

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 7851 OF 2023**

Vaishali Baban Dhumal ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary, Tribe Development Dept.  
(Social Justice Dept. ) And Ors. ...Respondents

-----  
Dr. Uday P. Warunjikar a/w Sonali R. Chavan and Jenish D. Jain for the  
Petitioner.

Mr. B.V. Samant, Additional GP a/w Pooja Joshi Deshpande for Respondent  
Nos.1 and 2 a/w Rupali Andhare Law Officer for CVC, Pune.  
-----

**CORAM : R. I. CHAGLA AND  
ADVAIT M. SETHNA, JJ.**

**DATED : 17TH JANUARY, 2026**

**PC.:-**

1. By this Writ Petition, the Petitioner has impugned the order dated 17 March 2023 passed by the Respondent No.2 in Case No.JPRAT/M.P.S.C/Satara/01/2005 and has sought quashing and setting aside of the same along with issuance of directions to Respondent No.2 to issue caste validity certificate in favour of the Petitioner.

2. The Respondents have filed their additional affidavit-in-reply dated 11 March 2024 wherein at paragraph 7 there is a reference to second order dated 14 September 2005 regarding re-inquiry and that reasons have been mentioned in Roznama noting dated 14 September 2005. It is further stated by the Respondent No.2 that the second re-inquiry was ordered because the

Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny Committee, Pune - Respondent No.2 had observed the deficiencies in the earlier Vigilance Committee Report i.e. first and second reports and which deficiencies have been highlighted in paragraphs 7(a) to 7(l) of the affidavits. It is thereafter stated in paragraph 8 that a re-inquiry would be necessary on the issues set out therein and therefore, the Committee ordered re-inquiry, for the second time.

3. It is pertinent to note that in the earlier round of challenge to the order dated 23 February 2007 passed by Respondent No.2 – Scrutiny Committee, the Division Bench of this Court vide judgment dated 22 August 2022 had in paragraph 32 considered the copies of the first two Vigilance Committee Reports. This Court noted that they were furnished to the Petitioner under the provisions of the Right to Information Act. The Respondent No.2 – Scrutiny Committee was directed to forward reasons for ordering a re-inquiry along with the materials referred in the said judgment to enable the Petitioner to make a representation on such grounds as may be permissible in accordance with law. The Scrutiny Committee, thereafter, was to proceed with the enquiry.

4. Dr. Warunjikar, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner has submitted that the aforementioned directions of the Division Bench of this Court have not been complied with by the Respondent No.2 - Scrutiny Committee.

5. This is countered by Mr. Samant, Additional Government Pleader for

Respondent No.2 - Scrutiny Committee who has placed reliance upon the aforementioned paragraph 7 of the additional affidavit-in-reply of Respondent No.2 – Scrutiny Committee. He has also placed reliance upon the documents which form part of the additional affidavit-in-reply dated 11 March 2024.

6. A lot will turn on these documents along with additional affidavit-in-reply which documents are in Marathi language. Mr. Samant states that an English translation will be produced of the said documents.

7. In addition to the translation of the aforementioned documents, the third and fourth Vigilance Committee Report also would require to be translated as they are in Marathi language and these reports appear to form the basis of the impugned order dated 17 March 2023 passed by the Respondent No.2 – Scrutiny Committee. Further, the impugned order dated 17 March 2023 is also in Marathi language. Accordingly, English translations will be provided of these documents by the Respondents.

8. The Respondent shall provide the English translations of the aforementioned Marathi documents within a period of three weeks from today.

9. Dr. Warunjikar has also further stated that affidavit in response to the alleged deficiencies which have been highlighted in paragraph 7 of the additional affidavit-in-reply of the Respondent No.2 – Scrutiny Committee will be furnished by way of affidavit filed on behalf of the Petitioner.

10. The affidavit of the Petitioner shall be filed within a period of three weeks from service of English translation of the aforementioned documents.
11. Place the Writ Petition for further consideration on 30 March 2026 at 3.00 pm.
12. It is clarified that only in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the Respondents have undertaken the task of providing English translation of the above-mentioned documents.

[ADVAIT M. SETHNA, J.]

[R.I. CHAGLA, J.]