



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2538 OF 2024

1. Shri. Karan Murlidhar Dadmal
Age about 18 years Occupation: Student
At: Post: Tas, Tah: Bhiwapur,
Dist: Nagpur-441201
M. 8767140212
e-mail. Id: Karandadmal82@gmail.com

... **PETITIONER**

...VERSUS...

1. The Scheduled Tribe Caste
Certificate Scrutiny Committee,
Nagpur,
Through its Member Secretary,
Giripeth, Nagpur-440 010
Email: tcsnagpur@gmail.com

... **RESPONDENT**

Mr. N.D. Jambhule, Advocate for petitioner.
Mrs. M.S. Naik, AGP for the respondent/State.

CORAM : SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR AND
NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.

RESERVED ON : 20th APRIL, 2026.
PRONOUNCED ON : 04th MAY, 2026.

JUDGMENT (PER : NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

1. **Rule.** Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the parties.

2. The present petition challenges the order of the Scrutiny Committee dated 15.06.2023, whereby the claim of the petitioner for “Mana” Scheduled Tribe has been invalidated.

3. The facts as stated in the petition are as under:

a) The petitioner forwarded his “Mana” Scheduled Tribe certificate for verification to the Principal of his college, which was received by the respondent - Committee on 27.09.2022. Along with the said documents, various supporting documents such as the caste certificate and other old documents were filed to support the claim.

b) The case of the petitioner was handed over to the police vigilance cell for detailed enquiry, as per Rule 12 (2) Maharashtra Scheduled Castes, De-notified Tribes (Vimukta Jatis), Nomadic

Shubham

Tribes, Other Backward Classes and Special Backward Category (Regulation of Issuance and Verification of) Caste Certificate Rules, 2012. Thereafter, since there were adverse entries found in the vigilance cell, show cause notice was issued on 10.01.2023 and the applicant was called for a hearing on 19.01.2023, along with his say on the vigilance report. The petitioner appeared before the Scrutiny Committee on 19.01.2023 and submitted his say on the vigilance cell report. Thereafter, the Scrutiny Committee rejected the application for validation. It is this order which is impugned in the present petition on various grounds, amongst others.

4. We have heard Mr. N. D. Jambhule, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mrs. M. S. Naik, learned AGP for the respondent/State.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the evaluation of documentary evidence by the respondent - Committee is arbitrary, rendering the order infirm in law. He further submits that the Scrutiny Committee has failed to appreciate the relevant

Shubham

documents and more particularly, the probative value of the said documents.

6. He further submits that the birth record, i.e., Kotwal Panji of one “Sitru Bisan Mana,” clearly shows that the caste of the namely is Mana. He places his reliance on the case of ***Mana Adim Jamat Mandal v. State of Maharashtra and others***, reported in **2003(3) Mh.L.J. 513**, and other cases to support his contentions.

7. Per contra, learned AGP supports the impugned order. She submits that, as can be seen from the various family trees, there is no person named “Maini,” and therefore the Scrutiny Committee was right in rejecting the claim of the petitioner.

8. Rival contentions fall for our consideration. We have gone through the impugned order and heard the learned counsels for the respective parties. The family tree, as reflected in the impugned order of the Scrutiny committee, is reproduced as under:

Shubham

वंशवृद्धा

बिसन (मुख्यपुरुष)

शिशु उर्फ शिशुका (पणजोबा)

डिंगर (आजोबा)

मंगर

मुलीधर (अज्जदार)

वासुदेव

कविता

करण (प्रमाणपत्र धारक)

प्राची

३.३

m. 7 ॐ वरुणवर्मा
सही

१. शिक्षा
 २. विद्या
 ३. विद्या
 ४. विद्या
 ५. विद्या
 ६. विद्या
 ७. विद्या
 ८. विद्या
 ९. विद्या
 १०. विद्या

शिवभुक्ता

निघोर उमादित्याबाई सुमन मंगारु
(निमगाव सावसाके) (चौधरी मंगलनी)

वासुदेव मुखर्जी छार कविता (मकरछोका)

कार्तिक सौरभ
(नास)

करण प्राली

लक्ष्मी असावशा विठ्ठल विमल वृषा
(छाडेगाव) (नारनवर सावरला) (कपरली) (कपडर)

आरुष

समक्ष

Mjanake

Shubham

10. It is clear from the perusal of the family trees that there is no person named “Maini” in either of the family trees. As far as documentary evidence is concerned, the oldest document is a birth record of a female child, namely “Maini,” born to Sitru Bisan Mana. The reason for discarding the said document is that there is nobody named “Maini” in the family tree, and therefore the relationship with the said person and the petitioner cannot be proved.

11. As can be seen from the impugned order, the Scrutiny Committee has relied on the statement of the grandmother of the petitioner during the vigilance enquiry, who stated that Sitru had two daughters, Ahilya and Suman, and there was no nickname to them.

12. Furthermore, the father of the petitioner, during the hearing before the Committee, stated that the birth record is of “Turja” and “Maini”, and that “Maini” and “Turja” are one and the same. But it is relevant to point out that nobody named “Turja” is also mentioned in any of the family trees. The Scrutiny Committee has also taken note of the vigilance cell report in that regard. The

Shubham

earliest document showing caste as “Mana”, after discarding the documents of Maini, is of 1984 in respect of the father of the petitioner. However, the findings of the oldest document cannot be said to be perverse.

13. A feeble attempt has been made by the petitioner to show the affidavits of one Mangru Dadmal, who claims to be the real brother of the female named “Maini”. However, only on the basis of affidavits, the caste claim of the petitioner cannot be decided. Similarly, in the case with affidavit of one Baban Timaji Sausakde, who claims that his mother’s nickname was “Maini”. Both these affidavits are executed on 04.03.2024, which is much after the date of the impugned order of the Scrutiny Committee. Therefore, no reliance can be placed on those affidavits.

14. Furthermore, the finding of the Scrutiny Committee that there is no person shown as “Maini” in any of the family trees cannot be said to be perverse, as it is supported by documentary evidence on record.

Shubham

15. We, therefore, find no merit in the petition, and it deserves to be dismissed.

16. The petition is accordingly rejected. No order as to costs.

17. Rule stands discharged.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

(SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR, J.)