



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CIVIL APPLICATION (W) NO. 292/2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 7289/2022

Jagannath Sherkure
..versus..
State CET Cell & others

.....
Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders or directions
and Registrar's orders

.....
Court's or Judge's orders

.....
Shri N.D. Jambhule, Advocate for the Petitioner(s)
Shri A.S. Fulzele, Addl. GP for the Respondent/State

CORAM:- M.S. JAWALKAR & NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.
FEBRUARY 24, 2026

On 12/01/2026, this Court passed the following order:-

- “1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondent.*
- 2. During the course of the argument, it is revealed that the Family Tree in the order of the Caste Scrutiny Committee on record is not the same in the order placed by the petitioner at Annexure - 1. It is not expected that the learned Counsel for the petitioner would manipulate the order of the Caste Scrutiny Committee and get altogether a different genealogy, produced in the order of the Caste Scrutiny Committee.*
- 3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner seeks time to verify the same, however, if it is found that it is an intentional, it would be*

seriously viewed and in that circumstances, the petitioner will have to suffer consequences.

4. *List the matter on 27.01.2026. ”*

(2) It appears that under the garb of removal of office objections, the Petitioner has replaced those pages wherein the typed copy of the genealogy was reproduced. In fact, there was variance in the copy of the order of the Scrutiny Committee in the record and in the Petition. Learned Addl. GP has drawn our attention about this variance.

(3) Now, learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that due to inadvertence, the typed copies of the Page Nos. 45, 47 and 48 were taken out with the brief.

(4) We have called the 'B' File from the office and personally verified that those replaced pages were not in the 'B' File. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that due to inadvertence, those pages were removed from the Petition as well as 'B' File.

(5) Whenever there are objections in respect of the pages, the office is required to retain the replaced pages in the 'B' File. However, it appears that neither the office nor the Counsel placed those replaced documents as a part of the record.

(6) We are of the considered opinion that it is a malafide act. Even from the record of the learned Addl. GP, the said documents were replaced. The Petitioner shall place on record the replaced pages. We are inclined to impose costs of Rs. 5,000/- which shall be paid by the Petitioner to the High Court Legal Services Sub-Committee, Nagpur within a period of one week.

(7) List the matter thereafter for further consideration.

(8) The Application stands **disposed of**.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

(M.S. JAWALKAR, J.)