



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved On	21.11.2025
Pronounced On	17.02.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.SARAVANANW.P.No.17364 of 2025andW.M.P.Nos.19684 and 19685 of 2025

D.Bernand,
 Secretary,
 Central Paramilitary Force Ex-Serviceman
 Welfare Association (TN),
 No.24, Main Road,
 Rajiv Gandhi Nagar,
 Avadi, Chennai – 600 055.

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Union of India,
 Represented by Secretary to Government,
 Ministry of Home Affairs,
 North Block,
 New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Chairman,
 Welfare and Rehabilitation Board,
 Ministry of Home Affairs,
 Room No.204 and 205,
 II Floor, F-Wing,
 Nirman Bhawan,
 New Delhi – 110 001.



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

3. The Director General,
Central Industrial Security Force,
No.13, GCO Complex,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi – 110 003.
4. The Director General,
Central Reserve Police Force,
GCO Complex,
Block No.1,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi – 110 003.
5. The Director General,
Indo-Tibetan Border Police Force,
GCO Complex,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi – 110 003.
6. The Inspector General of Police,
Central Reserve Police Force,
Southern Sector,
Rd.No.10, C-MP / MLA Colony,
Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad – 500 033.
7. The Inspector General of Police,
Rapid Action Force,
East Block,
R.K.Puram,
Vasanth Vihar,
New Delhi – 110 066.
8. The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Group Centre,
Central Reserve Police Force,
Avadi,
Chennai – 600 055.



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

9.The Commandant,
105, Rapid Action Force,
Mahalingapuram Colony,
Vellalore,
Coimbatore – 641 111.

10.The Commandant,
45, Battalion Indo-Tibetan Border Police Force,
Idaiyapatti Camp Post,
South Amur,
Madurai – 625 110.

11.The Commissioner,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 005.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records on the file of 3rd Respondent in No.E-42099/Court-case-CLMS/welfare/2025/698, dated 27.03.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the 8th, 9th and 10th respondents to procure liquor based on FL-4A license already issued by the 11th respondent and to distribute to the Members of the Petitioner's Association.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Kannan Kumar

For Respondents :

For R1, R4, R6 to R9 : Ms.A.Anuradha
Central Government Standing Counsel



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY In this Writ Petition, the Petitioner has challenged the impugned Order dated 27.03.2025 passed by the 3rd Respondent / Director General, whereby the request of the Petitioner for sale and supply of liquor through Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) canteen under Centralized Liquor Management System (CLMS) has been denied to the Petitioner's Association.

2. Relevant portion of the impugned Order dated 27.03.2025 passed by the 3rd Respondent / Director General is reproduced below:-

“7. As regards the plea of the petitioners that all the retirees have to be treated uniformly and that CISF should share the data of retirees with the ITBP, the Nodal Agency of CLMS, it is reiterated that as per its consistent and long-standing policy of not issuing liquor to its personnel, the CLMS has not been introduced in CISF. The same decision was also conveyed to the ITBP (Nodal Agency), MHA and Welfare & Rehabilitation Board (WARB) vide CISF Directorate letter No. (16979-E) Dated 23.06.2021, UO No. (15747-E) Dated 28.05.2021 and letter No. (27551-E) Dated 25.01.2022 respectively. Here it is pertinent to mention that CISF is deployed for providing security to India's most critical infrastructure/facilities like nuclear installations, space establishments, airports, seaports, power plants, refineries, Parliament House Complex & other important Government Buildings, iconic heritage monuments like Taj Mahal, Delhi Metro, etc., where there is not only large public interface but also heightened threats being strategic and high-value infrastructure of the country. There is also threat to



