

ISM

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 9172 OF 2019

Akshata D/o Bhagawan Choudhari ..Petitioner.

V/s.

Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny ..Respondents.
Committee and another

Mr. Pratap Jadhavar i/b Mr. Sagar S. Phatate for the petitioner
Mr. A. A. Kumbhkoni, Advocate General with Mr. P. P. Kakade,
Govt. Pleader a/w Mr. Tejas Deshmukh Counsel 'A' panel for the
State

**CORAM : NITIN W.SAMBRE AND
G.S.KULKARNI, JJ.**

DATE : AUGUST 21, 2019

P.C.:-

With consent of the parties, heard finally and disposed
of.

2 In Writ Petition No. 10388 of 2017, in relation to
brother of the petitioner, this Court has already directed issuance
of validity certificate as the petitioner claims that he belongs to
"Rajgond (S.T.)".

3 The Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny Committee,

Aurangabad (in short “the Committee”) has negated the claim on the ground that in the Vigilance Cell Inquiry, certain events which were suppressed by the petitioner were noticed including that of rejection of claim of one of the blood relation namely Satyawar whose order of rejection is informed to have been confirmed by this Court.

4 The learned counsel for respondent Committee submits that keeping the option open to the respondent to seek review of the order dated 05/10/2017, an appropriate order as is passed in other similarly matters can be passed.

5 In view of above, it will be appropriate in our opinion to pass following order:

6 By this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has assailed the order dated 27/07/2019 passed by the Committee whereby the petitioner's claim for Tribe validation as belonging to “Rajgond (S.T.)” has been rejected.

7 The grievance of the petitioner is, though Caste Validity Certificate granted on 17/10/2017 by the Committee in

favour of Ashish Bhagwan Chaudhary, blood relations namely Ram Kashinath Chaudhary granted on 27/04/2009, Sunil Kashinath Chaudhary granted on 30/09/2008 whereas one Balaji son of Narayan Choudhari granted on 18/02/2007 were relied upon, the Committee has discarded the same on the ground that the same would not absolve the Petitioner from discharging the burden of the production of the relevant evidence. The Committee also took a view that the validity certificates have been granted to Ashish Bhagwan Chaudhary, Ram Kashinath Chaudhary, Sunil Kashinath Chaudhary and Balaji Narayan Chaudhary, without taking into account the interpolation/adverse entries in the documents, on which reliance was placed at the time of issuance of the validity certificate by its holder. It is stated by the Respondent-State that appropriate show cause notice has already been issued to the caste validity certificate holder.

4. According to the learned counsel appearing for petitioner, the decision of the Committee runs contrary to the Division Bench judgment of this Court in the case of **Apoorva Vinay Nichale v/s Divisional Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee**

No.1 and others¹ which was based upon the Supreme Court judgment passed in the case of **Raju Ramsing Vasave v/s Mahesh Deorao Bhivapurkar and others²** So also the in the case of **Anand vs. Committee for Scrutiny and Verification of Tribe Claims and Others³**

5. The Division Bench in the case of **Apoorva Vinay Nichale (supra)** in Paragraph Nos. 7 and 9 observed thus :

“7. We thus come to the conclusion that when during the course of enquiry the candidate submits a caste validity certificate granted earlier certifying that a blood relation of the candidate belongs to the same caste as that claimed by the applicant, the committee may grant such certificate without calling for Vigilance Cell Report. However, if the committee finds that the earlier caste certificate is tainted by fraud or is granted without jurisdiction, the Committee may refuse to follow and may refuse to grant certificate to the applicant before it.

9. In the present case, we find that the committee has disbelieved the petitioner's case that she belongs to Kanjar Bhat after calling the school leaving certificate of Petitioner's father and noticing that the original caste written on it was 'Thakur' and that was subsequently changed to Kanjar Bhat. The committee observed that the caste has been changed without complying with the procedure prescribed by section 48(e) and 132(3) of Mumbai Primary Education Act. In fact, the caste has been changed on the basis of the affidavit. From the findings of the committee it appears that the committee has observed that the change of

1 2010 (6) Mh.L.J. 401

2 (2008) 9 SCC 54

3 (2012) 1 SCC 113

caste has been done illegally. Obviously, the committee which decided the caste claim of the petitioner's sister did not hold the same view, otherwise it would have refused to grant validity. In the circumstances, we are of the view that the committee which has expressed a doubt about the validity of caste claim of the petitioner and has described it as a mistake in its order, ought not to have arrived at a different conclusion. The matters pertaining to validity of caste have a great impact on the candidate as well as on the future generations in many matters varying from marriage to education and enjoyment, and therefore where a committee has given a finding about the validity of the caste of a candidate another committee ought not to refuse the same status to a blood relative who applies. A merely different view on the same facts would not entitle the committee dealing with the subsequent cast claim to reject it. There is, however, no doubt as observed by us earlier that if a committee is of the view that the earlier certificate is obtained by fraud it would not be bound to follow the earlier caste validity certificate and is entitled to refuse the caste claim and also in addition initiate proceedings for cancellation of the earlier order. In this view of the matter, we are of the view that the petition must succeed. Rule is made absolute in above terms. The Caste Scrutiny Committee is directed to furnish the caste validity certificate to the Petitioner."

6. The learned Government Pleader submits that since some interpolation is noticed in the school record of Ashish Bhagwan Chaudhary, Ram Kashinath Chaudhary, Sunil Kashinath Chaudhary and Balaji Narayan Chaudhary, the Committee has issued a show cause notice to them. We find that

the Committee has not recorded specific findings as regard possibility of some interpolation. Be that as it may, we have noticed that Ashish Bhagwan Chaudhary, Ram Kashinath Chaudhary, Sunil Kashinath Chaudhary and Balaji Narayan Chaudhary have already been granted caste validity certificate. Thus in our considered view, the reason assigned by the Committee for rejection of the petitioner's claim cannot be sustained as it runs contrary to the view taken by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Apoorva Vinay Nichale** (*supra*).

7. In the circumstances, in the light of the judgment in the case of law laid down in the cases of **Apoorva Nichale, Anand vs. Committee and Raju Ramsing Vasave** (*supra*), the petitioner is entitled to be granted caste validity certificate forthwith. However, the issuance of the certificate shall be subject to the outcome of the show cause notice which have been issued against Ashish Bhagwan Chaudhary, Ram Kashinath Chaudhary, Sunil Kashinath Chaudhary and Balaji Narayan Chaudhary by the Committee as the caste validity certificate issued to them is found to be based on interpolation / adverse entries.

8. In view of above, the Committee is directed to issue

Tribe validity certificate to the petitioner forthwith. As the Committee has already initiated proceeding for cancellation of validity issued to the blood relations of the petitioner, but in response to the Courts query, it is assured by the Committee that the Committee will conclude those proceeding within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. If the proceeding for cancellation of caste validity holder are answered against such certificate holder, it shall be open for the respondent Committee to issue show cause notice to the petitioner as to why the validity certificate granted to her should not be cancelled and it will be open for the Committee to take those proceeding to its logical end. Needless to say that the certificate issued to the petitioner is subject to the outcome of the proceeding for cancellation of validity issued in favour of her blood relations.

9. With the aforesaid observation, the petition is allowed to the extent indicated above.

(G.S.KULKARNI, J.)

(NITIN W.SAMBRE, J.)