Mohar Dhobi.
a. Jhubra son of Sohar Dhobi.
b. Nanki son of Krishna Baitha.
c. Neblal son of Sukra Baitha.
d. Lakhan son of Mohar Baitha.

431. Budhu son of Tuna Mahli.
a. Koka son of Tuna Mahli.
b. Sukra son of Tuna Mahli.
c. Faghu son of Gurka Mahli.
d. Jaso wife of Ketra Mahli.

432. Lalo Devo wife of Jogiya Kurmi.

433. Rusni son of Sitai Kurmi
a. Muter son of Sudra Kurmi.
b. Saburam son of Sitai Mahto.

434. Moharai son of Jhuba Mahto.
a. Tetri wife of Balku Mahto.
b. Mohan son of Bashudev Mahto.

435. Mati son of Lalnath Kurmi.
a. Lamohan son of Premnath Mahto.
b. Mathu son of Premnath Mahto.
c. Madan son of Premnath Mahto.
d. Tetri wife of Munsi Mahto.
436. Lutwa son of Budhnath Mahto.
a. Paribo wife of Ketra Mahto.
437. Bandhan son of Bartu Mahto.
438. Mohanrai son of Jhubla Mahto.
a. Bagdo son of Jhubla Mahto.
b. Tetri wife of Balku Mahto.
c. Mohan son of Basudev Mahto.
d. Sohan son of Basudev Mahto.
e. Ripu son of Basudev Mahto.
f. Rohan son of Basudev Mahto.
g. Pairo wife of Jhuthan Mahto.
h. Lalo wife of Jogiya Mahto.
i. Muter wife of Sudra Mahto.
j. Rusni wife of Bigai Mahto.
439. Birju son of Matnu Mahto.
440. Bilaso son of Chamru Mahto.
441. Thutha son of Udhwa Mahli.
a. Budhu son of Lattu Mahli.
b. Chander son of Lattu Mahli.
c. Kandru son of Lattu Mahli.
d. Mangru son of Lattu Mahli.
e. Madhu son of Sadhu Mahli.
f. Videshi son of Sadhu Mahli.
g. Balmuni son of Mangal Mahli.
h. Lagan son of Sunder Manjhi.
i. Billu son of Bandhan Mahli.
442. Karmi wife of Dharma.
a. Bajo wife of Sita.
b. Gudai son of Ropna Mahto.
443. Mallu son of Sabur Teli.
a. Tuman son of Sabur Teli.
b. Rajendra Prasad son of Sabur Teli.
444. Kariya son of Ramlal Sahu.
a. Jagarnath son of Panchan Sahu.
b. Ramnath son of Panchan Sahu.
c. Bhuneshwar son of Panchan Sahu.
445. Balmani wife of Mangu Mahto.
a. Laxman Devi son of Adhin Sahu.
446. Sadho wife of Ugan Teli.
447. Sawana son of Birsa Mahli.
448. ~~Jhalku son of Devnarayan Hazam~~.
i. Most. Mangla Devi (wife).
a. Tetri wife of Lal Hazam.
449. Gauri Shankar son of Darbari Sahu.
a. Tirath son of Darbari Sahu.

b. Shankar son of Gopi Sahu.
c. Kailash son of Gopi Sahu.
d. Bhola son of Gopi Sahu.

450. Kalawati wife of Kalal Sahu.
a. Bhonda son of Dasiya Sahu.
b. Jaleshwar son of Dasiya Sahu.

451. ~~Rameshwar son of Shambhu Teli~~.
i. Most. Devki Devi (wife).
ii. Tejnath Sahu (son).
iii. Dhaneshwar Kanshi Sahu (son).
iv. Jatru Kanshi (son).
v. Ganesh (son).
vi. Rajesh Kumar Kanshi (son).
a. Bhola son of Hariya Sahu.
b. Lalit son of Kolha Sahu.
c. Ram son of Mahli Teli.
d. Laxman son of Mahli Teli.
e. Bharat son of Mahli Teli.
f. Chatur son of Mahli Teli.

452. Chedan wife of Karma Sahu.
a. Dharma son of Krishtan Teli.
b. Rupchand son of Kisun Teli,
c. Balchand son of Kisun Teli.

453. Arti son of Jageshwar Sahu.
a. Gunuwa son of Jhubla Sahu.
b. Shankar son of Bandhu Sahu.

454. Ram son of Mahli Teli.
a. Laxman son of Mahli Teli.
b. Bharat son of Mahli Teli.
c. Chatur son of Mahli Teli.

455. ~~Rameshwar son of Shambhu Teli~~.
i. Most. Devki Devi (wife).
ii. Tejnath Sahu (son).
iii. Dhaneshwar Kanshi Sahu (son).
iv. Jatru Kanshi (son).
v. Ganesh (son).
vi. Rajesh Kumar Kanshi (son).
a. Bhola son of Hariya Sahu.
b. Lalit son of Kolha Sahu.

456. Arti daughter of Jageshwar Sahu.
a. Gunuwa son of Jhubla Sahu.
b. Shankar son of Bandhu Sahu.

457. Tirathnath son of Puran Kurmi.
a. Balak son of Puran Kurmi.

458. Sobhnath son of Lurka Mahto.
a. Sukra son of Lukra Mahto.

459. Bhola son of Tulsi Sahu.
a. Kasinath son of Tulsi Sahu.
b. Vasudev son of Hullas Sahu.
c. Mahabir son of Hullas Sahu.

d. Shahbir son of Hullas Sahu.

460. Rameshwar son of Sambhu Teli.

a. Bhola son of Hariya Sahu.
b. Lalit son of Kolha Sahu.
c. Arti son of Jogeshwar.
d. Gunuwa son of Jhubla Sahu.
e. Shankar son of Bandhu Sahu.
f. Chedhan wife of Karma Sahu.
g. Dharma son of Krishtan Teli.
h. Pratima wife of Rupchand.
i. Balchand son of Kisun Sahu.

461. Doman son of Charku Kumri

a. Sarula son of Charku Kurmi.
b. Samlal son of Jagarnath Kurmi.

462. Janki wife of Sabur Mahto.

a. Budhan wife of Bodhan Mahto.
b. Sobhnath son of Lurka Mahto.
c. Sukra son of Lurka Mahto.

463. Pusan son of Sohar Sahu.

a. Bulku son of Sohar Sahu.
b. Chedi son of Bhukhla Sahu.

464. Pahalad son of Situwa Mahto.

a. Aahalad son of Situwa Mahto.

465. Bhola son of Chinuu Sao.

a. Falinder son of Chinuu Sao.
b. Devendra son of Chinuu Sao.

466. Kalawati wife of Kalal Sahu.

a. Bhonda son of Dasiya Teli.
b. Jaleshwar son of Dasiya Teli.

467. Bisun son of Khedan Teli.

a. Bilas wife of Soharai Teli.
b. Siwar son of Jagatpal Sahu.
c. Riban son of Jagatpal Sahu.
d. Dipan son of Jagatpal Sahu.
e. Jitan son of Jagatpal Sahu.
f. Ritu son of Jagatpal Sahu.

468. Dhaneshwar son of Manrakhan Sahu.

a. Mahendra son of Sardhu Sahu.
b. ~~Gorakhnath son of Sardhu Sahu~~.

i. Surendra Mahto (son).

c. Rusan wife of Goberdhan Sahu.
d. Jitu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
e. Bandhu son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
f. Kameshwar son of Thasak Ram Sahu.
g. Jhari son of Hardayal.
h. Shyam son of Mahadev Baraik.

469. Jahri son of Hardayal.

a. Shyam son of Mahadev Baraik.

470. Gauri Shankar son of Darbari Sau.

a. Tirathnath son of Darbari Sau.

b. Shankar son of Gopi.
c. Kailash son of Gopi.
d. Bhola son of Gopi.
e. Jhari son of Hardayal Baraik.
f. Shyam son of Mahadev Baraik.

471. Buglu son of Ganesh Sahu.
a. Jugal son of Ganesh Sahu.
b. Ugan son of Ganesh Sahu.
c. Sita son of Ganesh Sahu.
d. Ganga son of Ganesh Sahu.
e. Manna son of Ganesh Sahu.
f. Jainath son of Ganesh Sahu.
g. Shyam son of Mahadev Baraik.
h. Jhari Baraik.

472. Mallu son of Sabur Teli.
a. Tuman son of Sabur Teli.
b. Rajendra son of Sabur Teli.
c. Jhari son of Hardayal Baraik.
d. Shyam son of Mahadev.

473. Doman son of Charku Kurmi.
a. Sarula son of Charku Kurmi.
b. Jhari son of Hardayal Baraik.
c. Shyam son of Mahadev.

474. Samkunwar wife of Pushwa Sahu.
a. Sukarmani wife of Charka Sahu.
b. Gopal son of Hardayal Sahu.
c. Soharai son of Ganesh Sahu.
d. Bhagat son of Ganesh Sahu.

475. Ratho son of Lalu Teli.
a. Paltu son of Bigal Teli.
b. Binand son of Bigal Teli.

476. Gauri Shankar son of Darbari Sahu.
a. Tirathnath son of Darbari Sahu.
b. Shankar son of Gopi Sahu.
c. Kailash son of Gopi Sahu.
d. Bhola son of Gopi Sahu.

477. Raghu son of Bhaura Sahu.
a. Raghunath son of Bhaura Sahu.
b. Sanicharwa son of Bhaura Sahu.
c. Faghu son of Bhaura Sahu.
d. Chaitu Sahu son of Ranjit Teli.
e. Bandhana Teli.
f. Bala Teli.

478. Lagnu son of Situ Sahu.
a. Kaushal son of Situ Sahu.
b. Rajendra son of Khoyna Sahu.
c. Sikendra son of Khoyna Sahu.
d. Vijendra son of Khoyna Sahu.
e. Santi wife of Mahesh Sahu.
f. Lukhri wife of Binu Sahu.

g. Lidee wife of Bansi Sahu.
h. Somari wife of Jagdish Sahu.
i. Radha son of Parasnath Sahu.
j. Kisan son of Parasnath Sahu.
k. Mani son of Parasnath Sahu.
l. Kunjbihari son of Parasnath Sahu.
m. Rasbihari son of Parasnath Sahu.

479. Raghu son of Bhaura Sahu.
a. Raghunath Sahu son of Bhaura Sahu.
b. Sanicharwa son of Bhaura Sahu.
c. Faghu son of Bhaura Sahu.
d. Chaitu son of Ranjit.
e. Bandhan son of Bala Teli.

480. Lagnu son of Situ Sahu.
a. Kaushal son of Situ Sahu.
b. Rajendra son of Khoyna Sahu.
c. Sikendra son of Khoyna Sahu.
d. Vijendra Sahu son of Khoyna Sahu.
e. Lukri wife of Binu Sahu.
f. Santi wife of Mahesh Sahu.
g. Liddi Devi wife of Bansi Sahu.

481. Radha Kisan son of Parasnath Sahu.
a. Mani son of Parasnath Sahu.
b. Kunj Bihari son of Parasnath Sahu.
c. Ras Bihari son of Parasnath Sahu.
d. Somari wife of Jagdish Teli.

482. Dhaneshwar son of Manrakhan Sahu.
a. Mahendra son of Sardhu Sahu.
b. Gorakhnath son of Sardhu Sahu.
c. Rusan wife of Gobardhan Sahu.
d. Jitu son of Thasak Sahu.
e. Bandhu son of Thasak Sahu.
f. Kameshwar Prasad son of Thasak Sahu.
g. Bandhana son of Bala Sahu.
h. Chaitu son of Ranjit Sahu.

483. Dukhan son of Adhin Sahu.
a. Laxman son of Adhin Sahu.
b. Devi Dayal son of Adhin Sahu.

484. Sibu Mahto son of Karma Mahto.
a. Panchmiya Devi wife of Sobhnath Mahto.

485. Sibu Mahto son of Karma Mahto.

486. Sibu Mahto son of Karma Mahto.
a. Panchmiya Devi wife of Sobhnath Mahto.

487. Panchmiya Devi wife of Sobhnath Mahto.

488. Balkisun son of Ghasiya Munda.
a. Mangri daughter of Nattu Munda.
b. Nanka son of Kewala Munda.

489. Santosh son of Rama Kurmi.

490. Panchu son of Bhonduwa Mahto.
a. Koka son of Bhonduwa Mahto.

491. Devnath S/o Sannu Mahto.
(a)Jagarnath S/o Sannu Mahto. (**Deleted and substituted v/o dated 25.09.2025** & **modified v/o dated 31.10.2025**)
1. Arjun Mahto.
2. Kalicharan Mahto.
3. Sulo Devi W/o Late Krishna Mahto
(b)Somnath S/o Lurksa Mahto. (**Deleted and substituted v/o dated 25.09.2025**)
1. Most Sanjho Devi.
(c)Buttan W/o Bodhan Mahto.
(d)Sukra S/o Lurka Mahto.

492. Koyli wife of Bigan Kumhar.
a. Sumitra wife of Bhola Prajapati.
b. Kamal Ram son of Raghunath Kumhar.
c. Sitaram son of Raghunath Kumhar.
d. Kaushilya Devi wife of Sahdeo.

493. Ropni wife of Ganpat Sahu.
a. ~~Buttan wife of Charku Sahu~~.
i. Sanjay Ram (son).
b. Aghnu son of Shahdev Sahu.
c. ~~Sadanand son of Shahdev Sahu~~.
i. Most. Bulku Devi (wife).
d. Chando wife of Sunwa Sahu.
e. Ratho son of Kandru Sahu.

494. Bugal son of Ganesh Sahu.
a. Jugal son of Ganesh Sahu.
b. Ugan son of Ganesh Sahu.
c. Sita son of Ganesh Sahu.
d. Ganga son of Ganesh Sahu.
e. Manna son of Ganesh Sahu.
f. Jaynath son of Ganesh Sahu.

495. ~~Gunjar wife of Jagnath Pahan~~.
a. Shiv Sagar Pahan (son).

496. ~~Gunjar wife of Jagnath Pahan~~.
i. Shiv Sagar Pahan (son).
a. Lilmohan son of Sukra Pahan.
b. Nandkishor son of Sukra Pahan.

497. Jodhan Ram son of Langra Ram Kumhar.
a. Dukhu Ram son of Langra Ram Kumhar.
b. Shankar Ram son of Madu Ram Kumhar.

498. Sadho son of Gandura.
a. Tijo son of Gandura.
b. Manju son of Gandura.
c. Panchu son of Kandru Sahu.

499. ~~Rameshwar son of Shambhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Devki Devi (wife).
ii. Tejnath Sahu (son).
iii. Dhaneshwar Kanshi Sahu (son).
iv. Jatru Kanshi (son).
v. Ganesh (son).

vi. Rajesh Kumar Kanshi (son).
a. Bhola son of Hariya Sahu.
b. Lalit son of Kolha Sahu.
500. Dhaneshwar son of Manrakhan Sahu.
a. Mahendra son of Sardhu Sahu.
b. ~~Gorakhnath son of Sardhu Sahu~~.
i. Surendra Mahto (son).
c. Rusan wife of Gobardhan Sahu.
d. Jitu son of Thask Ram Sahu.
e. Bandhu son of Thask Ram Sahu.
f. Kameshwar Prasad son of Thask Ram Sahu.
501. Parwati wife of Taju Sahu.
a. Jhalo wife of Ramjit Sahu.
b. Sukhilal son of Shortho Sahu.
c. Gokul Kumar son of Shorth Sahu.
d. Siban wife of Tilak Sahu.
e. Kandan son of Madhu Sahu.
f. Meena son of Vijay Sahu.
502. Samkunwar wife of Tetena Sahu.
503. Barju son of Mahadev Sahu.
a. Niraso wife of Ghurun Sahu.
b. Lal Kiswar son of Mahadev Sahu.
c. Samkunwar wife of Teteanga Sahu.
d. Maru son of Ballu Sahu.
504. Sadho son of Gandura Sahu.
a. Tijo son of Gandura Sahu.
b. Manju son of Gandura Sahu.
c. Panchu son of Kandru Sahu.
505. Gauri Shanker son of Darbari Sahu.
a. Tirathnath son of Darbari Sahu.
b. Shanker son of Gopi Sahu.
c. Kailash son of Gopi Sahu.
d. Bhola son of Gopi Sahu.
506. Rajendra son of Khedu Sahu
507. Bugal son of Ganesh Sahu
a. Jugal son of Ganesh Sahu
b. Ugan son of Ganesh Sahu
c. Sita son of Ganesh Sahu
d. Ganga son of Ganesh Sahu
e. Manna son of Ganesh Sahu
f. Jaynath son of Ganesh Sahu
508. Kasinath son of Dharmanath Sahu
a. Baijnath son of Dharmanath Sahu
509. Samkunwar wife of Charka Sahu
a. Sukarnmani wife of Charka Sahu.
510. Gopal Sahu son of Hardayal Sahu
511. Mo Shanti wife of Bishambar Lohar.
a. Putul wife of Ganga Lohar
b. Kamli wife of Guddan Lohar
512. Sonalal son of Shivcharan Lohar

a. Hiralal son of Shivcharan Lohar.
b. Devraj Lohar

513. Laxman son of Birsa Teli.
a. Premchand son of Birsa Teli
b. Savitri wife of Raju Sahu.

514. Lilmohan son of Sukra Pahan
a. Nand Kishor son of Sukra Pahan
b. Gunjir wife of Jagnath Pahan
c. Jhubra son of Charku Pahan
d. Balak son of Charku Pahan
e. Dhodhro son of Harku Pahan
f. Baleshwar son of Sajha Pahan
g. Kaleshwar son of Sajha Pahan
h. Koka son of Sajha Pahan
i. Koka son of Sajha Pahan
j. Bishram son of Mahaj Pahan
k. Sukhram son of Mahaj Pahan
l. Rusa son of Giridhari Pahan
m. Devnath son of Getu Pahan.
n. Hari son of Getu Pahan.
o. Reshmi wife of Koka Pahan.
p. Birsa son of Pandey Pahan.
q. Charka son of Pandey Pahan.
r. Bindu son of Dubraj Pahan.
s. Sumitra wife of Devendra Pahan.

515. Baleshwar son of Shaj Pahan.
a. Kaleshwar son of Shaj.
b. Koka son of Shaj.
c. Bishram son of Mahaj Pahan.
d. Ashram son of Mahaj Pahan.
e. Sukhram son of Mahaj Pahan.
f. Rusa son of Girodhari Pahan.
g. Mahabir son of Makro Pahan.

516. Lilmohan son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Gunjer wife of Jagnath Pahan.
b. Nand Kishore son of Sukra Pahan.

517. Lilmohan son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Gunair wife of Gajnath Pahan.
b. Nand Kishore son of Sukra Pahan.

518. Lilmohan son of Sukra Pahan.
a. Gunair wife of Gajnath Pahan.
b. Nand Kishore son Sukra Pahan.

519. Sunil son of Kalal Baraik.

520. Chedi son of Jhuba Teli.
a. Aklu son of Jhuba Teli.
b. Charku son of Jhuba Teli.
c. Etwa son of Jhuba Teli.
d. Faguwa son of Bahuran Sahu.
e. Raimuni wife of Jaggu Sahu.

521. Jageshwar son of Sulendra Munda.

a. Mithu son of Sulendra Mahto
522. Mohrai son of Jhubla Mahto
a. Bogdo son of Jhubla Mahto.
b. Tetri wife of Balku Mahto.
c. Rohan son of Basudev Mahto.
d. Rupu son of Basudev Mahto.
e. Sohan son of Basudev Mahto.
f. Mohan son of Basudev Mahto.
523. Rusni son of Sitai Kurmi.
a. Muter wife of Sudra Mahto.
524. Pairo wife of Juthan Mahto.
a. Moharai son of Jhubla Mahto.
b. Tetri wife of Balku Mahto.
c. Lalo wife of Jogia Mahto.
d. Muter wife of Sudra Mahto.
e. Mohan son of Basudev Mahto.
f. Sohan son of Basudev Mahto.
g. Rohan son of Basudev Mahto.
525. Lalo Devi wife of Jogia Kurmi.
526. Mallu son of Sabur Teli.
a. Tuman son of Sabur Teli.
b. Rajendra Prasad son of Sabur Teli.
527. Pairo wife of Juthan Mahto.
a. Moharai son of Jhubla Mahto.
b. Bogdo son of Jhubla Mahto.
c. Tetri wife of Balku Mahto.
d. Lalo wife of Jogia Mahto.
e. Muter wife of Sudra Mahto.
f. Mohan son of Basudev Mahto.
g. Sohan son of Basudev Mahto.
h. Rohan son of Basudev Mahto.
528. Lalo Devi wife of Jogia Kurmi.
529. Moharai son of Jhubla Mahto.
a. Bogdo son of Jhubla Mahto.
b. Tetri wife of Balku Mahto.
c. Lalo wife of Jogia Mahto.
d. Muter wife of Sudra Mahto.
e. Mohan son of Vasudev Mahto.
f. Sohan son of Vasudev Mahto.
g. Rohan son of Vasudev Mahto.
h. Rupu son of Vasudev Mahto.
530. Pairo Devi son of Juthan Mahto.
531. Rusni son of Sitai Mahto.
a. Muter wife of Sudra Mahto.
532. Pairvo Devi son of Juthan Mahto.
533. ~~Rameshwar son of Shambhu Sahu~~.
i. Most. Devki Devi (wife).
ii. Tejnath Sahu (son).
iii. Dhaneshwar Kanshi Sahu (son).
iv. Jatru Kanshi (son).

v. Ganesh (son).
vi. Rajesh Kumar Kanshi (son).
a. Bhola son of Hariya Sahu.
b. Lalit son of Kolha Sahu.
534. Ram son of Mahli Teli.
a. Laxman son of Mahli Teli.
b. Bharat son of Mahli Teli.
c. Chatur son of Mahli Teli.
535. Mohrai son of Jhubla Mahto.
a. Bogdo son of Jhubla Mahto.
b. Tetri wife of Balku Mahto.
c. Rohan son of Basudev Mahto.
d. Rupu son of Basudev Mahto.
e. Sohan son of Basudev Mahto.
f. Mohan son of Basudev Mahto.
536. Lalo Devi son of Jogia Kurmi.
537. Koyali wife of Bigna.
a. Sitaram son of Raghunath.
b. Sumitra wife of Bhola.
c. Ram son of Langra Kumhar.
d. Kaushalya wife of Shadeo Kumhar.
e. Jodhanram son of Langra Kumhar.
f. Dukhram son of Langra Kumhar.
g. Shankarram son of Maru Ram Kumhar.
538. Bhunnu son of Matia Munda.
a. Munna son of Matia Munda.
b. Lacho Ram son of Ropna Munda.
c. Charka son of Birsa Munda.
d. Ganga son of Birsa Munda.
e. Kaila son of Anduwa Munda.
539. Motilal son of Nand Sahu.
a. Andhru son of Nand Sahu.
b. Salik son of Nand Sahu.
c. Balo wife of Rameshwar Sahu.
d. Jaleshwar son of Kaliya Sahu.
e. Lakhan son of Kaliya Sahu.
f. Kamal son of Kaliya Sahu.
g. Jitlal son of Kaliya Sahu.
h. Mankunwar wife of Ramnu Sahu.
i. Ghuran son of Baliya Teli.
j. Kisor son of Mangu Sahu.
k. Agam Lal son of Nanku Sahu.
l. Babulal son of Nanku Sahu.
m. Kalicharan son of Birsa Pintu Kumar.
540. Doman son of Chokteya Kurmi.
a. Sarula son of Chokteya Kurmi.
541. Lalmohan son of Milku Mahto.
542. Jageshwar son of Sulendra Mahto.
a. Mittu sun of Sulendra Mahto.
543. Parwati wife of Kapil Mahto.

All are residents of Village Sugnu, P. O. Sugnu, P.S. Sadar, District Ranchi.

544. Sawana son of Birsa Munda.
a. Rajendra Munda son of Puswa Munda.
b. Deepak son of Puswa Munda.
c. Lalit son of Chamna Munda.
545. Mangi Devi daughter of Jogwa Oraon.
a. Roshni daughter of Jogwa Oraon.
b. Bhanu son of Sukro Devi.
c. Anil son of Sukro Devi.
546. ~~Jitlal Mahto son of Bhikhu Mahto~~.
i. ~~Rajendra Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Anita Devi (wife).
ii. Rajesh Mahto (son)
a. Murti Devi wife of Mahendra Mahto.
b. Devendra son of Sohanlal Mahto.
c. ~~Surendra son of Sohanlal Mahto~~.
a. Sita Devi (wife).
d. Sanjay son of Sohanlal Mahto.
547. ~~Jitlal Mahto son of Bhikhu Mahto~~.
i. ~~Rajendra Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Anita Devi (wife).
ii. Rajesh Mahto (son)
a. Murti Devi wife of Mahendra Mahto.
b. Devendra son of Sohanlal Mahto.
c. ~~Surendra son of Sohanlal Mahto~~.
a. Sita Devi (wife).
d. Sanjay son of Sohanlal Mahto.
548. Mahanand Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
a. Devnarayan Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
b. Kishor Kumar son of Tirath Mahto.
c. Dev Kumar son of Shivlal Mahto.
549. Mahanand Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
a. Devnarayan Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
b. Kishor Kumar son of Tirath Mahto.
c. Dev Kumar son of Shivlal Mahto.
550. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.
d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.
e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda.
551. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.

d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.
e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda.

552. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.
d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.
e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda.

553. Dhanswar Mahto son of Mohan Mahto.
a. Sonmati Devi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.
b. Chetan Kumar Mahto son of Kameshwar Mahto.

554. Dhanswar Mahto son of Mohan Mahto.
a. Sonmati Devi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.
b. Chetan Kumar Mahto son of Kameshwar Mahto.

555. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.
i. Vijay Kumar (son).
a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.
b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.
c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.
d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.
e. ~~Basanti wife of Ramnarayan Mahto~~.
i. Nagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).
ii. Sagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).
f. ~~Jitlal son of Bhikhu Mahto~~.
i. Rajendra Mahto (son)
ii. Rajesh Mahto (son)
g. Devendra son of Sohan Lal.
h. ~~Surendra son of Sohan Lal~~.
ii. Most. Sita Devi (wife).
i. Sanjay son of Sohan Lal.
j. Murti wife of Mahendra Mahto.
k. ~~Dhaneshwar son of Mohan Mahto~~.
iii. Rashka Devi (wife).
l. Sonmathi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.

556. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.
i. Vijay Kumar (son).
a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.
b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.
c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.
d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.
e. ~~Basanti wife of Ramnarayan Mahto~~.
i. Nagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).

ii. Sagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).

f. ~~Jitlal son of Bhikhu Mahto~~.

i. Rajendra Mahto (son)

ii. Rajesh Mahto (son)

g. Devendra son of Sohan Lal.

h. ~~Surendra son of Sohan Lal~~.

ii. Most. Sita Devi (wife).

i. Sanjay son of Sohan Lal.

j. Murti wife of Mahendra Mahto.

k. ~~Dhaneshwar son of Mohan Mahto~~.

iii. Rashka Devi (wife).

l. Sonmathi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.

557. Bhunwa son of Baijnath Mahto.

a. Guduwa son of Baijnath Mahto.

b. Jageshwar son of Bala Mahto.

c. Mahabir son of Bala Mahto.

d. Lalbir son of Bala Mahto.

e. Sandeep son of Kariya Mahto.

f. Bhuneshwar son of Kariya Mahto.

558. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.

Vijay Kumar (son).

a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.

b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.

c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.

d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.

e. Basanti wife of Ramnarayan Mahto.

559. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.

Vijay Kumar (son).

a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.

b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.

c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.

d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.

e. Basanti wife of Ramnarayan Mahto.

560. Salo Devi wife of Puran Gope.

a. Chotu son of Shivnath Gope.

b. Ashok son of Kisnath Gope.

c. Kishor son of Kisnath Gope.

d. Sobhnath son of Balu Ahir.

e. Meghnath son of Balu Ahir.

f. Sohan son of Balu Ahir.

g. Mahabir son of Balu Ahir.

h. Keshwar son of Mohan Gope.

i. Basu son of Bodhan Ahir.

j. Sukhdev son of Sudhu Gope.

k. Arjun son of Sudhu Gope.

l. Rajesh son of Sudhu Gope.

561. Sitaram Mahto son of Jitwahan Mahto.

a. Falindra Mahto son of Guru Mahto.

562. Mangal son of Meghu Mahto.

a. Gagarnath son of Meghu Mahto.

b. Baijnath son of Meghu Mahto.
c. Radho Devi wife of Yugal Mahto.
d. Pancho Devi wife of Sobhnath Mahto.
e. Sulen son of Kartik Mahto.
f. Choten son of Prema Mahto.
g. Sonaram son of Prema Mahto.
h. Jhunu Devi wife of Dhana Mahto.
i. Hirola Devi wife of Nandkishor Mahto.

563. Sawana son of Maharang Mahto.
a. Ramesh son of Charkhu Mahto.
b. Bindeshwar son of Puran Mahto.
c. Nandkishor son of Puran Mahto.
d. Salkho Devi wife of Naresh Mahto.

564. Chappan Mahto son of Bigal Mahto.
a. Fagan Devi wife of Suresh Mahto.
b. Bisheshwar Mahto son of Chappan Mahto.

565. Bono Pahan son of Aghnu
a. Mangur Pahan son of Jagnu Pahan.
b. Kujru Pahan son of Jugwa Pahan.

566. Bono son of Aghnu Pahan.
a. Mangru son of Jagnu Pahan.
b. Kujru son of Jugwa Pahan.
c. Chunu son of Sadho Pahan.
d. Dasrath son of Bandhan Pahan.
e. Bigal son of Pagla Pahan.
f. Dahari Devi wife of Deviya Pahan.
g. Sunita Devi wife of Khunita Pahan,

567. Chunu son of Sadho Pahan.
a. Dasrath son of Bandhan Pahan.
b. Bigal son of Pagla Pahan,
c. Dahari Devi wife of Deviya Pahan.
d. Sunita Devi wife of Khuinta Pahan.

568. Sabur son of Jhariya Mahto.
a. Ramdhan Balku son of Jhariya Mahto.
b. Gobardhan son of Jhariya Mahto.
c. Sham Sunder son of Santosh Mahto.
d. Satish Kumar son of Mohan Lal Mahto.

569. Somri Devi wife of Sarula Munda.

570. Subodhani Devi wife of Mathura Baraik.
a. Birendra Baraik son of Sukhdev Baraik.
b. Vishwanath Baraik son of Maku Baraik.

571. Dubhan Devi wife of Mahadev.
a. Ratan son of Bhado Munda.
b. Budhram son of Bhado Munda.
c. Rohni Devi wife of Dhumeshwar Munda.
d. Raju son of Kallu Munda.
e. Ajit son of Kallu Munda.
f. Anil son of Kallu Munda.
g. Sunil son of Kallu Munda.

572. Kishan (Kario) son of Aahlad Munda.

a. Jhari son of Aahlad Munda.
b. Raspati son of Sarula Munda.
c. Jitan Mundain wife of Gopal Munda.
d. Sikari son of Chedi Munda.
e. Manjer Devi wife of Sahdev Munda.
f. Gudlu son of Lengi Munda.
g. Pinku son of Sahadev Munda.
h. Deepak son of Bhutka Munda.
i. Karma son of Bhutka Munda.
j. Dharma son of Bhutka Munda.
k. Krishna son of Shadev Munda.

573. Kishan (Kario) son of Aahlad Munda.
a. Jhari son of Aahlad Munda.
b. Raspati son of Sarula Munda.
c. Jitan Mundain wife of Gopal Munda.
d. Sikari son of Chedi Munda.
e. Manjer Devi wife of Sahdev Munda.
f. Gudlu son of Lengi Munda.
g. Pinku son of Sahadev Munda.
h. Deepak son of Bhutka Munda.
i. Karma son of Bhutka Munda.
j. Dharma son of Bhutka Munda.
k. Krishna son of Shadev Munda.

574. Kishan (Kario) son of Aahlad Munda.
a. Jhari son of Aahlad Munda.
b. Raspati son of Sarula Munda.
c. Jitan Mundain wife of Gopal Munda.
d. Sikari son of Chedi Munda.
e. Manjer Devi wife of Sahdev Munda.
f. Gudlu son of Lengi Munda.
g. Pinku son of Sahadev Munda.
h. Deepak son of Bhutka Munda.
i. Karma son of Bhutka Munda.
j. Dharma son of Bhutka Munda.
k. Krishna son of Shadev Munda.

575. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.
d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.
e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda.

576. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.
d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.

e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda

577. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.
d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.
e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda

578. Tetra Pahan son of Lumba Pahan.
a. Mogro son of Tetra Pahan.

579. Tullu son of Baya Pahan.
a. Rusu son of Baya Pahan.
b. Pusu son of Baya Pahan.
c. Bauna son of Sukra Pahan.
d. Raju son of Undu Pahan.
e. Barju son of Undu Pahan.
f. Dhurwa son of Bhandu Pahan.
g. Kandru son of Budhu Pahan.
h. Bandhan son of Sikra Pahan.
i. Gopal son of Sikra Pahan.
j. Ganja son of Sikra Pahan.
k. Harilal son of Sikra Pahan.
l. Salikram son of Sikra Pahan.
m. Madan son of Sikra Pahan.
n. Kishor son of Sikra Pahan.
o. Etwa son of Somra Pahan.
p. Sarula son of Somra Pahan.
q. Chedan Devi wife of Jhari Pahan.
r. Baha son of Jhari Pahan.

580. Tetra Pahan son of Lumba Pahan.
a. Mogro son of Tetra Pahan.

581. Tullu son of Baya Pahan.
a. Rusu son of Baya Pahan.
b. Pusu son of Baya Pahan.
c. Bauna son of Sukra Pahan.
d. Raju son of Undu Pahan.
e. Barju son of Undu Pahan.
f. Dhurwa son of Bhandu Pahan.
g. Kandru son of Budhu Pahan.
h. Bandhan son of Sikra Pahan.
i. Gopal son of Sikra Pahan.
j. Ganja son of Sikra Pahan.
k. Harilal son of Sikra Pahan.

l. Salikram son of Sikra Pahan.
m. Madan son of Sikra Pahan.
n. Kishor son of Sikra Pahan.
o. Etwa son of Somra Pahan.
p. Sarula son of Somra Pahan.
q. Chedan Devi wife of Jhari Pahan.
r. Baha son of Jhari Pahan.

582. Etwa Pahan son of Somra.
a. Sarula Pahan son of Somra Pahan.
b. Chedan Devi wife of Jhari Pahan.
c. Baha Pahan son of Jhari Pahan.

583. Tetra Pahan son of Lumba Pahan.
a. Mogro son of Tetra Pahan.

584. Lachhan Lohar son Baldev Lohar.
a. Sadhan Devi wife of Salikram Lohar.

585. Hansraj Munda son of Runtu Munda.

586. Sahdeo son of Bodho Munda.
a. Basudeo son of Bodho Munda.
b. Dileshwar son of Mahadev Munda.
c. Suresh son of Mahadev Munda.
d. Ramesh son of Babulal Munda.
e. Anit son of Mahadev Munda.
f. Vikash son of Mahadev Munda.

587. Jitlal Mahto son of Bhikhu Mahto.

588. Murti Devi wife of Mahendra Mahto.
a. Devendra son of Sohanlal Mahto.
b. Surendra son of Sohanlal Mahto.
c. Sanjay son of Sohanlal Mahto.

589. Dileshwar Gope son of Mahabir Gope.
a. Dinesh Gope son of Mahabir Gope.

590. Subodhani Devi wife of Mathura Baraik.
a. Birendra Baraik son of Sukhdev Baraik.
b. Vishwanath Baraik son of Maku Baraik.

591. Baijnath son of Kariya Mahto.
a. Tirtu son of Kariya Mahto.
b. Rameshwar son of Kariya Mahto.
c. Jaleshwar son of Kariya Mahto.
d. Sadhinya Devi wife of Ropna Mahto.

592. Sanicharwa Devi wife of Puswa Munda.
a. Ugan Devi son of Bartu Munda.

593. Bacho son of Barka Dhano Oraon.
a. Fagan son of Barka Dhano Oraon.
b. Budhan son of Barka Dhano Oraon.
c. Kunwar Lakra son of Ramiya Devi.
d. Shemell son of Somari Devi.
e. Budu son of Somari Devi.
f. Ramnath son of Somari Devi.
g. Birsa son of Somari Devi.
h. Dingi Devi wife of Dhano Oraon.

594. Kolha son of Budhu Oraon.

a. Dhana son of Budhu Oraon.
b. Koili Devi wife of Mani Oraon.
c. Dinesh son of Ram Oraon.
d. Fagu son of Ram Oraon.
e. Ratiya son of Ram Oraon.
f. Vijay son of Karma Oraon.
g. Dhanna son of Karma Oraon
h. Munu Devi wife of Sadhu Oraon.
i. Budhu son of Charo Oraon.
j. Somari Orain wife of Bicha.
k. Sushil son of Mani Oraon.

595. Jagarnath son of Ram Oraon.
a. Chandar son of Goma Oraon.
b. Jatri Devi wife of Raju Oraon.
c. Chari Orain wife of Devcharan Oraon.
d. Ropna son of Eto Oraon.
e. Budhuwa son of Eto Oraon.
f. Kandan son of Eto Oraon.
g. Sudhir son of Birsa Oraon.
h. Binod son of Birsa Oraon.
i. Sukra son of Chander Oraon.

596. Chamru son of Mani Mahto.
a. Ramu son of Sukhdev Mahto.
b. Samal son of Sukhdev Mahto.
c. Kailash son of Sukhdev Mahto.
d. Doman son of Charku Kurmi.
e. Sarula son of Charku Kurmi.
f. Samlal son of Jagarnath Kurmi.

597. Jidiya Orain wife of Mahil Oraon.
a. Ranka son of Tima Oraon.
b. Ashok son of Tima Oraon.
c. Haura son of Langra Oraon.
d. Birsi Devi wife of Tapeshwar Oraon.
e. Sukhdev son of Jatru Oraon.
f. Dipi son of Sukra Oraon.
g. Sarifa son of Mangra Oraon.
h. Pici Orain daughter of Sukhram Oraon.
i. Sajan son of Ashok Oraon.

598. Tullu son of Baya Pahan.
a. Rusu son of Baya Pahan.
b. Pusu son of Baya Pahan.
c. Bauna son of Sukra Pahan.
d. Raju son of Undu Pahan.
e. Barju son of Undu Pahan.
f. Dhurwa son of Bhandu Pahan.
g. Kandru son of Budhu Pahan.
h. Bandhan son of Sikra Pahan.
i. Gopal son of Sikra Pahan.
j. Ganja son of Sikra Pahan.
k. Harilal son of Sikra Pahan.

l. Salikram son of Sikra Pahan.
m. Madan son of Sikra Pahan.
n. Kishor son of Sikra Pahan.
o. Etwa son of Somra Pahan.
p. Sarula son of Somra Pahan.
q. Chedan Devi wife of Jhari Pahan.
r. Baha son of Jhari Pahan.

599. Tullu son of Baya Pahan.
a. Rusu son of Baya Pahan.
b. Pusu son of Baya Pahan.
c. Bauna son of Sukra Pahan.
d. Raju son of Undu Pahan.
e. Barju son of Undu Pahan.
f. Dhurwa son of Bhandu Pahan.
g. Kandru son of Budhu Pahan.
h. Bandhan son of Sikra Pahan.
i. Gopal son of Sikra Pahan.
j. Ganja son of Sikra Pahan.
k. Harilal son of Sikra Pahan.
l. Salikram son of Sikra Pahan.
m. Madan son of Sikra Pahan.
n. Kishor son of Sikra Pahan.
o. Etwa son of Somra Pahan.
p. Sarula son of Somra Pahan.
q. Chedan Devi wife of Jhari Pahan.
r. Baha son of Jhari Pahan.

600. Piyaso wife of Jharia Mahto.
a. Balo wife of Chotelal Mahto.
b. Shajnath wife of Raghunath Mahto.
c. Karmi wife of Asharam Mahto.
d. Shivnaryan son of Hariya Mahto.
e. Jitpal son of Hariya Mahto.
f. Charki wife of Jitram Mahto.
g. Baleser son of Ghumeshwar Mahto.
h. Jageshwar son of Ghumeshwar Mahto.
i. Manu son of Ghumeshwar Mahto.

601. Balku son of Richika Mahtom Badru.
a. Keshnath son of Jitram Mahto.
b. Sahajnath son of Jitram Mahto.
c. Dharmnath son of Jitram Mahto.
d. Bangali son of Salikram Mahto.
e. Nageshwar son of Salikram Mahto.
f. Bhoden son of Bhupnath Mahto.
g. Madan son of Bhupnath Mahto.
h. Chandan son of Bhupnath Mahto.
i. Tilik son of Bhupnath Mahto.
j. Kamlesh son of Bhupnath Mahto
k. Pano Devi wife of Milak Mahto.

602. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.
i. Vijay Kumar (son).

a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.
b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.
c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.
d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.
e. Basanti Devi wife of Ramnarayan Mahto.

603. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.
d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.
e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda

604. Mahanand Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
a. Devnarayan Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
b. Kishor Kumar son of Tirath Mahto.
c. Dev Kumar Shivlal Mahto.

605. Dhenswar Mahto son of Mohan Mahto.
a. Sonmati Devi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.
b. Chetan son of Kameshwar Mahto.

606. Tullu son of Baya Pahan.
a. Rusu son of Baya Pahan.
b. Pusu son of Baya Pahan.
c. Bauna son of Sukra Pahan.
d. Raju son of Undu Pahan.
e. Barju son of Undu Pahan.
f. Dhurwa son of Bhandu Pahan.
g. Kandru son of Budhu Pahan.
h. Bandhan son of Sikra Pahan.
i. Gopal son of Sikra Pahan.
j. Ganja son of Sikra Pahan.
k. Harilal son of Sikra Pahan.
l. Salikram son of Sikra Pahan.
m. Madan son of Sikra Pahan.
n. Kishor son of Sikra Pahan.
o. Etwa son of Somra Pahan.
p. Sarula son of Somra Pahan.
q. Chedan Devi wife of Jhari Pahan.
r. Baha son of Jhari Pahan.
s. Mogro son of Tetra Pahan.

607. Mahanand Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
a. Devnarayan Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
b. Kishor Kumar son of Tirath Mahto.
c. Dev Kumar son of Shivlal Mahto.

608. ~~Jitlal Mahto son of Bhikhu Mahto~~.
i. ~~Rajendra Mahto~~ (son).
I. Most. Anita Devi (wife).
ii. Rajesh Mahto (son)

a. Murti Devi wife of Mahendra Mahto.
b. Devendra son of Sohanlal Mahto.
c. ~~Surendra son of Sohanlal Mahto~~.
a. Sita Devi (wife).
d. Sanjay son of Sohanlal Mahto.

609. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.
i. Vijay Kumar (son).
a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.
b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.
c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.
d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.
e. ~~Basanti wife of Ramnarayan Mahto~~.
i. Nagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).
ii. Sagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).
f. ~~Jitlal son of Bhikhu Mahto~~.
i. Rajendra Mahto (son)
ii. Rajesh Mahto (son)
g. Devendra son of Sohan Lal.
h. ~~Surendra son of Sohan Lal~~.
ii. Most. Sita Devi (wife).
i. Sanjay son of Sohan Lal.
j. Murti wife of Mahendra Mahto.
k. ~~Dhaneshwar son of Mohan Mahto~~.
iii. Rashka Devi (wife).
l. Sonmathi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.

610. Dhenswar Mahto son of Mohan Mahto.
a. Sonmati Devi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.
b. Chetan Kumar Mahto son of Kameshwar Mahto.

611. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.
i. Vijay Kumar (son).
a.Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.
b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.
c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.
d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.
e. Basanti Devi wife of Ramnarayan Mahto.

612. Khokha son of Bhawana Pahan.
a. Harischandra son of Puran Pahan.
b. Ramdas son of Puran Pahan.
c. Raghu son of Ghuran Sahu.
d. Saraswati wife of Rajkumar Munda.
e. Sukra son of Jamu Pahan.
f. Jereka son of Jamu Pahan.
g. Gopal son of Jamu Pahan.
h. Prem son of Domna Munda.
i. Sagar son of Domna Munda

613. Kandru son of Budhu Pahan.
a. Bandhan son of Sikra Pahan.
b. Gopal son of Sikra Pahan.
c. Ganja son of Sikra Pahan.
d. Harilal son of Sikra Pahan.

e. Salikram son of Sikra Pahan.
f. Madan son of Sikra Pahan.
g. Kishor son of Sikra Pahan.

614. Tullu son of Baya Pahan.
a. Rusu son of Baya Pahan.
b. Pusu son of Baya Pahan.
c. Bauna son of Sukra Pahan.
d. Raju son of Undu Pahan.
e. Barju son of Undu Pahan.
f. Dhurwa son of Bhundu Pahan.
g. Baha son of Jhari Pahan.

615. Etwa son of Somra Pahan.
a. Sarula son of Somra Pahan.
b. Chedan Devi wife of Jhari Pahan.
c. Kandru son of Budhu Pahan.
d. Gopal son of Jhari Pahan.
e. Bandhan son of Jhari Pahan.
f. Ganja son of Jhari Pahan.
g. Harilal son of Jhari Pahan.
h. Salikram son of Jhari Pahan.
i. Madan son of Jhari Pahan.
j. Kishor son of Jhari Pahan.
k. Baha son of Jhari Pahan.

616. Kishan (Kario) son of Aahlad Munda.
a. Jhari son of Aahlad Munda.
b. Raspati son of Sarula Munda.
c. Jitan Mundain wife of Gopal Munda.
d. Sikari son of Chedi Munda.
e. Manjer Devi wife of Sahdev Munda.
f. Gudlu son of Lengi Munda.
g. Pinku son of Sahadev Munda.
h. Deepak son of Bhutka Munda.
i. Karma son of Bhutka Munda.
j. Dharma son of Bhutka Munda.
k. Krishna son of Shadev Munda.

617. Kishan (Kario) son of Aahlad Munda.
a. Jhari son of Aahlad Munda.
b. Raspati son of Sarula Munda.
c. Jitan Mundain wife of Gopal Munda.
d. Sikari son of Chedi Munda.
e. Manjer Devi wife of Sahdev Munda.
f. Gudlu son of Lengi Munda.
g. Pinku son of Sahadev Munda.
h. Deepak son of Bhutka Munda.
i. Karma son of Bhutka Munda.
j. Dharma son of Bhutka Munda.
k. Krishna son of Shadev Munda.

618. Kishan (Kario) son of Aahlad Munda.
a. Jhari son of Aahlad Munda.
b. Raspati son of Sarula Munda.

c. Jitan Mundain wife of Gopal Munda.
d. Sikari son of Chedi Munda.
e. Manjer Devi wife of Sahdev Munda.
f. Gudlu son of Lengi Munda.
g. Pinku son of Sahadev Munda.
h. Deepak son of Bhutka Munda.
i. Karma son of Bhutka Munda.
j. Dharma son of Bhutka Munda.
k. Krishna son of Shadev Munda.

619. Mahanand Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
a. Devnarayan Mahto son of Tirath Mahto.
b. Kishor Kumar son of Tirath Mahto.
c. Dev Kumar son of Shivlal Mahto.

620. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.
i. Vijay Kumar (son).
a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.
b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.
c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.
d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.
e. ~~Basanti wife of Ramnarayan Mahto~~.
i. Nagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).
ii. Sagina Prasad Singh Mahto (son).
f. ~~Jitlal son of Bhikhu Mahto~~.
i. Rajendra Mahto (son)
ii. Rajesh Mahto (son)
g. Devendra son of Sohan Lal.
h. ~~Surendra son of Sohan Lal~~.
ii. Most. Sita Devi (wife).
i. Sanjay son of Sohan Lal.
j. Murti wife of Mahendra Mahto.
k. ~~Dhaneshwar son of Mohan Mahto~~.
iii. Rashka Devi (wife).
l. Sonmathi wife of Kameshwar Mahto.

621. ~~Navin son of Tulsi Mahto~~.
Vijay Kumar (son).
a. Prakash Chandra son of Tulsi Mahto.
b. Ranjeet son of Tulsi Mahto.
c. Ashok son of Kehmnath Mahto.
d. Subhash son of Kehmnath Mahto.
e. Basanti Devi wife of Ramnarayan Mahto.

622. Subodhani Devi wife of Mathura Baraik.
a. Birendra Baraik son of Sukhdev Baraik.
b. Vishwanath Baraik son of Maku Baraik.

623. Tetra Pahan son of Lumba Pahan.
a. Mogro son of Tetra Pahan.

624. Salo Devi wife of Puran Gope.
a. Chotu son of Shivnath Gope.
b. Ashok son of Kisnath Gope.
c. Kishor son of Kisnath Gope.
d. Sobhnath son of Balu Ahir.

e. Meghnath son of Balu Ahir.
f. Sohan son of Balu Ahir.
g. Mahabir son of Balu Ahir.
h. Keshwar son of Mohan Gope.
i. Basu son of Bodhan Ahir.
j. Sukhdev Arjun son of Sudhu Gope.
k. Arjun son of Sudhu Gope.
l. Rajesh Sadhu Gope.