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

the public safety as huge quantities of hazardous chemicals and inflammable gases are stored in many of these installations. Any security breach in these installations have national as well as international ramifications. Also, the size of the CISF Units range from 16 to 12463, at times its personnel staying in rented/hired accommodation interspersed along with the general public. Not issuing liquor to the CISF personnel is thus, a policy decision which has been taken, keeping in view the nature of its duties, responsibilities and varied formations unlike other forces who are organized on a fixed battalion pattern. In this context, any dilution in this policy is not desirable. Further, any extension of the facility to the retired personnel is likely to lead to competing demand from the serving personnel which will be prejudicial to the sensitive security duties of CISF

08. As regards the contention of the petitioners that the ITBP is ready to issue liquor to CISF retirees and the data of retirees of CISF should be shared with the ITBP, it is re-iterated that it will not only be against the long-standing policy of CISF, but also prejudicial to the security of strategic/high value installation of the country. As regards the plea that the ADG (HQr) ITBP, the Nodal Officer for implementation of CLMS not able to complete the assigned job for want of data from all CAPF, it is stated that ADG (HQr), ITBP has already been informed vide CISF Directorate letter No. (16979-E) Dated 23.06.2021 that the CISF may not be included in the CLMS proposal. The MHA has also been informed vide UO No. (15747-E) dated 28.05.2021 that there does not seem to be any genuine need or serious justification for the implementation of CLMS in CISF.

09. As regards the contentions of the petitioners that all the retirees should be treated uniformly and that it is policy decision taken by the Government of



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

India to provide liquor to the retired CAPF personnel and that the WARB has accordingly issued order regarding supply of liquor to the retired personnel and that the policy decision of the Government and unanimous decision of WARB in full coram cannot be diluted by a single unit, it is stated that the MHA vide its OM dated 23.11.2012 has given status of Ex-CAPF personnel to all the retired CAPF personnel and requested the State/UT Governments that they may extend suitable benefits to them on the lines of the benefits extended to the Ex-Servicemen of Defense Forces. But this direction of the MHA cannot be interpreted to indicate that it is mandatory for all the CAPFs to issue liquor to its personnel. As regards, the decision taken in the DsG meeting on Central Police Canteen (CPC) Services held on 27.05.2011 regarding introduction of liquor facilities in CPC, the same was examined in the CISF Directorate and it was finally decided not to implement the system in CISF. Subsequently, when it was proposed by the MHA to implement the Centralized Liquor Management System (CLMS) vide their ID dated 04.03.2021, it was informed to the MHA that CISF may not be included in the proposal vide CISF UO dated 28.05.2021. The same decision was also intimated to the ADG (HQR) ITBP, the Nodal Officer for CLMS vide letter dated 23.06.2021 that CISF may not be included in the proposal. Thus, CISF has taken a consistent stand on the issue and the same has also been informed to all the concerned including the MHA. Here it is also pertinent to mention that there are other uniformed organizations like Railway Protection Force (RPF) and State Police where liquor is not being issued either to the serving personnel or retired personnel due to the nature and sensitivities of their duties.

10. As regards the contention of the petitioners that in the interregnum period when the data is being entered in CLMS, the liquor should be issued to CISF



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

retirees from the Group Centre, CRPF Avadi; 105 RAF Coimbatore and 45 Bn ITBP Madurai on the basis of their ID cards, it is reiterated that CRPF Group Centre Pallipuram and others (Group Centre, CRPF Avadi; 105 Bn. RAF Coimbatore and 45 Bn ITBP Madurai) have unilaterally issued liquor cards to Ex-CISF personnel while the matter was sub-judice. Also, CISF was neither asked to provide any data nor did CISF provide any such data to any of the CAPF Canteens. Further, CISF was not consulted by CRPF, RAF or ITBP in this regard at any stage. As CISF was never a party to such an arrangement, it is not possible for CISF to issue any direction in this regard or to share any data with other CAPFs.

