

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
Department of Law and Public Safety
DIVISION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
NEWARK INTERNATIONAL PLAZA
U.S. Routes 1-9 (Southbound) Newark, N. J. 07114

BULLETIN 2334

December 4, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM

1. DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS (Newark) - TO CANCEL TRANSFER APPROVED BY ISSUING AUTHORITY FOR VIOLATING LOCAL MINIMUM DISTANCE ORDINANCE - LESS THAN 200 FEET FROM CHURCH - CHARGES SUSTAINED - TRANSFER DECLARED NULL AND VOID - TRANSFER MUST BE EFFECTED WITHIN 90 DAYS OR LICENSE CANCELLED.
2. DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS (Old Bridge) - LEWD SHOW - UNLAWFUL ACTIVITY PERTAINING TO CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES - LICENSE SUSPENDED FOR 90 DAYS.
3. STATE LICENSES - NEW APPLICATIONS FILED.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
 Department of Law and Public Safety
 DIVISION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
 NEWARK INTERNATIONAL PLAZA
 U.S. Routes 1-9 (Southbound) Newark, N. J. 07114

BULLETIN 2334

December 4, 1979

1. DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS - TO CANCEL TRANSFER APPROVED BY ISSUING AUTHORITY FOR VIOLATING LOCAL MINIMUM DISTANCE ORDINANCE - LESS THAN 200 FEET FROM CHURCH - CHARGES SUSTAINED - TRANSFER DECLARED NULL AND VOID - TRANSFER MUST BE EFFECTED WITHIN 90 DAYS OR LICENSE CANCELLED.

In the Matter of Disciplinary :
 Proceedings against :

City Hall Sandwich, Inc. :
 938-940 Broad Street :
 Newark, New Jersey 07102 :

CONCLUSIONS
 AND
 ORDER

Holder of Plenary Retail Consump- :
 tion Lic. 0714-32-143-001, issued :
 by the Municipal Board of Alcoholic :
 Beverage Control of the City of :
 Newark. :

. :

Anthony M. Lanza, Esq., Attorney for Licensee.
 Leonard A. Peduto, Jr., Esq., Deputy-Attorney General,
 Appearing for the Division.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

The Hearer has filed the following report herein:

HEARER'S REPORT

The Division instituted proceedings by Order to Show Cause dated June 20, 1977, why Plenary Retail Consumption License 0714-32-143-001 (formerly C-49) issued by the Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Newark to the subject licensee, for premises 938-940 Broad Street, Newark, should not be suspended, revoked or cancelled based upon the following charges:

1. Said license on May 25, 1976 was improvidently transferred by said Municipal Board to Paul Lustig's Inc., t/a Paul's Lounge & Liquor from premises 449 Clinton Avenue, Newark to premises 938-940 Broad Street, Newark, in violation of Title 4, Alcoholic Beverages, Revised Ordinances of Newark, Section 4:2-17, which section states in pertinent part: (a) "No plenary retail consumption license---shall be granted or transfer made to other premises within a distance of one thousand feet from any other premises than covered by other

license, and (d)... "in the event of any licensee's premises being taken for any municipal, county state or federal project, the new location to which the license is to be transferred under this exception shall not be located within a distance of six hundred feet from any other premises than covered by other license."

2. The aforementioned transfer was in violation of N.J.S.A. 33:1-76 which states in pertinent part: "Anything to the contrary hereinbefore notwithstanding and for the benefit not of property but of persons attendant therein, no license shall be issued for the sale of alcoholic beverages within two hundred feet of any church, or public school house, or private school house not conducted for pecuniary profit..."

I - FACTUAL FINDINGS

From the testimony and the documents presented at the hearing held in this Division, the following undisputed facts emerge: Paul Lustig's, Incorporated (Lustig) of which Paul Erdman was the sole stockholder, operated a bar and a package goods establishment in leased premises at 449 Clinton Avenue, Newark, for a number of years. In January 1975, the landlord was compelled to vacate the building because it was allegedly unfit for habitation. Subsequently, the building was ordered demolished. As a result, the Lustig license was rendered inactive.

Erdman negotiated with Benti Fulop and Arthur Fulop of City Hall Sandwich, Inc., the subject licensee, which operated a modest size restaurant at 938-940 Broad Street, Newark, to open and operate a bar with a package goods section, as a tenant therein, in the restaurant premises.

