



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

909 WRIT PETITION NO. 3417 OF 2025

**SATISH KISHANRAO DANDEWAD
VERSUS**

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS

AND

914 WRIT PETITION NO. 3422 OF 2025

**UTTAM VIKRAM DANDEWAD
VERSUS**

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS

AND

919 WRIT PETITION NO. 3434 OF 2025

**SANDEEP NAGORAO DANDEWAD
VERSUS**

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS

AND

929 WRIT PETITION NO. 3444 OF 2025

**SHRINIVAS MAROTI DANDEWAD
VERSUS**

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY & ANOTHER

AND

930 WRIT PETITION NO. 3445 OF 2025

**DATTATRAYA MANOHAR DANDEWAD
VERSUS**

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY & ANOTHER

AND

912 WRIT PETITION NO. 3420 OF 2025

OMKAR UTTAM DANDEWAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY & ANOTHER

.....

Advocate for the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jadhavar Pratap V.
AGP for Respondents/State : S/Shri R.K. Ingole, S.R. Wakale, S.V. Hange &
V.M. Kagne in respective petitions

.....

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
Y.G. KHOBRADE, JJ.**
DATE : 12.03.2025

P.C. :-

1. The petitioners are challenging the common judgment and order by preferring separate writ petitions, whereby by the order dated 04.03.2025 the committee has invalidated their 'Mannervarlu' tribe claims.
2. Issue notice to the respondent nos.1 and 2. The learned A.G.P. waives service for respondent nos. 1 and 2.
3. Writ petition no.3420/2025 has been preferred by son of the aforementioned Uttam by name Omkar Dandewad, aggrieved by a similar decision of the committee dated 04.12.2023, whereas the petitioner-Dattatraya Dandewad from writ petition no.3445/2025 is also taking exception to a similar order passed by the committee on 18.10.2023.

4. It is being pointed out that the impugned decisions are based on common vigilance inquiry undertaken by the committee in the matter of petitioners-Sandeep, Satish, Uttam and one Akash Dandewad & Aishwarya Dandewad. This would demonstrate that a common set of evidence is the subject matter of the scrutiny by the committee while deciding the individual claims of all these individuals.

5. For the reasons best known to the committee a separate order was passed in the matter of Akash Dandewad and Aishwarya Dandewad. On their challenge to the order of the committee in writ petition no.9328/2023, by the judgment and order dated 01.08.2023 the order of invalidation was quashed and set aside and they were held entitled to have certificates of validity subject to the condition that those would be co-terminus with the validities which the committee had decided to reopen.

6. Incidentally, the proposals of Omkar Dandewad and Dattatraya Dandewad were decided by the committee by adopting the same vigilance inquiry conducted in the matter of aforementioned five individuals albeit the committee has merely referred to the impugned judgments and orders that it was a vigilance inquiry in the matter of Aishwarya Dandewad and Akash Dandewad. The fact remains that the same vigilance inquiry is subject

matter before the committee while deciding the claims of Omkar Dandewad and Dattatraya Dandewad, as well.

7. Since the same set of evidence is the subject matter before the committee while rejecting the claims of all these petitioners by common judgment and order, in our considered view it would not be permissible for this Court to reach an incompatible conclusion with the one that of division bench in the matter of Aishwarya Dandewad and Akash Dandewad.

8. For the reasons mentioned in the matter of Aishwarya Dandewad and Akash Dandewad, these writ petitions are allowed. The impugned order is quashed and set aside. The committee shall issue certificates of validity to each of these petitioners which shall be co-terminus with the validity which the committee has decided to re-open. The petitioners shall not be entitled to claim equities.

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]