



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

909 WRIT PETITION NO. 2224 OF 2025

SUDHAKAR BASAPPA KOSKEWAD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.

AGP for Respondent nos. 1 & 2 : Mrs. S.S. Joshi

Advocate for Respondent no. 3 : Mr. Yogita Thorat

...

AND

912 WRIT PETITION NO. 2228 OF 2025

SARIKA MALLESHU KOSKEWAD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.

AGP for Respondent nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. R.K. Ingole

...

AND

922 WRIT PETITION NO. 2239 OF 2025

DATTAPRASAD PRALHAD KOSKEWAD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.

AGP for Respondent nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. V.M. Kagne

...

AND

924 WRIT PETITION NO. 2241 OF 2025

PRALHAD VITTHALRAO KOSKEWAD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.

AGP for Respondent nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. R.K. Ingole

Advocate for Respondent nos. 3 & 4 : Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar

...
AND

927 WRIT PETITION NO. 2244 OF 2025

GANESH GANGADHAR KOSKEWAD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.

AGP for Respondent nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. S.R. Wakale

Advocate for Respondent nos. 3 & 4 : Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar

...
AND

928 WRIT PETITION NO. 2245 OF 2025

GOVIND DIGAMBAR KOSKEWAD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.

AGP for Respondent /State: Mr. M.K. Goyanka

...
AND

934 WRIT PETITION NO. 2254 OF 2025

SHANKAR PRAKASH KOSKEWAD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.

AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. R.K. Ingole

...

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

DATE : 14.02.2025

PER COURT :

Heard.

2. Issue notice.

3. The learned A.G.P and the learned advocates waive service for the respective respondent/s. With the consent, the matters are taken up for decision finally at this stage itself.

4. In all these petitions, the petitioners are challenging the separate judgments and orders passed by the scrutiny committee, refusing to validate their 'Mannervarlu' scheduled tribe certificates, even when a common vigilance enquiry was conducted and a common report was submitted by the vigilance officer.

5. As has been pointed out, petitioner Govind's daughter Ashlesha had submitted a claim for validation of her tribe certificate. The committee decided it by the order dated 06.09.2024. While deciding the claim, the committee had referred to this very common vigilance report in the present matters. Though she had faced invalidation, this Court in Writ Petition No. 9883/2024, by the judgment and order dated 09.09.2024 held her entitled to have a certificate of validity.

6. Ashlesha is the daughter of one of the petitioners namely Govind Digambar Koskewad. Since she has been held entitled to have a certificate of validity, it would be logical that even her father gets a validity.

7. Additionally, since the very same common vigilance report was a subject matter of scrutiny by the scrutiny committee in the matter of Ashlesha and this Court has already set aside the judgment and order of the committee in her matter, in our considered view, the set of evidence being the same, no separate reasons are required to be assigned much less to arrive at some inconsistent conclusion.

8. For the reasons as mentioned in the matter of Ashlesha, all these petitions are partly allowed. The impugned judgments and orders are quashed

and set aside. The committee shall immediately issue certificates of validity to each of the petitioners as belonging to 'Mannervarlu' scheduled tribe, subject to the condition that the validities would depend upon the final outcome of the matters of the validity holders, which the committee has decided to reopen.

9. The petitioners shall not be entitled to claim equities.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

mkd/-