



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6017/2025

Jamana W/o Jetha Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Jasotaniyon
Ki Dhani Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur,
Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Barmer.

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5498/2025

Ram Panchmala S/o Shyam Panchmala, Aged About 20 Years, R/
o Sector 2 Baba Ramdev Road Masuriya District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur,
Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5501/2025

Jhilmil Mewara D/o Champa Lal Mewara, Aged About 31 Years,
R/o Village Sayra, Tehsil Gogunda, Udaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.





2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5502/2025

Nirmala Devi Choudhari W/o Jaswant Kumar Choudhari, Aged About 54 Years, R/o 33 E Block Adarsh Nagar Univar Sity Road, Udaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5503/2025

Manoj S/o Tarachand, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Charbhuj Mandir Ke Pas Guda Chatura, District Pali.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5504/2025

Priya W/o Vasu, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Old Railway Crossing Nut Basti Masuriya, District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner





Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5507/2025

Akhilesh Suwalka S/o Banshilal Suwalka, Aged About 57 Years,
72 Aklingji Nagar Goverdhan Vilas District Udaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5508/2025

Kamla Devi Sisodia W/o Pukhraj, Aged About 79 Years, Rajiv
Gandhi Colony Pal Link Road, Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5509/2025



Namit Chouhan, 63 Umaid Heritage Defence Lab Road Jodhpur

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5510/2025

Pista W/o Jiyaram, Aged About 41 Years, Vijay Nagar, Kudi Bhagtasani, District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5513/2025

Mahaveer S/o Ratanlal Mewada, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Gokuldham Apartment Surat Gujarat

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5514/2025





Joshi Siddhi D/o Bansilal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Surat, Gujarat.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5516/2025

Harsh Kumar Suwalka S/o Uankarlal, Aged About 55 Years, R/o 60 Gariyavas District Udaipur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5517/2025

Subham Kalal S/o Govindram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Pratap Colony, Shastri Circle Vilas District Udaipur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.





3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5518/2025

Yashoda Hemant Mewada W/o Hemant Mewada, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Gokuldham Appartment, Surat, Gujarat.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5593/2025

Poonam Chand S/o Mohanram, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Khariya Patawan District Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5594/2025

Rajesh Mewara S/o Prakash, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Jhandol Gorana Road Dudhkiya District Udaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.





2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5595/2025

Prem Singh S/o Khet Singh, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Ward No. 2, Bannasar, District Hanumangarh.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5598/2025

Divya Kumar Gangwani S/o Murlidhar Gangwani, Aged About 39 Years, R/o 203 Parti Bhawan Subhash Chouk Ratanada District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5599/2025

Poonam Singh S/o Ridmal Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.

----Petitioner





Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5601/2025

Jitu Singh S/o Kalyan Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Bagadsar Tehsil Kolayat, District Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5604/2025

Bulaki Sharma S/o Marvanlal Sharma, Aged About 52 Years, Sevgo Ki Bagichi, District Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5610/2025



Babita Kanwar W/o Mahendra Singh, Aged About 37 Years, B 82
Mataji Ke Mandir Ke Pas Sardulganj District Bikaner.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5613/2025

Mms Construction Company, Through Proprietor Ramsingh S/o Bheru Singh, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Vijay Petrol Pump Ke Samne Tilk Nagar, District Bikaner.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5655/2025

Santosh Mewara W/o Dolatraj, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Sonana Bheruji Mandir Ke Pas Shekhawas District Pali.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.





3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5656/2025

Omaram S/o Bhairaram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Ward No. 9
Purani Abadi Near Ravi Chowk Sri Ganganagar.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur,
Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Churu.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5658/2025

Rajan Singh Rathore S/o Laxman Singh, Aged About 41 Years,
R/o Kailashpuri Lalgah District Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur,
Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5659/2025

Kramod Kanwar W/o Mahendra Singh, Aged About 43 Years, R/o
Ward No. 16 Nya Bas Jhanjheu District Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.