11. As regards the Interim Order Dated 27.09.2023 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras Bench at Madurai in WP (MD) No. 8462/2021 and Interim Order Dated 21.02.2024 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP (C) No. 6592/2024, it is stated that CISF was not a party to the above WPs. However, as directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala vide JO dated 06.03.2024 in WP (C) No. 10204/2023 filed by Ex-Insp/Exe Sree Kumar PP & 02 Ors; WP (C) No. 13691/2023 filed by General Secretary Babu P, CISF Ex-Service Welfare Association, Kalamassery (Kerala) and WP (C) No. 8183/2024 filed by Mani PK & 1 Or., the petitioners were personally heard on 28.05.2024 and their pleas thoroughly examined by DG, CISF. The order dated 28.06.2024 was accordingly issued that the request of the petitioners to introduce the names of retired personnel of CISF in the CLMS cannot be acceded to. Aggrieved with the above order, CISF Ex-Service Welfare Association represented by its General Secretary has filed WP (C) No. 26101/2024 before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala Ernakulam which is sub-judice.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

12. In view of above, the request of the petitioners seeking distribution of liquor to retired CISF personnel cannot be acceded to.

13. This is issued in due compliance of the Judgment Order dated 14.11.2024 pronounced by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in Writ Petition No. 24328/2023.

14. This disposes off the representation dated 09.12.2024 & 27.01.2025 submitted by the petitioners."

3. This is the second round of litigation. Earlier, an Order dated 22.07.2023 came to be passed by the Chairman, Office of the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Group Centre, Central Reserve Police Force, Avadi, Chennai-600 035. The said order was challenged in W.P.No.2438 of 2023. The Writ Petition was taken up for hearing on 14.11.2024, wherein the following order was passed:-

"3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that they may be granted liberty to file a fresh representation seeking distribution of liquor to the petitioner Association and would submit that under similar circumstances interim orders have been made by the High Court of Kerala and the Madurai Bench of this Court.

4. Mr. M. Karthikeyan, learned Senior Panel Counsel for the Respondents 1 to 10 would submit that if any such representation is filed, the same would be considered taking into account the materials placed including the order of the High Courts and orders would be passed in accordance with law within



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. In view thereof, the writ petition stands disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner seeking distribution of liquor to retired Central Armed Police Personnel through CLMS taking into account the materials placed including the orders of the High Courts and pass orders in accordance with law within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order after affording the petitioner a reasonable opportunity of hearing. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed"

4. It is pursuant to the aforesaid directions of this Court dated 14.11.2024 in WP.No.2438 of 2023, the impugned Order dated 27.03.2025 has been passed by the 3rd Respondent / Director General. At that stage, it was the contention of the Respondent earlier that no license was issued by the State Government under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act, 1935, for supply of liquor under Central Liquor Management System (CLMS).

5. Assailing the impugned decision, learned counsel for the Petitioner would rely on a recent decision of the Kerala High Court rendered on **21.10.2025** in **WP(C) No.26101 of 2024** in **CISF Ex-Service Welfare Association Vs. Union of India and others.**



6. In the case of **CISF Ex-Service Welfare Association Vs. Union of**

India and others in WP(C) No.26101 of 2024, in Paragraph Nos. 24 and 25,

the Kerala High Court held as under:-

"24. I find that when liquor is supplied through the canteens to retired personnel of other CAPFs, denial of the said benefits to the retired personnel of CISF is grossly discriminatory. In Ext.P17 judgment in W.P.(C) No. 10204/2023, this Court directed the Director General of CISF to reconsider the claims of retired CISF personnel so as to enable them to continue to obtain the benefit of purchase of liquor as has been done in the past. Thereupon, the 4th respondent passed Ext.P18 order dated 28.06.2024. In Ext.P17 judgment, this Court had observed that one fails to understand why the CISF personnel stand on a different footing in the matter of access to liquor. Nevertheless, in Ext.P18, the 4th respondent held that it would be against the long standing policy of CISF and would lead to similar demands from the serving personnel, which if implemented, would adversely impact the security of critical infrastructure/establishments guarded by CISF.

