

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

November 8, 1978

BULLETIN 2302

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM

1. COURT DECISIONS - SPILLED, INC. - DIRECTOR AFFIRMED.
2. APPELLATE DECISIONS - TAK & YOUNG, INC. v. EAST RUTHERFORD.
3. PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RULING - RE HARRISON BEVERAGE CO. ET AL.
4. APPELLATE DECISIONS - BEACHVIEW BUILDING CORPORATION v. ATLANTIC CITY.
5. APPELLATE DECISIONS - LIPARI v. PASSAIC.
6. INFORMATIONAL LETTER OF DIRECTOR - POLICE OFFICERS AS DIRECTORS OF LICENSED CLUBS.
7. ADVISORY OPINION OF DIRECTOR - PROBATION OFFICERS HAVING AN INTEREST IN A LIQUOR LICENSE.
8. APPELLATE DECISIONS - NEW BROAD STREET BAR CORP. v. NEWARK.
9. 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 2302

November 8, 1978

1. COURT DECISIONS - SPILLED, INC. - DIRECTOR AFFIRMED.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
APPELLATE DIVISION  
A-3029-76

In the Matter of Disciplinary  
Proceedings against

SPILLED, INC.  
t/a Rocky's West  
1379 White Horse Pike  
Galloway Township  
Absecon, N. J.

---

Submitted September 12, 1978 - Decided September 22, 1978.

Before Judges Matthews and Milmed.

On appeal from the order of the Director of the Division  
of Alcoholic Beverage Control.

Mr. Charles H. Nugent, attorney for appellant.

Mr. John Degnan, Attorney General of New Jersey, attorney  
for respondent (Mr. William F. Hyland, former Attorney  
General; Ms. Erminie Conley, Deputy Attorney General, of  
counsel; Mr. Mart Vaarsi, Deputy Attorney General, on the  
brief).

PER CURIAM

(Appeal from the Director's decision in Re Spilled, Inc.,  
Bulletin 2262, Item 3. Director affirmed. Opinion  
not approved for publication by Court Committee on  
Opinions).

2. APPELLATE DECISIONS - TAK & YOUNG, INC. v. EAST RUTHERFORD.

Tak & Young, Inc., )  
 t/a Old Heidelberg Bar & Grill, )  
 )  
 Appellant, )  
 )  
 vs. )  
 )  
 Mayor and Council of the Borough )  
 of East Rutherford, )  
 )  
 Respondent. )

ORDER  
 DISMISSING  
 APPEAL

-----  
 Skoloff & Wolfe, P.A., by Saul A. Wolfe, Esq., Attorneys for Appellant.  
 Alfred A. Porro, Jr., Esq., by Richard W. Macaluso, Esq., Attorneys for Respondent.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

Appellant appeals from the alleged denial by respondent, Mayor and Council of the Borough of East Rutherford of its application for the renewal for the 1978-79 licensing period of Plenary Retail Consumption License 0212-33-021-001, heretofore issued to the appellant by the respondent for premises 235 Paterson Avenue, East Rutherford.

By letter dated July 14, 1978, the attorneys for the appellant state that said license was renewed for the current licensing period viz., from July 1, 1978 through June 30, 1979, subject to the special condition "that the licensee will not sell alcoholic beverages in individual containers for off-premises consumption after 9:00 p.m., prior to October 1, 1978."

Appellant requests that this special condition be approved, and that an order be entered "accordingly". Good cause appearing, I shall enter an order approving the said special condition and dismissing the said appeal.

Accordingly, it is, on this 7th day of August, 1978,

ORDERED that the special condition, as hereinabove set forth, imposed upon the renewal of Plenary Retail Consumption License 0212-33-021-001 issued by the respondent Mayor and Council of the Borough of East Rutherford for the 1978-79 licensing period to appellant Tak & Young, Inc., t/a Old Heidelberg Bar & Grill for premises 235 Paterson Avenue, East Rutherford be and the same is hereby approved; and it is further

ORDERED that the appeal herein be and the same is hereby dismissed.