2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5660/2025

Mukesh Kumar S/o Mohanlal, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Ward No. 3, Maya Near Jhulelal Mandir, Surat, District Ganganagar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5661/2025

Shaitan Bheel S/o Kalu Bheel, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Shobhaji Ka Kheda, District Bhilwara.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5662/2025

Hem Singh S/o Jog Singh, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Purana Bass Gada Gara District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,





Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.

2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5664/2025

Sugna Devi W/o Omaram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Bandhe Ki Dhaniya Palli Partham, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5665/2025

Radheshyam Mewara S/o Bhanwarlal Mewara, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Mahaveer Bhawan Ke Samne, Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5666/2025

Sarita W/o Raja Mohammed, Aged About 50 Years, R/o C-42, Sadul Gan,j District Bikaner.

-----Petitioner





Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5668/2025

Kamla Devi W/o Rameshwarlal, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Shantipura, Hathiram Ka Oda, Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5669/2025

Kalal Payal D/o Rajendra Prasad, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Babu Nagar, Ahmedabad.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5670/2025



Rajesh Kumar S/o Ramswoop, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Ward No. 9 Purani Abadi Near Ravi Chowk Sri Ganganagar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5671/2025

Jaswant Singh S/o Malam Singh, Aged About 34 Years, Jagdamba Colony, Mata Ka Than, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5672/2025

Kamal Mewara S/o Mangilal, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Vishnoeyo Ka Bas, Madera Colony, District Jodhpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.





3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5673/2025

Poonam Singh S/o Dal Singh, Aged About 31 Years, Pugal Dere
Ke Pass Purani Ginani District Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur,
Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5674/2025

Padma Ram S/o Nenna Ram, Aged About 36 Years, R/o
Betwasiya District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur,
Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5675/2025

Prashant Parashar S/o V D Parashar, Aged About 52 Years, R/o
Bhabhanagar District Chittorgarh.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.





2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Sirohi.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5676/2025

Vikram Singh S/o Samundra Singh, Aged About 30 Years, Jaleli Faujdar, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5677/2025

Mahaveer Prasad S/o Jagdish Suwalka, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Balaji Choraya Shakar Garh, District Bhilwara.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5748/2025

Diksha Chawla D/o Kunjbihari Chawla, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Gali No. 04, Kalal Colony, Nagori Gate Ke Andar, Jodhpur District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner





Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5799/2025

Chanchal Tak W/o Shiv Kumar Tak, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Near Bob Bank, Raja Ji Ka Kareda, Tehsil Kareda, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Parichwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Bhilwara

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5801/2025

Rajendra Singh Mewara S/o Inder Singh, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Sarswati Nagar Basni, District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5802/2025



Poonam Rathore D/o Raghuveer Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Old Karni Mata Mandir Ke Pass Tilak Nagar Ward No. 40 Bikaner

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5808/2025

Harvinder Singh S/o Hardayal Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Dhalewala 2 LI, Sriganganagar.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Sri Ganganagar.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5810/2025

Davrika Bai D/o Durgalal, Aged About 30 Years, Ward 19, C.a.d. Colony Keshoraipatan, Bundi, Rajasthan-323601 Rajasthan Aadhar No. 6399 63844 4501.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Joint Secretary, Finance (Excise) Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.





4. The Excise Commissioner, Government Of Rajasthan, Udaipur.
5. District Excise Officer, Excise Department, Chittorgarh.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5811/2025

Prashant Parashar S/o V.d. Parashar, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Pg 40 Rps Colony, Vtc, Rawatbhata, Po Bhabhanagar, Sub District Rawatbhata, District Chittorgarh, Rajasthan Aadhar No. 2340 9794 3970

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Joint Secretary, Finance (Excise) Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
4. The Excise Commissioner, Government Of Rajasthan, Udaipur
5. District Excise Officer, Excise Department, Sirohi.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5812/2025

Arvind Kumar S/o Ram Sagar, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No 41 Bijli Colony Ke Pass Hanumangarh Junction District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan 335512 Aadhar No. 8647 6792 8975

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Joint Secretary, Finance (Excise) Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
4. The Excise Commissioner, Government Of Rajasthan, Udaipur
5. District Excise Officer, Excise Department, Hanumangarh.





