BLOGS

Case Analysis: State of Bombay v. FN Balsara

Ruchika Mohapatra · 16 May 2025

State of Bombay v. FN Balsara is a landmark case that deals with the doctrine of pith and substance. Read the detailed case analysis here!

Introduction

The case of State of Bombay v. FN Balsara is a landmark decision of the Supreme Court of India that delves into the scope of legislative competence under the Constitution, particularly focusing on the Seventh Schedule.

This case is crucial in understanding the connection between Fundamental Rights, particularly Article 19(1)(g), and the State's powers to impose reasonable restrictions under Article 19(6).

Facts of the Case

The State of Bombay passed the Bombay Prohibition Act, 1949, imposing a complete prohibition on the manufacture, sale, possession, and consumption of liquor, except for medicinal and certain other purposes.

FN Balsara, a resident of Bombay, challenged several provisions of the Act. He contended that these provisions violated his Fundamental Rights under Articles 14 (Right to Equality), 19(1)(f) (Right to Property), and 19(1)(g) (Right to Practice Any Profession or Trade).

He challenged the validity of the Act under the following grounds:

- The prohibition was claimed to be excessive and discriminatory.
- The Act interfered with interstate and international trade and commerce, violating Article 301.
- The Act was challenged for allegedly transgressing the State's legislative competence under Entry 31 of the Union List, which deals with imports and exports.

Issues Identified

1. Did the State Legislature have the competence to enact such provisions under the Bombay Prohibition Act, 1949?
2. Were the provisions of the Act violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(f), and 19(1)(g)?
3. Did the prohibition hinder free trade under Article 301 of the Constitution?
4. Could the court sever invalid provisions of the Act without striking down the entire legislation?

Read More: Doctrine of Pith and Substance

Judgement of the Case

The Supreme Court upheld certain provisions of the Bombay Prohibition Act, while striking down others.

The Court held that the State Legislature was competent to enact laws on intoxicating liquors under Entry 8 of the State List (List II) and Entry 51 of the Union List (List I). The prohibition on possession and sale of liquor for medicinal and industrial purposes was deemed valid as it was within the purview of the State's police powers.

The Court applied the **doctrine of pith and substance** to determine the true legislative intent of the Act.

The Court found that the primary object of the Bombay Prohibition Act was to regulate and prohibit the consumption of alcohol within the State, a matter squarely falling under Entry 8 of the State List.

The incidental impact on imported liquor (governed by the Union List) was held valid because the dominant legislative purpose was within the State's competence.

The Court also stated that while states cannot make laws on subjects reserved for the Central Government, they can create laws on matters within their authority, even if these laws indirectly affect central subjects. Such indirect impact does not make the law invalid as long as its main purpose lies within the state's jurisdiction **[Doctrine of Incidental Encroachment]**

The Court examined the restrictions under Article 19(6). It concluded that the prohibition on trade in intoxicating liquors, being inherently harmful, was in the public interest and did not violate Article 19(1)(g).

The Court applied the **doctrine of severability**, holding that the invalid provisions (e.g., certain rules about possession by individuals) could be severed without affecting the validity of the entire Act.

The Court further clarified that while the Act may affect commerce, restrictions on harmful substances like alcohol do not violate Article 301 if imposed in the interest of public health and morality.

The Court also rejected the claim of discrimination under Article 14, as the classification between harmful and non-harmful uses of liquor was reasonable.

Conclusion

The State of Bombay v. FN Balsara is a landmark case that highlights the balance between individual rights and the State's authority to enforce public welfare laws. By upholding the Bombay Prohibition Act, the Supreme Court affirmed the State's power to regulate harmful substances like alcohol under its police powers, provided the restrictions are reasonable and serve a larger public interest. The application of the doctrine of pith and substance in this case clarified that incidental encroachment on Union subjects does not invalidate a law if its primary intent falls within the State's legislative competence.

Read More: Doctrine of Severability