

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
I.A. NO. OF 2025**

IN

T.C. (CIVIL) NO. 7 of 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Shivam Gautam

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of M.P & Ors.

.... Respondents

AFFIDAVIT ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF M.P.

ADVOCATE FOR THE RESPONDENT: MRINAL GOPAL ELKER

INDEX

S. No.	Particulars	Pages
1.	<u>AFFIDAVIT ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF M.P.</u>	1-37
2.	ANNEXURE NO. 1 Typed copy of the chart indicating the vacant posts	38-39
3.	ANNEXURE NO. 2 A year wise chart of reports and recommendations of State Backward Commission.	40-43
4.	ANNEXURE NO. 3 True and typed copy of list demonstrating castes/sub castes/classes	44-51

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
T.C. (CIVIL) NO. 7 OF 2025**

IN THE MATTER OF:

SHIVAM GAUTAM

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF M.P. & ORS.

....RESPONDENTS

AFFIDAVIT ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT STATE

1. The central question that arises for consideration in the captioned and other connected matters pertains to the validity of Section 4 of Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Act, 1994 as amended by the Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Act, 2019, by which the reservation in favour of Other Backward Classes (hereinafter called the “OBCs”) has been enhanced from 14% to 27% on all posts in the services of the State. Since the main contentious issue is common in all connected matters pertaining to State of Madhya Pradesh, i.e. enhancement of

reservation to other backward classes from 14 % to 27 %, therefore Respondent State seeks to adopt submissions filed herewith in other connected matters as well.

1. **Historical Genesis of Reservation in favour of Other Backward Classes**

1.1. On 05.09.1980, the Government of Madhya Pradesh set up a Backward Classes Commission under the Chairmanship of Shri Ramji Mahajan (hereinafter called the “**Mahajan Commission**”) to look into the social, education, and backwardness faced by various communities in the State of Madhya Pradesh. The terms of reference of Mahajan Commission were as follows:

- (a) Which classes or groups among the actual residents of Madhya Pradesh are socially and educationally backward, and in which revenue districts is the majority of these backward classes found?
- (b) What is the justification and necessity for making special provisions for the advancement of these backward classes?
- (c) What concrete steps can be taken to promote educational and economic progress among these backward classes?
- (d) Are proper arrangements made for the appointment of qualified members from these backward classes to state jobs or positions, and is it necessary to provide for adequate reservation for these members in the rules made under Article 309 of the Constitution, as is provided in Article 16?
- (e) Is there social exploitation of these backward classes in the state, and if yes, what concrete measures can be taken for prevention?

- (f) Is any group or caste among these backward classes subjected to untouchability, and if yes, what suggestions can be made for prevention?
- (g) For the purpose of ensuring educational progress among members of backward classes, have adequate and special provisions been made by the state government for admission in state-aided institutions? If not, what concrete steps can be taken to achieve the objective?
- (h) From the perspective of accelerating the pace of social and economic advancement of backward classes in the state, is it desirable to provide special training and economic assistance services to members of these groups? If yes, what should be its form?

1.2. The Mahajan Commission conducted a long and comprehensive state-wide survey. In this survey, the Commission collected data and gathered evidence from both official and non-official sources regarding the social and educational backwardness prevalent among the communities living in the state. To determine social backwardness, the Commission gathered evidence regarding social discrimination faced due to professions, population concentration, labour work performed by women, social discrimination, differential class treatment, food-related discrimination, other forms of backwardness, and place of residence. For educational backwardness, the Commission collected data on educational status, representation in government services, reasons for educational deficits, number of educated women, measures to alleviate educational backwardness, economic status, political influence, and related factors. After examining the data and evidence under these specific heads, the Commission concluded that a 35% reservation should be made in favour of OBCs in both state services and admissions to educational institutions.

- 1.3. On 08.06.1994, the State Legislature of Madhya Pradesh enacted the Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes) Act, 1994 (hereinafter called the “**Principal Act**”), to give 15%, 18% and 14% reservation on Class I and Class II posts to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes communities, respectively, and 13%, 20% and 14% reservation on Class III posts to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes communities, respectively.
- 1.4. Fifteen months later, the State Legislature of Madhya Pradesh, on 19.09.1995 passed the Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Bill, 1995 (hereinafter called the “**Amendment Bill 1995**”), granting 15%, 23% and 27% reservation on Class I and Class II posts to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes communities, respectively, and 13%, 23% and 27% reservation on Class III posts to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes communities, respectively.
- 1.5. The Amendment Bill 1995 was sent to the Hon’ble Governor with the advice that the same be reserved for consideration of the Hon’ble President in terms of Article 254(2) of the Constitution of India. On 07.12.2001, the Hon’ble President sent back the Amendment Bill 1995 to the State Legislature, *inter-alia*, with a message to reconsider and amend the said Bill in a way that the total reservation in favour of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes communities should not exceed 50%.
- 1.6. In the interregnum, the Madhya Pradesh Backward Classes Commission came out with its Annual Report 1996-97, recommending that the reservation in favour of Other Backward Classes communities should be enhanced from 14% to 27%.

- 1.7. Later, in 2000-01, the Madhya Pradesh Backward Classes Commission, while examining the issue of backwardness in the State of Madhya Pradesh, agreed with the recommendations of the Mahajan Commission, to grant an enhanced reservation in favour of Other Backward Classes.
- 1.8. In keeping with the message received from the Hon'ble President, the State Legislature of Madhya Pradesh, on 16.04.2002, passed the Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Act, 2002, making a provision for 16%, 20% and 14% reservation on all classes of posts in favour of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes communities.
- 1.9. To increase the reservation for Other Backward Classes (OBCs) to 27%, the Madhya Pradesh State Legislature passed the Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Bill, 2002, on 27.11.2002. Since this proposed increase would raise the total reservation in the state above 50%, the Bill was forwarded to the President for consideration under Article 254(2) of the Constitution. However, the President neither gave assent to the Bill, nor withheld it, nor returned it to the Governor with a request for the State Legislature to reconsider it. In view of this prevailing position, a decision was taken at the level of the State Government to initiate the exercise of increasing the reservation in favour of OBCs to 27%. As part of this exercise, the Administrative Department (Aboriginal Tribe and Backward Classes) was directed to gather information regarding backward classes communities in the State on the basis of the following nine indicators of development:
 - (a) Low per capita income
 - (b) Inadequate communication network particularly in rural areas
 - (c) Low industrial growth
 - (d) Mostly subsistence level of agriculture
 - (e) Lack of irrigation facilities

- (f) Low literacy levels
- (g) Low rural electrification
- (h) Low urbanisation
- (i) A high percentage of people living below the poverty line.

1.10. Based on the information gathered on the nine abovesaid indicators and in keeping with the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India*, the State Government determined that a sizeable section of the State population lives in far flung and remote areas, far away from the mainstream of national life. Accordingly, by Resolution dated 30.06.2003, it was concluded that special circumstances prevail within the State of Madhya Pradesh, thereby justifying the enhancement of overall reservation in posts and services in the State beyond 50%, and increasing the reservation for Other Backward Classes from 14% to 27%. The Resolution dated 30.06.2003 was published by the General Administration Department of the State of Madhya Pradesh in the Official Gazette.

1.11. To implement the Resolution dated 30.06.2003, it was decided at the higher levels of the State Government that, while reserving district-level posts for Other Backward Classes, the population figures of OBC communities as provided in the report of the Mahajan Commission shall be taken into consideration.

1.12. On 03.07.2003, the State Cabinet resolved that an Ordinance be promulgated to enhance the reservation for Other Backward Classes from 14% to 27%. However, since the Madhya Pradesh Legislature had already passed the Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Bill, 2002, which was pending consideration before the Hon'ble President of India, there existed a constitutional bar under Article 213 of the Constitution of India against promulgating such an Ordinance to effect the proposed enhancement in

reservation. Thereafter, the State Government decided to re-table the Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Bill, 2003, which enhanced the OBC reservation from 14% to 27%.

1.13. The validity of the resolution dated 30.06.2003 issued by the General Administration Department enhancing the OBC reservation to 27% was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Jabalpur, vide judgment and order dated 13.10.2014, in *Manish Mishra and Ors. v. State of Madhya Pradesh and Ors.*, W.P. No. 2798/2003, wherein the Hon'ble High Court quashed the Resolution dated 30.06.2003, *inter-alia*, on the ground that the Resolution dated 30.06.2003 has been issued in contravention of the provisions of Madhya Pradesh Lok Seva (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes) Act, 1994. The judgment and order dated 13.10.2014 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh has been assailed before this Hon'ble Court in SLP (C) No. 21195/2015, wherein this Hon'ble Court, vide order dated 24.07.2015 was pleased to issue notice. The matter is presently pending consideration. Since, in case of Manish Mishra (*supra*) the Hon'ble High Court *prima facie* held that an act could not be amended by a resolution as was done in this matter, and this led to quashing of the said resolution of 2003, it is humble submission of the Respondent State that in present amendment act of 2019, such anomaly does not survive anymore.

1.14. In 2019, while proposing the Madhya Pradesh Public Services (Reservation for SC, ST, and OBC) Amendment Ordinance, the State Government referred to and relied upon the minutes of the OBC Commission meeting dated 25.01.2000.

