

Decision Number **17/OFF/004/2022**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act  
2012 ('the Act')

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of an application by **ROUTE 2 JOY  
LIQUOR STORE LIMITED** for the  
renewal of an off-licence pursuant to  
s.127 of the Act in respect of premises  
situated at 47 Ashworth Street, Tokoroa  
trading as "Liquor Hut Tokoroa."

**BEFORE THE SOUTH WAIKATO DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE**

Chairman: Murray Clearwater  
Member: Gary Petley  
Member: Hamish Dane

**HEARING** at Tokoroa on 23 May 2023

**APPEARANCES**

Mr. Matthew Gordon – for **Route 2 Joy Liquor Store Limited** ("the applicant")  
Mr. Kulwant Singh Sandhar- for the applicant  
Julie Smale – South Waikato Chief Licensing Inspector ("the Inspector") in opposition  
Mrs. Nicole Zeier- for the Medical Officer of Health ("MOoH") – in opposition  
Ms. Adesanya- to assist the MOoH.  
Sergeant Gregory Weston- for the Police (Alcohol Harm Reduction Officer) in opposition  
Senior Constable Stein Thomas- to assist the Police.  
Sergeant Richard Wilson- witness for the Police  
Sergeant Wayne Dickson-witness for the Police (evidence handed up by consent)  
Constable Gurwinder Nagla- witness for the Police  
Ms. Kahumauku Cremins- witness for the Police

**RESERVED DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**Introduction**

1. By an application dated the 26<sup>th</sup> of May 2022, the applicant has applied for the renewal of the off-licence 17/OFF/004/2022 issued in the name of Route 2 Joy Liquor Store Limited. It was duly advertised and reported on by the agencies.
2. No public objections were received, however adverse reports were received from the Police and the Medical Officer of Health, and ultimately the Inspector.

3. The Police opposition related to a trail of alcohol purchases from the store over the last five months where those persons were apprehended moments later and found to be in varying states of intoxication. Subsequent enquiries were thwarted when CCTV footage was sought but not provided by the stores staff in a timely manner. Additional enquiries found a trail perceived training and rostering deficiencies at the store.
4. The MOoH opposed the renewal citing the vulnerable nature of the Tokoroa population and the apparent understaffing of the store and the high risk products being offered for sale.
5. We note that Tokoroa is a vulnerable community with several social deprivation indicators well below the average for other New Zealand rural towns.
6. The Inspector opposed the renewal on similar grounds and said that the applicant had failed to properly appoint and notify manager appointments.

### **Preliminary Matter**

7. A confidentiality order was sought pursuant to Section 203 (3) & (5) of the Act on the 4 CCTV clips the Police intended to produce.
8. The reason/s for this confidentiality ruling was to protect the privacy of the persons depicted in those video clips who are not direct parties to this application.
9. The order was granted, and the members of the public were removed from the hearing room while the clips were viewed by the Committee. Only generic comments will be made on the content of that video evidence.

### **Applicant's Evidence**

10. In November 2022, Matthew Gordon was appointed as one of 3 directors of the applicant company.
11. He opened the case and told us that he was unaware at the time of his appointment to **Route 2 Joy Liquor Store Limited** that the renewal had been opposed.
12. He was involved in another company, **Big Tree Investments Limited**, that was applying for a new OFF Licence for vacant premises on Balmoral Drive. He said he suggested to the group shareholders that he, and his business colleague Shannon Jenkins, should be appointed to **Route 2 Joy Liquor Store Limited** to bring his business acumen to the business.
13. He acknowledged that his experience lies in on-licensed premises and that he was unprepared for the specialist knowledge needed to operate a bottle store. He intended

to rely on the knowledge and skills of Mr. Kulwant Sandhar who has 8 years' experience working and managing off-licensed premises.