All are residents of Village Khatanga, P.O. Sugnu, P.S. Sadar, District Ranchi. **… … Claimants/Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 192 of 2014

1. Shanti Devi W/o Bisamber Lohar
2. Putul Devi W/o Ganga Lohar
3. Kamli Devi W/o Guddan Lohar
   All residents of Village & P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt., P.O. & P.S.- Danapur, District- Patna 801503 (Bihar)
2. The State of Jharkhand through the Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S.- Ranchi, Distt.- Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 193 of 2014

1. Sadhu Devi
2. Tijo Devi
3. Manju Devi
   1 to 3 D/o Gondura Sahu
4. Panchu Sahu S/o Kandru Sahu
5. Rajendra Sahu S/o Khedu Sahu
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt., P.O. & P.S.- Danapur Cantt., District- Patna 801503 (Bihar)
2. The State of Jharkhand through the Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.- G.P.O. Ranchi, P.S.- Kotwali

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 194 of 2014

Jitu Mahto S/o Ghasiya Mahto, Resident of Village+ P.O. Sugnu P.S. Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cant. P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist.-Ranchi

……. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 195 of 2014

1. Parwati Devi W/o Teju Sahu
2. **Jhalo Devi W/o Late Ramjit Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Sahabir Sahu S/o Late Ramjit Sahu
   2(b) Jayanti Devi W/o Late Mahabir Sahu
3. Shukhlal Sahu
4. **Gokul Kumar Prasad S/o Late Sartho Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a) Rukmani Devi W/o Late Gokul Kumar Prasad (aged about 63 years)
5. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. **Kandan Sahu S/o Late Madhu Sahu** (**Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025**)
   6(a) Most. Dashmin Devi W/o Late Kandan Sahu (aged about 61 years)
7. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu

   All resident of Village + P.O.– Sugna, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cant. P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist.-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 196 of 2014

Parwati Devi W/o Kapil Mahto

Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.– Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cant. P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist.-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 197 of 2014

1 Ledwa Mahto

2 Jaddu Mahto

1 & 2 S/o Sukhlal Kurmi

All resident of Village + P.O, Sugnu, P. S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cant. P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist.-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 198 of 2014

1. Gauri Shankar Sahu
2. Tirath Sahu
   1 & 2 S/o Darwari Sahu
3. Kailash Sahu
4. Bhola Sahu
   3 & 4 S/o Gopi Sahu
   All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S. -Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cant. P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist.-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 199 of 2014

Lalmohan Mahto S/o Milku Mahto, Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi **… … Claimant/Appellant**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cant. P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist.-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 200 of 2014

1. Dhaneshwar Sahu S/o Manrakhan Sahu
2. Mahendra Sahu S/o Sardhu Sahu
3. **Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto) S/o Late Sardhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 18.07.2025)**
   3(a). Surendra Mahto S/o Late Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto)
4. Rusan Devi W/o Gobardhan Sahu
5. Jitu Sahu
6. Bandhu Sahu
7. Kameswar Prasad Sahu
   5 to 7 S/o Thask Ram Sahu
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 201 of 2014

Ranth Devi, W/o Kalicharan Mahli, Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1 Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2 The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 202 of 2014

1. Agamlal Sahu
2. Babulal Sahu

1 & 2 S/o Nanku Sahu
All Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 203 of 2014

1. Virendra Mahto
2. **Jagnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**

2(a) Akhilesh Kumar (aged about 63 years)
2(b) Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (aged about 55 years)
2(c) Rajiv Kumar (aged about 48 years)
All sons of Late Jagnath Sahu

3. Yogendra Mahto
4. Surendra Mahto

1 to 4 S/o Late Charku Mahto
All Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A.No.204 of 2014

1. **Meghnath Mahto S/o Late Bishram Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**

1(a) Ramnath Mahto S/o Late Meghnath Mahto (aged about 63 years)
1(b) Most. Surnti Devi W/o Late Jainath Mahto (aged about 50 years)

2. **Kolha Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**

2(a) Tirath Nath Mahto (Aged about 56 years)
3. Madhu Mahto
1 to 3 S/o Bishram Mahto
4. Savitri Devi W/o Laldev Mahto
5. Bandhu Mahto
6. Jhollo Mahto
5 & 6 S/o Ropna Mahto
7. Faguram Mahto S/o Kodhi Mahto
All resident of Village + P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 205 of 2014

1. Parwati Devi W/o Teju Sahu
2. **Jhalo Devi W/o Ramjit Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
2(1) Most. Jayanti Devi W/o Late Mahabir Sahu
2(2) Sahabir Sahu S/o Late Ramjit Sahu
3. Shukhlal Sahu
4. **Gokul Kumar Prasad S/o Late Shortho Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
4(a) Most. Rukmani Devi (aged about 63 years)
5. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. **Kandan Sahu S/o Madhu Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
6(a) Most. Dashmin Devi W/o Late Kandan Sahu (aged about 61 years)
7. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu
All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District- Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 206 of 2014

Bilaso Devi W/o Chamru Kurmi
Resident of Village + P.O, Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 207 of 2014

1. **Liluwa Devi W/o Lala Hazam (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**

1(a) Jageshwar Thakur (aged about 64 years)

1(b) Sanjeev Kumar Thakur (aged about 47 years)

2. **Jhalku Thakur S/o Devnarayan Thakur (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**

2(a). Most. Mangla Devi (aged 62 years)

All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 208 of 2014

Jhubra Baitha S/o Sohar Baitha

Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 209 of 2014

1. Parwati Devi W/o Teju Sahu
2. **Jhalo Devi W/o Late Ramjit Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 02.09.2025)**

2(a) Sahabir Sahu S/o Late Ramjit Sahu (46 years)

2(b) Most. Jayanti Devi W/o Late Mahabir Sahu (38 years)

3. Shukhlal Sahu S/o Shortho sahu
4. **Gokul Kumar Prasad S/o Late Shortho Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 02.09.2025)**

4(a) Most. Rukmani Devi W/o Late Gokul Kumar Prasad (aged about 63 years)

5. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. **Kandan Sahu S/o Late Madhu Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 02.09.2025)**

6(a) Most. Dashmin Devi W/o Late Kandan Sahu (aged about 61 years)

7. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu

All Resident of Village + PO – Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 210 of 2014

1. **Meghnath Mahto S/o Bishram Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Ramnath Mahto (aged about 63 years)
   1(b) Most. Surnti Devi (aged about 50 years)
2. **Kolha Mahto S/o Late Bishram Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Tirath Nath Mahto (aged about 56 years)
3. Madhu Mahto
   1 to 3 S/o Bishram Mahto
4. Savitri Mahto W/o Laldev Mahto
5. Bandhu Mahto
6. Jhollo Mahto
   5 & 6 S/o Ropna Mahto
7. Faguram Mahto, S/o Kodhi Mahto
   All resident of Village + P.O Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 211 of 2014

1. Gauri Shankar Sahu
2. Tirath Sahu
   1 & 2 S/o Darwari Sahu
3. Kailash Sahu
4. Bhola Sahu
   3 & 4 S/o Gopi Sahu
5. Kashinath Sahu
6. Baijnath Sahu
   5 & 6 S/o Dharamnath Sahu
   All Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 212 of 2014

Keshwari Devi, W/o Kashinath Mahto
Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 213 of 2014

1. Sawna Munda S/o Birsa Munda
2. Rajenra Munda
3. Deepak Munda
   2 & 3 S/o Pusuwa Munda
4. Lalit Munda D/o Chamna Munda
   All resident of Village + PO-Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 214 of 2014

1. **Radhanath Mahto S/o Nocho Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a) Most. Sudhan Devi, aged about 60 years
   1(b) Rajkishor Mahto, aged about 55 years
   1(c) Sonaram Mahto, aged about 45 years
   1(d) Sunil Mahto, aged about 44 years
2. Rameswar Mahto
3. **Jaleswar Mahto S/o Nocho Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a) Most. Bajo Devi, aged about 67 years
   3(b) Krishna Mahto, aged about 47 years
   3(c) Pawan Mahto, aged about 38 years
4. Baleswar Mahto
5. Kaleswar Mahto
   1 to 5 S/o Nocho Mahto
   All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District- Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No.215 of 2014

Parwati Devi W/o Kapil Mahto
Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

…… Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No.216 of 2014

1. Dhaneshwar Sahu S/o Manrakhan Sahu
2. Mahendra Sahu S/o Sardhu Sahu
3. Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto) S/o Late Sardhu Mahto **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 18.07.2025)**
   3(a). Surendra Mahto S/o Late Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto)
4. Rusan W/o Gobardhan
5. Jitu Sahu
6. Bandhu Sahu
7. Kameswar Prasad Sahu
   5 to 7 S/o Thask Ram Sahu
   Resident of Village+P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 217 of 2014

1. Parwati Devi W/o Teju Sahu
2. **Jhalo Devi W/o Ramjit Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Sahabir Sahu @ Mahto (aged about 46 years)
   2(b) Jayanti Devi W/o Late Mahabir Sah (age 38 years)
3. Shukhlal Sahu S/o Shortho Sahu
4. **Gokul Kumar Prasad S/o Shortho Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a) Rukmani Devi W/o Late Gokul Kumar Prasad (aged about 63 years)
5. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. **Kandan Sahu S/o Madhu Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   6(a) Most. Dashmin Devi W/o Late Kandan Sahu (aged about 61 years)
7. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu

All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District- Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 218 of 2014

1. **Fukmani Devi W/o Dutiya Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Chamak Lal Mahto (aged about 60 years)
   1(b) Shyam Lal Mahto (aged about 55 years)
   1(c) Brij Lal Mahto (aged about 48 years)
   All sons of Late Fulmani Devi
2. **Lalit Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.8.2025)**
   2(a) Most. Riban Devi (aged about 48 years)
3. Pirtu Kurmi
4. Ramnath Kurmi
   2 to 4 S/o Chedi Kurmi
   All resident of Village + P.O., Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 219 of 2014

1. Sawna Munda S/o Birsa Munda
2. Rajenra Munda
3. Deepak Munda
   2 & 3 S/o Pusuwa Munda
4. Lalit Munda D/o Chamna Munda
   All resident of Village + PO-Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 220 of 2014

1. **Pahlad Mahto S/o Situwa Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a) Jitlal Mahto, aged about 46 years, S/o Late Pahalad Mahto

1(b) Jhabbu Lal Mahto, aged about 42 years, S/o Late Pahalad Mahto

2. **Aahlad Mahto S/o Situwa Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Rikhi Devi, aged about 56 years, D/o Late Ahalad Mahto
   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 221 of 2014

1. Jitram Mahto
2. Jitu Mahto
   1 & 2 S/o Anand Mahto
3. Budhram Mahto
4. **Bishu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a). Birendra Kumar Mahto (aged about 42 years)
5. **Babulal Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   5(a). Most. Rita Devi (aged about 38 years) W/o Late Shankar Kumar Mahto
   3 to 5 S/o Mani Mahto
6. Niranjan Mahto S/o Mukund Mahto
   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 222 of 2014

1. Sadho Devi
2. Tijo Devi
3. Manju Devi
   1 to 3 D/o Gandura Sahu
4. Pancho Sahu S/o Kandru Sahu
   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 223 of 2014

Aklu Sahu S/o Galuwa Sahu
Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 224 of 2014

1. Mo. Shanti Devi W/o Bishambar Lohar
2. Putul Devi W/o Ganga Lohar
3. Kamli Devi W/o Guddan Lohar

All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 225 of 2014

1. Sonalal Lohar
2. Hiralal Lohar

1 & 2 S/o Shivcharan Lohar

3. Devraj Lohar S/o Manna Lal

All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 226 of 2014

1. **Lalo Devi W/o Jogiya Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

1(a). Paras Mahto, aged about 60 years, S/o Late Lalo Devi
Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 227 of 2014

1. Agamlal Sahu
2. Babulal Sahu

   1 & 2 S/o Nanku Sahu

   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 228 of 2014

Birju Mahto S/o Matnu Mahto

Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 229 of 2014

1. Fagu Mahli S/o Matan Mahli
2. Ranth Devi @ Randh W/o Kalicharan Mahli

   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 230 of 2014

1. Mostt. Karmi Devi W/o Dharma Mahto
2. Most. Bajo Devi W/o Sita Mahto
3. Gudai Mahto S/o Ropna Mahto
4. Balram Mahto S/o Dashrat Mahto
5. Koka Mahto S/o Gondla Mahto
6. Sohrai Mahto
7. Baijnath Mahto

   6 & 7 S/o Lajher Mahto
8. Most. Bilaso Devi W/o Chamru Mahto

   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 231 of 2014

1. **Meghnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Ram Nath Mahto (aged about 63 years) S/o Late Meghnath Mahto
   1(b) Most. Surnti Devi (aged about 50 years) W/o Late Jainath Mahto
2. Kolha Mahto **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Tirath Nath Mahto (aged about 56 years)
3. Madhu Mahto
   1 to 3 S/o Bishram Mahto
4. Savitri Devi W/o Laldev Mahto
   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 232 of 2014

Lalmohan Mahto S/o Milku Mahto
Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 233 of 2014

1. Sadho Devi
2. Tijo Devi
3. Manju Devi
   1 to 3 D/o Gandura Sahu
4. Pancho Sahu S/o Kandru Sahu
   Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 234 of 2014

1. Bhagtain Devi W/o Mahru Sahu
2. Sulva Devi W/o Soharai Teli

All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 235 of 2014

Most. Sadho Devi W/o Ugna Sahu

Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 236 of 2014

1. Ram @ Ram Sahu
2. Laxman @ Laxman Sahu
3. Bharat @ Bharat Sahu
4. Chatur @ Chatur Sahu

All S/o Mahli Sahu @ Mahli teli

All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 237 of 2014

1. Doman Mahto
2. Sarula Mahto

1 & 2 S/o Charku Mahto

3. Syamlal Mahto S/o Jagarnath Mahto

All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 238 of 2014

Bandhan Mahto S/o Bartu Mahto
Resident of Village+P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.239 of 2014

1. Pusan Devi
2. Bulku Devi
   1 & 2 D/o Sohar Sahu
3. Chedi Sahu S/o Bhukhal Sahu
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 240 of 2014

1. Moharai Mahto S/o Jhubla Mahto
2. Tetri @ Tetri Devi W/o Balku Mahto
3. Mohan Mahto
4. Rohan Mahto
   3 & 4 S/o Basudev Mahto
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 241 of 2014

1. Ram @ Ram Sahu
2. Laxman @ Laxman Sahu
3. Bharat @ Bharat Sahu

4. Chatur @ Chatur Sahu
   1 to 4 S/o Mahli Sahu @ Mahli Teli
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 242 of 2014

1. Chedi Teli
2. Aklu Teli
3. Charku Teli
4. Etwa Teli
   1 to 4 S/o Jhubba Teli
5. Faguwa Sahu S/o Bahuran Sahu
6. Raimuni Devi W/o Jaggu Sahu
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 243 of 2014

Santosh Kurmi S/o Rama Kurmi
Resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 244 of 2014

1. **Lalo Devi W/o Late Jogiya Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Paras Mahto, aged about 60 years
   Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 245 of 2014

1. Gauri Shankar Sahu
2. Tirathnath Sahu
   1 & 2 S/o Darbari Sahu
3. Shankar Sahu
4. Kailash Sahu
5. Bhola Sahu
   3 to 5 S/o Gopi Sahu
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 246 of 2014

1. Jugla @ Jugla Mahto
2. Afkari @ Afkari Mahto
   1 & 2 S/o Tikuwa Kurmi
3. Nanka @ Nanka Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi
4. Manku @ Manku Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi
5. **Pakku Mahto S/o Pushpa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   5(a) Ropan Devi W/o Late Pakku Mahto (aged about 65 years)
6. **Chotka Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   6(a) Most. Rashmi Devi (aged about 62 years) W/o Late Chotka Mahto
7. **Sagwa Mahto D/o Mangla Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   7(a) Akhilesh Kumar (aged about 63 years)
   7(b) Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (aged about 55 years)
   7(c) Rajeev Kumar (aged about 48 years)
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 247 of 2014

1. Devnath Mahto S/o Late Sannu Mahto
2. **Jagarnath Mahto S/o Late Sannu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

2(a) Arjun Mahto, aged about 50 years, S/o Late Jagarnath Mahto
2(b) Kalicharan Mahto, aged about 55 years, S/o Late Jagarnath Mahto
2(c) Most. Sulo Devi, aged about 50 years, W/o Krishna Mahto

3. **Somnath Mahto S/o Lurka Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
3(a) Most. Sanjho Devi, aged about 65 years, W/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sukra Mahto
3 & 4 S/o Lurka Mahto
5. Buttan Devi W/o Bodhan Mahto
All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 248 of 2014

1. Mallu @ Mallu Sahu
2. Tuman @ Tuman Sahu
3. Rajendra Prasad @ Rajendra Prasad Sahu
1 to 3 S/o Sabur Sahu @ Sabur Teli
All resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 249 of 2014

1. **Sawana Mahli S/o Birsa Mahli (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
(a) Sudhu Mahli, aged about 42 years, S/o Late Sawana Mahli
(b) Ludhu Mahli, aged about 44 years, S/o Late Sawana Mahli
(c) Surju Mahli, aged about 30 years, S/o Late Sawana Mahli
(d) Most. Akli Devi, aged about 47 years, W/o Late Budhu Mahli
Resident of Village + P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S.- Danapur, Patna-801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO+PS-Ranchi, District-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 250 of 2014

1. **Jhalku Hazam (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Most. Mangla Devi (aged about 62 years) W/o Late Jhalku Thakur)
2. **Tetri @ Lilwa Devi W/o Late Lala Hazam (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Jageshwar Thakur (aged about 64 years)
   2(b) Sanjeev Kr. Thakur (aged about 47 years)
   Both S/o Late Tetri Devi
   All resident of Village+P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … **Appellants/ Claimants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… **Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 251 of 2014

Most. Sadho Devi W/o Ugna Sahu
Resident of Village+P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … **Appellant/Claimant**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 252 of 2014

1. **Meghnath Mahto S/o Bishram Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Ramnath Mahto (aged about 63 years) S/o Late Meghnath Mahto
   1(b) Most. Surnti Devi (aged about 50 years) W/o Late Jainath Mahto
2. **Kolha Mahto S/o Bishram Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Tirath Nath Mahto (aged about 56 years)
3. Madhu Mahto S/o Bishram Mahto
4. Savitri Devi W/o Laldev Mahto
5. Bandhu Mahto
6. Jhollo Mahto
   5 & 6 S/o Ropna Mahto
7. Faguram Mahto S/o Kodhi Mahto

All resident of Village+P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 253 of 2014

1. Dhaneshwar Sahu S/o Manrakhan Sahu
2. Mahendra Sahu S/o Sardhu Sahu
3. **Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto) S/o Late Sardhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 18.07.2025)**
   3(a). Surendra Mahto S/o Late Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto)
4. Rusan W/o Gobardhan
5. Jitu Sahu
6. Bandhu Sahu
7. Kameswar Prasad Sahu
   5 to 7 S/o Thask Ram Sahu
   All resident of Village+P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 254 of 2014

Lalmohan Mahto S/o Milku Mahto
Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Appellant/ Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 255 of 2014

1. Balkishun Munda S/o Ghasiya Munda
2. Mangri Devi D/o Nattu Munda
3. Nanka Munda S/o Kewla Munda
   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 256 of 2014

1. Siwan Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
2. **Kandan Sahu S/o Late Madhu Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Dashmin Devi (aged about 61 years) W/o Late Kanda Sahu
   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

…… … **Appellants/ Claimants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 257 of 2014

Panchmiya Devi W/o Sobhnath Mahto
Resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … … … **Appellant/ Claimant**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 258 of 2014

1. Sivlal Mahto S/o Karma Mahto
2. Panchmiya Devi W/o Sobhnath Mahto
   Both resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 259 of 2014

1. Sivlal Mahto S/o Karma Mahto
2. Panchmiya Devi W/o Sobhnath Mahto
   All resident of Village+ P.O., Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 260 of 2014

1. Ropani Devi W/o Ghanpat Sahu
2. **Butan Devi W/o Charku Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Sanjay Ram, aged about 45 years
3. Aghnu Sahu, S/o Sahdeo Sahu
4. **Sadanand Sahu S/o Sahadev Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a) Bulku Devi, W/o Late Sadanand Sahu, aged about 45 years
5. Chando Devi, W/o Sunwa Sahu
6. Ratho Sahu, S/o Kandru Sahu

   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sagnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S.- Danapur, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, Dist- Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 261 of 2014

1. Jugla Mahto
2. Afkari Mahto

   1 & 2 S/o Tikuwa Kurmi
3. Nanka Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi
4. Manku Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi
5. **Pakku Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   5(a) Most Rupan Devi, aged about 65 years, W/o Late Pakku Mahto
6. **Chotka Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   6(a) Most. Rashmi Devi, aged about 62 years W/o Chotka Mahto
7. **Sagwa Mahto D/o Mangla Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   7(a) Akhilesh Kumar, aged about 63 years
   7(b) Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar, aged about 55 years
   7(c) Rajeev Kumar, aged about 48

   All resident of Village + P.O, Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 262 of 2014

1. Lakhan Dhobi S/o Mohar Dhobi
2. Jhubra Dhobi S/o Sohar Dhobi

3. Nanki Baitha S/o Krishna Baitha
4. Neblal Baitha S/o Sukra Baitha
5. Lakhan Baitha S/o Mohar Baitha
   All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 263 of 2014

1. Faguram Mahto S/o Kodhi Mahto
2. Fagu Mahli S/o Tuna Mahli
3. Rath Devi W/o Kalicharan Mahli
   All resident of Village + P.O Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 264 of 2014

1. Thutha Mahli S/o Udhwa Mahli
2. Budhu Mahli
3. Chander Mahli
4. Kandru Mahli
5. Mangru Mahli
   2 to 5 S/o Lattu Mahli
6. Madhu Mahli
7. Videsi Mahli
   6 & 7 S/o Sadhu Mahli
8. Balmuni Devi W/o Mangal Mahli
9. Lagan Mahli S/o Sunder Mahli
10. Bilu Mahli S/o Bandhan Mahli
    All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 265 of 2014

1. Bilaso Devi W/o Chamru Mahto
   Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 266 of 2014

1. Birju Mahto S/o Matnu Mahto
   Resident of Village + PO – Sugnu PS – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 267 of 2014

1. **Meghnath Mahto S/o Bishram Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Ramnath Mahto, aged about 63 years, S/o Late Meghnath Mahto
   1(b) Most. Surnti Devi, aged about 50 years, W/o Late Jainath Mahto
2. **Kolha Mahto S/o Bishram Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Tirath Nath Mahto, aged about 56 years, S/o Late Kolha Mahto
3. Madhu Mahto S/o Bishram Mahto
4. Savitri Devi W/o Laldev Mahto
5. Bandhu Mahto
6. Jhollo Mahto
   5 & 6 S/o Ropna Mahto
7. Faguram Mahto S/o Kodhi Mahto
   All resident of Village + P.O. – Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 268 of 2014

1. Bhunnu Munda
2. Munna Munda
   1 & 2 S/o Malti Munda
3. Lachoram Munda S/o Ropna Munda
4. Charka Munda

5. Ganga Munda
   4 & 5 S/o Birsa Munda
6. Kaila Munda S/o Anduwa Munda
   All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 269 of 2014

1. Chedi Sahu
2. Aklu Sahu
3. Charku Sahu
4. Etwa Sahu
   1 to 4 S/o Jhubba Teli
5. Faguwa Sahu S/o Bahuran Sahu
6. Raimuni Devi W/o Jaggu Sahu
   All resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 270 of 2014

1. Gauri Shnakar Sahu
2. Tirathnath Sahu
   S/o Darbari Sahu
3. Shankar Sahu
4. Kailash Sahu
5. Bhola Sahu
   S/o Gopi Sahu
   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P. S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi **…… Appellants/ Claimants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 271 of 2014

1. Chedi Sahu
2. Aklu Sahu

3. Charku Sahu
4. Etwa Sahu
   1 to 4 S/o Jhuba Sahu
5. Faguwa Sahu S/o Bahuran Sahu
6. Raimuni Devi W/o Jaggu Sahu
   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 272 of 2014

1. Bhunnu Munda
2. Munna Munda
   1 & 2 S/o Malti Munda
3. Lachoram Munda S/o Ropna Munda
4. Charka Munda
5. Ganga Munda
   4 & 5 S/o Birsa Munda
6. Kaila Munda
   S/ o Andhuwa Munda
   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 273 of 2014

1. **Moharai Mahto S/o Jhubla Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most. Bilaso Devi, aged about 62 years, W/o Late Moharai Mahto
2. **Bogdo Mahto S/o Late Jhubla Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Most. Akli Devi, aged about 65 years, W/o Late Bogdo Mahto
3. Tetri Devi W/o Balku Mahto
4. Mohan Mahto
5. Sohan Mahto
6. Rupu Mahto
7. Rohan Mahto
   4 to 7 S/o Basudev Mahto
8. **Pairo Devi W/o Jhuthan Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o 26.08.2025)**
   8(a) Jaggu Mahto, aged about 65 years, S/o Late Pairo Devi

8(b) Jaglal Mahto, aged about 55 years, S/o Late Pairo Devi
8(c) Most. Vimla Devi, aged about 34 years, W/o Babulal Mahto

9. **Lalo Devi W/o Jogiya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o 26.08.2025)**
   9(a). Paras Mahto, aged about 62 years, S/o Late Lalo Devi
10. **Muter Devi W/o Sudra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o 26.08.2025)**
   10(a). Most. Bilaso Devi @ Jaymani Devi, aged about 45 years, W/o Late Surendra Mahto
11. Rusni Devi W/o Bigal Mahto

Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 274 of 2014

1. Parwati Devi w/o Teju Sahu
2. Jhalo Devi w/o Ramjit Sahu
3. Shukhlal Sahu
4. Gokul Kumar Prasad

3 & 4 S/o Shortho Sahu

5. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. Kandan Sahu S/o Madhu Sahu
7. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu

Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 275 of 2014

1. Jugla Mahto
2. Afkari Mahto

1 & 2 S/o Tikuwa Kurmi

3. Nanka Mahto
4. Manku Mahto

3 to 4 S/o Puswa Kurmi

5. Pakku Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)

5(a). Ropan Dev W/o Late Pakku Mahto (aged about 65 years)

6. Chhotka Mahto S/o Late Puswa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)

6(a) Rashmi Devi W/o Late Chotka Mahto (aged about 62 years)

7. Sagwa Devi D/o Mangala Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)

7(a) Akhilesh Kumar (aged about 63 years)

7(b) Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (aged about 55 years)

7(c) Rajeev Kumar (aged about 48 years)

Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 276 of 2014

1. Mati Mahto S/o Lalnath Kurmi
2. Lalmohan Mahto
3. Mathu Mahto
4. Madan Mahto

2 to 4 sons of Premnath Mahto

5. Tetri Devi W/o Munsi Mahto

All Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 277 of 2014

1. Mahanand Mahto
2. Devnarayan Mahto
3. Kishor Kumar

S/o Tirthanath Mahto

4. Dev Kumar S/o Shivlal Mahto

All Resident of Village – Khatanga, P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 278 of 2014

1. Jhari Baraik S/o Hardayal Baraik
2. Shyam Baraik S/o Mahadev Baraik

Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 279 of 2014

1. Dhaneshwar Sahu S/o Manrakhan Sahu
2. Mahendra Sahu S/o Sardhu Sahu
3. Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto) S/o Late Sardhu Mahto **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 18.07.2025)**
   3(a). Surendra Mahto S/o Late Gorakhnath Sahu (Mahto)
4. Rusan w/o Gobardhan
5. Jitu Sahu
6. Bandhu Sahu
7. Kameswar Prasad Sahu S/o Thask Ram Sahu
8. Jhari Baraik S/o Hardayal Baraik
9. Shyam Baraik S/o Mahadev Baraik

   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 280 of 2014

1. Gauri Shankar Sahu
2. Tirathnath Sahu

   1 & 2 S/o Darbari Sahu
3. Shankar Sahu
4. Kailash Sahu
5. Bhola Sahu

   3 to 5 S/o Gopi Sahu

   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 281 of 2014

1. Gauri Shankar Sahu
2. Tirathnath Sahu

   1 & 2 S/o Darbari Sahu

3. Shankar Sahu
4. Kailash Sahu
5. Bhola Sahu
   3 to 5 S/o Gopi Sahu
6. Jhari Baraik
   S/o Hardayal Baraik
7. Shyam Baraik
   S/o Mahadev Baraik
   All Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 282 of 2014

1. Sivlal Mahto
   S/o Karma Mahto
   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellant/ Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 283 of 2014

1. **Pahalad Mahto S/o Situwa Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a) Jitlal Mahto, aged about 46 years, S/o Late Pahalad Mahto
   1(b) Jhabbu Lal Mahto, aged about 42 years, S/o Late Pahalad Mahto
2. **Aahalad Mahto S/o Situwa Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Rikhi Devi, aged about 56 years, D/o Late Aahalad Mahto
   Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 284 of 2014

1. Pusan Devi

2. Bulku Devi
1 & 2 D/o Sohar Sahu
3. Chedi Sahu
S/o Bhukhla Sahu
Resident of Village + P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 285 of 2014

1. Sadhu Devi W/o Ugna Sahu @ Ugan teli Resident of Village + P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

……. Appellant/ Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 286 of 2014

1. **Kishan (Kario) Munda S/o Aahlad Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Bishu Munda (55 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(b). Bandhan Munda (52 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(c). Rushu Munda (50 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
2. Jhari Munda S/o Aahlad Munda
3. **Raspati Munda S/o Sarula Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Sabita Devi (40 years) W/o Late Raspati Munda
4. **Jitan Mundain W/o Gopal Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Harilal Munda (50 years) S/o Late Jitan Mundain
   4(b). Shibu Munda (45 years) S/o Late Jitan Mundain
5. **Sikari Munda S/o Chedi Munda (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
6. Manjer Devi, W/o Sahdev Munda
7. Gudul Munda, S/o Lengi Munda
8. Pinku Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
9. Deepak Munda
10. Karma Munda
11. Dharma Munda
    9 to 11 S/o Bhutka Munda
12. Krishna Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
    All resident of village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 287 of 2014

1. Bacho Devi
   D/o Barka Dhano
   Resident of Village + P. O. – Dahu, P. S. – Ormanjhi, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. Fagan Dhano
   D/o Barka Dhano
   Resident of Village- Hundrufall, Getalsud, P. S. – Angra, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. Budhan Devi
   D/o Barka Dhano
   Resident of Village- Bara Kawali, P. O. – Rajaulatu, P.S. – Namkum, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. Kunwar Lakra
   S/o Ramiya Devi
   Resident of Village – Lali Mahuwatoli, P. S. – Namkum, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. Shemell Oraon
6. Budu Oraon
7. Ramnath Oraon
8. Birsa Oraon
   5 to 8 S/o Somari Devi
9. Dingi Devi W/o Dhano Oraon
   All 5 to 9 resident of Village- Ranatoli, P. O. – Lali, P.S. – Tatisilwai, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 288 of 2014

1. Mahanand Mahto
2. Devnarayan Mahto
3. Kishor Kumar
   All S/o Tirathnath Mahto
4. Dev Kumar S/o Shivlal Mahto
   All Resident of Village – Khatanga, P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 289 of 2014

1. **Balku Mahto S/o Richika Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a) Manoj Mahto, aged about 33 years, S/o Late Balku Mahto
2. Bhadru Mahto
3. Keshnath Mahto
4. Sahajnath Mahto
5. Dharamnath Mahto
   2 to 5 S/o Jitram Mahto
6. Bangali Mahto
7. Nageshwar Mahto
   Both S/o Salikram Mahto
8. Bhodan Mahto
9. **Madan Mahto S/o Bhupnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   9(a) Mukesh Mahto, aged about 42 years
   9(b) Amit Mahto, aged about 38 years,
   Both S/o Late Madan Mahto
10. Chandan Mahto
11. **Tilak Mahto S/o Bhupnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
    11(a) Dipesh Kumar Mahto, aged about 32 years, S/o Late Tilak Mahto
12. Kamlesh Mahto
    8 to 12 S/o Bhupnath Mahto
13. Pano Devi
    W/o Milak Mahto
    All at present resident of Village + P. O, - Buti, P. S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 290 of 2014

1. **Dhaneshwar Matho S/o Mohan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a) Most. Raska Devi (aged about 61 years), W/o Late Dhaneshwar Mahto
2. Sonmati Devi W/o Kameshwar Mahto
3. Chetan Kumar Mahto S/o Kameshwar Mahto

All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S.- Danapur, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, Dist- Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 291 of 2014

1. **Tetra Pahan S/o Lumba Pahan (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. **Mogro Pahan S/o Tetra Pahan Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

2(a). Jugesh Munda S/o Late Mogro Pahan
2(b). Suraj Munda S/o Late Mogro Pahan
Resident of Village Khatanga, P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 292 of 2014

1. **Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

1(a). Rajesh Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jitlal Mahto
1(b). Most. Anita Devi (45 years) W/o Late Rajendra Mahto

2. Murti Devi W/o Mahendra Mahto
3. Devendra Mahto
4. **Surendra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

4(a). Most. Sita Devi (65 years) W/o Late Surendra Mahto

5. Sanjay Mahto

3 to 5 S/o Sohanlal Mahto
All Resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 293 of 2014

1. **Sabur Mahto S/o Jhariya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**

1(a). Pankaj Kumar Mahto S/o Late Gopal Mahto

1(b). Roshan Kumar Mahto S/o Late Rajkumar Mahto
1(c). Prakash Kumar Mahto S/o Late Raj Kumar Mahto

2. **Ramdhan Mahto S/o Late Jhariya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
2(a). Rameshwar Mahto S/o Late Ramdhan Mahto
2(b). Rajendra Mahto S/o Late Ramdhan Mahto
2(c). Hardev Mahto S/o Late Ramdhan Mahto
2(d). Ganesh Mahto S/o Late Ramdhan Mahto
3. Balku Mahto S/o Jhariya Mahto
4. **Govardhan Mahto S/o Jhariya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
4(a). Premnath Mahto S/o Late Govardhan Mahto
4(b). Charku Mahto S/o Late Govardhan Mahto
5. Shyam Sunder Prasad S/o Santosh Mahto
6. Satish Kumar S/o Mohan Lal Mahto

All resident of Village Khatanga, P.O. Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 294 of 2014

1. Sawana Mahto S/o Maharang Mahto
2. Ramesh Mahto S/o Charku Mahto
3. Bindeshwar Mahto
4. Nandkishor Mahto

Both S/o Puran Mahto

5. Salkho Devi W/o Naresh Mahto

All resident of Village Khatanga, P.O Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 295 of 2014

1. **Mangal Mahto S/o Meghu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
1(a). Ramnarayan Chaudhary S/o Late Mangal Mahto
2. Jagarnath Mahto S/o Late Meghu Mahto
3. **Baijnath Mahto S/o Meghu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
3(a). Dhananjay Kumar S/o Baijnath Mahto

4. Radho Devi W/o Yugal Mahto
5. Pancho Devi W/o Sobhnath Mahto
6. Sulen Mahto S/o Kartik Mahto
7. **Choten Mahto S/o Prema Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   7(a). Lakhinder Mahto S/o Late Choten Mahto
   7(b). Mantu Mahto S/o Late Choten Mahto
   7(c). Vikram Mahto S/o Late Barju Mahto
   7(d). Anoj Mahto S/o Late Barju Mahto
8. Sonaram Mahto S/o Prema Mahto
9. Jhunu Devi W/o Dhana Mahto
10. Hirola Devi W/o Nandkishor Mahto

All resident of Village Khatanga, P.O. Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 296 of 2014

1. **Tetra Pahan S/o Lumba Pahan (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. **Mogro Pahan S/o Tetra Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Jugesh Munda S/o Late Mogro Pahan
   2(b). Suraj Munda S/o Late Mogro Pahan
   Both resident of Village Khatanga, P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 297 of 2014

1. **Mangi Devi D/o Jagwa Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Karma Oraon (51 years) S/o Late Mangi Devi
   1(b). Vinay Toppo (36 years) S/o Late Mangi Devi
   At present Resident of Vill – Khatanga, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand
2. Roshni Devi D/o Jagwa Oraon
   At present resident of Vill + P.S. – Bariyatu, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand
3. Bhanu Kachhap
4. Anil Kachhap

3 & 4 S/o Sukro Devi
Both at present resident of vill – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 298 of 2014

1. **Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Rajesh Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jitlal Mahto
   1(b). Most. Anita Devi (45 years) W/o Late Rajendra Mahto
   Resident of Village – Sugnu, P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 299 of 2014

1. Murti Devi W/o Mahendra Mahto
2. Devendra Mahto S/o Sohanlal Mahto
3. **Surendra Mahto S/o Sohan Lal Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Sita Devi (65 years) W/o Late Surendra Mahto
4. Sanjay Mahto S/o Sohanlal Mahto
   All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 300 of 2014

1. Subodhani Devi W/o Mathura Baraik
2. Birendra Baraik S/o Sukhdev Baraik
3. **Vishwanath Baraik S/o Maku Baraik (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Ravi Baraik (aged 24 years) S/o Late Vishwanath Baraik

All resident of Village- Khatanga, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danadpur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danadpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 301 of 2014

1. **Baijnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sonalal Mahto (aged about 50 years) S/o Mohan Mahto
   1(b). Sonaram Mahto (aged about 45 years) S/o Mohan Mahto
2. **Tirtu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Most. Draupadi Devi W/o Late Asharam Mahto
3. **Rameshwar Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Motilal Mahto S/o Late Rameshwar Mahto
   3(b). Rohit Mahto S/o Late Rameshwar Mahto
   3(c). Gahnu Mahto S/o Late Rameshwar Mahto
4. Jaleshwar Mahto
   All S/o Kariyo Mahto
5. Sadhinya Devi W/o Ropna Mahto
   All resident of Village – AmbhaDhipa, P.O. + P.S. – Tatisilwai, Dist – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 302 of 2014

1. Mahanand Mahto
2. Devnarayan Mahto
3. Kishor Kumar
   S/o Tirathnath Mahto
4. Dev Kumar S/o Shivlal Mahto
   All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 303 of 2014

1. Mahanand Mahto
2. Devnarayan Mahto
3. Kishor Kumar
   All S/o Tirathnath Mahto
4. Dev Kumar S/o Shivlal Mahto
   All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/opp Parties

With

F.A. No. 304 of 2014

1. **Tetra Pahan S/o Lumba Pahan (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. **Mogro Pahan S/o Tetra Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Jogesh Munda (37 years) S/o Late Mogro Pahan
   2(b). Suraj Munda (26 years) S/o Late Mogro Pahan
   All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 305 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar
   All S/o Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
7. **Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   7(a). Rajesh Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jitlal Mahto
   7(b). Most. Anita Devi (45 years) W/o Late Rajendra Mahto
8. Devendra Mahto

9. Surendra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)
9(a). Most. Sita Devi (65 years) W/o Late Surendra Mahto
10. Sanjay Mahto
8 to 10 S/o Sohanlal Mahto
11. Murti Devi W/o Mahendra Mahto
12. **Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Mohan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
12(a). Most. Rashka Devi (61 years) W/o Late Dhaneshwar Mahto
13. Sonmati Devi W/o Kameshwar Mahto
All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 306 of 2014

1. **Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Mohan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
1(a). Most. Raska Devi (61 years) W/o Late Dhaneshwar Mahto
2. Sonmati Devi W/o Kameshwar Mahto
3. Chetan Kumar Mahto S/o Kameshwar Mahto
All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 307 of 2014

1. Mahanand Mahto
2. Devnarayan Mahto
3. Kishor Kumar
All S/o Tirathnath Mahto
4. Dev Kumar S/o Shivlal Mahto
All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 308 of 2014

1. **Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Mohan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most. Raska Devi (61 years) W/o Late Dhaneshwar Mahto
2. Sonmati Devi W/o Kameshwar Mahto
3. Chetan Kumar Mahto S/o Kameshwar Mahto
   All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 309 of 2014

1. **Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Mohan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most. Raska Devi (61 years) W/o Late Dhaneshwar Mahto
2. Sonmati Devi W/o Kameshwar Mahto
3. Chetan Kumar Mahto S/o Kameshwar Mahto
   All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 310 of 2014

1. Jagarnath Oraon S/o Ram Oraon
2. Chandar Oraon S/o Goma Oraon
3. Jatri Devi W/o Raju Oraon
4. Chari Orain W/o Devcharan Oraon
5. Ropna Oraon
6. Budhuwa Oraon
7. Kandan Oraon
   5 to 7 S/o Eto Oraon
8. Sudhir Oraon
9. Binod Kachhap
   Both S/o Birsa Oraon
10. Sukra Oraon S/o Chander Oraon
    All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhan.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 311 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar S/o Tulsi Mahato (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar
   All S/o Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
7. **Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   7(a). Rajesh Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jitlal Mahto
   7(b). Most. Anita Devi (45 years) W/o Late Rajendra Mahto
8. Devendra Mahto
9. **Surendra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   9(a). Most. Sita Devi (65 years) W/o Late Surendra Mahto
10. Sanjay Mahto
    8 to 10 S/o Sohanlal Mahto
11. Murti Devi W/o Mahendra Mahto
12. **Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Mohan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
    12(a). Most. Raska Devi (61 years) W/o Late Dhaneshwar Mahto
13. Sonmati Devi W/o Kameshwar Mahto
    All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 313 of 2014

1. **Sanichariya Devi W/o Puswa Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most Sabita Devi W/o Late Manoj Munda
2. Ugan Devi D/o Bartu Munda

All resident of Village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 314 of 2014

1. **Sitaram Mahto S/o Jitwahan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Ramesh Mahto (40 years) S/o Late Sitaram Mahto
2. Falindra Mahto S/o Guru Mahto
   Both resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 315 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar S/o Tulsi Mahato (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar
   All S/o Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   All resident of Village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 316 of 2014

1. **Bhunwa Mahto S/o Baijnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Jhabulal Mahto (aged 63 years) S/o Late Bhunwa Mahto
   1(b). Vinay Mahto (34 years) S/o Late Mahabir Mahto
   1(c). Laku Mahto (aged 61 years) S/o Late Bhunwa Mahto
   1(d). Dinesh Mahto (aged 53 years) S/o Late Bhunwa Mahto
   R/o village – Horhap, P.S.- Tatisilwai, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand
2. **Guduwa Mahto S/o Baijnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Most. Parvati Devi W/o Late Jitlal Mahto
   2(b). Ritulal Mahto (44 years) S/o Late Guduwa Mahto
3. Jageshwar Mahto
4. Mahabir Mahto
5. Lalbir Mahto
   3 to 5 S/o Bala Mahto
6. Sandeep Mahto
7. Bhuneshwar Mahto
   Both S/o Kariya Mahto
   2 to 7 All at present resident of Village- Pertol, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 317 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar
   All S/o Tulsi Mahato
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
7. Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto
8. Devendra Mahto
9. Surendra Mahto
10. Sanjay Mahto
    8 to 10 S/o Sohanlal Mahto
11. Murti Devi W/o Mahendra Mahto
12. Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Mohan Mahto
13. Sonmati Devi W/o Kameshwar Mahto

All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 318 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar S/o Tulsi Mahato (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto S/o Late Tulsi Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar S/o Late Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 319 of 2014

1. **Jidiya Orain W/o Mahli Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Rajni Oraon (18 years) S/o Late Arvind Oraon
   1(b). Sanjay Oraon S/o Late Budhwa Oraon
2. **Ranka Oraon S/o Tima Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). David Kachhap (23 years) S/o Late Deepak Kachhap
   2(b). Sunny Kachhap (21 years) S/o Late Deepak Kachhap
   2(c). Vishal Kachhap (19 years) S/o Late Deepak Kachhap
   2(d). Tima Oraon (53 years) S/o Late Ranka Oraon
   2(e). Rajesh Kachhap (45 years) S/o Late Ranka Oraon
3. **Ashok Oraon S/o Tima Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Sajan Oraon (aged 43 years) S/o Late Ashok Oraon
4. **Haura Oraon S/o Langra Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

4(a). Ravi Oraon (27 years)
4(b). Suraj Oraon (26 years)
4(c). Sonu Oraon (25 years)
4(d). Ranjan Oraon (18 years)
All S/o Late Mangal Oraon
4 (e). Mana Oraon S/o Late Haura Oraon

5. **Birsi Devi W/o Tapeshwar Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   5(a). Manu Oraon (45 years) S/o Late Tapeshwar Oraon
   5(b). Vinod Oraon (41 years) S/o Late Tapeshwar Oraon
   5(c). Karma Oraon (38 years) S/o Late Tapeshwar Oraon
6. **Sukhdev Oraon S/o Jatru Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   6(a). Most. Lalita Kachhap (50 years) W/o Late Sukhdev Oraon
7. Dipi Oraon S/o Sukra Oraon
8. **Sarifa Oraon S/o Mangra Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   8(a). Most. Sanichariya Devi (47 years) W/o Late Sarifa Oraon
   8(b). Sajan Oraon (27 years) S/o Late Sarifa Oraon
   8(c). Dablu Oraon (25 years) S/o Late Sarifa Oraon
9. Pici Orain, W/o Sukhram Oraon
10. Sajan Oraon S/o Ashok Oraon

All resident of village – Bakaindtoli, P.O.- Hotwar, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants/Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 320 of 2014

1. Sahdeo Munda S/o Late Bodho Munda
2. **Basudeo Munda S/o Late Bodho Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   2(a). Badal Bhut Kumar (52 years) S/o Late Basudeo Munda
   2(b). Pradeep Bhut Kumar (48 years) S/o Late Basudeo Munda
   2(c). Anup Bhut Kumar (46 years) S/o Late Basudeo Munda
   2(d). Vishwajit Bhut Kumar (43 years) S/o Late Basudeo Munda
3. Dileshwar Munda
4. Suresh Munda
   Both S/o Mahadev Munda
5. Ramesh Munda
6. Anit Munda
7. Vikash Munda
   5 to 7 S/o Babulal Munda

All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 321 of 2014

1. Chamru Mahto S/o Mani Mahto
2. Ramu Mahto
3. Samal Mahto
4. Kailash Mahto
   2 to 4 S/o Sukhdev Mahto
   All resident of Village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. Doman Kurmi
6. Sarula Kurmi
   Both resident of Village + P.O.- sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
7. Shyamlal Mahto S/o Jagarnath Mahto
   Resident of Village – Jintubera, P.S.- Angara, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 322 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar S/o Tulsi Mahato (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar
   All S/o Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
7. **Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   7(a). Rajesh Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jitlal Mahto
   7(b). Most. Anita Devi (45 years) W/o Late Rajendra Mahto
8. Devendra Mahto
9. **Surendra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

9(a). Most. Sita Devi (65 years) W/o Late Surendra Mahto
10. Sanja Mahto
8 to 10 S/o Sohanlal Mahto
11. Murti Devi, W/o Mahendra Mahto
12. **Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Mohan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
12(a). Most. Rashka Devi (61 years) W/o Late Dhaneshwar Mahto
13. Sonmati Devi., W/o Kameshwar Mahto
All resident of village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 323 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar S/o Tulsi Mahato (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar
All S/o Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
All resident of Village – Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 324 of 2014

1. **Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
1 (a). Rajesh Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jitlal Mahto
1 (b). Most. Anita Devi (45 years) W/o Late Rajendra Mahto
2. Murti Devi W/o Mahendra Mahto
3. Devendra Mahto
4. **Surendra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**

4(a). Most. Sita Devi (65 years) W/o Late Surendra Mahto

5. Sanjay Mahto

3 to 5 S/o Sohanlal Mahto

All resident of Village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 325 of 2014

1. Hansraj Munda S/o Rungtu Munda, resident of Village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 326 of 2014

1. **Chhappan Mahto S/o Late Bigal Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

1(a). Ashish Mahto (32 years)

1(b). Bisheshwar Mahto (40 years)

2. Fagan Devi, W/o Suresh Mahto
3. Bisheswar Mahto S/o Chappan Mahto

All resident of village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 327 of 2014

1. Subodhani Devi W/o Mathura Baraik
2. Birendra Baraik S/o Sukhdev Baraik
3. **Vishwanath Baraik S/o Maku Baraik (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

3(a). Ravi Baraik (aged 24 years) S/o Late Vishwanath Baraik

All resident of Village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 328 of 2014

1. **Kishan (Kario) Munda S/o Ahlad Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Bishu Munda (55 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(b). Bandhan Munda (52 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(c). Rushu Munda (50 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
2. Jhari Munda S/o Ahlad Munda
3. **Raspati Munda S/o Sarula Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Sabita Devi (40 years) W/o Late Raspati Munda
4. **Jitan Mundain W/o Gopal Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Harilal Munda (50 years)
   4(b). Shibu Munda (45 years)
5. **Sikari Munda S/o Chhedi Munda (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
6. Manjer Devi, W/o Sahdev Munda
7. Gudul Munda, S/o Lengi Munda
8. Pinku Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
9. Deepak Munda
10. Karma Munda
11. Dharma Munda
    9 to 11 S/o Bhutka Munda
12. Krishna Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda

    All resident of village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 329 of 2014

1. **Tullu Pahan S/o Baya Pahan (Deleted and vide order dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Raja Pahan (23 years) S/o Rajesh Pahan
2. **Rusu Pahan S/o Baya Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Sunil Munda (36 years) S/o Late Rusu Pahan
   2(b). Vishwanath Munda (33 years) S/o Late Rusu Pahan
   2(c). Karan Munda (28 years) S/o Late Rusu Pahan

3. **Pusu Pahan S/o Baya Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Ruko Devi (70 years) W/o Late Pusu Pahan
4. Bauna Pahan S/o Sukra Pahan
5. **Raju Pahan S/o Undu Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   5(a) Most. Suchita Devi (37 years) W/o Late Raju Pahan
6. Barju Pahan S/o Undu Pahan
7. **Dhurrwa Pahan S/o Bhundu Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   7(a). Rahul Munda (20 years) S/o Late Dhurwa Pahan
8. Kandru Pahan, S/o Budhu Pahan
9. Bandhan Pahan
10. Gopal Pahan
11. Ganja Pahan
12. **Harilal Pahan S/o Sikra Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
    12(a). Rahul Munda (20 years) S/o Late Harilal Pahan
    12(b). Raj Munda (19 years) S/o Late Harilal Pahan
13. Salikram Pahan
14. Madan Pahan
15. Kishor Pahan
    9 to 11 and 13 to 15 S/o Sikra Pahan
16. Etwa Pahan S/o Somra Pahan
17. **Sarula Pahan S/o Somra Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
    17(a). Surendra Munda (45 years) S/o Late Sarula Pahan
    17(b). Shailendra Munda (41 years) S/o Late Sarula Pahan
    17(c). Kushendra Munda (39 years) S/o Late Sarula Pahan
18. Chedan Devi W/o Jhari Pahan
19. **Tetra Pahan S/o Lumba Pahan (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
20. **Mogro Pahan S/o Tetra Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
    20(a). Jugesh Munda (34 years) S/o Late Mogro Pahan
    20(b). Suraj Munda (26 years) S/o Late Mogro Pahan
    All resident of village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants/Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 330 of 2014

1. **Kishan (Kario) Munda S/o Ahlad Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Bishu Munda (55 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(b). Bandhan Munda (52 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda

1(c). Rushu Munda (50 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
2. Jhari Munda S/o Ahlad Munda
3. **Raspati Munda S/o Sarula Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Sabita Devi (40 years) W/o Late Raspati Munda
4. **Jitan Mundain W/o Gopal Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Harilal Munda (50 years) S/o Late Jitan Mundain
   4(b). Shibu Munda S/o Late Jitan Mundain
5. **Sikari Munda S/o Chhedi Munda (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
6. Manjer Devi, W/o Sahdev Munda
7. Gudul Munda, S/o Lengi Munda
8. Pinku Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
9. Deepak Munda
10. Karma Munda
11. Dharma Munda
    9 to 11 S/o Bhutka Munda
12. Krishna Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda

All resident of village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 331 of 2014

1. **Kishan (Kario) Munda S/o Ahlad Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Bishu Munda (55 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(b). Bandhan Munda (52 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(c). Rushu Munda (50 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
2. Jhari Munda S/o Ahlad Munda
3. **Raspati Munda S/o Sarula Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Sabita Devi (40 years) W/o Late Raspati Munda
4. **Jitan Mundain W/o Gopal Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Harilal Munda (50 years)
   4(b). Shibu Munda (45 years)
5. **Sikari Munda S/o Chhedi Munda (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
6. Manjer Devi, W/o Sahdev Munda
7. Gudul Munda, S/o Lengi Munda
8. Pinku Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
9. Deepak Munda
10. Karma Munda
11. Dharma Munda
    9 to 11 S/o Bhutka Munda

12. Krishna Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
    All resident of village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

….. **Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 332 of 2014

1. **Piyaso Devi W/o Jhariya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Jageshwar Mahto S/o Late Piyaso Devi
   1(b). Nageshwar Mahto S/o Late Piyaso Devi
   1(c). Baleshwar Mahto S/o Late Piyaso Devi
2. Balo Devi W/o Chotelal Mahto
3. Sahajnath Mahto S/o Raghunath Mahto
4. Karmi Devi W/o Asharam Mahto
5. **Shivnarayan Mahto S/o Hariya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   5(a). Karan Kumar Mahto S/o Late Shivnarayan Mahto
   5(b). Arjun Kumar Mahto S/o Late Shivnarayan Mahto
6. Jitpal Mahto S/o Late Hariya Mahto
7. Charki Devi W/o Jitram Mahto
8. Baleser Mahto
9. Jageshwar Mahto
10. Manu Mahto
    8 to 10 S/o Ghumeshwar Mahto
    All resident of Village-Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 333 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar S/o Tulsi Mahato (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar
   All S/o Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto

6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   All resident of Village-Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi **Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 334 of 2014

1. **Kishan (Kario) Munda S/o Ahlad Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Bishu Munda (55 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(b). Bandhan Munda (52 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(c). Rushu Munda (50 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
2. Jhari Munda S/o Ahlad Munda
3. **Raspati Munda S/o Sarula Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Sabita Devi (40 years) W/o Late Raspati Munda
4. **Jitan Mundain W/o Gopal Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Harilal Munda (50 years)
   4(b). Shibu Munda (45 years)
5. **Sikari Munda S/o Chhedi Munda (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
6. Manjer Devi, W/o Sahdev Munda
7. Gudul Munda, S/o Lengi Munda
8. Pinku Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
9. Deepak Munda
10. Karma Munda
11. Dharma Munda
    9 to 11 S/o Bhutka Munda
12. Krishna Munda, S/o Sahadev Munda
    All resident of village- Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi, **Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 335 of 2014

1. Subodhani Devi W/o Mathura Baraik
2. Birendra Baraik S/o Sukhdev Baraik

3. **Vishwanath Baraik S/o Maku Baraik (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Ravi Baraik (aged 24 years) S/o Late Vishwanath Baraik
   All resident of Village-Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi, **Respondents/Respondents**

With
First Appeal No. 336 of 2014

1. **Jitlal Mahto S/o Bhikhu Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Rajesh Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jitlal Mahto
   1(b). Most. Anita Kumari (Devi) (45 years) W/o Late Rajendra Mahto
2. Murti Devi W/o Mahendra Mahto
3. Devendra Mahto
4. **Surendra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Most. Sita Devi (65 years) W/o Late Surendra Mahto
5. Sanjay Mahto
   All sons of Sohanlal Mahto
   All resident of Village-Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand **… Appellants/ Claimants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi,**… Respondents/Respondents**

With
First Appeal No. 337 of 2014

1. **Navin Kumar S/o Tulsi Mahato (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Vijay Kumar (39 years) S/o Late Navin Kumar
2. Prakash Chandra Mahto
3. Ranjit Kumar All S/o Tulsi Mahto
4. Ashok Kumar Patel
5. Subhash Kumar Patel
   Both S/o Khemnath Mahto
6. **Basanti Devi W/o Ram Narayan Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   6(a). Nagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (45 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   6(b). Sagina Prasad Singh (Mahto) (43 years) S/o Late Basanti Devi
   All resident of Village-Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… …Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 338 of 2014

1. Somari Devi W/o Sarula Munda
   Resident of Village-Khatanga, P.O.- Sugnu P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimant/Appellant**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi**… …Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 339 of 2014

1. **Tetra Pahan S/o Lumba Pahan (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. **Mogro Pahan S/o Tetra Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Jogesh Munda S/o Late Mogro Pahan
   2(b). Suraj Munda S/o Late Mogro Pahan
   Both resident of Village Khatanga, P.O. Sugnu P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 341 of 2014

1. **Kishan (Kario) Munda S/o Ahlad Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Bishu Munda (55 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(b). Bandhan Munda (52 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
   1(c). Rushu Munda (50 years) S/o Late Kishan (Kario) Munda
2. Jhari Munda S/o Ahlad Munda
3. **Raspati Munda S/o Sarula Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Sabita Devi (40 years) W/o Late Raspati Munda
4. **Jitan Mundain W/o Late Gopal Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Harilal Munda (50 years) S/o Late Jitan Mundain
   4(b). Shibu Munda (45 years) S/o Late Jitan Mundain
5. **Sikari Munda S/o Chhedi Munda (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
6. Manjer Devi W/o Sahdev Munda
7. Gudlu Munda S/o Lengi Munda
8. Pinku Munda S/o Sahadev Munda
9. Deepak Munda

10. Karma Munda
11. Dharma Munda
    9 to 11 S/o Bhutka Munda
12. Krishna Munda S/o Sahadev Munda

All Resident of Village – Khatanga, P. O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 342 of 2014

1. **Sawna Mahto S/o Mahadev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sitaram Mahto S/o Late Sawna Mahto
   1(b). Santu Mahto S/o Late Sawna Mahto
2. **Sikari Mahto S/o Basudev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Sanjay Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
   2(b). Manjay Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
   2(c). Ramesh Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
3. **Vishnu Mahto S/o Basudev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Radhika Devi W/o Late Vishnu Mahto
4. Most. Sonamati Devi W/o Bhikhari Mahto

All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 343 of 2014

1. Karamchand Oraon S/o Chamru Oraon
2. Ramesh Oraon S/o Nageshwar Oraon
3. Kishor Oraon S/o Bandhna Oraon
3. Raju Tigga
4. Arjun Tigga
5. Dilip Tigga
   3 to 5 S/o Mahendra Tigga

All present Resident of Village –Bandh Gari, P. O. –Bariatu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 344 of 2014

1. Most. Shanti Devi W/o Late Sewaram Mahto
2. Most. Basanti Devi W/o Shivnat Mahto
   Resident of Vill- Gari, P. O. Hotwar, P. S. Sadar, Ranchi, Jharkhand

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 345 of 2014

1. Lachhu Oraon S/o Annu Oraon
2. Hari Toppo S/o Lodhar Oraon
3. Prabhat Toppo
4. Pradeep Toppo
5. Prahlad Toppo
   3 to 5 S/o Jhari Oraon
6. Premkishor Oraon
7. Pankaj (Jwala) Oraon
   6 & 7 S/o Mahadev Oraon
8. Most. Sita Toppo W/o Prakash Oraon
   All present Resident of Village –Bandh Gari, P. O. –Bariatu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 346 of 2014

1. Paulus Gari (Kristan) S/o Naklu Krishtan
2. Sunil Arun Gari S/o Samuual Gari
3. John Gari
4. Jams Gari
5. Sukumar Gari
   3 to 5 S/o Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Kristan)
6. Albert Gari S/o Dilip Gari
7. Niral Gari
8. Sudhir Gari
   7 to 8 S/o Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan)

9. Roshni Gari D/o Pitter Gari
   Resident of Vill- Gari, P. O. Hotwar, P. S. Sadar, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
   ……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 347 of 2014

1. **Jaydev Oraon S/o Ramnarayan Khalkho (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most. Rajmani Khalkho (77 years) W/o Late Jaydev Oraon
   Resident of Vill-Karamtoli, P.O. –Lalpur, P.S. –Lalpur, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 348 of 2014

1. **Sawna Mahto S/o Mahadev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sitaram Mahto S/o Late Sawan Mahto
   1(b). Santu Mahto S/o Late Sawan Mahto
2. **Sikari Mahto S/o Vasudev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Sanjay Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
   2(b). Manjay Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
   2(c). Ramesh Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
3. **Vishnu Mahto S/o Vasudev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Radhika Devi W/o Late Vishnu Mahto
4. Most. Sonmati Devi W/o Bhikhari Mahto
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 349 of 2014

1. Surendra Bhogta S/o Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari)

2. Shyam Bhogta
3. Vinod Bhogta
   2 & 3 S/o Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta)
   All Resident of Vill- Gari, P. O. Hotwar, P. S. Sadar, Ranchi, Jharkhand.

……. Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

….. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 350 of 2014

1. **Sawna Mahto S/o Mahadev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sitaram Mahto S/o Late Sawan Mahto
   1(b). Santu Mahto S/o Late Sawan Mahto
2. **Sikari Mahto S/o Vasudev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Sanjay Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
   2(b). Manjay Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
   2(c). Ramesh Mahto S/o Late Sikari Mahto
3. **Vishnu Mahto S/o Vasudev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Radhika Devi W/o Late Vishnu Mahto
4. Most. Sonamati Devi W/o Bhikhari Mahto
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 351 of 2014

1. Aghnu Mahto S/o Tikla Gudla Mahto
2. Deepak Mahto S/o Tajuwa Mahto
3. Most. Chunnu Devi W/o Charthu Mahto
4. Lalbir Mahto
5. Sohrai Mahto
6. Babil Mahto
7. Manoj Mahto
   4 to 7 S/o Samlal Mahto
8. Motilal Mahto
9. Laxman Mahto
   8 & 9 S/o Mahadev Mahto
10. Santosh Mahto S/o Puran Mahto

All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 352 of 2014

1. Karmu Mahto S/o Naga Mahto
2. Mahbir Mahto
3. Sankar Mahto

   2 & 3 S/o Dharmu Mahto

   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 353 of 2014

1. Baburam Mahto
2. Devlal Mahto
3. Premsagar Mahto
4. Sahaj Kumar Swapan

   1 to 4 S/o Sobhnath Mahto
5. Jhari Mahto S/o Meghnath Mahto
6. Most. Malti Devi W/o Devnath Mahto
7. **Most. Malti Devi W/o Dharam Nath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

   7(a) Kamal Kumar S/o Late Dharam Nath Mahto

   7(b). Ashish Kumar S/o Late Dharam Nath Mahto

   7(c). Most. Sandhya Devi W/o Late Kishor Kumar

   All resident of Vill-Mahuram Toli, P.O. –Buti, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 354 of 2014

1. Karlus Beck

2. Kornelius Beck
   Both S/o Andhriyas Krishtan
3. Most. Anna Beck W/o Vijay Beck
4. Lorence Beck
5. Ignayush Beck
   4 & 5 S/o Aloyes Beck
6. Alphose Beck S/o Karlus Beck
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 355 of 2014

1. Surendra Bhogta S/o Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari)
2. Shyam Bhogta
3. Vinod Bhogta
   2 & 3 S/o Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta)
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F. A No. 356 of 2014

1. Sukhram (Oraon) Kispotta S/o Bhouta Oraon
2. Prakash Kispotta S/o Charwa Oraon
3. Bhouta Kispotta
4. Deepak Kispotta
5. Kali Kispotta
   3 to 5 S/o Somra Oraon
6. Suresh Kispotta S/o Sukra (Etwa) Oraon
7. **Ganesh Kispotta S/o Sukra (Etwa) Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   7(a). Sony Kispotta W/o Late Ganesh kispotta
8. Arjun Kispotta S/o Sukra (Etwa) Oraon
9. **Somari Kispotta W/o Naresh Kispotta (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   9(a). Karan Kispotta S/o Late Somari Kispotta
   9(b). Arti Kispotta D/o Late Somari Kispotta
   9(b). Deepika Kispotta D/o Late Somari Kispotta
10. Somra Kispotta

11. Mangal Kispotta
12. Vijay Kispotta
13. Lalu Kispotta
    10 to 13 S/o Etwa Oraon
14. Most. Sero Triky W/o Birsa Kispotta
    All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 357 of 2014

1. Shivnath Baitha S/o Bhondwa Dhobi (Baitha)
2. Most. Bhagtain Devi W/o Dasrath Dhobi (Baitha)
3. Nanhuha Dhobi (Baitha) S/o Ghamru Dhobi (Baitha)
4. **Bhunnu Dhobi (Baitha) S/o Ghamru Dhobi (Baitha) (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Most. Sonu Devi W/o Late Bhunnu Dhobi (Baitha)
5. Hari Dhobi (Baitha) S/o Baldev Dhobi (Baitha)
6. **Laldev Dhobi (Baitha) S/o Sundra Dhobi (Baitha) (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   6(a). Jagdish Baitha S/o Late Laldev Dhobi (Baitha)
   6(b). Dinesh Baitha S/o Late Laldev Dhobi (Baitha)
7. **Faguwa Dhobi (Baitha) S/o Sundra Dhobi (Baitha) (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   7(a). Most. Haliya Devi W/o Late Faguwa Dhobi (Baitha)
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 358 of 2014

1. Ruswa Pahan
2. Domna Pahan
   1& 2 S/o Sukra Pahan
3. Sukra Pahan S/o Bhokre Pahan
4. Anil Pahan S/o Domna Pahan
5. Chhedi Pahan
6. Domna Pahan
   5 & 6 S/o Dobal Pahan
7. Unit Pahan S/o Rana Pahan

All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

…. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 359 of 2014

1. **Most. Budhan Devi W/o Late Rambrish (Donge) Lohar (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most Pushpa Devi W/o Late Sudhir Lohra
2. Lembulal Lohar
3. Bharat Lohar
   2 & 3 S/o Kallu Lohar
4. Sikandra Lohra S/o Subhash Lohar
5. Makru Lohar
6. Ramdas Lohar
   5 & 6 S/o Baban Lohar
7. Puspa Devi
8. Sita Devi
9. Gita Devi
10. Nita Devi
    7 to 10 D/o Najo Lohar

All resident of Vill- Bandh Gari, P.O. –Bariyatu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

…. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 360 of 2014

1. Surendra Bhogta S/o Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari)
2. Shyam Bhogta
3. Vinod Bhogta
   2 & 3 S/o Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta)

All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 361 of 2014

Gaja Kispotta S/o Hango Oraon
Resident of Vill- Gari, P.O.- Hotwar, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 362 of 2014

1. Asmiya Devi D/o Birsa Lohar (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)
1(a). Sarvan Lohra (age 41 years) S/o Late Asmiya Devi
2. Jitan Devi
3. Budahan Devi
4. Sudhan Devi
5. Reshmi Tuti
1 to 5 D/o Birsa Lohar
6. Sauni Devi
7. Kasmi Devi
6 & 7 D/o Sukhdev Lohar
8. Mahadev Ram S/o Chhedi Kotwar (Lohar)
9. **Uday Karmali (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
9(a). Sujal Kumar (21 years) S/o Late Uday karmali
9(b). Shubham Karmali (18 years) S/o Late Uday Karmali
10. Vinay Karmali
11. Sunny Karmali
9 to 11 S/o Fagu Karmali
12. Most. Dulari Devi W/o Sukhu Lohar
13. Sukhnand Lohar
14. Budhram Lohar
15. Somra Lohar
13 to 15 S/o Bhola Lohar
16. Mogwa Lohra
17. Kali Charan Lohra
18. Bhanu Pratap Lohra
16 to 18 Sukra Lohar
19. Birbal Lohra
20. Ramu Lohra
21. Samu Lohra
19 to 21 S/o Karinath Lohar
All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 363 of 2014

1. Charku Bara S/o Mahadev Oraon
2. **Sanicharwa Bara S/o Mathura Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   2(a). Kunjlal Bara S/o Late Shanicharwa Oraon
   2(b). Mathura Bara S/o Late Shanicharwa Oraon
   2(c). Champa Bara S/o Late Shanicharwa Oraon
   2(d). Gajju Bara S/o Late Shanicharwa Oraon
3. Most. Malti Mara W/o Langra Bara
4. Kunwar Bara S/o Ludhuwa Oraon
5. Most. Sukro Bara W/o Champa Oraon
6. Most. Siwan Bara W/o Karma Bara
7. Dilip Bara S/o Tetra Bara
8. Most. Anita Bara W/o Bhojrai Bara
9. Most. Fulo Bara W/o Lauwa Bara
10. **Most. Somri Bara W/o Gandu Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
    10(a). Bhoukra Bara S/o Late Gandu Oraon
    10(b). Manoj Bara S/o Late Gandu Oraon
    10(c). Sunil Bara S/o Late Gandu Oraon
    10(d). Dasrath Bara S/o Late Gandu Oraon
11. Most. Niru Oraon W/o Mahesh Oraon
12. Most. Siwan Bara W/o Birsa Bara

    All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 364 of 2014

1. Pahna Oraon S/o Kunju Oraon
2. **Somra Oraon S/o Kunju Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Vijay Kachhap (45 years)
3. Khuniya Kachhap S/o Etwa Oraon
4. Raju Kachhap
5. Rajesh Kachhap
6. Nikil Kachhap

   4 to 6 S/o Kolha Kachhap
7. Pahna Kachhap S/o Polma Kachhap

8. Jagran Kachhap
9. Binod Kachhap
   8 & 9 S/o Thibu (Bhaua) Oraon
10. Most. Sujata Kachhap W/o Anand Kachhap
11. Somra Kachhap
12. Raju Kachhap
13. Vijay Kachhap
14. Sanjay Kachhap
15. Niraj Kachhap
    11 to 15 S/o Mangna Oraon
16. Sumit Kachhap S/o Sibu Kachhap
    All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi.

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 365 of 2014

1. Ruswa Pahan
2. Domna Pahan
   1& 2 S/o Sukra Pahan
3. Sukra Pahan S/o Bhokre Pahan
4. Anil Pahan S/o Domna Pahan
5. Chhedi Pahan
6. Domna Pahan
   5 & 6 S/o Dobal Pahan
7. Unit Pahan S/o Rana Pahan
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

…. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 366 of 2014

Meri Marget Linda W/o Babu Lal Oraon
All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

…. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 367 of 2014

1. Bipta Mirdha
2. Mahadev Mirdha
   1 & 2 S/o Budhu Dom
3. Karma Mirdha
4. Sukhlal Mirdha
5. Bhokre Mirdha
   3 to 5 S/o Sukra Dom
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

…. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 368 of 2014

1. Most. Bachan Devi W/o Late Durga Mirdha (Dom)
2. Most. Dropadi Devi W/o Late Birsa Mirdha (Dom)
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi

…. Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 369 of 2014

1. Karam Singh Lohra S/o Dasrath Lohar
2. **Jodhan (Sohrai) Lohra S/o Chamra Lohra (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Rajesh Lohra (48 years)
   2(b). Munna Lohra (34 years)
   2(c). Vinod Lohra (30 years)
3. Ramu Lohra S/o Chamra Lohar
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellant

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi.

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 370 of 2014

1. Paulus Gari (Krishtan) S/o Naklu Krishtan.
2. Sunil Arun Gari S/o Samuual Gari
3. Jon Gari
4. Jems Gari
5. Sukumar Gari
   3 to 5 S/o Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (Kristan)
6. Albert Gari S/o Dilip Gari
7. Niral Gari
8. Sudhir Gari
   7 & 8 S/o Murid (Murish) Gari (Krishtan)
9. Roshni Gari D/o Pitter Gari
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 371 of 2014

1. Chamu Lohra
2. Karu Lohar
   1 & 2 S/o Padya Lohar
3. Most. Tetri Devi W/o Lalu Lohar
4. Rajendra Lohra S/o Bhadwa Lohar
5. Arjun Lohra
6. Bhim Lohra
7. Nakul Lohra
   5 to 7 S/o Kartik Lohar
8. Visun Lohra
9. Krishna Lohra
10. Sankar Lohra
11. Sitaram Lohra
12. Raju Lohra
    8 to 12 S/o Budhu Lohar
13. Lakhan Lohra S/o Gauri Lohra
14. Dashrath Lohra S/o Kisun Lohra
    All resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 372 of 2014

1. Bipta Mirdha
2. Mahadev Mirdha
   1 & 2 S/o Budhu Dom
3. Karma Mirdha
4. Sukhlal Mirdha
5. Bhokre Mirdha
   3 to 5 S/o Sukra Dom
6. Most. Bachan Devi W/o Durga Mirdha (Dom)
7. Most. Dropadi Devi W/o Birsa Mirdha (Dom)
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 373 of 2014

1. Beronika Kerketta D/o Albis Kerketta
2. **Karlus Kerketta S/o Fransis Kerketta (Kristan) (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Usha Kerketta (64 years), mother of Late Karlus Kerketta
   2(b). Selestina Kerketta (31 years), sister of Late Karlus Kerketta
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

First Appeal No. 374 of 2014

1. Ramsundar Lohra
2. Manda Lohra
3. Bhandu Lohra
4. **Ankhu Lohra (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Most. Rupa Devi (40 years) W/o Late Ankhu Lohra
5. Kuddu Lohra
   1 to 5 S/o Budru Lohar
6. Rajan Lohra
7. Raju Lohra

8. Ajay Lohra
   S/o Chaitan Lohar
   All resident of Vill- Gari, P.O. – Hotwar, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P. O. + P. S. – Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P. O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist – Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

First Appeal No. 375 of 2014

1. Pairo Devi D/o Jainath Mahto
   Resident of Village- Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 376 of 2014

1. Jagat Narayan Jaiswal S/o Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal
   At present resident of Lalpur, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 377 of 2014

1. **Asmiya Devi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sarvan Lohra (age 41 years) S/o Late Asmiya Devi
2. Jitan Devi
3. Budahan Devi
4. Sudhan Devi
5. Reshmi Tuti
   1 to 5 D/o Birsa Lohar
6. Sauni Devi
7. Kasmi Devi
   6&7 D/o Sukhdev Lohar
8. Mahadev Ram S/o Chhedi Kotwar (Lohar)
9. **Uday Karmali (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   9(a). Sujal Kumar (21 years) S/o Late Uday Karmali
   9(b). Shubham Karmali (18 years) S/o Late Uday Karmali

10. Vinay Karmali
11. Sunny Karmali
9 to 11 S/o Fagu Karmali
12. Most. Dulari Devi W/o Sukhu Lohar
13. Sukhnand Lohra
14. Budhram Lohra
15. Somra Lohra
13 to 15 S/O Bhola Lohar
16. Mogwa Lohra
17. Kali Lohra
18. Bhanu PRatap Lohra
16 to18 S/o Sukra Lohar
19. Birbal Lohra
20. Ramu Lohra
21. Samu Lohra
19 to 21 S/o Karinath Lohar
All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 378 of 2014

1. Bahadur Gari
2. Somra Gari
1&2 S/o Mahadev Oraon
3. Most. Siwan Gari W/o Bandhu Gari
4. Most. Birsi Gari W/o Gargi Gari
5. Most. Nauri Gari W/o Sanicharwa Oraon
All resident of Village-Gari, P.O.- Hotwar, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 379 of 2014

1. **Birsa Oraon (Toppo) (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
1(a). Seema Toppo (40 years) W/o Late Birsa Oraon
2. Vinay Toppo
1 & 2 S/o Pran Oraon
3. Sonu Toppo S/o Chunda Oraon

4. Minu Toppo
5. Sanjay Toppo
   4 & 5 S/o Bodhan Oraon
6. **Puran Oraon S/o Bandhu Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   6(a). Most. Kaushalya Devi (55 years) W/o Late Puran Oraon
7. Birsa Oraon
8. **Mahabir Toppo (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   8(a). Most. Dulia Toppo (age 60 years)
9. Dahru Toppo
   7 to 9 S/o Eto Oraon
10. **Budhwa Oraon (Toppo) S/o Bhakre Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
    10(a). Most. Etwari Toppo W/o Late Budhwa Oraon (Toppo)(aged about 50 years)
    All resident of Village-Gari, P.O.- Hotwar, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand

... ... Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

First Appeal No. 380 of 2014

1. Most. Parwati Devi W/o Sivlal Singh
2. Govind Singh Bhogta S/o Sivlal Singh (Bhogta)
   Resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 381 of 2014

1. Surendra Bhogta, S/o Sibu Bhogta (Bhandari)
2. Shyam Bhogta
3. Vinod Bhogta
   2&3 S/o Ramnath Bhandari (Bhogta)
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 382 of 2014

1. Martin Linda
2. Agnesh Linda
   1&2 S/o Joakim Krishtan
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 383 of 2014

1. Ram Naresh Thakur (Hazam)
2. Lal Mohan Thakur (Hazam)
   1&2 S/o Putnu Hazam
3. Moti Lal Thakur
4. Ashok Thakur
   3&4 S/o Narayan Thakur (Hazam)
5. Sanjay Thakur S/o Tulsi Thakur (Hazam)
6. Kartik Thakur
7. Muneshwar Thakur S/o Dhannu Hazam (Thakur)
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 384 of 2014

1. Pairo Devi D/o Jainath Mahto
   Resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 385 of 2014

1. Martin Linda
2. Agnesh Linda
   1&2 S/o Joakim Krishtan
   Resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 386 of 2014

1. Mogo Mahto
2. **Sukul Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Dev Kumar Mahto (54 years)
   2(b). Narayan Mahto (52 years)
   2(c). Pawan Kumar (45 years)
   All sons of Late Sukul Mahto
3. Mukul Mahto
   1 & 3 S/o Budhu Mahto
4. Sankar Mahto S/o Devnath Mahto
5. Bhunu Gope S/o Mogal Mahto
6. Ramesh Yadav
7. Sanjay Yadav
   6 & 7 S/o Ramprasad Yadav
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand

... ... Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

First Appeal No.387 of 2014

1. Dinesh Kujur
2. Binesh Kujur
3. Bandhan Kujur
   1 to 3 S/o Viswa Oraon
4. Anand Kujur S/o Budhu Oraon
5. Most. Jhalo Kujur W/o Kura Oraon
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.388 of 2014

1. Most. Shanti Devi W/o Late Sewaram Mahto
2. Most. Basanti Devi W/o Late Shivnath Mahto

Both Resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.389 of 2014

1. Ruswa Pahan
2. Domna Pahan

   1&2 S/o Sukra Pahan
3. Sukra Pahan S/o Bhokre Pahan
4. Anil Pahan S/o Domna Pahan
5. Chhedi Pahan
6. Domna Pahan

   5&6 S/o Dobal Pahan
7. Unit Pahan S/o Rana Pahan

All resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 390 of 2014

1. Mahabir Mahto
2. Sahabir Mahto

   1 & 2 S/o Bhuneshwar Mahto
3. Dhaneshwar Mahto S/o Ropna Mahto
4. Srinath Mahto S/o Upendra Mahto
5. Puran Mahto
6. Devlal Mahto
7. Sohrai Mahto
8. Mahabir Mahto
9. Karamchand Mahto

5 to 9 S/o Devnath (Bhondwa) Mahto
At present resident of Vill-Mahuram toli, P.O. Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 391 of 2014

1. Bhunu Gope S/o Mogal Mahto
2. Ramesh Yadav
3. Sanjay Yadav
   2 & 3 S/o Ramprasad Yadav
   All resident of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS-Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 392 of 2014

1. Paulus Gari (Krishtan) S/o Naklu Krishtan
2. Sunil Arun Gari S/o Samual Gari
3. Jon Gari
4. Jems Gari
5. Sukumar Gari
   3 to 5 S/o Bandhna (Raimundi) Gari (kristan)
6. Albert Gari S/o Dilip Gari
7. Niral Gari
8. Sudhir Gari
   7 & 8 S/o Murid (Murish) Gari (krishtan)
9. Roshni Gari D/o Pitter Gari
   All resident of Vill –Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 393 of 2014

1. Raghuwar Dayal Singh S/o Late Janki Ganjhu **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most. Sunila Devi (76 years) W/o Late Raghuwar Dayal Singh

At present resident of Vill- Simlia, PO – Angara, PS-Angara, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 394 of 2014

1. Matiyas Gari
2. Marshal Gari
3. Sanjay Gari

1 to 3 S/o Siril Gari, All resident of Village – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 395 of 2014

1. Khuniya Oraon S/o Etwa Oraon
2. Somra Kachhap
3. Raju Kachhap
4. Sanjay Kachhap
5. Vijay Kachhap
6. Niraj Kachhap

2 to 6 S/o Mangna Oraon

7. Sumit Kachhap S/o Sibu Kachhap

All resident of Village – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimant/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 396 of 2014

1. Sanicharwa Oraon
2. Nandu Oraon

1 & 2 S/o Madru Oraon

3. Mahabir Gari
4. Soma Gari
5. Ranjit Oraon

3 to 5 S/o Mahadev Oraon

6. Ramesh Oraon S/o Somra Oraon
7. Sushil Oraon (Tigga) S/o Baha Oraon
8. Binod Gari
9. Chanda Gari

   8 & 9 S/o Jhibra Oraon

   At present resident of Village – Bandh Gari, PO Bariatu, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 397 of 2014

1. Ratiya Toppo S/o Birsa Oraon
2. Munna Toppo S/o Sukhdev Toppo

   At present resident of Vill-BandhGari, PO Bariatu, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 398 of 2014

1. **Etwa Oraon S/o Late Somra Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

   1(a). Alias Lakra (48 years) S/o Late Etwa Oraon

   1(b). Pradeep Anuj Lakra (31 years) S/o Late David Lakra
2. Most. Sila Lakra W/o Chama Oraon

   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

F.A. No. 399 of 2014

1. Rajendra Mahto
2. Mahendra Mahto

   Both S/o Jageshwar Mahto
3. **Devendra Mahto S/o Jageshwar Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

   3(a). Most. Lakshmi Devi (age 39 years) W/o Late Devendra Mahto

All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

F.A. No. 400 of 2014

1. Most. Sohri Devi, W/o Meghnath Mahto
2. Most. Mulo Devi, W/o Jhatlu Mahto
3. Bablu Mahto, S/o Meghnath Mahto
   All resident of Village – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 401 of 2014

1. Etwa Oraon
2. Gandura Oraon
3. Sanjay Oraon
   1 to 3 S/o Lodha Oraon
4. Abha Kujur, W/o Sitaram Oraon
   At present resident of Vill- Kokar, PO-Kokar, PS-Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 402 of 2014

1. Charku Mahto
2. Brijlal Mahto
   Both S/o Bahura Mahto
   Resident of Village – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 403 of 2014

1. Chamu Lohra
2. Karu Lohra
   1 & 2 S/o Padya Lohar
3. Most. Tetri Devi, W/o Late Lalu Lohar
4. Rajendra Lohra, S/o Bhadwa Lohar
5. Arjun Lohra
6. Bhim Lohra
7. Nakul Lohra
   5 to 7 S/o Kartik Lohar
8. Visun Lohra
9. Krishna Lohra
10. Sankar Lohra
11. Sitaram Lohar
12. Raju Lohra
    8 to 12 S/o Budhu Lohar
13. Lakhan Lohra, S/o Gauri Lohra
14. Dashrath Lohra S/o Kisun Lohra
15. Asho Devi W/o Kartik Lohar

    All resident of Vill-Gari, PO-Hotwar, PS-Sadar, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 404 of 2014

1. **Raghuwar Dayal Singh S/o Janki Ganjhu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

   1(a). Most. Sunila Devi (76 years) W/o Late Raghuwar Dayal Singh Present resident of Vill- Shimla, P.O.- Angara, P.S. – Angara, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ..Appellant/Claimant

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

F.A. No. 405 of 2014

1. Mogwa Lohra
2. Kali Charan Lohra
3. Bhanu Pratap Lohra
   1 to 3 S/o Sukra Lohar
4. Birbal Lohra
5. Ramu Lohra
6. Samu Lohra
   4 to 6 S/o Karinath Lohar
   All resident of Village – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 406 of 2014

1. Bauka Mahto S/o Lalu Mahto
2. Jagnu Mahto S/o Nanku Mahto
3. **Lalku Mahto S/o Tilak Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Jagdish Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Lalku Mahto
   3(b). Most. Meena Mahto (30 years) W/o Late Dinesh Mahto
4. **Shivlal Mahto S/o Tilak Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Satish Mahto (44 years) S/o Late Shivlal Mahto
5. **Jethuwa Mahto S/o Tilak Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   5(a). Krishna Mahto (42 years) S/o Late Jethuwa Mahto
   5(b). Ramesh Mahto (46 years) S/o Late Jethuwa Mahto
6. Molal Mahto S/o Aghnu Mahto
   All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

… … Respondents

With

F.A. No. 407 of 2014

1. Mogo Mahto
2. **Sukul Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Dev Kumar Mahto (56 years)
   2(b). Narayan Mahto (54 years)
   2(c). Pawan Kumar (44 years)
   All sons of Late Sukul Mahto

3. Mukul Mahto
   1 to 3 S/o Budhu Mahto
4. Sankar Mahto S/o Devnath Mahto
5. Veero Devi W/o Devnath Mahto
6. Sukhram (Oraon) Kispotta, S/o Bhauta Oraon
7. Prakash Kispotta, S/o Charwa Oraon
8. Bhauta Kispotta
9. Deepak Kispotta
10. Kali Kispotta
    8 to 10 S/o Somra Oraon
11. Suresh Kispotta S/o Sukra (Etwa) Oraon
12. **Ganesh Kispotta S/o Sukra (Etwa) Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
    12(a). Sony Kispotta (39 Years) W/o Late Ganesh kispotta
13. Arjun Kispotta S/o Sukra (Etwa) Oraon
14. **Somari Kispotta W/o Naresh Kispotta (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
    (a). Karan Kispotta (19 years) S/o Late Somari Kispotta
    (b). Arti Kispotta (22 years) D/o Late Somari Kispotta
    (c). Deepika Kispotta (21 years) D/o Late Somari Kispotta
15. Somra Kispotta
16. Mangal Kispotta
17. Vijay Kispotta
18. Lalu Kispotta
    15 to 18 S/o Etwa Oraon
19. Most. Sero Triky W/o Birsa Kispotta

All resident of Village-Gari, P.O._ Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… **Appellants**

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi **… … Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 408 of 2014

1. **Asmiya Devi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sarvan Lohra (41 years) S/o Late Asmiya Devi
2. Jitan Devi
3. Budahan Devi
4. Sudhan Devi
5. Reshmi Tuti
   1 to 5 D/o Birsa Lohar
6. Sauni Devi
7. Kasmi Devi
   6 & 7, D/o Sukhdev Lohar
8. Mahadev Ram S/o Chhedi Kotwar (Lohar)
9. **Uday Karmali S/o Fagu Karmali (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   9(a). Sujal Kumar (21 years) S/o Late Uday Karmali

9(b). Shubham Karmali (18 years) S/o Late Uday Karmali
10. Vinay Karmali
11. Sunny Karmali
9 to 10 S/o Fagu Karmali
12. Most. Dulari Devi W/o Sukhu Lohar
13. Sukhnand Lohra
14. Budhram Lohra
15. Somra Lohra
13 to 15 S/o Bhola Lohar
16. Mogwa Lohra
17. Kali Lohra
18. Bhanu Pratap Lohra
16 to 18 S/o Sukra Lohar
19. Birbal Lohra
20. Ramu Lohra
21. Samu Lohra
19 to 21 S/o Karinath Lohar
All resident of Village – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 409 of 2014

1. **Tintus Kujur S/o Thale Oraon (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**
1(a). Sanjay Kujur (41 years) S/o Late Tintus Kujur
1(b). Christina Kujur (37 years) D/o Late Tintus Kujur
Resident of village – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/opp. Parties

With

First Appeal No. 410 of 2014

1. **Bahadur Singh S/o Late Dillu Singh (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
1(a). Jitendra Bhogta S/o Late Bahadur Singh
1(b). Vishwakarma Bhogta S/o Late Bahadur Singh
1(c). Most. Budhmati Devi W/o Late Shiv Bhogta
2. Jagdish Singh

1 & 2 S/o Dillu Singh
3. Most. Parwati Devi W/o Sivlal Singh
4. Govind Bhogta S/o Sivlal Singh (Bhogta)
All resident of Vill.-Gari, P.O.-Hotwar
PS-Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi **Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 411 of 2014

1. Paunde Oraon
2. Birsa Oraon
1 & 2 S/o Sawna Oraon
3. Abhinash Oraon S/o Rana Oraon
All Resident of Vill-Gari, PO-Hotwar, PS-Sadar Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand … … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi… … **Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 412 of 2014

1. **Moti Mahto (Gope) S/o Nathu Mahto (Deleted and Substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
1(a). Shyam Sundar Gope (65 years) S/o Late Moti Mahto
Resident of Village-Gari, PO-Hotwar P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand … … **Appellant**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi … **Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 413 of 2014

1. **Chaitu Gari S/o Dane Oraon (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**
1(a). Most. Mangri Gari (50 years) W/o Late Chaitu Gari
2. Bandhan Gari
3. Sukar Gari
2 & 3 S/o Madi Oraon
4. Most. Budo Gari W/o Narayan Gari
5. **Birso Gari W/o Birsa Gari (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**
5(a). Fanuwa Gari (62 years) S/o Late Birso Gari
5(b). Rajendra Gari (55 years) S/o Late Birso Gari
5(c). Manoj Gari (45 years) S/o Late Birso Gari

5(d). Naveen Gari (42 years) S/o Late Birso Gari
6. Baijnath Gari
7. Sadhna Gari
8. Sukra Gari

6 to 8 S/o Chunda Oraon

All resident of Vill-Gari, PO-Hotwar, PS-Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi**… Respondents/Claimants**

With

F.A. No. 414 of 2014

1. **Sobran Mahto S/o Fekwa Mahto (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**

1(a). Vishveshwar Mahto (28 years) S/o Late Dinesh Mahto
1(b). Suraj Kumar (28 years) S/o Late Phulendra Mahto

2. Sohrai Mahto S/o Laxminath Mahto
3. Ajay Mahto S/o Premnath Mahto
4. Roshan Mahto S/o Trithnath Mahto
5. **Radhanath Mahto S/o Gansa Mahto (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**

5(a). Bhuneshwar Mahto (49 years) S/o Late Radhanath Mahto
5(b). Most. Sabita Devi (47 years) W/o Late Muneshwar Mahto

6. Mahesh Mahto S/o Rathua Mahto

All resident of Vill-Gari, PO-Hotwar P.S. Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi**… Respondents/Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 415 of 2014

1. **Hari Oraon S/o Champa Oraon (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**

1(a). Subhash Minz (61 years) S/o Late Hari Oraon
1(b). Roshan Minz (47 years) S/o Late Hari Oraon
1(c). Amit Minz (43 years) S/o Late Hari Oraon
1(d). Anmol Minz (37 years) S/o Late Hari Oraon

Resident of Khorha Toli, PO-Kokar, PS- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 416 of 2014

1. **Raghuwar Dayal Singh S/o Janki Ganjhu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
   1(a). Most. Sunila Devi W/o Late Raghuwar Dayal Singh
   At present resident of Vill.- Simlia, P.O. + P.S.-Angara Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi**… … Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 417 of 2014

1. Karlus Beck
2. Kornelius Beck
   1 & 2 S/o Andhriyas Krishtan
3. Most. Anna Beck W/o Vijay Beck
4. Lorence Beck
5. Ignayush Beck
   4 & 5 S/o Aloyes Beck
6. Alphose Beck S/o Karlus Beck
   All resident of Vill.-Gari, PO-Hotwar
   P.S.-Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand **… Appellants/ Claimants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi **… Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 418 of 2014

1. **Bahadur Singh S/o Dillu Singh (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Jitendra Bhogta (32 years) S/o Late Bahadur Singh
   1(b). Vishwakarma Bhogta (38 years) S/o Late Bahadur Singh
   1(c). Most. Budhmati Devi (33 years) W/o Late Shiv Bhogta
2. Jagdish Singh S/o Dillu Singh,
   Resident of Vill-Gari, PO-Hotwar, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… …Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 419 of 2014

1. Arjun Gope

2. Bharat Gope
3. Jamuna Gope
   1 to 3 S/o Jugni
4. **Ganga Gope S/o Jugni Gope (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Abhishek Gope (28 years) S/o Late Ganga Gope
   4(b). Nitesh Gope (31 years) S/o Late Ganga Gope
5. Kali Gope
6. **Ramprasad Gope S/o Mungiya Devi (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**
   6(a). Maheshwar Prasad Gope (40 years) S/o Late Ramprasad Gope
   6(b). Brajesh Gope (30 years) S/o Late Ramprasad Gope
7. Nandu Gope
8. Devraj Gope
   5 to 8 S/o Mungiya Devi
   All resident of Vill.- Gari, PO-Hotwar P.S. Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 420 of 2014

1. Soma Oraon (Kachhap) S/o Sadhu Oraon
2. Mangra Kachhap S/o Koka (Taji) Oraon
   All resident of Vill-Gari, PO-Hotwar PS-Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… …Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…….. Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 421 of 2014

1. Most. Shanti Devi W/o Sinu Oraon
2. Most. Butan Devi W/o Manga Oraon
3. Arjun Oraon S/o Babulal Oraon
4. Kajinath Oraon S/o Mangra Oraon
5. **Dukhu Oraon S/o Mangra Oraon (Deleted and Substituted vide order date 26.08.2025)**
   5(a). Prakash Gari (41 years) S/o Late Dukhu Oraon
6. Ram Gari S/o Maniya Oraon
7. Sankar Mohan Oraon
8. Subhash Gari
   7 & 8 S/o Baijnath Oraon
9. Most. Pendo Devi W/o Ropna Oraon
10. Nilam Gari S/o Budhu Oraon

11.Brish Oraon S/o Jirku Oraon (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)
All resident of Vill.-Gari, PO-Hotwar P.S. Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi …**Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 422 of 2014

1. Kusalnath Mahto
2. Sukhnath Mahto
3. **Sitaram Mahto S/o Rogha Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Most. Shanti Devi (54 years)
4. Balram Mahto
5. Jitlal Mahto
   1 to 5 S/o Rogha Mahto
6. **Bachan Devi W/o Dashrath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   6(a). Ritlal Mahto (43 years)
7. Dilnath Mahto
8. Dileswar Mahto
9. Gabeshwar Mahto
   7 to 9 S/o Kaila Mahto
10. Rajnarayan Mahto
11. Jitendar Mahto
    10 and 11 S/o Premnath Mahto
    All resident of Vill-Gari, PO-Hotwar P.S. Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi **… Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 423 of 2014

1. Most. Parwati Devi W/o Teju Sahu
2. **Jhalo Devi W/o Ramjit Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Sahabir Sahu S/o Late Ramjit Sahu
   2(b) Most. Jayanti Devi W/o Late Mahabir Sahu
3. Sukhlal Sahu S/o Shortho Sahu
4. **Gokhul Sahu S/o Sartho Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a) Most. Rukmani Devi (aged 63 years) W/o Late Gokhul Sahu
5. Most. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. **Kandan Sahu S/o Madhu Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   6(a) Most. Dashmin Devi (aged 61 years) W/o Late Kandan Sahu

7. Most. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu
   All at present resident of Village+P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… …Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi **Respondents/Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 424 of 2014

Most. Fulmani Devi W/o Late Etwa Oraon
At present resident of Village-Hesatu, P.S. Ormanjhi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi **… …Respondents/Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 425 of 2014

1. Sita Ram Mahto S/o Fagu Mahto
2. Sarwan Mahto S/o Shikhar Mahto
3. Sabi Devi W/o Ganesh Mahto
4. Nandu Mahto S/o Aguwa Mahto
5. Surender Mahto
6. Sawan Mahto
7. Pyarelal Mahto
   5 to 7 S/o Ramnath Mahto
8. Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
   All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi **…Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 426 of 2014

1. Jugla Mahto
2. Afkari Mahto
   Both sons of Tikua Kurmi
3. Nanka Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi
4. Manku Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi
5. **Pakku Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   5(a) Most. Ropan Dev W/o Pakku Mahto (aged about 65 years)
6. **Chotaka Mahto S/o Puswa Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   6(a) Rashmi Devi (aged about 62 years) W/o Late Chotaka Mahto

7. **Sagwa Devi D/o Mangala Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   7(a) Akhilesh Kumar (aged 63 years)
   7(b) Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar (aged about 55 years)
   7(c) Rajeev Kumar (aged about 48 years)
   All at present resident of Village+ P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi**… Respondents/Respondents**

With

First Appeal No. 427 of 2014

1. **Phul Kumari Jaiswal W/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. Naveen Kumar Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal
   All resident of village-Lalpur, P.S. Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand
   … … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 428 of 2014

1. Savitri Devi Jaiswal W/o Uma Shankar Jaiswal **(Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. Chittranjan Jaiswal S/o Uma Shankar Jaiswal **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Most. Shashi Jaiswal (67 years) W/o Late Chittranjan Jaiswal
   2(b). Sumit Jaiswal (44 years) S/o Late Chittranjan Jaiswal
   2(c). Vineet Jaiswal (35 years) S/o Late Chittranjan Jaiswal
   At present resident of Lalpur, P.S.-Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand
   … … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 429 of 2014

1. Md. Afjal Hussain (Chhedi) S/o Shekh Chaman
2. Kayum Ansari S/o Afjal Hussain
   All at present Resident of Village-Kisunpur, P.O.-Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

with

F.A. No. 430 of 2014

Mahadev Oraon, S/o Gulel Oraon, R/o Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 431 of 2014

1. Baya Oraon S/o Koka Oraon
2. Budhwa Oraon
3. Sohrai Oraon

Both S/o Sukra Praon

All resident of Village – Lalgunj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 432 of 2014

1. Mukund Munda
2. Shankar Munda

Both S/o Harisingh Munda

3. Guddu Munda, S/o Khedu Munda
4. Dasai Munda, S/o Sudhu Munda
5. Ramdhan Munda, S/o Jhirsingh Munda
6. Mukesh Munda
7. Sudama Munda

Both S/o Birbal Munda

All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … **Respondents/Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 433 of 2014

1. **Lilwa Devi W/o Lala Hazam (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Jageshwar Thakur, aged about 64 years
   1(b) Sanjeev Kr Thakur, aged about 47 years
2. **Jhalku Thakur S/o Devnarayan Thakur (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Most. Mangla Devi, aged about 62 years, W/o Late Jhalku Thakur
   All resident of Village – Sugnu, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … **Respondents/Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 434 of 2014

1. Rohit Singh Jaiswal
2. Rahul Jaiswal
   S/o Ranjit Kumar (Singh) Jaiswal
   Both resident of Village – Lalpur, P.S.- Lalpur, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand. … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … **Respondents/Respondents**

With

F.A. No. 435 of 2014

1. Virendra Mahto
2. **Jagnath Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Akhilesh Kumar, aged about 63 years
   2(b) Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar, aged about 55 years
   2(c) Rajiv Kumar, aged about 48 years
3. Yogendra Mahto
4. Surendra Mahto
   All S/o Late Charku Mahto
   All at present resident of Village + P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 436 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi, W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto, S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto, S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto, S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto, S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto, S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12 to 14 S/o Shivnath Mahto
15. Jhalo Kumari, D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi, W/o Ganesh Mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto

    All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 437 of 2014

1. Etwa Oraon
2. Debra Oraon
   Both S/o Jitu Oraon
3. Mannu Kachhap
4. Pandey Kachhap
5. Rajendra Kachhap
6. Thibu Kachhap
   3 to 6 S/o Ratan Oraon

7. Sanjit Kachhap, S/o Bana Kachhap
8. Malo Devi, W/o Binu Kachhap
9. Baya Oraon, S/o Koka Oraon
10. Sohrai Oraon, S/o Sukra Oraon

All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand. … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 438 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda

1 to 3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda

4. Ganga Munda, S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Munda
6. Rungtu Munda

5 & 6 S/o Gangadgar Munda

All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand. … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 439 of 2014

1. Sawan Toppo, S/o Late Mahadev Oraon
2. Madi Toppo
3. Dadhu Toppo

Both S/o Late Ram Oraon

4. Sukar Toppo, S/o Late Lachhu Oraon

All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 440 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda

1 to3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda

4. Ganga Munda, S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Singh Munda
6. Rungtu Munda

5&6 S/o Gangadhar Munda

7. Krishna Munda, S/o Lakhiram Munda
8. Sampat Pahan S/o Ramtahal Pahan

All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.441 of 2014

1. Most. Fulmaniya, W/o Etwa Oraon

At present resident of Village-Hesatu, P.S.-Ormanjhi, District-Ranchi, (Jharkhand).

... ... Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.442 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi, W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto

Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto

4. Sita Ram Mahto, S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto, S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto, S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto, S/o Chhattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surendar Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto

9 to10 S/o Ramnath Mahto

12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto

12 to14 S/o Shivnath Mahto

15.Jhalo Kumari, D/o Badas Mahto
16.Birju Mahto
17.Jitlal Mahto
Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18.Sabi Devi, W/o Ganesh Mahto
19.Sikandar Kumar Mahto, S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.443 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi, W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Subhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto, S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto, S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto, S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto, S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto, S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surendar Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9to11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12 to14 S/o Shivnath Mahto
15. Jhalo Kumari, D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi, W/o Ganesh Mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto, S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
    All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.444 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi, W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Subhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto, S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto, S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto, S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto, S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto, S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surendar Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9 to11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12to14 S/o Shivnath Mahto
15. Jhalo Kumari, D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi, W/o Ganesh Mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto, S/o Jaleshwar Mahto

    All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 445 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda
   1to3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda
4. Ganga Munda, S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Singh Munda
6. Rungthu Munda
   5 & 6 S/o Gangadhar Munda
7. Maklina, W/o Buida Munda

   All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.446 of 2014

1. Chandar Munda
2. Aklu Munda
   Both S/o Baku Munda
   Both at present resident of Village-Pertol, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand)
3. Mogo Munda, S/o Mangal Munda
4. Guddu Munda, S/o Billu Munda
   Both at present resident of Village-Tati. P.O.+P.S.-Tatisilwai, Ranchi(Jharkhand).