1.15. In that meeting, the Commission had extensively discussed and relied upon its earlier report of 1996–1997. The 1996–1997 Report recorded that although the OBC population constituted nearly 50% of Madhya Pradesh's

population, they were given only 14% reservation at that time, which was described as a "drop in the ocean."

1.16. The Commission strongly emphasized that for ensuring substantive equality and in line with the constitutional mandate under Article 16(4), the reservation for OBCs should be enhanced from 14% to 27%. The report highlighted that the Supreme Court's order in *Indra Sawhney* (1992) capped reservations generally at 50%, but it urged that the State Government should address this limitation in view of Madhya Pradesh's special circumstances, to safeguard the rights of its large backward class population. Consequently, in the 2000 meeting, the Commission formally adopted the recommendation to increase OBC reservation to 27%, building upon the 1996–1997 findings.

1.17. In March 2019, the State of Madhya Pradesh promulgated an ordinance enhancing the OBC reservation quota from 14% to 27%. This was a landmark executive measure by the State to ensure equitable representation of OBCs in public employment. The ordinance was issued keeping in view the demographic realities and political commitment to social justice. However, this proactive step by the State became the immediate subject of judicial scrutiny and was challenged before the High Court, triggering prolonged litigation. Further, the Ordinance was issued keeping in mind that the minutes of the meeting dated 25.01.2000 of the Madhya Pradesh Backward Classes Commission, in which the Commission recommended increasing the OBC reservation from 14% to 27%.

1.18. The ordinance enhancing OBC reservation was challenged before the Madhya Pradesh High Court in WP No. 5901/2019. By its interim order dated 19.03.2019, the High Court stayed the enhanced reservation from 14% to 27%, but restricted this stay only to the field of medical education. This order marked the first judicial intervention against the State's ordinance. It

reflected judicial caution while acknowledging that the matter involved complex constitutional issues requiring further consideration.

- 1.19. On 25.03.2019, a writ petition was filed before the Supreme Court challenging the amendment to the 1994 Reservation Act brought in by the ordinance. The Hon'ble Supreme Court issued notices on 12.04.2019 and tagged the matter with the already pending case.
- 1.20. In July 2019, the Government introduced a Bill in the Legislative Assembly with the express object and reasons that OBCs constitute around 27% of the total population of Madhya Pradesh. The Bill sought to regularize the 27% reservation initially brought through the ordinance. This step highlights the legislative intent of the State to align statutory reservation policy with demographic proportions and to provide stability and permanence to the measure.
- 1.21. The State of Madhya Pradesh filed Transfer Petition before the Supreme Court seeking to consolidate cases relating to OBC reservation which was numbered as Transfer Petition (civil) 1226/2019. However, on 15.07.2019, the Supreme Court rejected the petition, thereby allowing proceedings to continue simultaneously before the High Court and the Supreme Court. This rejection contributed to the multiplicity of proceedings, which prolonged the resolution of the matter and complicated the litigation strategy of the State.
- 1.22. In December 2019, the State notified rules to implement the enhanced OBC reservation of 27%. This was an administrative step towards operationalizing the legislative and executive decision of the Government. By issuing rules, the State intended to give practical effect to the policy and ensure that the enhanced quota was reflected in recruitment and admission processes. However, these rules themselves became the subject of subsequent challenges.

- 1.23. In WP No. 25181/2019 (Piyush Jain vs. State of MP), the High Court granted interim relief on 28.01.2020 similar to the relief earlier granted in Ashita Dubey.
- 1.24. On 25.08.2021, the Advocate General gave a considered opinion that there was no stay on admissions or recruitment by departments other than medical education. Therefore, the State was free to proceed with the enhanced reservation in other fields. This opinion provided a legal basis for the State to cautiously continue implementing 27% reservation where no specific judicial restraint existed.
- 1.25. Acting on the Advocate General's opinion, the General Administration Department (GAD) issued a circular on 02.09.2021 directing that 27% reservation be provided in all vacancies except those under pending litigation. This circular was a significant administrative move that reflected the State's intent to enforce the enhanced quota while remaining within the boundaries of ongoing court proceedings.
- 1.26. On 31.01.2022, the GAD issued another circular making it mandatory to implement the increased 27% reservation for the OBC category in all recruitments. This reflects showing the State's determination to extend enhanced benefits uniformly. However, it also invited direct legal challenges, leading to further judicial intervention.
- 1.27. In WP No. 3668/2022 (Shivam Gautam vs. State of MP), was filed challenging the Rules dated 24.12.2019 and circulars dated 02.09.2021 and 31.01.2022 the High Court passed a significant order on 04.05.2022, restraining the State from providing OBC reservation beyond 14% and staying the December 2019 Rules. This order was a major judicial setback for the State, as it effectively froze all attempts to implement the enhanced 27% reservation, irrespective of administrative circulars.
- 1.28. On 13.09.2022, in the Ashita Dubey matter, the High Court observed that there was a considerable overlap between issues pending before it and

those already before the Supreme Court. It directed parties to seek instructions on whether they wished to pursue matters before the Supreme Court instead.

1.29. Meanwhile, the GAD, on 22.09.2022, issued a circular directing publication of recruitment results in two categories: (i) 87% vacancies filled with 14% OBC quota, and (ii) 13% vacancies kept in abeyance, with separate lists prepared for OBC and unreserved candidates. This method attempted to balance judicial directions with administrative requirements. Due to this exercise, the recruitments in the State did not get stalled and at least 87% of the posts were filled. Simultaneously results were declared for remaining 13 % posts but no appointments could be made. This resulted in large-scale stagnation in recruitments, leaving nearly 865 Madhya Pradesh Public Service Commission posts (approximately as on date) and more than 3867 Employee Selection Board (ESB) posts vacant. Typed copy of the chart indicating the above vacant posts are hereby annexed as **ANNEXURE No. 1.**

1.30. In WP No. 24847/2022 (Harishankar Barodiya vs. State of MP), the High Court upheld the formula of bifurcating results into 87% and 13% categories. This judicial approval gave temporary legitimacy to the State's administrative arrangement but did not resolve the fundamental question of whether 27% OBC reservation could be implemented.

1.31. By 2024, multiple writ petitions challenging enhanced OBC reservation and validity of the amendment, rules made there under, order/advertisements issued as per the amended provisions were filed before Hon'ble High Court.

- 1.32. In the year 2024-25, writ petitions filed before the Hon'ble High Court were transferred to this Hon'ble Court. The State had filed an interlocutory application in WP No. 3668/2022, registered as Transferred Case (C) No. 7/2025, seeking vacation of the High Court's stay order dated 04.05.2022.
- 1.33. It is pertinent to state that the State Government is currently facing irreparable loss and injury as selection and recruitment processes since year 2022 in various 12 departments of the State Government are pending due to pendency of current issue involved in the present petition(s). That the State government have a prima-facie strong case and is suffering irreparable loss and injuries if the relief sought is not granted to the State Government to proceed with 27% reservation for OBC Category for appointment and selection process in Government Jobs subject to the outcome of the present petition.
- 1.34. This application was filed due to prevailing administrative exigencies in the State because of unfilled 13% posts. Also, there has been feeling of uncertainty in the mind of selected candidates who were given appointments despite their name being in the select list.
- 1.35. However, on 12.08.2025, the Supreme Court observed that interim orders had been continuing since 2019, and instead of vacating them, it directed that all transferred cases be listed for final hearing in the week commencing 22nd September 2025 as the first matter.

2. Findings of the Report of Mahajan Commission in 1982

Methodology adopted by the Mahajan Commission

- 2.1. For the purpose of determining whether a caste or community was socially and educationally backward, the Mahajan Commission undertook an extensive tour across the State to collect evidence and data on social and educational conditions. Prior to visiting a particular place, the Commission

publicised the purpose of its visit through newspaper notices, State officials, public representatives, and the personal efforts of its members. As methodology, the Commission identified specific criteria for assessing social and educational backwardness and applied these standards to evaluate the evidence, data, and responses received from castes and communities seeking recognition as backward classes. In furtherance of this objective, the Commission also circulated a comprehensive 75-point questionnaire to social groups and individuals. This questionnaire was divided into four categories: social, economic, educational, and political.

- 2.2. The Mahajan Commission investigated the social, educational, economic, and political status of Other Backward Classes (OBCs) in Madhya Pradesh. It noted that many communities are known by different names regionally but share the same traditional occupations, and most respondents reported severe social discrimination, including segregation in seating and food practices. Around 90% lived in kutchha houses with poor facilities. Educational attainment was extremely low, with negligible representation in higher or technical studies, and respondents demanded scholarships, fee waivers, and coaching for competitive exams. Economically, 83% said industrialization harmed their occupations, most sought low-interest loans, and exploitation through debt was common. Politically, OBC representation in the Legislative Assembly remained below 16%, and communities considered themselves politically backward.
- 2.3. General responses revealed that many urged SC/ST status, though all wanted OBC recognition. In state services, OBC representation was only 8.241% across all classes, with virtual absence in Class I and II services. Where present, employment was mostly confined to low-ranking posts. Despite constituting 48.08% of the population (1981 Census), OBCs remained grossly underrepresented in education, government services, and political institutions.

