





wp1176.13.odt

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

Writ Petition No.1176 of 2013

Payal d/o Sudhakar Jambhule, Aged about 20 years, Occupation – Student, R/o Madhuban Row House, 165-C-1, Yashwantnagar, Talegaon-Dabhade, Tah. Maval, Distt. Pune.

... Petitioner

Versus

- 1. The Scheduled Tribe Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee, Gadchiroli, through its Vice Chairman.
- 2. The Directorate of Higher Education, Maharashtra State, Pune.
- 3. The Principal,
 Pimpari Chinchwad College of
 Engineering,
 Pune.
- 4. The Registrar, Pune University, Pune.

... Respondents

Ms P.D. Rane, Advocate for Petitioner. Shri Anand Deshpande, Assistant Government Pleader for Respondent Nos.1 and 2. RT OF JUDICATURE

Coram: R.K. Deshpande & M.G. Giratkar, JJ.

Date: 15th November, 2017

Oral Judgment (Per R.K. Deshpande, J.):

The challenge in this petition is to the order 1.

dated 5-10-2012 passed by the Scheduled Tribe Certificate

Scrutiny Committee, Gadchiroli, Division Nagpur, invalidating

the caste claim of the petitioner for 'Mana', Scheduled Tribe,

which is an entry at Serial No.18 in the Constitution (Scheduled

Tribes) Order, 1950 and cancelling and confiscating the caste

certificate dated 15-12-2011 issued by the Sub-Divisional Officer,

Bramhapuri, District Chandrapur, and produced by the petitioner

for validation.

Before the Committee, the petitioner produced total 2.

eight documents, which were handed over to the police vigilance

cell for conducting home enquiry. The police vigilance cell

report shows one more document in the name of Muka Nago, the

great grandfather of the petitioner, in which an entry 'Mana' is recorded in the year 1954. The police vigilance cell also took out the caste validity certificate dated 1-10-2007 issued in the name of Devanand Jambhule, and another dated 2-8-2007 in the name of Nilesh Jambhule, the cousins of the petitioner. The Committee records the finding in para 14 of its order that the caste of the applicant and her paternal side relatives is consistently recorded as 'Mana' in their school and revenue record from the year 1920 to 2005. However, all these documents are rejected for the following reasons:

- (a) that 'Mana' community was included in the list of Scheduled Tribes in relation to the State of Maharashtra for the first time in the year 1960, that too in the specified area only, and the petitioner has failed to establish that he or his forefathers hail from the said area and migrated to the present place of their residence, from the said specified scheduled area,
- (b) that there are non-tribal communities like 'Badwaik Mana', 'Khand Mana', 'Kshatriya Mana',



4


wp1176.13.odt

'Kunbi Mana', 'Maratha Mana', 'Gond Mana', 'Mani'/'Mane', etc., and the petitioner has failed to satisfy crucial affinity test to establish that he belongs to 'Mana, Scheduled Tribe', which is an entry at Serial No.18 in the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order, 1950,

- (c) that in the year 1967, 'Mana' community was included in the list of Other Backward Classes at Serial No.268 and later on in the list of Special Backward Classes at Serial No.2 in relation to the State of Maharashtra, and
- (d) that the documents produced simply indicate the caste as 'Mana' and not 'Mana, Scheduled Tribe'.
- 3. In the decision of this Court in Writ Petition No.3308 of 2013 [Gajanan s/o Pandurang Shende v. The Head-Master, Govt. Ashram School, Dongargaon Salod, Tah. Sindewahi, Distt. Chandrapur, and others] decided on 8-11-2017, we have dealt with all the aforesaid reasoning and we point out below what we have held in the said decision:

- 4. In para 5 of the decision in *Gajanan's* case, we have held that the Committee was wrong in holding that 'Mana' community was included in the list of Scheduled Tribes Order in relation to the State of Maharashtra for the first time in the year 1960. We have also held that in fact, the said community was included in the said Order in the year 1956.
- 5. On the aspect of original place of residence and migration, we have held in para 7 of the said decision as under :
 - "7. ... The Act No.108 of 1976 was published in the gazette on 29-9-1976, and the area restriction of Scheduled Tribes in the State of Maharashtra for all the tribes, including 'Mana' tribe, was deleted. The members of different tribes or communities in the State of Maharashtra included in Entry No.18, are treated and conferred with the status of recognized Scheduled Tribes, irrespective of their place of residence in the State. The net result of such deletion was that the two-fold requirements of ordinary place of residence in tribal areas and migration to non-tribal areas, was done away with."

