



KAMARAJ IAS ACADEMY
Only IAS Academy by Grandson of "Perunthalsivam Kamarajar"

Lottery Regulation in India: Constitutional Framework, Judicial Position and the Debate over Regulation versus Prohibition

Published On: 30-09-2026

Recent Developments:

- The debate over **lottery regulation in India** has gained renewed attention because strict prohibition can coexist with continued demand through illegal lotteries, matka, satta and offshore betting platforms, while legal lotteries can generate public revenue and support regulated livelihoods.
- The present framework therefore raises an important governance question: how can **consumer protection, prevention of gambling-related harm, fiscal interests and regulatory accountability** be balanced without allowing illegal markets to expand?
- The taxation framework has also changed significantly. From **22 September 2025**, specified actionable claims including **lotteries, betting, gambling, horse racing, casinos and online money gaming** attract **40% GST**.
- The Supreme Court has previously recognised lotteries as **actionable claims** for GST purposes. In *Skill Lotto Solutions Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India (2020)*, the Court upheld the statutory framework treating lottery as goods for GST purposes.

Constitutional and Statutory Architecture:

Distribution of Legislative Powers:

- The constitutional framework distributes legislative competence over lotteries and gambling between the Union and the States.
- **Union List, Entry 40:** Parliament has exclusive competence over **lotteries organised by the Government of India or the Government of a State**.
- **State List, Entry 34:** State Legislatures have competence over **betting and gambling**, subject to the constitutional distribution of legislative powers.
- The earlier reference to **State List Entry 62** as a source of State taxation over lotteries is no longer applicable because the **101st Constitutional Amendment** altered the taxation framework; GST now governs the taxation of lottery supplies.

Lotteries Regulation Act, 1998:

- The **Lotteries (Regulation) Act, 1998** provides the principal central statutory framework for State-organised lotteries and lays down conditions governing their organisation and conduct.
- The Act requires State-organised lotteries to satisfy prescribed conditions relating to **government responsibility, ticket printing, draws and prize distribution**.
- **Section 5** permits a State Government to prohibit the sale of tickets of a lottery organised by another State within its territory, subject to the statutory framework.

Kamaraj IAS Academy

Plot A P.127, AF block, 6 th street, 11th Main Rd, Shanthi Colony, Anna Nagar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600040

Phone: **044 4353 9988 / 98403 94477 / Whatsapp : 09710729833**

- The Act therefore creates a regulatory structure in which **State Governments organise lotteries**, while the Union and States exercise different regulatory powers.

Online Lottery Regulation:

- The **Lotteries (Regulation) Rules, 2010** provide additional safeguards for online lottery operations, including requirements concerning lottery software and restrictions on unauthorised online sales.
- Digital lottery systems create additional regulatory challenges involving **identity verification, payment monitoring, software integrity, geolocation, audit trails and cross-border transactions**.
- Effective regulation therefore requires coordination between State authorities, financial regulators, technology agencies and law-enforcement institutions.

Judicial Jurisprudence:

Gambling as Res Extra Commercium:

- In **State of Bombay v. R.M.D. Chamarbaugwala (1957)**, the Supreme Court held that gambling is **res extra commercium**, meaning it falls outside the constitutionally protected sphere of ordinary trade and commerce.
- The Court held that gambling activities do not receive protection as a trade or business under **Article 19(1)(g)** and are not protected as trade and commerce under **Article 301**.
- This principle is significant because operators cannot automatically claim that restrictions on gambling violate the fundamental freedom to practise a profession or carry on trade or business.

Regulation and Inter-State Lotteries:

- In **B.R. Enterprises v. State of Uttar Pradesh (1999)**, the Supreme Court examined the power of States to restrict lotteries organised by other States under the 1998 regulatory framework.
- The judgment addressed the relationship between **State autonomy, inter-State lottery sales and the statutory power to prohibit lotteries**.
- The case is important for understanding the constitutional balance between the Union's role concerning State-organised lotteries and the States' regulatory authority over gambling and sales within their territories.

Lottery as Goods under GST:

- In **Skill Lotto Solutions Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India (2020)**, the Supreme Court upheld the inclusion of lottery within the GST framework as an actionable claim treated as goods for taxation purposes.
- The judgment recognised that Parliament had specifically brought **lottery, betting and gambling** within the taxable category of actionable claims under GST legislation.
- The case demonstrates that an activity may remain subject to restrictions under gambling law while simultaneously being brought within a **taxation framework**.

Major Concerns in Lottery Regulation:

Socio-Economic Risks:

- Lotteries can disproportionately affect **low-income households**, particularly where frequent purchases, instant-win formats and jackpot-based advertising encourage repeated participation.
- Gambling-related harm may include **compulsive behaviour, loss-chasing, household debt and financial distress**, creating a consumer-protection challenge for regulators.
- Regulation therefore needs to address both the legality of the activity and the behavioural risks associated with excessive participation.

Illegal and Offshore Markets:

Kamaraj IAS Academy

Plot A P.127, AF block, 6 th street, 11th Main Rd, Shanthi Colony, Anna Nagar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600040

Phone: **044 4353 9988 / 98403 94477** / Whatsapp : **09710729833**

- Complete prohibition does not necessarily eliminate demand for gambling-related products because consumers may shift towards **illegal lotteries, matka, satta and offshore betting platforms**.
- Illegal operators generally operate outside formal systems of **age verification, financial auditing, responsible-gambling safeguards, taxation and grievance redressal**.
- The growth of digital payments and offshore platforms makes enforcement more complex because operators, payment intermediaries and users may be located in different jurisdictions.