- 2.4. In the above backdrop, the Commission noted that, like Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the Other Backward Classes must also be entitled to reservation, recommending a reservation of 35% for them in all the departments of the State Government.
 - 2.5. The Principal Act currently provides for a reservation of 27% for the backward classes, which is significantly lower than the 35% reservation proposed by the Commission.
3. Further, annual reports of the Madhya Pradesh Backward class commission of the years 1996-97, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 respectively recommended for enhanced reservation. In 1996-97, commission recommended that the reservation in favour of Other Backward Classes communities should be enhanced from 14% to 27%.
 4. In the report of 1999-2000, the Commission, under Section 9(1) (c) of the Act, reviewed the 14% reservation for OBCs in Madhya Pradesh and found it inadequate compared to their estimated population of over 50%.
 - (i) Public representatives and stakeholders strongly demanded enhancement to **27% reservation**, in line with the Central Government. Previous Commissions also made similar recommendations.
 - (ii) The Commission noted that many other states provide higher reservations for OBCs (see table below).
 - (iii) Despite passing a resolution for 27% OBC reservation, the State's proposal was returned by the Central Government. The Commission advised resubmission, seeking relaxation of the **50% ceiling rule** set by the Supreme Court.
 - (iv) Complaints were received regarding irregularities in implementing reservation rules, especially in **universities and**

recruitment processes, where reservation rosters were not maintained.

- (v) The **Public Service Commission's policy** of preparing separate merit lists often disadvantaged OBC candidates, as cut-offs for General Category sometimes remained lower than OBC.
- (vi) In **1999-2000**, out of 18,095 seats for OBCs in competitive exams, **3,091 candidates** were selected under quota and **1,358 in open merit**.
- (vii) The Commission recommended:
 - a. Strict implementation of 14% reservation in universities.
 - b. Shifting OBCs from **5th to 3rd position** in the 100-point roster to improve benefits.
 - c. Raising OBC reservation in Madhya Pradesh to **27%**.

OBC Reservation in Other States (as per Commission's report)

State/UT	Reservation %
----------	---------------

Uttar Pradesh	27%
----------------------	-----

Delhi (NCT)	27%
--------------------	-----

Tamil Nadu	30% (BC) + 50% (ABC) + 20% (Denotified communities)
-------------------	---

Goa	2%
------------	----

West Bengal	5%
--------------------	----

Karnataka	32%
------------------	-----

5. The Madhya Pradesh State Backward Classes Commission in its Annual Report (2000–01) recommended enhancing reservation for backward classes to 35% in proportion to their population (48.08%), extending it

across government, semi-government, public institutions, appointments, promotions, and selection posts. It advised that meritorious OBC candidates selected in open competition should not be counted against the reserved quota, unfilled quotas should remain reserved for three years, and OBC candidates should receive a 5-year age relaxation. The Commission stressed strict implementation of the roster system and extension of reservation to corporations, cooperatives, self-government institutions, aided private establishments, and all universities/colleges. It further proposed framing rules under Articles 320(4), 16(4), 309, and 229 of the Constitution to safeguard OBC interests, alongside establishing training centres and special facilities in universities to prepare OBC candidates for competitive examinations and specialized positions.

6. It is pertinent to state that M.P. state backward class commission has been publishing annual reports on the backwardness of the other backward classes and has been recommending reservation to OBC communities. A year wise chart of such report and recommendations made therein is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure 2**.
7. That, as latest as in the year 2023, at the behest of State Government, a detailed study was conducted by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar social sciences (State University, Government of Madhya Pradesh) on **“Survey and social scientific study of the socio-economic, education al and political status of the Other Backward Classes of Madhya Pradesh and the reasons for their backwardness”**. This report underscores a stark disconnect between the **demographic strength and representation of OBCs in Madhya Pradesh**. The report reflects that OBCs continue to face **deep-rooted social discrimination, exclusion, and marginalization**—confined to traditional caste-based occupations, segregated localities, and lacking access to basic amenities—illustrating that despite numbers, they remain

socially backward in practice, and broad-based social reforms are needed alongside reservation.

8. Educationally and economically, OBCs also remain at a disadvantage. The report finds **high dropout rates, low presence in higher and technical education, and uneven benefits from reservation**, with advanced OBC sub-groups cornering most opportunities. Poor school infrastructure, poverty, and lack of awareness further widen this gap, restricting OBC youth from accessing professional fields like engineering, medicine, and research. Economically, most OBCs are engaged in **low-yield agriculture, petty trade, or informal labor**, with limited landholdings, poor access to credit, and dependence on moneylenders, leaving them vulnerable to debt and instability. These disadvantages are **interconnected**, creating cycles of poverty, illiteracy, and under-representation. Recognizing this, the report recommends multi-sectoral interventions: expanding **scholarships, hostels, and skill-development programs**, strictly enforcing **27% reservation in state jobs**, ensuring fair promotions, and improving **credit access, land reforms, and entrepreneurship opportunities**. Politically, it calls for rigorous compliance with the triple test to legitimize OBC reservation in local bodies. Overall, the report concludes that the **sustainable empowerment of OBCs demands a holistic approach**—combining education, employment, economic support, and political representation—to ensure equality, dignity, and justice for this numerically strong but persistently marginalized community.
9. The key issues and suggestions made in the report are reproduced herein below in tabular form for ease of reference-

Sector	Key Issues	Suggested Measures
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low enrollment and high dropout rates - Weak presence in higher/technical education - Benefits cornered by advanced OBC sub-groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand scholarships, hostels, remedial coaching, vocational training - Launch targeted schemes for OBC girls - Monitor delivery to marginalized OBC groups
Employment / Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under-representation in government jobs and organized sector - Poor access to higher-level positions and promotions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enforce 27% reservation strictly in state jobs - Provide skill development & entrepreneurship programs - Ensure OBCs get fair promotions and senior-level roles
Political Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited participation despite ~45–48% population - Supreme Court's triple test requirement - 50% ceiling restricts OBC quota to ~15% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish dedicated Commission reports (body-wise data) - Follow triple test and ceiling rule - Encourage political parties to field OBC candidates in general seats
Economic Empowerment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dependence on traditional occupations - Poor access to land, credit, and modern markets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve access to land reforms, institutional credit, cooperatives - Support self-employment

Sector	Key Issues	Suggested Measures
	- Vulnerability in unorganized sector	and entrepreneurship - Modernize traditional occupations and provide market linkages

10. The main contention of the Petitioners in the present matters is that enhancement of OBC reservation to 27% would result in the overall reservation exceeding the alleged “ceiling” of 50% which is impermissible in light of various judgements pronounced by this Hon’ble Court. In this regard, it is submitted that Article 16 (4) enables the government for making provisions for reservation in respect of backward classes which are not adequately represented in services under the State. Article 16 (4) is reproduced herein below for ready perusal-

“16. Equality of opportunity in matters of public employment.-(1)

.....

.....

(4) Nothing in this article shall prevent the State from making any provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in favour of any backward class of citizens which, in opinion of the State, is not adequately represented in the services under the State.

.....”

11. It is apparent from the bare reading of the provision that Constitution empowers the state government to make provisions for classes which are

not adequately represented. This was further interpreted by this Hon'ble court in catena of judgements holding that social, educational backwardness, inadequacy of representation shall be threshold test for determining the reservation.

12. It is submitted that this Hon'ble Court in the matter of M Nagraj has held that ;

“86. Clause (4-A) follows the pattern specified in clauses (3) and (4) of Article 16. Clause (4-A) of Article 16 emphasises the opinion of the States in the matter of adequacy of representation. It gives freedom to the State in an appropriate case depending upon the ground reality to provide for reservation in matters of promotion to any class or classes of posts in the services. The State has to form its opinion on the quantifiable data regarding adequacy of representation. Clause (4-A) of Article 16 is an enabling provision. It gives freedom to the State to provide for reservation in matters of promotion. Clause (4-A) of Article 16 applies only to SCs and STs. The said clause is carved out of Article 16(4). Therefore, clause (4-A) will be governed by the two compelling reasons—“backwardness” and “inadequacy of representation”, as mentioned in Article 16(4). If the said two reasons do not exist then the enabling provision cannot come into force. The State can make provision for reservation only if the above two circumstances exist..... ”

13. It is respectfully submitted that primary contention i.e. breach of 50% ceiling limit reflects a selective and erroneous reading of the law laid down by this Hon'ble court in *Indra Sawhney*. The Hon'ble Supreme Court itself

carved out exceptions, permitting relaxation of the 50% principle in extraordinary and compelling circumstances, particularly keeping in view India's diversity and the peculiar conditions of disadvantaged communities.

14. A bare perusal of the majority opinion in *Indra Sawhney reported in* (1992 Supp (3) SCC 217) makes it clear that while **50% is the general rule**, the Court recognized that exceptional circumstances such as regional imbalances, remoteness, or overwhelming backwardness may justify departure. This principle was further reaffirmed in later Constitutional Bench rulings, including *M. Nagaraj v. Union of India* and *Ashoka Kumar Thakur v. Union of India*, and also recognized in *S.V. Joshi v. State of Karnataka* (2017) 4 SCC 41, wherein quantifiable data was emphasized as the basis for exceeding the ceiling.

15. In Madhya Pradesh, the **2011 Census** reveals that Scheduled Castes constitute **15.6%**, Scheduled Tribes **21.1%**, and Other Backward Classes more than **51%** of the total population. Yet another report of OBC Commission, Madhya Pradesh of the year 2022 further substantiates the population figure of other backward classes i.e. more than 50 % in state. Thus, disadvantaged communities collectively comprise over **87% of the State's population**. Yet, OBCs were earlier confined to only **14% reservation**, which is wholly disproportionate to their demographic share and their actual educational and social backwardness. Hence, the enhancement to 27% is a constitutionally mandated corrective step.

