



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 8420 OF 2025

PETITIONERS :

1. Rohan S/o Ramesh Pawar,
Age 23 years, Occ.: Student,
Resident of Rest House Road,
Gahilot Nagar, At Post & Taluka Patur,
District Akola, Maharashtra-444 501.
2. Satyapal S/o Pandhari Chavan,
Age 27 years, Occ.: Student,
Resident of Al-Hatta, Post Pimpri
Khandare, Taluka Lonar,
District Buldhana, Maharashtra-443 301
3. Sumeet Vasant Rathod,
Age 25 years, Occ.: Student,
Resident of Airport Road Nath Nagar,
Vistarit Taroda Bk. Nanded Maharashtra

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Maharashtra,
Through its Principal Secretary,
Medical Education and Drugs
Department, Mantralaya,
Mumbai-400 032.
2. State CET Cell, Maharashtra,
Through the Commissioner,
8th Floor, New Excelsior Building,
A.K. Nayak Marg, Fort,
Mumbai-400 001.
3. Social Justice & Special Assistance
Department, Through its Secretary,
Government of Maharashtra,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-400 032.
4. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Research
and Training Institute (BARTI),
Through its Director General,
Pune 411 001.

5. District Caste Scrutiny Committee,
Jalgaon, Through its Member-Secretary,
Jalgaon - 425 001.
6. District Caste Scrutiny Committee,
Buldana, Through its Member-Secretary,
Buldana - 443 001.
7. Siddhant S/o Prakash Pardeshi,
Age: Major, Occ.: Student,
Resident of Village Tongaon,
Taluka Bhadgaon,
District Jalgaon-424 105.
8. Bhagyashree D/o Jagdish Ajabsing Patil,
Age: Major, Occ.: Student,
Resident of Jalgaon,
Taluka & District Jalgaon-425 001.
9. Jayesh S/o Chandrakant Mahale,
Age: Major, Occ.: Student,
Resident of Dahigaon (Sant.).
Taluka Pachora.
District Jalgaon-425 109.
10. Mangesh S/o Vijay Hade,
Age: Major, Occ.: Student,
Resident of Village Kolari. Tehsil
Chikhli, District Buldana.

Shri S. P. Bhandarkar, Advocate for petitioners.

Shri H. D. Futane, AGP for respondent Nos.1, 3 and 6.

CORAM: SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR AND
NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.
DATE : 09/02/2026.

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

1. **Rule.** Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally
with the consent of learned counsel appearing for the parties.

2. In view of the order, we do not think it expedient to call upon the other respondents i.e. respondent Nos.4, 7, 8, 9 and 10 for filing reply.

3. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent Nos.1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.

4. Even though there are substantive prayers made in the writ petition, going through the same with the assistance of the learned counsel for the petitioners, we find that the representation dated 27/11/2025 made by one Jagdish Rathod is pending before the respondent No.3.

5. However, learned counsel for the petitioners states that if direction is issued by this Court treating the entire writ petition as representation, that would be more helpful for adjudicating the issue involved in the present matter.

6. We have perused the record of the matter, in view of wide spectrum of the issue which the learned counsel for the petitioners has chosen to agitate by way of present writ petition. We think it expedient that the entire writ petition filed before this

Court be treated as representation to the respondent No.3 and respondent No.3 would decide the same by taking into consideration the entire legal position in that regard.

7. In view of that, writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondent No.3 to decide the representation which has already stated above would be the present writ petition in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and till 30/04/2026.

8. The petitioners to appear before the respondent No.3 on **17/02/2026** and apprise the said respondent of the order of this Court which would act in accordance with what has been stated as above.

9. Rule is made absolute in above terms. Writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

[JUDGE]

[JUDGE]