JOSEPH H. LERNER  
 DIRECTOR

3. PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RULING - RE HARRISON BEVERAGE CO. ET AL.

In Re: Petition for Declaratory Ruling by Harrison Beverage Co., S & S Distributors, South Jersey Distributors and Kramer Beverages.	) ) )	CONCLUSIONS and ORDER
---	-------------	-----------------------------

-----  
 Freidman and D'Alessandro, Esqs., by Edward G. D'Alessandro, Esq.,  
 Attorneys for Petitioners.  
 Eugene Taylor, Receiver, appearing Pro se.  
 Perskie and Callinan, Esqs., by John F. Callinan, Esq.,  
 Attorneys for Christi, Inc., t/a Herald's Inn,  
 Edna D. Barrett and Franklin P. Barrett.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

The Hearer has filed the following report herein:

Hearer's Report

Petitioners filed for Declaratory Ruling after receiving a Letter Opinion from this Division, dated October 27, 1977, the import of which will be hereinafter set forth, which was adverse to their respective interests as duly licensed New Jersey wholesale distributors of malt alcoholic beverages.

The following stipulated facts form the basis of Petitioners' request.

All of the above referenced wholesale distributors sold malt alcoholic beverages to All Star, Inc., t/a Herald's Inn, holder of Plenary Retail Consumption License C-4 located in Rio Grande, Middle Township. All Star was placed upon the default list, and thereafter, on September 6, 1977 it was put on the non-delivery list as a consequence of its continuing delinquency in payments to petitioners.

The bank that held the first mortgage on the real property instituted foreclosure proceedings due to default on its mortgage, and in its action named as parties, all judgment creditors of record. The various petitioners were not named because their claims were not reduced to (recorded) judgments.

In May 1977, Eugene T. Taylor, a former owner of the license, was appointed receiver of the assets of All Star.

A request for a letter opinion was received from the Receiver's Attorney relative to Division policy concerning Rule 4(c) of State Regulation No. 39. He was advised, on October 27, 1977..."It is the routine practice of the Division's default

section to immediately remove a licensee's name from the default list or non-delivery list whenever the license has been extended to a receiver, executor, administrator or trustee, etc. Applying the Division's policy to the situation in which you are presently involved, the outstanding unpaid liquor bills will not follow the transfer of the license. The transferee will take the license free and clear."

In November, 1977, the premises and liquor license held by All Star, Inc. were sold, pursuant to a Sheriff's sale, to Christi, Inc., whose principals are Edna D. and Franklin T. Barrett.

Petitioners are still owed the following monies:

Harrison Beverage Co.	\$13,590.22
S & S Distributors	4,075.41
South Jersey Distributors	5,819.99
Kramer Beverages	4,763.05

Subsequently, the license (now owned by Christi, Inc.) was transferred, and, according to Division records it was removed from the non-delivery list as a consequence of the Sheriff giving title, free of any incumbrances. Parenthetically, this is contra to Division policy in the instance where the transfer is a voluntary one, Rule 4 (c) of State Regulation No. 39.

The proceeds realized at the Sheriff's sale were insufficient to extinguish the recorded judgments, much less pay the unsecured creditors, among them the petitioners herein.

On December 14, 1977 the Petitioners filed the Petition for Declaratory Ruling, sub judice. Among other allegations, they state, in Paragraph Fourteen..."if Regulation 39, Rule 4(c) is not applied, the result will be that petitioners will have lost the intended protection afforded by that particular Rule, since they will be without any remedy against the new holders of the liquor license."

In oral argument, they allege that the Division has taken a position which is contrary to the intent and purpose of the Division Rules and Regulations which were designed to protect sellers of alcoholic beverages.

## I

In Bulletin 1647, Item 1, the then Director Lordi, stated that Rule 4(c) of State Regulation 39 was adopted to prevent the evasion of the Division's credit control rules through sham transfers. A licensee could run up a substantial indebtedness from wholesale liquor purchases and then transfer the license to a corporation in which he was the major stockholder, thereby evading

the credit regulation, since the transferee would then not be bound by the default status of the transferor.

Director Lordi held that, in situations wherein there was reasonable assurance that the license transfer was not intended to evade the credit regulation (such as receivership, an assignment for the benefit of creditors, a levy by the Internal Revenue Service, transfer by an executor or administrator after the death of the licensee, etc., etc.), Rule 4(c) of State Regulation would be deemed inapplicable.

