

a caste which is known as 'Telangi Chhatri' (Tailor).

4. The petitioner did not bring on record anything to indicate that he has similarity with anthropological characteristics of tribals by name "Chhatri". He indicated that his family originally belonged to Chandrapur district. The Vigilance report also indicates that the petitioner and his family members' ancestors traditionally worked as 'tailor'. It is therefore clear that even affinity test is not satisfactorily passed.

5. What is further peculiar in petitioner's case is that the petitioner and even his near relatives were admitted to School and their caste was not mentioned at all as "Chhatri". He and his relations were described as 'Hindu'. This happened in respect of his all the family members. No one mentioned his or her caste as 'Chhatri'. Everyone avoided to mention caste as 'Tailor' or 'Shimpi' or 'Telgu Shimpi'. In view of these circumstances, we reject the petitioner's claim that he belonged to tribe 'Chhatri'. We do not see any error in the impugned judgment.

6. It is settled position in law that in a case involving proof of tribe claim, the burden of proving the tribe claim is always upon the person approaching the Committee for validation of his claim. He has to

produce the requisite documents in support of his claim. The Scrutiny Committee merely performs the role of verification of the claim and therefore, can only scrutinize the documents and material produced by the petitioner. We have no hesitation in observing that in the present case the material produced by the petitioner do not prove his claim. The Scrutiny Committee is not expected to gather the evidence on it's own to prove or disprove the claim of the applicant. As discussed above, the material placed on record i.e. School record as that of the petitioner, his close relatives and family members do not support the claim of the petitioner. In view of this, we do not find any error in the reasons and findings recorded by the Committee. The reasons and findings recorded by the Committee are found to be quite consistent with the material on record. We are therefore not inclined to interfere with the order passed by the Committee.

7. The writ petition is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

[V.L. ACHLIYA, J.]

[A.V. NIRGUDE, J.]