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 447 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi, W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobnath Mahto
4. Satrudhan Mahto, S/o Ghasi Mahto
5. Baleshwar Mahto
6. Ramesh Mahto
7. Suresh Mahto
   5 to 7 S/o Shivnath Mahto
8. Sannu Mahto, S/o Chhattu Mahto
9. Birju Mahto
10. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
11. Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
    All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.448 of 2014

1. Most. Parwati Devi W/o Teju Sahu

2. **Jhalo Devi W/o Ramjit Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Sahabir Sahu (46 years) S/o Late Ramjit Sahu
   2(b) Most. Jayanti Devi (38 years) W/o Late Mahabir Sahu
3. Shukhlal Sahu S/o Sortho Sahu
4. **Gokhul Sahu S/o Sortho Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a) Most. Rukmani Devi w/o Late Gokhul Sahu (aged about 63 years)
5. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. **Kandan Sahu** (**Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025**)
   6(a) Most. Dashmin Devi w/o Late Kandan Sahu (aged about 61 years)
7. Most. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu

   All resident of Village + P.O. – Sugna, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Claimant/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cant. P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist.-Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 449 of 2014

1. Budhwa Oraon, S/o Biswa Oraon
2. Pyari Devi, W/o Koka Oraon

   All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 450 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda

   1 to 3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda
4. Ganga Munda, S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Singh Munda
6. Rungthu Munda

   5 & 6 S/o Gangadhar Munda
7. Maklina, W/o Buida Munda

   All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 451 of 2014

1. Savitri Devi Jaiswal W/o Umashankar Jaiswal **(Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. Pradeep Kumar Jaiswal S/o Umashankar Jaiswal
   At present resident Lalpur, PS Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 452 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi, W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto, S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto, S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto, S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto, S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto, S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12 to 14 S/o Sivnath Mahto
15. Jhalo Kumari, D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi, W/o Ganesh Mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto, S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
    All resident of Village Lalganj, PO Sugnu, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 453 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi, W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto, S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto, S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto, S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto, S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto, S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12 to 14 S/o Sivnath Mahto
15. Jhalo Kumari, D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi, W/o Ganesh Mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto, S/o Jaleshwar Mahto

    All resident of Village Lalganj, PO Sugnu, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 454 of 2014

1. **Asmiya Devi D/o Birsa Lohra (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sarvan Lohra (41 years)
2. Jitan Devi
3. Budahan Devi
4. Sudhan Devi
5. Reshmi Tuti
   1 to 5 D/o Birsa Lohar
6. Sauni Devi
7. Kasmi Devi
   6 & 7 D/o Sukhdev Lohar
8. Mahadev Ram S/o Chhedi Kotwar (Lohar)

9. **Uday Karmali S/o Late Fagu Karmali (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   9(a). Sujal Kumar (21 years) S/o Late Uday Karmali
   9(b). Shubham Karmali (18 years) S/o Late Uday Karmali
10. Vinay Karmali
11. Sunny Karmali
    9 to 11 S/o Fagu Karmali
12. Most. Dulari Devi, W/o Sukhu Lohar
13. Sukhnand Lohar
14. Budhram Lohar
15. Somra Lohar
    13 to 15 S/o Bhola Lohar
16. Mogwa Lohra
17. Kali Charan Lohra
18. Bhanu Pratap Lohra
    16 to 18 S/o Sukra Lohar
19. Birbal Lohra
20. Ramu Lohra
21. Samu Lohra
    19 to 21 S/o Karinath Lohar
    Resident of Vill –Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 455 of 2014

Jagat Narayan Jaiswal, S/o Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal
At present resident of Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 456 of 2014

1. Jerka Gope, S/o Aseshwar Mahto
2. Koka Mahto, S/o Bhola Mahto
3. Chandarnath Mahto
4. Dinu Gope
5. Manoj Gope
   3 to 5 S/o Nimku Mahto
6. Most. Sita Devi W/o Falindra Gope
7. Shanti Devi

8. Punam Devi
9. Soni Devi
   7 to 9 D/o Santu Gope
10. Kalicharan Gope
11. Rajendra Gope
12. Jageswar Gope
    10 to 12 S/o Chandra Mahto
13. Pannalal Gope, S/o Babulal Gope
14. Balram Gope
15. Krishna Gope
    14 & 15 S/o Somnath Mahto
16. Brijmohan Gope
17. Parasnath Gope
18. Dhaneswar Gope
    16 to 18 S/o Saheb Ram Mahto
    At present resident of Vill – Bandh Gari, PO Bariatu, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 457 of 2014

1. Sukra Runda
2. Soma Runda
3. Sadhu Runda
4. Munna Runda
   1 to 4 S/o Bijla Oraon
5. Most. Goyandi Runda
   W/o Goyanda Runda
6. Most. Somari Runda, W/o Budhwa Runda
7. Kunwar Runda
8. Sukhram Runda
   7 & 8 S/o Nato Oraon
   All resident of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 458 of 2014

1. **Devcharan Gope S/o Chedi Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Mohan Gope (62 years) S/o Late Devcharan Gope
   1(b). Sohan Gope (55 years) S/o Late Devcharan Gope

1(c). Sidhnath Gope (50 years) S/o Late Devcharan Gope
2. Shivlal Gope S/o Chedi Mahto
3. Rajendra Gope
4. Raju Gope
5. Rajesh Gope
   3 to 5 S/o Shivcharan Mahto
6. **Charka Gope, S/o Baldev Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   6(a). Krishna Gope (50 years)
   6(b). Rajkumar Gope (45 years)
7. Beni Gope, S/o Jagdish Gope
8. Most. Sobha Devi, W/o Kapil Gope
9. Rajendra Gope
10. Kaleshwar Gope
    9 & 10 S/o Jaglal Mahto
11. Indra Gope, S/o Antru Gope (Mahto)
12. Most. Karuna Devi, D/o Budhu Mahto

All resident of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. & P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.459 of 2014

1. Bauka Mahto, S/o Lalu Mahto
2. Jagnu Mahto, S/o Nanku Mahto
3. **Lalku Mahto S/o Late Tilak Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   3(a). Jagdish Mahto (42 years), S/o Late Lalku Mahto
   3(b). Most. Meena Mahto (30 years), W/o Late Dinesh Mahto
4. **Shivlal Mahto S/o Late Tilak Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   4(a). Satish Mahto (44 years)
5. **Jethuwa Mahto S/o Late Tilak Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   5(a). Krishna Mahto (42 years)
   5(b). Ramesh Mahto (46 years)
6. Mohitlal Mahto, S/o Aghnu Mahto

All resident of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O.+ P.S. Danapur, Dist. Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With
F.A. No. 461 of 2014

1. Baha Oraon
2. Sanicharwa Oraon
   Both S/o Paklu Oraon
3. Mangra Oraon
4. Dhana Oraon
   Both S/o Budhu Oraon
5. Etwa Oraon
6. Birsa Oraon
7. Choto Oraon
   5 to 7 S/o Sukra Oraon
8. Ranjit Oraon
9. Laxman Oraon
   Both S/o Bhandu Oraon
10. Nanki Devi, W/o Kajru Oraon
    All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With
F.A. No. 462 of 2014

1. Baha Oraon
2. Sanicharwa Oraon
   Both S/o Paklu Oraon
3. Mangra Oraon
4. Dhana Oraon
   Both S/o Budhu Oraon
5. Etwa Oraon
6. Birsa Oraon
7. Chhoto Oraon
   5 To 7 S/o Sukra Oraon
8. Ranjit Oraon
9. Laxman Oraon
   Both S/o Bhandu Oraon
10. Nanki Devi, W/o Kajru Oraon
    All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 463 of 2014

1. Jugla Mahto
2. Afkari Mahto
   Both S/o Tikua Kurmi
3. Nanka Mahto
4. Manku Mahto
5. **Pakku Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   5(a) Most. Ropan Devi, aged about 65 years, W/o Late Pakku Mahto
6. **Chotaka Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   6(a) Most. Rashmi Devi W/o Chotaka Mahto
   3 to 6 S/o Puswa Kurmi
7. **Sagwa Devi D/o Mangala Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   7(a) Akhilesh Kumar, aged about 63 years
   7(b) Kameshwar Prasad Kunwar, aged about 55 years
   7(c) Rajeev Kumar, aged about 48 years
   All S/o Sagwa Devi
   All resident of Village + P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 464 of 2014

1. Lakhan Lohar, S/o Devman Lohar
2. Basanti Devi, D/o Devnath Lohar
   All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 465 of 2014

1. Kistto Munda
2. Manoj Munda
   Both S/o Sukra Munda
   Both at present resident of Village – Hesal Jara, P.S.- Angara, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand
3. Mogo Munda, S/o Dharu Munda
4. Nanhu Munda, S/o Shikhar Munda
   3 & 4 resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 466 of 2014

1. Sawan Toppo, S/o Late Mahadev Oraon
2. Madi Toppo
3. Dadhu Toppo
   Both S/o Late Ram Oraon
4. Sukar Toppo, S/o Late Lachhu Oraon
   All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 467 of 2014

1. Shekh Saukat
2. Md. Adam Ansari
   Both S/o Sultan Ali
3. Md. Afjal Hussain (Chhedi) S/o Shekh Chaman
   All at present resident of Village – Kisunpur, P.O.- Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 468 of 2014

1. Fagu Mahto S/o Bigal Mahto
2. Mathu Mahto
3. Mannu Mahto
   Both S/o Charku Mahto
   Both resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 469 of 2014

1. Kandri Devi, W/o Gurucharan Munda
2. Romni Devi, W/o Eto Munda
3. Bhanu Devi, W/o Chhattu Munda
4. Tupal Munda, S/o Sukhu Munda
5. Alomani Devi, W/o Charka Munda
6. Narayan Munda, S/o Dhanraj Munda
7. Shankar Munda, S/o Tupal Munda

All resident of Village – Laaganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 470 of 2014

1. Lilwa Devi W/o Late Lala Hazam **(Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**

1(a) Jageshwar Thakur, aged about 64 years

1(b) Sanjeev Thakur, aged about 47 years

At present resident of Village + P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Dandpur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, Dist. – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 471 of 2014

1. Fagu Mahto, S/o Bigal Mahto
2. Mithu Mahto
3. Mannu Mahto

Both S/o Charku Mahto

All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand **…… Appellants/Claimants**

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

With

First Appeal No. 472 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalkho S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalkho S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Sushila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman Khalkho
7. Vinni khalkho
   5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho
8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalkho
10. Susma Khalkho W/o Prem Khalkho
11. Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalkho
    11 & 12 S/o Daud Khalkho
13. Jaymasih Khalkho
14. Edward Khalkho
    13 & 14 S/o Kunwar Khalkho
15. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16. Nirmal Khalko S/o Siril Khalkho
17. Amrit Khalkho
18. Eliyajar Khalkho
19. Nirmal Khalkho
    17 to 19 S/o Aanand Mashih Khalkho
20. Kunwar Khalkho
21. Iswardas Khalkho
22. Fransis Khalkho
    20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho
23. Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho

    All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, (Jharkhand)

… … … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … …Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 473 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalkho S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalkho S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Shushila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman Khalkho
7. Vinni Khalkho
   5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho
8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalkho

10.Sushma Khalkho W/o Prem Khalkho
11.Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalkho
11&12 S/o Daud Khalkho
13.Jaymasih Khalkho
14.Edward Khalkho
Both S/o Kunwar Khalkho
15.Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16.Nirmal Khalkho S/o Siril Khalkho
17.Amrit Khalkho
18.Eliyajar Khalkho
19.Nirmal Khalkho
17 to 19 S/o Aananad Masih Khalkho
20.Kunwar Khalkho
21.Iswardas Khalkho
22.Fransis Khalkho
20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho
23.Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho
All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, (Jharkhand)

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 474 of 2014

1. Sawan Toppo S/o Late Mahadev Oraon
2. Madi Toppo
3. Dadhu Toppo
Both S/o Late Ram Oraon
4. Sukar Toppo S/o Late Lachhu Oraon
All resident of Village Lalganj, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 475 of 2014

1. Sawan Toppo S/o Late Mahadev Oroan
2. Madi Toppo
3. Dadhu Toppo
Both S/o Late Ram Oraon
4. Sukar Toppo S/o Late Lachhu Oraon
All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 476 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalkho S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalkho S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Suhsila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman khalkho
7. Vinni Khalkho

   5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho
8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalkho
10. Susma Khalkho W/o Prem Khalkho
11. Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalko

    Both S/o Daud Khalkho
13. Jaymasih Khalkho
14. Edward Khalkho

    Both S/o Kunwar Khalkho
15. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16. Nirmal Khalkho S/o Siril Khalkho
17. Amrit Khalkho
18. Eliyajar Khalkho
19. Nirmal Khalkho

    17 to 19 S/o Aanand Mashih Khalkho
20. Kunwar Khalkho
21. Iswardas Khalkho
22. Fransis Khalkho

    20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho
23. Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho

    All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, (Jharkhand).

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 477 of 2014

1. Shekh Saukat
2. Md. Adam Ansari

Both S/o Sultan Ali
3. Md. Afjal Hussain S/o Shekh Chaman
4. Kayum Ansari S/o Afjal Hussain
All resident of Village- Kisunpur, P.O.- Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi (Jharkhand)

…… … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 478 of 2014

Jagatnarayan Jaiswal S/o Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal
Resident of Village- Lalpur, P.O.+P.S.- Lalpur, Ranchi (Jharkhand)

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 479 of 2014

1. Anil Oraon S/o Sadho Oraon
2. Baya Oraon
3. Bandhu Oraon
Both S/o Madho Oraon
4. Kunwari Devi W/o Bicha Oraon
5. Sohari Devi W/o Balo Oraon
All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 480 of 2014

1. **Savitri Devi Jaiswal W/o Umashankar Jaiswal (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
1(a) Purnima Chaudhari W/o Late Randhir Prasad Choudhary.
1(b) Pratima Chaudhari W/o Manmohan Choudhary.
1(c) Kumkum Prasad W/o Ram Kuber Prasad.
1(d) Most. Shashi Jaiswal W/o Late Chittranjan Jaiswal
1(e) Sumit Jaiswal S/o Late Chittranjan Jaiswal
1(f) Vineet Jaiswal S/o Late Chittranjan Jaiswal

2. Pradeep Kumar Jaiswal, S/o Umashankar Jaiswal
   At present resident- Lalpur, P.S.- Lalpur, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 481 of 2014

1. Baya Oraon S/o Koka Oraon
2. Budhwa Oraon
3. Sohrai Oraon
   Both S/o Sukra Oraon
   All Resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi (Jharkhand)

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 482 of 2014

1. **Phul Kumari Jaiswal W/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal (Deleted v/o dated 12.08.2025)**
2. Naveen Kumar Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal
   All resident of Village- Lalpur, P.O.+P.S.- Lalpur, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 483 of 2014

1. Shekh Saukat
2. Md. Adam Ansari
   Both S/o Sultan Ali
   All at Present Resident of Village- Kisunpur, P.O.- Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi (Jharkhand)

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 484 of 2014

1. Chandar Munda
2. Aklu Munda
   Both S/o Baku Munda
   All at present resident of Village- Pertol, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand
3. Mogo Munda S/o Mangal Munda
4. Guddu Munda S/o Billu Munda
   All at Present resident of Village- Tati, P.O.+P.S.- Tatisilwai, Ranchi (Jharkhand)

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 485 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda
   1 to 3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda
4. Ganga Munda S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Singh Munda
6. Rungthu Munda
   5&6 S/o Gangadhar Munda
7. Maklina W/o Buida Munda
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 486 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto S/o Shekhar Mahto

7. Sannu Mahto S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12 to 14 S/o Shivnath Mahto
15. Jahlo Kumari D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi W/o Ganesh Mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
    All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 487 of 2014

1. Chandar Munda
2. Aklu Munda
   Both S/o Baku Munda
   All at present resident of Village- Pertol, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi (Jharkhand)
3. Mogo Munda, S/o Mangal Munda
4. Guddu Munda, S/o Billu Munda
   Both at present resident of Village-Tati. P.O.+P.S.-Tatisilwai, Ranchi (Jharkhand).

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 488 of 2014

1. Sanichariya Devi W/o Sukhlal Oraon
2. Birsa Oraon S/o Tipna Oraon
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 489 of 2014

1. Baya Oraon S/o Koka Oraon
2. Budhwa Oraon
3. Sohrai Oraon
   Both S/o Sukra Oraon
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 490 of 2014

Most. Fulmani Devi W/o Late Etwa Oraon
At present resident of Village- Hesatu, P.S.- Ormanjhi, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellant/ Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 491 of 2014

1. Baha Oraon
2. Sanicharwa Oraon
   Both S/o Paklu Oraon
3. Mangra Oraon
4. Dhana Oraon
   Both S/o Budhu Oraon
5. Etwa Oraon
6. Birsa Oraon
7. Choto Oraon
   5 to 7 S/o Sukra Oraon
8. Ranjit Oraon
9. Laxman Oraon
   Both S/o Bhandu Oraon
10. Nanki Devi W/o Kajru Oraon

All resident or Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 492 of 2014

1. Kandri Devi W/o Gurucharan Munda
2. Romni Devi W/o Eto Munda
3. **Bhanu Devi W/o Chattu Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   3(a) Naresh Munda (aged about 32 yrs.)
   3(b) Phulendra Munda (aged about 27 yrs.)
4. **Tupal Munda S/o Sukhu Munda (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a) Sukhram Munda (aged about 38 yrs.)
   4(b) Shankar Munda (aged about 36 yrs.)
5. Shankar Munda S/o Tupal Munda
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 493 of 2014

1. Lattu Oraon S/o Bodhan Oraon
2. Dhano Oraon
3. Somra Oraon
4. Ratan Oraon
   2 to 4 S/o Sanicharwa Oraon
5. Birsa Oraon S/o Ropan Oraon
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 494 of 2014

1. Jagarnath Munda
2. Natwar Munda
   Both S/o Goverdhan Munda
   Both resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 495 of 2014

1. Baha Oraon
2. Sanicharwa Oraon
   Both S/o Paklu Oraon
3. Mangra Oraon
4. Dhana Oraon
   Both S/o Budhu Oraon
5. Etwa Oraon
6. Birsa Oraon
7. Chhoto Oraon
   5 to 7 S/o Sukra Oraon
8. Ranjit Oraon
9. Laxman Oraon
   Both S/o Bhandu Oraon
10. Nanki Devi W/o Kajru Oraon
    All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 496 of 2014

1. Mukund Munda
2. Shankar Munda
   Both S/o Hari Singh Munda
3. Guddu Munda S/o Khedu Munda
4. Dasai Munda S/o Sudhu Munda
5. Ramdhan Munda S/o Jhir Singh Munda
6. Mukesh Munda
7. Sudama Munda
   Both S/o Birbal Munda
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 497 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalkho S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalkho S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Sushila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman Khalkho
7. Vinni Khalkho
   5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho
8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalkho
10. Sushma Khalkho W/o Prem Khalkho
11. Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalkho
    Both S/o Daud Khalkho
13. Jaymasih Khalkho
14. Edward Khalkho
    Both S/o Kunwar Khalkho
15. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16. Nirmal Khalkho S/o Siril Khalkho
17. Amrit Khalkho
18. Eliyajar Khalkho
19. Nirmal Khalkho
    17 to 19 S/o Aanand Mashih Khalkho
20. Kunwar Khalkho
21. Iswardas Khalkho
22. Fransis Khalkho
    20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho
23. Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho
    all resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 498 of 2014

1. Samu Oraon
2. Jhirga Oraon

3. Etwa Oraon
   All S/o Gunga Oraon
4. Ravi Oraon S/o Budhuwa Oraon
5. Somari Devi W/o Kali Oraon
6. Bandhani Devi W/o Mangra Oraon
   all resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 499 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalko S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalko S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Sushila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman Khalkho
7. Vinni Khalkho
   5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho
8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalkho
10. Susma Khalkho W/o Prem Khalkho
11. Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalkho
    Both S/o Daud Khalkho
13. Jaymasih Khalkho
14. Edward Khalkho
    Both S/o Kunwar Khalkho
15. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16. Nirmal Khalho S/o Siril Khalkho
17. Amrit Khalkho
18. Eliyajar Khalkho
19. Nirmal Khalkho
    17 to 19 S/o Aanand Mashih Khalkho
20. Kunwar Khalkho
21. Iswardas Khalkho
22. Fransis Khalkho
    20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho
23. Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho
    all resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 500 of 2014

1. Bhakdu Oraon
2. Garha Oraon
   Both S/o Somra Oraon
3. Bana Oraon S/o Bicha Oraon
4. Munna Oraon S/o Tulgu Oraon
5. Kandana Oraon S/o Sukha Oraon
6. Jatru Oraon
7. Koyalo Oraon
8. Tulgu Oraon
   6 to 8 S/o Puran Oraon
9. Puran Oraon
10. Sukha Oraon
11. Baha Oraon
    9 to 11 S/o Jatru Oraon
12. Maghya Oraon
13. Chamra Oraon
14. Gabdru Oraon
    12 to 14 S/o Tugu Oraon
    All Resident of Village- lalganj, P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 501 of 2014

1. Mukund Munda
2. Shankar Munda
   Both S/o Harisingh Munda
3. Guddu Munda S/o Khedu Munda
4. Dasai Munda S/o Sudhu Munda
5. Ramdhan Munda S/o Jhirsingh Munda
6. Mukesh Munda
7. Sudama Munda
   Both S/o Birbal Munda
   All- resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 502 of 2014

1. Dalal Oraon S/o Mangu Oraon
2. Jaggu Oraon S/o Koka Oraon

All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 503 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalkho S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalkho S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Sushila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman Khalkho
7. Vinni Khalkho

5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho

8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalkho
10. Susma Khalkho W/o Prem Khalkho
11. Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalkho

Both S/o Daud Khalkho

13. Jaymasih Khalkho
14. Edward Khalkho

Both S/o Kunwar Khalkho

15. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16. Nirmal Khalkho S/o Siril Khalkho
17. Amrit Khalkho
18. Eliyajar Khalkho
19. Nirmal Khalkho

17 to 19 S/o Aanand Mashih Khalkho

20. Kunwar Khalkho
21. Iswardas Khalkho
22. Fransis Khalkho

20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho

23. Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho

all resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 504 of 2014

1. Jagatnarayan Jaiswal S/o Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal
   resident of Village- Lalpur, P.O.+P.S.- Lalpur, Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … … … Appellant/ Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 505 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto S/o Chattu mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12 to 14 S/o Shivnath Mahto
15. Jhalo kumari D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi W/o Ganesh mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
    All Resident of Village- lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 506 of 2014

1. **Phul Kumari Jaiswal W/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. Naveen Kumar Jaiswal, S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal
   At present resident- Lalpur, P.S.- Lalpur, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/opp. Parties

With

First Appeal No. 507 of 2014

1. Naveen Kuamr Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal
   At present resident of Village- Lalpur, P.S.- Lalpur, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellant/ Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. **The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi**

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 508 of 2014

1. Dalal Oraon S/o Mangu oraon
2. Jaggu Oraon S/o Koka Oraon
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. **The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi**

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 509 of 2014

1. Most. Parwati Devi W/o Teju Sahu
2. **Most. Jhalo Devi W/o Ramjit Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Sahabir Sahu S/o Late Ramjit Sahu
   2(b) Most. Jayanti Devi W/o Late Mahabir Sahu
3. Sukhlal Sahu S/o Shortho Sahu

4. **Gokhul Kumar Prasad S/o Sartho Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4(a) Rukmani Devi (aged 63 yrs.)
5. Most. Siban Devi W/o Tilak Sahu
6. **Kandan Sahu S/o Madhu Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   6(a) Most. Dashmin Devi (aged 61 yrs.)
7. Most. Meena Devi W/o Vijay Sahu
   All at present resident of Village + P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 510 of 2014

1. Ratni Devi W/o Mahadev Oraon
2. Manju Devi W/o Bandhan Oraon
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 511 of 2014

1. Rakesh Linda S/o Late Mahavir Linda
   Resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Appellant/Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 512 of 2014

1. Baha Oraon
2. Sanicharwa Oraon
   Both S/o Paklu oraon
3. Mangra Oraon
4. Dhana Oraon

Both S/o Budhu Oraon
5. Etwa Oraon
6. Birsa Oraon
7. Chhoto Oraon
   5 to 7 S/o Sukra Oraon
8. Ranjit Oraon
9. Laxman Oraon
   Both S/o Bhandu Oraon
10. Nanki Devi W/o Kajru Oraon
    All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 513 of 2014

1. **Phul Kumari Jaiswal W/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   Through her Representative namely, Naveen Kumar Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal ***(Substituted)***
   Resident of Village- Lalpur, P.S.- Lalpur, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellant/Claimant

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/opp. Parties

With

First Appeal No. 514 of 2014

1. Jagatnarayan Jaiswal
   S/o Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal
   At present resident of Village- Lalpur, P.O.+P.S.- Lalpur, Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 515 of 2014

1. Shekh Saukat
2. Md. Adam Ansari

Both S/o Sultan Ali
3. Md. Afjal Hussain
S/o Shekh Chaman
4. Kyum Ansari
S/o Afjal Hussain
All at present Resident of Village- Kisunpur, P.O.- Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 516 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalkho S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalkho S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Sushila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman Khalkho
7. Vinni Khalkho
5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho
8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalho
10. Susma Khalho W/o Prem Khalkho
11. Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalkho
Both S/o Daud Khalkho
13. Jaymasih Khalkho
14. Edward Khalkho
Both S/o Kunwar Khalkho
15. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16. Nirmal Khalkho S/o Siril Khalkho
17. Amrit Khalkho
18. Eliyajar Khalkho
19. Nirmal Khalkho
17 to 19 S/o Aanand Mashih Khalkho
20. Kunwar Khalkho
21. Iswardas Khalkho
22. Fransis Khalkho
20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho
23. Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho
All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi Jharkhand.

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 517 of 2014

1. Shekh Saukat
2. Md. Adam Ansari
   Both S/o Sultan Ali
   All at present Resident of Village- Kisunpur, P.O.- Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 518 of 2014

1. Prakash Khalkho S/o Romal Khalkho
2. Jasman Khalkho S/o Sahay Khalkho
3. Ashish Khalkho S/o Yedo Khalkho
4. Sushila Khalkho W/o Komal Khalkho
5. Josef Khalkho
6. Herman Khalkho
7. Vinni Khalkho
   5 to 7 S/o Johan Khalkho
8. Tersa Khalkho W/o Daniel Khalkho
9. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Daud Khalho
10. Susma Khalho W/o Prem Khalkho
11. Polus Khalkho
12. Kalyan Khalkho
    Both S/o Daud Khalkho
13. Jaymasih Khalkho
14. Edward Khalkho
    Both S/o Kunwar Khalkho
15. Prabhu Khalkho S/o Nirmal Khalkho
16. Nirmal Khalkho S/o Siril Khalkho
17. Amrit Khalkho
18. Eliyajar Khalkho
19. Nirmal Khalkho
    17 to 19 S/o Aanand Mashih Khalkho
20. Kunwar Khalkho
21. Iswardas Khalkho
22. Fransis Khalkho
    20 to 22 S/o Nate Khalkho
23. Abraham Khalkho S/o Bimal Khalkho

All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 519 of 2014

1. Samu Oraon
2. Jhirga Oraon
3. Etwa Oroan
   All S/o Gunga Oraon
4. Ravi Oraon
   S/o Budhuwa Oraon
5. Somari Devi
   W/o Kali Oraon
6. Bandhani Devi
   W/o Mangra Oraon
   All Resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 520 of 2014

1. Mukund Munda
2. Shankar munda
   Both S/o Harisingh Munda
3. Guddu Munda
   S/o Khedu Munda
4. Dasai Munda
   S/o Sudhu Munda
5. Ramdhan Munda
   S/o Jhirsingh Munda
6. Mukesh Munda
7. Sudama Munda
   Both S/o Birbal Munda
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 521 of 2014

1. Chattu Oraon
   S/o Fagu Oraon
2. Etwa Oraon
3. Somra Oraon
   Both S/o Pachu Oraon
4. Budhwa Oraon
   S/o Siwa Oraon
5. Punam Devi
   W/o Vijay Oraon
6. Dunu Oraon
7. Jagtu Oraon
   6&7 S/o Somra oraon
8. Bhado Oraon
   S/o Mangra Oraon
   all resident of Village- Lalganj, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 522 of 2014

1. Savitri Devi Jaiswal W/o Umashankar Jaiswal **(Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
2. Pradeep Kumar Jaiswal S/o Umashankar Jaiswal
   At present resident of Lalpur, P.S.-Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 523 of 2014

1. Etwa Oraon
2. Debra Oraon
   Both S/o Jitu Oraon
3. Mannu Kachhap

4. Pandey Kachhap
5. Rajendra Kachhap
6. Thibu Kachhap
   3 to 6 S/o Ratan Oraon
7. Sanjit Kachhap S/o Bana Kachhap
8. Malo Devi W/o Binu kacchap
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 524 of 2014

1. Shekh Saukat
2. Md. Adam Ansari
   Both S/o Sultan Ali
3. Md. Afjal Hussain S/o Shekh Chaman
4. Kayum Ansari S/o Afjal Hussain
   All at present Resident of Village- Kisunpur, P.O.- Buti, P.S.- Sadar. Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 525 of 2014

1. **Habil Kachhap S/o Late Abhiram Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Bhanu Kachhap (aged about 40 yrs.) S/o Late Habil Kachhap
   1(b) Anil Kachhap (aged about 37 yrs.) S/o Late Habil Kachhap
2. **Birsa Oraon (Deleted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
3. **Munna Oraon (Deleted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
4. Prakash Kachhap
5. Deepak Kachhap
   Both S/o Samel Kachhap
6. Jiwan Kachhap
7. Habil Kachhap
8. Prabhu Dayal Kachhap
9. Ranjan kachhap
   6 to 9 S/o Junus Kachhap
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sungu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 526 of 2014

1. Samu Oraon
2. Jhirga Oraon
3. Etwa Oraon
   All S/o Gunga Oraon
4. Ravi Oraon S/o Budhuwa Oraon
5. Somari Devi W/o Kali Oraon
6. Bandhani Devi W/o Mangra oraon
   all resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, (Jharkhand).

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 527 of 2014

1. **Phul Kumari Jaiswal W/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal (Deleted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a) Praveen Jaiswal (60 years)
   1(b) Naveen Kumar Jaiswal (58 years)
   1(c) Amit Jaiswal (55 years)
   1(d) Shilpi Jaiswal (51 years)
2. Naveen Kumar Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal
   All at present resident Lalpur, PS Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 528 of 2014

1. Most. Keshwari Devi W/o Kasinath Mahto
   at present resident of Village+P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi

… … Appellant/ Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 529 of 2014

1. **Sheonarayan Jaiswal S/o Laxminarayan Jaiswal (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Manoranjan Jaiswal (73 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(b). Most. Tanuja Jaiswal (61 years) W/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
   1(c). Kushagra Vikram Jaiswal (37 years) S/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
   1(d). Taruna Jaiswal (33 years) D/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
   1(e). Shashi Ranjan Jaiswal (63 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(f). Priyo Ranjan Jaiswal (62 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(g). Krishna Ranjan Jaiswal (57 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(h). Sushma Jaiswal, (71 years) W/o Shambhu Nath Jaiswal
   1(i). Suman Jaiswal, (69 years) W/o Late Rajesh Jaiswal
   1(j). Seema Gupta, (59 years) W/o Sanjay Gupta
   At present resident Lalpur, PS Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/opp. Parties

With

F.A. No. 530 of 2014

1. Chander Munda
2. Aklu Munda
   Both S/o Baku Munda
   Both at present resident of Village – Pertol, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist- Ranchi (Jharkhand)
3. Mogo Munda S/o Mangal Munda
4. Guddu Munda S/o Billu Munda
   Both at present resident of Village – Tati P.O. + P.S. – Tatisilwai, Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 531 of 2014

1. Niranjan Baraik, S/o Dashin Singh Baraik
2. Fagu Singh, S/o Hardayal Baraik
3. Jagarnath Baraik
4. Shankar Baraik
5. Shambhu Baraik
   3 to 5 S/o Sohan Baraik

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 532 of 2014

1. Baha Oraon
2. Sanicharwa Oraon
   Both S/o Paklu Oraon
3. Mangra Oraon
4. Dhana Oraon
   Both S/o Budhu Oraon
5. Etwa Oraon
6. Birsa Oraon
7. Chhoto Oraon
   5 To 7 S/o Sukra Oraon
8. Ranjit Oraon
9. Laxman Oraon
   Both S/o Bhandu Oraon
10. Nanki Devi W/o Kajru Oraon
    All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)**… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 533 of 2014

1. Mukund Munda
2. Shankar Munda
   Both S/o Harisingh Munda
3. Guddu Munda S/o Khedu Munda
4. Dasai Munda S/o Sudhu Munda
5. Ramdhan Munda S/o Jhirsingh Munda
6. Mukesh Munda
7. Sudama Munda
   Both S/o Birbal Munda

All resident of Village – Lalganj P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi … … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 534 of 2014

1. **Fulmani Devi (Hirmain Devi) W/o Dutiya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Chamak Lal Mahto, aged about 60 years
   1(b) Shyam Lal Mahto, aged about 55 years
   1(c) Brij Lal Mahto, aged about 48 years
2. Pirtu Mahto
3. **Lalit Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   3(a) Most. Riban Devi, aged about 72 years
4. Ramnath Mahto
   2 to 4 S/o Chhedi Kurmi
   All present resident of Village + P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi … … **Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 535 of 2014

1. **Sheonarayan Jaiswal S/o Rai Sahab Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Manoranjan Jaiswal (73 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(b). Most. Tanuja Jaiswal (61 years) W/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
   1(c). Kushagra Vikram Jaiswal (37 years) S/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
   1(d). Taruna Jaiswal (33 years) D/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
   1(e). Shashi Ranjan Jaiswal (63 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(f). Priyo Ranjan Jaiswal (62 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(g). Krishna Ranjan Jaiswal (57 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(h). Sushma Jaiswal, (71 years) W/o Shambhu Nath Jaiswal
   1(i). Suman Jaiswal, (69 years) W/o Late Rajesh Jaiswal
   1(j). Seema Gupta, (59 years) W/o Sanjay Gupta
   At present resident Lalpur, PS Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/opp. Parties

With

F.A. No. 536 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda
   1 to 3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda
4. Ganga Munda S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Singh Munda
6. Rungthu Munda
   5 to 6 S/o Gangadhar Munda
7. Maklina W/o Buida Munda
   All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist-Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 537 of 2014

1. Lattu Oraon S/o Bodhan Oraon
2. Dhano Oraon
3. Somra Oraon
4. Ratan Oraon
   2 to 4 S/o Sanicharwa Oraon
5. Birsa Oraon S/o Ropan Oraon
   All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 538 of 2014

1. **Sheonarayan Jaiswal S/o Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Manoranjan Jaiswal (73 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
   1(b). Most. Tanuja Jaiswal (61 years) W/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
   1(c). Kushagra Vikram Jaiswal (37 years) S/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal

1(d). Taruna Jaiswal (33 years) D/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
1(e). Shashi Ranjan Jaiswal (63 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
1(f). Priyo Ranjan Jaiswal (62 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
1(g). Krishna Ranjan Jaiswal (57 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
1(h). Sushma Jaiswal, (71 years) W/o Shambhu Nath Jaiswal
1(i). Suman Jaiswal, (69 years) W/o Late Rajesh Jaiswal
1(j). Seema Gupta, (59 years) W/o Sanjay Gupta
At present resident Lalpur, PS Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/opp. Parties

With

F.A. No. 539 of 2014

1. Chhatu Oraon S/o Fagu Oraon
2. Etwa Oraon
3. Somra Oraon
   Both S/o Pachu Oraon
4. Budhwa Oraon S/o Siwa Oraon
5. Punam Devi W/o Vijay Oraon
6. Dunu Oraon
7. Jagtu Oraon
   Both S/o Somra Oraon
8. Bhado Oraon S/o Mangra Oraon
   All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. - Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 540 of 2014

1. Md. Afjal Hussain (Chhedi) S/o Shekh Chaman
2. Kyum Ansari S/o Afjal Hussain
   All at present Resident of Village-Kisunpur, P.O.-Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 541 of 2014

1. Lattu Oraon S/o Bodhan Oraon
2. Dhano Oraon
3. Somra Oraon
4. Ratan Oraon
   2 to 4 S/o Sanicharwa Oraon
5. Birsa Oraon S/o Ropan Oraon
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 542 of 2014

1. Bandhni Devi W/o Mangra Oraon
2. Somari Devi W/o Kali Oraon
3. Ravi Oraon S/o Budhwa Oraon
   All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 543 of 2014

1. Md. Afjal Hussain S/o Shekh Chaman
2. Kayum Ansari S/o Md. Afjal Hussain
   All at present Resident of Village-Kisunpur, P.O.-Buti, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.544 of 2014

1. Chandar Munda
2. Aklu Munda
   Both S/o Baku Munda
   Both at present resident of Village-Pertol, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand)

3. Mogo Munda, S/o Mangal Munda
4. Guddu Munda, S/o Billu Munda

Both at present resident of Village-Tati. P.O.+P.S.-Tatisilwai, Ranchi (Jharkhand).

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 545 of 2014

1. Budhuwa Oraon S/o Luduwa Oraon
2. Durga Oraon
3. Ludu Oraon

Both S/o Bhonduwa Oraon

All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O.-Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.-Ranchi

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O.+P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.-Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 546 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto

Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto

4. Sita Ram Mahto S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto

9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto

12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto

12 to14 S/o Shivnath Mahto

15. Jhalo Kumari D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto

Both S/o Mangan Mahto

18. Sabi Devi W/o Ganesh Mahto

19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 547 of 2014

1. **Sheonarayan Jaiswal S/o Rai Sahab Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
1(a). Manoranjan Jaiswal (73 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
1(b). Most. Tanuja Jaiswal (61 years) W/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
1(c). Kushagra Vikram Jaiswal (37 years) S/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
1(d). Taruna Jaiswal (33 years) D/o Late Omiya Ranjan Jaiswal
1(e). Shashi Ranjan Jaiswal (63 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
1(f). Priyo Ranjan Jaiswal (62 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
1(g). Krishna Ranjan Jaiswal (57 years) S/o Late Sheonarayan Jaiswal
1(h). Sushma Jaiswal, (71 years) W/o Shambhu Nath Jaiswal
1(i). Suman Jaiswal, (69 years) W/o Late Rajesh Jaiswal
1(j). Seema Gupta, (59 years) W/o Sanjay Gupta
At present resident Lalpur, PS Lalpur, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Appellants/ Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/opp. Parties

With

First Appeal No. 548 of 2014

1. Sanichariya Devi W/o Sukhlal Oraon
2. Birsa Oraon S/o Tipna Oraon
All resident of Village- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

…… Appellants/ Claimants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O. and P.S. Danapur, Patna, 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 549 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto
11. Payrelal Mahto
    9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12. Baleshwar Mahto
13. Ramesh Mahto
14. Suresh Mahto
    12 to14 S/o Shivnath Mahto
15. Jhalo Kumari D/o Badas Mahto
16. Birju Mahto
17. Jitlal Mahto
    Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18. Sabi Devi W/o Ganesh Mahto
19. Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
    All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 550 of 2014

1. Lagan Devi W/o Bharat Mahto
2. Bhupnath Mahto
3. Nanku Mahto
   Both S/o Sobhnath Mahto
4. Sita Ram Mahto S/o Fagu Mahto
5. Nandu Mahto S/o Aguwa Mahto
6. Sarwan Mahto S/o Shekhar Mahto
7. Sannu Mahto S/o Chattu Mahto
8. Satrudhan Mahto S/o Ghasi Mahto
9. Surender Mahto
10. Sawan Mahto

11.Payrelal Mahto
9 to 11 S/o Ramnath Mahto
12.Baleshwar Mahto
13.Ramesh Mahto
14.Suresh Mahto
12 to14 S/o Shivnath Mahto
15.Jhalo Kumari D/o Badas Mahto
16.Birju Mahto
17.Jitlal Mahto
Both S/o Mangan Mahto
18.Sabi Devi W/o Ganesh Mahto
19.Sikandar Kumar Mahto S/o Jaleshwar Mahto
All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No.551 of 2014

1. Suresh Oraon S/o Birsa Oraon
Resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 552 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda
1 to 3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda
4. Ganga Munda
S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Singh Munda
6. Rungthu Munda
5 to 6 S/o Gangadhar Munda
7. Maklina W/o Buida Munda
All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 553 of 2014

1. Ratni Devi W/o Mahadev Oraon
2. Manju Devi W/o Bandhna Oraon

All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)**… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 554 of 2014

1. Bhakdu Oraon
2. Garha Oraon

Both S/o Somra Oraon

3. Bana Oraon S/o Bicha Oraon
4. Munna Oraon S/o Tulgu Oraon
5. Kandana Oraon S/o Sukha Oraon
6. Jatru Oraon
7. Koyalo Oraon
8. Tulgu Oraon

6 to 8 S/o Puran Oraon

9. Puran Oraon
10. Sukha Oraon
11. Baha Oraon

9 to 11 S/o Jatru Oraon

12. Maghya Oraon
13. Chamra Oraon
14. Gabdru Oraon

12 to 14 S/o Tugu Oraon

All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 555 of 2014

1. Bhakdu Oraon
2. Garha Oraon

Both S/o Somra Oraon

3. Bana Oraon S/o Bicha Oraon
4. Munna Oraon S/o Tulgu Oraon
5. Kandana Oraon S/o Sukha Oraon
6. Jatru Oraon
7. Koyalo Oraon
8. Tulgu Oroan
   6 to 8 S/o Puran Oraon
9. Puran Oraon
10. Sukha Oraon
11. Baha Oraon
    9 to 11 S/o Jatru Oraon
12. Maghya Oraon
13. Chamra Oraon
14. Gabdru Oraon
    12 to 14 S/o Tugu Oraon
    All Resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 556 of 2014

1. Rohit Jaiswal
2. Rahul Singh Jaiswal
   Both S/o Ranjit Kumar Jaiswal
   Both at present resident of Village – Lalpur P.S. – Lalpur, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 557 of 2014

1. Sundra Munda
2. Radha Munda
3. Bhola Munda
   1 to 3 S/o Fatu Singh Munda
4. Ganga Munda S/o Arjun Munda
5. Mohan Singh Munda
6. Rungthu Munda
   5 to 6 S/o Gangadhar Munda
   All resident of Village – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi (Jharkhand)

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 558 of 2014

Naveen Kumar Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal
At present resident of Village – Lalpur, P.S. – Lalpur, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 559 of 2014

1. Jagatnarayan Jaiswal S/o Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal
At present resident of Village – Lalpur, P.O. + P.S. – Lalpur, Ranchi (Jharkhand) **… … Claimant/Appellant**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 560 of 2014

1. **Most. Pairo Devi, W/o Jhuthan Kurmi (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1.(a) Jaggu Mahto (age about 65 years)
   1.(b) Jaglal Mahto (aged about 55 years)
   1.(c) Most. Vimla Devi W/o Late Babulal Mahto (aged about 34 years)
2. **Moharai Mahto S/o Jhubla Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   2(a) Most. Bilaso Devi (62 years) W/o Late Moharai Mahto
3. Most. Tetri Devi W/o Balku Mahto
4. **Most. Lalo Devi W/o Jogiya Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   4.(a) Paras Mahto (aged about 62 years)
5. **Most. Muter Devi W/o Sudra Mahto (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   5(a) Most. Akshi Devi W/o Late Kandu Mahto
6. Mohan Mahto
7. Sohan Mahto

8. Rohan Mahto
   S/o Vasudev Mahto
   Resident of Village + P.O. Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, District- Ranchi

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.561 of 2014

1. Rohit Jaiswal
2. Rahul Singh Jaiswal
   Both S/o Ranjit Kumar Jaiswal
   Both at Present Resident of Village-Lalpur, P.S- Lalpur, District-Ranchi (Jharkhand).

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.562 of 2014

1. Kistto Munda
2. Manoj Munda
   Both S/o Sukra Munda
   Both at present resident of Village-Hesal Jara, P.S.- Angara, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. Mogo Munda, S/o Daharu Munda
4. Nandu Munda, S/o Shikhar Munda
   3 & 4 resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O- Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.563 of 2014

1. Anil Oraon, S/o Sadho Oraon
2. Baya Oraon
3. Bandhu Oraon
   Both S/o Madho Oraon
4. Kunwari Devi W/o Bicha Oraon
5. Sohri Devi, W/o Balo Oraon

All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 564 of 2014

1. Fagu Mahto, S/o Bigal Mahto
2. Mathu Mahto
3. Mannu Mahto

Both S/o Charku Mahto

All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 565 of 2014

1. Budhwa Oraon, S/o Biswa Oraon
2. Pyari Devi, W/o Koka Oraon

All resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 451 of 2018

1. Birsa Oraon, 48 years
2. Etwa Oraon, 41 years

1 & 2 S/o Late Karma Oraon

3. Jbara Oraon, 51 years
4. Kanu Oraon, 54 years

3 & 4 S/o Late Mangara Oraon

5. Mahesh Linda @ Mahesh, 40 years
6. Sonu Linda @ Sonu, 27 years

5 & 6 S/o Late Rijhu Oraon

At present all residents of Vill.- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt., P.O. & P.S.- Danapur, District- Patna 801503 (Bihar)
2. The State of Jharkhand through the Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S.- Ranchi, Distt.- Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

3. Most. Mangri Devi @ Mangri W/o Karma Oraon
   At Present resident of Vill.- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Claimant/Proforma Respondent

With

F.A. No. 455 of 2018

1. Sushil Linda @ Sushil, 63 years
2. Fransis Linda @ Fransis, 59 years
3. Simon Linda, 48 years
   1 to 3 S/o Birsa Oraon
   All resident of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

…… Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O.+ P.S. Danapur, Dist. Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 456 of 2018

1. Birsa Oraon @ Birsa, 48 years
2. Etawa Oraon @ Ewa, 41 years
   1 & 2 S/o Late Karma Oraon
3. Jbara Oraon @ Jbara, 51 years
4. Kanu Oraon @ Kanu, 54 years
   3 & 4 S/o Late Mangara Oraon
5. Mahesh Linda, 40 years
6. Sonu Linda, 27 years
   5 & 6 S/o Late Rijhu Oraon,
   At present Resident of Vill.- Lalganj, PO – Sugnu, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O.+ P.S. Danapur, Dist. Patna, 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

… Respondents

3. Most. Mangri Devi, @ Magri, W/o Karma Oraon, At present Resident of Vill.- Lalganj, PO – Sugnu, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Proforma Respondent

With

F.A. No. 459 of 2018

1. Siva Oraon @ Siwa Oraon, 28 years, S/o Late Rakesh Oraon
2. Suraj Oraon @ Suraj Toppo, 29 years, S/o Late Cheral Oraon
3. Sukro Toppo, 49 years, W/o Late Madho Oraon

All resident of Vill –Gari, PO Hotwar, PS. Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Appellants/Claimants**

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate officer, Danapur Cantt, P.O.+ P.S. Danapur, Dist. Patna, 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S. Ranchi, Dist. Ranchi

…… Respondents/Respondents

3. Sukro Oraon, W/o Late Chudu Oraon,
Resident of Vill. Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand

… Performa Respondent

With

First Appeal No. 463 of 2018

1. Mahadev Oraon (aged 78 years) S/o Gulel Oraon

At present resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.464 of 2018

1. Bhola Sahu, aged about 47 years, S/o Late Hariya Sahu
2. Ram Sahu @ Ram, aged about 72 years
3. Laxman Sahu @ Laxman, aged about 66 years
4. Bharat Sahu @ Bharat, aged about 62 years
5. Chatur Sahu @ Chatu, aged about 60 years

2, 3, 4 & 5 S/o Late Mahli Teli

All resident of Village-Sugnu, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

3. Rameshwar Sahu @ Rameshwar S/o Late Sambhu Teli @ Shambhu Teli
4. Lalit Sahu @ Lalit, S/o Late Kolha Sahu

3&4 at present all resident of Village-Sugnu, P.O- Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Proforma Respondents

With

First Appeal No. 465 of 2018

1. Bhunu Gope, 60 years, S/o Mogal Mahto
2. Ramesh Yadav, 49 years
3. Sanjay Yadav, 39 years

2 & 3 S/o Late Ramprasad Yadav

At present all resident of Village-Gari, P.O. Hotwar, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.466 of 2018

1. **Ratho Sahu, aged about 82 years, S/o Late Lalu Sahu (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

1(a). Jagdish Kumar Sahu (44 years) S/o Late Ratho Sahu

2. Paltu Mahto aged about 62 years
3. Binand Sahu aged about 60 years

2 & 3 S/o Late Bigal Sahu

All resident of Village-Sugnu, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Appellants/Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

3. Motilal Sahu @ Motilal
4. Andhru Sahu@Andhru
5. Salik Sahu@Salik

3, 4 & 5 S/o Nanda Sahu @ Nand Sahu

At present all resident of Village-Sugnu, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Proforma Respondents

With

First Appeal No.467 of 2018

Bhola Sahu @ Sahu aged about 47 years, S/o Hariya Sahu

Resident of Village-Sugnu, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

3. Rameshwar Sahu @ Rameshwar S/o Sambhu Teli @ Shambhu Teli
4. Lalit Sahu @ Lalit, S/o Kolha Sahu

At present all resident of Village-Sugnu, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Proforma Respondents

With

First Appeal No.468 of 2018

1. Most. Sanichariya Devi, Aged 75 years, W/o Fotindar Linda
2. Sharwan Linda, S/o Kailash Oraon, aged 55 years

At present all resident of Village-Lalganj, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

First Appeal No.469 of 2018

1. Lilamohan, age about 65 years
2. Nandkishor, age about 60 years

1 & 2 S/o Late Sukra Pahan

3. Gunjair, age about 42 years, W/o Late Gajnath Pahan

At present all resident of Village-Sugnu, P.O. Sugnu, P.S.-Sadar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi

... ... Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 470 of 2018

1. Anisul Rahman aged about 55 years
2. Samiul Rahman age about 53 years

1 & 2 both S/o Late Abdul Rauf

3. Gulam Mustaffa Age about 52 years
4. Gulam Murtaja age about 50 years
5. Gulam Rasul age about 48 years

3, 4 & 5 S/o Late Sekh Alimuddin

At present all resident of Vill. – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 471 of 2018

1. **Indar Hazam (Thakur) S/o Late Lachhu Hazam (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Mahabir Thakur (58 years)
   1(b). Ramesh Thakur (42 years)
   1(c). Anuj Thakur (24 years)
2. **Bharu Hazam (Thakur) S/o Late Lachhu Hazam (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   2(a). Sunil Kumar (34 years)
3. Bhagtu Thakur S/o Late Nathuwa Hazam (Thakur)
4. Koka Thakur S/o Kisun Hazam
5. Vishal Thakur S/o Late Bisun Hazam

   All resident of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand **…… Appellants/Claimants**

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

3. Ramchandra Hazam (Thakur) S/o Late Lachhu Hazam
4. Gopal Thakur S/o Late Sudarshan Thakur
5. Galwa Devi W/o Late Bisun Hazam
6. Dumri Devi W/o Late Soharlal Thakur
7. Rahul Thakur S/o Late Jitu Thakur
8. Dipu Thakur S/o Late Sukhlal Hazam

   3 to 8 residents of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand**.**

…… Proforma Respondents

With

F.A. No. 472 of 2018

1. Anisul @ Anilsul Rahman @ Anilsul Rahman (age about 55 years)

2. Samiul @ Shamiul Rahman @ Shamiul Rehman (age about 53 years)

   1 & 2 both S/o Late Abdul Rauf

3. Gulam Mustaffa (age about 52 years) S/o Shekh Alimuddin
4. Gulam Murtaja (age about 50 years) S/o Shekh Alimuddin
5. **Gulam Rasul S/o Late Shekh Alimuddin (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**

5(a). Most. Shamma Parween (43 years) Widow of Late Gulam Rasul
6. Imaman @ Emanan Ansari @ Emanan Ansari (age about 57 years)
7. Islam Ansari (age about 55 years)
8. Asraff @ Ashraf Ansari @ Asraf Ansari (age about 50 years)
6, 7 & 8 S/o Mustaffa

9. Jalil Ansari (age about 49 years) S/o Jamruddin @ Jamruddin Ansari @ Jumruddin Ansari

At present All resident of Vill.- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P. S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

…… Appellants/ Claimants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

3. Jamruddin Ansari @ Jumruddin Ansari son of Muslim
4. Shomruddin Ansari
5. Sajad Ansari
4 & 5 S/o Shabuddin
6. Sabruddin Ansari S/o Shekh Mahju
7. Israfil Ansari
8. Alam Ansari
7 & 8 S/o Late Mustaffa
9. Islam Ansari S/o Mustaffa

3 to 9 all resident of Vill.- Lalganj, P.O.- Sugnu, P.S.- Sadar, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand

….. Awardees/Proforma Respondents

With

F.A. No.473 of 2018

1. Birsa Oraon @ Birsa, 48 years
2. Etawa Oraon @ Etwa, 41 years
1 to 2 S/o Late Karma Oraon
3. Jbara Oraon @ Jabra, 51 years
4. Kanu Oraon @ Kanu, 54 years
3 & 4 S/o Late Mangra Oraon
5. Mahesh Linda @ Mahesh, 40 years
6. Sonu Linda @ Sonu, 27 years
5 & 6 Late Rijhu Oraon

At present all resident of Vill. – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Dist. - Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

3. Most. Mangri Devi W/o Karma Oraon
   At present resident of Vill. – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Proforma Respondent

With

F.A. No. 474 of 2018

1. Ratho Sahu @ Ratho age about 82 years
   S/o Late Lalu Sahu @ Lalu Teli
2. Paltu Mahto @ Patlu age about 62 years
3. Binand Sahu @ Binand age about 60 years
   2 & 3 S/o Late Bigal Sahu @ Bigal Teli
   At present all resident of Vill.- Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 475 of 2018

1. Kalawati Devi @ Kalawati age about 65 years, W/o Late Kalal Sahu
2. Bhonda Sahu @ Bhonda, age about 60 years
3. Jaleshwar Sahu @ Jaleshwar age about 50 years
   2 & 3 S/o Late Dasiya Teli
   At present all resident of Vill.- Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 477 of 2018

1. **Gunjar Devi W/o Late Jagannath Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o 12.08.2025)**
   1(a) Shiv Sagar Pahan, aged about 28 years
2. **Lilmohan Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o 12.08.2025)**
   2(a). Most. Shulgan Devi W/o Late Lilmohan Pahan
3. Nandkishor Pahan age about 60 years
   2 & 3 S/o Late Sukra Pahan
   All present all resident of Vill. – Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 479 of 2018

1. **Mahli Oraon S/o Chunda Oraon (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 26.08.2025)**
   1(a). Sanjay Tigga (36 years) S/o Late Mahli Oraon
   1(b). Sanjeet Tigga (34 years) S/o Late Mahli Oraon
   1(c). Most. Rukmani Devi (40 years) W/o Late Krishna Tigga
   1(d). Most. Shubhani Tigga (38 years) W/o Late Shyam Tigga
2. Jagnu Tigga S/o Bijla Oraon

All resident of Vill – Gari, PO Hotwar, PS Sadar, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand**. …… Appellants/ Claimants**

Versus

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur Cantt. P.O +P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O.+P.S.- Ranchi, District-Ranchi.

