

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.647 OF 2021

1. Dr.Kshipra Kamlesh Uke,
Aged about 45 years, occupation Research & Training,
Resident of 173, RPTS Road, Laxminagar, Nagpur.
2. Dr.Shiv Shankar Das,
Aged about 37 years, occupation Research & Training,
resident of 173, RPTS Road, Laxminagar, Nagpur. **Petitioners.**

:: VERSUS ::

1. The National Commission for Scheduled Castes,
New Delhi having its office at 5th Floor, Loknayak Bhawan,
Khan Market, New Delhi-110003.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Nagpur Division,
having its office at Old Secretary Building, Civil Lines, Nagpur.
3. The Regional Deputy Commissioner,
Department of Social Welfare, Nagpur Division,
having its office at Samajik Nyay Bhawan,
Deekshabhoomi Chowk, Nagpur.
4. The Commissioner of Police, Nagpur City, Nagpur.
5. The Chairperson,
Committee to Review and Monitor Cases
under the PCR Act & SC/ST (PoA) Act,
Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment,
Government of India, New Delhi.
6. The Chairperson,
State-Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committee
under SC/ST (PoA) Act, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai.
7. The Chairperson,
District-Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committee
under SC/ST (PoA) Act, Nagpur District, Nagpur.

2

8. The Additional Director General of Police,
SC/ST Protection Cell/PCR, Maharashtra State, Mumbai.

9. The Commissioner,
Department of Social Welfare, Maharashtra State,
Pune. **Respondents.**

=====

Dr.(Ms) Kshipra Kamlesh Uke, petitioner in-person.
Shri S.A.Chaudhari, Counsel for respondent no.1.
Shri T.A.Mirza, Addl.P.P. for the state.

=====

CORAM : **V.M.DESHPANDE, & AMIT B.BORKAR, JJ.**

DATE : **MARCH 11, 2022**

ORAL JUDGMENT (Per : Amit B.Borkar, J.)

1. Heard Dr.(Ms) Kshipra Kamlesh Uke, petitioner in-person
and learned counsel Shri S.A.Chaudhari for respondent No.1. **RULE.**
Rule is made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent of learned
counsel for parties.

2. Learned counsel Shri S.A.Chaudhari for respondent No.1,
states that he has no instruction in the matter though this Court had
granted time to obtain the same.

3. We have carefully scrutinized averments in the writ
petition and in our opinion a limited relief is sought by petitioners which
is to effect that respondent No.1 to complete enquiry within stipulated
time in relation to complaint filed by petitioners.

4. Since there are no instruction from respondent No.1 to

.....3/-

3

learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1, after having considered the petition along with its annexures, we are satisfied that petitioners are entitled for limited relief in terms of prayer clause (i) of the petition as respondent No.1 has not completed enquiry into the complaint of petitioners for more than three years i.e. from 27.9.2018.

5. In this view of the matter, we direct respondent No.1 to complete enquiry in relation to petitioners' complaint bearing File No.Mah/30/2019-APCR within a period of six weeks from today.

The criminal writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.

The Rule is made absolute in above terms.

JUDGE

JUDGE

!! BRW !!

BHUSHAN
RANA
WANKHEDE

Digitally signed
by BHUSHAN
RANA
WANKHEDE
Date:
2022.03.14
15:44:21 +0530