14. Over the years, he has learnt some hard lessons about verbal training methods and records and the company has since committed to producing policies and procedures for Liquor Hut and delivering sound training to all staff.
15. He produced evidence of those policies and training records that have been put in place since his involvement in the company.
16. He accepted that the company had failed to properly notify manager appointments and terminations. He also acknowledged the criticism about the lack of certificated managers and stated that despite their best efforts they were still struggling to attract suitable candidates to their Tokoroa store. He confirmed that currently they only have one certificated manager and one Temporary Manager and if necessary Kulwant Sandhar and Gurnek Singh Brar, who are both certificated managers within the larger Group, will stand in.
17. He was asked why he had been silent on the forthcoming Police evidence of 10 drink drive apprehensions coming from the store over the last 5 months. He said they accepted the number of apprehensions but queried whether all purchasers would have been observably affected by alcohol.
18. Mr. Sandhar had not told him Police were seeking CCTV footage. During questioning he agreed that was an error on Mr. Sandhar part. He agreed that the video footage could have exonerated his staff or provided evidence of intoxicated persons being sold alcohol.
19. He was congratulated by the Committee on the comprehensive Incident Book that they run at the store, but he agreed its contents were sobering in that staff were regularly having confrontations with customers when they arrived without ID or were intoxicated.
20. He agreed that the current staff are working long hours. He agreed that making single sales when some very vulnerable members of the community lived nearby was 'risky' but said it could be managed with good policies.
21. Kulwant Sandhar spoke to us and outlined his experience in off-licensed premises. He is a director in several companies that operate other Liquor Hut stores.
22. He said he had welcomed the input of Matt Gordon and Shannon Jenkins and believed they would add value to the business. He said they had good staffing systems in place.
23. He outlines the processes and systems that they have in place such as the "CCTV that is accessible at all times." He did not believe the store had a more than minor effect on the amenity and good order of the area, even though the Police were going to tell us about 10 drink drive apprehensions from the store in the last 5 months.

24. He did acknowledge the difficulties in attracting staff and said that they would keep trying to attract the right type of workers for the business. He assured the Committee that they would only employ off licence experienced staff and would not use staff from their related on-licensed premises in the town.
25. He too, accepted that his staff did work long shifts but said they were entitled to shut the door and take a break if they were working alone. He said he was monitored their workload to ensure they were coping. We heard later from an ex-employee that she had never shut the door to take a break and often had her lunch at the counter between serving customers.
26. He said they have reduced the range of single serve cans in an attempt to deter customers from the adjacent holiday camp that accommodates emergency housing people that regularly cause problems in the store. He was asked what benefits came to the town by the presence of the bottle store. He could only offer "employment opportunities."
27. He too failed to comment on the 10 drink drive apprehensions involving customers of Liquor Hut. When questioned he said he only became aware on the 15<sup>th</sup> of March 2023 that the Police were making enquiries about the purchases and had made a request for CCTV footage. He believed that Senior Constable Thomas had issued them with a warning and that was the end of the matter. He denied that they had deliberately withheld the footage from the Police.
28. When closing the case for the applicant Mr. Gordon said the company was suitable to be granted a renewal but acknowledged the environment they were in was challenging and that they needed more certificated managers to work at this store and for the proposed new one on Balmoral Drive.
29. He was invited to put on the table any concessions for the Committee to reduce the risks of further harm and breaches of the Act should a renewal be considered. After consulting with Mr. Sandhar, he said they would accept a truncated renewal during which time they would engage more certificated managers and arrange additional competent external training for the team.
30. He said they would remove all the 500ml cans of high strength beers such as Kingfisher Strong and Hagen and the 1250ml range of Nitro Vodka with Guarana. He said they would no longer sell any single sales of mainstream alcoholic product not intended by the manufacturer to be sold as singles. In future they would be clipped up, and sold and 4's or 6's.
31. The 'concessions' were significant and were helpful to the Committee when we evaluated the revised application as a whole.

## **Inspector's Evidence**

32. In her updated report, dated 23 April 2023 the Inspector reported that the application was lodged before the expiry date of 28 June 2022 however, she was concerned about the revolving status of directors and staff and about the matters to be raised in the Police Report. She believed that the applicant was spreading its management and staff too thinly to be able to comply with the provisions of the Act.
33. In closing she said that the application, as originally presented, was unlikely to help in achieving the Object of the Act.