25. The aforesaid reasoning cannot stand the scrutiny of law as the different approach sought to be made by the 4th respondent is palpably unsustainable. Firstly, all the wings of Central Armed Police Forces are discharging duties which can be described as sensitive in view of the national security requirements. It cannot be said that CISF personnel require a different yardstick in the matter of security and discipline. Denial of the benefit to the retired CISF personnel offends Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Secondly, the petitioners are retired CISF personnel and supply of liquor through canteens to retired CAPF personnel cannot impact the discipline of the Force and that too, of CISF alone. The further reason that similar demand will arise from other



sectors cannot be a reason to discriminate the petitioners. Ext. P18 order therefore cannot be sustained."

7. Finally, the Kerala High Court in Paragraph No.26 observed as under:-

"26. In the circumstances of the case, Ext.P18 is set aside. It is declared that retired CISF personnel are entitled for purchase of liquor through CLMS System from CRPF Liquor Canteen or any other Liquor Canteens of CAPFs. The 4th respondent is directed to share data of retired CISF personnel to Liquor Canteens of other CAPFs as per CLMS requirements. Respondents 2 and 5 are directed to continue sale of liquor to the retired CISF personnel through CLMS System.

Writ Petitions are disposed as above."

8. Learned Central Government Standing Counsel for the Respondents 1, 4, 6 to 9 submitted that license had been granted during the period August, 2023 and therefore nothing survives insofar as the challenge to the Order dated 22.07.2023 was concerned.

9. As far as the second prayer namely for a direction to the Distribution of liquor for Members of the Petitioner's Association under the auspices of the Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) is concerned, it was



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

submitted that there was a direction to the Respondents to consider the same and to pass appropriate orders.

10. I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Central Government Standing Counsel for the Respondents 1, 4, 6 to 9.

11. It is noticed that in the impugned order itself, it has been stated that since the issue was sub-judice before the Kerala High Court in **CISF Ex-Service Welfare Association** (cited *supra*), no decision can be arrived at.

12. The Kerala High Court in **CISF Ex-Service Welfare Association** (cited *supra*) has now answered the issue in favour of the Petitioner by its Order dated **21.10.2025**.

13. As per Clause (2) to Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the power conferred by Clause (1) to the Writ Courts to issue directions, orders or writs to any Government, authority or person may also be exercised by any High Court exercising jurisdiction in relation to the territories within which the cause of action, wholly or in part, arises for the exercise of such power,



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

notwithstanding that the seat of such Government or Authority or the Residence of such person is not within its territories.

14. In Paragraph No.22, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kusum Ingots and Alloys Limited Vs. Union of India and another**, (2004) 6 SCC 254, held as under:-

“22. The Court must have the requisite territorial jurisdiction. An order passed on a writ petition questioning the constitutionality of a parliamentary Act, whether interim or final keeping in view the provisions contained in clause (2) of Article 226 of the Constitution of India, will have effect throughout the territory of India subject of course to the applicability of the Act.”

15. In Paragraph No.27, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kusum Ingots and Alloys Limited** (cited *supra*) further observed as under:-

“27. When an order, however, is passed by a court or tribunal or an executive authority whether under provisions of a statute or otherwise, a part of cause of action arises at that place. Even in a given case, when the original authority is constituted at one place and the appellate authority is constituted at another, a writ petition would be maintainable at both the places. In other words, as order of the appellate authority constitutes a part of cause of action, a writ petition would be maintainable in the High Court within whose jurisdiction it is situate having regard to



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

the fact that the order of the appellate authority is also required to be set aside and as the order of the original authority merges with that of the appellate authority.”

16. Though the above principle in Paragraph No.22 has been rendered in the context of challenge to the provisions of a Central Enactment (Parliamentary Act) quay both interim and / or final order(s) of the Writ Court will have a binding effect throughout the territory of India in view of Article 226(2) of the Constitution of India, of course subject to the applicability of the Act.

17. Thus, the decision of the Kerala High Court rendered in the context of a Central Enactment or the policy issue which are to apply Pan India and is binding on the authorities and therefore the Respondent cannot ignore the same.

