



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

932 WRIT PETITION NO. 4251 OF 2025

SINDHUJA D/O POSHATTI BAKKAWAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.
AGP for Respondents: Mr. V.M. Kagne

...
937 WRIT PETITION NO. 4259 OF 2025

GANGAPRASAD GANGADHAR BAKKAWAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat Chandrakant R.
AGP for Respondents: Mr. S.R. Wakale

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

DATE : 28.03.2025

PER COURT :

Leave granted to delete respondent no. 2 in Writ Petition No. 4259/2025. The amendment is to be carried out forthwith.

2. The petitioners, by way of these separate writ petitions are challenging a common order dated 19.03.2025, whereby the respondent-scrutiny committee has refused to validate their 'Mannervarlu' scheduled tribe certificates.

3. Issue notice.

4. The learned A.G.P waives service for all the respondents.

5. At the joint request, both the matters are being disposed of today itself for the reasons as would be made out from the following observations.

6. The petitioners' proposals have been rejected after they were permitted to adopt the vigilance reenquiry conducted in the matter of their distant cousin Dinesh Kishor Bakkawad and the response filed by him. A specific observation can be found in the impugned order in paragraph no. 4.

7. This circumstance makes it evident that a common set of evidence has been the subject matter of scrutiny before the committee not only while deciding Dinesh's matter but even while deciding the petitioners claims.

8. Incidentally, having faced invalidation, Dinesh had preferred Writ Petition No.14649/2023. By the order dated 07.12.2023 his petition was allowed and he was held entitled to have a certificate of validity subject to the final outcome of the matters of the validity holders which the committee had decided to reopen and further indicating that he would face the consequences as laid down in the matter of *Shweta Balaji Isankar Vs. State of Maharashtra and others* (writ petition no. 6320 of 2017).

9. Since the impugned judgment is based on the same set of evidence, in our considered view, no separate scanning of the material would be needed much less to reach a conclusion incompatible with the one reached while deciding Dinesh's claim.

10. For the reasons recorded in the matter of Dinesh in Writ Petition No. 14649/2023 , these petitions are allowed partly.

11. The impugned order is quashed and set aside. The respondent-committee shall immediately issue tribe validity certificates to the petitioners as belonging to 'Mannervarlu' scheduled tribe. It shall be subject to the final outcome of the matters which the committee has decided to reopen.

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

(Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

mkd/-