16. It is further pertinent to submit that State Government has currently revised the State list of other backward classes in the State of Madhya Pradesh with the aid and advise of the Madhya Pradesh State Backward Classes Commission, which has been constituted in compliance of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Indra Sawhney (Supra). It is further submitted that the recent list demonstrates that, there are as many as 94 castes/sub castes/classes, which have been categorized as other Backward Classes in the State of Madhya Pradesh. True and typed copy of list demonstrating castes/sub castes/classes is hereby annexed as **ANNEXURE 3**.

17. Further, it is pertinent to state that Mahajan Commission, after extensive field studies across the State, recommended **35% reservation** for OBCs, having found them to be socially, educationally, and economically backward. It's detailed survey constitutes valid and quantifiable data supporting the increase. The State Backward Classes Commission has also reaffirmed this position, listing 94 OBC castes/sub-castes engaged predominantly in traditional, menial, and agriculture-related occupations, reflecting their continuing marginalization.

18. *Further in Indra Sawhney (supra)*, this Hon'ble Court while explaining the concept of "adequate representation embedded in Article 16(4) of the Constitution held as follows:

"807. We must, however, point out that clause (4) speaks of adequate representation and not proportionate representation. Adequate representation cannot be read as proportionate representation.

Principle of proportionate representation is accepted only in Articles 330 and 332 of the Constitution and that too for a limited period. These articles speak of reservation of seats in Lok Sabha and the State -legislatures in favour of Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes proportionate to their population, but they are only temporary and special provisions. It is therefore not possible to accept the theory of proportionate representation though the proportion of population of backward classes to the total population would certainly be relevant. Just as every power must be exercised reasonably and fairly, the power conferred by clause (4) of Article 16 should also be exercised in a fair manner and within reasonable limits — and what is more reasonable than to say that reservation under clause (4) shall not exceed 50% of the appointments or posts, barring certain extraordinary situations as explained hereinafter. From this point of view, the 27% reservation provided by the impugned Memorandums in favour of backward classes is well within the reasonable limits. Together with reservation in favour of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, it comes to a total of 49.5%. In this connection, reference may be had to the Full Bench decision of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in V. Narayana Rao v. State of A.P. [AIR 1987 AP 53 : 1987 Lab IC 152 : (1986) 2 Andh LT 258] , striking down the enhancement of reservation from 25% to 44% for OBCs. The said enhancement had the effect of taking the total reservation under Article 16(4) to 65%.

808. It needs no emphasis to say that the principal aim of Articles 14 and 16 is equality and equality of opportunity and that clause (4) of Article 16 is but a means of achieving the very same objective. Clause (4) is a special provision — though not an exception to clause

(1). Both the provisions have to be harmonised keeping in mind the fact that both are but the re-statements of the principle of equality enshrined in Article 14. The provision under Article 16(4) — conceived in the interest of certain sections of society — should be balanced against the guarantee of equality enshrined in clause (1) of Article 16 which is a guarantee held out to every citizen and to the entire society. It is relevant to point out that Dr Ambedkar himself contemplated reservation being “confined to a minority of seats” (See his speech in Constituent Assembly, set out in para 693). No other member of the Constituent Assembly suggested otherwise. It is, thus, clear that reservation of a majority of seats was never envisaged by the Founding Fathers. Nor are we satisfied that the present context requires us to depart from that concept.

809. From the above discussion, the irresistible conclusion that follows is that the reservations contemplated in clause (4) of Article 16 should not exceed 50%.

.....”

19. It is important to note that in *Indra Sawhney*, a Bench of nine judges framed 14 key issues. The particular relevance was Question No. 6, which directly addressed the ceiling of 50% rule. The Court examined whether the principle was binding, whether it applied exclusively to Article 16(4) reservations or extended to all forms of affirmative action, and whether it was to be applied annually or to the cadre strength as a whole. This shows that the Court treated the 50% figure as a flexible guideline subject to contextual interpretation, not as an immutable constitutional bar.

20. The majority view clarified that exceptions could be made in certain situations. Hon'ble Justice B.P. Jeevan Reddy, speaking for the majority in *Indra Sawhney*, emphasized that although 50% should ordinarily be the rule, India's social diversity and the existence of far-flung, marginalized communities necessitate a more nuanced approach. The Court expressly acknowledged that special situations might require going beyond 50%, provided the State demonstrates compelling and extraordinary circumstances. In such cases, strict scrutiny is warranted, but relaxation is constitutionally permissible. Para 810 of *Indra Swahney* is reproduced hereunder substantiating the above:-

“ 810. While 50% shall be the rule, it is necessary not to put out of consideration certain extraordinary situations inherent in the great diversity of this country and the people. It might happen that in farflung and remote areas the population inhabiting those areas might, on account of their being out of the mainstream of national life and in view of conditions peculiar to and characteristical to them, need to be treated in a different way, some relaxation in this strict rule may become imperative. In doing so, extreme caution is to be exercised and a special case made out.”

21. Several concurring opinions in *Indra Sawhney* further diluted the rigidity of the 50% figure. Hon'ble Justice S. Ratnavel Pandian observed that no scientific or constitutional basis existed for fixing a precise 50% ceiling,

stressing that adequacy of representation must be judged case by case. In particular, he held:

“183. As to what extent the proportion of reservation will be so excessive as to render it bad must depend upon adequacy of representation in a given case. Therefore, the decisions fixing the percentage of reservation only up to the maximum of 50% are unsustainable. The percentage of reservation at the maximum of 50% is neither based on scientific data nor on any established and agreed formula. In fact, Article 16(4) itself does not limit the power of the Government in making the reservation to any maximum percentage; but it depends upon the quantum of adequate representation required in the Services. In this context, it would be appropriate to recall some of the decisions of this Court, not agreeing with *Balaji* [1963 Supp 1 SCR 439 : AIR 1963 SC 649] as regards the fixation of percentage of reservation.

....

243(9) No maximum ceiling of reservation can be fixed under Article 16(4) of the Constitution for reservation of appointments or posts in favour of any backward class of citizens “in the services under the State”. The decisions fixing the percentage of reservation only up to the maximum of 50% are unsustainable.”

Similarly, Justices Fazal Ali and Krishna Iyer, in earlier precedents cited within *Indra Sawhney*, warned against reducing social justice to a mathematical formula. Justice Chinnappa Reddy explicitly held that the 50% mark is at best a convenient guideline and cannot be treated as an inviolable maximum. These opinions collectively confirm that the ceiling is neither absolute nor universal.

22. Reservation may ordinarily not exceed 50%, but can surpass it with valid justification. In Indra Swahney case Hon'ble Justice P.B. Sawant, concurring with the majority, stated that ordinarily reservations under Articles 16(4) and 16(1) together should remain within 50%. However, he clarified that whenever this limit is exceeded, the State must justify the excess with cogent and demonstrable reasons. Thus, the judgment leaves open the constitutional space for exceeding 50%, so long as quantifiable data and extraordinary circumstances are shown.

23. Further, in the matter of Indra Swahney (Supra), it has been held that adequacy of Representation in the services under the state is to be left to the subjective judgement of the State/executive. Para 798 in this regard is reproduced herein below for ready reference-

“798. Not only should a class be a backward class for meriting reservations, it should also be inadequately represented in the services under the State. The language of clause (4) makes it clear that the question whether a backward class of citizens is not adequately represented in the services under the State is a matter within the subjective satisfaction of the State. This is evident from the fact that the said requirement is preceded by the words “in the opinion of the State”. This opinion can be formed by the State on its own, i.e., on the basis of the material it has in its possession already or it may gather such material through a Commission/Committee, person or authority. All that is

required is, there must be some material upon which the opinion is formed. Indeed, in this matter the court should show due deference to the opinion of the State, which in the present context means the executive. The executive is supposed to know the existing conditions in the society, drawn as it is from among the representatives of the people in Parliament/Legislature. It does not, however, mean that the opinion formed is beyond judicial scrutiny altogether. The scope and reach of judicial scrutiny in matters within subjective satisfaction of the executive are well and extensively stated in Barium Chemicals v. Company Law Board [1966 Supp SCR 311 : AIR 1967 SC 295] which need not be repeated here. Suffice it to mention that the said principles apply equally in the case of a constitutional provision like Article 16(4) which expressly places the particular fact (inadequate representation) within the subjective judgment of the State/executive.”