... ... Respondents/opposite Parties

with

F.A. No. 480 of 2018

Bhola Sahu age about 47 years, S/o Late Haria Sahu

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

3. Rameshwar Sahu S/o Late Shambhu Sahu
4. Lalit Sahu S/o Late Kolha Sahu

At present all resident of Vill. – Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Proforma Respondents

With

F.A. No. 482 of 2018

1. **Gunjar Devi W/o Late Jagannath Pahan (Deleted and substituted v/o dated 01.08.2025)**
   1(a) Shiv Sagar Pahan, aged about 28 years, S/o Late Gunjar Devi

At present all resident of Vill. – Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar

2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 484 of 2018

1. Sahamat Ansari age about 80 years
2. Hamid Ansari age about 65 years
   S/o Rojan @ Rojen
3. Md. Kayamuddin Ansari age about 72 years S/o Late Wali @ Wali
4. Most. Sayara age about 50 years
   W/o Jalaluddin Ansari @ Jalaluddin
   All present all resident of Vill. – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 486 of 2018

1. Bandhan Oraon, 46 years
2. Tuntun Oraon, 40 years
   1 & 2 S/o Mahadev Oraon
3. Most. Somari Devi, 46 years, W/o Rupu Oraon
4. Jethu Oraon, 46 years, S/o Birsa Oraon
   At present all resident of Vill. – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 487 of 2018

1. Most. Sanicharwa Devi 75 years, W/o Late Fotinder Linda
2. Sarwan Linda, 55 years, S/o Kailash Oraon, 55 years
   At present all resident of Vill. – Lalganj, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Appellants

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 489 of 2018

Bhola @ Bhola Sahu aged about 47 years, S/o Late Hariya Sahu

… … Claimant/Appellant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… … Respondents/Respondents

3. Rameshwar Sahu @ Rameshwar S/o Sambhu Teli
4. Lalit Sahu @ Lalit S/o Kolha Sahu

At present all resident of Vill. – Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand

.. .. Awardees/Proforma Respondents

With

F.A. No. 491 of 2018

1. Mallu @ Mallu Sahu, age about 60 years
2. Tuman @ Tumam Sahu, age about 55 years
3. Rajendra Prasad @ Rajendra Sahu, age about 50 years

All S/o Late Sabur Sahu @ Sabur Teli

At present all resident of Vill.– Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand **… … Claimants/Appellants**

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

With

F.A. No. 492 of 2018

Bhola @ Bhola Sahu aged about 47 years, S/o Late Hariya Sahu

… … Appellant/Claimant

-Versus-

1. Union of India through the Defense Estate Officer, Danapur, Cantt, P.O. + P.S. Danapur, Patna 801503, Bihar
2. The State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O. + P.S. – Ranchi, District – Ranchi

… Respondents/Respondents

3. Rameshwar Sahu @ Rameshwar S/o Late Sambhu Teli
4. Lalit Sahu @ Lalit S/o Late Kolha Sahu
5. Arti Devi @ Arti D/o Late Jageswar Sahu
6. Gunwa Sahu @ Gunwa S/o Jhubla Sahu @ Shankar
7. Sankar Sahu S/o Late Bandhu Sahu
8. Chedan Devi W/o Late Karma Sahu
9. Dharma Sahu @ Dharma S/o Late Kristan Teli
10. Most. Pratima Devi @ Pratima W/o Rupchand Sahu @ Rupchand
11. Balchand Sahu @ Balchand S/o Kishun Sahu

At present all resident of Vill. – Sugnu, P.O. – Sugnu, P.S. – Sadar, Dist. -Ranchi, Jharkhand

… … Claimants/Awardees Proforma Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Appellant-UOI	: Mr. Prashant Pallav, ASGI : Mr. Abhijeet Kumar Singh, CGC : Mr. Parth Jalan, Advocate [in FA No. 367 of 2018]
For Appellants (Claimants)	: Mr. S. K. Tripathi, Senior Advocate : Mr. Mitul Kumar, Advocate : Mr. Anand, Advocate : Mr. B.N. Dey, Advocate : Mr. S. K. Dey, Advocate : Mr. Rishabh Srivastava, Advocate : Mr. B. R. Rochan, Advocate [in FA 192 of 2014 and analogous cases except F.A. No. 367 of 2018]
For the State	: Mr. Om Prakash Tiwari, GP-III : Mr. Krishna Kr. Bhatt, AC to SC-I : Mr. Suresh Kumar, SC (L&C) II [in FA 468/2018 & FA 484/2018]
For the Respondents	: Mr. S. K. Tripathi, Senior Advocate : Mr. Mitul Kumar, Advocate : Mr. Anand, Advocate : Mr. B.N. Dey, Advocate : Mr. S. K. Dey, Advocate : Mr. Rishabh Srivastava, Advocate : Mr. B. R. Rochan, Advocate [in F.A. No. 367 of 2018]

Reserved on 01.12.2025 **Pronounced on 23.12.2025**

1. All these 399 first appeals arise out of the common Award dated 01.08.2014 read with Supplementary Award dated 18.09.2014 passed by the learned Arbitrator in Arbitration Case No.5 of 2013 in connection with requisition and acquisition of the respective lands of the claimants/land losers total measuring 1846.99 acres of land situated in four Villages namely, Sugnu, Lalganj, Khatanga and Gari for military / defence purposes. The Union of India has filed F.A. No.367 of 2018 under Section 11 of the ***Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act of 1952')*** against enhancement of compensation amounts awarded to the claimants/land losers vide impugned Award / Supplementary Award. The claimants/land losers have filed F.A. No.192 of 2014 and other analogous appeals (total 398 appeals) seeking enhancement of

compensation amounts awarded to them vide Award / Supplementary Award.

2. The award has been passed under the provisions of the aforesaid Act of 1952 and the learned arbitrator was appointed pursuant to the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 25.09.2012 in Civil Appeal No.7152 of 2012. The learned Arbitrator has enhanced the amount of compensation as assessed by the concerned authority with respect to land.

3. The learned Arbitrator passed the common Award dated 01.08.2014 and Supplementary Award dated 18.09.2014 in Arbitration Case No.5 of 2013 in the following manner: -

a. Appendix-1 to the award is the final list of awards. As per the award, Compensation for the Land (Market Value) at the time of acquisition has been fixed at flat rate for all types of lands for all the four villages @ Rs.41,750/- per acre.

b. The learned Arbitrator has awarded solatium @20% on the balance compensation amount and simple interest @ 9% per annum on the balance compensation amount and the solatium from 01.01.1976 to 31.07.2014 (date of award).

c. Certain omissions and errors were corrected by the supplementary award and it was also clarified that the award is concerned with the claimants/land losers under the 623 awards made by the competent authority as per **Appendix-1.**

d. **Appendix-2** to the Supplementary Award was made as per the substitutions, and the method of calculation.

e. The payment as per **Appendix-2** was directed to be made after proper verification and enquiry of the substitution petitions. The Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi (R-2) could also get the calculation in **Appendix-2** checked and it was also directed that if any person/legal heir interested in any Award, raised any claim/ objection, R-2 would decide it by a speaking order, after giving opportunity of hearing to the parties.

f. As per the award/supplementary award, the Respondent authority was directed to issue public notice and ensure payment

of the total compensation awarded as per Appendix-2, to the persons found entitled, in the following manner:

(i) The payments will be made by A/C payee cheques.

(ii) The competent authority will take affidavit from the claimants, with their photos affixed thereon, in which the claimants will give details of the person(s) with their bank details, in whose favour payment by cheque is to be made on behalf of all the claimants.

g. The exercise was to be undertaken and payments were directed to be made by 31.01.2015, failing which the authorities were to pay simple interest @ 15% per annum on the total compensation awarded from 01.02.2015 till the date of payment/ realization.

h. The award has been passed in the following format: -

Award

A.	Compensation for the Land (Market Value) at the time of acquisition per acre – flat rate, for all types of lands	Rs.41,750/=
B.	Deduct the amounts paid by the Competent Authority	Rs.
C.	"A" – "B"	Rs.
D.	Add Solatium @ 20% on amount "C"	Rs.
E.		Rs.
F.	Add Simple Interest @ 9% per annum on amount "E" from 01.01.1976 to 31.07.2014	Rs.
G.	Total compensation awarded	Rs.

It has been directed in the award itself that the award amount at "G" must be paid to the claimants/land losers in the manner specified by 31.01.2015, failing which the claimants/land losers will also be entitled to simple interest @ 15% per annum on the amount "G" from 01.02.2015 till the date of payment/realization.

4. The learned counsels for the parties advanced their arguments and also filed their respective written submissions. The gist is as under.

5. Written Submissions on behalf of Union of India

I. Chronology of Facts.

I.1. The land forming the subject matter of the instant appeal was requisitioned in 1941-42. Soon thereafter, the land was acquired in the year 1971-72. Compensation was paid to 80% of the land losers by 1975 without any protest. However, some land losers who were aggrieved with the compensation approached the Hon'ble Patna High Court by filing a writ petition, being CWJC No. 1590 of 1991, 2257 of 1991 and 2252 of 1991. The State of Bihar (now Jharkhand) appointed an arbitrator vide notification dated December 18, 1992, only for adjudication of those who had approached the Hon'ble High Court.

I.2. The aforesaid notification was modified on June 5, 1993 wherein all the land losers, i.e., apart from those who had approached the Hon'ble Court could get their compensation adjudged.

I.3. The notification dated June 5, 1993 was assailed before the Hon'ble Patna High Court in CWJC No. 8131 of 1993, during the pendency of which the notification was cancelled on November 18, 1993, wherein the appointment of arbitrator was again restricted to only those who had initially approached the Hon'ble High Court.

I.4. In the third round of litigation, the notification dated November 18, 1993 was challenged in CWJC No. 2273 of 1994(R), wherein the land losers sought to challenge the notification on the basis of discrimination. The High Court was pleased to dismiss the writ petition vide order passed in the year 2008.

This was assailed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 7152 of 2012. The Hon'ble Apex Court was pleased to appoint the Learned Arbitrator for all while clearly expressing that it had not expressed any view on the merits or demerits of the case. In terms thereof a fresh notification dated February 23, 2013 for all the land losers was issued.

II. Points of Determination with submissions.

II.1. Whether compensation can be increased for those who have accepted entire compensation, without protest?

II.1.1. It is not in dispute that the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to appoint the arbitrator for all the land losers. However, in its order dated September 25, 2012 passed in Civil Appeal No. 7152 of 2012, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to clearly hold that it had not expressed its opinion on the merits or demerits of the case.

II.1.2. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had not gone into the merits of the case. However, the High Court of Jharkhand in its order passed in CWJC No. 2273 of 1994(R) had crystallized all the facts. The High Court has categorically held that most of the land losers [including the writ petitioners in CWJC No. 2273 of 1994(R)] had accepted the payment without any protest. The High Court has held that they are not on the same footing as the other persons who had approached the High Court initially. Though the said order of the High Court was set aside, but the aforesaid fact was borne out from the record and as such those facts will be material for the adjudication of the present appeals.

II.1.3. The learned Arbitrator has failed to adjudicate the issue pertaining to the entitlement of such persons (i.e., who received compensation without any objection or demur) solely on the basis that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had been pleased to appoint arbitrator for such persons and that Form-K was never executed. In the attending facts of the case there was no arbitrable dispute for the said persons, as their case fell within the ambit of deemed acceptance. The appellant places reliance on the awards prepared by the competent authority ***(Marked as Exhibit R-2/A-3, R-2/B-3, R-2/C-3 & R-2/D-3)*** and submitted that the payment was without any protest.

II.1.4. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Munsha and Ors [1995 Supp (4) SCC 600]*** has categorically held that despite the agreement under Form-K not being executed, when there is no communication conveyed to the central government and no protest/refusal while receiving the compensation, then in such case delay would not be attributable to the State and it will be a case of deemed acceptance. However, the

factor to determine if there was a delay in the appointment of the arbitrator would be a demand/protest/demur from the side of the land losers. The relevant portion of the judgement relied upon are paragraphs 5 to 7 of the report.

II.1.5. In the case at hand, it is admitted that 80% of the persons had received the compensation without any protest or demur, and as such, they are not entitled to any enhanced compensation.

II.1.6. The Act of 1952 does not provide for any specific period of limitation for raising claims but clearly stipulates that the acceptance or otherwise has to be communicated within a period of 15 (fifteen) days. It is the specific case of the Union of India that even though the compensation was accepted by 80% of the persons without any protest or demur, there is no communication of any objection from their side. Reliance has been placed on the judgement of ***Union of India v. Satyawati (Smt) (1996) 7 SCC 740 and Ors*** , paragraph 5.

II.1.7. The land losers have failed to bring on record any evidence to substantiate their claim that compensation was accepted with any protest or demur. Reliance is placed on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Satyawati (Smt) and Ors (supra)***, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has categorically stated that where no action has been taken by the claimant with respect to communicating the objection for the award within the prescribed time (i.e. 15 days) as mentioned in Rule 9(6) of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Rules, 1953, it must be deemed that the award has been accepted. Thus, the case of the appellant (Union of India) is that in the present facts of the case there was no occasion to appoint an arbitrator for the purpose of determining compensation for such class of persons. It is significant to state that the purpose of the appointment of an arbitrator is only to determine compensation, and when the competent authorities' determination of compensation is accepted without any objection, in such circumstances there is no cause for appointment of an arbitrator. Moreover, as the prescribed time

under the Rules of 1953 is 15 (fifteen) days, the claims are also barred.

II.2. Whether Appellant (Union of India) can be held liable for any delay?

II.2.1. An arbitrator, as mandated under the scheme of the Act of 1952, was appointed upon the directions of the Hon'ble Court. The records reflect that the first set of litigation (i.e. CWJC Nos. 1590 of 1991, 2257 of 1991 and 2252 of 1991) was filed after a lapse of almost 16 (sixteen) years by the land losers. There is nothing to show that prior to the said period any demand/representation was made by the land losers for appointment of an arbitrator.

II.2.2. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Satyawati (Smt) and Ors (supra)*** has held that if no demand is made for the appointment of an arbitrator within a period of 15 (fifteen) days, there is to be a deemed acceptance of the compensation. The same is evident from the Awards, which is exhibited by the Union. This fact is further evident from the factual matrix recorded in the order passed in the case of ***Virendra Mahto v. Union of India [CWJC No. 2273 of 1994(R)].*** Reference has been made to paragraph 10 of the report .

II.2.3. Albeit the above decision with respect to the appointment of arbitrator was reversed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, no comments were made with respect to the merits of the case; rather, the Hon'ble Apex Court declined to make any comments on the merits or demerits of the case.

II.2.4. The land losers have not produced any evidence to show that any objection was raised by them within a period of 15 (fifteen) days. The same has also not been disputed by the land losers and the sole basis to seek enhancement of compensation is the fact that the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided to appoint an arbitrator. It is trite law that any liberty which is granted to a litigant (such as in the present case) does not give rise to any right. Reliance is placed on the case of ***Asgar v. Mohan Varma reported in (2020) 16 SCC 230***, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has clarified in para 21 of the report that when liberty is granted to a litigant to pursue an

alternative remedy as per law, then the Respondent is also free to raise all defences.

II.2.5. In light of the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Satyawati (Smt) and Ors (supra)*** and the absence of any evidence to show that the land losers had sought appointment of an arbitrator prior to 1991, the delay cannot be attributed to the State. It is not the case of the Claimants that they were not aware about the preparation of the award and the offers which were made to them.

II.3 Whether the learned Arbitrator has failed to take into consideration Section 8(3) of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952?

II.3.1. The objective for the enactment which pertains to the acquisition of law is different. While the acquisition under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 is general for commercial and public purposes (such as construction of road etc.), the land which was acquired under the Act of 1952 was for national interest and to regularize the land which was requisitioned earlier.

II.3.2.In light of the above, Section 8(3) of the Act of 1952 provides for a special and distinct method of computation of compensation which is payable.

II.3.3. Section 8(3) of the Act of 1952 has been interpreted by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Dayal Singh and Ors v. Union of India and Ors. reported in (2003) 2 SCC 593*** in paragraph 17 and 18 has held that the Act of 1952 is a self-contained code and the arbitrator must be conscious of the limitations as imposed under the Act of 1952. It has also been held that the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act and the 1952 Act are not in pari materia with the Land Acquisition Act, 1894; The mode and manner in which the compensation payable for acquisition of land under the 1952 Act and the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 are distinct and different and the provision of section 28 A – redetermination of the amount of compensation on the basis of the award of the court .

II.3.4. In the case at hand, the learned Arbitrator has failed to ignore the fact that the Claimants have themselves accepted that on

the date of requisition, the land in question was agricultural land. The said fact has been admitted by the land losers in their cross-examination. (Question 19 of the cross of witness no.1 and Question No.13 of cross of witness no.13) However, despite the same, the Learned Arbitrator has assumed that the land is residential in nature and thereafter computed the compensation on the basis of presumptions and conjectures.

II.3.5. The Learned Arbitrator has failed to provide any basis with respect to the 10% escalation of price granted for lands situated in the vicinity. It is submitted that though the principle of escalation and de-escalation may be an acceptable form to compute compensation, the escalation must be done keeping in mind all relevant facts. The award of the learned Arbitrator fails to provide any basis towards the 10% annual increment.

II.3.6. Moreso, the sale deeds relied upon by the learned Arbitrator are all with respect to residential plots; however, the nature of the land in the case at hand is admittedly agricultural in nature.

II.4. Whether the award of solatium and post-award interest legal?

II.4.1. It is submitted that the solatium and post-award interest which have been granted by the learned Arbitrator are contrary to law. It is submitted that solatium and post-award interest are not prescribed under the Act of 1952. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a plethora of judgements has taken a consistent stand that no solatium or additional interest is payable in cases of land acquisition under the Act of 1952.

II.4.2. In the case of ***Union of India v. Seneth Munda reported in (2010) 3 SCC 673***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para 10 of the report has held that landowners under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 vis-à-vis the Requisition and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952 are different, and interest and solatium on compensation is not legally tenable by referring to the judgement in the case of ***Union of India v. Chajju Ram (Died) reported in (2003) 5 SCC 568*** where in the Constitutional Bench

of the Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down that the Act of 1952 is a self-contained code and expressly held that the grant of solatium and interest is not contemplated under the Act of 1952 and as such the same is not payable. Reference has been made to paragraph 16 and 17 of the report.

II.4.3. 30% and the interest of 9 % strong reliance on the case of ***Harbans Singh Shanni Devi v. Union of India (CA No. 470 and 471 dated February 11, 1985)***, wherein the Hon'ble Court had not interfered with the grant of solatium and interest. It is submitted that the said judgement was passed in light of the peculiar fact that despite having requested the appointment of an arbitrator, the same was not done for 16 (sixteen) years. In light of the said peculiarity, the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the case of ***Union of India v. Chajju Ram (Died) (supra)***, has observed that the decision in ***Harbans Singh Shanni Devi (supra)*** cannot be said to be a binding precedent. The Union cannot be held liable for any delay, as despite taking the compensation without any demur or protest, the land loser had not raised any objection.

II.5. Whether the claimants are entitled for any enhancement in compensation?

II.5.1. The Claimants have argued that the compensation awarded by the learned Arbitrator is not in accordance with law and 2 (two) important exhibits have not been taken into consideration. It has been argued that ***Exhibit-4*** [Judgement rendered in the case of ***Mansoor Hassan v. State of Bihar reported in 1990 (1) BLJ 66)],*** is relating to an acquisition of the year 1971 for land situated in Ward No. 5 and 6 at Ranchi. In the said acquisition proceeding, a rate which is much higher than the present, was awarded to the land loser.

As with respect to the said exhibit, it is submitted that the land forming the subject matter of the proceedings referred to was located in Doranda. The map exhibited by the Claimants themselves will show that while the area of Doranda is located within the town area, the land forming the subject matter of the instant dispute is outside town area. Further, the proceedings in the

case of ***Mansoor Hassan (Supra)*** were under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and not under the Act of 1952.

II.5.2. The Claimants have next placed reliance on ***Exhibit-12*** to demonstrate that for an acquisition which took place in the year 1954 a compensation of ₹ 1,35,000/- per acre was awarded for land located in Ward No. 3 of Ranchi.

The said reliance is again not proper as in the said case, the land was located near Ranchi Club i.e. Main Road. The land was situated within the town area and unlike the land forming the subject matter of the instant case, which is admittedly situated in the outskirts.

The submission of the claimants that the land forms part of Ward No. 4, i.e., between Ward Nos. 3, 5 and 6, and as such the same measure is to be adopted for the land, is not a proven fact. On the contrary, if map (Exhibit-1) is perused, it will reveal that the land forming the subject matter of disputes in Exhibit-4 and Exhibit-12 is not contiguous with the land forming the subject matter of the instant dispute.

II.5.3. In the case of ***Manoj Kumar v. State of Haryana [(2018) 13 SCC 96]*** the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that a prior award is to be construed as evidence and should not be blindly followed. A reference has been made to paragraph 11 of the judgment.

II.5.4. The learned Arbitrator has rightly rejected the exhibits on the basis of significant distinction between the lands and accordingly, the Claimants are not entitled to any further enhancement.

6. <u>Written arguments of the claimants</u>

A. Hon'ble Supreme Court (Constitution Bench) in the case of ***Union of India Vs. Kamlabhai Harjiwan Das Parekh and others*** reported in ***1967 SCC online SC 149*** at para 6 has held that, under clause (a) of sub section (1) of Section 8 of the Act of 1952 compensation is to be paid in accordance with the agreement, if any, reached between the owner and the

government and if no such agreement can be reached, an arbitrator has to be appointed for the purpose in terms of clause (b).

B. It is an admitted fact of the present case that there is no document specifically Form 'K' and 'L' available which can establish that there was any agreement between the land losers and the government with regard to the actual market price of the acquired land. Since, there was no agreement arrived at between the parties for determining the amount of compensation and moreover the amount paid to the land losers is not in accordance with any such agreement, it was the bounden duty of the Central government to appoint an arbitrator without any further delay.

C. In absence of any such agreement it cannot be presumed that the land losers received whatever compensation amount as per their free will and have given their consent/acceptance for the same.

D. In view of the aforesaid judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the provision of the section 8 of the Act of 1952, there is no force or legal sanctity in the contention of the Union of India, inter alia, that the arbitration should have been confined with respect of only 20 land losers, who had preferred the Writ application before the Hon'ble High Court and not in respect of all the land losers.

E. It is pertinent to mention herein that the aforesaid contention of the Union of India is also devoid of any merit in the light of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Virendra Mahto and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors.; Civil Appeal No. 7152 of 2012, arising out of SLP (C) No. 20729 of 2008.*** Said Special Leave Petition was filed challenging the order passed by the High Court of Jharkhand at Ranchi in CWJC No. 2273 of 1994(R), whereby the High Court was pleased to dismiss the said writ petition on various grounds and thus declined the prayer for appointment of an arbitrator. The Hon'ble Supreme Court while allowing the Special Leave to Appeal held that, ***"the High Court, in our opinion, very strangely has dismissed the***

Writ petition filed by the petitioners". The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the said order at Para 6 and 7 has also held inter-alia that: -

> *"**6.** In our opinion, it may not be necessary to go into the details of the case, since we are of the considered opinion that the High Court was not justified in rejecting a reasonable request made by the petitioners in Writ Petition No. 2273 of 1995. At this stage we also take note of the fact that the persons who have lost their lands because of the requisitioning, are poor, illiterate and Scheduled Tribe people. In a matter of this nature, in our opinion, the good conscience should have prevailed on the respondents to have accepted the reasonable request made by the appellants, instead of arguing the matter on technicalities.*
>
> ***7.** In view of the above, while allowing this appeal, we restore the order/notification passed/issued by the State Government dated 05.06.1993. We are informed that the Arbitrator appointed under the aforesaid notification is no more. Therefore, we direct the State Government to appoint a new arbitrator (retired High Court Judge) to decide the lis between the appellants and others and also in respect of those persons who have lost their lands pursuant to the notification issued by the State Government dated 05.06.1993 as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a month's time from the date of receipt of this Court's order…"*

F. In view of the aforesaid order, it would be absolutely wrong to say that the present arbitration should be confined only in respect to the persons who had filed the Writ petition before the High Court. The aforesaid SLP was filed in the representative capacity and the same was approved/accepted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

G. Once an arbitrator is appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to decide the lis between the parties, it would be of no use to indulge in the fact that whether the land losers had accepted the amount with protest or not, or whether the land losers received the full amount or 80% of the compensation amount. Once the arbitrator

has been appointed it is deemed that no agreement was arrived at between the parties with regard to the compensation amount.

H. In view of the same, the stand/ground taken by the Union of India that the learned arbitrator is wrong in passing the award in favour of all the land losers, whose names have been mentioned/found in the notification dated 05.06.1993, is legally not sustainable. Such a stand would amount to an act of interfering with the aforesaid order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

I. Before the learned arbitrator, the land losers have examined four witnesses of the four villages whereas the Union of India has examined three witnesses in support of their case. Apart from that, the Claimants have produced/filed altogether 14 documents, whereas the Union of India have filed 13 documents in support of their case. It is submitted that in their depositions all the four witnesses of the Claimants have categorically stated, *inter-alia*, that the land is situated around NH 33, abutting the Ranchi Town, the state highway is also there, the Namkum Railway Station is 3 to 4 kms. away, the land of all four villages became semi town, nearby the villages there are so many industries, school, hospital, rice mill, etc.., near thereby there is Tatisilway Railway Station, in the south of the Village Gari there is Kokar Industrial Area wherein many industries like head office of newspaper group, wine factory, office of Electricity Board is existing etc. Exhibit 1 of the claimants i.e. the map of Kanke Anchal, District. Ranchi is also reflecting that the NH-33 is crossing in between Village Gari and the Namkum Railway Station and Kokar is nearby. It is pertinent to mention herein that nothing has been put in cross examination by the Union of India controverting the said statement made by the witnesses of the Claimants. Even the respondents failed to produce any document to establish that the compensation amount paid to the land losers was a fair amount and that the statements made by the witnesses of the Claimants are not correct.

J. Before the learned arbitrator, in order to establish their claim (i.e.; 2,00,000/- per acre), the Claimants heavily placed reliance upon the Exhibit 12 i.e.; the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Smt. Tribeni Devi and Others Vs. Collector of Ranchi and vice versa, reported in (1972 (1) SCC 480 (3 Judges Bench)***. It is submitted that the said case was related to Acquisition of land situated in Ward No. 3 of Ranchi Municipality in the year 1954. The Court in that case passed a decree in respect of the lands acquired as follows:

(1) At the rate of Rs 1,35,000/- per acre for 4.65 acres;

(2) 5 per cent severance and 15 per cent solatium on the market value computed as in (1);

(3) Interest at 6 per cent from the date of taking possession.

K. It is submitted that this document (exhibit-12) has not been taken into consideration by the Learned arbitrator on the ground that land in the said case was situated on the Ranchi Chaibasa Road, which is factually not correct. The correct fact is that, the land acquired in the said case was not situated in Main Ranchi Chaibasa Road but sale deed Exhibit C-1 of that case was relating to sale deed executed by the Ranchi Club for the property situated on Ranchi Chaibasa Main Road.

L. The learned arbitrator also erred in not considering the fact that the District Land Acquisition Officer (D.W. No. 3) in cross examination at Para 8 has accepted that Village Gari is within Ward No. 4 of Municipal Corporation.

M. It is submitted that for the acquisition of the land in the year 1954 situated in Ward No. 3, the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed a decree fixing the market rate of that land @ of Rs. 1,35,000/- per acre, whereas the Learned Arbitrator has fixed the market rate of the land situated in Ward No. 4, acquired in the year 1971 at only Rs. 41,750/- per acre. It is submitted that it would be difficult to believe that nearly about after 17 years, the rate of the land

situated in next ward, that is , ward no.4, would be only Rs. 41,750/- per acre.

N. The learned arbitrator also erred in not taking consideration of Exhibit 4, i.e., a judgement of the Hon'ble Patna High Court, Ranchi Bench at Ranchi in the case of ***Mansoor Hasan and Ors. Vs. State of Bihar, dated 05.02.1990*** dealing with acquisition of land situated in Ward No.5 & 6 of Doranda within Ranchi municipality in the year 1971. In the said judgment, the High Court by taking note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Smt. Tribeni Devi & Ors. Vs. Collector of Ranchi (supra)*** was pleased to affirm the compensation of Rs. 2,50,000/- per acre. The reason given by the Learned Arbitrator for not considering this Exhibit 4 is that the land in the present case was situated near the railway Station and Bus Stand. However, the Learned Arbitrator failed to take note of the fact that in the deposition of witnesses of the claimants it has come that Namkum railway station is situated within 3-4 kilometres from south of their villages and the Tatisilway railway station also exists near their villages and hence the reason given by the Learned Arbitrator for not considering the Ext.4 is not justified.

O. Considering the fact that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Tribeni Devi (supra)*** was pleased to fix the market rate for the land situated in ward No.3 acquired in the year 1954 at the rate of Rs.1,35,000/- per acre and further the High Court was pleased to affirm the market rate of the land situated in Ward No.5 & 6 acquired in the year 1971 at the rate of 2,50,000/- per acre, it cannot be believed from any angle that just and reasonable market rate of the land situated in ward No.4 acquired in the year 1971 would be at the rate of 41,750/- per acre.

P. The Learned Arbitrator also erred in not considering the oral evidence/depositions in its true perspective specially in respect of the locality of the land and its potential value etc., which has been reflected from the said depositions and cross examination of the respondent witnesses and also reflected from Ext.1 (the

map) and Ext.10 (DLO Report/Order). It is submitted that apart from the Ext.1, witness No.2 of the respondent has accepted in his cross examination that NH-33 runs between Ranchi and the Four villages in question. Further, respondent's witness no. 3 in his cross examination has also accepted that from a perusal of a copy of Anchal Map produced on behalf of the Land loser, it appears that the road connecting NH passes through the villages Khatanga and Lalganj. The Respondent Witness no. 1 has also stated in his cross examination that between Ranchi Town and said four villages, NH33 is situated. The Land Acquisition Officer, Ranchi in his order/report dated 19.04.1972 (Ext.10) has also mentioned that agricultural lands of any class near "basti" and town are being used for building purposes and as such they may be treated as Single class of land for the purpose of valuation of land, valuation on the basis of their present disposition i.e. on the basis of classification of land based on agriculture will not be applicable in this case as these lands are near Ranchi Town.

Q. That apart from these two judgments (i.e. exhibit- 12 and 4), the claimants had also produced other documents before the Learned arbitrator. One of such documents is the Ext.9. A bare perusal of this Ext. 9, which is the sale deed of the year 1971, it seems that the said sale deed was executed between the known people and the value of the land has been underestimated and the same seems to be a distress sale. Hence, fixing the market value of the land in question on the basis of this document (Ext.9) alone, may not be justified by ignoring the exhibit- 12 and 4. Ext.8, is a sale deed dated 13.11.1962 of Village Lalganj whereby the land was sold at the rate of Rs.30,000/- per acre. Considering the same it would be highly unbelievable that after about 9 years the rate of the land (Ext.9) would be only Rs. 27,000/- per acre. Accordingly, the Ext.9 cannot be taken as the basis for fixing the market value of the land in question as the rate mentioned therein is very much doubtful.

R. The Learned Arbitrator not only erred in fixing the market rate of the land in question at the rate of Rs. 41,750/- per acre, but also erred in not granting solatium at the rate of 30%, specifically in view of the market rate given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court in the above mentioned two judgments and in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the Case of ***Defence Estate Officer Vs. Syed Abdul Saleem & Ors.*** whereby, the award giving solatium at the rate of 30% and the interest at the rate of 9%, was affirmed. Further, Ext. 11 which is the order dated 11.02.1985 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Harbans Singh Sanni Devi Vs. Union of India*** has also granted solatium at the rate of 30% and the interest of 9 %.

S. The judgments on which reliance has been placed upon by the respondent/appellant (Union of India) are not applicable in the present case. The judgments placed by the Union of India on the point that it is the duty of the claimants/land losers to approach the competent authority and raise objections within stipulated time for appointment of arbitrator, are not good law/per incurium in view of the Constitution Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India Vs. Kamla Bhai Harjiwan Das Parekh & Ors.*** and also, in view of the provision of section 8 (1) (a) & (b) of the Act of 1952. It is submitted that it would not be justified to reagitate the points and place reliance upon the points which were already taken by the respondents before the High Court in CWJC No.2273 of 1994(R), as the judgment passed by the High Court in the year 2008 was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court whereby leave was granted and a direction was passed to appoint an arbitrator while not agreeing the view taken by the High Court. Hence, the judgment passed by the High Court in the year 2008 merged with the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 25.09.2012.

T. So far as reliance placed upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India & Ors. Vs. Sneth Munda &***

Ors. is concerned, it is submitted that the said judgment is neither applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case. It is not clear from the said judgement what were the facts in that case in which the decision was given. Granting/allowing the post award interest by the arbitrator in the event when the awarded amount was not deposited in stipulated time, is not unreasonable as it does not tantamount to payment of interest on interest. It is submitted that if post award interest is not granted then it would be very difficult for the award holder to realize the awarded amount and the judgment debtor would take advantage and not deposit the awarded amount in time. In this case the lands were acquired in the year 1971, the arbitrator was appointed nearly after 40 years and the award was passed on 01.08.2014. There is no stay granted by this Hon'ble Court against the said award. Despite this fact, till date the awarded amount has neither been paid to the claimants/land losers nor the same has been deposited in the Court. It is submitted that though the Arbitration Act is not applicable to the Act of 1952, however, the principle behind awarding post award interest has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the Case of ***M/S Hyder Consulting (UK) Ltd. Vs. Governor, State of Orissa Tr. Chief Eng. Reported in 2015 (2) SCC 109*** and in the case of ***North Delhi Municipal Corporation -Versus- M/S S.A. Builders Ltd***.

U. Most of the claimants are poor, illiterate and persons belonging to Scheduled Tribe. They have been waiting since the last 40 years for getting a just and fair market value/compensation of their land which was acquired under compulsory acquisition by Union of India way back in the year 1971.

7. The claimants have placed reliance upon the following judgements in support of their case/claim:

Sl. No.	**Name of the case**	**Citation**	**Para No.**
1.	Union of India vs. Kamlabhai Harjiwandas Parekh and others	1967 SCC OnLine SC 149	6

2.	New Okhla Industrial Development Authority Vs Harnand Singh (Deceased) Through Lrs and Others	2024 SCC OnLine SC 1691	35
3.	Defence Research and Development organisation Vs. Anjanappa and Another	(2014) 15 SCC 161	5
4.	Gujrat Mineral Development Corporation Vs. Ram Sang Bahilalbhai	(2015) 11 SCC 483	1 & 5
5.	Haryana State Industrial Development Corporation Limited Vs. Udal and others	AIR 2013 SC 3111	22
6.	General Manager, Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited Vs. Rameshbhai Jivanbhai Patel	(2008) 14 SCC 745	7
7.	Attar Singh Vs. Union of India	(2009) 9 SCC 289	10
8.	Ram Kishan (since deceased) through His Lrs. Vs. State of Haryana	AIR 2025 SC 2306	13
9.	Rajendra Kumar Vs. State of U.P.	1993 LAC 577	18
10.	Bernard Francis Joseph Vaz Vs. Government of Karnataka	SLP(C) No. 10338 of 2023 decided on 02.01.2025	42, 43, 47
11.	Dilawar Singh Vs. Union of India	(2010) 14 SCC 357	13-16
12.	Defence Estate Officer Vs. Syed Abdul Saleem	(2015) 12 SCC 294	6-7
13.	Union of India Vs. Hari Krishan Khosla (Dead) by Lrs.	1993 Supp (2) SCC 149	79
14.	EXT. 11(Harbans Singh Shanni Devi and Others v. Union of India and Others).	Order dated 11.02.1985 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP(C) Nos. 12723 and 12747 of 1984	
15.	Ashok Kumar Vs. State of Haryana	(2016) 4 SCC 544	6-7
16.	Narendra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh	(2017) 9 SCC 426	8, 11-12
17.	Union of India, Ministry of Defence through Defence Estates Officer, Danapur, Patna Vs. Sita Ram	F.A. No. 3 of 2005	Last Para
18.	Ajay Pal Vs. State of Haryana	(2015) 14 SCC 462	4-7
19.	Union of India Vs. Sanicharwa Lakra	Civil Appeal No. 8287 of 2002	

8. The learned counsel has also submitted that since no agreement was available on record in Form – K, the State Government had rightly issued the notification in the year 1993 for the purposes of adjudication of claim of all the land losers.

9. The learned counsel for the claimants has submitted that once the process of payment of compensation was not complete, the judgement passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India and Others Vs. Munsha and Ors. reported in 1995 Supp. (4) SCC 660*** was not applicable. Consequently, the subsequent judgement following this judgement passed in the case of ***Union of India Vs. Satyawati and Ors.*** reported ***in (1996) 7 SCC 740*** was also not applicable. The learned counsel has submitted that the judgement of ***Dayal Singh and others Vs. Union of India and Ors.*** reported in ***(2003) 2 SCC 593*** is not applicable inasmuch as in the said case, the parties had entered into the agreement in the required form and there was a concluded contract between the parties.

10. Learned counsel for the claimants has referred to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***(2010) 3 SCC 673 (Union of India versus Seneth Munda and Others)*** and has submitted that the said judgment cannot be read in the manner to exclude interest on the component of interest which stood crystalized on the date of Award. He has submitted that the learned Arbitrator has rightly awarded the post award interest also, by including all the three components i.e. the awarded amount, the solatium and the interest component, and therefore, the post award interest would carry interest on all the three components after the cut-off date as stipulated by the learned Arbitrator.

11. The learned counsel has also submitted that the award passed by the learned Arbitrator is essentially a money decree which has to be paid within the stipulated time and the interest component till the date of the Award partakes the character of principle amount, and therefore, the post award interest will run on all the three components i.e. the award, solatium and interest component accrued till the date of the award as the claimants were entitled for payment immediately after the

award. Having not paid, the delayed payment interest at the rate of 15% with default clause was given by the learned Arbitrator and the same does not call for any interference by this Court.

12. He has placed the aforesaid judgment of ***Seneth Munda*** **(supra)** in full and has submitted that the arbitral award was passed with awarded amount, solatium and interest @ 9% per annum on the balance amount payable to the claimants with a default clause that if the amount is not paid, the rate of interest would be 12% per annum. He further submits that the High Court interfered with the award of the Arbitral tribunal only to the extent of reducing the post awarded interest from 12% to 9% with a default clause that if the amount is not paid within three months, then the post award interest would carry interest @ 12% per annum. The High Court has also extended the period for payment but the same was not honoured by the Union of India. It was only in the contempt proceeding there was a direction to pay interest @ 12% from 22.06.2003 (appears to be the date of award) till 25.11.2006 (appears to be the date of payment) and the quantified amount on which the interest was to be paid @ 12% from 22.06.2003 to 25.11.2006 was on a sum of Rs. 1,37,98,860.08. The Union of India was in appeal and the claimants before the Hon'ble Supreme Court had contended that 12% interest was payable on the awarded amount, solatium and also the amount of interest. However, the Hon'ble Supreme Court ultimately held that payment of 12 % interest on the entire aforesaid amount from 22.06.2003 to 25.11.2006 would tantamount to payment of interest on interest which was not permissible under the Act and consequently the order of the High Court in the contempt jurisdiction was set aside.

13. The learned counsel for the claimants perused R-2/A-3, R-2/B-3, R-2/C-3 and R-2/D-3, but at the same time the learned counsels did not accept that entire awarded amount as quantified by DLAO was paid to any of the claimants and have asserted that only 80% amount was paid to many of the claimants and have also asserted that the documents contain the signature of DLAO showing as 'paid' and the signatures are not of the claimants. The claimants had received payment through

vouchers where they had mentioned that the payment was being received under protest.

Some observation/modification of the cause title

14. The Union of India has filed the amended cause title in ***F.A. No. 367 of 2018*** pursuant to the order passed by this court and the cause title in this final judgement has been prepared in terms of the amended cause title with slight change by inserting State of Jharkhand as Respondent no. 1(a) as the State of Jharkhand was directed to be added as 1(a) pursuant to earlier order passed in the said case.

15. At the time of finalizing this judgement certain discrepancies in the matter of substitution/ deletion of the appellants(claimants) in some of the first appeals have been noticed which appears to be on account of inadvertent errors and accordingly the following modification is made: -

a. **I.A. No. 10141 of 2025 in F.A. No. 218 of 2014**

In order dated 01.08.2025 in paragraph 43 dealing with I.A. No. 10141 of 2025 in F.A. No. 218 of 2014 prayer for substitution of the appellants, namely, Fukmani Devi and Lalit Kurmi were subject matter of consideration, but they have been wrongly numbered as appellant no. 1 and 3 in the interlocutory application and accordingly, they have been mentioned as appellant no. 1 and 3 in the order also but they are appellant nos. 1 and 2 respectively. ***Consequently, in paragraph 43 of the order dated 01.08.2025, the appellant no. 3 is directed to be read as appellant no. 2.***

b. **I.A. No. 10246 of 2025 in F.A. No. 525 of 2014**

In order dated 01.08.2025 in paragraph 175 dealing with I.A. No. 10246 of 2025 in F.A. No. 525 of 2014 it has been recorded that through the interlocutory application prayer for substitution of appellant nos. 1 and 2, namely, Habil Kachhap and Birsa Oraon was made, although upon perusal of the interlocutory application, it appears that prayer for substitution of only appellant no. 1, namely, Habil Kachhap was made and there was also a prayer for deletion of appellant nos. 2 and 3, namely, Birsa Oraon and Munna Oraon respectively stating that they have died issueless.

Accordingly, the reference to appellant no. 2 in line nos. 2, 5 and 7 of paragraph ***175 is directed to be deleted. Further the following words are directed to be added at the end of paragraph 178 : -***

> ***"The name of appellant nos. 2 and 3 is directed to be deleted from the cause title."***

c. <u>I.A. No. 10705 of 2025 in F.A. No. 295 of 2014</u>

In order dated 12.08.2025 in paragraph 11 dealing with I.A. No. 10705 of 2025 in F.A. No. 295 of 2014, the prayer for substitution has been allowed with respect to appellant nos. 1, 3 and 5, namely, Mangal Mahto, Baijnath Mahto and Choten Mahto respectively, although the records reveal that the appellant, namely, Choten Mahto is appellant no. 7 and not appellant no. 5.

Consequently, the reference to appellant no. 5 in line nos. 3, 6 and 8 of paragraph 11 is directed to be read as appellant no. 7.

d. <u>I.A. No. 10710 of 2025 in F.A. No. 318 of 2014</u>

From perusal of the records, it appears that in I.A. No. 10710 of 2025 in F.A. No. 318 of 2014, a reference has been made to substitute the legal heirs of appellant nos. 1,6, 7, 9 and 12, however, there are no such appellants as appellant no. 7,9 and 12 in the cause title of F.A. No. 318 of 2014.

Accordingly, the reference to appellant nos. 7, 9 and 12 in line no. 2,3,6 and 8 of paragraph 53 of order dated 12.08.2025 is directed to be deleted.

e. <u>I.A. No. 10708 of 2025 in F.A. No. 320 of 2014</u>

In order dated 12.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 10708 of 2025 in F.A. No. 320 of 2014 in paragraph 59, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant no. 3, namely, Basudeo Munda, however, from perusal of the records, it appears that the Basudeo Munda is appellant no. 2 and not appellant no. 3.

Consequently, in line no. 2,5 and 7 in paragraph 59 of order dated 12.08.2025, the appellant no. 3 is directed to be read as appellant no. 2.

f. <u>I.A. No. 10713 of 2025 in F.A. No. 333 of 2014</u>

From perusal of the records, it appears that in I.A. No. 10713 of 2025 in F.A. No. 333 of 2014, a reference has been made to substitute the legal heirs of appellant nos. 1,6, 7, 9 and 12, however, there are no such appellants as appellant no. 7,9 and 12 in the cause title of F.A. No. 333 of 2014.

Accordingly, the reference to appellant nos. 7, 9 and 12 in line no. 2,3,6 and 8 of paragraph 83 of order dated 12.08.2025 is directed to be deleted.

g. <u>I.A. No. 11411 of 2025 in F.A. No. 286 of 2014</u>

In order dated 26.08.2025 in paragraph 42 dealing with I.A. No. 11411 of 2025 in F.A. No. 286 of 2014, it has been recorded that this interlocutory application has been filed seeking substitution of appellant nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5, namely, Kishan (Kario) Munda, Raspati Munda, Jitan Mundain and Sikari Munda respectively. However, from perusal of interlocutory application, it appears that prayer for substitution has been made only with respect to appellant nos. 1, 3 and 4 and a prayer has been made to delete the name of appellant no. 5 having died issueless.

Accordingly, the reference of appellant no. 5- Sikari Munda in line no. 2,6 and 8 in paragraph 42 of order dated 26.08.2025 is directed to be deleted and further following words are directed be added in order dated 26.08.2025 with respect to appellant no. 5 at the end of paragraph 44 of the order dated 26.08.2025 : -

> ***"The appellant no. 5 is directed to be deleted from the cause title."***

h. <u>I.A. No. 11771 of 2025 in F.A. No. 362 of 2014</u>

In order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11771 of 2025 in F.A. No. 362 of 2014 in paragraph 227, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant nos. 1 and 8, namely, Asmiya Devi and Uday Karmali respectively. However, from perusal of the records, it appears that said Uday Karmali is appellant no. 9 and not appellant no. 8.

Consequently, in paragraph 227 of order dated 26.08.2025, the appellant no. 8 is directed to be read as appellant no. 9 in line number 2,5 and 7.

i. **I.A. No. 11437 of 2025 in F.A. No. 289 of 2014**

In order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11437 of 2025 in F.A. No. 289 of 2014 in paragraph 47, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant nos. 1, 8 and 10 namely, Balku Mahto, Madan Mahto and Tilak Mahto respectively. However, from perusal of the records, it appears that the said Madan Mahto and Tilak Mahto are appellant nos. 9 and 11 and not appellant no. 8 and 10.