----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5831/2025

Sumitra Devi W/o Uday Pal, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Ward 36, J.p Colony, Hanumangarh Town, Hanumangarh Rajasthan 335512 Aadhar No. 5200 0395 9568.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Joint Secretary, Finance (Excise) Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
4. The Excise Commissioner, Government Of Rajasthan, Udaipur
5. District Excise Officer, Excise Department, Hanumangarh.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5870/2025

Lal Chand S/o Rameshwar, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Chamaro Ka Bas, Motipura, Dobhi, Tehsil Bhadra, District Hanumangarh. (Liquor Shop Code No. 3101026, Village Dobhi, Tehsil Bhadra, District - Hanumangarh).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The District Excise Officer, Hanumangarh.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5875/2025

Mahipal S/o Kanwra Ram, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Kudo Ka Bas, Jajiwala Gehlota District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner





Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5887/2025

Dolat Ram S/o Hari Singh Hudda, Aged About 48 Years, Ward No. 8 Gogamedi District Hanumangarh.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5888/2025

Vishal Bishnoi S/o Kailash Bishnoi, Aged About 32 Years, R/o House No. 108, Agarsen Nagar Ke Pas, Laxmi Nagar, District Sriganganagar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5926/2025



Babu Lal Vishnoi S/o Prabhu Ram Vishnoi, Aged About 45 Years,
Dhorimanna, District Barmer

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Barmer

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5929/2025

Bhajan Lal S/o Kishna Ram, Aged About 37 Years, Khileriyo Ki
Dhani, Cheetradi, District Barmer

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Secretary Finance, Government Of
Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Barmer

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5943/2025

Birbal Ram S/o Kishna Ram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Kakdo Ki
Dhani Chenpura, District Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur,
Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Barmer.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5946/2025





Purana Ram S/o Lichman Ram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Meghwalo Ka Mohalla, Chindaliya, District Nagaur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gunaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Nagour.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6032/2025

Pappu Singh Rajvi S/o Hanuman Singh, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Khasra No. 84 Shri Ram Nagar Bhadvasiya District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6241/2025

Vaishno Devi Madira Sang, R/o Patel Circle Kishan Pole Hiran Magari District Udaipur

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Excise Officer, Udaipur

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6981/2025





Dholu Singh S/o Shri Sher Singh, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 12, 1 C.h.d. Kakadwala, Bikaner. (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur (Raj.).
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner, (Raj.).

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7398/2025

Om Singh S/o Raghu Nath Singh, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 12, 1.c.h.d. Kakadwala, Bikaner.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur (Raj.).
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner, (Raj.)

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7268/2025

Suman Kanwar W/o Mukan Singh, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Khuri District Nagour.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Finance, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Excise Officer, Nagour.

-----Respondents



**D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7399/2025**

Mangan Kanwar W/o Sher Singh, Aged About 64 Years,
Resident Of Ward No. 12, Kankarwala, Lunkaransar, Dist.
Bikaner.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Jaipur (Raj.).
2. Commissioner, Excise Department, Government Of
Rajasthan, 2, Gumaniwala, Panchwati, Udaipur (Raj.).
3. District Excise Officer, Bikaner, (Raj.).

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Girish Joshi
Mr. Kshitiz Vyas
Mr. Sachin Dave
Mr. Manoj Chotia
Mr. Rishabh Handa
MR. P.C. Bishnoi
Mr. Manjeet Godara
Mr. Pritam Joshi
Mr. Shrijeet Singh Solanki

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mahaveer Bishnoi, Additional
Advocate General
assisted by Mr. Harshwardhan Singh

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH

Judgment

1. Date of conclusion of arguments	13.01.2026 & 05.02.2026
2. Date on which judgment was reserved	13.01.2026 & 05.02.2026
3. Whether the full judgment or only the operative part is pronounced:	Full Judgment
4. Date of pronouncement	06.03.2026

Reportable**Per Dr. Pushpendra Singh Bhati, J:**

1. The instant batch of Civil Writ Petitions arises out of a common factual background, involves common questions of law and fact, and challenges identical action of the Excise Department,





Government of Rajasthan. Since the controversy involved in all the matters is substantially similar, the same are being decided together by this common judgment for the purpose of analogous adjudication.