24. *It is submitted that in the state of Madhya Pradesh, State government has done extensive exercise of collecting data ever since 1982 demonstrating backwardness and inadequacy of other backward classes in the state. Further, minutes of meeting of Madhya Pradesh Backward class commission dated 25.01.2000, recommended enhancement of OBC reservation to 27%. This was further followed by nine point's indicators of development determined by the administrative department (aboriginal tribes and backward classes) demonstrating backwardness prevailing amongst other backward classes. A study of Said indicators was done in the year 2002. It is submitted that it is apparent from above that State has*

been taking endeavors by collecting data on backwardness and inadequacy of representation for a very long time. This Hon'ble Court in B.K. Pavitra has held that-

“100. In dealing with the submissions of the petitioners on this aspect, it is relevant for this Court to recognise the circumspection with which judicial power must be exercised on matters which pertain to propriety and sufficiency, in the context of scrutinising the underlying collection of data by the State on the adequacy of representation and impact on efficiency. The Court, is above all, considering the validity of a law which was enacted by the State Legislature for enforcing the substantive right to equality for the SCs and STs. Judicial review must hence traverse conventional categories by determining as to whether the Ratna Prabha Committee Report considered material which was irrelevant or extraneous or had drawn a conclusion which no reasonable body of persons could have adopted. In this area, the fact that an alternate line of approach was possible or may even appear to be desirable cannot furnish a foundation for the assumption by the Court of a decision-making authority which in the legislative sphere is entrusted to the legislating body and in the administrative sphere to the executive arm of the Government.

.....

104. We find merit in the above submissions. The methodology which was adopted by the Ratna Prabha Committee has not been demonstrated to be alien to conventional social science methodologies. We are unable to find that the Committee has based its conclusions on any

extraneous or irrelevant material. In adopting recourse to sampling methodologies, the Committee cannot be held to have acted arbitrarily. If, as we have held above, sampling is a valid methodology for collection of data, the necessary consequence is that the exercise cannot be invalidated only on the ground that data pertaining to a particular department or of some entities was not analysed. The data which was collected pertained to thirty-one departments which are representative in character. The State has analysed the data which is both relevant and representative, before drawing its conclusions. As we have noted earlier, there are limitations on the power of judicial review in entering upon a factual arena involving the gathering, collation and analysis of data.

.....

106. We are of the view that once an opinion has been formed by the State Government on the basis of the report submitted by an expert committee which collected, collated and analysed relevant data, it is impossible for the Court to hold that the compelling reasons which Nagaraj [M. Nagaraj v. Union of India, (2006) 8 SCC 212 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 1013] requires the State to demonstrate have not been established. Even if there were to be some errors in data collection, that will not justify the invalidation of a law which the competent legislature was within its power to enact. After the decision in B.K. Pavitra (1) [B.K. Pavitra v. Union of India, (2017) 4 SCC 620 : (2017) 2 SCC (L&S) 128] , the Ratna Prabha Committee was correctly appointed to carry out the required exercise. Once that exercise has” been carried out, the Court must be circumspect in exercising the

power of judicial review to re-evaluate the factual material on record.”

25. In the matter of Jaishri Laxmanrao Patil v. State of Maharashtra, (2021) 8 SCC 1, this Hon’ble Court explained the social test it had developed in *Indra Sawhney* by holding that “.. we fully endorse the submission of Shri Rohatgi that extraordinary situations indicated in para 810 were only illustrative and cannot be said to be exhaustive. We however do not agree with Mr Rohatgi that para 810 provided only a geographical test. The use of expression “on being out of the mainstream of national life” is a social test. Which also needs to be fulfilled for a case to be covered by exception.

.....

.....

Shri Rohatgi had submitted that the test laid down in para 810 is only geographical test which was an illustration. It is true that in *Indra Sawhney* the expression used was “flung and remote areas” but the social test which was a part of the same sentence stated “the population inhabiting those areas might, on account of their being out of the mainstream of national life and in view of conditions peculiar to and characteristically to them”. Thus, one of the social conditions in para 810 is that being within the mainstream of national life, the case of Marathas does not satisfy the extraordinary situations as indicated in para 810 of *Indra Sawhney*. The Marathas are in the mainstream of the national life. It is not even disputed that Marathas are politically dominant caste.

.....”

26. Further, in *Janhit Abhiyan v. Union of India* (2023) 5 SCC 1, this Hon’ble Court took the view that the ceiling limit of 50% for reservations was a

desirable requirement and was not meant to be inviolable and inflexible for all times to come. Specifically, this Hon'ble Court noted:

“171. Thus, having examined the permissible limits of affirmative action in light of the possible harm of preferential treatment qua other innocent class of competitors i.e. general merit candidates, this Court has expressed the desirability of fifty per cent as the ceiling limit for reservation in education and public employment but, as observed hereinbefore, all such observations are required to be read essentially in the context of the reservation obtaining under Articles 15(4), 15(5) and 16(4) or other areas of affirmative action like that in relation to local self-government (the case of K. Krishna Murthy [K. Krishna Murthy v. Union of India, (2010) 7 SCC 202 : (2010) 2 SCC (L&S) 385]) and cannot be overstretched to the reservation provided for entirely different class, consisting of the economically weaker sections.

172. Moreover, as noticed, this ceiling limit, though held attached to the constitutional requirements, has not been held to be inflexible and inviolable for all times to come. Reasons for this are not far to seek. As mentioned hereinbefore, reservation by affirmative action is not having trappings of any such essential feature of the Constitution, collectively enumerated by Kesavananda [Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, (1973) 4 SCC 225] and successive decisions, that its modulation with reference to any particular compelling reason or requirement could damage the basic structure of the Constitution.

173. In another view of the matter, the prescription of ceiling limit of fifty per cent, being apparently for the benefit of general merit candidates, does not provide any justified cause to the candidates standing in the bracket of already available reservation to raise any

grievance about extra ten per cent reservation for the benefit of another section of society in need of affirmative action. In any case, there is no question of violation of any such basic feature of the Constitution that the entire structure of equality of opportunity in Article 16 would collapse by this EWS reservation.”

27. That, various data sets collected from time to time conclusively establishes that the Other Backward Classes (OBCs) in the State suffer from entrenched and multi-dimensional backwardness i.e., social, educational, economic, and political—that severely impairs their ability to compete on an equal footing with the more privileged sections of society. This backwardness goes beyond mere numerical disadvantage; it manifests in systemic exclusion, discrimination, and deprivation. In *Indira Sawhney*, this Hon’ble Court recognized that the 50% reservation ceiling is a general rule but acknowledged the possibility of “extraordinary situations” warranting relaxation of this limit (paras 809-810). The Court provided illustrations including far-flung, remote, or isolated communities who are “out of the mainstream of national life” as classic examples requiring exceptional protection.

28. The Commission’s findings reveal that the OBCs of the State, though constituting nearly half of the population, have negligible representation in higher posts within the State services, reflective of sustained exclusion. Further, the OBCs experience severe social disabilities such as pervasive caste discrimination, denial of access to public spaces, food-based ostracism etc.

29. Such entrenched social isolation and exclusion demonstrate that these communities remain severely “out of the mainstream of national life” for

all practical purposes, satisfying the social test laid down by the Court in *Indira Sawhney* (para 810). This social marginalization inhibits their ability to derive equitable benefits from education, employment, and political participation.

30. As per the commission's reports economically, members of backward classes suffer adverse impacts from industrialization on traditional occupations, exploited labor conditions due to debt bondage, and lack of presence in medium or large scale business enterprises. The absence of meaningful economic advancement signifies structural barriers, justifying affirmative action beyond conventional limits.
31. Educationally, lack of attainment of higher and technical education reinforces that these communities cannot be adequately empowered without an enhanced reservation regime. The Commission's evidence of failing representation in professional and technical institutions underscored an urgent need for special measures. Politically, OBC representation over decades remains negligible and isolated, further warranting extraordinary intervention to correct historic injustices. This breach is necessary to achieve substantive equality and to dismantle systemic barriers, goals at the heart of constitutional affirmative action.
32. Recent judgments such as *Jaishri Laxmanrao Patil (supra)* reaffirm that the 50% rule admits exceptions upon demonstration of special circumstances. The multi-faceted and deep-rooted backwardness exposed in the Commission's data provides precisely such extraordinary grounds, and hence justifying the breach.
33. Thus, the exceptional social, educational, economic, and political circumstances prevailing in the State's OBC communities constitute "extraordinary situations" within the meaning of the judicial precedent, justifying the increased reservation percentage recommended by the Commission.

34. It is also humbly submitted that the socio-economic backwardness and exclusion, is a deeply entrenched and long-standing issue that does not disappear quickly with the passage of time. Historical data capture the systemic deprivation that continues to persist across generations, and therefore remain relevant for affirmative action even decades later. The pace of socio-economic mobility for backward classes is often extremely slow owing to limitations in access to education, resources, and social networks. Thus, indicators of backwardness recorded in earlier decades continue to reflect present-day realities, until fresh, reliable data prove otherwise. Therefore, use of historic data to satisfy the social test is justified.
35. Lastly, backwardness is capable of being transmitted intergenerationally. The historic lack of educational and economic opportunities faced by older generations translates into cumulative disadvantage persisting generationally across families and communities, warranting an enhancement of reservation.

In view of the foregoing submissions, it is most humbly submitted that present case falls under the exceptional circumstances as envisaged in various judgments of this Hon'ble Court. The enhanced reservation to Other Backward Classes in state of Madhya Pradesh is thus justified and meets with constitutional mandate. Present matters are not fit for any interference from this Hon'ble Court and therefore, liable to be dismissed.

It is therefore most humbly prayed that these written submissions may be read along with the Counter Affidavit on record and in light of submissions herein the Transfer Case(s) challenging the enhancement of OBC reservation from 14 % to 27% deserves to be dismissed.

