

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
Department of Law and Public Safety
DIVISION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
25 Commerce Drive Cranford, N.J. 07016

BULLETIN 2162

October 24 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM

1. SEIZURE - FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS - SPEAKEASY IN UNLICENSED BUILDING - CLAIM FOR RETURN OF SUM SEIZED BY POLICE RECOGNIZED - ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND CASH FORFEITED.
2. SEIZURE - FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS - SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN UNLICENSED RESTAURANT - CLAIM FOR SUM DEPOSITED BY LANDLORD REJECTED - ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES, CASH AND PERSONAL PROPERTY FORFEITED.
3. APPELLATE DECISIONS - PAULISON LIQUORS, INC. et al v. CLIFTON et al.
4. STATE LICENSES - NEW APPLICATIONS FILED.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
Department of Law and Public Safety
DIVISION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
25 Commerce Drive Cranford, N.J. 07016

BULLETIN 2162

October 24, 1974

1. SEIZURE - FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS - SPEAKEASY IN UNLICENSED BUILDING - CLAIM FOR RETURN OF SUM SEIZED BY POLICE RECOGNIZED - ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND CASH FORFEITED.

In the Matter of the Seizure :
on May 5, 1974 of a quantity :
of alcoholic beverages, miscel- : On Hearing
laneous personal property and :
\$530.00 in cash in the unlicensed : CONCLUSIONS and ORDER
premises at 24 Newfield Street, :
in the City of East Orange, County :
of Essex and State of New Jersey. :

.....
Oscar S. James, Claimant, Pro Se.
Walter H. Cleaver, Esq., Appearing for Division.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

This matter came on for hearing pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 33:1-66 and State Regulation No. 28 to determine whether 275 containers of alcoholic beverages, miscellaneous personal property, and \$530.00 in cash, as set forth in an inventory attached hereto, made part hereof, and marked Schedule "A", seized on May 5, 1974 at unlicensed premises at 24 Newfield Street, East Orange, New Jersey, constitute unlawful property and should be forfeited.

Oscar S. James appeared and sought the return of the sum of \$485.00, confiscated from his person, representing part of the sum of \$530.00 seized herein.

The Division file was admitted into evidence. It contained a list of the alcoholic beverages in unopened containers containing the brand label of each with the alcoholic contents of each so identified. The said alcoholic beverages were certified by the Division chemist to be fit for beverage purposes, and exceeded the statutory limitations N.J.S.A. 33:1-1(b). A certification by the Director also established that no license or permit for the sale of alcoholic beverages had been issued to any person at, or for the premises 24 Newfield Street, East Orange.

Charles Hutchins, a police officer of the East Orange Police Department testified that, on May 5, 1974, he was assigned to investigate an alleged speakeasy operation at the unlicensed premises. He entered and proceeded to purchase two drinks of alcoholic beverage for which he paid with "marked" money. He was informed that a number of persons, then present, were members or friends of the Guyanese Cultural Association.

A raid by the police department officers followed which resulted in the seizure of the alcoholic beverages described in Schedule "A". The occupants of the premises were arrested and taken to the local police headquarters. He admitted that he did not observe the seizure of any monies or alcoholic beverages; such seizure was accomplished by other officers.

The claimant, Oscar S. James, testified in corroboration of the description of the premises and the raid as recounted by Officer Hutchins, and admitted the illegal sale of the alcoholic beverage by members of the Association. He described being taken to police headquarters and there, being required to empty his pockets. He described an envelope which had been in the breast pocket of his jacket which contained deposits received by him from some of the members of the Guyanese Cultural Association, toward a prospective trip to Guyana.

He produced numerous deposit receipts which he stated had been obtained both prior to and at the meeting. He asserted that he had in this envelope both the receipts and \$485.00 which belonged to the members who had planned to join in the proposed trip. He produced a flyer describing the trip which contained the names of the officers of the Association, including his own. While he was unsuccessful in obtaining a receipt for the money taken at the police headquarters, he knew that these funds were then put into an individual envelope, which was marked with his name thereon. He vigorously denied that any of his funds related to either the sale of alcoholic beverages, or for future purchases thereof.

Officer Hutchins, recalled, testified that the practice in the East Orange Police Department was to take the possessions of those arrested, and to place the same in sealed envelopes, the front of which would contain a description of the contents.

