

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

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL APPLICATION (REVIEW) 1475 OF 2017
IN
WRIT PETITION 2482 OF 2017 (D)

Sachin Umashankar Metkar,
aged about 34 yrs, Occ Unemployed,
r/o. Near Jaiswal Chakki,
Frezarpura, Amravati,
Tahsil and District Amravati

.....**APPLICANT**

...V E R S U S...

The Scheduled Tribe Certificates
Scrutiny Committee, Amravati Division,
Amravati through its Member - Secretary

.....**RESPONDENT**

Mr. V.A. Kothale, counsel for applicant.
Mr. N.S. Rao, AGP for respondent/State.

CORAM: **ROHIT B. DEO AND ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.**
DATE: **1st AUGUST, 2022.**

ORAL JUDGMENT: (Per : Rohit B. Deo, J.)

The applicant is the original petitioner in Writ Petition 2482/2017, in which challenge was to the order dated 15.9.2015, rendered by the Scheduled Tribe Certificates Scrutiny Committee, Amravati Division, Amravati ("Scrutiny Committee"), whereby the claim of the petitioner of belonging to Mannewar "Scheduled Tribe" was invalidated.

2. This Court dismissed the petition vide order dated 10.7.2017.

3. This Court noted that every pre-constitution document, which is placed on record by the petitioner refers to his caste as Manewar. This Court further noted that the petitioner failed to establish affinity.

4. Review of the order dated 10.7.2017 is sought on the ground that a contrarian view is taken by a Coordinate Bench in Writ Petition 757/2010 alongwith the connected petitions, which is decided on 10.8.2010. We have perused the said decision. The decision turns on its factual matrix since in paragraph 5, the observation is that the Scrutiny Committee committed an error in holding that the petitioner did not establish affinity. The next decision which is brought to our notice is the decision in Writ Petition 5119/2016. The said decision does support the submission of the petitioner – review applicant herein that in vernacular language Manewar and Mannewar may possibly be used or recorded interchangeably.

5. The issue is not whether we have decided the matter

correctly. If we have erred, the appropriate remedy lies elsewhere. We do not find any reason to entertain review. While a Coordinate Bench may have taken a view which supports the petitioner, we do not see any apparent error on the face of the record as would impel us to exercise review jurisdiction.

6. Miscellaneous Civil Application 1475/2017 is dismissed.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)

(ROHIT B. DEO, J.)

Belkhe