

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

918 WRIT PETITION NO. 13968 OF 2024

**SATISH BALAJIRAO AKULWAR AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
AND OTHERS**

**AND
919 WRIT PETITION NO. 13971 OF 2024**

**GANGADHAR RAMKISHAN AKULWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
AND OTHERS**

...
Mr. S.M. Vibhute, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. M.M. Nerlikar, A.G.P. for respondents/State.
...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, JJ.**

DATED : 19 DECEMBER 2024

ORDER:-

. Heard both sides.

2. By way of these two separate writ petitions the petitioners are challenging the common judgment and order of the respondent Scrutiny Committee dated 17.12.2024 refusing to validate their "Mannervarlu" tribe certificates.

3. It is being pointed out that the common vigilance enquiry was conducted in the matter of these three petitioners and

three other individuals Mahesh Satishrao Akulwar, Laxman Shankar Akulwar and Anil Shankar Akulwar. The Committee chose to pass separate order in the matter of one Shravan Umakant Akulwar and Mahesh Satish Akulwar on 10.10.2024 and passed the impugned order thereafter. In the meantime, in Writ Petition No. 11515 of 2024, by the order dated 22.10.2024 the order of the Committee in respect of Shravan and Mahesh was quashed and set aside and they were held entitled to have certificates of validity.

4. Incidentally, Mahesh is the son of petitioner Satish.

5. It is also been pointed out that apart therefrom, Suryakant Hanmant Akulwar and Rushikesh Suryakant Akulwar were granted certificates of validity by the orders of this Court and there is no dispute about them being related to all these individuals by blood from the paternal side.

6. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, when the same set of evidence collected and verified through Vigilance Cell was the subject matter for the scrutiny of the Committee in the matter of Mahesh and even this Court had verified it objectively before holding Mahesh entitled to have certificate of validity, in our considered view, no fresh scrutiny

needs to be resorted. Incidentally, there seems to be a mistake in the order passed in the matter of Shravan and Mahesh referring *inter alia* the validity of the petitioner Satish when he was still to get the certificate of validity.

7. Be that as it may, for the reasons recorded in the matter of Mahesh, even these petitions are allowed partly. The impugned order is quashed and set aside. The Committee shall issue certificates of validity to each of these petitioners which shall be subject to the final outcome of the matters which the Committee has decided to reopen.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR)
JUDGE

(MANGESH S. PATIL)
JUDGE