The negotiations conducted between Erdman and Fulop resulted in a lease agreement being drawn and executed between Lustig and City Hall Sandwich for a period of five years from June 1, 1976. Application for a place-to-place transfer made by Lustig from 449 Clinton Avenue to 938-940 Broad Street was approved by the Newark Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control on May 25, 1976.

Following a minor disagreement, a transfer of the liquor license was negotiated between the parties. This was consummated by the approval of a person-to-person transfer of the said liquor license from Lustig to City Hall Sandwich, Inc., on July 12, 1976 by the Newark Board.

It was unchallenged that two liquor licenses which were issued by the Newark Alcoholic Beverage Control Board and were in active use, were located less than six hundred (600) feet distant from the subject premises, 938-940 Broad Street. The license issued to Rose Marie Conte at 911 Franklin Street was located two hundred and eight (208) feet and three hundred and six (306) feet distant from its nearest and most distant doorway from the situs of the subject license.

The liquor license issued to Old Hillcrest, Inc., was three hundred and ninety-five (395) feet distant from the subject license. Additionally, seven (7) liquor licenses issued and in active use are located more than six hundred (600) feet but less than one thousand (1,000) feet distant from the subject transfer situs, as follows: Natale, Inc., 897 Broad Street, six hundred and four (604) feet; City Hall Bar & Grill, 882 Broad Street, six hundred and twenty-six (626) feet; Continental, Inc., 982-984 Broad Street, six hundred and twenty-eight (628) feet; Joe Peterman's, Green Street Corporation, 20 Green Street, six hundred and eighty-two (682) feet; Joseph Martino, Inc., 244 Mulberry Street, nine hundred and six (906) feet; Club Savoy, 274 Halsey Street, nine hundred and thirteen (913) feet and 360 Washington Street Corporation, 360 Washington Street, nine hundred and thirty-two (932) feet.

It was unchallenged that Grace Episcopal Church, located at 948-956 Broad Street is one hundred and ninety-six (196) feet distant from City Hall Sandwich.

It was undisputed that the foregoing measurements were taken in accordance with the standard set forth in N.J.S.A. 33:1-76.

II - CHARGE NO. I

The operative portions of the Newark Revised Ordinance 42:2-17(a) and (d) have been recited in Charge No. 1 above.

It is evident that there are a total of nine (9) licenses located within the prohibited distance of one thousand (1,000) feet contained in sub-section (a) of the foregoing ordinance.

Assuming, but not conceding, that the demolition of the building at 449 Clinton Avenue amounts to a "taking" of private property for a public project within the intendment of sub-section (d) of the quoted ordinance, the violation thereof still exists. There are two (2) liquor licenses (RoseMarie Conte and Old Hillcrest, Inc.) located within six hundred (600) feet of City Hall Sandwich.

In defense of this charge, licensee urged that it had no knowledge that the Board's approval of the place-to-place transfer was invalid. It had the subject license transferred to it assuming that the Board's action was valid and had, in good faith reliance of the Board's action, spent considerable sums of money on improvements. A revocation of the license would, it asserts, inflict severe financial hardship upon it.

It is a firmly established principle that a local governing body has no jurisdiction to grant or transfer a license in violation of the local ordinance. Petrangeli v. Barrett, 33: N.J. Super. 378 (App. Div. 1954) and cases cited therein.

It is most regrettable that the Board has acted in total disregard of the local ordinance. An abuse of discretion among mortals is understandable. So is a mistake of judgment. However, the Board's action herein in approving the transfer was not discretionary. The Board was proscribed by the plain terms of the ordinance from approving the transfer. Its ultra vires act has placed a licensee in a unfortunate and untenable position.

I conclude place-to-place transfer approval by the Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Newark was patently erroneous and that the said license was improvidently transferred.

III- CHARGE NO. II

N.J.S.A. 33:1-76 contains a provision in addition to that quoted in this charge, as follows:

The protection of this section may be waived at the issuance of the license and at each renewal thereafter, by the duly authorized governing body on authority of such church or school, such waiver to be effective until the date of the next renewal of the license.

In defense of this charge, the licensee presented in evidence a writing on the stationary of Grace Church in Newark, (located a distance of one hundred and ninety-six (196) feet from the subject licensed premises), dated July 1, 1977, which reads, as follows:

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

It is my understanding that the liquor license of City Hall Sandwich, Inc., trading as Sandwichtown, located at 938 Broad Street, Newark, is due for renewal.

In the past Grace Church has signed the necessary waiver when requested to do so. Please be advised that we would be happy to do so again.

