



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

909 WRIT PETITION NO.5642 OF 2025

**SATYAVAN SHAMRAO SALVE
VERSUS**

- 1. THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR. IT'S SECRETARY TRIBAL
DEPARTMENT MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI – 32**
- 2. THE SCHEDULED TRIBE CERTIFICATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, CHH.
SAMBHAJINAGAR THR. ITS DEPUTY DIRECTOR (R)**
- 3. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, BULDHANA,
TQ. AND DIST. BULDHANA**

...

**Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Jadhavar Pratap V.
AGP for Respondents: Ms. VN. Patil Jadhav**

...

AND

922 WRIT PETITION NO.5680 OF 2025

**AMOL PRAKASH SALVE
VERSUS**

- 1. THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR. IT'S SECRETARY TRIBAL
DEPARTMENT MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI – 32**
- 2. THE SCHEDULED TRIBE CERTIFICATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE,
CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR THR. ITS DEPUTY DIRECTOR (R)**
- 3. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR
TQ. AND DIST. CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR**

...

**Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Jadhavar Pratap V.
AGP for Respondents: Mr. R.K. Ingole**

...

AND

924 WRIT PETITION NO.5685 OF 2025

**VIJAY BHIMRAO SALVE
VERSUS**

- 1. THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR. IT'S SECRETARY TRIBAL
DEPARTMENT MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI – 32**
- 2. THE SCHEDULED TRIBE CERTIFICATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE,
CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR THR. ITS DEPUTY DIRECTOR (R)**
- 3. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR
TQ. AND DIST. CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR**

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Jadhavar Pratap V.
AGP for Respondents: Mr. S.R. Wakale

...

AND

925 WRIT PETITION NO.5686 OF 2025

MUKESH BHIMRAO SALVE

VERSUS

1. THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR. IT'S SECRETARY TRIBAL
DEPARTMENT MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI – 32
2. THE SCHEDULED TRIBE CERTIFICATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE,
CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR THR. ITS DEPUTY DIRECTOR (R)
3. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR
TQ. AND DIST. CHH. SAMBHAJINAGAR

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Jadhavar Pratap V.
AGP for Respondents: Ms. V. N. Patil Jadhav

...

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

DATE : **29.04.2025**

PER COURT:

The petitioners by way of these separate writ petitions are taking exception to a common judgment and order dated 21.04.2025, whereby, the respondent – Scrutiny Committee refused to validate their 'Koli Malhar' scheduled tribe certificates.

2. We have heard both the sides.

3. It is a matter of record that impugned order is a common order. Pertinently, the Committee to scrutinize the petitioners' claim is a common vigilance inquiry report dated 10.10.2022 which was conducted in common in respect of petitioners Mukesh, Amol, Satyavan and one

Suraj Ganpatrao Salve. In Writ Petition No.12729/2023 by the order dated 17.10.2024, Suraj has been held entitled to have a certificate of validity *albeit* conditional. These circumstances make it evident that a common set of evidence has played a role for the committee in adjudicating all these claims as also that of Suraj. Once Suraj has been held entitled to have a certificate of validity obviously on scrutiny of the same set of circumstances and evidence, for the selfsame reasons as have been recorded by this Court in that matter, all these petitions are allowed partly. Impugned order is quashed and set aside to the extent of these petitioners. They shall be issued with certificates of validity which shall be coterminous with the validities in the family which the Committee has decided to reopen.

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

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)