

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION (WP) NO. 4875 OF 2025

Ku Bhawana Rajendra Dadmal

.Vs.

The Joint Commissioner cum Vice Chairman and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions Court's or Judge's orders.
and Registrar's Orders.

Mr N. D. Jambhule, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr H. D. Marathe, AGP for the respondent No. 1/State
Mr V. V. Joshi, Advocate for respondent No. 3

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, JJ.
DATED : AUGUST 26, 2025.

Heard.

2. Issue notice to the respondents, returnable on
10.09.2025.

3. Learned AGP waives service of notice on behalf
of respondent No.1/State.

4. Mr Joshi, learned counsel waives service of notice
on behalf of respondent No.3.

5. Petitioner (s) is/are permitted to serve remaining
respondent (s) by private mode of service, in addition to
regular mode of service and shall file an affidavit of service by
next date, failing which the petitioner (s) shall deposit costs of

Rupees Five Hundred with the High Court Gazetted Officer's Association, Nagpur.

6. The prayer is made for issuing direction to Caste Scrutiny Committee to decide the caste claim of the petitioner within stipulated time so as to enable the petitioner to submit the same to the respondent No.2, as the provisional admission has been granted to the petitioner.

7. Learned AGP, on instructions, makes a statement that within one month the claim of the petitioner will be decided. The statement is accepted.

8. Mr Jambhule, learned counsel for the petitioner praying for interim relief directing the respondent No.2 not to cancel the provisional admission granted to the petitioner.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that there are two validity certificates in the family, one is of the father and another is of real uncle of the petitioner. He submits that today is the last date for submission of validity certificate. He has drawn attention of this Court to the validity certificates of father and uncle. From the validities it is evident that the same were granted in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in CA 5270 of 2004.

10. Considering the above referred fact that there are two validities that too of the father and real uncle of the

petitioner, we are of the opinion that interim protection needs to be granted to the petitioner.

11. Accordingly, we direct the respondent No. 2 not to cancel the provisional admission granted to the petitioner till next date.

12. Place this matter on **10.09.2025**.

13. Steno-copy be provided to the parties.

[AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J]

[ANIL S. KILOR, J.]

Namrata