The critical issue involved is whether the sum of \$485.00, alleged to be the property of the claimant was, in fact, taken from him at police headquarters, and was his own funds, unrelated to and not the product of the illegal sale of alcoholic beverages.

Following the hearing, and at the request of counsel appearing for the Division, one of its agents secured a photostatic copy of the label on the exterior of the envelope prepared by the police officers at the time of the claimant's arrest. That inventory revealed that the sum of \$489.65 had been taken from the claimant, together with items of personalty consisting of rings, bracelet, comb, glasses and the like.

The funds seized and in possession, initially, of the East Orange Police Department were commingled. That fact was admitted by the police officer. It has been held that "The line of cases at the Division which deal with the commingling of funds generally support the proposition that funds innocently involved in the incident shall not, due to an unfortunate set of circumstances be forfeited as part of the unlawful personalty contemplated by N.J.S.A. 33:1-66(b). "Seizure Case No. 11,797, Bulletin 1731, Item 4; Seizure Case No. 12,081, Bulletin 1856, Item 2." Seizure Case No. 12,367, Bulletin 2047, Item 8.

Since it is undisputed that claimant's monies were on his person at police headquarters and thereafter were commingled with other funds retrieved at the unlicensed premises, the above cited principle is applicable.

The claimant waived the issuance of a Hearer's Report and requested that the Director determine the matter from the evidence presented.

As the above stated principle, which reflects the policy of this Division is relevant hereto, I have determined to recognize the claimant's claim for the return of his funds, held by the Division, in the sum of \$489.65. The alcoholic beverages and the remainder of the cash seized were part of an illegal sale of alcoholic beverages, constitute unlawful property and shall be ordered forfeited. Seizure Case No. 11,597, Bulletin 1679, Item 7.

Accordingly, it is on this 2nd day of August, 1974

DETERMINED and ORDERED that the claim of Oscar S. James for the return of the sum of \$489.65 be and the same is hereby recognized, and the same shall be returned to him; and it is further

DETERMINED and ORDERED that the remainder of the cash seized, being in the sum of \$40.35 be and the same is hereby forfeited in accordance with the provisions of N.J.S.A. 33:1-66, to be disposed of in accordance with law; and it is further

DETERMINED and ORDERED that the alcoholic beverages, as more fully described in Schedule "A", attached hereto, be and the same is hereby forfeited in accordance with the provisions of N.J.S.A. 33:1-66, and shall be retained for the use of hospitals, and State, county or municipal institutions or destroyed, in whole or in part, at the direction of the Director of the Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control.

Leonard D. Ronco,
Director

Schedule "A"

275 - containers of alcoholic beverages
Miscellaneous personal property
\$530.00 cash

2. SEIZURE - FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS - SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN UN-
LICENSED RESTAURANT - CLAIM FOR SUM DEPOSITED BY LANDLORD REJECTED -
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES, CASH AND PERSONAL PROPERTY FORFEITED.

In the Matter of the Seizure	:	Case No. 13,014
on January 23, 1974 of a quantity	:	
of alcoholic beverages, miscel-	:	On Hearing
laneous personal property and	:	
\$49.98 in cash in the unlicensed	:	CONCLUSIONS and ORDER
premises of La Vaca Loca Restaurant,	:	
at 815 Elizabeth Avenue, in the City	:	
of Elizabeth, County of Union and	:	
State of New Jersey.	:	

.....
 Isidro Ibarria, Claimant, Pro Se.
 Cascades Music, Inc., by Patsy M. Colichio, Owner, Claimant.
 Walter H. Cleaver, Esq., Appearing for Division.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

The Hearer has filed the following Report herein:

Hearer's Report

This matter came on for hearing pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 33:1-66 and State Regulation No. 28, and, further, pursuant to two stipulations, dated January 23 and 24, 1974, respectively, one entered into by Patsy M. Colichio, agent for and on behalf of Cascades Music, Inc. and the other entered into by Isidro Ibarria, to determine whether eight containers of alcoholic beverages, miscellaneous personal property, equipment and \$49.98 in cash, as set forth in an inventory attached hereto and made part hereof and marked Schedule "A", seized on January 23, 1974 at the unlicensed premises of La Vaca Loca Restaurant, 815 Elizabeth Avenue, Elizabeth, constitute unlawful property and should be forfeited; and to determine whether the sum of \$400.00 deposited with the Director, under protest, by the Cascades Music, Inc., under the aforesaid stipulation, representing the appraised value of a cigarette vending machine and a juke box, which were returned to it, should be forfeited or returned to it; and, further, to determine whether the sum of \$1,600.00 deposited with the Director, under protest, pursuant to the aforesaid stipulation by Isidro Ibarria, representing the value of miscellaneous personal property as set forth in the inventory attached hereto and marked Schedule "A", made part hereof, which said properties were returned to him, should be forfeited or returned to him.