Obviously the intent was to prevent fraud on the part of a licensee, not to protect or guarantee the collection of monies due liquor wholesalers. Their protection lies in reducing their past due claims to a recordable judgment, through appropriate action, in a competent court of plenary jurisdiction; this is not within the authority of the Division. Thus, this Division is not the proper forum for such action.

An inquiry into the propriety of the appointment of Eugene Taylor as receiver may not be entertained in this Division. Actions of courts, judges and sheriffs must, in this Division, be accepted prima facie as being within the scope of authority. Any attack of this nature must be made elsewhere, as in fact, was already initiated in this matter, wherein the Division is named as a defendant.

I find no basis to exist whereby the Letter Opinion of October 27, 1977 should be reversed. I, therefore, recommend that the Petition be denied.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

Written Exceptions to the Hearer's Report in this Declaratory Ruling proceeding were filed by the Petitioners, and written Answers thereto were submitted on behalf of Christi, Inc.

In its Exceptions, the Petitioners advance the same arguments set forth in their Petition, Brief in Support thereof and oral argument of counsel at the hearing in this Division. The reply to the Exceptions are consistent with Christi, Inc.'s position previously set forth in its letter brief to the Hearing Officer. I find that these Exceptions have been fully considered and correctly resolved by the Hearer, and lack merit.

The Division's interpretation of Rule 4(c) of State Regulation No. 39, i.e., to exclude from its effect those involuntary transfers of licenses which are consummated under court supervision, through a court appointed person acting in a fiduciary capacity, is consistent with the intent and purpose of the regulation. Additionally, any objections to the manner of proceedings by the receiver appointed by the Court is cognizable

in that forum.

Having carefully considered the entire record herein, including the transcript of testimony, the exhibits, the written memoranda of counsel, the Hearer's Report, the written Exceptions filed thereto and the written reply to the said Exceptions, I concur with the findings and recommendations of the Hearer, and adopt them as my conclusions herein.

Accordingly, it is, on this 14th day of August, 1978,

DETERMINED that the provisions of Rule 4(c) of State Regulation No. 39, now N.J.A.C. 13:2-39.4(c), do not apply to those situations where a license is transferred by a receiver, executor, administrator, trustee or other fiduciary appointed by a court of plenary jurisdiction pursuant to applicable statutes. The holding of the letter opinion of October 27, 1977 is reaffirmed.

JOSEPH H. LERNER  
DIRECTOR

4. APPELLATE DECISIONS - BEACHVIEW BUILDING CORPORATION v. ATLANTIC CITY.

Beachview Building Corporation,	)	ON APPEAL
Appellant,	)	CONCLUSIONS
v.	)	AND
Board of Commissioners of the City of Atlantic City,	)	ORDER
Respondent.	)	

-----  
 Roy S. Baylinson, Esq , Attorney for Appellant.  
 Richard I. Rosenberg, Esq., Attorney for Transferor.  
 John C. Matthews, Esq., Attorney for Respondent.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

The Hearer has filed the following report herein:

HEARER'S REPORT

This is an appeal from the action of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Atlantic City (hereafter Board) which, on April 27, 1978, denied appellant's application for a person-to-person transfer of Plenary Retail Consumption License, C-99, issued by the Board to Samuel Hunter, t/a Belport Inn for premises 1660 West Riverside Drive and Kuehnle Avenue, Atlantic City.

The chronology of events preceding this appeal include a previous denial of the same application, by resolution of the Board, dated December 9, 1977, wherein the Board determined, in essence, that the existing use by the transferor was a disruptive influence in the neighborhood. A timely appeal was filed therefrom by the appellant. Since the denial was, in effect, a "punishment" to the transferor, and did not relate to the qualifications of appellants, the matter was remanded for further hearing by the Board. After hearing, the application was denied and this appeal followed.

An appeal de novo was heard in this Division, with full opportunity afforded the parties to introduce evidence and to cross-examine witnesses, pursuant to Rule 6 of State Regulation No. 15. Additionally, the parties introduced transcripts of the hearings held by the Board, in accordance with Rule 8 of State Regulation No. 15. The factual situation as set forth in the transcripts was

not controverted by either party.

In addition, George Peorner and Richard F. DeLucas testified in support of the appeal. They are the sole stockholders of appellant corporation, and as such, supplemented the record with testimony as to their personal expertise in conjunction with the alcoholic beverage industry, and the proposed plans they have for use of the license.