Consequently, in line number 2,5 ,7 and 8 of paragraph 47 of order dated 26.08.2025, the ***appellant nos. 8 and 10 is directed to be read as appellant no. 9 and 11.***

j. **I.A. No. 11765 of 2025 in F.A. No. 377 of 2014**

In order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11765 of 2025 in F.A. No. 377 of 2014 in paragraph 252, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant nos. 1 and 8, namely, Asmiya Devi and Uday Karmali respectively. However, from perusal of the records, it appears that the said Uday Karmali is appellant no. 9 and not appellant no. 8.

Consequently, in line no. 2,5 and 7 paragraph 252 of order dated 26.08.2025, the appellant no. 8 is directed to be read as appellant no. 9.

k. **I.A. No. 11766 of 2025 in F.A. No. 454 of 2014**

In order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11766 of 2025 in F.A. No. 454 of 2014 in paragraph 356, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant nos. 1 and 8, namely, Asmiya Devi and Uday Karmali respectively. However, from perusal of the records, it appears that the said Uday Karmali is appellant no. 9 and not appellant no. 8.

Consequently, in line no. 2,5 and 7 of paragraph 356 of order dated 26.08.2025, the appellant no. 8 is directed to be read as appellant no. 9.

l. <u>I.A. No. 11772 of 2025 in F.A. No. 408 of 2014</u>

In order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11772 of 2025 in F.A. No. 408 of 2014 in paragraph 292, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant nos. 1 and 8, namely, Asmiya Devi and Uday Karmali respectively. However, from perusal of the records, it appears that the said Uday Karmali is appellant no. 9 and not appellant no. 8.

Consequently, in line no. 2,5 and 7 of paragraph 292 of order dated 26.08.2025, the appellant no. 8 is directed to be read as appellant no. 9.

m. <u>I.A. No. 11677 of 2025 in F.A. No. 451 of 2014</u>

In order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11677 of 2025 in F.A. No. 451 of 2014, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant no. 2, namely, Chittranjan Jaiswal. However, from perusal of the records, it appears that the name of appellant no. 2, namely, Chittranjan Jaiswal mentioned in the interlocutory application does not appear in the cause title mentioned in the memo of appeal. There is also a prayer for deletion of appellant no.1, namely Savitri Devi Jaiswal stating that her legal heirs are already on record.

Accordingly, in line no. 9 of para 353 of order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11677 of 2025 in F.A. No. 451 of 2014 the words "and substitution of appellant no.2" is directed to be deleted.

n. <u>I.A. No. 10987 of 2025 in F.A. No. 513 of 2014</u>

In F.A. No. 513 of 2014, there is only one appellant, namely, Phul Kumari Jaiswal. However, from paragraph 380 of order dated 26.08.2025, it appears that a submission was made to seek deletion of the name of appellant no. 1, namely, Phul Kumari Jaiswal and it was also submitted that her legal heirs and successors are already on record, although there is no other appellant in this case.

It has been observed that the deceased appellant no. 1, namely, Phul Kumari Jaiswal was also party in F.A. Nos. 427/2014, 482/2014, 506/2014 and 527/2014 in which her name has been

deleted by stating that her legal representative, namely, Naveen Kumar Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal is already on record. Admittedly, Phul Kumari Jaiswal is wife of Prabhu Shankar Jaiswal and Naveen Kumar Jaiswal is her son.

Consequently, paragraph 382 of order dated 26.08.2025 is modified by adding the following words ***at its end: -***

> ***"The sole Appellant is substituted by her legal representative, namely, Naveen Kumar Jaiswal S/o Prabhu Shankar."***

o. <u>I.A. No. 11676 of 2025 in F.A. No. 522 of 2014</u>

In order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11676 of 2025 in F.A. No. 522 of 2014, a reference has been made with regard to substitution of appellant no. 2, namely, Chittranjan Jaiswal. However, from perusal of the records, it appears that the name of appellant no. 2, namely, Chittranjan Jaiswal mentioned in the interlocutory application does not appear in the cause title mentioned in the memo of appeal. There is also a prayer for deletion of appellant no.1, namely Savitri Devi Jaiswal stating that her legal heirs are already on record.

Accordingly, in line no. 9 of para 387 of order dated 26.08.2025 dealing with I.A. No. 11676 of 2025 in F.A. No. 522 of 2014 the words "and substitution of appellant no.2" is directed to be deleted.

<u>Findings of this Court.</u>

16. It is not in dispute during the course of arguments that the properties involved in these cases are relating to ward no. 4 falling in Ranchi Municipal Area. Exhibit-4 relates to ward nos. 5 and 6-Doranda and Exhibit 12 relates to ward no. 3.

<u>Background relating to appointment of Arbitral Tribunal</u>

17. Before proceeding further, it would be relevant to refer to the background in which the learned arbitrator was appointed which is as follows: -

i. The property in the present case was requisitioned by the Defence of India way back in the year 1941 and they remained in possession of the property. The lands relating to 4 villages

namely, Sugnu, Gari, Lalganj and Khatanga were acquired under Section 7 of the aforesaid Act of 1952 on 30.05.1970. Thereafter, the compensation was assessed and was said to have been paid to a number of land losers. However, some of the land losers had approached the authority for appointment of arbitrator to determine the correct value of the land acquired, but no steps were taken and ultimately those land losers filed writ petition in the year 1991 for appointment of Arbitrator. The High Court directed for appointment of an arbitrator under Section 8(1)(b) of the aforesaid Act of 1952 within three months and to determine the quantum of compensation on the basis of market value relating to the land of land-losers. This was followed by a notification dated 18.12.1992 issued by the State Government appointing Sri R.C.P Sinha a Retired Judge of Patna High Court as an Arbitrator.

ii. Immediately thereafter, the Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi noticed that the arbitrator was appointed in connection with only those persons who had approached the High Court in writ jurisdiction.

iii. The Deputy Commissioner on his own requested the government to issue notification for inclusion of other cases relating to all the land-losers and to modify the notification dated 18.12.1992.

iv. Consequently, a notification dated 05.06.1993 was issued modifying the earlier notification dated 18.12.1992 including the other cases of land-losers, interalia, of the aforesaid four villages for determining the rate of the land.

v. Since, the scope of arbitration was extended beyond those persons who had filed the writ petitions in the year 1991, the fresh notification dated 05.06.1993 was challenged by the Central Government before the High Court.

vi. In the meantime, the Deputy Commissioner, again sent a letter dated 30.10.1993 requesting for cancellation of the notification dated 05.06.1993 indicating that 05.06.1993 notification referring all the cases for arbitration may not be proper.

Thereafter, on the basis of the letter dated 30.10.1993 the State Government issued notification dated 18.11.1993 cancelling the notification dated 05.06.1993 and restoring the notification dated 18.12.1992.

vii. It was the subsequent notification dated 18.11.1993 which was challenged by altogether 20 petitioners on their behalf and on behalf of other land-losers and the said writ petition was subject matter of consideration before this Court in the case of ***"Virendra Mahato and Others vs. Union of India" reported in 2008 (1) JCR 415 (Jhr.)*** a copy of which has been placed on record by the learned counsel for the Union of India. The said writ petition filed by ***Virendra Mahato and Others (Supra)*** was dismissed by Division Bench of this Court in the year 2008 citing numerous reasons for dismissal. Thus, the notification dated 18.12.1992 survived confining the arbitration only to those persons who had earlier filed writ petition way back in the year 1991 seeking appointment of arbitrator.

viii. The said judgment passed by this Court in the year 2008 in the case of ***Virendra Mahato (Supra)*** was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***S.L.P (C) No. 20729 of 2008*** in which leave was granted and it was numbered as ***Civil Appeal No. 7152 of 2012***. The ***Civil Appeal No. 7152 of 2012*** was allowed in terms of order dated 25.09.2012. The Hon'ble Supreme Court observed in paragraph 4 of the said judgment as under: -

> *"4. Since similarly situated persons had approached the State Government to issue an appropriate notification referring their matters also before the arbitrator, the State Government by issuing a Notification dated 05.06.1993 had referred the cases of all the persons notified under that notification for adjudication of their claims for compensation by an arbitrator. Subsequently, the said notification came to be withdrawn for the reasons best known to them alone. Aggrieved by the action of the State Government, the petitioners went before the High Court in Writ Petition No.2273 of 1994. The High Court, in our opinion, very strangely has dismissed the writ petition filed by the petitioners. That is how, the appellants, inter*

alia, claiming that they have filed this appeal in the representative capacity, are before us in this appeal."

ix. Thus, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was of the view that the High Court was not justified in rejecting a reasonable request made by the writ petitioners and the Hon'ble Supreme Court also took note of the fact that the persons who have lost their lands because of requisitioning, are poor, illiterate and Schedule Tribe people and in a matter of this nature, the good conscience should have prevailed on the respondents of the case i.e. Union of India and Others to have accepted the reasonable request made by the claimants instead of arguing the matter on mere technicalities. Paragraph 6 of the aforesaid judgment is quoted as under: -

"6. In our opinion, it may not be necessary to go into the details of the case, since we are of the considered opinion that the High Court was not justified in rejecting a reasonable request made by the petitioners in Writ Petition No. 2273 of 1995. At this stage we also take note of the fact that the persons who have lost their lands because of the requisitioning, are poor, illiterate and Scheduled Tribe people. In a matter of this nature, in our opinion, the good conscience should have prevailed on the respondents to have accepted the reasonable request made by the appellants, instead of arguing the matter on technicalities."

x. The Hon'ble Supreme Court ultimately restored the notification issued by the State Government dated 05.06.1993 and upon being informed that the Arbitrator appointed under the said notification was no more, the State Government was directed to appoint a new Arbitrator, a Retired High Court Judge, to decide the *lis* between the parties pursuant to the notification issued by the State Government dated 05.06.1993 as expeditiously as possible which included those persons who have lost their lands. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the aforesaid judgment are quoted as under: -

"7. In view of the above, while allowing this appeal, we restore the order/notification passed/issued by the State Government dated 05.06.1993. We are informed that the

Arbitrator appointed under the aforesaid notification is no more. Therefore, we direct the State Government to appoint a new arbitrator (retired High Court Judge) to decide the lis between the appellants and others and also in respect of those persons who have lost their lands pursuant to the notification issued by the State Government dated 05.06.1993 as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a month's time from the date of receipt of this Court's order. We further request the learned arbitrator, who may be nominated/appointed by the State Government, to decide the lis between the parties as expeditiously as possible in view of the fact that the requisition of these lands was done by the Central Government way back in the year 1972.

8. We clarify that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits or demerits of the case of the parties to the lis."

xi. The Hon'ble Supreme Court clarified that they have not expressed any opinion on the merits or demerits of the case of the parties to the lis.

xii. Pursuant to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the learned Arbitrator was appointed to decide lis between the parties.

The Arbitral proceedings.

18. The specific case of the claimants as recorded by the learned Arbitrator under Chapter II in a summary manner is quoted as under:

CLAIMANT'S CASE

1. The land losers/claimant's case and their arguments are summarized as under:

a) Nearly 2000 acres of land for military purposes in 4 villages were requisitioned in the year 1941-42, and then have been acquired in the year 1971, by the respondents.

b) The compensation paid for acquisition was very low. It was not assessed as per the law. Moreover it was assessed and paid by categorizing the lands arbitrarily, as the nature and character of land changed during requisition period of 30 years.

c) The land losers had received the payment made to the extent of 80% under protest and claimed proper compensation.

d) *In the circumstances, the authorities were obliged to appoint Arbitrator, but it was not done inspite of repeated requests. Hence litigation started in the year 1991.*

Ultimately the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide its aforesaid order dt. 25.09.2012 directed the State Government to appoint an arbitrator to decide the cases of all those who have lost their lands pursuant to the notification issued by the State Government dt. 05.06.1993. (In Chapter I Short synopsis, the details of litigation has been narrated and therefore it is not repeated here).

e) *The area in question was already developed in the year 1971, after requisition was done 30 years ago in the year 1941-42.*

f) *Though the lands had irrigation facilities, the nature and use thereof changed during last 30-40 years and the area became urbanized and therefore the lands could not be categorized and treated as agricultural lands, by the Respondents.*

g) *The authorities did not take into consideration the relevant matters while fixing compensation.*

h) *The acquired lands have very high potentialities having good irrigation facilities and being near/adjacent to Zumar river and Swarnrekha river and also to National Highway NH 33.*

i) *A State pitch road has passed through village Lalganj and Khatanga meeting two N.H. No. 33 and 31.*

j) *The lands are semi-urban and wrongly treated as agricultural lands, by the Respondents.*

k) ***Even the order sheet dt. 19.04.1972 of DLAO, Ranchi mentions that agricultural land of any class near Ranchi 'Basti' and town are being used for building purposes and as such they may be treated as single class of land for the purposes of valuation of land and; that valuation on the basis of classification of land on the basis of agriculture will not be applicable in this case as these lands are near to Ranchi Town and all the lands form the same status since they are in occupation of the Military since 1942-43.***

l) *The land losers are entitled to a flat rate of Rs. 2 Lakh per acre for all kinds of land, Rs. 1 Lakh per house, Rs. 10,000/-per Well and Rs. 500/- per tree.*

m) *There is delay of about 40 years in appointing arbitrator in this case and therefore the Awardees / land losers are also entitled to Solatium at the rate of 30% and interest @ 9% 15% per year.*

n) *The land losers have relied on several Exhibits and judgments in support of their contentions.*

Lastly it has been submitted by the claimant's that all the facts detailed in the Statement of claim, Evidence, Documents / Exhibits are sufficient and they completely dispel the Defense version of the respondents and the claimants are entitled for all the reliefs as claimed including litigation costs.

19. So far as the Union of India is concerned, the summary of the case has been recorded in Chapter IV of the award which is as follows:

Respondent's Defence

The respondents have objected and challenged the claim of the claimants. The same is summarized as under:

1. *The respondents have resisted the claim of the land losers in toto.*
2. *Claim on behalf of all the land losers/awardees is not permissible in law and the claimants should furnish the exact and correct number of the Awardees.*
3. ***The instant arbitration is confined in respect of 20 land losers who had preferred the writ application i.e. CWJC No. 2273 of 1994 (R) and not in respect of all the land losers, and there is no direction of the Supreme Court to entertain the claims of other land losers, and the 20 persons cannot represent other land losers.***
4. *The amount Awarded and paid is as per the law and was awarded as per prevailing market price.*
5. *The lands were acquired for defence purposes and the area was undeveloped at the relevant time.*
6. ***The compensation was accepted without any protest and after more than 40 years, the claimants cannot claim for higher amount.***
7. *The correct position of land losers as well as their legal the representatives may be verified by Deputy Commissioner/District Land Acquisition Officer, Ranchi.*
8. ***There is no provision under RAIP Act for payment of Solatium and interest.***
9. ***Lastly, it has been contended by the respondents that the award of compensation was proper and the same was as per the market value and was received without any objection/demur; and that the land losers claim is stale***

and they have failed to make out any case for enhancement and as such the instant claims are liable to be dismissed with costs.

20. On the basis of the claims of the parties, the learned Arbitrator framed 4 issues for consideration, which are as follows:

A. Whether the claims are maintainable?

B. Whether the instant Arbitral Proceeding is confined to 20 writ petitioners or to all the land-losers as mentioned in the Notification dated 05.06.1993?

C. Whether the awarded amount is/was proper and as per the market value?

D. Whether the claimants are entitled to any reliefs, as claimed for? If yes, to what extent and to whom?

21. The claimants/land losers filed the following documents in support of their claims:

(i) Survey Map of Kanke Anchal – **Exhibit-1.**

(ii) Notice u/s 12(2) of L.A. Act – Exhibit-2, 2(a) and 2(b).

(iii) Certified copy of Khatian of Khata Nos.97 & 98 of Village Gari – Exhibit- 3 and 3(a) respectively.

(iv) Certified copy of Judgment dated 06.02.1990 passed by Hon'ble Patna High Court, Ranchi Bench, Ranchi in Appeal from Original Decree No.220 of 1977 (R) – **Exhibit-4.**

(v) Certified copy of judgment dated 09.03.1998 passed by Hon'ble Patna High Court, Ranchi Bench, Ranchi in M.A. Nos.38, 39 & 132 of 1994(R) - Exhibit-5.

(vi) Certified copy of judgment dated 09.05.2012 passed by Land Acquisition Judge-II, Ranchi in L.A.R No.5/2008 / L.A. No. 27/2006-2007 – Exhibit-6.

(vii) Certified copy of Sale Deed dated 19.06.1963 of Village-Gari – Exhibit-7.

(viii) Original Sale Deed dated 13.11.1962 of Village- Lalgangj – Exhibit- 8.

(ix) Certified copy of Sale Deed dated 02.04.1971 of Village Gari - Exhibit-9.

(x) Photocopy of order of DLAO, Ranchi with respect to 4 Villages – Exhibit-10.

(xi) Order dated 11.02.1985 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP Nos. 12723 & 12747 of 1984 – Exhibit-11

(xii) Judgment dated 25.01.1972 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 661 & 1380 / 1967 and 1885-1886 of 1967 - **Exhibit 12.**

(xiii) The Ranchi Municipal Corporation (Division of Ranchi into Wards) Rules, 1981.

(xiv) Notification dated 05.06.1993.

22. The claimants/land losers examined 4 witnesses of the 4 Villages in support of their case, who are as under:

(a) Claimants Witness No.1 Virendra Mahto- from Sugnu

(b) Claimants Witness No.2 Rajendra Gope- from Gari

(c) Claimants Witness No.3 Jitlal Mahto-from Khatanga

(d) Claimants Witness No.4 Sheikh Afzal- from Lalganj.

23. The Union of India & State of Jharkhand filed the following documents in support of their claims:

I. Notification for Village Khatanga - Exhibit-R-2/A-1

II. Valuation report for Village Khatanga - Exhibit-R-2/A-2

III. Award pertaining to Village Khatanga – Exhibit-R-2/A-3

IV. Notification for Village Gari – Exhibit-R-2/B-1

V. Valuation report for Village Gari – Exhibit-R-2/B-2

VI. Award pertaining to Village Gari – Exhibit- R-2/B-3

VII. Notification for Village Sugnu – Exhibit-R-2/C-1

VIII. Valuation report for Village Sugnu – Exhibit-R-2/C-2

IX. Award for Village Sugnu – Exhibit-R-2/C-3

X. Notification for Village Lalganj - Exhibit R-2/D-1

XI. Valuation report for Village Lalganj – Exhibit-R-2/D-2

XII. Award for Village Lalganj – Exhibit-R-2/D-3

XIII. Sale Deed dated 27.07.1978 (Rectification Deed dated 19.10.1987)

24. Three witnesses were examined on behalf of Union of India/State of Jharkhand -

(1) Evidence of D.W. No.1: Shri Nitish Ranjan Das, SDO-II in Defense Estate Office, Job Circle, Danapur Cantt.

(2) Evidence of D.W. No.2: Shri Rajendra Kumar, SDO-III in Defense Estate Office, Job Circle, Danapur Cantt.

(3) Evidence of D.W. No.3: Shri Abhay Nandan Ambastha, District Land Acquisition Officer (DLAO), Ranchi.

25. <u>The impugned Award</u>

I. The learned arbitrator took up ***issue No. A and B*** together and while deciding the same, the learned arbitrator specifically quoted paragraph 6, 7 and 8 of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and was of the view that the objection filed by the Union of India with respect to deciding the case of all land-losers mentioned in notification dated 05.06.1993 and confining to only 20 writ petitioners, was not maintainable and not tenable. The learned arbitrator ultimately recorded that the claims were maintainable and the arbitral proceeding is not only confined to 20 writ petitioners, but it covers all the land-losers mentioned in the notification dated 05.06.1993.

II. While deciding the ***issue No.(C),*** the learned arbitrator has proceeded to consider whether the award made by the authorities is correct and observed that under Section 8(3) of the Act of 1952, the compensation payable for acquisition of any property should be price which the requisitioned property would have fetched in the open market, if it had remained in the same condition as it was at the time of requisitioning and been sold on the date of acquisition. The learned arbitrator observed that in other words the market value of the property on the date of acquisition is payable. The learned arbitrator referred to the report of ***District Land Acquisition Officer (hereinafter referred as DLAO)*** which was marked as Exhibit-10 and prepared a

summary with respect to all the four villages which were involved in the case and considered the materials placed on record. With respect to all the four villages, the learned arbitrator has awarded compensation at the flat Rate of Rs.41,750/- per acre.

III. The learned arbitrator was of the view that Exhibit-10 was irrelevant as it was contradictory and arbitrary considerations were applied in fixing the compensation amount for the land of the four villages.

IV. The learned arbitrator has observed that the various classes of land were sold at various prices and rational given by the concerned officials in not considering the sale deeds of highest consideration was unjustified. It was also observed with respect to Exhibit-10 itself in paragraph 11 of the award that the concerned official, simply ignored the sale deeds by giving passing remarks that the lands were far off from the lands under acquisition. The learned arbitrator was of the view that there was acquisition of nearly 2000 acres of land and 36 chains cannot be considered to be too big a distance, more so, when transfer of lands in the vicinity of the acquired land was quite scarce and possibly this was so on account of requisition of the land by the Defense department and consequently only a few sale deeds were available.

V. By further discussing Exhibit-10, the learned Arbitrator recorded in paragraph 12 that the lands were requisitioned as early as in the year 1942-43 and since then they were under the possession of the Military for about 30 years and were developed due to establishment of Cantonment. The learned arbitrator was of the view that under such circumstances the classification of lands in various types was redundant. The learned Arbitrator was of the view that four villages were contiguous to each other and were similar in potentiality, but on the one hand flat rate of Rs.5882/- per acre was fixed for village Gari on the ground that it was not an agricultural land and on the other hand the valuation of the

lands of other three villages i.e., Lalganj, Sugnu and Khatanga was done by classifying them as agricultural land.

VI. The learned arbitrator was also of the view that, so far as village Gari is concerned, some of the sale deeds of the year 1970 and 1971 were not considered on the ground that there was big variance in the sale prices, but one of them i.e. sale deed dated 02.04.1971 was made the basis for fixing flat rate of Rs.5882/- per acre.

VII. After aforesaid discussion in connection with Exhibit-10 right from paragraph 10 to 12 of the award, the learned arbitrator was of the view that there was no justifiable basis for fixing compensation and the authorities have not assessed and paid the proper market value of the lands acquired under the Act of 1952. The learned arbitrator was of the view that flat rate of the lands should have been taken for determining the compensation amount and then referred to Exhibit-5 wherein the High Court had also affirmed the flat rate of Rs.2000/- per decimal for the lands of some other village acquired for Military purpose and ultimately the issue No. (C) was decided by the learned Arbitrator against Union of India while holding that the awarded amount was not proper and was not as per market value.

VIII. Thereafter, the learned Arbitrator went on to decide ***issue No. (D)*** and observed that the claimants had claimed flat rate of Rs.2 lakhs per acre for land, Rs.1 lakh per house, Rs.10,000/- per well, Rs.500/- per tree apart from solatium @ 30% and interest @ 9% - 15% per year and such claim was totally denied by the Union of India. The learned Arbitrator considered numerous judgments which were cited and also observed that the claimants had examined 4 witnesses of the four villages and all the witnesses deposed on identical lines and had claimed Rs.2 lakhs per acre due to location of their land and potentiality of development, being semi town area near to Ranchi town and that the acquired land was near National Highway 33 and State Highway No. 32.

The learned Arbitrator was of the view that the witnesses had stood the test of cross examination.

IX. The learned Arbitrator thereafter considered the evidence led by Union of India and discussed the same in paragraph 19 of the impugned award. With respect to the witness No.1 on behalf of Union of India, the learned Arbitrator observed that the witness No. 1 and witness No. 2 had deposed at identical lines, but they have not visited the villages between 1942 to 1970 and they were recently posted and the witness No.2 had admitted that National Highway runs between Ranchi and near to the four villages in question. The learned arbitrator discussed the evidence of DLAO who referred to the Government rates of land which were fixed on 01.01.2013 and he had also stated that the villages appear to be developed as they are near Ranchi town but could not say anything about the position of the land at the time of acquisition. The learned Arbitrator further recorded that the DLAO also admitted that he had not visited the villages during the period between 1942 to 1970.

X. The learned Arbitrator thereafter refused to consider the sale deed dated 27.07.1978 relied by the Union of India by stating that it was of different village altogether.

XI. In paragraph 23 of the Award, the learned Arbitrator has referred to the various documents which were exhibited on behalf of the claimants which were regarded as not relied upon by the learned Arbitral Tribunal. The learned Arbitral Tribunal rejected Exhibit-4 as well as Exhibit-12 which have been heavily relied upon by the learned counsel for the claimants during the course of arguments before this Court.

XII. The learned Arbitrator in paragraph 24 referred to the documents which were relevant for ascertaining the market value, they are :-

a. **Exhibit-1** is the survey map.

b. **Exhibit-5** is the certified copy of the judgment of High Court dated 09.03.1998 ***[Sanicharwa Lakra & Ors- M.A. 38, 39 and 132 of 1994 (R)].*** By referring to Exhibit-5, the

learned Arbitrator observed that the High Court, while hearing the matter, affirmed the award of the learned arbitrator in the said case wherein flat rate of Rs.2,00,000/- per acre was granted for the lands acquired for military purpose along with solatium @ 30% with interest @ 12% per year and recorded that the land in the present proceeding were similarly situated. The exhibit-5 was relating to the acquisition of the year 1986-87 i.e. about 15 years after the acquisition involved in the present case and ultimately the learned Arbitrator while considering Exhibit-5, in order to arrive at approximate market value for the year 1971, adopted the reverse process and deducted the market value of 10% every year from the year 1986 to 1971 and arrived at the rate of Rs.42,000/- per acre in the year 1971.

c. The learned arbitrator thereafter considered ***Exhibit-7*** which is certified copy of sale deed dated 19.06.1963 pertaining to village Gari for an area of 5 khatas and the rate mentioned in the sale-deed was Rs.24,000/- per acre and in order to arrive at the market value in the year 1971, the learned arbitrator added 10% every year up to 1971, right from 1963 and arrived at Rs. 51,446/- per acre, thereafter deducted 20% towards development costs. On the basis of Exhibit-7, the learned Arbitrator was of view that the market value on the date of acquisition of the present land will come to approximately Rs.41,000/- per acre.

d. The learned Arbitrator considered ***Exhibit-8*** which was the original sale deed relating to village Lalganj dated 13.11.1962 and observed that as per the sale deed, the rate was Rs.30,000/- per acre. The learned Arbitrator adopted the same method as was adopted in Exhibit-7 and added 10% every year with respect to the rate right from 1962 to 1971 and arrived at Rs.70,726/- per acre and deducted

20% towards development costs and as per Exhibit-8, arrived at the market value to approximately Rs.57,000/- per acre.

e. The learned Arbitrator also considered ***Exhibit-9*** which was certified copy of sale deed of village Gari dated 02.04.1971 which was for 23 katahs 11 chatak and 27 Sq.ft which was sold at the rate of Rs.27,000/- per acre. The learned Arbitrator also observed that the sale deed was of the village involved in the acquisition and was near about the date of acquisition and could be used for the purposes for determining the market value.

f. The learned Arbitrator thereafter noted that the requisition was of the year 1941-42, the acquisition was of the year 1971-72 and the properties remained in possession of the Defence Department for more than 30 years and the same was developed due to the establishment of Cantonment Area. The arbitrator also observed that it was not in dispute that the properties are situated very near to the capital city of Ranchi (the then Town of Ranchi) and that it was also not in dispute that National Highway and State Highway is adjacent and water bodies in form of rivers are also in the vicinity.

g. The learned Arbitrator ultimately took the average of the valuation arrived at by referring to ***Exhibit-5, 7, 8 and 9*** and calculated the average of four valuations which came to ***Rs.41,750/- per acre*** and was of the view that the same would be the just and reasonable market price of the lands at the time of acquisition. The learned Arbitrator fixed this rate as flat rate for all types of lands for all the four villages. The learned Arbitrator also observed that in Exhibit-10 the DLAO himself recommended flat rate for village Gari, which was contiguous to other three villages and also referred to Exhibit-5 which was a High Court's judgment whereby the flat rate granted by the learned

arbitrator was approved. The learned Arbitrator held that there was no justification for categorization of lands for assessment/payment of compensation.

XIII. Thus, the learned Arbitrator rejected Exhibit-4 as well as Exhibit-12 which have been relied upon by the claimants during the course of hearing of this case seeking enhancement of compensation and the learned Arbitrator relied upon Exhibits-5, 7, 8 and 9 for assessment of compensation. Exhibit-5 was used by deducting the value of land @10% per year to arrive at the valuation as on in the year 1971. Exhibit-7 and 8 were used by increasing the value @ 10% every year from 1962-1963 onwards till 1971 to arrive at the valuation of the year 1971 and Exhibit-9 relating to the village Gari was also considered which was in connection with one of the villages which was acquired in the present case and was also found to be in the vicinity with respect to the time regarding acquisition of the land. The learned arbitrator thereafter, vide paragraph 27 onwards considered the claim regarding solatium and interest and referred to the various judgment as relied upon by the parties. They were reported as follows:-

a. ***1993 Supp (2) SCC 149 (Union of India v. Hari Krishan Khosla.)***
b. ***1998 (2) LAL 188 (Sanicharwa Lakra v. Charo Oraon)***
c. ***(2010) 14 SCC 357 (Dilawar Singh v. Union of India)***
d. ***Exhibit-11:- Order dated 11.02.1985 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP(C) Nos. 12723 and 12747 of 1984 (Harbans Singh Shanni Devi and Others v. Union of India and Others).***

XIV. The learned Arbitrator also considered that the question of entering into an agreement in Form 'K' arises when the offer is accepted and since the agreement in Form 'K' was not entered, there was no justification for payment of only 80% of amount

likely to be assessed as compensation. The finding of the learned Arbitrator in paragraph 30 of the award is quoted as under:-

> *"**30.** As per Rule 9(3) of RAIP Rules, the competent authority is required to communicate each person interested, an offer of what, in his opinion, is a fair amount of compensation payable. Then as per Rule 9(5)(i) such person(s), within fifteen days of receipt of such offer, is required to reply in writing, his acceptance or otherwise of the offer. If the offer is accepted an agreement in Form 'K' is to be entered into. As per Rule 9(5)(ii) on account payment of 80% of the amount likely to be assessed as compensation, can be made – (a) when there is likely to be delay in assessment, (b) where there is delay in reaching an agreement and (c) where it is clear that an agreement can not be reached."*

XV. The learned Arbitrator ultimately held that in absence of any agreement in form 'K' there was dispute right from very beginning in connection with compensation amount and it was the duty of the authorities to get the matter referred to arbitration in terms of Section 8(1)(b) of the Act of 1952, but they did nothing. On account of this there was a delay in appointing arbitrator and therefore, the solatium cannot be denied to the claimants. ***However, the learned Arbitrator was of the opinion that 20% solatium would be just and reasonable.***

XVI. The learned Arbitrator thereafter took up the point of interest and was of the view that compensation was paid up to the year 1975 and it would be just and reasonable that at least from 01.01.1976 simple interest @ 9% per annum was granted. Para 33 of the award is quoted as under: -

> *"<u>33. Now the question of interest.</u>*
> *In several cases, as noticed above, interest has been granted in the cases under RAIP Act, apparently to compensate the land losers to some extent, on account of long lapse of period in payment of awarded amount. If no interest is granted, the inflation during such period will practically make the enhanced compensation nil. Therefore the claimants can not be denied interest. As the compensation was paid up to the years 1975, it will be just and reasonable that at least from 01.01.1976, simple interest @ 9% per annum is granted."*

XVII. The interest on account of default in payment as per the award was directed to be paid as under: -

> *"The Awarded amount at "G" must be paid to the Claimants/land losers, in the manner specified hereinbefore, by 31.01.2015, failing which the claimants/land losers will also be entitled to simple interest @ 15% per annum on amount G from the date of this award till the date of payment/realization."*

26. The list of 20 persons who were party in ***C.W.J.C. No. 2273 of 1994 (R) (Virendra Mahto and others versus Union of India) (supra)*** which was decided in the year 2008 has been referred to by the learned counsel appearing for Union of India by producing a certified copy of said Judgment, which is as follows: -

1. *Virendra Mahto*
2. *Jagarnath Pahan*
3. *Chhedi Mahto*
4. *Ganga Ram Lohar*
5. *Luttu Mahton*
6. *Dasrath Barik*
7. *Arun Prasad*
8. *Jaggu Mahto*
9. *Doman Mahto*
10. *Fotindra Oran*
11. *Mahanand Mahto*
12. *Dhaneshwar Mahto*
13. *Mahadeo Munda*
14. *Chamru Mahto*
15. *Chotan Oraon*
16. *Dharmu Mahto*
17. *Mahadeo Oraon*
18. *Baghu Mahto*
19. *Shibu Bhagat*
20. *Anand Kujur*

27. Considering the submissions of the parties and the materials on record, the points for determination by this Court are as under: -

a. Whether the arbitral proceedings were required to be confined only to 20 writ petitioners of C.W.J.C. No. 2273 of 1994 (R) or to all the land-losers of the four

villages as, interalia, mentioned in notification dated 05.06.1993?

b. Whether 80% of the land-losers had accepted full compensation or it was only that a large number of claimants were paid about 80% of the compensation?

c. Whether the land-losers had accepted compensation (full or part) with or without any protest?

d. Whether the award of solatium and interest is legal in the matter arising out of acquisition of land under the Act of 1952?

e. Whether the claimants are entitled to solatium @30% instead of 20% as awarded by the learned Arbitrator?

f. Whether the decision of the learned Arbitrator to enhance the rate of compensation for the acquired land and the extent of its increase call for any interference by this court?

g. Whether the learned Arbitrator was justified in awarding interest @15% per annum on the entire awarded amount upon default in payment of the awarded amount within the stipulated period as it has resulted in payment of interest on interest quantified till the date of the award?

28. Before proceeding to decide the aforesaid points for determination with regard to the scope of the arbitral proceeding, it would be relevant to discuss the provision of law and the judgments cited by the respective parties on the point.

Section 8 of Requisitioning And Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952

"8. Principles and method of determining compensation*.—(1) Where any property is requisitioned or acquired under this Act, there shall be paid compensation the amount of which shall be determined in the manner and in accordance with the principles hereinafter set out, that is to say,—*

(a) where the amount of compensation can be fixed by agreement, it shall be paid in accordance with such agreement;

(b) where no such agreement can be reached, the Central Government shall appoint as arbitrator a person who is, or has been, or is qualified for appointment as, a Judge of a High Court;

(c) the Central Government may, in any particular case, nominate a person having expert knowledge as to the nature of the property requisitioned or acquired to assist the arbitrator and where such nomination is made, the person to be compensated may also nominate an assessor for the same purpose;

(d) at the commencement of the proceedings before the arbitrator, the Central Government and the person to be compensated shall state what in their respective opinion is a fair amount of compensation;

(e) the arbitrator shall, after hearing the dispute, make an award determining the amount of compensation which appears to him to be just and specifying the person or persons to whom such compensation shall be paid; and in making the award, he shall have regard to the circumstances of each case and the provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3), so far as they are applicable;

…….

(2) …….

(2-A) …….

(2-B) …….

(3) The compensation payable for the acquisition of any property under section 7 shall be the price which the requisitioned property would have fetched in open market, if it had remained in the same condition as it was at the time of requisitioning and been sold on the date of acquisition."

Rule 9 of Requisitioning & Acquisition of Immovable Property Rules, 1953.

***"9. Compensation**: -(1) An authority to whom the powers of the Central Government have been delegated shall, as far as may be, associate with itself the local officer of the Central Government concerned with the property in fixing compensation under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 8, and obtain the approval of the Central Government in the administrative Ministry concerned [or of any officer authorised by that Government in this behalf.]*

(2). Compensation for requisitioned property, other than agricultural land, shall be paid by the competent authority quarterly in arrears. In the case of agricultural land, the

compensation shall be paid either annually or on release of the land, whichever is earlier. The compensation shall be paid either in cash or by cheque at the discretion of the competent authority.

[(3) The competent authority shall, as soon as may be practicable after the making of a requisitioning order or the service of a notice of acquisition, communicate to each person interested an offer of what, in the opinion of the competent authority, is a fair amount of compensation payable to such person in respect of the property requisitioned or acquired.

(4) If the owner of the property is not readily traceable or if there be no person competent to alienate the property or if the ownership of the property is in dispute or if there be any dispute as to the title to receive the compensation or as to the apportionment of the amount offered as compensation, the competent authority shall deposit in Court the amount of the compensation as determined by him under clause(a) of sub-section (1) of section 8. The competent authority shall at the same time submit to the Central government a report setting forth the full facts of the case with all connected papers and apply for the appointment of an arbitrator. Where the compensation is recurring, the competent authority shall, in cases covered by this sub-rule, deposit the amount in court from time to time in arrear as it falls due.

(5) (i) Every person interested to whom an offer is made under sub-rule(3) shall, within fifteen days of the receipt of the offer, communicate in writing to the competent authority his acceptance, or otherwise of the offer. If he accepts the offer, the competent authority shall enter into an agreement with him on behalf of Central Government in Form 'K'.

(ii) In the following circumstances, the competent authority may, at his discretion, make, to [all eligible claimants] "on account" payment up to 80 per cent. of the amount which, in his opinion, is likely to be assessed as compensation or recurring compensation as the case may be:-

(a) When there is likely to be delay in assessing compensation;

(b) Where the competent authority has made an assessment but there is delay in reaching an agreement though there is a reasonable prospect of agreement being reached; or

(c) where it is clear that an agreement cannot be reached.

(iii) If the competent authority makes an "on account"; payment under clause (ii), he shall enter into an agreement with the person to whom payment is made on behalf of the Central Government in Form "L" with such modification as the nature of the case may require.

(6) If any person to whom an offer is made under sub-rule(3) does not accept the offer or does not within fifteen days of the receipt of the offer communicate in writing to the competent authority his acceptance or otherwise of the offer, the competent authority shall, as soon as may be, submit to the Central Government a report setting forth the full facts of the case, particularly as regards the nature and extent of disagreement between himself on the one hand and the said person on the other hand and he shall also forward with the report all connected papers. The competent authority shall at the same time deposit in Court the amount offered by him to the said person under sub rule (3).

29. ***Rule 9*** of the ***Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Rules, 1953 (hereinafter referred to as the "Rules of 1953")*** deals with compensation. As per Rule- 3, the competent authority is to communicate to each person interested an offer of what, in the opinion of the competent authority, is a fair amount of compensation with respect to the property requisitioned or acquired.

As per ***Rule 9(4)*** of the Rules of 1953, in case the owner of the property is not readily traceable or if there was no person competent to alienate the property or if the ownership of the property is in dispute or if there be any dispute as to the title to receive compensation or as to the apportionment of the amount offered as compensation, the competent authority is still required to deposit in the Court the amount of compensation as determined by him under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 8 of the Act of 1952 and is also required to submit a report to the Central Government giving the full facts with connected paper and apply for appointment of an arbitrator. Section 8(1)(a) of the Act of 1952 clearly provides that where the amount of compensation can be fixed by agreement, it shall be paid in accordance with the agreement and section 8(1)(b) of the Act of 1952 provides that where no such agreement can be reached, the Central Government shall appoint an arbitrator and the arbitrator is required, as per section 8(1)(e) of the Act

of 1952 after hearing the dispute, to determine the amount of compensation which appears to him to be just and specify the person to whom the compensation shall be paid.

Rule 9 (5)(i) of the aforesaid Rules of 1953 provides that every person interested to whom such offer has been made, shall within 15 days of the receipt of the offer, communicate in writing to the competent authority his acceptance or otherwise of the offer. If he accepts the offer, the competent authority shall enter into an agreement with him on behalf of the Central Government in Form – K. Sub-rule 5(ii) of Rule 9 further provides that in certain circumstances, the competent authority may, at his discretion, make, to all eligible claimants on account payment upto 80% of the amount which, in his opinion, is likely to be assessed as compensation. Those circumstances are as follows:

(a) When there is likely to be delay in assessing compensation;

(b) Where the competent authority has made an assessment but there is delay in reaching an agreement though there is a reasonable prospect of agreement being reached; or

(c) Where it is clear that an agreement cannot be reached.

Further, sub-rule 5(iii) of Rule 9 of the Rules of 1953 provides that if the competent authority makes an on-account payment under sub-rule 5(ii), he shall enter into an agreement with the person to whom payment is made on behalf of the Central Government, in Form "L" with such modification as the nature of the case may require.

Sub-rule (6) of Rule 9 of the Rules of 1953 provides that if a person to whom an offer is made under sub-rule (3), does not accept the offer or does not within 15 days of the receipt of the offer communicate in writing to the competent authority, his acceptance or otherwise of the offer, the competent authority shall, as soon as may be, submit to the Central Government a report setting forth the full facts of the case, particularly as regards the nature and extent of disagreement between himself on the one hand and such person on the other and he shall also forward with the report all connected papers and the competent authority shall at the same time deposit in Court the amount offered by him to the said person under sub rule(3).

30. The Union of India has challenged the award enhancing the compensation amount so far as it relates to the lands and has also challenged the award of solatium @ 20% and also award of interest as awarded by the learned Arbitrator. Their further grievance is that the learned Arbitrator had no jurisdiction to enter into and decide the compensation with respect to those persons who had taken full compensation amount from District Land Acquisition Officer by putting their signatures and without registering any protest and the learned Arbitrator ought to have confined the award with respect to those persons only who had not taken the compensation.

31. So far as the claimants are concerned, they are seeking enhancement of compensation for lands as awarded by the learned Arbitrator by submitting that the materials placed on record have not been properly appreciated and during the course of arguments specific reference has been made to Exhibit-4 and 12 in order to seek enhancement of compensation.

32. So far as grant of compensation in connection with trees, houses, wells etc. standing on the property are concerned, no dispute has been raised and accordingly no argument in that connection have been made by either party. Thus, the dispute is in connection with rate of compensation with respect to land involved in this case.

Point of determination nos. (a) (b) (c)(d) and (e)

a. ***Whether the arbitral proceedings were required to be confined only to 20 writ petitioners of C.W.J.C. No. 2273 of 1994 (R) or to all the land-losers of the four villages as, interalia, mentioned in notification dated 05.06.1993?***
b. ***Whether 80% of the land-losers had accepted full compensation or it was only that a large number of claimants were paid about 80% of the compensation?***
c. ***Whether the land-losers had accepted compensation (full or part) with or without any protest?***

d. Whether the award of solatium and interest is legal in the matter arising out of acquisition of land under the Act of 1952?

e. Whether the claimants are entitled to solatium @30% instead of 20% as awarded by the learned Arbitrator?

33. Before the learned Arbitrator, a specific stand was taken on behalf of the claimants that the land losers had received the payment made to the extent of 80% under protest and claimed proper compensation. The Union of India/State had taken a specific stand that the compensation was accepted without any protest and after more than 40 years, the claimants cannot claim for higher amount; the award of compensation was proper and the same was as per the market value and was received without any objection/demur. It was their case that nothing was left to be paid***. A finding was recorded by the learned Arbitrator that only 80% of the compensation was paid.***

34. ***Before this Court, the learned counsel for the Union of India has taken a different stand.*** The learned ASGI for the Union of India has specifically submitted that 80% of the claimants were paid 100% of compensation as offered and they accepted the payment without any protest and it was not correct to say that only 80% of the likely compensation was paid .For this, the ASGI appearing for the appellant Union of India has referred to Exhibits R-2/A-3(village Khatanga) , R-2/B-3 (village Gari) , R-2/C-3 (Village Sugnu) and R-2/D-3 (village Lalganj) showing full payment and it was contended that many of the land losers did not come for payment. The said exhibits R-2/A-3(village Khatanga) , R-2/B-3 (village Gari) , R-2/C-3 (Village Sugnu) and R-2/D-3 (village Lalganj) have also been perused by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the claimants.

35. Learned ASGI for the Union of India, during the course of argument, has specifically submitted by referring to Exhibits R-2/A-3(village Khatanga) , R-2/B-3 (village Gari) , R-2/C-3 (Village Sugnu) and R-2/D-3 (village Lalganj) that most of the claimants have put their signatures and have taken the amount offered to them without

registering any protest and has submitted that there were others who did not come forward to accept any amount and therefore 80% of the claimants had taken 100% of the compensation amount. The learned counsel has referred to the last column of the aforesaid exhibits where entries have been made as 'paid' with signature.

36. With respect to acceptance of amount without protest, the learned ASGI has referred to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in the case of ***Union of India v. Munsha*** reported in ***[1995 Supp (4) SCC 660]*** and also the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Satyawati (Smt) and Ors*** reported in ***(1996) 7 SCC 740.***

37. ***However, the learned counsel for the claimants*** has stated that only 80% of the compensation was offered and paid and were received through payment voucher under protest. It has also been submitted that Exhibits R-2/A-3(village Khatanga) ,R-2/B-3 (village Gari) , R-2/C-3 (Village Sugnu) and R-2/D-3 (village Lalganj) do not contain the signature of the claimants but the entries are signed by the concerned District Land Acquisition Officer who had disbursed the amount by stating 'paid'. The payment vouchers where protest was mentioned have not been exhibited by the Union of India to demonstrate that no protest was made while receiving payment.

38. It has been argued by the learned counsel for the claimants that the claimants were paid only 80% of the amount and many of them were not paid at all. Further, the learned counsel for the claimants has also submitted that the signatures in the aforesaid Exhibits R-2/A-3(village Khatanga) , R-2/B-3 (village Gari) , R-2/C-3 (Village Sugnu) and R-2/D-3 (village Lalganj) with the word "paid" in each row in remarks column , on the face of it appear to be of one and the same person, which is the signature of the concerned District Land Acquisition Officer, whose signature with designation is also present on the document . He has asserted that the signatures pointed out by the learned ASGI are not the signatures of the concerned claimant(s). He has also submitted that the voucher by which the payment was made to the claimants and the amount was received under protest having their signature/thumb

impression, have not been exhibited by the Union of India before the learned Arbitrator.

39. In the aforesaid circumstances, it has to be examined as to what percentage of compensation amount was offered/paid by the District Land Acquisition Officer to the claimants and whether the amount so received were under protest. It has also to be examined as to what would be the consequence of such payment when admittedly agreement in prescribed form "K" was not entered into with any of the claimant. It has also to be examined as to whether on account of such payment the arbitral award was required to be confined only to 20 writ petitioners of C.W.J.C. NO. 2273 of 1994 (R) who had approached the high court seeking appointment of arbitrator.

40. This Court finds that the compensation offered by the authorities in connection with the four villages, except the village Gari, was based on classification of land. With respect to village Gari, flat rate for all categories of land was to be paid. This Court found it proper to examine case of one of the claimants by way of sample in open court in connection with village Gari where compensation was fixed by the authorities for the acquired land at flat rate @ Rs. 5882 per acre.

41. From perusal of Exhibit R-2/B-3 relating to village Gari, relating to award no. 98, it has been prepared in the name of Ram Naresh Hazam, Lal Mohan Hazam, Narayan Hazam, Tulsi Hazam and Dhanu Hazam, S/o of Jagu Hazam of village Gari and the offered amount which has been shown as "paid" is Rs. 21512/-. However, the area of the land acquired of this claimant has not been mentioned in the aforesaid exhibit. From perusal of the impugned award in relation to village Gari, the award no. 98 finds place at serial no. 76 wherein the paid amount has been shown to be Rs. 21,512/- and the land acquired in connection with this award has been shown as 4.57 acres. The calculation would be as under: -

Area acquired	**Total compensation @ Rs. 5882/- per acre**	**Paid amount**

4.57 acres	**Rs.26,880.74** ***80% would be Rs. 21,504.59.***	**Rs.21,512/-** (***approx. 80% of the total compensation as arrived by the authority.)***

In view of exhibit R-2/B-3, it appears that under the heading "award payable to each", the amount of Rs. 21,512.00 has been shown against award no. 98, meaning thereby, what has been offered to the claimant was Rs. 21,512/- only with respect to award no. 98 and not Rs. 26,880.74 and consequently the offered amount was approximately 80%. The learned ASGI was confronted with this aspect of the matter and he could not dispute the calculation as stated above.

42. With respect to village Gari at the top of Exhibit- R-2/B-3, it has been mentioned that it contains the list of 80% "on account payment" in terms of Rule 9(5) at page 69 of the record received. Similarly in connection with village Khatanga at the beginning of R-2/A-3, which is the list of the persons to whom payment has been made, it is has been mentioned "80% paid" at page 107 of the record received.

43. With respect to other two villages i.e. Sugnu and Lalganj, it is not clear as to what percentage of compensation has been paid and no such argument has been advanced by the learned counsel for the parties to demonstrate the percentage of compensation paid with respect to village Sugnu (exhibit R-2/C-3) and Village Lalganj (exhibit R-2/D-3).

44. However, it is the common case with respect to all the claimants of all the four villages involved in these cases that payment was received under protest while receiving the payment through voucher and the fact that the payment was made through voucher is not in dispute, but the payment vouchers have not been exhibited by the Union of India before the learned Arbitrator to demonstrate that no such protest was recorded. Further, it was the specific case of the Union of India before the learned Arbitrator that the entire payment of compensation has been made to all the claimants and nothing was payable, whereas it was the specific case of the claimants that only 80%

of compensation was paid which they received under protest and the Union of India has taken a different stand before this Court by stating that 80% of the land losers were paid 100% of compensation which they failed to demonstrate before this Court.

45. ***This court also finds that there are a large number of claimants who were offered and paid 80% of the compensation amount only. In such circumstances, the argument of the learned ASGI that whosoever was paid, he received 100% of the compensation, does not appear to be correct. Moreover, the learned ASGI has not been able to show from the records as to who are the persons who received 100% of the compensation although before the learned Arbitrator it was their specific case that all the land losers had received compensation without any protest and noting was payable.***

46. ***The point of determination no. (b) is answered by holding that a large number of claimants were offered and paid 80% of the compensation amount only and the learned ASGI has failed to demonstrate that 80% of the land losers were paid 100% of the compensation.***

47. After having recorded the aforesaid findings with respect to point of determination no. (b), it is yet to be examined as to whether the payment (80% or full) was received under protest.

