



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 3334 OF 2025

Suresh S/o Shankarrao Gajulwar,
Age 54 years, Occu. Service
R/o Daregaon, Taluka Degloor,
Dist. Nanded

...Petitioner

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through Secretary,
Department of Tribal Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny Committee,
Kinwat, Head Office Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar
Through its Member Secretary.
3. The Joint Director of Health Sciences
(Leprosy & TB),
Infront of Vishrantwadi Police Station,
Aalandi Road, Yerwada, Pune.
4. The Assistant Director of Health Sciences
(Leprosy),
Vazirabad, Nanded

...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 3335 OF 2025

Jyoti D/o Hulappa Gajulwar,
Age 40 years, Occu. Service
R/o Markhael, Taluka Degloor,
Dist. Nanded

...Petitioner

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through Secretary,
Department of Tribal Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

2. Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny Committee,
Kinwat, Head Office Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar
Through its Member Secretary.
3. The Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Ratnagiri.

...Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 3450 OF 2025**

Babu S/o Shankarrao Gajulwar,
Age 52 years, Occu. Service
R/o Daregaon, Taluka Degloor,
Dist. Nanded.

...Petitioner

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Tribal Development Department
Through its Secretary,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-400 001.
2. Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny Committee,
Kinwat, Head Office Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar
Through its Member Secretary.
3. Superintendent of Police, Nanded
Tq. & Dist. Nanded

...Respondents

...

- **Mr. Deepak D. Choudhari and Mr. Vijay G. Gangalwad,**
Advocates for the Petitioner in WP No. 3334 of 2025 & WP No. 3335 of 2025.
- **Mr. Sagar S. Phatal,** *Advocate for the Petitioner in WP No. 3450 of 2025.*
- **Ms. P. J. Bharad,** *AGP for Respondents/State in all petitions.*

...

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

DATE : 19.03.2025

ORDER (MANGESH S. PATIL, J.) :

. By way of these separate writ petitions, the blood relatives *inter se* are questioning different orders of the committee refusing to validate their '*Mannervarlu*' scheduled tribe certificates by passing separate orders on the same day i.e. 21.02.2025.

2. Rule in all the matters.

3. The learned AGP waives service for the contesting respondents.

4. In order to avoid rigmarole, inasmuch as same evidence has been the subject matter of scrutiny of the committee, we are disposing of these petitions by this common order at the joint request of the parties.

5. The petitioners - *Suresh* and *Babu* are real brothers and the petitioner – *Jyoti* is their first degree cousin.

6. Admittedly, there are several validities in the family. Real brothers of *Jyoti* by name *Ashok* and *Manohar*, *Ashok's* son *Avinash*, *Manohar's* daughter *Mansi*, *Jyoti's* another brother *Vyankat's* daughters *Gamnashree* and *Gamyashree* possess certificates of validity.

7. Similarly, Suresh and Babu's real sister Shobha, Suresh's daughter Aishvarya, Babu's son Gajanan and daughter Pranita and their first degree niece Parvati, daughter of their real brother Ashok possess certificates of validity.

8. Admittedly, *Gamanashree Venkat Gajulwar, Aishwarya Suresh Gajalwar, Gajanan Babu Gajulwar* and *Pranita Baburao Gajulwar* have been held entitled to have certificates of validity by this Court in their respective writ petitions. These are as follows:-

Name	Writ Petition Nos.	Order Date
Gamanashree Venkat Gajulwar	8930 of 2018	03.08.2018
Aishwarya Suresh Gajalwar	10027 of 2018	31.08.2018
Gajanan Babu Gajulwar	129 of 2021	14.01.2021
Pranita Baburao Gajulwar	9717 of 2023	07.08.2023

9. Besides, a common vigilance enquiry was conducted in the matter of these petitioners and *Babu's* son *Gajanan* and few other individuals. Meaning thereby that the evidence was collected in common in the matter of all these petitioners and the validity holder – *Gajanan*, albeit for the reasons best known to the committee, it has chosen to pass separate orders. One wonders what made the committee to resort to such duplication of work. At least no reason

has been mentioned in any of the orders to adopt such unprecedented procedure which *ex facie* is illogical.

10. Be that as it may, a common set of evidence has been the subject matter by the scrutiny committee in the matters of these petitioners as well as *Gajanan*. If on the objective scrutiny, this Court has held *Gajanan* entitled to have a certificate of validity that in itself is sufficient to allow these petitions, since the petitioners cannot be belonging to a different caste than what *Gajanan* belongs to.

11. For the reasons mentioned in the matter of *Gajanan*, we allow these writ petitions partly, quash and set aside the impugned judgments, and direct the scrutiny committee to issue certificates of validity to all the petitioners.

12. These validities shall be subject to the final outcome of the matters which the committee has decided to reopen.

13. The petitioners are not entitled to claim equities.

(Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

jhs/