## **Medical Officer of Health Evidence**

34. Delegated Officer for the MOoH, Mrs. Nicole Zeier, spoke about the matters in opposition raised by her former colleague, Ms. Ashleigh Mail. Ms. Mail had conducted a 'site visit' of the premises in July 2022 and took photos and asked to see documents required to be held by the licensee.
35. On 8 May 2023 Mrs. Zeier conducted another site visit and produced to the Committee photos of training records and rosters. Fortunately, the Police who do have powers of entry and to demand the production of documents produced a similar suite of documents.
36. We reminded the MOoH delegated officer that Parliament specifically prescribed powers of entry to the Police and the Inspector to enter licensed premises and examine and take copies of any documents required to be held under the Act. Any site visits undertaken by the MOoH to ascertain if public health matters are being complied with must be undertaken by way of informed consent if there is to be any evidential value and weight to be put on their findings.
37. As stated above, in paragraph 32, the evidential status of the MOoH findings is not in question in this case, as it was also contained in the Police evidence.
38. In closing, Ms. Adesanya standing in for Mrs. Zeier, remained opposed to the renewal but did ask if there was to be a renewal approved, that there be a condition imposed relating to restricting single sales of alcohol from the store.

## **Police Evidence**

39. Sergeant Weston called three sworn Police officers who outlined the apprehension of 10 alcohol impaired drivers over the last 5 months. They had observed customers leaving the store with alcohol purchases and when the drivers were stopped moments later, they had blown excess breath readings from 450mcg of alcohol per litre of breath to over 1300 mcg of alcohol per litre of breath.

40. He then called Senior Constable Stein Thomas who outlined his involvement with the company directors and staff in regard to a 17 year old apprehended in April 2022 for purchasing alcohol from the store.
41. Senior Constable Thomas also told us of his attempts to secure the CCTV recordings of 4 times and dates when some of the sales to intoxicated person took place.
42. Despite numerous attempts and assurances from staff, and Kulwant Sandhar, and even after an Order to Produce was delivered from this Committee, the applicant failed to provide the footage and has advised us that the footage has now been deleted from the hard drive as it is apparently only held for 6 weeks. Section 267 of the Act carries a requirement, and a finable offence, for not providing information when required to do so (by a constable or an inspector).
43. The Police then called Kahumauku Amedia Cremins. She told us she worked with the applicants for several months in 2022. She said the rosters and pay slips were haphazard and she had called the Police to the store many times for fights outside the store and threats from and between customers mainly from the nearby emergency housing.
44. She had held fears for her safety working alone and had a concealed weapon at the store. In the early days cash was just stashed in a bag until it was collected once a week. There is a safe there now, so the cash is secure. She spoke fondly of Kulwant Sandhar who she said was always kind and friendly towards her. She left her employment there in August 2022 to pursue other interests. She produced a video clip of an intending female customer urinating in the store car park prior to trying to enter the store. This clip and the ones from the Police of a DIC apprehension were declared confidential by the committee and are not to be published in any format.

## Relevant legislation

45. Section 3 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (“the Act”) states the purpose of the Act as follows:
  - (1) *The purpose of Parts 1 and 3 and the schedules of this Act is, for the benefit of the community as a whole, –*
    - (a) *to put in place a new system of control over the sale and supply of alcohol, with the characteristics stated in subsection (2); and*
    - (b) *to reform more generally the law relating to the sale, supply, and consumption of alcohol so that its effect and administration help to achieve the object of this Act.*
  - (2) *The characteristics of the new system are that–*
    - (a) *It is reasonable; and*
    - (b) *Its administration helps to achieve the object of this Act.*
46. Section 4 states the object of the Act as follows:
  - (1) *The object of this Act is that –*
    - (a) *The sale, supply, and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and*

*responsibly; and*  
(b) *The harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised.*

(2) *For the purposes of subsection (1), the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol includes –*

(a) *Any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behaviour, illness, or injury, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol; and*

(b) *Any harm to society generally or the community, directly or indirectly caused, or directly and indirectly contributed to, by any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behaviour, illness, or injury of a kind described in paragraph (a).*

39. Section 131 of the Act provides the criteria that the licensing committee must have regard to in deciding whether to renew a licence as follows:

*(a) the matters set out in paragraphs (a) to (g), (j), and (k) of section 105(1):*

*(b) whether (in its opinion) the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be increased, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of a refusal to renew the licence:*

*(c) any matters dealt with in any report from the Police, and inspector, or a Medical Officer of Health made by virtue of section 129:*

*(d) the manner in which the applicant has sold (or, as the case may be, sold and supplied), displayed, advertised, or promoted alcohol.*

### **Criteria to be considered.**

40. The Act provides that in deciding whether to renew a licence, the licensing committee must have regard to the matters contained in section 131 and 132 of the Act. These are:

### **Section 105(1)(a) The Object of the Act**

41. Section 105(1)(a) of the Act requires that the licensing committee must have regard to the Object of the Act and decisions of higher courts have said that we must measure the other criteria for renewal against the aim of helping to achieve the Object of the Act.