Poerner is a construction contractor and the owner of Mechanical Dry Wall Systems, Inc. for the past eighteen years. Mechanical Dry Wall Systems is presently engaged in the fulfillment of numerous contracts, some of which approach one hundred thousand dollars. For two years, Peorner served as Mayor of Waretown and, prior to that, was Committeeman for three years.

He has served as a bartender and bar manager at the Waretown firehouse, when they had their social affairs pursuant to special ABC permits. He has enjoyed that activity and on many occasions has acted as a bartender and manager of social events where alcoholic beverages have been served.

Should the appellant acquire the subject license, it would hire a bartender-manager. The person the appellant has retained for that purpose is presently the manager of a well known restaurant and has served as assistant manager at the Knife and Fork Restaurant and the Smithville Inn. The subject premises will be operated as a restaurant and cocktail lounge, and not as a "discotheque".

Richard F. DeLucas testified that he is a builder with twelve years experience and has particular familiarity with payroll and other tax requirements. He will be the fiscal officer of the appellant.

An examination of the transcripts before the Board discloses that the objecting neighbors opposed the application to transfer to bring a close to a licensed operation at that location, and an end to the prior operation which had caused them so much difficulty. By a split vote of the four voting members, the Board denied the application. No reasoning was offered by the Board in critique of the character and abilities of the principals of appellant corporation.

Both witnesses for appellant affirmed that, although substantial renovation of the exterior and interior of the subject premises was contemplated, in order to make it an attractive restaurant in place of the present bar-type operation, there would be no premises enlargements whatever.

The transfer of a liquor license is not an inherent or automatic right. If denied on reasonable grounds, such action will be affirmed. Richmon, Inc. v. Trenton, Bulletin 1560, Item 4. On the other hand, if the denial is unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious, the action will be reversed. Tomkins v. Seaside Heights, Bulletin 1398, Item 1. As stated in Common Council of Hightstown v. Hedy's Bar, 86 N.J. Super, 561, 562 (App. Div. 1965):

However, where the municipal action was unreasonable ... or improperly grounded ... the Director will grant such relief or take such action as is appropriate.

An examination of the transcripts of the proceedings before the Board reveals that there was not a scintilla of evidence produced in substantiation of the contention that the appellant's ownership would continue the alleged evils of its predecessor. There was no testimony that the principals of appellant corporation are unqualified or without personal integrity, so as to make them unfit to become owners of the premises.

Likewise, there was not a shred of evidence to substantiate the belief that, if, indeed, such belief was sincere, the premises would remain as they are presently being operated. To the contrary, the appellants have volunteered to have the license specially conditioned, if necessary, prohibiting discotheque operations. This offer was made as assurance of the appellant's good faith intentions to conduct a fine restaurant and cocktail lounge.

I distinguish this case from Lyons Farms Tavern v. Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Newark, 68 N.J. 44 (1975), wherein objections to a person-to-person transfer were sustained to the extent that special conditions were imposed. It was proven therein, that an expanded utilization of the licensed premises would be put into operation upon the approval of the transfer, and that the neighbors objected to same. The court held that such neighborhood sentiment should be given thoughtful consideration in a person-to-person transfer. In this instant matter however, the neighborhood sentiment was directed solely to the mode of prior operation and, as there is no intended continuation or expansion of the undesired use, but rather, a restriction thereof, the fears of such neighbors are conjectural.

A person-to-person transfer application relates to the persons who are about to become licensees. Objections to their character and fitness should be seriously taken. In this matter,

there are no objections whatever to the character of the two principals, and the speculative objections raised are not dispositive of the issue to be decided.

In reviewing the record herein, including the exhibits and the testimony presented, I find no factual or legal foundation to support the Board's action, and I find that the action of the Board was unreasonable and arbitrary.

For the reasons stated, I conclude that the appellant has sustained the burden imposed upon it under Rule 6 of State Regulation No. 15.

It is, therefore, recommended that the action of the Board be reversed and that an order be entered directing the Board to grant the application for transfer in accordance with the application filed therefor, subject to the imposition of the special condition that no "discotheque" operations be conducted at the licensed premises.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

No written Exceptions to the Hearer's Report were filed pursuant to N.J.A.C. 13:2-17.14 (prior Rule 14 of State Regulation No. 15).