FILED BY:



(MRINAL GOPAL ELKER)

**Advocate for the Respondent State of
M.P.**

Date: 23.09.2025

37
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION
TRANSFERRED CASE (CIVIL) NO. 7 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

SHIVAM GAUTAM

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

...RESPONDENT

AFFIDAVIT

I, Ajay Katesaria, S/o Late Gajanand Katesaria, Aged about 44 years, presently working as Deputy Secretary General Administration Department, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, presently at New Delhi do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as under:

1. I am the Officer-in-Charge on behalf of the State of Madhya Pradesh in the above mentioned matter and as such conversant with the facts of present case and competent to file this Affidavit.
2. That I have read and understood the content of the accompanying compilation of Act & Rules and I say that the contents thereof are true and correct to my knowledge and based on information received for record.
3. That I have read and understood the contents of the accompanying Applications, and I say that what is stated therein is true to my knowledge.
4. The Documents filed along with the compilation of Act & Rules are true copies of their respective original and formed part of the record of the case.


DEPONENT

19 SEP 2025

VERIFICATION

Verified at New Delhi on this September day of 19th, 2025 that the contents in the aforesaid affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



CERTIFIED THAT THE DEPONENT
Shri/Smt./Km.....
S/o, W/o, D/o.....
R/o.....
Identified by Shri/Smt.....
has solemnly affirmed before me at Delhi
on.....at St. No.....
that the contents of the affidavit which have
been read & explained to him are true and
correct to his knowledge.

Notary Public, Delhi


DEPONENT

S. No.	FB	Madhya Pradesh Staff Selection Board, Bhopal			
00	Selection Bhavan, Chinara Park (East) Bhopal 462011	Previously conducted recruitment examinations by the Board, whose results were declared in the year 2024-2025 2025-26			
Sl. No.	Name of Examination	Date of Result	Total Result	Results Declared	Reserved/Backward Class Held Results
01	Combined Recruitment Examination 2023 for Group-1 Subgroup-1 & Group-2 Subgroup-1	04/02/2024	1978	1565	252
02	Combined Recruitment Examination-2023 for Staff Nurse, Paramedical Staff and other posts under Group-5	12/02/2024	4852	4792	211
03	Higher Secondary Teacher Selection Examination-2023	20/02/2024	8720	4921	565
04	Combined Recruitment Examination 2023 for Assistant Grade-3, Stenographer and other posts under Group-4	26/02/2024	3047	2395	254
05	Forest Guard, Range Officer, Jail Warder and Jail Assistant Superintendent Recruitment Examination-2023	13/12/2024	2145	1626	178
06	Recruitment Examination-2024 for Sub-Engineer under Group-3	05/12/2024	283	210	21
07	ITI Training Officer Recruitment Examination-2024	24/12/2024	450	326	57
08	Police Constable Recruitment Examination-2023	12/03/2025	7090	6446	923
09	Combined Recruitment Examination for Staff Nurse, Paramedical Staff and other posts under Group-5	29/04/2025	3060	2293	364
10	Combined Recruitment Examination-2024 for the post of Supervisor under Women & Child Development Department Recruitment Examination-2024	21/06/2025	660	560	83
11	Secondary Teacher (Subject, Sports, Music, Dance) & Primary Teacher (Sports, Music, Dance) Selection Examination-2024	Expected in July 2025	10758	9914	844
12	Combined Recruitment Examination-2024 for Assistant Grade-3, Stenographer and other posts under Group-4	Expected in July 2025	966	888	78

Sl. No.	Name of Examination	Date of Result	Total Result	Results Declared	Reserved/Backward Class Held Results
13	Group-1 Subgroup-3 Combined Recruitment Examination-2024	Expected in August 2025	157	141	16
14	Group-1 Subgroup-1 & Group-2 Subgroup-1 Combined Recruitment Examination-2024	Expected in August 2025	172	151	21
Total			44338	36228	3867

Information related to backward class reservation mentioned in the annual reports of Madhya Pradesh State Backward Class Commission

S.No.	Reporting Year	Pg. No.	Details related to reservation	Remark
1	1994-95	26 - 27		OBC population was stated to be more than 50 percent.
		35	14 percent	Reference has been made to the orders of the G.PV.
		39	27 percent - in government service	The announcement was made. Orders were issued on 13.08.90.
		41	14 percent	The order for 14 percent reservation was circulated by the Govt. Reservation Cell on 17.12.93.
		42	25 percent political reservation	It was implemented on the elections of Gram Panchayats, Municipal Councils and Municipal Corporations.
		47, 48, & 51	14 percent given in the state. 27 percent is in the center.	While the total population of the reserved category in the state is 87 percent - Other Backward Classes 49 percent, Scheduled Tribes — 15 percent. Scheduled Caste — 23 percent
2	1995-96		No Numerical Value	
3	1996-97	35-36	Increase from 14 percent to 27 percent	There are 369 groups/classes/castes in the state.
4	1998-99	37	Recommendation to make 27 percent reservation like the Centre	

5	1999-2000	44-45	Increase from 14 percent to 27 percent	During the tour, regional conferences, meetings, it has been proposed by various public representatives that the population of Other Backward Classes is more than 50 percent.
6	2000-01	11	Increased from 14 percent Act passed by the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly providing 27 percent reservation.	To provide 27 percent reservation from 14 percent We will try to get the Centre's approval in this regard.
		37	25 percent	Provisions in local bodies and panchayats.
		39	Increase from 14 percent to 27 percent	During the tour, regional conferences, meetings, it has been proposed by various public representatives that the population of Other Backward Classes is more than 50 percent.
		40	27 percent	The proposal was presented at the Advisory Board meeting on 9 May 2000. The State Government's draft legislation was sent to the Central Government. The Scheduled Tribe population has declined since the division of Chhattisgarh. A proposal to provide the same amount of reservation to the Other Backward Classes, within the 50 percent limit, was sent to the Chief Minister.

		74 & 88	Required _ 48.08% Recommendation 35% —	Reservations for backward classes are expected to be 48.08 percent, proportional to their population. The Commission, taking into account all aspects of the Constitution, court decisions, and the example of states like Tamil Nadu, recommends providing 35 percent reservation for backward classes in jobs in all government, semi-government, and public institutions.
7	2002-03	55-54	27 percent reservation has been recommended.	
8	2004-05	51	27 percent reservation has been Recommended.	
9	2005-06	48	A proposal regarding 27 percent reservation was sent to the government.	
10	2007-08	58	A proposal regarding 27 percent reservation was sent to the government.	
		59	Accepting 27 percent reservation, it was recommended to clarify the position before the court.	
11	2009-10	57-58	27 percent reservation has been recommended.	
12	2010-11	27-28	Recommendation to increase reservation from 14 percent	

Recommendations related to backward class reservation mentioned in the report of MP Backward Class Welfare Commission - Year 2022

1	2022 First Report Part-1-	99	The State Government should reserve at least 35 per cent seats for Other Backward Classes in all levels of the three-tier Panchayat elections.	Other Backward Classes constitute approximately 48 percent of the state's voters. After subtracting Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe voters from the total electorate, the Other Backward Classes constitute 79 percent of the remaining voters.
			The State Government should reserve at least 35 percent seats for Other Backward Classes in all levels of urban body elections.	Of the total urban voters in the state, Other Backward Class voters constitute 44 percent.

ANNEXURE NO. 3

Table No. 4.3: Declared Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh		
No.	code	Name Caste/Sub-Caste/Class Group
1	1	Ahīr, Brajwasi, Gawali, Goli, Jadav (Yadav) Bargahi, Bargah, Thethwar, Raut Gowari, (Gwari) Gowra, Gawari, Gwara, Gowari, Mahakul (Raut) Mahkul, Gop Gwali, Lingayat, Gopal, Gwal, Gwala
2	2	Asara, Asada
3	3	Vaishnava (Vaishnava)
4	4	Banjara, Banjari, Mathura, Nayak, Nayakada, Dhuria, Labhana, Labana Lamanē
5	5	Barai, Tamoli, Tamboli, Kumawat, Kumawat, Warai, Chaurasia
6	6	Carpenter, Carpenter, Davej, Kunder (Vishwakarma)
7	7	okay
8	8	Vasudev, Vasudeva, Vasudev, Vasudeva, Harbola, Kapadia, Kapadi, Gondhali, Tharwar
9	9	Bhādbhujā, Bhujwa, Bhurji, Dhuari, or Dhuari
10	10	Bhaat, Charan, Sutia, Salvi, Rao, Janmalodhi, Jasonodhi, Marusonia
11	11	Chhipa, Bhavsar, Neelgar, Jeenagar, Nirali, Rangari, Mandhav
12	12	Dhimar, Bhoi, Kahar, Kahra, Dhiwar / Mallah/Nawada / Turha, Boatman (Kashyap, Nishad, Raikwar, Batham), Keer, Britia (Vrittia), Singraha, Jalari, Jalarnalu
13	13	Panwar, Powar, Bhojar, Bhojar
14	14	haunted, ghostly
15	15	bhopa, respect
16	16	innkeeper
17	17	Chunkar, Chungar, Kulvandhaya, Rajgir
18	18	thatchatari
19	19	Tailor, Chhipi, Chhipi, Shipi, Mavi, (Namdev)
20	20	washerman, furnace, barber, washerman
21	21	Meena (Rawat) Deshwali, Mewati, Meena
22	22	Kirar, Kirad, Dhaakad
23	23	Gadaria, Dhangar, Kurmar, Hatgar, Hatkar, Hatkar, Gadari, Dharia, Dhoshi, (Gadariya) Gari, Gayri, Gadaria (Pal Baghele)
24	24	Kadere, Dhunkar, Dhuniya, Dhanaka, Kodar
25	25	Koshta, Koshti (Dewangan) Costa, Mala, Padmashali, Sali, Sutsali, Salvear, Salvi, Devang, Jandra, Koskati, Koshkati (Lingayat) Gadwal, Gadewal, Garewar, Garwar, Dukar, Kolhati
26	26	Dholi/Dafali/Dafli/Dholi, Damami, Gurav
27	27	Gusai, Goswami