48. The aforesaid finding that a large number of land-losers were offered and paid 80% of the compensation only is over and above the fact that the claimants had not signed on Exhibits R-2/A-3(village Khatanga) , R-2/B-3 (village Gari) , R-2/C-3 (Village Sugnu) and R-2/D-3 (village Lalganj) but the same was shown as “paid” and signed by the District Land Acquisition Officer. Therefore, Exhibits R-2/A-3(village Khatanga) , R-2/B-3 (village Gari) , R-2/C-3 (Village Sugnu) and R-2/D-3 (village Lalganj) cannot be relied upon to say that the payments were received by the claimants without any protest. The fact remains that the vouchers by which the payments were tendered to the claimants have not been exhibited before the learned Arbitrator for the reasons best known to the Union of India or the State.

49. ***Thus, Exhibits R-2/A-3, R-2/B-3, R-2/C-3 and R-2/D-3 which have been relied upon by the learned ASGI to say that the amount was received without any protest do not reveal the signature of the various claimants, rather they record amount paid under the signature of the then District Land Acquisition Officer and therefore, the said exhibits cannot be relied upon to show that the amount was received under protest rather the payment vouchers ought to have been exhibited to show as to whether any protest was actually recorded by the claimants or not. Once the Union of India claimed that the amount was received without any protest, it was for them to prove by exhibiting payment vouchers that at the time of receiving payment and putting the signature on payment vouchers, the claimants did not register any objection/protest. This is over and above the fact as discussed above that many of the claimants were paid only to the extent of 80% of the compensation amount.***

50. The aforesaid aspect of the matter has to be further seen with the oral evidence adduced by the parties. The discussions of oral evidence of the parties on the point of payment under protest /without protest are as under.

51. The claimants had examined four witnesses.

a. The ***witness no. 1*** for the claimant has stated in paragraph 3 that they had accepted the amount of compensation under protest and they had also filed application for enhancement of compensation. However, there is no cross-examination of this witness on this point by the Union of India. This witness has specifically stated in his cross examination that he had not been paid compensation as per market rate.

b. Similarly, the ***witness no. 2*** has also stated that they had accepted the amount of compensation under protest and they had also filed application for enhancement of compensation but there is no cross-examination on this point. During his cross examination, he has specifically stated that he had put his signature over payment slip after putting his objection /protest. Admittedly, the payment slip has not been exhibited by the Union of India. This

witness has also denied the suggestion that he was paid compensation as per the prevailing market rate and has emphatically stated that they did not get adequate compensation.

c. So far as ***witness no. 3*** on behalf of the claimants is concerned, he has also stated that he had accepted the compensation under protest and had given application for enhancement of compensation. This witness has also been cross-examined. In his cross-examination, this witness has categorically stated that the compensation was not paid as per the prevailing market rate, rather it was too low and has also stated that the villagers had accepted the compensation with protest while receiving the amount of compensation. The witness no. 3, upon cross-examination by respondent no. 2 before the learned Arbitrator, has stated that he had received the amount of compensation with objection and has denied the suggestion that whatever amount was given as compensation was paid as per the market rate in the year, 1971.

d. The ***witness no. 4*** for the claimants has also made similar statement that he had received the amount of compensation under protest and had filed application for enhancement of compensation. This witness has also been cross-examined by both the respondents before the learned Arbitrator. This witness during cross-examination has categorically stated that the compensation was not paid as per prevailing market rate and rather it was very low and that he had accepted the compensation amount under protest and had signed the payment voucher by endorsing objection/protest to the payment.

e. All the witness during their cross-examination have also stated that they have not been paid the compensation amount as per the market value of the land.

52. ***The perusal of the oral evidence on behalf of the claimants clearly reveals that they had received the compensation with objection and they had also requested for enhancement of compensation by filing application. They have categorically stated that the***

compensation amount was very low and the market rate of the land in the year, 1971 was much higher. They have also stated that the compensation amount under protest was received by signing the payment voucher by endorsing objection/protest to the payment. The Union of India/State had not confronted them with any of the payment vouchers nor there is any cross-examination in connection with the statement that they had applied for enhancement of compensation.

53. This Court finds that a large number of persons were paid compensation upto 80% and apparently it goes to show that at the threshold there was no agreement on the point of compensation so as to enter into an agreement in form – "K". Admittedly, no such agreement in Form- "K" has been entered into and consequently, no such agreement has been exhibited before the Court. Further, no such agreement in terms of Form- "L" has been exhibited which is in relation to payment of 80% compensation nor it is the case of the Union of India that any such agreement was entered into with any of the claimants.

54. Further, the Union of India has not brought on record any report prepared and furnished to the Central Government in terms of Sub-rule (6) of Rule 9 of the Rules of 1953. Admittedly, it is not the case of the Union of India that any amount of compensation was ever deposited in the Court in terms of Sub-rule (4) or sub-rule (6) of Rule 9 of the Rules of 1953. Even upon repeated query made by this Court to the learned ASGI and the learned counsel for the State with regard to deposit of any amount in terms of Sub-rule (4) or (6) of Rule 9 of the Rules of 1953 before the Court, they have not submitted that any amount in terms of Rule 9(4) or (6) was deposited before the Court. Rather their case before the learned arbitrator was that entire amount was paid and nothing was payable. However, as demonstrated and held above, many of the persons were paid 80% of the compensation amount and admittedly some were not paid or they did not receive.

55. This Court finds that the procedure as prescribed under the Act of 1952 and the Rules of 1953 with regard to payment of compensation has not been followed by the Union of India in the present case,

inasmuch as, no agreement has been entered into either in Form- "K" or in Form – "L" nor any deposit has been made in the Court with regard to assessed compensation amount partly paid /not paid nor any report has been furnished to the Central Government by the competent authority in terms of the Act of 1952 and the Rules of 1953.

56. ***Thus, the point of determination no. (c) is decided in favour of the claimants-land losers by holding that the claimants-land losers received compensation (full or part-80%) under protest through payment vouchers and the Union of India/State have failed to demonstrate through exhibits or otherwise that the payment in full was made and was received without any protest and they have not exhibited the payment vouchers before the learned Arbitrator for the reasons best known to them.***

57. Having held that the compensation in full or part-80% was received under protest by the claimants-land losers while answering the point of determination no. (c) , there can be no doubt that the arbitrator was required to be appointed by the Union of India to determine the 'just' compensation considering the facts and circumstances of the case but admittedly no such appointment was made for years together and ultimately some of the poor and illiterate persons , mostly tribals, had to move this court for appointment of arbitrator in a few writ petitions filed in the year 1991 which led to appointment of arbitrator by the order of this court and when the authority himself extended the scope of arbitration to all the claimants-land losers the Union of India challenged such notification and the entire sequence of events have been already mentioned above. Thus, there can be no doubt that there was laches on the part of the Union of India to act in terms of the aforesaid Act of 1952 and Rules of 1953 in the matter of appointment of arbitrator for which the claimants-land losers cannot be made to suffer on account of delay. The consequence of delay in appointment of arbitrator attributable to the Union of India is required to be examined in the light of the fact that the said Act and the Rules do not provide for payment of solatium and interest.

58. The constitutional validity of Section 8(3)(a) of the Act of 1952, with respect to the absence of a provision for solatium at 15% of compensation amount and interest at 6% on acquisition of requisitioned land under the Act of 1952, unlike Sections 23 and 34 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, was challenged as being violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India in the case of ***Hare Krishna Khosla (supra)***. However, the challenge was declined by holding that the failure to provide such benefit does not make it discriminatory on the ground that the provisions are not similar. It has been held that where a property which was subject to prior requisition comes to be acquired, the compensation should be awarded on the basis of the principles adumbrated in the 1952 Act. The amount of compensation can be fixed by agreement under Section 8 (1) (b). In the absence of such an agreement, it is left to the discretion of the Arbitrator, who under Section 8 (1) (e) is to hear the dispute. The Arbitrator must determine the amount of compensation which appears to him to be just, but he must have regard to sub-sections (2) and (3) of Section. 8. It has also been held that the significant omission of solatium is indicative of the legislative intent, necessitating stress on the expressions "just" and "circumstances of each case" occurring in sub-section (1) (e) of Section 8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that yet another distinguishing feature is the expression 'open market' in Section 8 (3) (a) and held that the reason why solatium has not been provided is that "open market" contemplates a bargain between a free buyer and a free seller unfettered by the consideration of requisition and consequent acquisition.

59. In the judgement passed by Patna High Court reported in ***1998 (2) Land Acquisition Laws 188 (Sanicharwa Lakra and other Vs. Charo Oraon and others),*** it has been held that when there is delay in appointment of Arbitrator, then on equitable principles the claimants are entitled to interest and solatium and grant of such relief by the concerned Arbitrator in the said case was upheld. In the said case, the compensation was assessed at a very low rate and the claimants took objection long back and asked for referring the matter to the Arbitrator, but the same was not done and the claimants had to come to the court

in writ jurisdiction seeking appointment of an arbitrator, and upon much lingering, the Arbitrator was appointed after a gap of 7 years from the date of acquisition. The findings of the court in paragraph 15 of the said judgment are as under: -

> *"**15**. Taking the ratio of all the above mentioned judgements of the Apex Court, it can be formulated in the following manner :- Under the Act of 1952, when there is no provision of solatium and interest then it must be held that ordinarily there is no jurisdiction of the Arbitrator or the Court to grant solatium and interest on the compensation assessed as a Rule as per section 23(2) and 28 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and when there is ommission in the Act, 1952, then it must be held that ommission was premeditated and with intention. The analogy might be that when there was already requisition long back and the claimants were getting rates as per the requisition then it is not the case that the possession being taken by the authorities at the time of acquisition rather possession had alrady been vested with the State/Union of India long back and at the time of acquisition only just compensation can be paid to the claimants as the possession is not being taken in advance as is done in the case of Land Acquisition Act but still then there remains the scope of playing the principle of equity in the field if it could be found that in making compensation and when objection is being raised the appropriate authority slept over the matter for a long period in referring the matter to the Arbitrator, then on equity solatium and interest can be paid to the awardees claimants. In the present case, applying the said principle, it could be found that although the compensation was assessed at a very low rate long back and the claimants appellants took objection in the matter and asked for referring the matter to the Arbitrator but the same had not been done and the claimants had to come up in the writ petition before this Court and then there was direction by this Court for appointment of Arbitrator but then also it was not done by the Union of India i.e. respondents and then the claimants had to come up contempt petitions before this Court; then and then only the Arbitrator could be appointed. The acquisition took in the year 1985 and e Arbitrator was appointed in the year 1992 i.e. seven years had elapsed, for the negligence on the part of the Union of India in appointing the Arbitrator and such Arbitrator was appointed only at the direction of this Court as the Central Govt. was not in a mood to comply with the mandatory provision of Section 8 of the Act. The learned Arbitrator had considered those aspects and after considering different rulings had awarded interest and solatium in the nature and circumstances of the case. Solatium has been granted at the rate of 15% and the interest at the rate of 12%."*

60. In the judgement reported in ***(2015) 12 SCC 294 (Defence Estate Officer Vs. Syed Abdul Saleem and Ors.)***, the learned Arbitrator had awarded solatium at 30% and interest at 9% on account of delay in appointment of the Arbitrator by 19 years and the fact of undue delay in the institution of arbitral proceedings having been determined, the award of solatium and interest under the aforesaid Act of 1952 by the learned Arbitrator was upheld, in spite of the fact that the Act of 1952 does not specifically provide for grant of solatium and interest. Similar view was taken in the judgement reported in ***(2010) 14 SCC 357 (Dilawar Singh and Others Vs. Union of India and others),*** where there was delay of 16 years in appointment of the Arbitrator and the Hon'ble Court considered the earlier decision in the case reported in ***(2003) 5 SCC 568 (Union of India Vs. Chajju Ram)*** in paragraph 11 and observed that even in Union of India v. Chajju Ram, the Court noted the delay in appointment of an arbitrator and directed that the amount of interest and solatium paid to the landowners decades back shall not be recovered from the landowners.

61. Thus, the law is well settled that although under the Act of 1952 there is no provision of payment of interest and solatium, but in the case of delay in appointment of Arbitrator on the part of the Union of India/competent authority, interest and solatium can be awarded by the learned Arbitrator on grounds of equity, which are otherwise provided for under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. However, the extent of interest and solatium is certainly within the domain of the learned Arbitrator. In the present case, the learned Arbitrator as well as this Court has found that there was delay and laches on the part of the competent authority/Union of India in the matter of appointment of Arbitrator and therefore this Court holds that the learned Arbitrator was justified in awarding interest as well as solatium.

62. In the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Munsha and Ors. (Supra)***, as relied upon by the learned counsel for the Union of India, the facts of the case reveal that under Section 8 of the Act of 1952, the award was prepared way back

in the year 1970 and in the year 1986, a writ was filed seeking appointment of arbitrator. The learned Arbitrator awarded the compensation amount and also awarded 30% solatium and 9% interest per annum for one year and on expiry thereof interest @ 15% on the enhanced compensation. The award was challenged in appeal and the appeal was dismissed. During the pendency of the L.P.A. against the order of the learned Single Judge, the High Court had directed by the order impugned before the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 05.03.1993 to release the payment of compensation forthwith with respect to the land acquired and it was this order dated 05.03.1993 which was under challenge before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

It was the specific case of the claimants in ***Munsha and Ors. (Supra)*** that on failure to accept the offer of payment of compensation determined by the competent authority, though the respondents had not communicated in writing their refusal to accept the award, on expiry of the prescribed period, a duty was cast upon the competent authority and the central government to appoint an arbitrator and therefore the Union of India was also required to make good the losses. Reliance was placed on the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India vs. Hari Krishan Khosla reported in (1993) Supp.(2) SCC 149***. In the aforesaid background, the question was posed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court whether the Union of India was liable to pay interest to the claimants for the delay in appointment of arbitrator.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court examined the provisions of the Act of 1952 and observed that under Section 8(1) of the Act of 1952, compensation is to be determined either by (i) fixation by agreement; or (ii) determination by arbitrator to be appointed by the Central Government where no agreement could be reached. The Hon'ble Supreme Court also observed that Section 9 enjoins payment of amount of compensation under the award and therefore the authority has to pay the amount of compensation to the persons entitled thereto in such manner and within such time as may be specified in the award. It has also been observed that Under sub-rule (3) of Rule 9, the Land

Acquisition Officer is enjoined with a duty, as soon as may be practicable, to communicate to each interested person, an offer of compensation payable, which is fair in his opinion with respect of the acquired property and upon an offer being made to such person, the concerned person shall within 15 days of the receipt of the offer, communicate in writing to the competent authority his acceptance or otherwise of the offer; if he accepts the offer, the competent authority should enter into an agreement with such person on behalf of the Central Government in Form K.

In the aforesaid background, the Hon'ble Supreme Court ultimately held in paragraph 5 that reading of rules of 1953 indicates that after an award has been made, the competent authority is enjoined to communicate its offer in writing to the person interested and such interested person is also enjoined and shall communicate within 15 days of the receipt of the offer, in writing to the competent authority his acceptance or otherwise of the offer and if he accepts the offer, the competent authority is further enjoined to enter into an agreement, on behalf of the Central Government, with him in Form K and to pay the compensation awarded by him. If the interested person does not accept the offer nor communicates within 15 days of the receipt of the offer in writing to the competent authority his acceptance or otherwise of the offer, the competent authority is enjoined to submit to the Central Government a report setting forth the full facts, in particular the nature and extent of disagreement between the District Land Acquisition Officer and the interested person.

After having held as aforesaid, the Hon'ble Supreme Court distinguished the earlier judgment passed in the case of ***Seeto Devi vs. Union of India*** which was relied upon by the claimants of the said case and recorded that in the facts of the case of ***Seeto Devi,*** the claimants had accepted the amount sent to them under protest and therefore they did not sign to the agreement in Form-K which was sent to them. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case at hand held that there was no communication of acceptance or otherwise of the offer made by the competent authority, there was no duty cast on the Union of India to

appoint an Arbitrator. Thus, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was of the view that the judgment passed in the case of ***Hari Krishan Khosla (supra)*** did not help the claimants of the said case and consequently held that there was no question of payment of solatium and interest after having found that there was no laches on the part of the Union of India in appointment of arbitrator as the obligation to appoint arbitrator arises where the interested person communicates his non-acceptance of the offer enjoined by sub-rule (5)(i) of Rule 9 of the Rules of 1953. The requirement of sub-rule (6) to submit a report to the Central Government where the person to whom offer has been made does not communicate within 15 days, cannot be regarded as requiring the Central Government to appoint arbitrator on knowing about the fact of non-communication of the interested person. According to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, something more was needed to require appointment of arbitrator – the interested person must communicate about his non-acceptance of the offer, which was not done in the said case.

63. This Court finds that the aforesaid judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Munsha and others (supra)*** is clearly distinguishable on the facts of this case. In the said case the arbitrator was appointed but no laches was found on the part of the Union of India in delay in appointment of arbitrator as the claimants had not at all indicated/communicated their non acceptance of the offer in writing or otherwise. Inspite of the aforesaid, the appointment of arbitrator was not in dispute and the only question was posed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court whether the Union of India was liable to pay interest to the claimants for the delay in appointment of arbitrator. The case of ***Seeto Devi (supra)*** was distinguished by observing that the claimants in the case of ***Seeto Devi (supra)*** had accepted the amount sent to them under protest and therefore they did not sign to the agreement in Form-K which was sent to them.

64. ***In the present case***, as held above, the claimants have specifically asserted that they had accepted the payment by registering their protest on the payment vouchers but there is no material cross examination of the witnesses of the claimants on this point and there is

no contradiction. Further, the Union of India /state have not exhibited any payment voucher to show that no such protest was mentioned by the claimants and it is also not their case that the payment was not made through payment vouchers. There can be no dispute that the payment vouchers must have been in the custody of the authorities which were not exhibited for the reasons best known to them. Admittedly, agreement in form "K" or agreement in form "L" was not entered and no such form was/could be exhibited by the authorities. Further, it has also been held above that in large number of cases, only 80% of the compensation was paid. Even if full amount is assumed to have been paid in some cases, the factum of receipt of compensation by recording protest in the payment vouchers stood established by the claimants' witnesses. This court finds that the facts of the present case are somewhat similar to that of the case of ***Seeto Devi (supra).***

65. In such circumstances, this Court is of the view that there was no laches on the part of the claimants with respect to registering their protest while receiving compensation (part or otherwise) through payment vouchers and they have also established through their witnesses that they had requested for appointment of arbitrator but the arbitrator was not appointed. Admittedly, in the present case, the report of the competent authority which was required to be submitted to the Union of India under Rule 9(6) of the Rules of 1953 have not been exhibited. It is also not clear as to whether the report under Rule 9(6) of the Rules of 1953 was at all prepared or not.

66. This Court also finds that at the relevant point of time, apparently the concerned District Land Acquisition Officer was conscious of the fact that arbitrator was required to be appointed for all the claimants which is apparent by his action that the said authority had *suo-moto* got issued a notification dated 05.06.1993 for appointment of arbitrator covering all the claimants mentioned therein and it was this notification dated 05.06.1993 which ultimately revived upon the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Virendra Mahato and others (supra)*** and the learned Arbitrator who has passed the present impugned award was appointed. It is not in dispute that any agreement

in Form-K was never entered into between the Union of India and the claimants whose names are mentioned in the notification dated 05.06.1993 so far as it relates to the 4 villages involved in these cases.

67. So far as the other judgment which is reported in ***(1996) 7 SCC 740 (supra)*** is concerned, in the said case two sets of Civil appeals were disposed of. In the 1st set, since the arbitrator was already appointed and the award was prepared and challenged before the High Court which was pending, the Hon'ble Supreme Court did not express their view, but so far as other set of Civil Appeal is concerned, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was of the view that the case at hand was squarely covered by the judgment passed in the case of ***Union of India vs. Munsha (supra)***. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that since no action was taken by the claimants in communicating the objection under law, it must be deemed that they accepted the award and consequently the omission to appoint the arbitrator was not vitiated by any error of law. The said judgment also does not apply to the facts of the present case. In view of the aforesaid findings recorded above there is no question of coming to a finding of deemed acceptance of the award by the claimants and the arbitrator having been appointed was under a legal obligation to assess just compensation in terms of the Act of 1952 and the rules framed thereunder read with other settled principles of law in connection with award of compensation/interest/ solatium. There is a finding of the learned Arbitrator in paragraph 31 of the award that there has been no agreement in Form-K. Paragraph-31 of the award is quoted as under: -

> *"31. According to the Respondents, the acquisition was made and compensation was paid as per the procedure laid down under the law. But they have brought nothing on the record to show that Rule 9(3) of RAIP Rules was complied by them. Therefore there was no occasion for the land losers to comply with Rule 9(5) (i). There is no agreement in Form 'K'. Further there is nothing to show that the circumstances enumerated in Rule 9(5)(ii)(a) or (b) existed, justifying payment of only 80% of 'likely compensation'.*
>
> *Therefore, as per Rule 9 (5)(ii)(c) it was clear that there was no agreement on the compensation.*

Thus, the objection/dispute to the amount of compensation existed from the very beginning.
In such circumstances, the Respondents were duty bound to get the matter referred to arbitration in terms of Section 8(1)(b) of RAIP Act, but they did nothing.
Having failed in their duty, the Respondents cannot contend that the land losers moved the court in 1991 i.e. after about twenty years of acquisition. As noticed above, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, interalia, observed that the land losers were poor, illiterate and Schedule Tribe people. In the circumstances, the land losers, cannot be penalized, if they could move the court only in the year 1991. Further, as per the order of Hon'ble Supreme Court all the land losers under notification dated 05.06.1993, who raised objections and who did not raise objection are to be treated equally."

68. A lot of argument has been advanced by the learned ASGI by referring to the judgment passed by this Court in the case of ***Virendra Mahato and others (supra)*** decided in the year 2008 whereby this High Court had refused to interfere with the notification dated 18.11.1993 cancelling the earlier notification dated 05.06.1993 [restoring the notification dated 18.12.1992]. The High court had confined the arbitration only in connection with 20 writ petitioners by upholding the notification dated 18.11.1993. Reliance has been placed on the findings recorded in the High Court's Judgement which was impugned before the Hon'ble Supreme court. The fact remains that the said judgment of the High Court was set-aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the notification dated 05.06.1993 extending the arbitration to all the persons whose names were mentioned in the notification dated 05.06.1993 was revived.

69. In this background, this Court is of the view that the findings or discussions which have been recorded in the judgment passed by the High Court in ***Virendra Mahto vs. Union of India in C.W.J.C. No. 2273/1994(R) (supra)*** cannot be relied upon by the Union of India to impress upon this Court that the arbitration was required to be confined only with respect to the persons who were 20 in numbers in the writ petition or the learned Arbitrator was not justified in enhancing the award with respect to the persons beyond 20 writ petitioners.

70. ***In the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the learned Arbitrator has rightly recorded while deciding issue nos. A and B that the claims were maintainable and the arbitration proceeding was not only confined to 20 writ petitioners of the writ petition filed by Virendra Mahato and others (supra) , but it would cover all the land losers mentioned in the notification dated 05.06.1993 issued by the competent authority and has adjudicated with respect to the four villages involved in these cases . The point of determination no. (a) is accordingly decided in favour of the claimants-land losers and against the Union of India.***

71. This Court is also of the considered view that there was unexplained delay and laches on the part of the Union of India in appointment of Arbitrator and vide the notification dated 18.12.1992 arbitrator was appointed only upon direction issued in the writ petitions of the year 1991. Further, when the concerned authority extended the scope of notification to other land losers vide notification dated 05.06.1993, the same was challenged by Union of India in writ petition . However, the notification dated 05.06.1993 was withdrawn unilaterally vide another notification dated 18.11.1993 and thereby the arbitration was confined only to the writ petitioners of the year 1991. Further, the notification dated 18.11.1993 withdrawing the notification dated 05.06.1993, was subject matter of challenge in the writ petition filed by 20 persons in the case of ***Virendra Mahato (supra)*** where the writ petition was dismissed and upon appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court the appeal was allowed and the notification dated 05.06.1993 extending the arbitration to the land losers mentioned therein revived.

72. This court has held as aforesaid that the claimants had received the compensation under protest by mentioning their protest in the payment vouchers and /or part payment of compensation to the extent of 80% was made to many of the claimants and admittedly agreement in form "K" or "L" was never entered. In such circumstances, it was the duty of the competent authority to appoint an arbitrator as per the mandate of the Act of 1952 but they failed to act as per law and

maintained complete silence at their end. The report of the competent authority forwarding the entire facts as per the provisions of Act of 1952 read with Rule 9(6) of the Rules of 1953 has not been exhibited for the reasons best known to the Union of India /State. The District Land Acquisition Officer, who deposed before the learned Arbitrator, was apparently not present at the relevant time in the year 1970 to 1975 and he stated nothing except producing the records and did not exhibit any materials from the record to show that while receiving payment (part payment to the extent of 80% or full) through vouchers the claimants had not registered any protest as claimed and deposed by their witnesses before the learned Arbitrator and no such material has been pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the Union of India /State before this court during their course of arguments. The learned ASGI has failed to demonstrate that 80% of the claimants had accepted 100% payment of compensation as offered to them without any protest. Rather the records reveal, as discussed above that many of the claimants were offered and received only 80% of compensation as assessed by the authority and admittedly no agreement in form "K" or form "L" was entered with any of the claimants.

73. In such circumstances, most of the claimants being poor, illiterate and tribal people in the State of Jharkhand ultimately had to approach till the Hon'ble Supreme Court for the purposes of appointment of Arbitrator in terms of notification dated 05.06.1993 and the entire sequence of events in connection with appointment of arbitrator has already been narrated above which reveals that there was delay and laches in appointment of arbitrator attributable to the Union of India/State which is also the finding recorded by the learned arbitrator as quoted above while awarding solatium @ 20% on the differential value of just compensation and also while awarding interest from 01.01.1976 till the date of award , 31.07.2014 @9% on differential value of just compensation and also on solatium. The format in the tabular form as given in the award has already been quoted above.

74. ***This Court is of the considered view that the claimants were entitled for solatium and interest on account of delay in appointment***

of arbitrator under the Act of 1952 attributable to the Union of India on equitable grounds although there is no such provision of payment of interest and solatium under the Act of 1952. The finding of the learned Arbitrator on this point is as per law and does not require interference by this court. The point of determination no. (d) is accordingly decided in favour of the claimants-land losers and against the Union of India.

75. The learned counsel for the claimants has also sought to argue that the solatium ought to have been @ 30% and not @ 20%. However, this court is not inclined to accept such an argument. The fact remains that the Act of 1952 does not provide for solatium and interest and such relief is provided on equitable ground on account of delay in appointment of arbitrator as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in various judgements and discussed and followed by the learned Arbitral Tribunal and it also appears that 80% of the compensation amount was already paid to many of the claimants. ***This Court is of view that the learned Arbitrator has exercised sound discretion in limiting the solatium amount only to the extent of 20% and interest to the extent of 9%.*** The award of future interest has been considered while deciding the point of determination no.(g). ***The point of determination no. (e) is accordingly decided against the claimants-land losers and in favour of the Union of India.***

Point of determination no. (f)

76. Extensive arguments have been advanced on behalf of the parties on the point of quantum of compensation with regard to rate at which compensation has been awarded concerning the acquired land.

77. The learned Arbitrator has arrived at the market value of the land as on the date of acquisition in the year 1970-71 by considering the materials on record in the following manner: -

> ***"23. The claimants' documents, which are not relied, by this Tribunal are:-***
>
> *i)* ***Exhibit- 4-*** *Certified copy of judgment of Hon'ble High Court.*

The said Exhibit is a judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in F.A. No. 220 of 1977(R) dt. 06.02.90, in relation to the land situated near the Railway Station, Bus Stand which were acquired under L.A. Act on 28.08.1971 and for which compensation of Rs. 2,50,000/- per Area was awarded.
However, in view of the proximity of the said land nearer to Railway Station and Bus Stand, I am not inclined to consider the said judgment for the purposes of calculation of compensation, in this case.

ii) ***Exhibit-6*** *-Certified copy of judgment of L.A. Judge, Ranchi dt. 09.05.12, in which the lands were acquired under L.A. Act in 2006 / 2007 for construction of Overbridge on NH 33 at Village Namkum and on the basis of Sale Deed of lands at vicinity, compensation @ Rs.30,000/- per decimal and additional compensation @12%, Solatium @ 30% on enhanced award and interest @ 9% p.a. for one year and 15% p.a. for rest years were allowed by the Learned Land Acquisition Judge.*
The lands were better in location, and hence no much weightage can be given to this Exhibit in the present case.

iii) ***Exhibit-12-*** *Judgment dt. 25.01.1972 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 661 & 1380/67 and 1885-1886 of 1967: Smt. Tribeni Devi & others v. Collector of Ranchi.*
The same pertained to the land situated at Main Ranchi-Chaibasa Road and the Hon'ble Supreme Court fixed the rate at Rs.1,35,000/- per acre and also granted 5% severance, 15% solatium and interest @6% from date of possession.
The land in this case was on the Main Road and therefore is not relevant in the present case.

24. However, the following Exts are relevant and relied in this case for ascertaining the market value:

(i) ***Exhibit-1*** *– Survey Map of Kanke Anchal: From the same, it is evident that lands at Sugnu, Lalganj, Gari and Khatanga are contiguous having road access with National Highway. The lands in question are very near to the Town of Ranchi*

(ii) ***Exhibit 5*** *- Certified copy of judgment of High Court dated 09.03.98 (Sanicharwa Lakra & Ors - M.A. 38, 39 and 132 of 1994(R)).*

The said judgment is in relation to acquisition under RAIP Act of lands situated at Village Khutiyatu and Tumbagutu, acquired in 1986-87 for the purposes of Khoja Toli Army Camp and situated about 10-12 kms from the heart of Ranchi Town. The Hon'ble High Court while hearing the matter affirmed the Arbitrator's Award wherein flat rate of Rs. 2,00,000/- per acre was granted for the lands acquired alongwith solatium @ 30% with interest @ 12% per year.

The lands under the present proceedings are similarly situated and the ratio as laid down in this judgment applies to the instant case.

The distance of the present Villages under acquisition from Ranchi town is less than the Villages involved in this judgment.

It transpires that flat rate of Rs. 2,00,000/- was fixed pertaining to acquisition in the year 1986-87 i.e. about 15 years after the present acquisition.

For arriving at an approximate market value for the year 1971, I am inclined to adopt the reverse process thereby making deduction of 10% per year from the said amount, viz-

1986 = Rs. 2,00,000/-
1985 = Rs. 1,80,000/-
1984 = Rs. 1,62,000/-
1983 = Rs. 1,45,800/-
1982 = Rs. 1,31,220/-
1971 = Rs. 42,000/- (Approx)

*(iii)**Exhibit-7** - Certified copy of Sale Deed dt. 19.06.63 of Village- Gari.*

This pertains to sale of land of 5 khatas in Village Gari on 19.06.63 at Rs. 2000/- i.e. Rs. 24,000/- per acre.

This sale deed is of one of the Villages involved in the present acquisition and is of a prior date than the date of acquisition of this case and can be used for the purposes for determining the market value.

For determining the value of the lands in the year 1971, I am inclined to add 10% every year upto 1971, viz-

1963 = Rs. 24,000/-
1964 = Rs. 26,400/-
1965 = Rs. 2,90,40/-
1971 = Rs. 51,446/-

I deduct 20% towards development costs of the said land.

As such, as per this Exhibit, the market value will come to approximately Rs. 41,000/-.

(iv)***Exhibit-8*** *-Original Sale Deed of Village Lagangj dt. 13.11.1962.*

This pertains to sale of land at Village- Lalganj of 1 decimal of land sold at Rs. 300/- i.e. Rs. 30,000/- per acre.

This sale deed is of one of the Villages involved in the acquisition and is of a prior date than the date of acquisition of this case and can be used for the purposes for determining the market value.

For determining the value of the lands in the year 1971, I am inclined to add 10% every year upto 1971, viz-

1962 = Rs. 30,000/-
1963 = Rs. 33,000/-
1964 = Rs. 36,300/-
1971 = Rs. 70,726/-

I deduct 20% towards development costs of the said land.

As such, as per this Exhibit, the market value will come to approximately Rs. 57,000/-.

(v) ***Exhibit 9*** *- Certified copy of Sale Deed of Village Gari dt. 02.04.71.*

This pertains to sale of land at Village Gari measuring 23 kathas 11 chatak and 27 sq. ft. which was sold at Rs.10,000/- on 02.04.1971 i.e. at Rs. 27,000/- per acre (approx.).

This sale deed is of one of the Villages involved in the acquisition and is near about the date of acquisition of this case and can be used for the purposes for determining the market value.

25. *In the instant case, as noted above, admittedly the properties were requisitioned in the year 1941-42 by the Defence and were acquired in the years 1971 - 72. As such, the properties remained in possession of the Defence Department for more than 30 years and the same developed due to the establishment of Cantonment Area. It is not in dispute that the said properties are situated very near to the capital city of Ranchi (the then Town of Ranchi). Further, it is also not in dispute that National Highway and State Highway is adjacent and water bodies in form of rivers is also in the vicinity.*

26. *From the exhibits noticed above, the approximate valuation*
per acre comes as follows:
Ext. 5 - Rs. 42,000/=, Ext. 7 Rs. 41,000/=,

Ext. 8- Rs. 57,000/=, Ext. 9- Rs. 27,000/=

In my view, the average of these four valuations i.e. Rs.41,750/= Per Acre would be just and reasonable market price at the time of acquisition. I am fixing this rate as flat rate for all types of lands. In Ext. 10, the DLAO himself recommended flat rate for Village Gari, which is contiguous to

other three Villages. Moreover, in the High Court Judgment-Ext. 5, flat rate granted by arbitrator was approved. It has been already held that there was no justification for categorization of lands for assessment/payment of compensation."

78. It is not in dispute that about 1846.99 acres of land for military purposes in the four villages involved in these cases were requisitioned in the year 1941-42 and were acquired in the year 1971-72 by the Union of India under the aforesaid Act of 1952. Section 7 deals with the *'power to acquire requisitioned property'* and Section 8 deals with the *'principles and method of determining compensation'*. Section 8(3) clearly provides that the compensation payable for the acquisition of any property requisitioned under Section 7 shall be the price which the requisitioned property would have fetched in the open market, if it had remained in the same condition as it was at the time of requisitioning and been sold on the date of acquisition.

79. During the course of argument, it is not in dispute amongst the learned counsel for the parties that the market value of the property is to be determined with respect to the date of acquisition. However, the learned counsel for the Union of India has specifically argued that the status of the property is to be seen referable to the date of requisition and accordingly, they have submitted that on the date of requisition the property was of agricultural nature and therefore, the District Land Acquisition Officer had classified the land in different categories under the agricultural head for three villages except the village Gari.

80. With respect to the method of calculation of market value, as considered and adopted by the learned Arbitrator, it is the case of the learned counsel for the Union of India that Exhibit-10, which was exhibited by the claimants themselves, is relating to the rate chart

prepared by the District Land Acquisition Officer and that being an admitted document on record could not have been discarded by the learned Arbitrator. They have also assailed the method of arriving at the market value of the property on the date of acquisition by referring to Exhibits-5, 7 and 8 which are the document relating to acquisition of the year 1986-87, sale deed dated 19.06.1963 and sale deed dated 13.11.1962 respectively. They have submitted that the backward and forward calculation which has been adopted by the learned Arbitrator to come to the value of land in the year 1971 by deducting or adding 10% per year, as the case may be, is not in accordance with law.

81. ***On the other hand,*** it has been argued by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the claimants that the market value of the property has to be seen on the date of acquisition and therefore the value of the property referable to the date of requisition has got no relevance. It has also been argued on behalf of the claimants that otherwise also the position and location of the property which existed on the date of requisition with respect to existence of National Highway and State Highway in the vicinity of the villages continued to exist even till the date of acquisition and thus there has been no material change with regard to the status of the property from the date of requisition till the date of acquisition except that the property continued to be in possession of the Defence Department of Union of India and apparently certain constructions etc. might have come up on the requisitioned property.

82. The learned counsels representing the claimants has also raised serious objection in connection with rejection of ***exhibit-4 and exhibit-12*** by the learned Arbitrator and have submitted that the same have been wrongly rejected.

83. With respect to ***exhibit-4***, they have submitted that the same is the certified copy of the judgment of High Court passed in F.A. No. 220/1977 (R) dated 06.02.1990 with respect to the land acquired under Land Acquisition Act, 1894 on 28.08.1971 where compensation was given @ Rs. 2,50,000/- per acre by observing that the property was situated near the railway station and bus stand in relation to ward no. 5

and 6, but the learned Arbitrator has wrongly observed by holding that the case in F.A. No. 220/1977 (R) is distinguishable as the said land was situated near railway station and bus stand and has ignored the evidences placed on record by the witnesses of the claimants in the present case wherein it was asserted that the property involved in this case also are nearby two railway stations of the local area. With respect to Exhibit-4, they have also stated that the same was in relation to ward nos. 5 and 6 and the property involved in the present case is in relation to ward no. 4 and therefore the property involved in this case is also in the vicinity of the property involved in Exhibit-4 and therefore the same could have been a good parameter to come to a conclusion on the point of market value on the date of acquisition . They have also submitted that the compensation awarded in the said case was @ Rs. 2,50,000/- per acre and the compensation awarded in the present case by the learned arbitrator is @ Rs. 41,750/- per acre and there is a huge gap between both the figures.

84. With respect to ***Exhibit-12,*** the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the claimants has submitted that the same has been rejected by the learned Arbitrator who has committed error on fact by observing that the land was situated at main Ranchi-Chaibasa Road. Rather, the exemplar sale in exhibit-12 was located in Ranchi-Chaibasa Road and not the land involved in Exhibit-12. They have submitted that Exhibit-12 is the judgment dated 25.01.1972 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 661 & 1380 of 1967 and 1885-1886 of 1967 and the same could have been used as a good parameter to assess the market value of the land involved in the present case. They have also submitted that the property of Exhibit-12 was situated in ward no. 3 and therefore, it is contiguous to ward no. 4 involved in the present case.

85. ***On the other hand,*** with respect to ***Exhibit-4,*** the argument advanced on behalf of the Union of India is that merely because the property in the said case was with respect to ward no. 5 and 6 and the property in the present case is with respect to ward no. 4, the same is not decisive and cannot be a parameter to hold that the property involved in this case was adjacent or nearby the property involved in

Exhibit-4. They have also referred to the map which is Exhibit-1 and have pointed out the location of the property involved in the present case. They have submitted that the property was away from the town area of Ranchi, though falling in municipal area of Ranchi and the property involved in Exhibit-4 was within the Ranchi town of Doranda and have submitted that though the learned Arbitrator has cited only one reason in connection with proximity of railway station and bus stand, but otherwise also Exhibit-4 is not fit for consideration when seen in the light of the location and position of the property.

86. With respect to ***Exhibit-12,*** The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Union of India has submitted that there is no error in consideration of Exhibit-12 by the learned Arbitrator while rejecting the same. They have again submitted that merely because the property involved in Exhibit- 12 was in ward no. 3 and the present property is in ward no. 4, the same does not mean that the property was contiguous with that of the present land. They submitted that otherwise also upon perusal of Exhibit-12, the same is not fit to be taken into consideration in the present case.

87. With respect to the rate of compensation, the learned counsel for the Union of India has specifically relied upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Manoj Kumar v. State of Haryana*** reported in ***(2018) 13 SCC 96*** and has referred to paragraphs 11 to 13 of the said judgment which are quoted as under : -

> *"**11.** In our opinion, the High Court could not have placed an outright reliance on Swaran Singh case **[Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044]**, without considering the nature of transaction relied upon in the said decision. The decision could not have been applied ipso facto to the facts of the instant case. In such cases, where such judgments/awards are relied on as evidence, though they are relevant, but cannot be said to be binding with respect to the determination of the price, that has to depend on the evidence adduced in the case. However, in the instant case, it appears that the land in Swaran Singh case **[Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044]** was situated just across the road as observed by the High Court as such it is relevant evidence*

but not binding. As such it could have been taken into consideration due to the nearness of the area, but at the same time what was the nature of the transaction relied upon in the said case was also required to be looked into in an objective manner. Such decisions in other cases cannot be adopted without examining the basis for determining compensation whether sale transaction referred to therein can be relied upon or not and what was the distance, size and also bona fide nature of transaction before such judgments/awards are relied on for deciding the subsequent cases. It is not open to accepting determination in a mechanical manner without considering the merit. Such determination cannot be said to be binding.

12. *We have come across several decisions where the High Court is adopting the previous decisions as binding. The determination of compensation in each case depends upon the nature of land and what is the evidence adduced in each case, may be that better evidence has been adduced in later case regarding the actual value of property and subsequent sale deeds after the award and before preliminary notification under Section 4 are also to be considered, if filed. It is not proper to ignore the evidence adduced in the case at hand. The compensation cannot be determined by blindly following the previous award/judgment. It has to be considered only a piece of evidence, not beyond that. The court has to apply the judicial mind and is supposed not to follow the previous awards without due consideration of the facts and circumstances and evidence adduced in the case in question. The current value reflected by comparable sale deeds is more reliable and binding for determination of compensation in such cases award/judgment relating to an acquisition made before 5 to 10 years cannot form the safe basis for determining compensation.*

13. *The awards and judgment in the cases of others not being inter partes are not binding as precedents. Recently, we have seen the trend of the courts to follow them blindly probably under the misconception of the concept of equality and fair treatment. The courts are being swayed away and this approach in the absence of and similar nature and situation of land is causing more injustice and tantamount to giving equal treatment in the case of unequals. As per situation of a village, nature of land, its value differ from distance to distance, even two-to-three-kilometre distance may also make the material difference in value. Land abutting highway may fetch*

higher value but not land situated in interior villages."

88. Upon perusal of the map (Exhibit-1), this Court finds that the property involved in these cases are in village Gari, Khatanga, Lalganj and Sugnu which are away from Ranchi Town area, though they are situated on the National Highway/State Highway or in their vicinity. The National Highway passes right through the village Gari and between Gari and Khatanga there is thana no. 180 - Hotwar and the villages Khatanga, Lalganj and Sugnu are one after another and the State Highway in their vicinity is immediately joining the National Highway. Water bodies are also in the vicinity. Thus, the properties in these villages are bound to have locational advantage.

Claimants' witnesses *with respect to the rate of compensation for acquired land -position/location of the property*

89. The ***Claimants Witness No.1 (Virendra Mahto)*** belongs to ***Village- Sugnu*** and he filed his evidence on affidavit stating that the lands were acquired by the Government of India in 1971 for Military purposes and the lands in all the four Villages (Sugnu, Lalganj, Gari and Khatanga) are of the same nature and are agricultural lands and all the lands were suitable for construction of houses and the market value of the lands in 1971 was more than Rs.2,00,000/- per acre. He further stated that the lands of all the four Villages are situated near National Highway-33 and therefore, their value is higher. He also stated that the land losers had received the compensation with objection. He further stated that Kokar Industrial Area having different industries such as Head Office of the newspaper group, printing press, liquor factory, office of the electricity department, motor factory, etc. is situated adjacent south of Gari Village and the lands of all the four Villages had become semi-urban area in 1971 itself and therefore, the lands of all the four Villages are fit to be considered as urban area and their value is fit to be assessed as urban area. The acquired lands had become suitable for construction of houses and therefore, the compensation is fit to be assessed accordingly. He further stated that majority land holders of all the four Villages belong to Scheduled Tribe and Backward Castes and

permission is required from the Government for sale of their lands and therefore, only a few sale deeds are available in the Village. He further stated that Ranchi town is situated in the north at a distance of 5 kilometers only from the said villages and all the four Villages have been included within the Municipality area and the lands of all the four Villages are part of Ranchi Town. The lands of all the four Villages are surrounded by river on three sides and National Highway-33 is situated in the west of the Villages and all the facilities of a town like market, bank, school, hotel, petrol pump, daily market, different kinds of shops, high buildings, shops, etc. are available in the Villages. This witness further stated that Ward No.7 known as Booty More is situated adjacent to NH-33, where all the facilities of electricity, water and road are available. He further stated that NH-33 has passed through Khatanga and Lalganj Villages which connects the SH-32 Purulia which was available in the last survey of 1932. The lands of both sides of NH-33 were acquired in 1971 which are suitable for construction of houses and the value of the lands is more than Rs.2,00,000/- per acre. He further stated that Getalhatu Village is situated in the north of the four Villages where multi-storeyed buildings have been constructed and petrol pump, hotel and shops are also available, B.I.T. Mesra Engineering College also lies in the north and the main branches of BSNL and PNT are also there. All the four Villages are adjacent to each other and several factories and industries like Usha Martin Ropeway Factory, Waxpole, School of Birla, State Government High School, Hospital, Rice Mill, Flour Mill, Transformer factory (EEF) and FCI Godown, etc. lie in Tatisilway which is situated adjacent to the Villages in the south-west and Tatisilway Railway Station is also situated in the nearby. Namkum Railway Station, Petrol Pump and Cement Depo are situated in the south of the Villages. The value of the land acquired by the Government for construction of overbridge for the NH-33 has been assessed by the court as Rs.30,00,000/- per acre. He further stated that the Arbitrator has awarded Rs.2,00,000/- per acre for the lands acquired for the forces in Kutiyatu Village in 1986, which has been approved by the Hon'ble High Court, whereas Kitiyatu Village is 12 Km away from town and ½

mile away from NH-33 and the acquired lands of the four Villages are adjacent to the Ranchi Town and NH-33 has passed through the western boundary of the Villages and therefore, the valuation of the land of the four Villages has been wrongly assessed by the D.L.O., Ranchi. He also stated that as per the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court, the land losers are entitled for 30% solatium and 15 % interest per annum, apart from the value of the land. During ***cross-examination on behalf of Union of India,*** he replied to the suggestion stating that the compensation was not paid at the prevailing market rate. During ***cross-examination by the State of Jharkhand,*** he admitted at Para-1 that he was one of the petitioners before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and at Para-5, he admitted his Award No.45. He further admitted at Para-15 that he got Rs.27,000/- against 11.5 acres of land of Village-Sugnu and at Para-20, he admitted that he used to grow crops four times in a year i.e. paddy, Maduwa, Arhar, Shakar Kand, Urad, Gondli, wheat, etc. He stated that SH-32 was also existing in the year 1971 which connects Purulia and passes through the Village- Lalganj.

90. ***Claimants Witness No.2 (Rajendra Gope)*** belongs to ***Village-Gari,*** Claimants Witness No.3 (Jitlal Mahto) belongs to ***Village-Khatanga*** and Claimants Witness No.4 (Sheikh Afzal) belongs to ***Village- Lalgunj*** and they filed their evidences on affidavits stating similar facts as stated by the Claimants Witness No.1 (Virendra Mahto).

91. ***Witness No.2 (Rajendra Gope) during his cross-examination*** on behalf of Union of India, admitted at Para-2 that the distance between Khatanga Village and Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi is about 5 Kms. He admitted at Para-4 that he was awarded Rs.64,000/- and odd as compensation for his land acquired by the Government. He further admitted at Para-6 that he had put his signature over payment slip after his objection/protest. During cross-examination on behalf of State of Jharkhand, he admitted at Para-1 that he was not a petitioner before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. He further admitted at Para-4 that he used to cultivate paddy, makai, urad, madua and some vegetable in the riverside part of his land and his yearly income was Rs.20,000/- to

Rs.25,000/- per acre from those lands and his all lands were agricultural and cultivable lands, but he did not get adequate compensation.

92. ***Claimants Witness No.3 (Jitlal Mahto)*** during his cross-examination on behalf of Union of India, admitted at Para-2 that he is a resident of Village- Khatanga and at Para-3, he admitted that the distance between Khatanga and H.E.C. is about 5 Kms. He also admitted at Para-12 that the Villagers had made their protest while receiving the compensation amount. He further admitted at para-13 that he was authorised by all the Villagers to give evidence in the case on their behalf also. During cross-examination on behalf of the State of Jharkhand, he admitted that his acquired land belonged to Village-Khatanga. He admitted at Para-7 that his land was surrounded by agricultural and cultivable lands from all the four corners. He admitted at Para-9 that he had received the compensation amount with objection. He admitted at Para-12 that paddy crop and other crops were cultivated on his land.

93. ***Claimants Witness No.4 (Sheikh Afzal)***, during his cross-examination on behalf of Union of India, admitted at Para-5 that about 6.5 acres of land belonging to him has been acquired in the case. He admitted at Para-6 and 7 that he was paid compensation @ Rs.200/- per acre for his acquired land, but the compensation was not paid at the prevailing market rate and it was very low. He further admitted at Para-8 and 9 that he had accepted the compensation amount by endorsing objection / protest on the payment voucher. He further admitted at Para-10 that he was one of the petitioners in CWJC No.2273 of 1994 (R) filed before Ranchi Bench of the Hon'ble Patna High Court. He also admitted at Para-11 and 12 that his name is recorded in the Khatiyan against his land of Khata No.19. He further admitted at Para-13 that he deposed on behalf of the Villagers also, although he had not been authorised by the Villagers in writing. During his cross-examination on behalf of the State of Jharkhand, he admitted at Para-2, 3 and 4 that his land is situated in Village- Lalganj and 6 ½ acres (approximately) of land in Khata Nos. 19, 117, 228, 212, 223, etc. has been acquired. He also admitted at Para-5 that he gave his evidence on behalf of the

Villagers also. He admitted at para-6 that paddy and other crops were cultivated in his land. He admitted at para-8 that NH-33 is at about ½ Kms away from his land and crosses through the Village. He further admitted at Para-10 that he had himself receive the compensation amount. He also admitted at Para-14 and 15 that he has furnished sale deed of the year 1971 of the nearby land of his Village and he is claiming compensation on the basis of the value of his crop.

