

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).
14911-14913/2013

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 25/02/2013 in WP No. 23773/2012 and order dated 28/03/2013 in MP No. 9/2013 and MP No. 10/2013 in WP No. 23773/2012 passed by the High Court of Madras)

THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU REP. BY SEC.&ORS

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

K. BALU & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With interim relief and office report)
(For final disposal)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 8267/2014

(With Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 8971/2014

(With appln.(s) for intervention and appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order and Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 35454/2014

(With appln.(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and appln.(s) for impleadment and Office Report)

S.L.P. (C)...CC No. 231/2015

(With appln.(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and Office Report)

CONMT.PET.(C) No. 376/2014 In SLP(C) No. 8971/2014

(With appln.(s) for directions and appln.(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and Office Report)

Date : 08/09/2015 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.A. BOBDE

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, AG
Ms. Nupur Choudhary, Adv.
Mr. K.M. Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Vishwapal Singh, Adv.

Mr. Nikhil Nayyar, AAG

Mr. Jagjit Singh Chhabra, Adv.

Mr. K.K. Venugopal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prabu Ramasubramanian, Adv.
Mr. V. G. Pragasam, Adv.

Mr. Kailash Vasdev, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Atul Sharma, Adv.
Mr. C. Kannan, Adv.
Mr. B. Balaji, Adv.
Mr. T. Ashok Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Sripradha, Adv.
Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Nupur Choudhary, Adv.
Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.

Mr. P.B. Suresh, Adv.
Mr. Vipin Nair, Adv.
Mr. Prithu Garg, Adv.
For M/s Temple Law Firm

Mr. Rakesh Dwivedi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Subramonium Prasad, Sr. Adv.
Mr. V. Balaji, Adv.
Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, Adv.
Ms. R. Shase, Adv.

Mr. V.K. Biju, Adv.
Mr. Maneesh, Adv.

Contemnor

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. Harsh Vardhan, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Jain, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Ashok Panda, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Binu Tamta, Adv.
Mr. D. S. Mahra, Adv.

Mr. S. Thananjayan, Adv.

Mr. Shubham Bhalla, Adv.
Mr. Ritesh Khatri, Adv.

Ms. Sunita Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Manoj V. George, Adv.
Mr. Siju Thomas, Adv.
Ms. Shilpa M. George, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Adlakha, Adv.
Mr. Kamlendra Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Himanshu Gupta, Adv.

Mr. R. Kamal Gupta, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

SLP (C) Nos. 14911-14913/2013, SLP(C) No. 8267/2014, SLP(C) No. 8971/2014, SLP(C) No. 35454/2014 and S.L.P. (C)...CC No. 231/2015

This batch of cases pertains to the sale of alcoholic beverages and alcohol in the proximity of the National Highways and the State Highways.

After having heard learned counsel for the parties as well as suggestion that has been given by the learned Attorney General, we are of the opinion that the appropriate course of action would be if a meeting of the concerned authorities from the States, Union Territories and the Union Government is held to have a fresh look at the Model Policy for Alcoholic Beverages & Alcohol.

It has been brought to our notice that this exercise was earlier carried out some time in 2005/2006 and a Model Policy / Taxation / Act / Rules for Alcoholic Beverages & Alcohol was prepared for consideration and adoption by States / Union Territories and Union Ministries concerned by the Government of India. Now, since about ten years have gone by and some judgments have been delivered by the High Courts in this regard, it would be more appropriate if the policy is revisited with regard to the location of liquor vends and sale of alcoholic beverages and alcohol in the proximity of the National Highways and the State Highways.

Learned Attorney General says that he will convey this to the concerned authorities and a meeting will be called within a period of two months from today.

The out-come of the discussions should be filed by way of an affidavit in this Court and a copy served to the standing counsel for all the States and the Union Territories and the appearing parties.

The officer authorized by the Union of India will take a decision on allowing stake holders or their representatives to participate in the meeting. However, the Prohibition Council, Mahe, Arrive Safe Society will be entitled to participate in the meeting in any event.

List the matters immediately after the affidavit is filed.

CONMT.PET. (C) No. 376/2014

We are not inclined to entertain this contempt petition.

The contempt petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Meenakshi Kohli)
COURT MASTER

(Jaswinder Kaur)
COURT MASTER