Revenue and Fiscal Federalism:

- State-organised lotteries can generate **tax and non-tax revenue**, creating a fiscal incentive for some States to retain regulated lotteries.
- The present GST framework imposes **40% GST** on specified actionable claims including lotteries, betting and gambling, making taxation an important component of the regulatory architecture.
- Lottery policy therefore intersects with **fiscal federalism**, because regulatory choices can influence State revenues while taxation is governed substantially through the GST framework.

Livelihood Concerns:

- Legal lottery distribution can provide income to **small vendors and economically vulnerable groups**, particularly where States reserve distribution opportunities for registered vendors.
- Sudden prohibition can therefore affect legitimate livelihoods even though the underlying activity carries gambling-related risks.
- A regulatory framework must distinguish between protecting vulnerable workers and encouraging excessive gambling participation.

International and Domestic Regulatory Approaches:

Controlled Legality:

- Different jurisdictions adopt different approaches ranging from prohibition to **strictly regulated legality**, with variations in State ownership, licensing, taxation, advertising controls and consumer safeguards.
- Regulated models generally seek to bring operators within an identifiable legal framework so that transactions can be monitored and unlawful activity can be detected.

Public-Operator Model:

- A **State-operated or State-controlled model** can provide greater direct governmental oversight over ticket issuance, draws, prize distribution and revenue utilisation.
- Private entities may still provide technological, logistical or distribution services subject to contractual and regulatory controls.
- Independent auditing becomes important where the same governmental institution is responsible for both operating and supervising a lottery.

Kerala Model:

- Kerala's State lottery system provides an example of linking a regulated lottery with **social-welfare expenditure**.
- The State operates lotteries through its governmental lottery department and uses lottery-related revenues within the broader framework of State finances and welfare programmes.
- The model is relevant to UPSC because it raises the question of whether potentially harmful activities should be regulated and taxed with **earmarked public-interest objectives** rather than being left entirely to illegal markets.

Measures for a More Accountable Regulatory Framework:

Strengthening Inter-State Regulation:

- The legal framework should ensure that restrictions on lotteries from other States are **clear, transparent and non-discriminatory**, while respecting the statutory powers available to destination States.
- Greater coordination between States can reduce regulatory arbitrage in which operators shift activities to jurisdictions with weaker enforcement.

Independent Technical and Financial Audits:

- Lottery systems should undergo **independent audits** covering draw procedures, random-number generation, ticket databases, cybersecurity, payment systems and prize distribution.
- Separation between the agency operating the lottery and the institution responsible for auditing it can improve **institutional accountability**.
- Digital lottery platforms should maintain tamper-resistant audit trails to facilitate investigation of irregularities.

Consumer Protection:

- Regulators can introduce **age verification, purchase limits, responsible-gambling warnings and restrictions on misleading advertisements**.
- Credit-based lottery purchases can be restricted to reduce the risk of excessive borrowing and loss-chasing.
- Advertising should clearly communicate that winning depends on chance and should not create misleading expectations of guaranteed financial gain.

Combating Illegal Digital Gambling:

- Enforcement agencies should strengthen mechanisms for identifying and blocking **illegal offshore gambling platforms**, unlawful payment channels and money-laundering networks.
- Coordination between financial-intelligence, cybercrime, taxation and law-enforcement authorities is necessary because illegal gambling increasingly operates through digital ecosystems.
- Cross-border cooperation is particularly important where operators are located outside India's jurisdiction.

UPSC Relevance:

GS-II: Constitution and Governance:

- **Seventh Schedule:** Distribution of legislative competence over lotteries, betting and gambling.
- **Article 19(1)(g):** Freedom to practise any profession or carry on any occupation, trade or business, subject to constitutional limitations; gambling does not receive the same protection as lawful trade.
- **Article 301:** Freedom of trade, commerce and intercourse throughout India; gambling has been held outside its protected scope.
- **Federalism:** Interaction between Union competence over State-organised lotteries and State competence over betting and gambling.
- **Governance:** Regulatory capacity, inter-State coordination, digital enforcement and consumer protection.

GS-III: Economy and Internal Security:

- **Taxation:** GST treatment of lotteries and other specified actionable claims.
- **Fiscal Federalism:** Revenue implications of State-regulated lotteries.
- **Digital Economy:** Offshore betting platforms, payment gateways and cyber-enabled financial crime.
- **Financial Crime:** Illegal gambling can create channels for fraud, tax evasion and money laundering.
- **Social Sector:** Use of regulated lottery revenues for healthcare and welfare expenditure.

Value Addition for UPSC:

Key Constitutional and Judicial Takeaways:

- **Union List, Entry 40:** Covers lotteries organised by the Government of India or a State Government.
- **State List, Entry 34:** Covers betting and gambling.
- **Article 19(1)(g):** Does not provide constitutional protection to gambling as an ordinary trade or business.
- **Article 301:** Does not constitutionally protect gambling as trade and commerce.
- **Lotteries (Regulation) Act, 1998:** Provides the principal statutory framework for regulation of State-organised lotteries.
- **R.M.D. Chamarbaugwala, 1957:** Established the principle of **res extra commercium** for gambling activities.
- **B.R. Enterprises, 1999:** Examined State restrictions concerning lotteries organised by other States.
- **Skill Lotto Solutions, 2020:** Upheld the GST treatment of lottery as an actionable claim included within the taxable category of goods.
- **GST from 22 September 2025:** Specified actionable claims including **lottery, betting and gambling** attract 40% GST.
- **Mains Analytical Link:** Lottery regulation demonstrates the tension between **individual choice, consumer protection, public morality, State revenue, federalism and enforcement against illegal markets.**
- **Balanced Policy Framework:** The central governance challenge is not merely whether lotteries should exist, but how a legally authorised activity can be subjected to **transparent regulation, independent oversight, responsible advertising, consumer safeguards, effective taxation and strong action against illegal operators.**