

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAVERING LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**APPLICATION TO TRANSFER LICENCE REGARDING THE DRINKS SELLER SITUATED AT 59**

**CHIPPENHAM ROAD, ROMFORD, RM3 8HL**

1. The Sub – Committee have considered two applications; to transfer the premises licence and to make a variation to the DPS, following objections received from the Metropolitan Police.
2. The Metropolitan Police’s objections state that they strongly believe both applications represents a transfer by proxy in that the proposed DPS, Ms Hashveen Hakimzada (the applicant), is being put forward in name only while Mr Gurmeet Singh Hakimzada (her father) exercises influence or control behind the scenes. The Metropolitan Police detailed that the applicant’s contact details listed on the application form is Mr Gurmeet Hakimzada’s contact details and evidenced this by way of police report details as found in the agenda pack.
3. The police stated that Mr Gurmeet Hakimzada had his premises licence revoked in 2018 when quantities of illegal tobacco were seized. This decision was appealed & resulted in a six-week suspension whereby during that suspension the sale of alcohol continued as demonstrated by a test purchase carried out by Ealing Council officers. The licence was then revoked in March 2019.
4. The Sub – Committee were cognisant of the Secretary of States’ section 182 guidance which states at paragraph 4.69; ‘In exceptional circumstances where the chief officer of police believes the transfer may undermine the crime prevention objective, the police may object to the transfer.’
5. The Sub – Committee were cognisant of the Secretary of States’ section 182 guidance which states at paragraph 8.101; ‘In exceptional circumstances where the chief officer of police believes the transfer may undermine the crime prevention objective, the police may object to the transfer.’

6. The Sub – Committee were cognisant of the Secretary of States’ section 182 guidance which states at paragraph 2.1; ‘Licensing authorities should look to the police as the main source of advice on crime and disorder.’

*Decision*

7. The Sub – Committee was satisfied that the applicant was indeed a proxy to Mr Gurmeet Hakimzada’s applications. This is because;
  - a. The Sub – Committee accepted the evidence presented by the police to demonstrate that contact details listed on the application form was of Mr Gurmeet Hakimzada. The applicant’s agent’s brief explanation for this was that Mr Gurmeet Hakimzada has been their client for a number of years and they had made an administrative error by adding his contact details of the application form. Simultaneously, it was said by the applicant that she had completed the form herself so two different accounts were given to the Sub – Committee.
  - b. The applicant and her agent spent most of their time to demonstrate that the applicant understands the licensing regime rather than addressing the police’s objections and which was the key issue for the hearing.
  - c. Whilst seeking to demonstrate the applicant’s competency, the applicant on a number of occasions stated that her father will be her guide to running the business, that her father had been involved in the application process and in securing a lease at the premises, and with her father’s support she wants to make her father proud. All of these points in turn supporting the police’s concerns.
  - d. The applicant could not explain on what terms the premises is being acquired in that who will hold the lease and the length lease agreement.
  - e. The applicant stated that since January 2025 she had been present at the premises 3 days a week since. However, when asked to explain in what capacity was she was present / working in the premises, she could not give an

explanation other than to say she was there for the transitional period and to order stock of alcohol.

- f. The Sub-Committee also found that the applicant leaned very heavily on her agents to respond to members questions of her understanding of the licensing regime, to the extent that it appeared the applicant was reading of the agent's screen as the agent typed away. Where direct questions were asked to the applicant, for example an explanation of the council's statement of licensing policy and cumulative impact zone, the applicant could simply not respond.
8. The Sub – Committee therefore accepted the police's objections in its entirety decided that to reject both applications.