RT OF JUDICATURE



7. On the other aspect that there are non-tribal communities like 'Badwaik Mana', 'Khand Mana', 'Kshatriya Mana', 'Kunbi Mana', 'Maratha Mana', 'Gond Mana', 'Mani'/'Mane', etc., we have considered the impact of the Constitution Bench decision of the Apex Court in the case of *State of Maharashtra* v. *Milind*, reported in *2001(1) Mh.L.J. 1*, which overruled earlier decision in the case of *Dina* v.



EGIRT OF STRATURE AT

wp1176.13.odt

Narayansing, reported in 38 ELR 212. We have held in para 11 of the decision in Gajanan's case as under:

"11. ... The effect of overruling of the decision in Dina's case is that the entry 'Mana', which is now in the cluster of tribes at Serial No.18 in the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order, has to be read as it is and no evidence can be let in, to explain that entry 'Mana' means the one which is either a 'sub-tribe of Gond' or synonym of 'Gond' and/or it is not a sub-tribe either of 'Maratha' or of any other caste or tribe."


In para 12 of the said decision, we have held as under:

"12. ... To hold that 'Mana' in Entry No.18 in the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order does not include 'Kashtriya Badwaik Mana', 'Maratha Mana', 'Kunbi Mana', etc., would amount to permitting evidence to be let in to exclude certain 'Mana' communities from the recognized Scheduled Tribe. Such tinkering with the Presidential Order is not permissible. Once it is established that 'Mana' is a tribe or even a sub-tribe, it

is not permissible to say that it is not a recognized Scheduled Tribe in Entry No.18 of the Order. The Scrutiny Committee has failed to understand such effect of overruling the decision in Dina's case."

In view of the Constitution Bench decision in *Milind's* case, we hold that it is not permissible to invoke the affinity test to exclude certain 'Mana' communities from the recognized Scheduled Tribe.

8. On the aspect of inclusion of 'Mana' communities in the lists of Other Backward Classes and Special Backward Classes, we have relied upon the decision of this Court in *Mana Adim Jamat Mandal* v. *State of Maharashtra*, reported in *2003(3) Mh.L.J. 513*, which is confirmed by the Apex Court in its decision in the case of *State of Maharashtra* v. *Mana Adim Jamat Mandal*, reported in *(2006) 4 SCC 98*. We have held in paras 13 and 14 of *Gajanan's* case as under:




"13. ... This view has been confirmed by the Apex Court in the case of State of Maharashtra & Ors. v. Mana Adim Jamat Mandal, reported in (2006) 4 SCC 98, and it is specifically held that 'Mana' is a separate Scheduled Tribe by itself included in Entry No.18 of the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order and it is not a sub-tribe of 'Gond'."

"14. This Court has held and it is confirmed by the Apex Court in the aforesaid decisions that even if it is assumed that there was a separate entity, which is called as 'Mana' in Vidarbha Region, which has no affinity with 'Gond' tribe, that community would also fall within the scope of the Scheduled Tribes Order by virtue of the Amendment Act, 1976, and the State Government was not entitled to issue orders or circulars or resolutions contrary thereto. It holds that since under Entry 18, 'Manas' are specifically included in the list of Scheduled Tribes in relation to the State of Maharashtra, 'Manas' throughout the State must be deemed to be Scheduled Tribe by reason of provisions of the Scheduled Tribes Order. Once 'Manas' throughout the State are entitled to be treated as a Scheduled Tribe by reason of the Scheduled Tribes Order as it now stands, it is not open to the State Government to say

otherwise, as it has purported to do in various Government Resolutions. It further holds that it is not open to the State Government or, indeed to this Court to embark upon an enquiry to determine whether a section of 'Manas' was excluded from the benefit of the Scheduled Tribes Order."


The Apex Court has held that 'Mana' is a separate Scheduled Tribe in Entry No.18 and it is not a sub-tribe of 'Gond'. The Division Bench of this Court has held that it is not open to the State Government or indeed to this Court to embark upon an enquiry to determine whether a section of 'Manas' was excluded from the benefit of Scheduled Tribes Order. In para 15 of *Gajanan's* case, we have held that the Committee was clearly in error in holding that 'Mana' community was included in the list of Other Backward Classes and later on in the list of Special Backward Classes, and though the petitioner has established that he belongs to 'Mana' community, it is not established that he belongs to 'Mana Scheduled Tribe'.

E SURL OX ... ATURE A.



