



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

**NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 883 OF 2026**

1. Ku. Srushti D/o. Dharam Tumade,  
Aged about 17 years, Occ. Student,  
Through her Natural Guardian  
Mother Bharti W/o. Dharam  
Tumade, Aged about 38 years,  
Occ. Household, R/o. Frezarpura,  
Library Chowk, Near Corporation  
School No. 6, Amravati, Tah. And  
District – Amravati.

**... PETITIONER**

**...VERSUS...**

1. District Caste Certificate Scrutiny  
Committee, Amravati, B Wing, 1<sup>st</sup>  
Floor, Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar  
Samajik Nyay Bhawan, Camp  
Road, Amravati, Through its  
Research Officer and Member  
Secretary.

**...RESPONDENT**

-----  
Mr. R.D. Karode, Advocate for petitioner.  
Mrs. H.S. Dhande, AGP for respondent/State.  
-----

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

**RESERVED ON : 18<sup>th</sup> APRIL, 2026.**  
**PRONOUNCED ON : 05<sup>th</sup> 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 dated 15.10.2025 passed by the respondent- District Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee, Amravati, in Case No.ED-2025-01819195.
3. The facts as can be seen from the petition are as under:
  - a) The petitioner belonging to "Telangi" caste, which is a sub-caste Dhangar recognized as 'N.T. (C)' category, was having a caste certificate. On 09.05.2025, her caste claim was forwarded to the respondent-Committee for verification along with all documents.
  - b) On 31.01.2025, the Vigilance Cell submitted an enquiry report in case of cousin sister of the petitioner, namely Nidhi Prakash Tumade, and a certificate was issued to the said cousin Shubham

sister on 09.04.2025. On 25.09.2025, the Vigilance Officer issued a communication to the respondent-Committee and suggested to consider the vigilance enquiry report of said cousin sister, Nidhi, for adjudication of the claim of the petitioner. Thereafter, on 15.10.2025, respondent-Committee passed an order and rejected the claim of the petitioner on a ground that the petitioner has failed to establish her affinity. It is this order which is impugned in the present petition.

4. We have Mr. R. D. Karode, learned counsel for the petitioner, as also Mrs. H.S. Dhande, learned AGP for the respondent/State.

5. Mr. R. D. Karode, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the impugned order is contrary to the provisions of law, since the vigilance enquiry report sufficiently establishes her affinity test of "Telangi" sub-caste of Dhangar "N.T. (C)" which fact the respondent-Committee has completely overlooked. It is his submission that the documentary evidence produced by the petitioner has not been disputed by the Committee, wherein the caste is recorded as "Telangi". He further submits that the Shubham

Committee has failed to consider the validity certificate granted to her cousin sister by considering the same vigilance enquiry report.

6. Per contra, the learned AGP supports the impugned order and states that the documents filed by the petitioner herself show that the caste is “Telgu Mannewar”. Furthermore, she submits that, as far as the “N.T. (C)” is concerned, the traditional occupation is goat/sheep farming and it has come on record that the ancestors of the petitioner were engaged in labour and other allied avocations. She, therefore, submits that the Committee was correct in rejecting the caste claim.

7. We have perused the contentions canvassed by the learned counsels for the respective parties and have also gone through the record of the Scrutiny Committee. The reasons for rejecting the caste claim of the petitioner are that, in the statement of the father of the petitioner, it has come on record that the forefathers in the family were engaged in labour work. However, from the statement dated 15.10.2025 of Dharam Ramkisan alias Ramkrushna Tumade, it is clearly seen that the said reasoning of the Scrutiny Committee

Shubham

is contrary. As can be seen, from the said statement, the said person unequivocally states that the ancestors of the family were engaged in goat/sheep farming, but since the income was insufficient, thereafter some of them shifted to labour work. He also states that their caste is "N.T. (C)". It therefore follows that the reasoning of the Scrutiny Committee, based on the statement, is erroneous, apart from it being contrary to record.

8. Furthermore, as far as the validity granted to the cousin is concerned, the Scrutiny Committee has found that she was granted permission to apply in "N.T. (B)" category. However, this also cannot come into the way of the petitioner, since by way of affinity test, it has come on record that the original occupation of the petitioner's family was goat/sheep farming. In Writ Petition No. 5952 of 2025, *Bharat s/o Digambar Mukpalli Vs. District Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee, Amravati*, we have already observed that the crux of the matter lies in earlier judgment of this Court in *Onkar s/o Yogesh Mallekar Vs. The District Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee and others* (Writ Petition No. 4372 of 2022 decided on 11.06.2024) wherein it is observed that the crucial

Shubham

question arises as to in which category/caste the “Telangi” sub-caste falls, i.e., whether in the Beldar ‘NT-B’ or Dhangar ‘NT-C’ categories. It seems that the main factor in determining the controversy is to ascertain the petitioner's traditional occupation. Therefore, it is necessary to scrutinize the affinity test and the traditional occupation of the petitioner.

9. It is therefore apparent that the traditional occupation of the petitioner’s family would be a deciding factor to come to a conclusion whether the petitioner falls in the Beldar ‘NT-B’ or Dhangar ‘NT-C’ categories categories. As already stated by us supra, that the father of the petitioner had unequivocally stated that the traditional occupation of the family is goat/sheep farming. It was, therefore expected of the Scrutiny Committee to give due weightage to the said aspect.

10. Furthermore, there was a document dated 02.02.1938, which was a mutation sheet showing caste as “Telangi” of one Ramkrushna and Malanna, who happen to be the great-grandfather of the petitioner. This document has also not been considered by

Shubham

the respondent – Committee, as it does not specifically mention that it belongs to “N.T.-C”. This approach of the Scrutiny Committee cannot be countenanced, since a cumulative reading of the statement of the father, as mentioned by us above, and the oldest document could have led to the conclusion that the petitioner belongs to “N.T. (C)” category. The order, being unsustainable in law, cannot be supported. In that view of the matter, we pass the following order:

**ORDER**

- i) The Writ Petition is allowed.
- ii) The impugned dated 15.10.2025 passed by the respondent-District Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee, Amravati in Case No.ED-2025-01819195 is set aside.
- iii) it is directed that the respondent Scrutiny Committee, Amravati should issue a validity certificate in the name of the petitioner declaring that she belongs to “Telangi” (N.T.-C) caste

Shubham

which is recognized as Nomadic Tribe (C) within four weeks from the date of the order.

11. Rule is made absolute in the aforesaid terms, and the Writ Petition is disposed of.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

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

Shubham