1.1. For the sake of convenience, D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6017/2025 (Jamana Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.) is being treated as the lead case, and the facts are being taken therefrom.

1.2. It is further clarified that though arguments in the batch were heard together, the matters were reserved on different dates. While most of the writ petitions were reserved on a common date, D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7399/2025 was reserved for judgment separately on 05.02.2026. However, as the issues involved are common, all the matters are being disposed of by this common judgment.

2. The petitioner has preferred the present writ petition praying for the following reliefs:

"In view of above it is humbly prayed that the Hon'ble Court may by appropriate writ order or direction:

a) Quash and set-aside clause 2.2.6, 2.2.7 and 2.2.8 of the Excise and Temperance Policy 2025-2029 (Annx-1) as being contrary to the Excise Policy as well as the Rajasthan Excise Act, Rajasthan Excise Rules as well as the Constitution of India;

b) Direct the respondents to renew the license of the petitioner's shop and not to create any hindrance in the operation of the licensed vend of the petitioner. If need be the notice dated 25.02.2025 (Annx-4) qua petitioners shop may kindly be quashed and set aside;





c) Any other relief, order or direction that this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the interest of equity, justice and good conscience."

3. The present writ petition arises out of the Rajasthan Excise & Temperance Policy, 2025–2029 issued by the Finance (Excise) Department, Government of Rajasthan vide notification dated 29.01.2025, whereby the State Government introduced a revised framework for settlement of retail liquor shops for the financial years 2025–2029.

3.1. Under the said policy, while retaining the total number of retail liquor shops in the State at 7665, a system of district-wise "clusters" was introduced for the first time. As per Clause 2.2.1 of the policy, shops were to be grouped into clusters on a contiguous basis, comprising minimum one and maximum five shops.

3.2. The policy further provided an option of renewal to existing licensees for the financial year 2025–26, subject to fulfillment of prescribed eligibility conditions, including enhancement of the Annual Guarantee Amount by 10% over the previous year.

3.3. The controversy in the present petition centers around Clauses 2.2.6, 2.2.7 and 2.2.8 of the policy. As per Clause 2.2.6, renewal of licenses in a district was made conditional upon receipt of renewal applications from at least 70% of the eligible licensees in the district, and further subject to all shops within a particular cluster applying for renewal. Clause 2.2.7 stipulates that if renewal applications are received from less than 70% of eligible licensees in a district, then all shops in that district are liable to be settled through cluster-wise e-auction/e-tender. Clause 2.2.8





provides that where one or more shops within a cluster are not renewed, opportunity shall be given to existing licensees within the cluster to take such unrenewed shops; failing which the entire cluster shall be put to auction.

3.4. The petitioner, who was an existing licensee of a Country Liquor and IMFL/Beer Composite Retail Off Vend in District Barmer, submitted an application for renewal within the prescribed time along with the requisite renewal fee.

3.5. It is the case of the petitioner that in the cluster in which her shop was included, one shop remained unrenewed. In view thereof, and after issuance of notice dated 25.02.2025, the petitioner's renewal application came to be cancelled, and the concerned cluster was proposed to be settled through auction process.

3.6. Aggrieved by the operation of the impugned clauses and consequential cancellation/non-consideration of her renewal application, the petitioner has preferred the present writ petition challenging the constitutional validity of Clauses 2.2.6, 2.2.7 and 2.2.8 of the Excise & Temperance Policy 2025–2029, and seeking renewal of her licence.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, at the outset, submitted that the present writ petitions are maintainable under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India notwithstanding the fact that the dispute arises out of liquor trade.

4.1. It was contended that although there exists no fundamental right to carry on trade in liquor, it is now well settled that State





action in matters relating to grant, renewal or regulation of excise licences remains subject to constitutional scrutiny on the touchstone of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The absence of a fundamental right to trade in liquor does not exclude judicial review where arbitrariness, discrimination or violation of declared policy is alleged.

