



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

1 WRIT PETITION NO. 11855 OF 2025

Sneha Prakash Gazile

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Another

...

AND

2 WRIT PETITION NO. 11856 OF 2025

Satish Baburao Gejele

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Others

...

Mr. Sunil Mahadevappa Vibhute, Advocate for the Petitioner in both.

Mr. P. K. Lakhotiya, AGP for Respondents/State in both.

...

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

DATED : SEPTEMBER 26, 2025

P.C.:

1. Both these Writ Petitions have taken up together since the petitioners are challenging the one and the same order passed by Respondent No.2 -Committee.
2. The petitioners claim to have belonged to '*Koli Mahadev*', Scheduled Tribe. The Scrutiny Committee declined to grant validity certificates to the petitioners. They are therefore before us.
3. Heard. The fact is that this Court vide judgements and orders dated 10.10.2024 passed in Writ Petition No.11204 of 2024 and 10.12.2024 passed in Writ Petition No.4574 of 2021 directed to grant

validity certificates to the real brother and father of the petitioner in Writ Petition No.11855 of 2025, respectively. They are the blood relations of the petitioners. We have therefore no other option but to grant petitioners same treatment. Hence the following order :-

:: ORDER ::

- i. The Writ Petitions are allowed.
- ii. The impugned judgment and order dated 24.09.2025 passed by Respondent No.2-Committee is quashed and set aside.
- iii. Respondent No.2-Committee is directed to issue validity certificate to the petitioners belonging to 'Koli Mahadev', Scheduled Tribe, immediately in the prescribed proforma, on the condition of facing consequence recorded in ***Shweta Balaji Isankar vs. The State of Maharashtra and others***, Writ Petition No.5411 of 2018, dated 27.07.2018.
- iv. The Validity Certificates of the petitioners would be subject to the outcome of the re-verification undertaken by Respondent No.2/Committee of the validity holders on the basis of which validities were claimed.
- v. The petitioners would not be entitled to claim equities.

[ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.]

[R. G. AVACHAT, J.]