



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 9971 OF 2025

SAUMYA SHEKHAR GAJJAL

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

- Mr. M. B. Karande, Advocate for the Petitioner
- Mr. S. D. Ghayal, Addl.GP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3
- Mr. S. V. Kuptekar, Advocate for Respondent No. 4

...

CORAM : MANISH PITALE AND
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.

DATE : 19.08.2025

PER COURT :

1. This petition is filed for a limited direction to respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee for deciding the tribe claim of the petitioner of belonging to the Scheduled Tribe – *Koli Mahadev*, at the earliest.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is urgency in the matter as the petitioner has been allotted college for Engineering Course and that the last date for submitting validity certificate is 05.09.2025.

3. Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 are represented by the learned AGP and Mr. Kuptekar, learned counsel appears on behalf of respondent No. 4, i.e, the competent authority of the State Common Entrance Test Cell, Maharashtra.

4. The required norms show that the petitioner must produce validity certificate as per the last date indicated by respondent No. 4.

5. In such cases, we have been issuing directions to respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee to decide the tribe claims as expeditiously as possible and looking to the urgency in the matters, we have specified dates before which the Scrutiny Committee is expected to decide the tribe claims.

6. But, in the present case the petitioner has approached this Court, only a couple of weeks before the last date for submission of validity certificate. The most crucial aspect of the matter is that the proposal for grant of validity certificate itself was moved on behalf of petitioner recently on 06.06.2025.

7. Although the petitioner claims that since her father has a validity certificate, the proceedings before the Scrutiny Committee ought not to take much time, we are of the opinion that the relevant provisions of law require vigilance cell enquiry to be conducted when

such proposals are received for grant of validity certificate. It is crucial to note that the validity certificate granted in favour of the father of the petitioner was as far back as on 13.08.2010 and yet the petitioner herself chose to place the proposal before the Scrutiny Committee for grant of validity only on 06.06.2025.

8. Since, this is the time period when admissions to various courses are undertaken, including professional courses, respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee is already overburdened with students matters. We have been issuing directions for time bound decisions which has certainly increased the load of respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee. In most of the cases, where we have given such directions, the proceedings were found to be almost at the stage of culmination or where final hearings were being conducted, but in the present case, even the police vigilance enquiry is pending.

9. In such a situation, the petitioner has failed to make out a case for directing respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee to leave all the other work aside and to take up the case of the petitioner for immediate decision and disposal. Any direction issued by this Court may have the effect of the police vigilance cell hurrying though the vigilance enquiry, which would also not be in the interest of justice.

10. Therefore, this petition can be disposed of by issuing limited direction to respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee. Accordingly, the writ petition is **disposed of** by directing respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee to decide the tribe claim of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible , preferably within six months from the date of this order being produced before respondent No. 2 – the Scrutiny Committee.

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)