9. On the aspect of carving out a distinction that the documents of pre-Independence, produced on record, simply indicating the caste as 'Mana' and not 'Mana Scheduled Tribe', we have relied upon the decision of the Apex Court in the case of *E.V. Chinnaiah* v. *State of Andhra Pradesh*, reported in 2004(9) SCALE 316. We have held in para 18 of *Gajanan's* case as under:

"18. Applying the law laid down in E.V. Chinnaiah's case, it has to be held in the facts of the present that once it is clear that 'Mana' community is included in entry No.18 of the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order, it has to be read as it is, representing a class of 'Mana' as a whole and it is not permissible either for the Executive or for the Scrutiny Committee to artificially sub-divide or sub-classify 'Mana' community as one having different groups, like 'Badwaik Mana', 'Khand Mana', 'Kshatriya Mana', 'Kunbi Mana', 'Maratha Mana', 'Gond Mana', 'Mani/Mane', etc., for the purposes of grant of benefits available to a recognized Scheduled Tribe. To exclude such persons from the entry 'Mana', to be recognized as Scheduled Tribe, amounts to interference, re-arrangement, re-



We have held that after following the decision in E.V. Chinnaiah's case that 'Mana' community throughout the State is a class as a whole and to artificially explain or sub-divide it to exclude different groups like 'Badwaik Mana', 'Khand Mana', 'Kshatriya Mana', 'Kunbi Mana', 'Mani'/'Mane', etc., for denying benefits of recognized Scheduled Tribe is not only without any authority but violative of Articles 14 and 342 of the Constitution of India. We have held that the Committee was in error in rejecting the claim by holding that the documents produced



RI OF JUDICATURE

wp1176.13.odt

simply indicate the caste 'Mana' and not 'Mana Scheduled Tribe'.

- 10. In para 19 of the said decision, we have held that the concept of recognized Scheduled Tribe for the purposes of giving benefits and concessions was not prevailing prior to 1950 and, therefore, only caste or community to which a person belonged was stated in the birth, school and revenue records maintained. We have also held that the documents are issued in the printed format, which contains a column under the heading 'Caste' and there is no column of tribe. We have held that irrespective of the fact that it is a tribe, the name of tribe is not shown in the column of caste, and while entering the name of caste or tribe, the distinction between the caste and the tribe is ignored.
- 11. On the aspect of primacy of documents over the affinity test, we have relied upon the decision of the Apex Court in the case of *Anand* v. *Committee for Scrutiny and Verification of Tribe Claims and others*, reported in (2012) 1 SCC 113, and applied the broad parameters laid down therein. We have held that in view



SURT OF STRATURE AT

wp1176.13.odt

of the said decision of the Apex Court that the affinity test is to be used to corroborate the documentary evidence and it is not to be used as the sole criteria to reject a claim.

12. In the light of the decision of the Apex Court in *Anand's* case, cited supra, and the finding recorded by the Committee in para 14 of its order that all the documents produced by the petitioner from 1920 to 2005 consistently show the caste as 'Mana' recorded in the name of the paternal relatives of the petitioner, the Committee was in error to invoke the affinity test to reject the claim of the petitioner. The overwhelming evidence produced on record establishes the claim of the petitioner for 'Mana', Scheduled Tribe. The Committee also failed to notice two more caste validity certificates issued in the name of the cousins of the petitioner, which were procured by the police vigilance cell. The cousins were granted the certificate validating their claim for 'Mana', Scheduled Tribe. In view of the decision of the Apex Court in Anand's case, cited supra, the Committee has no option but to grant the certificate in favour of the



wp1176.13.odt

petitioner for 'Mana', Scheduled Tribe, in the absence of any finding that there was any fraud or misrepresentation in obtaining the caste validity certificate by the cousins of the petitioner. Thus, the findings recorded by the Committee cannot be sustained and the order impugned needs to be quashed and set aside.

- 13. In the result, the petition is allowed in the following terms:
 - (i) The order dated 5-10-2012 passed by the Scheduled Tribe Certificate Scrutiny Committee, Gadchiroli, Division Nagpur, is hereby quashed and set aside.
 - (ii) The certificate dated 15-12-2011 issued by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Bramhapuri, District Chandrapur, certifying that the petitioner belongs to caste 'Mana', Scheduled Tribe, which is an entry at Serial No.18 in the



E HE STREET

wp1176.13.odt

Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order, 1950, is held to be valid, and it is declared that the petitioner has established her claim for 'Mana', Scheduled Tribe.

(iii) The Committee is directed to issue a validity certificate in the name of the petitioner accordingly within a period of one month from the date of producing the copy of this judgment by the petitioner to it.

14. Rule is made absolute in the aforesaid terms. No order as to costs.

(M.G. Giratkar, J.)

(R.K. Deshpande, J.)

Lanjewar, PS