

## Ban on liquor - Part III

Click [here](#) for earlier parts of Ban on Liquor

\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**.

\n

- It went on to assert that the proscription would cover not just retail outlets but hotels and bars too.

\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.

\n

- More than a third of the liquor sale and consumption points will be hit.

\n

- The order **does not exempt outlets in cities and towns**, where most of the consumers are local residents.

\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.

\n

- **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.

\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