42. Following the recent Supreme Court decision, we are also required to ‘read together’ both the **Purpose and the Object of the Act**. Notably, and very relevantly, to this case, Section 3 talks about the administration of the Act should be “**for the benefit of the community as a whole.**”

### **Section 105(1)(b) Suitability of the Applicant**

42. Section 105(1)(b) provides that the applicant must be a suitable person to hold an off-licence. In this regard, the suitability of the applicant is challenged by the agencies.

Suitability has been defined in many judicial forums.

In Page v Police (unreported) HC Christchurch AP 84/98 24 July 1998<sup>1</sup>, Panckhurst J stated:

***“Such suitability is not established in a vacuum but in the context of a particular case”.***

In New Zealand Police v Casino Bar No. 3 Limited CIV 2012-485-1491; [2013] NZHC 44<sup>2</sup> the High Court treated suitability as a broad concept.

***The assessment of it includes the character and reputation of the applicant, its previous operation of premises, its proposals as to how the premises will operate, its honesty, its previous convictions and other matters. It also includes matters raised in reports under s.11 (now 103 under SASSA) of the Act. (our emphasis)***

In Re Sheard [1996] 1 NZLR 751<sup>3</sup> Holland J said :

***“Obviously, the applicant’s past conduct will be very relevant to the consideration of suitability. The real issue is whether the evidence of that past conduct will indicate a lack of confidence that the applicant will properly carry out the obligations of a licensee.***

And again, in Sheard...***“The real test is whether the character of the applicant has been shown to be such, that he is not likely to carry out, properly, the responsibilities that go with the holding of a licence.”***

The High Court in Christchurch Medical Officer of Health v J & G Vaudrey Ltd<sup>4</sup> confirmed there is no presumption that a new licence or renewal of an existing licence will be granted: ***Thus, when the relevant body receives an application, they must consider it against s 105 in deciding “whether to issue a licence”. There is no presumptive position, and certainly no foregone conclusion. I think the reality of the position is that if the object of the Act cannot be achieved by the application, then it cannot succeed.***

43. The Committee must undertake an evaluative approach and adopt a merits-based assessment of the application. We determine our position on the suitability of the applicant later in our decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> Page v Police (unreported) HC Christchurch AP 84/98 24 July 1998

<sup>2</sup> New Zealand Police v Casino Bar No. 3 Limited CIV 2012-485-1491; [2013] NZHC 44

<sup>3</sup> Re Sheard [1996] 1 NZLR 751

<sup>4</sup> Christchurch Medical Officer of Health v J & G Vaudrey Ltd



### **Section 105(1)(c) Relevant Local Alcohol Policy**

44. South Waikato District Council does not have a Local Alcohol Policy. There is nothing for us to consider.

### **Section 105(1)(d) The days and hours of operation of the licence**

45. The current licensed days and hours are **Monday to Thursday 9.00am to 10.00pm, Friday and Saturday 9.00am to 11.00pm, and Sunday 10.00am to 9.30pm**. They are unremarkable in 'off licence' terms, and within the default national maximum trading hours for off licences, but we know that many impulse or 'top up' purchases are attempted later in the evening.
46. We also remind ourselves of the challenging location of the store in regard to vulnerable persons and the high deprivation index of the town generally. Later hours may no longer be suitable in the current environment.

### **Section 105(1)(e) The design and layout of any proposed premises**

47. The design and layout of the premises is also unremarkable and is fit for purpose.

### **Section 105(1)(f) Whether the applicant is engaged in or proposes on the premises to engage in, the sale of goods other than alcohol, low-alcohol refreshments, non-alcoholic refreshments, and food, and if so, which goods.**

48. The applicant sells a small range of food and tobacco and vape products.

### **Section 105(1)(g) Whether the applicant is engaged in or proposes on the premises to engage in, the provision of services other than those directly related to the sale of alcohol, low and non-alcoholic refreshments, and food, and if so, which services.**

49. No other services are offered by the store.

### **Section 105(1)(j) Whether the applicant has appropriate systems, staff, and training to comply with the law.**

50. The applicant company has recently adopted the new suite of policies and training programmes developed by Mr. Gordon and his colleagues and they presented them to the Committee. Of concern was a futile attempt to put staff through the Australian version of the Topsy hospitality programme. We were advised by a former staff member that it was confusing and inaccurate for NZ conditions.
51. Whilst the monthly training records presented were potentially impressive on paper, the former employee, who did leave on good terms, told us it was mainly just a tick and sign

exercise. It was also noted by the Police that in the section for learnings from recent incidents almost all boxes were marked N/A. This was during the period where multiple entries had been made in the incident book of refusal of service to intoxicated persons and potential minors.