4.1.1. Learned counsel submitted that the State, while exercising its exclusive privilege in respect of intoxicants, is nevertheless bound to act strictly in accordance with the governing statute, the rules framed thereunder and its own declared policy, and any deviation therefrom is amenable to judicial review.

4.1.2. In support of the aforesaid submission, reliance was placed upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Secretary to Government, Tamil Nadu & Anr. vs. K. Vinayagamurthy, (AIR 2002 SC 2968); State of Kerala & Ors. vs. Unni & Anr., (AIR 2007 SC 819); and Kerala Samsthana Chethu Thozhilali Union vs. State of Kerala & Ors., (AIR 2006 SC 3480)**, wherein it has been held that though liquor trade is a regulated privilege, the State is duty-bound to act fairly, non-arbitrarily and in conformity with Article 14 of the Constitution.

4.1.3. It was thus argued that the challenge raised by the petitioners is not to any vested right in liquor trade, but to the alleged arbitrary exercise of policy power and discriminatory application of the Excise Policy, which squarely falls within the scope of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.





4.2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that although the State enjoys exclusive privilege and regulatory control over liquor trade, such monopoly does not confer uncanalised or absolute power. The exercise of such privilege, it was argued, remains circumscribed by constitutional limitations, particularly the mandate of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. It was contended that State monopoly in excise matters does not eclipse the requirement of fairness, transparency and non-arbitrariness in decision-making. Even in a restricted trade such as liquor, executive action must satisfy the test of reasonableness and cannot be capricious, opaque or discriminatory.

4.2.1. Learned counsel placed reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Khoday Distilleries Ltd. vs. State of Karnataka [(1995) 1 SCC 574]***, to submit that while the State has exclusive privilege in respect of intoxicating liquors, the method adopted for grant or regulation of licences must not be arbitrary or discriminatory. It was emphasized that even where the State acts in its domain of privilege, it cannot transgress constitutional guarantees.

4.2.2. It was therefore argued that the impugned clauses, though forming part of an excise policy, are amenable to constitutional scrutiny and must withstand the test of equality and fairness under Article 14.

4.3. Learned counsel further submitted that the impugned Clauses 2.2.6, 2.2.7 and 2.2.8 of the Excise & Temperance Policy, 2025–2029 are ex facie arbitrary inasmuch as they make the renewal





rights of an individual licensee dependent upon the conduct and choices of other licensees within the cluster and even upon the overall renewal percentage at the district level.

4.3.1. It was contended that under Clause 2.2.6, even where a licensee fulfills all eligibility conditions and submits the renewal application along with the prescribed fee, renewal can be denied if all licensees within the cluster do not apply or if the district-wide renewal percentage does not reach the prescribed 70% threshold. According to learned counsel, such a stipulation introduces an artificial and unreasonable classification amongst similarly situated licensees.

4.3.2. Learned counsel argued that Clause 2.2.7, which mandates that if renewal applications in a district fall below 70% of eligible licensees, all shops in that district shall be settled through e-auction, is manifestly arbitrary. The fate of a compliant licensee, it was submitted, is made contingent upon factors beyond his control, thereby violating the doctrine of intelligible differentia and rational nexus under Article 14.

4.3.3. With respect to Clause 2.2.8, it was urged that an existing licensee is effectively compelled to opt for renewal of other unrenewed shops within the cluster in order to protect his own renewal. Such a condition, according to learned counsel, amounts to economic coercion and compels participation in additional commercial obligations unrelated to the licensee's original shop.

4.3.4. Learned counsel further submitted that the 70% renewal criterion has not been supported by any disclosed empirical study





or rational basis. The application of a district-level threshold, it was argued, results in unequal treatment between districts depending upon renewal participation, thereby creating variability in rights of renewal based on external factors.

4.4. It was also contended that the respondents themselves have taken a stand that clustering of unrenewed shops for auction is permissible only where the 70% threshold is not achieved. However, in the present case, even after more than 70% shops stood renewed, clusters of already renewed shops were allegedly clubbed with unlifted or non-viable shops and subjected to auction, thereby acting contrary to the policy itself. Such action, it was argued, renders the impugned decision ultra vires the declared policy framework.