It appears that the principal officers of the corporate appellant are reputable persons. The appellant has represented that it intends to operate these premises as a high-class restaurant and cocktail lounge, and has agreed to accept the special condition prohibiting a discotheque operation. It was this discotheque type of operation which apparently caused the objectionable conditions.

In any event, it is assumed that these premises will now be operated in a lawful manner. In the event that these premises are operated in such manner as to constitute a nuisance, the Board of Commissioners should promptly institute disciplinary proceedings which may result in the suspension or revocation of the said license.

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 18th day of August, 1978,

ORDERED that the action of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Atlantic City be and the same is hereby reversed; and it is further

ORDERED that the said Board be and is hereby directed to grant the application for transfer in accordance with the application filed thereof, which said transfer shall be subject to the special condition that no discotheque or similar type operation shall be conducted at the licensed premises.

JOSEPH H. LERNER  
DIRECTOR

5. APPELLATE DECISIONS - LIPARI v. PASSAIC.

JOSEPH LIPARI, JR.,  
t/a Pal Joey's

Appellant,

v.

Municipal Board of Alcoholic  
Beverage Control of the City  
of Passaic,

Respondent.

ON APPEAL  
ORDER

.....  
Jack Krakauer, Esq., Attorney for Appellant.  
Randolph Newman, Esq., Attorney for Respondent.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

This is an appeal from the action of the Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Passaic which, by Resolution of February 21, 1978, suspended appellant's license for five days upon a finding of guilt to charges alleging a violation of the local hours ordinance.

By Order of the Director of this Division, dated March 1, 1978, the suspension imposed by the Board was stayed pending the determination of this appeal.

A notice of hearing was mailed to the parties scheduling a hearing in this Division on April 5, 1978. This hearing was

adjourned pursuant to appellant's request to pay a fine in lieu of suspension. The appellant failed to provide information upon which a fine could be assessed, and the matter was rescheduled for hearing on July 24, 1978 at 9:30 A.M. peremptorily. On that date and time, no one appeared for or on behalf of the appellant to move the matter, although due notice of the date of hearing had been furnished.

Therefore, I shall dismiss the appeal for failure to prosecute and reimpose the effective dates of the suspension.

Accordingly, it is, on this 2nd day of August, 1978,

ORDERED that the appeal filed herein be and the same is hereby dismissed; and it is further

ORDERED that the stay of suspension granted pursuant to my Order of March 1, 1978, be and the same is hereby vacated; and it is further

ORDERED that Plenary Retail Consumption License 1607-33-016-002 issued by the Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Passaic to Joseph Lipari Jr., t/a Pal Joey's, for premises 52 Garden Street, Passaic, be and the same is hereby suspended for five (5) days commencing at 3:00 A.M. on Friday, August 11, 1978 and terminating at 3:00 A.M. on Wednesday, August 16, 1978.

JOSEPH H. LERNER  
DIRECTOR

6. INFORMATIONAL LETTER OF DIRECTOR - POLICE OFFICERS AS DIRECTORS OF LICENSED CLUBS.

August 31, 1978

Bernard Blum, President  
Hanover Country Club

Dear Sir:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated August 22, 1978 from Walter B. Moore, who requests a further explanation why his membership on the Board of Directors of the Hanover Country Club is prohibited by virtue of his status as a law enforcement officer.

This Division has consistently held that those who occupy an elected or appointed office in a club, exercise an interest in the license.

A corporation is merely a legal entity. It is composed of individuals who are either general members or office holders. The corporate licensee acts through its Board of Directors. They dictate policy and delineate the club's operation. As such, it is the Board which has, within the provisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Law and its Regulations, an interest in the club license.

Therefore, general membership by a law enforcement officer is permitted in a non-profit club license, but any office holding therein is prohibited.

JOSEPH H. LERNER  
DIRECTOR

7. ADVISORY OPINION OF DIRECTOR - PROBATION OFFICERS HAVING AN INTEREST IN A LIQUOR LICENSE.

September 26, 1978

Mr. John W. Ryan  
Bricktown, N. J.

Dear Sir:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter, with enclosures, requesting an advisory opinion whether a probation officer is disqualified from having an interest in a liquor license pursuant to the above referred regulation.

After review of the documents enclosed and applicable law, I have determined that a probation officer is not disqualified under the "police officer" rule. The position lacks law enforcement powers. Specific limited statutory duties and powers are established, none of which include the enforcement of the Alcoholic Beverage Law.

