

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

933 WRIT PETITION NO. 918 OF 2026

**DNAYNESHWAR SUDHAKAR THAKUR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER**

...

Mr. Manish Paithane, Advocate holding for Mr. M.A.
Golegaonkar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. S.P. Sonpawale, A.G.P. for respondents-State.

...

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

DATED : 23 JANUARY 2026.

Per Court :

1. Heard.
2. This is second round of litigation by which the petitioner is required to approach this Court seeking direction to the respondent/Scrutiny Committee to decide his tribe claim of belonging to "Thakur" Scheduled Tribe. In earlier round of litigation, this Court, by order dated 08.08.2012 in Writ Petition No. 6513 of 2012, had directed the respondent/Scrutiny Committee to decide the tribe claim of the petitioner expeditiously, however, it is the contention of petitioner that till today his tribe claim has not been decided.
3. Be that as it may, we have been informed by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned A.G.P. that

Vigilance Cell enquiry has been conducted and Vigilance Cell report has already been submitted to respondent/Committee, to which the petitioner has also filed his reply.

4. In that view of the matter, we direct the respondent/Scrutiny Committee to decide the tribe claim of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of six months from today, if not already decided.

5. With this direction, petition stands disposed of.

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE)
JUDGE

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE)
JUDGE