

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**8 CONT. PETITION NO.852 OF 2018
IN WP/2792/2018**

**RANI VITTHAL PUJARWAD
VERSUS
SANDIP G GOLAIID AND ANOTHER**

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. S.M. Ganachari
...

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
MANGESH S. PATIL, JJ.
DATE : 17.12.2018**

PC. :-

By an order dated 05.12.2018, we have directed the respondent nos.1 and 2 to remain personally present in this Court with an explanation as to why inspite of two orders being passed by this Court issuing directions to the committee to decide the validation proceedings of the petitioner, the same is not decided.

2. Today, the learned A.G.P. by inviting our attention to the affidavit in replies filed on behalf of respondent nos.1 and 2 submitted the factual position before us. The respondent nos.1 and 2 are also personally present in this Court. At the outset, the respondents have tendered their unconditional apology to this Court for the delay. It is then stated in the affidavit in reply that the petitioner was directed to appear before the committee on

26.03.2018 and on 28.03.2018 an application was submitted by the petitioner to the committee as the inquiry of vigilance cell was still pending the office of respondent no.1 i.e. Sandip s/o Dayaram Golait, Joint Commissioner, Scheduled Tribe Caste Scrutiny Committee, Nashik completed the process of home inquiry through the vigilance cell and then on 11.12.2018 a copy of the vigilance cell report was supplied to the petitioner seeking his reply on the report. The petitioner though requested for grant of time by letter dated 11.12.2018 had not filed any reply and on 12.12.2018 submitted the reply.

3. It is then submitted that as there are as many as 5,000 cases pending before the committee and the committee is not possessing the sufficient staff it takes some time to decide the cases. It is also submitted in the affidavit in reply that the committee on priority basis takes the exercise of assessment of the complaints of validity certificate of medical and engineering students and the students of professional courses.

4. It is then submitted that before the Nashik committee there are as many as 7125 proposals pending for decision. It is then submitted that the committee is expecting to decide the claim of the petitioner within two weeks as it is under process. A request is made to grant two weeks time to the committee to complete the exercise of deciding the claim of the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner would also co-

operate the committee for the ultimate decision. In view of the statements made by the respondent nos.1 and 2 in the affidavit in replies, who are present in this Court and a specific statement that within two weeks the committee would decide the claim of the petitioner, the Contempt Petition stands disposed of.

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

[PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.]