

Licensing Act 2003

Representation by a Responsible Authority

Note: Please be aware that this form may be viewed by the Applicant or by a representative of the Applicant. It may also be read out in public at the Licensing Panel hearings.

Representations may be made at any time during a period of 28 consecutive days starting on the day after the application was given to the Licensing Authority.

Representations are only relevant to an application if they relate to at least one of the four Licensing Objectives listed below:

- 1. The Prevention of Crime and Disorder**
- 2. Public Safety**
- 3. Prevention of Public Nuisance**
- 4. The Protection of Children from Harm**

Please enter your details below:

Responsible Authority:	Lincolnshire Police
Contact Officer:	Pc 642 McConville
Address:	Alcohol Licensing Myle Cross Centre Macaulay Drive Lincoln LN2 4EL
Telephone Number:	101 – Lincolnshire - 3298438
E-mail:	countylicensinggroup@lincs.pnn.police.uk

Please provide details of the application to which your representation refers:

Name:	City Stores Applicant - Ramesh Babu MOHAN
Address:	112 Bridge Road Sutton Bridge PE12 9SA

Application Details:	Premises Licence Application
Date Application Received:	15/11/2020

Please provide details of your representation in the box below. Indicate which of the Licensing Objectives your representation refers to by ticking the relevant box(es):

- **The Prevention of Crime and Disorder** **X**
- **Public Safety**
- **Prevention of Public Nuisance**
- **The Protection of Children from Harm** **X**

In relation to this application, the following Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 has been considered –

Section 2.1, Licensing Authorities should look at the Police as the main source of advice on crime and disorder.

Section 9.12....Each responsible authority will be an expert in their own field....for example the police have a key role in managing the night-time economy.....However, any responsible authority under the 2003 Act may make representations with regard to any of the licensing objectives if they have evidence to support such representations. Licensing Authorities must therefore consider all relevant representations from responsible authorities carefully, even where the reason for a particular responsible authority’s interest or expertise in the promotion of a particular objective may not be immediately apparent.

Section 11.27, which is in relation to reviews but deemed relevant....there is certain criminal activity that may arise in connection with licensed premises which should be treated particularly seriously. These are the use of licensed premises for employing a person which is disqualified from that work by reason of their immigration status in the UK.

This application relates to 112 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge. There has been some confusion over the numbering as the premises previously held a premises licence, however it was numbered as 110. Research has shown the smaller numbers of the road are towards the bridge, with Pizza Perfection on the right as you look at the premises, which is listed as 110, and City Stores, on the left, as 112. To clear up any confusion premises 110 on the old licence is the same premises this application refers to.

The previous premises licence with Arumugam SARANKAN as the premises licence holder (PLH) and designated premises supervisor (DPS) was revoked on 20th October 2021 following an illegal worker serving 2 x 15-year-olds alcohol and non-compliance with the premises licence conditions. The committee also heard that that premises licence had also previously been reviewed some years before for the same reason and conditions were added at that time. The 2021 decision notice stated the committee had no confidence in the management of the premises.

It is understood that on 3/11/21 the revoked premises licence was appealed against, with Mr Sarankan as the appellant, meaning it still stands, he still had standing, and therefore an element

of control to be licence holder and the premises can still serve alcohol with him as PLH and DPS. However, we also have this new premises licence application by Ramesh Babu MOHAN which was received less than a month after the revocation. Which, if granted means 2 premises licences running, with separate conditions and separate PLH and DPS, which could be extremely confusing for all involved.

On receiving the application Lincolnshire Police were immediately concerned due to the history of the premises, the very quick turn around since revocation and an application in a differing name from that of the appeal. The licensing sub-committee has experience of the many and varied ways they've seen premises, having had a licence revoked or application refused, try and obtain a new premises licence, with a new figurehead, when in reality the person behind the business is the same individual who had their licence revoked or refused. Due to past lesson learnt, Lincolnshire Police scrutinise these applications and request paperwork to evidence business sale, as well as carrying out open and close source checks to either prove or disprove the change of hands.

