



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

982 WRIT PETITION NO. 3264 OF 2026

RANJEET VITTHAL SAPKAL

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND
ANR

...

Mr. h/f Mr. Suradkar Yogesh Ramdas, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. G. A. Kulkarni, AGP for Respondent-State

....

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

DATED : 28/04/2026

P. C. : (PER : ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.) :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned AGP
for the respondent-State.

2. By this writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the order
dated 26/02/2026 passed by Respondent No. 2/Scrutiny
Committee, whereby the tribe claim of the petitioner belonging to
the "Koli Malhar" Scheduled Tribe has been invalidated.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, apart from
placing on record voluminous documents to substantiate the
petitioner's tribe claim of belonging to the "Koli Malhar" Scheduled

Tribe, the petitioner has also relied upon several validity certificates granted to his blood relatives by the Scrutiny Committee, as well as a validity granted by this Court. He further submits that the Respondent/Scrutiny Committee has discarded the documents placed on record, as well as the validities relied upon by the petitioner. Inviting the attention of this Court to the genealogy annexed to the writ petition, which was also placed before the Respondent/Scrutiny Committee, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a close blood relative of the petitioner, namely Umesh Pandurang Sapkal, whose tribe claim was invalidated by the Respondent/Scrutiny Committee along with other blood relatives, had approached this Court by filing Writ Petition No.8671 of 2023. This Court, by an order dated 03/08/2023, granted conditional validities to all those petitioners. He, therefore, urges that similar conditional validity be granted to the present petitioner.

4. Per contra, the learned AGP submits that the Respondent/Scrutiny Committee has noticed several contra entries which disentitle the petitioner from even being granted conditional validity. He submits that, considering the fact that the Respondent/Scrutiny Committee has considered all the material

placed before it and has arrived at a conclusion that the petitioner has failed to establish that he belongs to the “Koli Malhar” Scheduled Tribe, the writ petition is devoid of substance.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned AGP, we find that the genealogy placed before this Court, which also forms part of the record before the Scrutiny Committee, indicates that Umesh Pandurang Sapkal, whose tribe claim was invalidated, had approached this Court by filing Writ Petition No.8671 of 2023 along with other blood relatives who had also challenged their invalidation. This Court, by an order dated 03/08/2023, allowed those writ petitions by granting conditional validities to all those petitioners, on which the present petitioner places reliance. We find that there is no dispute regarding relationship of the petitioner with the said validity holders, as the learned AGP has not been able to point out that the petitioner is not related to the validity holders. In that view of the matter, and in the light of the order passed by this Court in the case of Umesh Pandurang Sapkal (*supra*) in Writ Petition No. 8671 of 2023, we are of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to be granted conditional validity. We, therefore, pass the following order:

ORDER

- A) The writ petition is partly allowed. The impugned order is quashed and set aside
- B) The Committee shall immediately issue tribe validity certificate to the petitioner as belonging to 'Koli Malhar' Scheduled Tribe, which shall be subject to the decision to be taken by the committee in the reopened matters.
- C) The petitioner shall not be entitled to claim equities.
- D) In case, the committee seeks review of the order passed by this court on 22/04/1997 in Writ Petition No.1665 of 1996 then the respondents are at liberty to take steps against the present petitioners.
- E) With these directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.) (SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)