4.5. Learned counsel further argued that the formation of clusters lacks transparency and uniform criteria. It was submitted that the policy provides that clusters may consist of one to five contiguous shops; however, no objective parameters have been disclosed for determining contiguity, revenue potential or grouping. The alleged non-publication of the finalized cluster list prior to issuance of auction notice dated 25.02.2025 was cited as indicative of opacity and post-decisional manipulation.

4.5.1. It was argued that similarly situated shops were treated differently in different districts, and the inclusion of an unlifted shop in the petitioner's cluster became the sole basis for rejection of renewal, whereas in other districts single shops were





independently auctioned. Such selective treatment, according to learned counsel, demonstrates arbitrariness.

4.6. Learned counsel also contended that the respondents' justification that vendors deliberately avoid lifting high-potential shops is speculative and unsupported by material. It was submitted that several shops remain unlifted due to geographical inaccessibility, low commercial viability or structural disadvantages, and the State cannot presume mala fides on the part of licensees.

4.6.1. In this context, reliance was placed upon Sections 101 and 102 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 to submit that the burden to justify such assumptions lies upon the State, particularly where policy restrictions are sought to be defended on factual grounds.

4.7. It was further argued that the cluster mechanism, as implemented, operates as a tool of economic compulsion by clubbing profitable shops with non-viable shops and threatening auction of the entire cluster if any shop remains unrenewed. According to learned counsel, such a mechanism amounts to unjust enrichment under the guise of revenue maximization.

4.8. Learned counsel submitted that revenue enhancement cannot be achieved by coercive or discriminatory means, and the State cannot indirectly compel cross-subsidization of non-viable shops by leveraging renewal rights of compliant licensees.

4.9. It was also contended that no issue of prospective or retrospective application arises in the present case. Even if clusters have been provisionally allotted through auction, each





shop retains its independent identity and guarantee amount. Any third party who participated in auction did so subject to the outcome of the present writ petitions, and therefore no vested right or equity arises in favour of such allottee.

4.10. On the aforesaid premises, learned counsel prayed that Clauses 2.2.6, 2.2.7 and 2.2.8 of the Excise & Temperance Policy, 2025–2029 be declared unconstitutional and the consequential cancellation of the petitioners' renewal applications and auction proceedings be quashed.

5. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents opposed the writ petitions and submitted that the challenge laid by the petitioners is wholly misconceived, both on facts and in law.

5.1. Learned counsel submitted that the petitioners have an efficacious alternative remedy of appeal under Section 9A of the Rajasthan Excise Act, 1950 before the Excise Commissioner, Rajasthan, Udaipur against the order of cancellation/non-renewal. The extraordinary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 ought not to be invoked in the presence of such statutory remedy.

5.2. Learned counsel further submitted that liquor trade is not a fundamental right and is merely a privilege regulated by the State in exercise of its powers under Entry 8 and Entry 51 of List II of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution of India. In view of Section 37 of the Rajasthan Excise Act, 1950, no licensee has any vested right to renewal of licence nor any claim for compensation





upon non-renewal. Thus, the petitioners cannot assert renewal as a matter of right.

5.3. It was submitted that the Excise & Temperance Policy, 2025–2029 has been framed after due consideration of revenue interests, administrative efficiency, transparency and long-term stability in excise administration. The cluster system was introduced to ensure rationalization of settlement, prevention of revenue leakage and avoidance of fallow or unregulated areas.

5.4. Learned counsel submitted that the 70% renewal threshold is a policy decision taken after study and deliberation, intended to ensure substantial participation of existing licensees before granting the benefit of renewal. The said condition operates uniformly across the State and applies equally to all districts and all licensees. There is neither discrimination nor arbitrariness in prescribing such a uniform benchmark.

5.5. It was further submitted that after implementation of the policy, out of 7665 liquor shops in the State, approximately 6420 licensees opted for renewal under the cluster mechanism, thereby demonstrating overwhelming acceptance of the policy framework. The fact that a large majority of licensees complied with and benefited from the policy, it was argued, negates the allegation of arbitrariness.

