



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

941 WRIT PETITION NO. 3998 OF 2025

GANGASAGAR RAMCHANDRA RAMOD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

AND
WRIT PETITION NO.2301 OF 2025

SHARMILA SAYANNA RAMOD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

AND
WRIT PETITION NO. 2339 OF 2025

VINAYAK SHANKARRAO RAMOD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

AND
WRIT PETITION NO.3144 OF 2025

BALIRAM NAGNATHRAO RAMOD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

....

Mr. M. A. Golegaonkar, Advocate for the Petitioners
Ms V. N. Patil – Jadhav, AGP for the Respondent – State

....

CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.

DATE : 25.03.2025

PER COURT :-

. Writ petition Nos. 2301 of 2025, 2339 of 2025, and 3144 of 2025 are not on board. On a request, the papers are called.

2. Issue notice in Writ Petition No.3998 of 2025. Learned AGP waives service of notice on behalf of all the respondents in this petition.

3. We have heard both the sides finally in the peculiar circumstances.

4. All these petitioners by way of separate writ petitions are putting up challenge to the common judgment and order of the respondent scrutiny committee in a proceeding under Section 7 of the Maharashtra Act XXIII of 2021, whereby it has refused to validate their '*Mannervarlu*' scheduled tribe certificates vide order dated 17.01.2025.

5. The learned advocate for the Petitioners tenders across the bar a copy of common order dated 31.01.2025 passed in Writ Petition No.1513 of 2025 and Writ Petition No.1516 of 2025, preferred by Sainath Dattatray Ramod and Shashikant Dattatray Ramod, respectively. The impugned common order also covers the

claims of Sainath and Shashikant. Meaning thereby that the impugned common order has already been set aside by this court in the matter of Sainath and Shashikant. No separate and independent reasons need to be recorded, much less for reaching some incompatible conclusion with the order of the coordinate division bench. For this reason alone, all these writ petitions deserve to be allowed for the same reasons as have been recorded in the matter of Sainath and Shashikant.

6. Incidentally, a common vigilance inquiry was conducted in the matter of all these petitioners and few other individuals, who had faced a similar invalidation, namely, Snehalata Ashokrao Ramod, Laxman Suryakant Ramod and Swapnil Gangadhar Ramod. In their respective petitions, the orders in their matters whereby their claims were invalidated, have already been quashed and set aside by this court in Writ Petition Nos.1256 of 2023, 1096 of 2022 and 947 of 2022. For this reason also, the impugned order does not stand scrutiny of law for same reasons as have been recorded in the matters of Snehlata, Laxman and Swapnil.

7. The writ petitions are allowed partly. The impugned order is quashed and set aside even to the extent of these petitioners.

For the reasons recorded by this court in the matter of Sainath Dattatray Ramod and Shashikant Dattatray Ramod. The committee shall issue certificates of validity to all these petitioners, which shall be subject to the final outcome of the matters of the validity holders which the committee has decided to re-open.

[Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

SMS