Sandwichtown is in no way an objectional or undersirable (sic) neighbor. We are pleased at the high level with which this business is conducted.

(Signed) George H. Bowen
Rector of Grace Church in Newark

I construe this document to operate as an adequate waiver within the intendment of the quoted statute.

Therefore, it is recommended that the action instituted by the Division requiring the licensee to show cause why the license should not be suspended, revoked or cancelled pertaining to this charge, be dismissed.

IV - PENALTY RECOMMENDATION

The recommended determinations, above expressed, are made without reservation. However, it is manifest that the licensee would suffer a severe financial loss which would have been avoided had not the local Board approved the place-to-place license transfer in contravention of the applicable ordinance. I am aware of former Director Ronco's admonition in Re 808 South Orange Avenue Corp., Bulletin 2191, Item 1, wherein he warned prospective license transferees that future transfers of license in violation of the ordinance would be voided by the Division. In 808 South Orange Avenue Corp., the Director dismissed the charge. In view of former Director Ronco's admonition, I recommend that an order be entered, as follows:

- (1) A determination that the said transfer is null and void;
- (2) The licensee shall be given an opportunity to perfect an application to the

Board for a place-to-place transfer to other premises in the City of Newark within three months from the effective date of the Director's order, and which would be consistent with the provisions of the subject ordinance; and

- (3) In the event that such transfer is not effected within three months from the date of the Director's said order or any extension thereof which may be granted by the Director of this Division, the said license shall be cancelled.

CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

No written Exceptions to the Hearer's Report were filed by the parties pursuant to N.J.A.C. 13:2-19.6.

Having carefully considered the entire record herein, including the transcript of the 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 30th day of May, 1979,

ORDERED that the transfer of Plenary Retail Consumption License No. 0714-32-143-001 issued by the Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Newark to City Hall Sandwich, Inc., for premises 938-940 Broad Street, Newark, be and the same is hereby declared null and void; and it is further

ORDERED that the licensee or any renewal thereof be and the same shall have three months from the date of this Order to perfect a transfer application to premises consistent with the distance-between-premises ordinance of the City of Newark; and it is further

ORDERED that, in the event such transfer is not effected within three months from the date herein, or any renewal thereof, said license be and the same shall be cancelled immediately. I shall permit continued operations during the three month period of search for an appropriate situs for this license, subject to the lawful action of respondent with respect to an application for the renewal of the said license.

JOSEPH H. LERNER
DIRECTOR

2. DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS - LEWD SHOW - UNLAWFUL ACTIVITY PERTAINING TO CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES - LICENSE SUSPENDED FOR 90 DAYS.

In the Matter of Disciplinary Proceedings against	:	
Fizer Corp.	:	S-11,219
t/a Your Susie's Place	:	X-53,629-A
Highway #35 and Lawrence Parkway	:	
Old Bridge, New Jersey 08879	:	CONCLUSIONS
Holder of Plenary Retail Consumption Lic. #1209-33-015-001, issued by the Township Council of the Township of Old Bridge.	:	AND
.....	:	ORDER

.....
Wilentz, Goldman & Spitzer, Esqs., by Warren W. Wilentz, Esq., Attorneys for Licensee.
Mart Vaarsi, Esq., Deputy Attorney General, Appearing for the Division.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

The Hearer has filed the following report herein:

HEARER'S REPORT

Licensee pleaded "not guilty" to a ten count charge which, in essence, accuses it of allowing, permitting and suffering lewd activity in its licensed premises on February 3, 1977, in violation of Rule 5 of State Regulation No. 20; and of allowing, permitting and suffering unlawful activity pertaining to controlled dangerous substances (C.D.S.), in its licensed premises on specified dates during February 1977, in violation of Rule 4 of State Regulation No. 20

A.B.C. Agent P, the Division's principal witness herein testified that, on February 3, 1977, in the company of A.B.C. Agent L, she entered licensee's premises at approximately 8:00 P.M. There were about forty patrons, a bar maid, identified as Dee (Dolores) Orlando, the manager, Steve Fizer, a corporate stockholder Elizabeth Fizer, and two go-go dancers, one of whom was performing, in the licensed premises at that time.

The dancer, in the course of her performance rubbed her vagina several times with her hand and reclined upon the floor and simulated sexual intercourse by body movement.

On February 4, 1977, Agent P returned with A.B.C. Agent W. Another agent, D'O entered shortly thereafter, and remained

apart from them while they were in the establishment.