5.6. Learned counsel contended that Clause 2.2.8 merely provides that if a shop within a cluster remains unrenewed, existing licensees of that cluster are given an opportunity through limited bidding to settle such shop. Only if the cluster remains unsettled





thereafter is it put to open e-auction. This mechanism, it was argued, ensures full settlement of all shops within a cluster, thereby protecting revenue and preventing illegal liquor trade in unserved areas.

5.7. It was further submitted that the petitioners themselves, while submitting their renewal applications, expressly accepted the terms and conditions of the Excise Policy, including the condition that renewal may be cancelled if 70% threshold is not met or if cluster conditions are not satisfied. The renewal application form signed by the petitioners contains an undertaking to this effect. Having participated in the process with full knowledge of the policy, the petitioners are estopped from challenging the same after failing to secure renewal.

5.8. Learned counsel denied the allegation of non-transparency in cluster formation and submitted that individual notices were issued to concerned licensees and opportunity of limited tender was provided before cancellation of renewal applications. The plea regarding non-publication of cluster lists, it was argued, is factually incorrect.

5.9. It was contended that the policy does not compel any licensee to adopt additional commercial obligations. Renewal is voluntary and subject to prescribed eligibility conditions. The State cannot permit selective renewal of profitable shops while leaving non-viable shops unsettled, as that would lead to revenue loss and proliferation of illegal liquor trade in unregulated areas.





5.10. Learned counsel emphasized that formulation of excise policy falls squarely within the executive domain. Judicial review in such matters is limited to examining manifest arbitrariness or constitutional violation. Courts do not sit in appeal over policy wisdom or substitute their own views regarding revenue mechanisms.

5.11. It was thus prayed that the impugned clauses are neither arbitrary nor discriminatory; they are rational, uniformly applicable and framed in furtherance of legitimate State objectives. The writ petitions, therefore, deserve to be dismissed.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties at length. The record of the case as well as the judgments cited at the Bar have been carefully perused.

6.1. This Court observes that the subject of intoxicating liquors falls within Entry 8 of List II of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution of India, which empowers the State Legislature to legislate on "intoxicating liquors, that is to say, the production, manufacture, possession, transport, purchase and sale of intoxicating liquors." Further, Entry 51 of List II confers power upon the State to levy duties of excise on alcoholic liquors for human consumption.

6.2. This Court further observes that Article 47 of the Constitution of India, forming part of the Directive Principles of State Policy, casts a duty upon the State to endeavour to bring about prohibition of intoxicating drinks except for medicinal purposes. Thus, the constitutional scheme unmistakably places regulation of





liquor trade within the domain of State control and policy determination.

6.3. It is therefore clear that the field of excise, particularly with respect to liquor, is an area where the State enjoys regulatory privilege and wide discretion in determining the manner of grant, renewal and settlement of licences.

6.3.1. This Court finds that it is well settled that there exists no fundamental right to trade in liquor. The business of liquor is not protected under Article 19(1)(g) as an unrestricted commercial activity, but is treated as a privilege subject to complete control of the State.

6.3.2. At this juncture, reference may be made to the authoritative pronouncements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Khoday Distilleries Ltd. (Supra)** held as follows:

"62. We, therefore, hold that a citizen has no fundamental right to trade or business in liquor as beverage. The State can prohibit completely the trade or business in potable liquor since liquor as beverage is res extra commercium. The State may also create a monopoly in itself for trade or business in such liquor. The State can further place restrictions and limitations on such trade or business which may be in nature different from those on trade or business in articles res commercium. The view taken by this Court in K.K. Narula case¹⁷ as well as in the second Synthetics and Chemicals Ltd. case³⁰ is not contrary to the aforesaid view which has been consistently taken by this Court so far.

63. One of the incidental contentions, viz., whether the State can create monopoly in trade or business in potable





liquor is already answered above. This is apart from the fact that [Article 19\(6\)](#) provides for such monopoly in favour of the State even in trades and businesses which are legitimate. It is not, therefore, necessary to dilate upon this aspect any further.”

