



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

51 WRIT PETITION NO. 8287 OF 2025

1. Narawad Dinesh Shankar,
Age : 31 Years, Occ. Service
2. Narawad Akshita Sayaram,
Age : 17 Years, Occ. Student,
Through its natural guardian Father Sayaram
Ganganna Narawad, Age : 42 Years,
Occ. Agriculture.
3. Narawad Asmita Sayaram,
Age : 19 Years, Occ. Student,
All above resident of
Post Kundalwadi Tq. Biloli,
District. Nanded. ..Petitioners

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
Tribal Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai- 32.
2. The Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny
Committee, Kinwat Division, Aurangabad
Through its member Secretary
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer,
Biloli, Nanded
4. The Joint Commissioner of Police (Admin)
Commissioner of Police, Brihanmumbai,
Near Crawford Market, D.N. Road,
Mumbai- 400 001. .. Respondents

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. A.D. Sonkawade h/f
Jayewar Sainath Gangadhar
AGP for Respondent/State: Mrs. Chaitali R. Chaudhari
....

**CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE AND
ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, JJ.**

DATED : JANUARY 5, 2026

ORDER:-

1. Heard.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioners is seeking quashment of the order dated 10.06.2025 passed by respondent No.2/ the Scheduled Tribe Scrutiny Committee whereby, the claim of the petitioners that they belong to 'Mannervarlu' Schedule Tribe reserved category, is rejected.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, while passing the impugned order dated 10.06.2025, respondent No.2/Caste Scrutiny Committee did not consider the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***State of Maharashtra and Another Vs. Shrinivas Chinnana Narwad and Others in Special Leave to Appeal No. 9926 of 2004***, whereby the cousin Shrinivas Chinnana Narawad of the petitioners, granted validity.
4. The learned A.G.P does not dispute the relationship of the petitioners with said Shrinivas Chinnana Narawad.
5. Admittedly, respondent No.2/the Caste Scrutiny Committee has not considered the order of Hon'ble Apex Court as mentioned above. Under such circumstances, it would be proper to remand the matter

back to respondent No.2/ Caste Scrutiny Committee for taking decision afresh by considering the order of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *State of Maharashtra and Another Vs. Shrinivas Chinnana Narwd and Others (supra)*. Needless to say that, the impugned order dated 10.06.2025 invalidating tribe claim of the petitioners stands quashed and set aside with direction to respondent No.2/ Caste Scrutiny Committee to decide the claim of the petitioner afresh within two months from the date of order.

6. The petition accordingly disposed of.

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE)
JUDGE

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE)
JUDGE

YSK/