The Division file was admitted into evidence, together with samples of the seized alcoholic beverages. The file included the chemical analysis of such alcoholic beverages, certified by the Director, which established that the quantity of alcohol therein contained consisted of alcoholic beverages, fit for beverage purposes, and exceeded the statutory limitations. A

certification by the Director admitted into evidence established that no license or permit for the sale of alcoholic beverages had been issued to claimant or to Carlos Gonzales, operator of the La Vaca Loca Restaurant or to such restaurant itself or for premises 815 Elizabeth Avenue, Elizabeth.

At the hearing in this Division, the testimony of ABC Agent C relating his purchase, payment and receipt of alcoholic beverages was uncontroverted. The owner or manager of the restaurant, Carlos Gonzales did not appear at the hearing herein; the address which he had given to the agents was a spurious one and he did not respond to the published notice of the hearing.

However, Patsy M. Colichio, one of the owners of the Cascades Music, Inc., appeared and testified in connection with its claim for the return of the sum posted under the aforesaid stipulation. From the testimony of both ABC Agent C and Colichio it appeared that the La Vaca Loca Restaurant (The Lazy Cow) is an establishment appealing to the Spanish speaking population of the City. There were no alcoholic beverages visible or available without specific request.

Colichio added that although he visited the premises weekly between 10:00 A.M. and 2:00 P.M., he had never seen any alcoholic beverages served, nor suspected that any were available. The type of restaurant resembled a luncheonette; no full meals were served and he never conceived that alcoholic beverages would be available.

The remaining claimant, Isidro Ibarria, testified under language difficulty. With the aid of an interpreter, he stated that he was the owner of the furnishings of the restaurant in that he had leased the premises in which the restaurant was located as well as a rear portion which he used as a furniture store.

The lease was made to the I. & I. Furniture Co. by the Municipal Capital Corporation whereupon, the claimant, Isidro Ibarria, who apparently traded as the I. & I. Furniture Co. in turn leased the front portion to two persons named Roul Arengo and Silvirio Alzamora. It was they who established the restaurant, with Ibarria supplying the funds to purchase the equipment. Ibarria claimed ownership of those possessions. He had never been paid for them.

Without documentation, Arengo and Alzamora apparently sold their interest in the restaurant to Carlos Gonzales. Thereafter, without notice to Ibarria, Gonzales transferred his interest to one Aristobulo Pineda. Ibarria claimed that the personalty still belonged to him and that is why he posted the \$1,600.00 under the aforesaid stipulation.

At the initial date of hearing, the claimant, appearing without counsel, and with an apparent language barrier, was

advised to secure counsel and prepare to produce proof of ownership of the furnishings at a later date.

At an adjourned date, Ibarria appeared without counsel, and although counsel had previously contacted this Division, Ibarria determined then that he did not desire to be represented, and in lieu of an attorney, brought with him a friend whose basic language was English. Despite the prior admonition that he must produce some convincing proof that he was, in fact, the owner of the seized furnishings (N.J.S.A. 33:1-66(e)), he produced none. Additionally, he was unable to indicate how the furnishings got into the possession of Pineda. He was unaware that Pineda had been charged by the Prosecutor's Office of Union County with selling alcoholic beverages without a license.

The seized alcoholic beverages are illicit because they were intended for sale and sold without a license. N.J.S.A. 33:1-1 (i); N.J.S.A. 33:1-2, 50 (a, b). Therefore, the alcoholic beverages, personal property and cash seized constitute unlawful property and are subject to forfeiture. N.J.S.A. 33:1-66. Seizure Case No. 11,597, Bulletin 1679, Item 7.

The test relating to the forfeiture of seized equipment revolves about the bona fideness of the owner of the equipment. If the owner knew or should have known that the equipment was being used in conjunction with illicit sales of alcoholic beverages, the equipment thus seized would be subject to forfeiture. See Seizure Case No. 12,367, Bulletin 2008, Item 5, N.J.S.A. 33:1-66(e).