18. Therefore, this Writ Petition deserves to be allowed in the light of the decision of the Kerala High Court following the above ratio of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kusum Ingots and Alloys Limited Vs. Union of India and another**, (2004) 6 SCC 254.



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

19. That apart, the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) under the Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi includes Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) apart from Border Security Force (BSF), Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), Indo Tibetan Border Police (ITBP), Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB) as they function under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs at New Delhi.

20. The e-Awas Portal of the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) has recognized Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) also under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA), New Delhi.

21. The Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) is deployed in aid of civil power in matters relating to maintenance of law and order, internal security and counterinsurgency and is headed by Officer of DGP Rank. Similarly, the Indo Tibetan Border Police (ITBP) as also Border Security Force (BSF) and Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB) are meant for specific purposes. As far as the Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) is concerned, it meant for giving security to Industrial Establishments.



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

22. Coming to the Central Liquor Management System (CLMS), each Department has to implement the Central Liquor Management System (CLMS). The Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) has to appoint a nodal officer to oversee the implementation of Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) in each of the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) so that the retired and serving personnel of any Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) can purchase or procure liquor from any Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) liquor canteens at concessional rates.

23. Literature in the Web Portals / Internet indicates that the Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) have been developed in PHP with MySQL as Database Solutions. The application is intended to such as Border Security Force (BSF), Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), Indo Tibetan Border Police (ITBP), Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB) to purchase liquor from any Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) liquor canteens through integration of Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) application of all Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs). Each force is expected to develop its own Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) and its central server which is required to be integrated with all Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) applications for payment gateway.



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

WEB COPY

24. The discrimination has arisen only on account of non-implementation of Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) portal as it has not been implemented by Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) if the retired personnel of Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), Border Security Force (BSF), Indo Tibetan Border Police (ITBP) and Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB) are entitled to buy liquor through any Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) liquor canteens, it remains unanswered as to why the Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) has been left out from the purview of the Central Liquor Management System (CLMS).

25. Thus, it is the obligation of the Respondent to enable the procurement of liquor by making the above application applicable for its retired personnel. There cannot be any discrimination between any of the retired personnel of the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs).

26. I therefore see no reason why the retired personnel from Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) should be discriminated and denied the benefit of Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) as all of them are under the Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs).



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

27. Therefore, the Respondent is directed to take steps to adopt Central Liquor Management System (CLMS) and implement the same on par with other Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

28. This Writ Petition is allowed with the above observations. No costs. Connected Writ Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

17.02.2026

Neutral Citation: Yes / No

arb

To:

1.The Union of India,
Represented by Secretary to Government,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Chairman,
Welfare and Rehabilitation Board,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
Room No.204 and 205,
II Floor, F-Wing,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

18/21



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

3. The Director General,
Central Industrial Security Force,
No.13, GCO Complex,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi – 110 003.
4. The Director General,
Central Reserve Police Force,
GCO Complex,
Block No.1,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi – 110 003.
5. The Director General,
Indo-Tibetan Border Police Force,
GCO Complex,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi – 110 003.
6. The Inspector General of Police,
Central Reserve Police Force,
Southern Sector,
Rd.No.10, C-MP / MLA Colony,
Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad – 500 033.
7. The Inspector General of Police,
Rapid Action Force,
East Block,
R.K.Puram,
Vasanth Vihar,
New Delhi – 110 066.
8. The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Group Centre,
Central Reserve Police Force,
Avadi,
Chennai – 600 055.



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

9.The Commandant,
105, Rapid Action Force,
Mahalingapuram Colony,
Vellalore,
Coimbatore – 641 111.

10.The Commandant,
45, Battalion Indo-Tibetan Border Police Force,
Idaiyapatti Camp Post,
South Amur,
Madurai – 625 110.

11.The Commissioner,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 005.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17364 of 2025

C.SARAVANAN, J.

arb

Pre-delivery Order in W.P.No.17364 of 2025

17.02.2026