



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 5936 OF 2025

UMAKANT SURESH THAKUR  
VERSUS  
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA  
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

- Mr. C.K. Bhangoji and Mr. S.K. Shinde, Advocates for the Petitioner (Online)
- Mr. R. K. Ingole, AGP for Respondents/State

...

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

DATE : 06.05.2025

PER COURT :

. Heard learned advocate for the petitioner as also learned AGP and perused the papers.

2. The petitioner is in the peculiar situation. His proposal for validation of the '*Thakur*' scheduled tribe certificate was pending before the respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee. For the reason mentioned in the impugned order, the committee disposed of the proposal rather returned it on the ground that the purpose for seeking validation inasmuch as he was undertaking some education and had subsequently passed 12<sup>th</sup> standard. The proposal was returned. He now seeks direction to the committee by setting aside the impugned order to undertake a fresh scrutiny of his tribe claim.

3. Bearing in mind the fact that these caste scrutiny matters are merely meant for deciding the social status so as to extend the benefit if at all a person is entitled to derive it under the reservation policy of the State, the matters cannot be looked upon as adversarial litigation.

4. Admittedly, the petitioner's claim has not been decided on merits but the proposal was merely sent back without scrutiny.

5. In light of above, we allow the writ petition with a direction to respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee to revive the proposal of the petitioner and take appropriate decision after the scrutiny as is contemplated under the Maharashtra Act No. XXIII of 2001 and the rules framed thereunder. If necessary, whenever the committee calls upon the petitioner, he shall cooperate with the committee and tender the documents. It is clarified that we have not touched the merits of the matter/claim of the petitioner and the committee shall be at liberty to decide it on its own merits.

6. At this stage, the learned advocate for the petitioner submits that in fact already a vigilance enquiry has been undertaken. The petitioner has also responded to it, having served with a copy and the matter may be expedited. In view of these circumstances, the committee may consider the petitioner's request and endeavor to decide the proposal, as expeditiously as possible and shall decide it finally within four months.

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)