52. A refresher programme was undertaken with an external provider in January 2023, but it appears that little was provided, or taken onboard and applied at Liquor Hut.
53. The evidence was clear that the directors of Route 2 Joy Liquor Store Limited were having trouble attracting and retaining competent, experienced certificated managers. This is a common problem with absentee licensees. It is harder to competently manage stores when you live out of town.
54. We observed that with limited numbers of qualified staff working 50-80 hours a week it is only a matter of time before mistakes are made. We can see from the Police traffic apprehensions that that is what has been already happening.

**Section 105(1)(k) Any matters dealt with in any report of the Police, an Inspector and the Medical Officer of Health under Section 129**

55. The MOoH opposed the application to renew the off licence around lack of staffing and training. Their views are canvassed in detail elsewhere in this decision.
56. The Inspector believes the suitability of the applicant to continue to hold an OFF licence was still very much in question.
57. The Police said that they genuinely fear for the safety of community members if persons affected by alcohol are sold additional alcohol by the staff at Liquor Hut. However, as we discussed at the hearing only two of the 10 apprehensions were over 1000 mcg of alcohol per litre of breath. It is the view of the Police, and the understanding of the Committee, that these persons would most likely have appeared intoxicated when they entered the store. They should have been assessed as intoxicated and refused service. They weren't.
58. In fairness to the applicants the other 8 'could' have appeared sober or at worse influenced, and a sale could have been lawfully made.
59. Equally a number of them could have been visibly intoxicated and should have been refused service. The CCTV footage would have either confirmed the Police view or exonerated the staff members. Sadly, that objective evidence is not before us.

+++++++

**Section 131 of the Act says we must also have regard to whether the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be increased, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of a refusal to renew the licence.**

60. There was no evidence of public disorder, littering or graffiti presented to the Committee that this business had physically reduced the amenity and good order of the locality by more than a minor extent.
61. But we have had at least 10 persons who have purchased alcohol and then been processed for excess breath alcohol moments later. Tokoroa has had more than its share of intoxicated driving incidents including a fatality and serious injury of an older couple run down on a pedestrian crossing by a drunk driver.
62. The Committee will be required to weigh up the effects of a refusal to renew over a restrictive renewal as proffered by the applicant in their closings.

**Reasons for the Decision**

63. Section 3 of the Act requires us to act reasonably in the exercise of our duties with the aim of helping to achieve of the Object of the Act. We are also obliged to read Section 3 & 4 together.
64. As this is a 'straight renewal,' 102(4) of the Act applies, and the grounds for an objection from a member of the public, may not relate to any other matter other than the suitability of the applicant.
65. But this does not restrain the agencies or the Committee from fully examining the application to renew as there is no 'right of renewal' as confirmed in Vaudrey.
66. The evidence of the Police and the apparent staffing difficulties are of concern to the Committee. Staff working 10-12 days in a row and up to 80 hours a week will be prone to fatigue and mistakes can be made.
67. The assessment of intoxication and the identification of minors requires skill, knowledge, and commitment, and a clear alert mind.
68. Both directors assured the Committee that they are committed to securing more experienced competent certificated managers for this store.
69. The concessions that they offered in closing have been helpful with our determination.