Agent P had a conversation with Bill, the bouncer, later identified as William Mansfield, pertaining to controlled dangerous substances. Bill introduced the agents to a young man known as Jim, who stated, in Bill's presence that he had some "Speed" (Methadrine) for sale, as well as a quantity of barbituates. Agent P expressed some interest in barbituates but a lesser quantity than Jim was offering. Jim stated that they would cost one half-dollar each, and departed for Asbury Park to obtain them.

Bill next introduced Agents P and W to one, "Sonny", whose last name is unknown. Sonny warned the agents not to trust, Jim, or even Bill the bouncer. Bill was advised of Sonny's attitude towards him and Jim, and responded "Well, if he's so concerned ... let him go out with you when you go to make the buy, if you're so worried about it." Sonny agreed to accompany them, assuming he was still on the premises.

Jim returned at 11:15 P.M. and Agent P, accompanied by Sonny, departed the premises with Jim and consummated the sale in the parking lot. Upon their return to the bar, Bill who witnessed their departure with Jim a few minutes earlier, inquired whether everything was alright; Agent P responded affirmatively, and informed him she had just purchased a large quantity of barbituates, and had arranged to buy Methadrine the following evening.

On February 5, 1977, Agents P and W returned to the licensed premises. Agent D'O was present and remained apart, as he had on the previous evening. Agent P asked Bill whether or not Jim was in the tavern. Bill stated he might be late, or could not get the drugs or gotten "hung up". Later, she spoke to the barmaid, Dee, explaining she had purchased "downers" from Jim the previous evening and was waiting for him in order to purchase "speed" on this evening.

On February 10th Agent P returned and was introduced to a patron named Gary, by Bill. Gary had just supplied Bill with two "black beauties" (Bi-Amphetamine). Gary was supposedly able to introduce her to persons from whom she could purchase drugs. Arrangements were made with Gary to purchase drugs at 3:00 P.M. the following afternoon, but he failed to appear at the agreed time.

Agent L corroborated Agent P's testimony relative to February 3. He stated that the dancer wore a mesh-like costume

and her breasts and nipples were clearly visible, although a seven inch metallic tassel one quarter inch wide was affixed, which was intended to (but did not) cover the nipple area.

From Agent L's description, the dancer was a contortionist capable of remarkable gymnastic feats. He too, asserted that she simulated sexual intercourse by pelvic gyrations while in a prone position.

A.B.C. Agent W corroborated the testimony of Agent P. In addition, she described their conversation with Dee, the barmaid, in which she was told that Sonny was going to sell them cocaine. Dee stated that they (agents P and W) should not deal with Sonny as "she had just snorted some cocaine with Sonny and she didn't get off on it, it was pharmaceutical coke".

Additionally, Agent W stated that Bill, the bouncer, wrote Gary's phone number on a coaster and gave it to them the evening that Gary was delayed in keeping an appointment to deliver drugs.

A.B.C. Agent S testified as to the chain of possession of the purchases made by Agents P and W; including their storage and hand delivery by him to the State Police Laboratory at Little Falls and pick-up after analysis was completed.

Nora Rodriquez and Margaret Turner, forensic chemists possessing ample qualifications in their field, and employed by the New Jersey State Police, testified that the chemical analysis each performed upon the various samples purchased and submitted established that they were controlled dangerous substances.

Stephen Fizer, manager and son of the corporate stockholders, testified on licensee's behalf. He described the dancer's routine as that of an "Olympic gymnast", denying it to be lewd. He admitted that the costume was see-through in nature. The following testimony is pertinent:

Q. Could you see through it?

A. It's a tight fishnet, you could see through it, yes.

Q. Also it had some sort of other object there like, lets say, rhinestones or ...

A. Also known as pasties, and panties, right.

. . .

Q. Would you tell me what if anything, the top part of the costume had to obscure the dancers busts while she was performing?

A. Rhinestones.

. . .

Q. She had worn pasties?

A. Pasties built into the costume.

Q. When you say pasties built into the costume could you be more specific?

A. On the inside of the costume, pasties which covered the nipple.

Fizer denied any knowledge of illegal activities relative to C.D.S. within the tavern. The balance of his testimony dealt with issues not relevant to the charges herein.

Delores Orlando, the barmaid, denied any discussion with Division agents relative to illegal activities within the bar, and her alleged use of C.D.S. She, too, described the Go-Go dancer as a contortionist and disagreed with the allegation that it was lewd. She stated that the dancer did not perform the motions simulating intercourse, as alleged by the agents.