Table No. 4.3: Declared Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh, continued		
No.	code	Name Caste/Sub-Caste/Class Group
28	28	Gurjar (Gurjar)
29	29	Blacksmith, Ironsmith, Iron-pitta, Gadole, Hunga Blacksmith, Iron-pitta, Gadola, Blacksmith (Vishwakarma)
30	30	Garpagari, Nath-Jogi, Joginath, Haridas
31	31	ghoshi
32	32	Goldsmith, goldsmith, jhani, jhadi (goldsmith) Avadhiya, Oudhiya, Soni (goldsmith)
33	33	(a) Kachhi (Kushwaha, Shakyas, Maurya) Koeri or Koiri (Kushwaha), Panara, Murai, Sonkar, Kohri, (b) Mali (Saini), Marar, Phulmali (Phulamari)
34	34	Joshi (Bhaddi) from Dakota, Dakota
35	35	Lakhera, Lakher, Kachera, Kacher
36	36	Thathera, Kasar, Kasera, Tamera, Tambatkar, Otari, Coppersmith, Tamer, Ghadwa, Jharia, Kaser
37	37	Khatia, Khatia, Khati
38	38	Potter (Prajapati), potter
39	39	Kurmi, Kurmar, Kunbi, Kurmi, Patidar (Kulmi, Kulmi, Kulambi) Kurmavanshi, Chandrakar, Chandranahu, Kumbhi Gawal (Gawail), Sirvi
40	40	Kamariya
41	41	Kauravas, Kanwars
42	42	Kalar (Jaiswal) Kalal, Dadsena
43	43	Kaluta, Kaluta, Kolta, Kolta
44	44	Lonia, Lunia, Od, Ode, Oriya, Naunia, Murha, Muraha, Murha, Mudha
45	45	Naai (Sen, Savita, Usrete, Srivas) Mhali, Naavi, Usrete
46	46	Naita, Naida
47	47	Panaka, Panika
48	48	Patka, Patki, Patwa
49	49	Lodhi, Lodha, Lodh
50	50	Sikligar
51	51	Teli (Thatha, Sahu, Rathore)
52	52	Turha, Tirwali, Baddar
53	53	Cassidy, Cassidy
54	54	voveria
55	55	Rautiya, Rautiya
56	56	Agreed, Nahal
57	57	Kotwal
58	59	Lodha (Tanwar)
59	60	Mowar

Table No. 4.3: Declared Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh, continued

No.	code	Name Caste/Sub-Caste/Class Group
60	61	menstruation
61	62	Aghariya
62	63	Tiur, Turi
63	64	Bharud
64	65	Son Charioteer-Staff/Sahees
65	66	telanga, tilaga
66	67	Raghavi
67	68	Rajbhar / Rajbhar
68	69	Kharol
69	71	Golan, Gavalan, Golan
70	72	Razzaad, Razzaad
71	73	Jadam
72	74	Dangi / Dangi
73	75	Gayar / Pardhanian
74	76	kudmi
75	77	my
76	78	Age / Skill, Age
77	79	Pinjara (Hindu)
78	82	Aajna
79	83	Dhoria
80	84	Gehlot Mewar
81	85	Rewari
82	86	Ruwala/Ruhela
83	87(1)	dyer
	87(2)	water carrier, "Abbasi" "Sakka"
	87(3)	hidden
	87(4)	Hela
	87(5)	innkeeper
	87(6)	Washerman
	87(7)	Mewati
	87(8)	Pinjara, Nadaf, Behna, Dhuniya, Dhunkar, Fakir, Shah, Sai, Gravedigger
	87(9)	Kunjra Raine
	87(10)	Manihar
	87(11)	butcher

Table No. 4.3: Declared Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh, continued

No.	Code	Name Caste/Sub-Caste/Class Group
	87(12)	Mirasi
	87(13)	Mirdha
	87(14)	Carpenter, Lathe, Kamligar
	87(15)	Barber
	87(16)	Hammal
	87(17)	Momin Julaha (weavers who are believers)
	87(18)	Blacksmith, Nagauri
	87(19)	crack
	87(20)	Nomad
	87(21)	Cobbler
	87(22)	Teli, Nayata, Pindari (Pindara) Kankar
	87(23)	pemdi
	87(24)	Kalaigar
	87(25)	farrier
	87(26)	Sheeshgarh
	87(27)	bullet
	87(28)	Rajgir
	87(29)	Dafali
	87(30)	Ghoshi and Gawli, bullet
	87(31)	Sikligar
	87(32)	Oranges
	87(33)	the nut
	87(34)	Sheikh Mehtar
	87(35)	niyargar
	87(36)	cushion
	87(37)	Mukeri, Makrani
	87(38)	parody/imitation
84	88	Baiswar
85	89	Voice
86	90	Bishnoi, Jat
87	91	Rathore
88	92	Bahawalpuri
89 93		Saundhiya
90	94	transgender

Table No. 4.4: Communities declared as Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh

a small number	declared list less	Kamak	community name	less number	announced	serial list	community name
1	1	1	Ahir	61	10	1	Bhat
2	1	2	Brajvasi	62	10	2	bard
3	1	3	Gawli	63	10	3	bitch
4	1	4	bullet	64	10	4	Salvi
5	1	5	Jadav	65	10	5	Rao
6	1	6	Jadav (Yadav)	66	10	6	Jammalondhi
7	1	7	Bargahi	67	10	7	Jasondhi
8	1	8	bargah	68	10	8	marusonia
9	1	9	typical	69	11	1	hidden
10	1	10	Raut	70	11	2	sequence of being
11	1	11	Gowari	71	11	3	Eucalyptus
12	1	12	Gowari (Gwari)	72	11	4	ginagar
13	1	13	Guara	73	11	5	unique
14	1	14	Gowri	74	11	6	color
15	1	15	Mahakul	75	11	7	Mandhav
16	1	16	Mahakul (Raut)	76	12	1	Dhimar
17	1	17	Mahakul	77	12	2	Bhoi
18	1	18	Gop	78	12	3	havoc
19	1	19	Gwali	79	12	4	Kahra
20	1	20	Lingayat	80	12	5	धीवर
21	2	1	asara	81	12	6	Sailor
22	2	2	asada	82	12	7	Nawada
23	3	1	recluse	83	12	8	Trumpet
24	3	2	Vaishnava (Vaishnava)	84	12	9	boatman
25	4	1	Nomad	85	12	10	Nishad
26	4	2	banjari	86	12	11	Raikwar
27	4	3	Mathura	87	12	12	batham
28	4	4	hero	88	12	13	Kir
29	4	5	Naikada	89	12	14	Britia
30	4	6	axle	90	12	15	Brittiya (Vrittiya)
31	4	7	to attract	91	12	16	Singraha
32	4	8	Labana	92	12	17	mesh
33	4	9	Lamne	93	12	18	jalaranlu
34	5	1	barai	94	13	1	Pamwar
35	5	2	Tamoli	95	13	2	Powar
36	5	3	Tamboli	96	13	3	Bhoyer
37	5	4	Kumavat	97	13	4	Bhoyar
38	5	5	Kumawat	98	14	1	haunted
39	5	6	Ward	99	14	2	haunted
40	5	7	Chaurasia	100	15	1	bhopa
41	6	2	carpenter	101	15	2	respect
42	6	3	Carpenter	102	16	1	innkeeper
43	6	4	davej	103	17	1	by choosing
44	6	5	Kunder	104	17	2	Chungar
45	6	6	Kunder (Vishwakarma)	105	17	3	Kulvadhaya
46	7	1	okay	106	17	4	Rajgir
47	8	1	Vasudev	107	18	1	Chitari
48	8	2	Vasudeva	108	19	1	the ruler
49	8	3	Vasudev	109	19	2	hidden
50	8	4	Vasudeva	110	19	3	hidden
51	8	5	Harbola	111	19	4	Shipi
52	8	6	Kapadia	112	19	5	Mavi
53	8	7	Cloth	113	19	6	Mavi (Namdev)
54	8	8	dusky	114	20	1	the farmer
55	8	9	Thursday	115	20	2	butti
56	9	1	Bhadbhuj	116	20	3	Baretha
57	9	2	Bhujwa	117	20	4	Rajak
58	9	3	Bhuj	118	21	1	Meena
59	9	4	spindle	119	21	2	Meena (Rawat)
60	9	5	spindle				Continuous