Considering the character of the restaurant, I am satisfied that the claim of the Cascades Music, Inc., is bona fide, and I recommend that its claim be recognized, and the sum of \$400.00 deposited under the aforesaid stipulation be returned to it.

The claim of Ibarria for the return of the sum posted by him appears to be without merit. According to the testimony of ABC Agent C and the reports of the remaining agents as contained in the Division file, sales of alcoholic beverages were readily made to the agents by one Aristobulo Pineda who claimed to be an employee of one Carlos Gonzales. Pineda, however, made an immediate telephone call to Anthony Ibarria, son of the claimant, and notified him of the seizure. Gonzales never appeared, and Ibarria acted throughout the seizure as the owner of the premises. His claim to have been the owner of the restaurant furnishings which he rented to Gonzales appears contrived.

Despite every opportunity afforded him to produce some documentary evidence upon which to base his assertion that he was not the owner of the restaurant or not in control of it, such proof was lacking. It can only be concluded that Ibarria, Pineda and perhaps Gonzales were engaged in a joint enterprise of operating the restaurant. In that capacity, he loses the benefit of being a lienor claimant.

It is indisputable that a principal is liable for the acts of his agents including unlawful sales made by him will bind the principal in these matters or under these circumstances. Cf. Seizure Case No. 1009, Bulletin 1391, Item 4.

Whatever the connection, it is apparent that Pineda was acting for the claimant Ibarria, hence the illegal sale of alcoholic beverage and the recommendation of denial of the claim.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the claim of the Cascades Music, Inc. for the return of the sum of \$400.00 deposited by it be recognized. It is further recommended that the claim of Isidro Ibarria for the return of the sum of \$1,600.00 deposited by him under the aforesaid stipulation be rejected and the same be forfeited. It is further recommended that the alcoholic beverages and the \$49.98 in cash be forfeited.

Conclusions and Order

No exceptions to the Hearer's Report were filed within the time limited by Rule 4 of State Regulation No. 28.

Having carefully considered the entire record herein, including an abstract of the transcript of testimony, the exhibits and the Hearer's Report, I concur in the findings and recommendations of the Hearer and adopt them as my conclusions herein.

Accordingly, it is on this 2nd day of August, 1974,

DETERMINED and ORDERED that the claim of Cascades Music, Inc. be and the same is hereby recognized; and the sum of \$400.00 deposited by Patsy M. Colichio, agent for Cascades Music, Inc. under one of the stipulations aforesaid, be returned to it; and it is further

DETERMINED and ORDERED that the seized property, more fully described in Schedule "A" attached hereto, constitute unlawful property; and the sum of \$1,600.00, representing the appraised value of certain furnishings and equipment described in the aforesaid Schedule "A", which said property was returned to Isidro Ibarria, be and the same is hereby forfeited, in accordance with the provisions of N.J.S.A. 33:1-66, to be accounted for in accordance with law; and it is further

DETERMINED and ORDERED that the cash in the amount of \$49.98 seized herein, constitutes unlawful property, and the same be and is hereby forfeited in accordance with the provisions of N.J.S.A. 33:1-66, to be accounted for in accordance with law; and it is further

DETERMINED and ORDERED that the seized alcoholic beverages constitute unlawful property and are hereby forfeited in accordance

with the provisions of N.J.S.A. 33:1-66, and shall be retained for use of hospitals and State, county and municipal institutions or destroyed, in whole or in part, at the direction of the Director of the Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control.

Leonard D. Ronco,
Director

SCHEDULE "A"

- 8 - containers of alcoholic beverages
- 2 - coffee makers; 1 - ice machine;
- 2 - freezers; 2 - refrigerators;
- 2 - stoves; 1 - cash register;
- 1 - range; 1 - safe; 1 - pizza oven;
- 1 - television set; 1 - juke box;
- 1 - cigarette machine
- Miscellaneous personal property
- \$49.98 - cash

3. APPELLATE DECISIONS - PAULISON LIQUORS, INC. et al v. CLIFTON et al.

Paulison Liquors, Inc.,)
t/a Paulison)
Michael Vargo and)
North Jersey Package)
Stores Association,)

Appellants,)

v.)

Municipal Board of Al-)
coholic Beverage Control)
of the City of Clifton and)
Ukranian Orthodox Holy)
Ascension Church,)

Respondents.)