Elizabeth Fizer, who, with her husband Andrew owns the outstanding corporate stock, testified that she is active in the daily operation of the licensed premises. She stated that she runs a "clean" place and everybody knows it. She denied that any of the dancer's routine was either suggestive or lewd. She specifically denied that the dancer performed in the manner described by the agents. She likewise denied that any illegal activity is tolerated in the licensed premises; and she has never heard any discussion relative to the sale of drugs.

I

At the hearing in this Division, two motions were

made by licensee's attorney on procedural grounds.

The first motion was to dismiss the charges on the contention that an unduly long period of time elapsed between the last claimed occurrence and the preferment of the charges herein. This lapse of time is claimed to have prevented a proper investigation by the licensee and has rendered it impossible to prepare a proper defense.

I find that less than three months had elapsed between the last claimed infraction and the mailing of charges. Such time period is not at all unusual in length, nor could it be construed as the proximate cause of the licensee's alleged inability to prepare a proper defense to the charges herein.

The second motion to dismiss was based upon the allegation that, while granting discovery, the Division refused to supply the home addresses of its undercover agents who participated in the investigation, which culminated in the charges preferred against the licensee.

It is asserted that this was necessary for the licensee to make an investigation of them, their reliability, etc., in order to be able to attack their credibility as witnesses.

The Division maintains that, for reasons of security, this information is not supplied; and, moreover, under the Administrative Procedures Act, there is no automatic right to discovery. The particular agency establishes its own rules and limitations concerning the same.

The Division has a long established policy precluding disclosure of agent's addresses. These proceedings are civil, not criminal in nature, and are against the license, not the person of the licensee.

For the reasons stated, I find no basis for granting either of the motions and recommend that they be denied.

II

In adjudicating matters of this kind we are guided by the firmly established principle that disciplinary proceedings against liquor licensees are civil in nature and require proof by a preponderance of the believable evidence only. Butler Oak Tavern v. Div. of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 20 N.J. 373 (1956); Freud v. Davis, 64 N.J. Super. 242 (App. Div. 1960).

In appraising the factual picture presented herein the credibility of witnesses must be weighed. Testimony, to be believed, must not only proceed from the mouth of a credible witness but must be credible in itself. It must be such as the common experience and observation of mankind can approve as probable in the circumstances. Spagnuolo v. Bonnet, 16 N.J. 546 (1954); Gallo v. Gallo, 66 N.J. Super. 1 (App. Div. 1961).

The general rule in these cases is that the finding must be based on competent legal evidence and must be grounded on a reasonable certainty as to the probabilities arising from a fair consideration of the evidence. 32A C.J.S. Evidence, sec. 1042.

I find the testimony of the Agents relative to conversations with the various employees and patrons of licensee to be convincing and detailed. They were present in the establishment as a result of a specific assignment, and have no interest whatsoever, beyond the proper performance of their job, in the outcome of the matter.

On the other hand, the denials and negative statements by the licensee's witnesses were unconvincing.

From the evidence presented, it is clear that the licensee, through its employees, permitted and suffered the sale of controlled dangerous substances to take place on the licensed premises, as charged.

As the Supreme Court said in Essex Holding Corp. v. Hock, 136 N.J.L. 28, 31 (Sup. Ct. 1947):

Although the word "suffer" may require a different interpretation in the case of a trespasser, it imposes responsibility on a licensee, regardless of knowledge, where there is a failure to prevent the prohibited conduct by those occupying the premises with his authority.

III

With respect to the charge of lewdness in the licensed premises, it has been clearly established that topless dancing or its equivalent is prohibited. Re Play Pen Incorporation, Bulletin 1778 Item 5, affirmed by the Appellate Division (1968), not officially reported, reprinted in Bulletin 1805 Item 1.

Our courts have uniformly held that the standard applied by this rule (Rule 5 of State Regulation No. 20), (now N.J.A.C. 13:2-23.6) to licensed premises has been more restrictive than the standards applied to commercial or non-licensed premises. In Davis v. New Town Tavern, 37 N.J. Super. 376, 378 (App. Div. 1955), the court ruled:

What is lewdness or immorality for purposes of a rule regulating premises licensed for the sale of alcoholic beverages may be determinable on a distinctly narrower basis than for purposes of regulation of commercial entertainment generally.