Table No. 4.4: Communities declared as Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh

serial number	declared list less	serial number	community name	a small number	declared serial number less	community name	
120	22	1	Deshwali	175	28	1	Gurjar
121	22	2	Mewati	176	28	2	Gurjar (Gurjar)
122	22	3	Meena	177	29	1	Blacksmith
123	22	4	contract	178	29	2	blacksmith
124	22	5	Kirad	179	29	3	iron hammer
125	22	6	dashak	180	29	4	gadol
126	23	1	shepherd	181	29	5	whippen
127	23	2	Dhangar	182	29	6	Blacksmith
128	23	3	Kurmar	183	29	7	iron plate
129	23	4	Hatgar	184	29	8	Gadola
130	23	5	off the	185	29	9	Blacksmith
131	23	6	Haatkar	186	29	10	Blacksmith (Vishwakarma)
132	23	7	Shepherd	187	30	1	garpagari
133	23	8	Dharia	188	30	2	Nath-Jogi
134	23	9	washer	189	30	3	Joginath
135	23	10	Dhoshi (shepherd)	190	30	4	Haridas
136	23	11	Gari	191	31	1	Ghopi
137	23	12	gyri	192	32	1	Sonar
138	23	13	shepherd	193	32	2	goldsmith
139	23	14	Shepherd (Paal)	194	32	3	bell
140	23	15	Shepherd (Baghele)	195	32	4	bush
141	24	1	the sides	196	32	5	bush (golden)
142	24	2	by tuning	197	32	6	periods
143	24	3	dhuniya	198	32	7	odhiya
144	24	4	of money	199	32	8	Oudhiya (goldsmith)
145	24	5	coder	200	33	1	Kachhi
146	25	1	costa	201	33	2	Kachhi (Kushavarha)
147	25	2	bohe	202	33	3	Kachhi (Shakya)
148	25	3	Koshti (Devangan)	203	33	4	Kachhi (Maurya)
149	25	4	costa	204	33	5	Koyari
150	25	5	Garland	205	33	6	Koeri
151	25	6	Padmashali	206	33	7	Koeri (Kushwaha)
152	25	7	in the year	207	33	8	Panara
153	25	8	Sutsali	208	33	9	Murai
154	25	9	salwar	209	33	10	Sonkar
155	25	10	Salvi	210	33	11	fog
156	25	11	Devang	211	33	12	gardener
157	25	12	Jandra	212	33	13	Gardener (Saini)
158	25	13	Coscatty	213	33	14	Marar
159	25	14	Koshkati	214	33	15	fruit gardener
160	25	15	Koshkati (Lingayat)	215	33	16	Phulmaari (Flower Gardener)
161	25	16	Garhwal	216	34	1	Joshi
162	25	17	Gadhewal	217	34	2	Joshi (Bhaddi)
163	25	18	done	218	34	3	Dacocha
164	25	19	Garwar	219	34	4	Dakota
165	25	20	Pig	220	35	1	Lakhera
166	25	21	Kolhati	221	35	2	lakeher
167	26	1	dholi	222	35	3	trash
168	26	2	Dafali	223	35	4	Kacher
169	26	3	Duffle	224	36	1	scoffer
170	26	4	dholi	225	36	2	Kasar
171	26	5	Damami	226	36	3	courseira
172	26	6	Guruv	227	36	4	Tamera
173	27	1	gusai	228	36	5	Tambatkar
174	27	2	Goswami	229	36	6	Otari

Table No. 4.4: Communities declared as Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh

serial number	declared list less	serial number	community name	serial number	declared list less	serial number	community name
230	36	7	coppersmith	286	48	1	Patka
231	36	8	Tamer	287	48	2	Patki
232	36	9	pitcher	288	48	3	Patwa
233	36	10	Jharia	289	49	1	Iodhi
234	36	11	tightly	290	49	2	Lodha
235	37	1	cot	291	49	3	Lodh
236	37	2	cot	292	50	1	Sikligar
237	37	3	eats	293	51	1	Oil
238	38	1	Potter	294	51	2	Teli (Chic)
239	38	2	Potter (Prajapati)	295	51	3	Oilman (Sahu)
240	38	3	burden	296	51	4	Teli (Rathore)
241	39	1	Kurmi	297	52	1	Trumpet
242	39	2	Kurmar	298	52	2	Tirwali
243	39	3	Kunbi	299	52	3	budder
244	39	4	Kurmi	300	53	1	Kisdi
245	39	5	Patidar	301	53	2	Chaldean
246	39	6	Patidar (Kulmi)	302	54	1	voveriya
247	39	7	Patidar (Kulmi)	303	55	1	Rotiya
248	39	8	Patidar (Kulambi)	304	55	2	Rautiya
249	39	9	Chandranah	305	56	1	considering
250	39	10	Chandrakar	306	56	2	Nahal
251	39	11	Chandranahu	307	57	1	Kotwal
252	39	12	Aquarius	308	58		
253	39	13	gavali	309	59	1	Lodha
254	39	14	Gavali (Gmail)	310	59	2	Lodha (Tanwar)
255	39	15	sirvi	311	60	1	Mowar
256	40	1	Kamariya	312	61	1	Rajwar
257	41	1	Kaurava	313	62	1	Aghariya
258	41	2	Crows	314	63	1	Tiur
259	42	1	Kalaar	315	63	2	Turri
260	42	2	Kalar (Jaiswal)	316	64	1	Bharud
261	42	3	Kalal	317	65	1	sleep
262	42	4	army	318	65	2	charioteer
263	43	1	Kalota	319	65	3	Charioteer-Staff/Sahis
264	43	1	Kalota	320	66	1	telanga
265	43	2	Colata	321	66	2	Tilga
266	43	3	Kolta	322	67	1	Raghavi
267	44	1	Lonia	323	68	1	Rajbhar
268	44	2	lunia	324	68	2	Rajbhar / Rajbhar
269	44	3	the ode	325	69	1	Kharol
270	44	4	Ode	326	70		
271	44	5	Odia	327	71	1	golani
272	44	6	Naunia	328	71	2	Gavlan
273	44	7	Murha	329	71	3	Göulan
274	44	8	Muraha	330	72	1	Razdi
275	44	9	twisted	331	72	2	fuss
276	44	10	Mudaha	332	73	1	Jadam
277	45	1	Barber	333	74	1	Dangi
278	45	2	Barber (Sen)	334	74	2	Dangi / Dangi
279	45	3	Barber (Savita)	335	75	1	gayar
280	45	4	barber (usarete)	336	75	2	Gayar / Pardhania
281	45	5	Barber (Shrivastava)	337	76	1	kudmi
282	46	1	Knight	338	77	1	my
283	46	2	Naida	339	78	1	Baya Mahara
284	47	1	Panka	340	78	2	Baya Mehra / Kaushal
285	47	2	Panika	341	78	3	age

Table No. 4.4: Communities declared as Other Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh

less number	declared list less	serial number	sub command	community name	less number	declared list less	No	sub command	community name
342	79	1		cage	384	87	15	1	manmad
343	79	2		Pinjara (Hindu)	385	87	15	1	Momin
344	80				386	87	15	2	momin weaver
345	81				387	87	15	3	momin weaver (Those weavers who are believers)
346	82	1		Anjana	388	87	16	1	lakshmi
347	83	1		Dhoria	389	87	16	2	Nagauri
348	84	1		Gehlöt	390	87	17	1	dance of fury
349	84	2		Gehlöt Mewada	391	87	18	1	Nomad
350	85	1		Rewari	392	87	19	1	Cobbler
351	86	1		Ruwala	393	87	20	1	Teli, Nayata, Pindari (Pindara) Kankar
352	86	2		Ruvala/Rudela	394	87	20	2	Nalta
353	87	1	1	dye	395	87	20	3	Pindari
354	87	1	2	Water carrier "Abbasi"	396	87	20	4	Pindari (Pindara)
355	87	1	3	Water carrier "Savka"	397	87	20	5	Kakar
356	87	1	4		398	87	21	1	pemdi
357	87	2	1		399	87	22	1	Kalaigar
358	87	3	1	Hela	400	87	23	1	farrier
359	87	4	1	innkeeper	401	87	24	1	shilgar
360	87	5	1		402	87	25	1	bullet
361	87	6	1	Mewati	403	87	26	1	Rajgir
362	87	7	1	cage	404	87	27	1	Dafali
363	87	7	2	Naddaf	405	87	28	1	Ghopi
364	87	7	3	Bedna	406	87	28	2	Gawli
365	87	7	4	dhuniya	407	87	28	3	bullet
366	87	7	5	by tuning	408	87	29	1	Sikligar
367	87	7	6	Saint	409	87	30	1	Oranges
368	87	7	7	Shah	410	87	31		Barua
369	87	7	8	Sai	411	87	32	1	Shelkh
370	87	7	9	gravedigger	412	87	32	2	scavenger
371	87	8	1	Kujda	413	87	33	1	niyargar
372	87	8	2	Kunjra Raine	414	87	34	1	cushion
373	87	9	1	Manihar	415	87	35	1	mukeri
374	87	10	1	butcher	416	87	35	2	Makrani
375	87	10	2	cassava	417	87	36	1	rent
376	87	11	1	Mirasi	418	87	36	2	fuck/copy
377	87	12	1	Mirdha	419	88	1		Baiswar
378	87	13	1	carpenter	420	89	1		Voicé
379	87	13	2	Carpenter	421	90	1		Vishnoi
380	87	13	3	lathe	422	91	1		Rathore
381	87	13	4	Kamligar	423	92	1		Bahawalpur
382	87	14	1	barber	424	93	1		Yaundhia
383	87	14	2	Barber	425	94	1		transgender