On Appeal

CONCLUSIONS
and
ORDER

Chester & Krakauer, Esqs., by Jack Krakauer, Esq., Attorney
for Appellants
Arthur J. Sullivan, Esq., by John D. Pogorelec, Esq., Attorney
for Respondent - Board
Goldman, Carlet, Garrison & Bertoni, Esqs., by Frank A. Carlet, Esq.,
Attorneys for Respondent Ukranian Church

BY THE DIRECTOR:

The Hearer has filed the following report herein:

Hearer's Report

This is an appeal from the action of respondent Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Clifton (hereinafter Board) which, on April 30, 1974, approved a person-to-person and place-to-place transfer of a plenary retail consumption license from Joseph A. and Eleanor E. Shook for premises 645 Van Houten Avenue, Clifton to respondent Ukranian Orthodox Holy Ascension Church (hereinafter Church) for premises to be located 655 Broad Street, Clifton.

Appellants' petition of appeal contended principally that a transfer of a plenary retail consumption license to a church is an invalid exercise of municipal authority. It further challenged the action of the Board as causing an economic hardship to other licensees, and that the proposed location would be violative of the existing zoning ordinance of the municipality.

The respondents generally denied these contentions. A de novo hearing on this appeal was held in this Division pursuant to Rule 6 of State Regulation No. 15, with full opportunity afforded the parties to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

Appellants presented the testimony of three witnesses. Alfred E. Zimmerman, Jr. the owner of the corporate stock of a corporation holding an existing license, stated that his objection to a license being granted to a church stemmed from the tax advantages a church enjoys, which he felt caused unfair competition. Moreover, it was his opinion that a church licensee could not be properly policed.

The president of the New Jersey Restaurant Association, Stanley Bader, testified that he is familiar with the issue present in the matter, and objects in principle to churches being licensees. Those objections surround the special advantages a church would have as a licensee as compared to the ordinary licensee. These advantages were never contemplated by the Legislature when the Alcoholic Beverage Law was adopted.

One of the then councilmen who served as a member of the Board which adopted the subject resolution Joseph S. Kolodziej, testified that he had no objection to the granting of the license to the Church, for he felt its use would serve the best interests of its members and the municipality and would not be inimical to the public interest.

The respondents offered no testimony but presented evidence in the form of copies of the application for transfer and the various municipal reports from the fire, police, building, health and other agencies all of which were positive.

It was agreed among counsel that, in lieu of the presentation of a number of witnesses on behalf of the respondent Church, its counsel would make a short statement for the record indicating the proposed use of the license, which statement would be a summary of the evidence presented before the Board at its hearing.

From such statement, it was apparent that the Church had been precluded from applying for a club license due to an existing ordinance limiting the number of club licenses to be issued; and that number had already been reached. The social functions of the church required repeated applications to this Division for "special permits"; the application for the plenary retail consumption license was intended to open an avenue by which the Church could hold these functions, or rent its facilities for them, without the need for myriad special permits.

No usual bar facilities, characteristic of taverns would be installed. He further asserted that the Church would have no

objection if the license contained a special condition prohibiting the installation of such bar facilities.

In respect to appellants' contention that his business and that of the other licensees would be negatively affected by the proposed transfer, it has long been held that an issuing authority is not obligated to consider whether the financial interest of any pre-existing licensee will be promoted or harmed in its determination whether to grant a liquor application. Kelly v. Manalapan, Bulletin 531, Item 3; Forbes Liquors Inc. v. Brick Twp. et al., Bulletin 1641, Item 1; Monmouth County Package Stores Ass'n. v. Highlands, et al., Bulletin 1735, Item 1. The ultimate consideration is whether it is in the public interest to grant or deny the said transfer. Cf. Blanck v. Magnolia, 38 N.J. 484 (1962).

Appellant's further contends that the proposed location of the licensed premises is in an "A" residential area, hence is a "non-conforming use" and is invalid. Such argument falls when tested against Lubliner v. Bd. of Alcoholic Bev. Con. Paterson, 59 N.J. Super. 419, 433 (App. Div. 1960). Affd. 33 N.J. 498, which states the well-settled principle that the grant of a transfer of a license does not permit the licensee to operate without complying with all applicable ordinances, including zoning ordinances.

