



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

Review Application No. 225 Of 2024

In

Writ Petition No. 9563 Of 2024

1. Pradip s/o Ramesh Shinde
Age : 22 years, Occupation-Student,
R/o. Sawana, Tq. Sengaon,
Dist. Hingoli.
2. Sandip s/o Ramesh Shinde
Age : 28 years, Occupation-Student,
R/o. Sawana, Tq. Sengaon,
Dist. Hingoli.

.. Applicants

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Department of Tribal Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
Through its Security.
2. The Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny
Committee, Kinwat
(Headquarter- Chh. Sambhajinagar)
Tq. & Dist. Chh. Sambhajinagar.
Through its Member Secretary.

.. Respondents

- * Mr. S.C. Yeramwar, Advocate for the Applicants.
- * Mr. P.S. Patil, Addl.GP for Respondents/State.

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
SHAILESH P. BRAHME, JJ..**

RESERVED ON : 24 OCTOBER 2024

PRONOUNCED ON : 11 NOVEMBER 2024

ORDER (Per Shailesh P. Brahme, J.) :

. Heard both the sides finally considering exigency for the applicants. It is informed that applicant no.1 aspires to secure admission to B.A.M.S. Course.

2. The applicants are seeking review of our judgment and order dated 18.09.2024, dismissing writ petition and thereby confirming judgment and order passed by the Scrutiny Committee. Only ground pressed by the learned Counsel for the applicants in the present application is the subsequent discovery of school extract bearing school entry no.182 of Ambadas Rajaram Thakar, indicating caste as Thakar. It is sought to be contended that our finding discarding the selfsame entry is perverse on the face of the record.

3. At the outset, we would like to record that in our order under review in paragraph no.9 and 10, the charts of contrary entries and favourable entries are incorporated. Considering those entries, we had recorded that the favourable record was of a subsequent period having lesser probative value. The oldest record bearing school entry no.182 was that of Ambadas Rajaram Thakar of 1952 showing 'Hindu' as a caste. Everything hinges upon the school entry no.182 of Ambadas Rajaram Thakar.

4. After our order under review, the applicants had applied for the extract of coloured photocopy of entry no.182 on 20.09.2024. It was supplied to them. On the basis of the

subsequently discovered material, present application is filed. By our interim order dated 30.09.2024, the Committee was directed to undertake verification of the coloured photocopy bearing school entry no.182 and to submit the report. Accordingly the report is submitted on 08.10.2024. We have examined the submissions on the basis of the coloured photocopy of extract of the school register and the report of the Committee.

5. Learned Counsel for the applicants has submitted that the coloured photocopy shows caste as Thakar and religion as Hindu of Ambadas Rajaram Thakar who happened to be cousin uncle of the applicants and the entry is at serial no.182. This entry has been wrongly appreciated. The entry was verified and the Committee submitted report on 08.10.2024 stating that the original record was called for from the concerned school and it revealed that there was no title at the top of the pages and all pages were unbound. Considering the sequence of the entries and the dates of admission, the extract is reported to be bogus.

6. Again with the assistance of learned Counsel for both the sides, we have gone through the coloured photocopy of the extract of the school register having school entry no.182 of Ambadas Rajaram Thakar. We have seen the sequence of the entries as well as the dates of admission of the students. We do not find any infirmity in the finding recorded by the Committee in its report dated 08.10.2024. We have no iota of doubt that the school entry of Ambadas is bogus. As observed by the Committee even we could notice that this cannot be the original

register extract else there could not have been discrepancy in the sequence and dates of admission. We have already discarded it in our judgment in review. Additionally we also commented on two certified extract of the selfsame school entry. We do not find that there is any mistake apparent on the face of the record. Learned Counsel for the applicants did not agitate any other ground for reviewing our earlier order. There is no merit in the application.

7. The review application is rejected.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME]
JUDGE

[MANGESH S. PATIL]
JUDGE

najeeb..