

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.7817 OF 2025

Vinodkumar Kulwantsingh Kapoor ..Petitioner
vs.
The Schedule Tribe Certificate
Scrutiny Committee, Nashik Division
and ors. ..Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.7326 OF 2025**

M/s. Nashik Enterprises and ors. ..Petitioners
vs.
The Collector Nashik and ors. ..Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.7356 OF 2025**

Govind Dagdu Dev and ors. ..Petitioners
vs.
The Collector, Nashik and ors. ..Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.7351 OF 2025**

Govind Dagdu Dev and ors. ..Petitioners
vs.
The Collector, Nashik and ors. ..Respondents

Adv. Vivek Punjabi i/b. Adv. Parichehr Zaiwalla, for the
Petitioners in WP/7356/2025 and WP/7326/2025.

Adv. Akshay Petkar i/b. Adv. Parichehr Zaiwalla, for the
Petitioners in WP/7351/2025.

Mr. Nikhil Sakhardande, Senior Advocate a/w Adv. Tanvi
Tapkire, Adv. Ashish Venugopal, for the Petitioner in
WP/7817/2025.

Mr. V. G. Badgujar, AGP, for the Respondent-State in
WP/7817/2025.

Ms. R. A. Salunkhe, AGP, for the Respondent-State in

WP/7356/2025, WP/7326/2025 and WP/7351/2025.

Adv. Vivek Salunke a/w Adv. Ajinkya Jaibhave, for Respondent Nos.4 to 10 in WP/7351/2025.

Adv. Prajit S. Sahane, for Respondent No.4 in WP/7326/2025.

**CORAM : M. S. KARNIK &
N. R. BORKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 17th JULY, 2025

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. Mr. Sakhardande, learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioners made an attempt to contend that the impugned order passed by the Additional Tahsildar, Nashik is without jurisdiction and therefore though there is a remedy of filing an Appeal before the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, this Court can still entertain the present Writ Petitions. However, when we showed our disinclination to entertain the petition in view of availability of remedy of appeal, Mr. Sakhardande, learned Senior Advocate, on instructions, submitted that the Petitioners will approach the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal. Learned Senior Advocate submits that the revenue entries are in favour of the Petitioners since 1989 and therefore a limited protection be granted. Learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioners on instructions makes a

statement that no third party interest in the property shall be created by the Petitioners.

3. Mr. Salunkhe, learned counsel for the Respondent Nos.4 to 10 opposed this request. It is submitted that on the last occasion already an order is passed that all steps taken shall be subject to the outcome of these Writ Petitions.

4. However, with a view not to precipitate the matter and enabling the Petitioners to make out a case for interim reliefs before the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal we direct that the status quo as on today shall be maintained for a period of four weeks. It is made clear that the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal shall proceed to consider the application if made for interim reliefs on its own merits without being influenced by this limited protection.

5. All contentions of the parties are kept open.

6. Writ Petitions are disposed of as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

(N. R. BORKAR, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)