It was agreed among counsel that the paramount and overriding issue here presented was whether a religious organization should have a liquor license for profit. Assuming that any sale of alcoholic beverage by the Church results in "profit", it has long been held that a religious organization is not precluded from possessing such license. Cf. McDermott v. Garfield, Bulletin 2032, Item 1.

Among the earliest decisions in the Division was a determination concluding with the paragraph "However I will gladly entertain applications for Special Permits for occasional affairs to be conducted by this Church". Special Permits, Bulletin 118, Item 4 (April 30, 1936).

That same year, Commissioner Burnett added:

"If the Church or the club to which you refer is able to qualify in accordance with the statute and the State and local regulations, there is no reason why the Township Committee cannot issue them a license. They stand in the same position as any other applicant....".

Re: St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Church, Bulletin 136, Item 13.

From the totality of the evidence adduced and the declarations of the Church's counsel, the acquisition of the license by the Church was an expensive means to obviate the necessity of making continual applications to this Division for special permits for

permission to dispense alcoholic beverages at its numerous social functions. A concomitant benefit is derived by the municipality in that such transfer results in one less active tavern.

The intended transfer to the Church for this ostensible purpose negates the challenge that the Church would be placing itself in a competitive relationship to the other "C" licensees in the community. The total absence of a bar, barroom, bar "hours" or professional bartenders characterizes the potential use of the license as merely a convenience for the Church to do what it may do and has done, with wider regulatory sanction.

Counsel for the Church has conceded that there would be no objection to the imposition of conditions to be attached to the license, limiting the proposed activity to social functions and restricting the use of an "open public bar". In view of the contemplated use of the license and the Church's concession, the Board could have so limited the use of the license. The practice of conditioning licenses by the local issuing authority has been judicially approved. Lublinter v. Bd. of Alcoholic Bev. Con. Paterson, supra; 4 Leaf Liquors & Lounge v. Newark, Bulletin 1830, Item 1. N.J.S.A. 33:1-32.

Ample illustrations of licenses issued with special conditions attached exist under which the Board could have so issued the subject license. Thus: Lyons Farms Tavern Inc. v. Newark, Bulletin 2073, Item 1 wherein non-enlargement of bar constituted a special condition; Murphy v. Red Bank, Bulletin 1971, Item 1 in which license was conditioned on premises being used as a restaurant; Hudson-Bergen Package Stores Association v. North Bergen, et al., Bulletin 1981, Item 1 in which the license was conditioned upon appellant having possession of proposed premises.

It is accordingly recommended that the action of the Board be affirmed and the appeal be dismissed but that the Board shall attach to the license the following conditions:

- (a) That the license be used solely for social functions; and
- (b) That no "stand-up" bar be permitted.

Conclusions and Order

No exceptions to the Hearer's report were filed pursuant to Rule 14 of State Regulation No. 15.

Having carefully considered the entire record herein including the transcript of testimony, the exhibits and the Hearer's report, I concur in the findings and recommendations of the Hearer and adopt them as my conclusions herein.

Accordingly, it is, on this 7th day of August, 1974

ORDERED that the action of the Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Clifton be and the same is hereby affirmed and the appeal filed herein be and the same is hereby dismissed; and it is further

ORDERED that the Board shall impose the following special conditions to the subject license, upon its issuance:

- (a) That the license shall be used solely for social functions; and
- (b) That no "stand-up" bar shall be permitted in the licensed premises.

LEONARD D. RONCO
DIRECTOR

4. STATE LICENSES - NEW APPLICATIONS FILED.

Cameron Craig Ltd.
Sixty Park Place
Rooms 1309-1310 A
Newark, New Jersey

Application filed October 17, 1974 for place to place transfer of its warehouse from 15 East Union Ave., East Rutheford, New Jersey to 501 Schuyler Ave., Lyndhurst, New Jersey.

Home Beverage, Inc.
824 E. St. George Ave.
Linden, New Jersey

Application filed October 21, 1974 for person-to-person and place-to-place transfer of State Beverage Distributor's License SBD-59 to Central Jersey Beverage Distributors, Inc., 475 Watchung Ave., Watchung, New Jersey

Joseph A. Aiello,
26 E. Madison Ave.
Dumont, New Jersey

Application filed October 24, 1974 for person-to-person transfer of State Beverage Distributor's License SBD-14 from Joseph A. Aiello to Anthony J. Ciccio, 26 E. Madison Ave. Dumont, New Jersey.


Leonard D. Ronco
Director