In McFadden's Lounge v. Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 33 N.J. Super. 61, 68 (App. Div. 1954) the court pointed out:

(We) are not presently concerned with the preliminary censorship of a book or of an oral address or lecture. Our immediate interest and attention is confined to the disciplinary action taken against the licensee of a public tavern, whose privileges may lawfully be tightly restricted to limit to the utmost the evils of the trade. Vide, Paul v. Gloucester County, 50 N.J.L. 585 (E. & A. 1888).

Conduct in a licensed premises, whether it be in the form of art, dress or speech, like morality in general, consists in drawing the line some place. To reason contra would be inviting the rule of the jungle to prevail.

It is a well established and fundamental principle that a licensee is responsible for the misconduct of persons employed and is fully responsible for their activities during their employ on licensed premises. In re Olympic, Inc., 49 N.J. Super. 299 (App. Div. 1958); In re Schneider, 12 N.J. Super. 449 (App. Div. 1951); Rule 33 of State Regulation No. 20 (now N.J.A.C. 13:2-23.28). Furthermore, the responsibility of the licensee does not depend upon his personal knowledge or participation. In fact, it has been held that a licensee is not relieved even if the employee violates his explicit instructions. Greenbrier, Inc. v. Hock, 14 N.J. Super. 39 (App. Div. 1951); F. & A. Distributing Co. v. Div. of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 36 N.J. 34 (1961).

Finally, it may be well to point out that all licensees are charged with knowledge of the admonition of former Director

Lordi expressed in Re Play Pen Incorporation, Bulletin 1778, Item 5, as follows:

In passing, however, I wish emphatically to advise all licensees that so-called "topless" female employees, whether entertainers or otherwise, and whether with pasties described by the Division agents or the larger ones described by the licensee's witnesses, will not be tolerated on licensed premises in this State.

Accordingly, after considering the entire record and the various precedents cited, I am persuaded by the clear and convincing proof in this case that this charge has been sustained by a fair preponderance of the credible evidence. I, therefore, recommend that the licensee be found guilty of the charge.

IV

I conclude that a fair evaluation of the evidence and the legal principles applicable thereto, clearly and reasonably preponderates in favor of a finding of guilt of said charges, for the reasons set forth above.

I, therefore, recommend that the licensee be adjudged guilty of said charges.

Absent prior record, I recommend that the license be suspended sixty days for violations of Rule 4 and thirty days for violation of Rule 5 of State Regulation 20 (now N.J.A.C. 13:2-23.5 and N.J.A.C. 13:2-23.6); totalling ninety days.

CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

No written Exceptions to the Hearer's Report were filed by the parties pursuant to N.J.A.C. 13:2-19.6.

Having carefully considered the entire record herein, including the transcript of the 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.

For record purposes, it is noted that upon a plea of non vult to the charges herein, a seventy-two days license suspension was imposed by Conclusions and Order dated October

31, 1978. A Supplemental Order of January 19, 1979 fixed the term of suspension when the licensee resumed active operations. A Second Supplemental Order vacated prior Orders and permitted the licensee to withdraw its non vult plea. Thus, the within Order is predicated upon the full hearing in this Division, wherein I find the licensee guilty as charged. The license shall be suspended for ninety (90) days.

Accordingly, it is, on this 30th day of May, 1979,

ORDERED that Plenary Retail Consumption License No. 1209-33-015-001 issued by the Township Council of the Township of Old Bridge to Fizer Corp., t/a Your Susie's Place, for premises Highway #35 and Lawrence Parkway, Old Bridge be and the same is hereby suspended for the balance of its term, viz., midnite, June 30, 1979, commencing 2:00 a.m. Thursday, June 14, 1979; and it is further

ORDERED that any renewal of said license which may be granted be and the same is hereby suspended until 2:00 a.m. Wednesday, September 12, 1979

JOSEPH H. LERNER
DIRECTOR

3. STATE LICENSES - NEW APPLICATIONS FILED.

Abate Importing Co.
28 North Kentucky Avenue
Atlantic City, New Jersey
Application filed October 29, 1979
for limited wholesale license.

Statewide Beer Distributing Inc.
Route 57 & Hensfoot Road
Phillipsburg, New Jersey
Application filed November 15, 1979
for person-to-person transfer of
Limited Wholesale License 3400-25-111-001
from Morris Nemerofsky, t/a Statewide
Distributing.

Vallese Beverage Inc.
3501 Park Boulevard
Wildwood, New Jersey
Application filed November 19, 1979 for
additional warehouse license covering
premises 3915 Park Boulevard, Wildwood,
New Jersey, under State Beverage Distributor's
License 3400-19-278-001.



Joseph H. Lerner
Director