



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

WRIT PETITION NO.11988 OF 2025

Vilas s/o Vitthalrao Telang

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

... RESPONDENTS

.....
Mr. C.R. Thorat, Advocate for petitioner
Ms R.P. Gaur, A.G.P. for respondents
.....

**CORAM : R.G. AVACHAT AND
ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, JJ.**

DATE : 1ST OCTOBER, 2025

ORDER :

Heard. The learned Advocate for the petitioner urged for remand of the matter on the ground the Scrutiny Committee to have not served the petitioner with the Vigilance Cell report. The learned A.G.P. has strong objection on the ground that the report was sent on the petitioner's address. The petitioner did not revert back to the Scrutiny Committee and as such, he himself did not avail the opportunity to meet the Vigilance Cell report.

2. The fact is, however that, the Vigilance Cell report is adverse to the case of the petitioner. The record indicates the petitioner to have not been given the Vigilance Cell report and as such, he has not been offered an opportunity to meet the report which is adverse to his case. The said report has been relied on by the respondent Scrutiny Committee to negative the petitioner's claim.

3. For want of opportunity to the petitioner to meet the Vigilance Cell report, the principles of natural justice have not been complied with. It is also the mandate of Rule 12 of the 2003 Rules. In this view of the matter, the petition partly succeeds. Hence the order :

ORDER

- (i) The Writ Petition is partly allowed.
- (ii) The impugned order dated 14/8/2025, passed by the respondent No.2 Scrutiny Committee is set aside. Matter is remanded back to the Scrutiny Committee.
- (iii) The petitioner undertakes to appear before the Scrutiny Committee on 13/10/2025. The Scrutiny

Committee shall offer the petitioner full opportunity to meet the Vigilance Cell report and then decide the claim of the petitioner within a period of one month.

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.)

(R.G. AVACHAT, J.)

fmp/-