Pc 642 McConville had a phone conversation with Mr Mohan (who is a DPS at a garage premises within Boston Borough), explaining the history of the premises, the police's concerns, and the need to provide evidence of genuine business purchase. Mr Mohan explained that he has been looking for a premises to buy and heard City Stores was for sale, so went and viewed it and bought it. He said Mr Sarankan had nothing to do with the premises anymore and he didn't know him before the business deal.

If, as stated by Mr Mohan that Mr Sarankan isn't involved with the premises anymore then he has no standing for the appeal and doesn't fulfil the requirement for the role of premises licence holder. The licence under appeal hasn't been transferred to Mr Mohan.

Following the phone conversation Pc McConville sent an email to Mr Mohan requesting evidence of a genuine business purchase, the date Mr Mohan took ownership of the premises and details of any connection to the previous premises licence holder Mr Arumugam Sarankan.

An email thread going back and forward over the next few weeks is attached with the documents provided by Mr Mohan re-labelled as Mohan 10-12 (for date received) then description of the paperwork. However, the important points are -

Mr Mohan states he bought the business on 8th of November and that he has formed a company under the business with a formal vat registration number. The Vat registration appeared to have been created on 20/11/21 and backdated to 9/11/21, for company Lakshnas Retail Ltd, with the use of accountancy firm Futurewise Accountancy Ltd.

Mr Mohan has provided evidence of business set up, stock take, purchase of goods and set up with parcel companies, however he did not show evidence of business purchase, lease, or movement of money.

In answer to the question around there being any connection to Mr Arumugam Sarankan, Mr Mohan replied 'we don't have any connection with him in our business. We took over from him 8th of November'. When asked who the 'we' was? He stated, 'mean myself and my store' and 'I know previous guys by business deal only'.

There are points of concern regarding Mr Sarankan still having involvement with the premises. The plan submitted with the application is dated 11/21 with the project no. being 211103-01, which if this is representative of the date it is the same date the appeal for the revoked premises licence was lodged. The plan shows the client as being Mr Sarankan, questioning why he was commissioning a plan for a business that he was selling/had sold, when the set up and licenced area may have been changed by the new business owner. Having seen many plans submitted for many licence applications, you do not see specifically commissioned plans by the previous user.

Companies House is an open-source database, it shows Mr Sarankan as director of Nlitegroup Limited, which is connected to the 112 Bridge Road address through Vat search. Mr Sarankan provided the email address [REDACTED] on his applications, this address was also used to exchange paperwork for the review and is supplied as his contact details on the stock take report provided by Mr Mohan in the email thread.

Nlitegroup Limited's registered office address (as per Companies House) is Flat 4, Wallwood Road, Erskine Court, London, E11 1DG and Mr Sarankan's person correspondence address is the same.

Lakshnas Retail Ltd registered office address is the premises address, 112 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge whereas Mr Mohan's personal correspondence address is Flat 4, Wallwood Road, Erskine Court, London, England, E11 1DG, the same address Mr Sarankan and his company Nlitegroup Limited has been connected to since December 2019. A look at the filing history for Lakshnas Retail Ltd shows the Flat 4 address was also proposed at the registered office address for the company on incorporation on 9th November 2021 as well as the personal address for Mr Mohan. On the 11th November the office address was changed to City Stores, Bridge Road, then to City Stores 112 Bridge Road, all on the same date.

Research into Flat 4, Wallwood Road, Erskine Court, London, England, E11 1DG shows it to be a residential address, with the correct way of writing the address being Flat 4, Erskine Court, 10 Wallwood Road, London, E11 1DG, likely a 2 bed, leased flat. Yet written incorrectly in the same manner for both businesses and personal associations for the only those 2 business and individuals connected to that address on Companies House under a postcode search. It doesn't appear to be an address for an accountant as it doesn't show up for one on an internet search and it appears by the paperwork submitted that the accountant Futurewise Accountancy Ltd was used for the VAT registration and they aren't registered at that address.

Lincolnshire Police have emailed Mr Mohan and asked him what Flat 4, Erskine Court, 10 Wallwood Road, London, E11 1DG means to him, but had no reply prior to this submission. Lincolnshire Police would like the applicant to account for the addresses being the same for both companies and individuals, when he stated via email that his only involvement with Mr Sarankan's