Witnesses of Union of India/State with respect to the rate of compensation for acquired land -position/location of the property

94. ***Respondent Witness No.1 (Nitish Ranjan Das)*** filed his evidence on affidavit stating that he is working as SDO-II in the office of Defense Estate Officer, Job Circle, Danapur Cantt. since July, 2013. He stated that on the requisition of the Union of India, the State of Bihar, now Jharkhand acquired total lands measuring 1846.99 acres in four Villages namely, Sugnu, Lalganj, Gari and Khatanga in the year 1970 for military purposes under Section-7 of the Act of 1952. Thereupon, compensation had been paid by the Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi to the land losers on the basis of the prevailing market value. He stated that abandoned lands were acquired for the purpose of defence and at the time of acquisition, the area was undeveloped, there was no market nearby the area and Ranchi was only a district having very less population and no school and colleges were nearby the area. During ***cross-examination*** on behalf of the claimants, he admitted that he had not taken part in the process of acquisition of four Villages and he has joined on his present post six months back and he got knowledge from the records about the acquisition of the Villages and NH-33 is situated between Ranchi town and the four Villages. He further admitted that the requisition was done in 1942 and the acquisition was done in 1970. After acquisition, temporary construction was made and no pucca construction was done between requisition and acquisition. He further admitted that during his visit, he found that after acquisition, the area of the four Villages has developed. He also admitted that at present, Ranchi is an industrial area.

95. ***Respondent Witness No.2: Shri Rajendra Kumar, SDO-III in the office of Defence Estate Officer, Job Circle, Danapur Cantt*** filed his evidence on affidavit stating the same facts as stated by the Respondent Witness No.1 (Nitish Ranjan Das). ***During his cross-examination*** on behalf of the claimants, he admitted that NH-33 runs between Ranchi and the four Villages-in-question and he was not present at the time of payment of compensation.

96. ***Respondent Witness No.3: Abhay Nandan Ambastha, District Land Acquisition Officer (DLAO), Ranchi*** in his evidence stated that he was working as District Land Acquisition Officer, Ranchi since December, 2012 and he submitted photocopies of the relevant records of all the four Villages namely, Sugnu, Lalganj, Gari and Khatanga. During his ***cross-examination*** on behalf of the claimants, he admitted at Para-6 & 8 that the Villages are near Ranchi town divided by NH-33 and at present, Gari is within Ward No.4 of Ranchi Municipal Corporation. He admitted at Para-7 that the State Government has fixed the rates of different classes of land through the concerned Deputy Commissioner of the district and it is true that the rate of the land of Village Gari, effective from 01.01.2013, has been fixed at Rs.1,56,000/- per decimal for residential plots, Rs.1,88,186/- per decimal for the road side plots, Rs.3,13,643/- per decimal for the land for commercial purpose and Rs.3,76,372/- per decimal for the plots on the side of municipal road. Likewise, the rates of the other Villages namely, Sugnu, Lalganj and Khatanga have also been fixed w.e.f. 01.01.2013. He also admitted at Para-9 that he will file certified copies of sale deeds of Village- Getlatu executed on 27.07.1978 and he does not know whether the sale deed of Getlatu was considered at the time of fixing rate of compensation. He also admitted at Para-10 that at present, the area of four Villages appears to be developed as they are near Ranchi Town. He admitted at Para-11 that from perusal of a copy of Anchal map produced on behalf of the land losers, it appears that the road connecting NH passes through the Villages Khatanga and Lalganj. During cross-examination on behalf of the Union of India, he stated that the compensation has been paid adequately by the defence to the land

losers at the prevailing market rate existing in the year 1971 and at present, there is no outstanding amount to any land loser.

97. The learned Arbitrator has taken note that Section 8(3) of the Act of 1952 provides that the compensation payable for the acquisition of any property under section 7 shall be the price which the requisitioned property would have fetched in open market, if it had remained in the same condition as it was at the time of requisitioning and been sold on the date of acquisition.

98. Upon perusal of the evidence of the witnesses produced on behalf of the claimants, it is clear that they have deposed in the same lines and the evidence reveals that the property involved in these cases is nearby National Highway-33 and the State Highway No.32 and the State Highway No. 32 also joins the National Highway-33. There are rivers nearby and Namkum Railway Station is situated about 3-4 kilometers away. It is also clear that though this property is not within the Ranchi Town, but it is certainly within Ranchi Municipality and is towards the outskirts of Ranchi Town. The map as produced and exhibited before the learned Arbitrator reveals that between Ranchi Town and the nearest village towards Ranchi Town i.e. the village Gari there is an area called Kokar and the other three villages i.e. village Lalganj, Sugnu and Khatanga are adjoining to each other but the village Gari is separated by an area under P.S. Hotwar. The National Highway passes through Gari and State Highway joining the National Highway is passing through Khatanga, Lalganj and Sugnu when all the three villages which are contiguous are taken together.

99. In view of the deposition of the witnesses, the location of the property is quite clear when seen in the light of the map. Considering the location of National Highway /state Highway as discussed above there can be no doubt that the land of the four villages taken together having been requisitioned at the same time and also having been acquired at the same time certainly had locational advantage even on the date of requisition and also in terms of market value of the property on the date of acquisition. The property certainly had locational advantage on the date of requisition as the location is towards the

outskirts of Ranchi town but within Ranchi Municipality. It has been argued by both the parties that the property falls under ward no.4. There is further locational advantage as there are rivers nearby and Namkum Railway Station is situated only about 3-4 kilometres away from the acquired property.

100. So far as the market value on the date of acquisition in the year 1971 -72 is concerned, nothing concrete comes out of oral evidence of both the parties with respect to the rate except that there has been increasing trend in the market value of the property with urbanization of Ranchi town. Therefore, what remains to be considered is the documentary evidences which were filed by the respective parties before the learned Arbitrator. The contents of the impugned award of the learned Arbitrator have been discussed at length in the aforesaid paragraphs. The learned Arbitrator has enlisted the claimants' documents which have not been relied upon and they are exhibits-4, 6 and 12.

101. With respect to non-reliance of exhibit-6, the claimants have no objection, but they have heavily relied upon exhibits-4 and 12 and have submitted that these two exhibits could have been the parameter to determine the quantum of compensation and if these two exhibits are taken into consideration, then the compensation would be much higher.

102. So far as ***exhibit-4*** (judgment passed in the case of ***"Mansoor Hassan and Others Vs. State of Bihar"*** reported in ***1990 SCC OnLine Pat 417*** **)** is concerned, this Court finds from paragraph 2 of exhibit 4, which is the judgment passed by this Court in connection with land acquired under Land Acquisition Act, 1894, that for acquisition of land in the said case, notice under Section 4 was issued on 28.08.1971 and the land was situated in ward nos. 5 and 6 of Doranda within Ranchi Municipality and a declaration under Section 6 of the aforesaid Act of 1894 was made on 15.11.1971. When area Doranda is seen in the map (exhibit-1), this Court finds that the same falls in Thana No. 223 which is shown within Ranchi town and the same is certainly much away from the villages, which are acquired and involved in the present cases. From further perusal of exhibit-4, this Court finds that the claimants of the

said case, had argued that the land involved in the said case was situated in the heart of Ranchi town and was in commercial area and it was also asserted that the same was very near to the railway station and depot belonging to Bihar State Road Transportation and had great potential value as it was on the side of the main road and in fact the lands were acquired for the construction of the over-bridge. The High Court in the said judgment also observed that the trial court did not accept the valuation with respect to exhibit-5/a, exhibited in the said case, only on the ground that it was more than three years prior to the date of notification issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. The High Court was of the view that the approach of the learned trial court was not correct and the Hon'ble Supreme Court has already held that in land acquisition proceeding, computation should be made on the basis of the sale deeds which were executed in respect of the land at about the time when the notification was issued under Section 4 of the Act and in absence of such a document, the Court has to consider all the available documents and in computing the market value of the property, some amount of guess work was permissible. The High Court further held that it could not be said that exhibit-5/a was wholly inadmissible in evidence. The High Court also observed that the learned trial court had sought to compute the value of the land upon taking the average of the valuation of the land as found by the Land Acquisition Officer and held that it was well-settled that a rate report is not admissible in evidence if the maker thereof has not been examined. The High Court then referred to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Tribeni Devi Vs. Collector of Ranchi (supra),*** which has been marked as ***Exhibit-12*** in the present case also, and observed that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down the criteria upon which the Court should pass its decision in computing the value of the land. Ultimately, the High Court in paragraph 19 of the judgment took into consideration all aspects of the matter as no deed of sale were proved near about the land in question. The High Court considered that the land in question was by the side of the main road, near the railway station, bus stand and other important offices and was having great

commercial value and valued the acquired land in question @ Rs.2500/- per decimal to meet the ends of justice. In view of the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, the High Court further awarded solatium @15% per annum and interest @ 6% per annum from the date of taking possession of the land i.e. 25.10.1972 till its realization.

103. This Court finds that vide ***Exhibit-4(supra)*** , the High Court was dealing with the case where the notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act was issued on 28.08.1971 but the location and position of the property was very different from the four villages involved in the present case and further in the said case, the Court was of the view that since no deed of sale was proved with regard to the land near about the land in question, the Court thought it proper to award compensation considering the position of the property by the side of the main road, near railway station, bus stand and other important offices and having great commercial value @ Rs.2500/- per decimal, which according to the court would meet the ends of justice.

104. This Court is of the view that ***Exhibit-4(supra)*** is not fit to be relied upon in the present case. The location, position and commercial value of the property is very different as compared to that of the properties of the four villages involved in present case. Merely because the property was situated in Ward Nos.5 and 6, the same cannot be a reason to fix the same rate as that of the property situated in Ward No.4 unless the market value of the property is found to be the same. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered view that Exhibit-4 cannot be relied upon for the purposes of fixing the market value of the land involved in the present case and the learned Arbitrator in the present case has rightly refused to rely upon exhibit-4.

105. So far as ***Exhibit-12 [judgement passed in the case of "Tribeni Devi & Ors. v. Collector of Ranchi" reported in (1972) 1 SCC*** 480*]* is concerned, the same has been referred to in the judgment contained in Exhibit-4 also. In the said case in exhibit 12, the Notification under Section 4 of the Act of 1894 was issued on 07.07.1954 with respect to property in Ward No.3 of Ranchi Municipality. In the said case, the land

in question was leased out to Military authority on 22.09.1944 on a lease rent for ten years with certain terms and conditions and it was acquired after expiry of the lease period. The Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the various sale deeds and materials which were placed on record in the said case and ultimately fixed the compensation @ Rs.1,35,000/- per acre with other benefits of solatium, interest, etc.

106. This Court finds that the property involved in Exhibit-12 as relied upon by the learned counsel for the claimants, though situated in Ward No.3 of Ranchi Municipality, was certainly within the Ranchi Town and the notification in the said case under Section 4 was issued way back on 07.07.1954. In the said judgment, numerous sale deeds and numerous materials were placed on record for the purposes of computing the market value but the location and position of the properties involved in the said case is quite different from that of the property which are involved in the present case. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered view that Exhibit-12 cannot be relied upon for the purposes of fixing the market value of the land involved in the present case and the learned Arbitrator in the present case has rightly refused to rely upon exhibit-12.

107. ***Thus, the reliance of the claimants on exhibit-4 and 12 for seeking enhancement of rate of compensation for land is devoid of any merits, hence rejected.***

108. Now, it has to be examined as to whether the Union of India has succeeded in challenging the rate of compensation for land as fixed by the learned Arbitrator.

109. The learned Arbitrator in paragraph 24 of the award referred to the documents which were relevant for ascertaining the market value, they are :-

a. **Exhibit-1** is the survey map.
b. **Exhibit-5** is the certified copy of the judgment of High Court dated 09.03.1998 ***[Sanicharwa Lakra & Ors- M.A. 38, 39 and 132 of 1994 (R)].*** By referring to Exhibit-5, the learned Arbitrator observed that the High Court, while hearing the matter, affirmed the award of the learned

Arbitrator wherein flat rate of Rs.2,00,000/- per acre was granted for the lands acquired for military purpose along with solatium @ 30% with interest @ 12% per year and recorded that the land in the present proceeding was similarly situated. The exhibit-5 was relating to the acquisition of the year 1986-87 i.e. about 15 years after the acquisition involved in the present case and ultimately the learned Arbitrator while considering Exhibit-5, in order to arrive at approximate market value for the year 1971, adopted the reverse process and deducted the market value of 10% every year from the year 1986 to 1971 and arrived at the rate of Rs.42,000/- per acre in the year 1971.

c. The learned arbitrator thereafter considered ***Exhibit-7*** which is certified copy of sale deed dated 19.06.1963 pertaining to village Gari for an area of 5 khatas and the rate mentioned in the sale-deed was Rs.24,000/- per acre and in order to arrive at the market value in the year 1971, the learned arbitrator added 10% every year up to 1971, right from 1963 and arrived at Rs. 51,446/- per acre, thereafter deducted 20% towards development costs and on the basis of Exhibit-7, the learned Arbitrator was of view that the market value on the date of acquisition of the present land will come to approximately Rs.41,000/- per acre.

d. The learned Arbitrator considered ***Exhibit-8*** which was the original sale deed relating to village Lalganj dated 13.11.1962 and observed that as per the sale deed, the rate was Rs.30,000/- per acre. The learned Arbitrator adopted the same method as was adopted in Exhibit-7 and added 10% every year with respect to the rate right from 1962 to 1971 and arrived at Rs.70,726/- per acre and deducted 20% towards development costs and as per Exhibit-8, arrived at the market value to approximately Rs.57,000/- per acre.

e. The learned Arbitrator also considered ***Exhibit-9*** which was certified copy of sale deed of village Gari dated 02.04.1971 which was for 23 katahs 11 chatak and 27 Sq.ft of land sold at Rs.27,000/- per acre. The learned Arbitrator also observed that the sale deed was of the village involved in the acquisition and was near about the date of acquisition and could be used for the purposes for determining the market value.

f. The learned arbitrator thereafter noted that the requisition was of the year 1941-42, the acquisition was of the year 1971-72 and the properties remained in possession of the Defence Department for more than 30 years and the same was developed due to the establishment of Cantonment Area. The arbitrator also observed that it was not in dispute that the properties are situated very near to the capital city of Ranchi (the then Town of Ranchi) and that it was also not in dispute that National Highway and State Highway is adjacent and water bodies in form of rivers were also in the vicinity.

g. The learned Arbitrator ultimately took the average of the valuation arrived at by referring to ***Exhibit-5, 7, 8 and 9*** and calculated the average of four valuations which came to ***Rs.41,750/- per acre*** and was of the view that the same would be the just and reasonable market price at the time of acquisition. The learned arbitrator fixed this rate as flat rate for all types of lands for all the four villages. The learned arbitrator also observed that in Exhibit-10 the DLAO himself recommended flat rate for village Gari, which was contiguous to other three villages and also referred to Exhibit-5 which was a High Court's judgment whereby the flat rate granted by the learned arbitrator was approved. The learned arbitrator held that there was no justification for categorization of lands for assessment/payment of compensation.

110. With regard to challenge to the rate of compensation for land, it is the specific case of the Union of India that the market value of the land has to be seen with respect to the date of acquisition of the property but the condition of the land is to be seen with respect to the date of requisition. The date of requisition in the present case is of the year 1941-42 and the date of acquisition is of the year 1970-71. The case of the Union of India is that the condition of the property as in the year 1941-42 is to be seen but the market rate has to be determined with reference to the date of acquisition of the year 1970-71. However, it is not in dispute that the market value of the property on the date of acquisition of the land is to be seen.

111. On the point of rate of compensation, the Union of India has relied upon the judgment reported in ***(2018) 13 SCC 96 (Manoj Kumar and Others versus State of Haryana and Others)*** paragraph 11 and 12 to submit that a prior award or any material placed before the court is required to be examined and the same cannot be blindly followed. A prior award has to be considered only as a piece of evidence, not beyond that. The court has to apply the judicial mind and is supposed not to follow the previous awards without due consideration of the facts and circumstances and evidence adduced in the case in question. The current value reflected by comparable sale deeds is more reliable and binding for determination of compensation and in such cases award/judgment relating to an acquisition made before 5 to 10 years cannot form the safe basis for determining compensation.
In paragraph no. 14 of the said judgment of ***Manoj Kumar and Others (supra)*** it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that the previous award/judgments are the only piece of evidence at par with comparative sale transactions and the similarity of the land covered by previous judgments/award is required to be proved as any other comparative exemplar.

It has also been observed in paragraph 15 of the said judgment that there is yet another serious infirmity seen in following the judgment passed in acquisition made before 10-12 years and the price determined on that basis by giving either flat increase or cumulative increase as per the

choice of the individual judge without going into the factual scenario. It has been observed that the said method of determining compensation is available only when there is absence of sale transaction before issuance of notification under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act and for giving annual increase, evidence should reflect that the price of the land had appreciated regularly and did not remain static. Paragraph 15 of the aforesaid judgment is quoted as under: -

> "***15.*** *There is yet another serious infirmity seen in following the judgment or award passed in acquisition made before 10 to 12 years and price is being determined on that basis by giving either flat increase or cumulative increase as per the choice of individual Judge without going into the factual scenario.* ***The said method of determining compensation is available only when there is absence of sale transaction before issuance of notification under Section 4 of the Act and for giving annual increase, evidence should reflect that price of land had appreciated regularly and did not remain static.*** *The recent trend for last several years indicates that price of land is more or less static if it has not gone down. At present, there is no appreciation of value. Thus, in our opinion, it is not a very safe method of determining compensation."* ***(emphasis added)***

112. ***On the other hand, the claimants*** have relied upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***2024 SCC Online 1691 [New Okhla Industrial Development Authority versus Harnand Singh (Deceased) through Lrs and Others]*** and they have referred to paragraph 35 of the said judgment to submit that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has broadly referred to the relevant factors for determination of rate of land and has classified it into three different categories. Paragraph 35 of the aforesaid judgement is quoted as under:-

> *" **35**. Broadly, such relevant factors can be divided into three categories:*
>
> ***i.*** *Characteristics of the land: The valuation of land is undeniably influenced by its inherent characteristics. A parcel of land endowed with advantageous features that enhance its accessibility and usability tends to command higher market price and thus, a greater valuation in comparison to lands lacking such attributes. Key factors contributing to such features include connectivity via roads and other means of transportation, the size and shape of the land, availability of essential utilities such as electricity and water, the evenness or levelling of the land's surface,*

width of frontage, and nature and status of the surrounding area etc.;

ii. *Future potentiality of the land : In addition to its characteristics, the valuation of land is also influenced by its potentiality. Lands with the potential to be used for commercial or residential purposes; that are located in or near a developed area; or which are proximate to tourist destinations, are perceived to hold greater value in the future. Consequently, landowners may anticipate higher future prices and accordingly demand higher sale prices compared to lands lacking these attributes. Accordingly, these features also lead to an increase in valuation; and*

iii. *Factors denoting market sentiment : Market sentiments are powerful drivers of land valuation. Even if a particular piece of land possesses all desirable features, its valuation can still suffer if the market conditions at the time of publication of the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act were unfavourable. Factors such as economic recessions, political instability, speculative investments or real estate crisis can impact the perceived value of the land. Thus, these extraneous economic and political factors must also be considered when assessing land valuation."*

113. Perusal of the judgement in ***New Okhla Industrial Development Authority (supra) reveals*** that the heading ***"E.1.1-evidence used in determining the quantum of compensation"*** runs from paragraph 22 onwards.

In ***paragraph 23*** of the judgment, it has been observed that the Land Acquisition Act of 1894 does not provide a strict definition of the term market-value, it essentially refers to the price that the asset would likely fetch in an open market transaction.

The court considered in ***paragraph 24*** that given the statutory intention behind the term market value, the natural corollary is that the sale exemplars reflecting the prices paid by a willing buyer to a willing seller would be the most relevant piece of evidence for determining such value.

In ***paragraph 25***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that for utilizing the sale deeds as the foundation for determining compensation, it is imperative that the sale instances satisfy certain criteria of comparability and those factors are -

(i) The sale must be a genuine transaction;

(ii) *The sale deed must have been executed at the time proximate to the date of the notification issued under Section 4 of the Act of 1894;*
(iii) *The land covered by the sale must be in the vicinity of the acquired land;*
(iv) *The nature of land including its size must be similar to that of the acquired land.*

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***paragraph 26*** of the said judgment observed that price of small plots of land cannot ordinarily serve as the basis of evaluating the market value of large tracts of land. However, there was no legal impediment against considering sale exemplars of smaller parcels of land, provided they are subjected to cuts or deductions. It was observed that the reasoning behind this exercise is that smaller plots of land are typically valued at a higher price owing to their developed nature, contrasting with larger tracts that require substantial areas to be set aside towards setting up infrastructure such as roads, parks or other civic amenities. Therefore, adjusting these values through appropriate cuts would provide a more accurate approximation of the land's value.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court considered in ***paragraph 27*** of the judgment that the acquired land in the said case exceeded more than 5000 times as compared to the exemplar which was cited. The issue was not restricted to the smaller size of the land but rather the fact was that there was only a solitary instance of sale brought on record. The Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that had there been multiple such sale instances, there could have been some basis for estimation. However, the solitary sale deed which was relied upon by way of example was not only inadequately representing the values of the land being acquired but also introduced significant risk and imprecision, if relied upon as the sole foundation of the assessment therefore the court was extremely reluctant to rely on the solitary sale deed as a direct piece of evidence for determining the fair and just market value of the acquired land.

In the said case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***paragraph 30*** has observed that there existed no direct piece of evidence to determine fair

and just compensation and therefore resorted to settled principle of guesstimation. Thereafter the Hon'ble Supreme Court went on to consider the '***applicability and use of principle of guesstimation'*** under ***E.1.2.*** from ***paragraph 31 onwards.***

It has been held in ***paragraph 32*** that determining compensation for land is not a matter of exact science but involves a significant element of estimation.

In ***paragraph 34*** it has been held that the court can use the principle of guesstimation in reasonably estimating the value of the land in the absence of direct evidence, the exercise ought not to be hypothetical instead, the court must embrace a holistic view and consider all relevant factors and existing evidence even if not directly comparable, to arrive at a fair determination of compensation. In that connection a reference to an earlier decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been made which has been passed in the case of ***Trishala Jain versus State of Uttaranchal*** wherein the principle has been summarized with respect to guesstimate and it has been held therein that discretion of the court in applying guesswork to the facts of a given case is not unfettered but has to be reasonable and should have a connection to the data on record produced by the parties by way of evidence.

In the said judgment, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held in ***paragraph 40*** that mere absence of multiple sale exemplars also does not itself support a conclusion that the market conditions were unfavorable and that the lands had stagnant demand and low value.

In ***paragraph 41***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the factors enumerated in the judgment and estimated that the value of land was appreciating at around 15% annually and the rough estimate was supported by the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***ONGC Ltd. Vs. Rameshbhai Jivanbhai Patel*** which recognized that a 15% annual growth in prices can be assumed for lands situated in urban areas.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***paragraph 43*** of the judgment then referred to the judgment passed in ***Krishan Kumar v. Union of India*** where the Hon'ble Supreme Court acknowledged that while sale

exemplars may not directly establish the amount of compensation to be granted, compensation could be determined applying the principles of guesstimation based on the circle rate after granting a marginal increase over the same.

114. Paragraphs 32, 34, 40, 41 and 43 of the judgment in ***New Okhla Industrial Development Authority (supra)*** are as under:

> ***"32.*** *This principle accentuates the fundamental understanding that determining compensation for land is not a matter of exact science but involves a significant element of estimation. Indeed, this holds true for valuation of land in general, which is affected by a multitude of factors such as its location, surrounding market conditions, feasible uses etc. Accordingly, while evidence and calculations can aid in estimating the land value, they ultimately serve as tools for approximation rather than precision. Instead, land valuation—and consequently the affixation of compensation—remains an exercise of informed estimation, requiring the integration of diverse data points and professional judgment concerning subjective, intangible and dynamic elements. Pursing a single precise valuation or compensation figure is bound to be unjust, representing a rigid approach and a procrustean endeavour at best.*
>
> ***34.*** *Accordingly, while the Court can use the principle of guesstimation in reasonably estimating the value of land in the absence of direct evidence, the exercise ought not to be purely hypothetical. Instead, the Court must embrace a holistic view and consider all relevant factors and existing evidence, even if not directly comparable, to arrive at a fair determination of compensation. Trishala Jain v. State of Uttaranchal, summarizes these yardsticks as follows:*
>
> > *"65. It will be appropriate for us to state certain principles controlling the application of "guesstimate":*
> >
> > *(a) Wherever the evidence produced by the parties is not sufficient to determine the compensation with exactitude, this principle can be resorted to.*
> >
> > *(b) Discretion of the court in applying guesswork to the facts of a given case is not unfettered but has to be reasonable and should have a connection to the data on record produced by the parties by way of evidence. Further, this entire exercise has to be within the limitations specified under Sections 23 and 24 of the Act and cannot be made in detriment thereto."*
>
> ***40.*** *At this juncture, we may clarify that the mere absence of multiple sale exemplars also does not by itself support a conclusion that the market condition was unfavourable or that the lands had stagnant demand and low value, as sellers often hold on to lands whose prices are in the process of increasing or likely to increase in the near*

future, owing to urbanisation or other upcoming development projects and changes.

41. *Thus, even devoid of numerous sale exemplars showing frequent transactions and considering the factors enumerated in the preceding paragraph, we are inclined to estimate that the value of the subject land was appreciating at around 15% annually. This rough estimate of ours is supported by the decision of this Court in ONGC Ltd. v. Rameshbhai Jivanbhai Patel, which recognised that a 15% annual growth in prices can be assumed for lands situated in urban areas*

43. *In order to further substantiate this estimation, we place our reliance on the decision rendered in Krishan Kumar v. Union of India, where this Court acknowledged that while sale exemplars may not directly establish the amount of compensation to be granted, compensation could be determined applying the principle of guesstimation, based on the circle rate after granting a marginal increase over the same."*

115. The other judgment which has been relied upon by the learned counsel for the claimants is reported in ***(2014) 15 SCC 161 (Defence Research and Development Organisation versus Anjanapra and another),*** (paragraph 5 and 6), where the method of 10% increase every year in the market value of the land by referring to the exemplar to arrive at the market price, was upheld.

With respect to the aforesaid judgment it has been argued that the court can adopt method of 10% increase every year in the market value of the land and use the exemplar to come to the market value of the property.

116. Another judgment which has been relied upon is reported in ***AIR 2013 SC 3111 (Haryana State Industrial Development Corporation Limited v. Udal and Others etc.),*** paragraph 22, to again submit that it is permissible to determine the rate of compensation by giving annual increase of 15% with respect to the exemplar to arrive at the market value on the relevant date.

117. Another judgment on the application of the same principle has been cited by the learned counsel for the claimants reported in ***(2008) 14 SCC 745 (General Manager Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited versus RameshBhai Jivanbhai Patel).*** Paragraphs 13 to 16 of the aforesaid judgment are quoted as under:-

"***13.*** *Primarily, the increase in land prices depends on four factors: situation of the land, nature of development in surrounding area, availability of land for development in the area, and the demand for land in the area. In rural areas, unless there is any prospect of development in the vicinity, increase in prices would be slow, steady and gradual, without any sudden spurts or jumps. On the other hand, in urban or semi-urban areas, where the development is faster, where the demand for land is high and where there is construction activity all around, the escalation in market price is at a much higher rate, as compared to rural areas. In some pockets in big cities, due to rapid development and high demand for land, the escalations in prices have touched even 30% to 50% or more per year, during the nineties.*

*" **14.** On the other extreme, in remote rural areas where there was no chance of any development and hardly any buyers, the prices stagnated for years or rose marginally at a nominal rate of 1% or 2% per annum. There is thus a significant difference in increases in market value of lands in urban/semi-urban areas and increases in market value of lands in the rural areas. Therefore, if the increase in market value in urban/semi-urban areas is about 10% to 15% per annum, the corresponding increases in rural areas would at best be only around half of it, that is, about 5% to 7.5% per annum. This rule of thumb refers to the general trend in the nineties, to be adopted in the absence of clear and specific evidence relating to increase in prices. Where there are special reasons for applying a higher rate of increase, or any specific evidence relating to the actual increase in prices, then the increase to be applied would depend upon the same.*

15. *Normally, recourse is taken to the mode of determining the market value by providing appropriate escalation over the proved market value of nearby lands in previous years (as evidenced by sale transactions or acquisitions), where there is no evidence of any contemporaneous sale transactions or acquisitions of comparable lands in the neighbourhood. The said method is reasonably safe where the relied-on sale transactions/acquisitions precede the subject acquisition by only a few years, that is, up to four to five years. Beyond that it may be unsafe, even if it relates to a neighbouring land. What may be a reliable standard if the gap is of only a few years, may become unsafe and unreliable standard where the gap is larger. For example, for determining the market value of a land acquired in 1992, adopting the annual increase method with reference to a sale or acquisition in 1970 or 1980 may have many pitfalls. This is because, over the course of years, the "rate" of annual increase may itself undergo drastic change apart from the likelihood of occurrence of varying periods of stagnation in prices or sudden spurts in prices affecting the very standard of increase.*

> ***16.*** *Much more unsafe is the recent trend to determine the market value of acquired lands with reference to future sale transactions or acquisitions. To illustrate, if the market value of a land acquired in 1992 has to be determined and if there are no sale transactions/acquisitions of 1991 or 1992 (prior to the date of preliminary notification), the statistics relating to sales/acquisitions in future, say of the years 1994-1995 or 1995-1996 are taken as the base price and the market value in 1992 is worked back by making deductions at the rate of 10% to 15% per annum. How far is this safe? One of the fundamental principles of valuation is that the transactions subsequent to the acquisition should be ignored for determining the market value of acquired lands, as the very acquisition and the consequential development would accelerate the overall development of the surrounding areas resulting in a sudden or steep spurt in the prices. Let us illustrate. Let us assume there was no development activity in a particular area. The appreciation in market price in such area would be slow and minimal. But if some lands in that area are acquired for a residential/commercial/industrial layout, there will be all round development and improvement in the infrastructure/amenities/facilities in the next one or two years, as a result of which the surrounding lands will become more valuable. Even if there is no actual improvement in infrastructure, the potential and possibility of improvement on account of the proposed residential/commercial/industrial layout will result in a higher rate of escalation in prices. As a result, if the annual increase in market value was around 10% per annum before the acquisition, the annual increase of market value of lands in the areas neighbouring the acquired land, will become much more, say 20% to 30%, or even more on account of the development/proposed development. Therefore, if the percentage to be added with reference to previous acquisitions/sale transactions is 10% per annum, the percentage to be deducted to arrive at a market value with reference to future acquisitions/sale transactions should not be 10% per annum, but much more. The percentage of standard increase becomes unreliable. Courts should, therefore, avoid determination of market value with reference to subsequent/future transactions. Even if it becomes inevitable, there should be greater caution in applying the prices fetched for transactions in future. Be that as it may."*

118. Another judgment which has been relied upon by the learned counsel for the claimants is Arising out of ***SLP (C) No. 10338 of 2023 (Bernard Francis Joseph Vaz and others versus Government of Karnataka and others)*** and the learned counsel has relied upon

paragraph 42 onwards of the said judgment to submit that the right to property ceases to be a fundamental right by the Constitution 44th Amendment Act, 1978 and it is a constitutional right under Article 300-A of the Constitution of India. It has been submitted that at the time of acquisition the right to property was a fundamental right. It has been further submitted by referring to paragraph 45 of the judgment that the State cannot abdicate its constitutional and statutory responsibility of payment of compensation by arguing that its role was limited to initiating acquisition proceedings. It has also been observed that delay in payment of compensation, in accordance with law, to the landowners after taking away ownership of the subject land from them is in contravention to the spirit of Article 300-A of the Constitution of India and idea of a welfare State. In paragraph 46 of the said judgment, it has been held that the owners whose lands get acquired are paid compensation/awarded amount as declared by the statutory award at the earliest.

119. ***In the present case, the evidence regarding circle rate has come for the year 2013 which is much higher and the point is that market value has to be determined with respect to the date of acquisition of the year 1971-72. However, it is not in dispute that there is enough evidence on record to show that the market value of the property has appreciated throughout on account of urbanization and spread of Ranchi town and it is not in dispute that the property in the year 1970-71, though was not in Ranchi Town but was certainly within Ranchi municipality and towards the outskirts of Ranchi town.***

120. This Court finds that amongst all the acceptable exhibits with regard to the quantum of compensation, the learned Arbitrator found exhibits- 5,7,8 and 9 suitable for consideration.

121. ***Exhibit-5*** (judgment passed in M.A. No. 38 and 39 of 1994) reveals that lands in the said case were requisitioned way back in the year 1942 under the provisions of Defence of India Act and subsequently they were acquired in the year 1986-87 under Section 7 of the aforesaid Act of 1952 for the purposes of construction of Army cantonment at Ranchi. Altogether 75 decimals of land were acquired.

The learned Arbitrator in the said case had fixed flat rate of Rs. 2,000 per decimal and granted 15% solatium on the above with interest @ 12% per annum from 01.04.1987 to 31.12.1993. While considering the aforesaid exhibit-5 the learned Arbitrator of the present case found that the flat rate of compensation of Rs. two lacs per acre pertaining to acquisition in the year 1986-87 was fixed which was about 15 years after the acquisition involved in the present case of the year 1971 and the learned Arbitrator adopted a reverse process of deducting 10% value per year from the rate of the year 1986-87 @ Rs. two lacs per acre. The Exhibit-5 was relating to the village Kutiyatu and Tumbagutu. The learned Arbitrator recorded that the lands involved in Exhibit-5 were similarly situated and the ratio of the judgment at Exhibit-5 was applicable. By taking the rate calculation by deducting 10% value per year, the learned Arbitrator came to the rate with respect to the year 1971 to be approximately Rs. 42,000/- per acre.

122. ***Exhibit-7,*** which was another accepted exemplar which has been taken into consideration by the learned Arbitrator, is the certified copy of the sale deed dated 19.06.1963 of village Gari which is one of the acquired villages in the present case. The exhibit-7 was related to only 5 katthas of land in village Gari and the rate per katha as per Exhibit-7 was Rs. 24,000 per acre.

123. The learned Arbitrator has observed that the aforesaid sale deed was relating to one of the villages involved in the present acquisition and the sale deed was of prior date than the date of acquisition and was of the view that this could be used for the purposes of determining the market value and for that purpose the learned Arbitrator calculated the value of the land by adding 10% every year up to 1971 and arrived at Rs. 51,446 per acre. The learned Arbitrator further deducted 20% towards development cost of the land and was of the view that market value will come to approximately Rs. 41,000 per acre. It appears that while considering exhibit-7 the learned Arbitrator has deducted 20% towards development cost apparently on account of small area of the exemplar sale deed though it was of village Gari.

124. Thereafter the learned Arbitrator referred to ***Exhibit-8*** which is the original sale deed of village Lalganj dated 13.11.1962 which is also relating to one of the villages where the land has been acquired in the present cases. The sale deed was only for one decimal of land which was sold @ Rs. 30,000/- per acre and the sale deed was of a prior date than the date of acquisition. The learned Arbitrator was of the view that this sale deed could also be used for determining the market value by adding 10% every year till the year 1971 and the learned Arbitrator arrived at the rate for village Lalganj in the year 1971 at Rs. 70,726 per acre. Considering the small area involved in Exhibit-8, the learned Arbitrator deducted 20% towards development cost of the said land and arrived at approximate market value of Rs. 57,000/- per acre.

125. Another exemplar which has been considered by the learned Arbitrator is ***exhibit-9*** which is the certified copy of the sale deed of village Gari dated 02.04.1971 which was for an area of only 23 kattha 11 chhatak and 27 square ft. and was sold for Rs. 10,000/- on 02.04.1971 meaning thereby it was sold @ Rs. 27,000 per acre. The learned Arbitrator observed that the sale deed was with respect to one of the villages involved in the acquisition of the present cases and was of the view that this sale deed could be used for the purposes of determining the market value of the property.

126. The learned Arbitrator thereafter recorded in paragraph 25 of the Award that it was not in dispute that the properties involved in this case were situated very near to the capital city of Ranchi and national highway as well as state highway and were adjacent to water bodies in the form of rivers.

127. Considering the fact that large area was acquired at a time, *interalia*, with respect to four villages, the learned Arbitrator found it fit to consider all the aforesaid exhibits i.e., exhibits – 5,7,8 and 9 in the aforesaid manner to arrive at market price of the acquired lands in the year 1971-72. The learned Arbitrator took average of the value so determined by referring to exhibit-5 @Rs. 42,000 per acre, Ext. 7 @ Rs. 41,000 per acre, Exhibit-8 @ Rs. 57,000 per acre and Exhibit-9 @ Rs. 27,000 per acre and upon taking average, the learned arbitrator was

of the view that Rs. 41,750/- per acre would be just and reasonable market value at the time of acquisition. The learned Arbitrator chose to fix flat rate for all types of land and also observed that the District Land Acquisition Officer in Exhibit-10 himself had recommended flat rate of village Gari which was contiguous to other three villages. In the High Court's judgment (Exhibit-5) with regard to acquisition of land under the Act of 1952, flat rate granted by the learned Arbitrator was approved. The learned Arbitrator also recorded that there was no justification for categorization of lands for assessment/payment of compensation.

128. This Court finds that huge chunk of land measuring 1846.99 acres was acquired at one go with respect to four villages. From the perusal of the map (exhibit-1) , it appears that the villages involved in this case were adjoining/in the vicinity of the national highway/state highway and there were water bodies in the vicinity and village Gari was separated from the rest three villages by one area called Hotwar. Thus, all the four villages were almost contiguous. The four villages with respect to locational position and other aspects vis-a-vis the national highway and State Highway were found to be of similar nature by the learned Arbitrator.

129. These aspects of the matter are not in dispute and the findings by referring to the map has already been recorded as aforesaid. This court finds that admittedly no sale deed of the relevant point of time was available for consideration. Amongst the sale deeds which were found suitable for assessment of compensation, except exhibit-9 which was a certified copy of the sale deed of the village Gari which is dated 02.04.1971 but was for a very small area, no other sale deed or exhibit was available with respect to year of acquisition of land involved in these cases. Exhibit-7 was of village Gari but relating to much earlier point of time i.e. 19.06.1963 and exhibit-8 was of village Lalganj which was also of earlier point of time i.e., of 13.11.1962. The transaction involved in exhibit-7 and 8 had taken place within 10 years from the date of acquisition involved in the present case. This court further finds that the learned Arbitrator while referring to Exhibit-9 has observed that

the sale deed was with respect to one of the villages involved in the acquisition and was near about the date of acquisition of the case and therefore has taken the same into consideration. However, at the same time, this court finds that the exhibit-9 was only for the small area of 23 katthas, 11 chhattak and 27 square ft. and the total land which was acquired in the present case was 1846.99 acres (184700 decimals approx.) in four villages. The land acquired was approximately 5277 times larger than the exemplar sale of exhibit-9. This court is of the considered view that exhibit-9 could not have been the sole basis for determining market value for such huge chunk of land which were acquired at that time and were almost contiguous to each other and were similarly situated with respect to the location and position when it is referable to National Highway/State Highway joining the national highway and the water bodies near the property or flowing through the property. This would be the position of law when seen in the light of the judgment passed in the case of ***New Okhla Industrial Development Authority (supra)*** (paragraph 27) wherein it has been held that when large area of land is acquired at the same time, it would not be proper to rely upon solitary instance of sale of small size by way of exemplar for arriving the market price of the whole chunk of acquired land.

130. This court finds that under aforesaid circumstances where no sale exemplar/ order relating to fixation of compensation were available with respect to the acquired land at the relevant point in time and only one sale seed (exhibit-9) but for a much small area than the acquired land was available, and when there was clear evidence regarding constant rise in the price of land in the area due to urbanization of Ranchi town , the learned Arbitrator has rightly taken into consideration the exhibit-5, exhibit-7 and exhibit-8 which were of the same area but were of different point in time by taking increase or decrease in the rate of land @ 10% per year as the case may be and also exhibit-9 and then arrived at the market rate with respect to the acquired land of all the four villages at flat rate by taking average of the rate derived as in the year 1970-71 in the aforesaid manner . This Court is of the view that the Arbitrator had no option but to apply the principles of estimation in

the matter of fixing the rate of compensation of land and while doing so, the learned Arbitrator has taken into consideration all the acceptable exhibits i.e. exhibit-5,7,8 and 9 to arrive at the flat rate of Rs. 41,750/- per acre.

131. This court is of the considered view that the learned Arbitrator has exercised sound discretion in considering the aforesaid exhibits and coming to reasonable market price at the time of acquisition of land. This court is of the view that in the given facts of the case and the materials placed before the learned Arbitrator, the needful has been done by the learned arbitrator in accordance with law and the same cannot be said to be contrary to any of the judgments which have been cited by the learned counsels for the parties.

132. This Court is of the view that the value of the land arrived through estimation by the learned arbitrator in the aforesaid manner is as per law based on materials available on record, both oral and documentary. The approach of the learned arbitrator in the matter of fixation of rate of acquired land on the date of acquisition is neither arbitrary nor perverse nor illegal nor contrary to the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme court and it is based on sound reasons and due application of legal principles in the given facts and circumstances of the case and the materials available on record. In such view of the matter, this court is of the considered view that the fixation of flat rate of compensation @ Rs. 41,750/- per acre does not call for any interference.

133. ***This court is of the considered view that the learned Arbitrator was justified in enhancing the compensation with respect to the rate of the land and has done the needful in accordance with law based on the circumstances and materials brought on record by the respective parties. The challenge to enhancement of rate of acquired land in the year 1970-71 on behalf of the Union of India as well as the prayer on behalf of the claimants-land losers seeking further enhancement in the awarded rate of compensation, are rejected. Accordingly, the point of determination no. (f) is answered by holding that the decision of the learned arbitrator to enhance the rate of compensation for the***

acquired land and the extent of its increase do not call for any interference by this Court.

Point of determination no. (g)

> ***(g) Whether the learned Arbitrator was justified in awarding interest @15% per annum on the entire awarded amount upon default in payment of the awarded amount within the stipulated period as it has resulted in payment of interest on interest quantified till the date of the award?***

134. In the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Hari Krishna Khosla (supra)*** the constitutional validity of Section 8 of the Act of 1952, with respect to the absence of a provision for solatium and interest on acquisition of requisitioned land under the Act of 1952, unlike Sections 23 and 34 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, was challenged as being violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. However, the challenge was declined by holding that the failure to provide such benefit does not make section 8 of the Act of 1952 discriminatory by holding that the provisions of the two acts are not similar.

135. In the case reported in ***(2003) 5 SCC 568 (Union of India Vs. Chajju Ram)*** it has been held with respect to the aforesaid Act of 1952 that it is a self-contained code. It lays down the procedure as well as machinery for determining the amount of compensation and that the provisions for payment of compensation under the Land Acquisition Act would not ipso facto apply to the acquisition made under the said Act of 1952 and that the provisions of the two Acts do not also provide for the same scheme for acquisition. A reference was also made to the earlier decision of ***Hari Krishan Khosla (supra)*** wherein it has been clearly held that the provisions for grant of solatium and interest under the Land Acquisition Act cannot be read into the provisions of the said Act of 1952.

136. In the judgement passed by Patna High Court reported in ***1998 (2) Land Acquisition Laws 188 (Sanicharwa Lakra and other Vs. Charo Oraon and others),*** it has been held that when there was delay

in appointment of Arbitrator under the aforesaid Act of 1952 attributable to the Union of India, then on equitable principles the claimants were entitled to interest and solatium and grant of such relief by the concerned Arbitrator was upheld. In the judgement reported in ***(2015) 12 SCC 294 (Defence Estate Officer Vs. Syed Abdul Saleem and Ors.)***, the learned Arbitrator had awarded solatium @ 30% and interest @ 9% on account of delay in appointment of the Arbitrator by 19 years and the fact of undue delay in the institution of arbitral proceedings having been determined, the award of solatium and interest under the aforesaid Act of 1952 by the learned Arbitrator was upheld, in spite of the fact that the Act of 1952 does not specifically provide for grant of solatium and interest. Similar view was taken in the judgement reported in ***(2010) 14 SCC 357 (Dilawar Singh and Others Vs. Union of India and others),*** where there was delay of 16 years in appointment of the Arbitrator.

137. Thus, the law is well settled that although under the Act of 1952 there is no provision for payment of interest and solatium and accordingly the same is not payable, but in case of delay in appointment of Arbitrator on the part of the Union of India/competent authority, interest and solatium can be awarded by the learned Arbitrator on grounds of equity, which are otherwise not provided for under the Act of 1952 and provided for under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. However, the extent of interest and solatium is certainly within the domain of the learned Arbitrator.

138. In the present case, the learned Arbitrator as well as this Court has found that there was delay and laches on the part of the competent authority/Union of India in the matter of appointment of Arbitrator and therefore this Court has held that the learned Arbitrator was justified in awarding interest as well as solatium.

139. The Union of India is also aggrieved by the manner in which post award interest has been awarded and their grievance is that such award of interest on the awarded amount has resulted in awarding interest on interest which is not permissible in view of the judgement passed in the case of ***Civil Appeal No. 2290 of 2010 (Union of India Vs. Seneth***

Munda) reported in (2010) 3 SCC 673 wherein it has been held that under the Act of 1952, award of interest on interest is not permissible.

140. The case of *Seneth Munda (supra)* arises from the judgement of this court in ***F.A. No. 107 of 2003 (Union of India through Defence Estate Officer Vs. Seneth Munda and others)*** and the matter was arising out of acquisition of property under the aforesaid Act of 1952 but on account of delay in appointment of arbitrator, solatium @ 20% and interest @ 9% per annum from the date of acquisition i.e., 01.04.1987 till the date of award i.e., 22.06.2003 and post award interest @ 12% was also allowed if the amount was not paid within stipulated time . This Court in the 1st appeal modified the award only to the extent that the rate of post award interest of 12% was reduced to 9% with a further rider that if the same is not paid within three months, the claimants would be entitled to post award interest @ 12% as per the award. When the order was not complied, a contempt petition being Contempt Case (C) No. 815 of 2007 was filed and this court vide order dated 02.04.2009 recorded that it prima-facie appeared that the opposite party had violated the order of the court by not paying the interest @12% per annum from 22.06.2003 (after the award was passed) till 25.11.2006 (when the amount as per award was paid) and directed the opposite parties to calculate and pay the interest for the aforesaid period on the quantified amount of interest which was calculated in the award dated 21.06.2003 amounting to Rs. 1,37,98,860.08 being interest @ 9% from 01.04.1987 to 22.06.2003. It was this order which was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Civil Appeal No. 2290 of 2010 (Union of India Vs. Seneth Munda) (supra)*** and the Hon'ble Supreme Court by referring to the judgment passed in the case of ***"Union of India Vs. Chhaju Ram (dead) by Lrs. and others" reported in (2003) 5 SCC 568*** observed that it was clearly laid down in the said judgement that the land owners under the Land Acquisition Act *vis-à-vis* the aforesaid Act of 1952 or the Defence of India Act, are not similarly situated and solatium and interest on the amount of compensation are not legally sustainable and ultimately held that direction of the High Court to make payment of ***interest on interest was not permissible***

under the aforesaid Act of 1952 and the impugned order of the High Court passed in the contempt proceeding directing payment of future interest on the interest component of the award was set-aside.

141. So far as the challenge to post award interest on interest component of the award in the present case is concerned, the same would be squarely covered by the judgement passed in the case of ***Civil Appeal No. 2290 of 2010 (Union of India Vs. Seneth Munda) (supra).*** Though the said case was arising out of contempt proceedings but the post award interest awarded in the said case was also in similar terms as in the present case and the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court that ***award of interest on interest was not permissible under the aforesaid Act of 1952*** is binding on this court.

142. Further, admittedly, the scheme of award of compensation under the aforesaid Act of 1952 and Land Acquisition Act of 1894 are different and the learned arbitrator could award solatium and interest under the Act of 1952 on equity, as already settled by the Hon'ble supreme court in numerous judgements as mentioned above, on account of delay on the part of the Union of India in appointing the arbitrator in spite of the fact that the Act of 1952 does not contain provision for payment of solatium and interest like that of section 34 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

143. ***The point of determination no.(g) is accordingly answered by holding that the learned Arbitrator was not justified in awarding interest @ 15% on the entire awarded amount upon default in payment of awarded amount within stipulated time as it has resulted in awarding 'interest on 'interest quantified till the date of the award' which has been held to be not permissible under the aforesaid Act of 1952 in the case of Civil Appeal No. 2290 of 2010 (Union of India Vs. Seneth Munda) (supra) reported in (2010) 3 SCC 673.***

144. ***As a result of the aforesaid findings, the post award interest @ 15% on the awarded amount [differential compensation payable + solatium + interest @ 9% on the aforesaid two components till the date of passing of the award] as mentioned in the component "G" of the chart in the award is not sustainable to the extent it relates to post***

award interest @ 15% on the interest component of the award. Consequently, the post award interest @ 15% will be payable only on differential compensation payable + solatium, that is, on component C and D only. The award of the learned arbitrator is accordingly modified to the aforesaid extent.

145. The appellant in F.A No. 367 of 2018 is directed to deposit the entire differential amount as per the impugned award with up-to-date interest as modified above, before the competent authority, the District Land Acquisition Officer, Ranchi within a period of 3 months from today who shall disburse the amount in the same manner as directed by the learned Arbitrator but under the supervision of Jharkhand Legal Services Authority within a period of 6 months thereafter.

146. In the present proceedings also, a number of substitution petitions have been allowed, but the same would certainly be subject to the same methods of identification of claimants and their legal heirs and verification of quantum of compensation which has been directed by the learned Arbitrator to be followed at the time of disbursement of the compensation amount.

147. In the first appeals filed by the claimants/land losers, they have been exempted from filing court fees and a direction has been passed by this Court that the deficit court fees will be deducted from the amount of compensation and then only rest of the amount will be released, if any, to the claimants.

148. In such circumstances, office is directed to prepare a list of the appeals with the deficit court fees and forward it to the District Land Acquisition Officer who shall ensure that at the time of release of the amount to the concerned claimants/land losers, the court fees is deducted and is deposited under appropriate head of the State Government.

149. It is further directed that in case, the amount is not disbursed in favour of one or the other claimants/land losers for any reason whatsoever within stipulated time, the District Land Acquisition Officer shall deposit the amount in the court in terms of the Act of 1952 and the

rules framed thereunder and it will be open to the concerned court to deal with the money as provided under the Act and the Rules.

150. The F.A No. 367 of 2018 filed by the Union of India is partly allowed by modification on the point of interest in the aforesaid terms and all the 1st Appeals seeking enhancement of awarded amount filed by the claimants/land -losers are dismissed.

151. Pending Interlocutory application, if any, is closed.

152. The office is directed to transmit the records received from the learned Arbitrator to the aforesaid authority.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Judgment: 23.12.2025
Pankaj/Mukul
Date of Uploading: 23.12.2025