The Hon'ble Apex Court has categorically held that the State has exclusive privilege in respect of intoxicating liquors and no citizen has an inherent right to carry on such trade.

6.3.3. However, this Court also notes that though no fundamental right exists in liquor trade, State action in this domain is not immune from judicial review. The exercise of privilege must conform to constitutional standards of non-arbitrariness under Article 14. Thus, the limited question before this Court is whether the impugned clauses suffer from manifest arbitrariness or unconstitutional discrimination.

6.3.4. This Court observes that formulation of excise policy is a matter of executive wisdom involving fiscal considerations, administrative convenience, revenue optimization and regulatory strategy. Courts ordinarily refrain from interfering with policy decisions unless they are patently arbitrary, discriminatory or ultra vires statutory provisions.

6.3.5. This Court further observes that judicial review does not extend to examining the economic merits of policy choices or substituting judicial views for executive wisdom. The Court's role is confined to testing whether the policy transgresses constitutional boundaries.





6.4. This Court finds that Clause 2.2.6 and Clause 2.2.7 prescribe a condition that renewal of licences would be subject to at least 70% of eligible licensees in a district opting for renewal and fulfillment of cluster conditions.

6.4.1. The prescription of a threshold percentage is a policy mechanism intended to ensure substantial participation and stability in settlement before granting renewal benefits. Such a benchmark operates uniformly across all districts and applies equally to all licensees.

6.4.2. The mere fact that renewal rights of an individual licensee are linked to cluster-level or district-level participation does not ipso facto render the provision arbitrary. In fiscal and regulatory matters, the State is entitled to adopt collective mechanisms to secure revenue and administrative uniformity.

6.4.3. This Court finds no material on record to demonstrate that the 70% criterion is manifestly arbitrary or without rational nexus to the object of ensuring revenue stability and preventing fragmented settlement.

6.5. The introduction of cluster formation is a structural feature of the new Excise Policy aimed at rationalizing settlement of retail shops and avoiding fallow areas.

6.5.1. The policy expressly provides for grouping of contiguous shops between one and five units. The determination of such grouping is an administrative exercise falling within the competence of the Excise Commissioner.





6.5.2. The argument that cluster formation promotes monopolization or compels economic coercion cannot be accepted in absence of concrete material demonstrating discriminatory application. The mechanism applies uniformly and provides opportunity of renewal, limited tender and thereafter open e-auction.

6.5.3. This Court further finds that renewal is not an absolute right but subject to compliance with declared policy conditions. Section 37 of the Rajasthan Excise Act, 1950 clearly stipulates that no person has a claim to renewal of licence.

6.6. The petitioners have contended that even after achieving 70% renewal, clusters of renewed shops were allegedly clubbed with unrenewed shops and put to auction. However, from the material placed on record, it appears that the renewal applications were processed in accordance with Clause 2.2.8, and limited opportunity was granted for settlement of remaining shops within the cluster before proceeding to auction.

6.6.1. In absence of demonstrable mala fides or deviation from declared procedure, this Court does not find sufficient ground to hold the impugned action ultra vires the policy.

6.6.2. This Court notes that the petitioners participated in the renewal process after accepting the terms and conditions of the Excise Policy, including the stipulation regarding 70% district threshold and cluster settlement.





6.6.3. It is well settled that a party who participates in a process with knowledge of conditions cannot subsequently challenge those very conditions merely because the outcome is unfavourable.

6.7. Upon overall consideration, this Court finds that:

- The subject of liquor trade falls squarely within State legislative and executive competence;
- There exists no fundamental right to renewal of liquor licence;
- The impugned clauses operate uniformly and are part of a comprehensive excise policy;
- No manifest arbitrariness, hostile discrimination or constitutional infirmity has been demonstrated.

6.7.1. The petitioners have essentially sought judicial substitution of policy wisdom, which is impermissible within the limited scope of judicial review.

7. Consequently, for the reasons recorded hereinabove, this Court finds no merit in the present batch of writ petitions, and therefore, the instant writ petitions are accordingly **dismissed**. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J

SKant/-