## The Decision

70. We are acutely aware of the Lyger decision from Tauranga where ARLA determined that with applications that the DLC determine will not meet the Object of Act cannot be repaired by the arbitrary imposition of conditions.
71. However, we distinguish this case from Lyger in that the application finally put before the DLC on hearing day was significantly lower in risk than the one that first lodged.
72. In ER BELLAS LIMITED CIV-2020-488-60 [2020] NZHC 2517 Gault J said at

*[29] Ms. Chen submitted there is a two-step test. The first step is determining whether renewing the licence would be consistent with the object of the Act, or whether the application is capable of meeting the object of the Act. If so, the second step is whether, and what, conditions need to be imposed.*

*[30] I accept that the overriding question is whether granting the application is consistent with the object of the Act. But it does not follow that the issue of conditions is always irrelevant to that assessment and only to be considered at a second stage if the object of the Act can be met (effectively without conditions). It may be that in a particular case the object of the Act can be met by the imposition of conditions. In that sense, there may be overlap between the two steps. For example, proposed hours of operation is a mandatory consideration in s 105(1)(d). If the only respect in which an application did not meet the object of the Act were its proposed hours of operating, and a condition limiting those hours would minimise the alcohol-related harm so that the application did meet the object of the Act, I consider it would be open to the decision-maker to grant the application subject to that condition.*

5

73. After standing back and cross-checking the evidence and the submissions we have before us we have come to the conclusion that we can approve a truncated renewal of the licence subject to **consented** conditions including reduced hours of operation, and the removal of high risk products and promotions.
74. We believe that the competent operation of the bottle store under a new condition regime will help to achieve the object of the Act in this vulnerable community of Tokoroa.

75. The application to renew the licence is approved for 18 months from the date of expiry i.e. 28 June 2022 meaning that the licence will expire on 28 December 2023, some 6 months away.
76. Clearly the goal for the applicant is to run a compliant responsible business with no intoxicated persons or minors being served alcohol and the agencies not opposed to a further renewal.
77. Requests for CCTV footage from the Police or the Inspector must be complied with within 7 days. No exceptions will be tolerated. If the current system is not fit for purpose then it must be replaced, and all staff trained in its operation and data retrieval.
78. During this time, we expect additional off-licence experienced certificated managers to be engaged and employed at Liquor Hut Tokoroa.
79. All conditions will be subject to review in 6 months' time at the next renewal. The Licence will be subject to the suite of **agreed conditions** itemised below.

The **South Waikato District Licensing Committee**, acting pursuant to the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, approves an application by **Route 2 Joy Liquor Store Limited** for the renewal of an OFF Licence in respect of premises situated at 47 Ashworth Street Tokoroa, known as "Liquor Hut Tokoroa", subject to conditions.

Conditions:

The licence is subject to the following conditions:

1. Alcohol may be sold on, or delivered from, the premises for consumption off the premises, or supplied free as a sample for consumption on the premises, only on the following days and hours:  
**Monday to Sunday 10.00am to 8.00pm;**
2. No alcohol is to be sold on, or delivered from, the premises on Good Friday, Easter Sunday or Christmas Day or before 1.00 pm on Anzac Day;
3. While alcohol is being supplied free as a sample, water is to be provided to patrons free of charge at the place where the samples are being supplied,
4. The whole of the premises is designated as a **Supervised Area**;
5. The Licensee must have available for purchase on the premises, at all times when the premises are open for the sale and supply of alcohol, a reasonable range of non-alcoholic and low-alcohol beverages;

6. A properly appointed Certificated, or Acting or Temporary, Manager must be on duty at all times, **within the licensed area**, when the premises are open for the sale and supply of alcohol and their full name must be on a sign prominently displayed in the premises;
7. The Licensee must display:
  - a. At every point of sale, signs detailing restrictions on the sale and supply of alcohol to minors and intoxicated persons;
  - b. At the principal entrance to the premises, so as to be easily read by people immediately outside the premises, a sign stating the ordinary hours of business during which the premises will be open for sale of alcohol;
  - c. A copy of the licence attached to the inside of the premises so as to be easily read by people entering each principal entrance.
8. **No 500ml cans or bottles of high strength beers, or the 1250ml Nitro with Guarana are to be sold or supplied from this store.**
9. **No single sales of mainstream beers, ciders or RTDs, not designed by the manufacturer to be sold as singles are to be sold. Items resulting from damaged boxes are to be clipped up as 4's or 6's for retail sale.**

**The renewal will be for 18 months from the expiry date of the current licence and a Replacement Licence is to be issued.**

**The renewed licence will expire on 28 December 2023.**

**DATED** at TOKOROA this 29<sup>th</sup> day of May 2023.



Murray Clearwater  
Commissioner  
For the South Waikato District Licensing Committee

**NOTE**

**Sections 152 to 155 of the Act relating to the right to appeal against this decision are in effect.**

**This decision shall have no effect for 10 working days from when it is received by the parties.**