JOSEPH H. LERNER  
DIRECTOR

8. APPELLATE DECISIONS - NEW BROAD STREET BAR CORP. v. NEWARK.

New Broad Street Bar Corp.,	:	
t/a Cowboys Lounge,	:	
Appellant,	:	ON APPEAL
vs.	:	CONCLUSIONS
	:	AND
Municipal Board of Alcoholic	:	ORDER
Beverage Control of the City	:	
of Newark,	:	
Respondent.	:	

.....

Hilton Davis, Esq., Attorney for Appellant.  
John C. Pidgeon, Esq., Attorney for the Respondent.

BY THE DIRECTOR:

The Hearer has filed the following report herein:

HEARER'S REPORT

This is an appeal from the action of the Municipal Board of Alcoholic Beverage Control of the City of Newark, which by Resolution dated June 16, 1977, denied appellant's application for renewal of its Plenary Retail Consumption License No. C-234, for the 1977-78 licensing year.

In its Petition of Appeal, the appellant alleges that the action of the Board, in failing to provide the appellant with adequate opportunity to obtain counsel and prepare for the hearing before the Board, was arbitrary, capricious and improper.

The Board, in its Answer, denies the substantive allegations and interposes, as a separate defense, the failure of appellant to file its appeal within the thirty days as provided by N.J.S.A. 33:1-22.

The matter was submitted for determination in this Division upon the pleadings, summations, and transcript of hearing held before the Board on June 13, 1977, pursuant to Rule 8 of State Regulation No. 15.

The documents reveal that the hearing of June 13, 1977 resulted in the adoption of a formal resolution denying renewal, dated June 16, 1977, a copy of which was mailed to the licensee on June 30, 1977.

The first submission of appeal-type documents to this Division was filed November 3, 1977. For the purpose of this report, I shall consider that date as the effective date of filing. A second filing of documents, in proper form, was received in this Division on December 9, 1977.

Rule 3 of State Regulation No. 15 provides as follows:

Appeals from the issuance of a license and from the granting of an application for the extension or transfer of a license must be taken within thirty (30) days from the date of the action appealed from: all other appeals must be taken within thirty (30) days after the service or mailing of notice by the municipal issuing authority of the action appealed from.

The resolution of June 16, 1977, was mailed to the licensee on June 30, 1977, approximately four months prior to the appellants filing of its Notice of Appeal, on November 3, 1977.

The effect of a failure to file a timely appeal with this Division was set forth by the Appellate Division of the Superior Court in the matter of Hess Oil and Chemical Corp. v. Doremus Sport Club, 80 N.J. Super. 393, 396 (App. Div. 1963), wherein the court stated:

Since the appeal was untimely, the Division acted properly in refusing to hear it. Indeed, the Division had NO JURISDICTION to accept the appeal.  
(emphasis added)

See also, First Baptist Church of Bloomfield v. Bloomfield and Proud Mary's Inc., Bulletin 2249, Item 3 and Lake Lenape Lodge, Inc. v. Township Committee of the Township of Andover, Bulletin 2272, Item 2.

Therefore, the Director has no jurisdiction to review the determination below where the appeal has been untimely filed.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the appeal be dismissed.

Conclusions and Order

No written Exceptions to the Hearer's Report were filed pursuant to N.J.A.C. 13:2-17.4 (formerly Rule 14 of State Regulation No. 15).

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 recommendation of the Hearer and adopt them as my conclusions herein.

Accordingly, it is, on this 8th day of September, 1978,

ORDERED that the appeal herein be and the same is hereby dismissed for lack of jurisdiction in this Division, because of appellant's failure to timely file the said appeal.

JOSEPH H. LERNER  
DIRECTOR

9. STATE LICENSES - NEW APPLICATIONS FILED.

Bokma USA Inc.  
1099 Wall Street West  
Lyndhurst, New Jersey

Application filed November 3, 1978 for  
place-to-place transfer of its plenary  
wholesale license from 252 Nassau Street,  
Princeton, New Jersey.

Trenton Beverage Importers  
831 Parkway Avenue  
Trenton, New Jersey

Application filed November 3, 1978  
for limited wholesale license.



Joseph H. Lerner  
Director