

## Ban on liquor - Part III

Click <u>here</u> for earlier parts of Ban on Liqour

\n\n

## Why in news?

\n\n

\n

- Supreme Court in March 2017 confirmed its December order on banning sale of liquor near National and State highways.
- It went on to assert that the proscription would cover not just retail outlets but hotels and bars too.  $\gamman{\cap{black}l} n$

\n\n

## What are the shortcomings?

\n\n

\n

- The order is intended to prevent drunk driving, which is without doubt a contributor to road accidents and fatalities.
- More than a third of the liquor sale and consumption points will be hit.  $\ensuremath{\sc vn}$
- The order does not exempt outlets in cities and towns, where most of the consumers are local residents.  $\gamma_n$
- The court's clarification goes against the opinion Attorney-General gave the Kerala govt that the December order applied only to retail outlets and not to bar-attached hotels and parlours.
- Retail outlets can perhaps move another 500 m with minimal expense and no great loss of clientele but established hotels and clubs does not

enjoy such luxury.

\n

- If drunk driving along the highways is the provocation for the order, there can be no reason to cover clubs that serve only their members.  $\n$
- State governments will face a huge loss in revenue.  $\slash n$
- Smaller administrative units such as Union Territories will be the worst-hit.

\n

• Puducherry, which includes enclaves such as Mahe, will find relocation of many shops impossible, as they are caught between the highway and the sea.

\n

• Goa, a small State that depends heavily on tourism, is in a similarly difficult situation.

\n

- The relaxation of the liquor-free zone from 500 m to 220 m from the highways in the case of areas with a population of 20,000 or less might only partly address their concerns.  $\n$
- Prohibition as a policy has had a history of failure. Good intentions do not guarantee good outcomes.
  \n

\n\n

\n\n

## Source: The Hindu

∖n

