

**From:** Philip Day <

**Sent:** 02 June 2025 13:42

**To:** GOSLING Gareth 2551 <.Licensing <[licensing@dorset.pnn.police.uk](mailto:licensing@dorset.pnn.police.uk)>; Sarah Rogers - Licensing <

**Cc:** Lacey's Solicitors Licensing <[Licensing@laceyssolicitors.co.uk](mailto:Licensing@laceyssolicitors.co.uk)>; Sarah Rogers - Licensing <SUJEEVAN MURALIMOHAN <

**Subject:** Hillside Stores Licensing Review (MU300/2)

Dear Sgt Gosling and Mrs Rogers

Sgt Gosling: I have been trying to telephone you to follow up on previous emails and to attempt mediation but understand that you may not be available until the morning of the hearing. I had hoped that you would let me have the additional information requested in advance of the hearing itself but if you are unable to do that, I reserve the right to seek an adjournment (although that is something I would like to avoid if at all possible).

Looking at the Premises Licence, I now recall that it was I who drafted the original application (and the conditions set out in Annex 2). However, times have moved on and having regard to the matters raised in the review application, I propose this matter be disposed of by amending the conditions as follows:

Amend condition 2.1 so that it reads:

"A digital CCTV system shall be installed and then maintained in good working order. The system shall cover all public parts of the premises and externally, the entrance to the premises. Recordings shall be maintained for a minimum of 30 days. Facilities shall be made available for authorised officers to view recordings immediately on request and to be provided with copies of recordings in playable format as soon as is reasonably practicable, provided that any request to view recordings or to be provided with copies is compliant with Data Protection legislation. The PLH, DPS or other senior manager shall check the CCTV system on a weekly basis and make a written record of any fault which must be rectified as soon as possible".

Delete condition 2.3 ("loss leader sales") as this is now covered by the mandatory conditions introduced in 2014 following the original grant of this licence.

Amend condition 2.7 so that it reads as follows:

"The premises shall operate a Challenge 25 policy so that any person attempting to purchase alcohol who appears to be under the age of 25 shall be required to produce photographic ID in one or other of the forms specified by the mandatory conditions before being served."

Replace conditions 2.8 and 2.9 with the following:

"All staff concerned with the sale or supply of alcohol shall receive training on restricted sales (i.e. to persons under 18 and persons who are intoxicated) and the terms of this licence before they commence their duties. Refresher training shall be undertaken at least annually. Written records shall be maintained of all staff training, kept on the premises and made available for inspection by authorised officers on request".

Amend condition 2.10 so that it refers to Challenge 25 signage (as opposed to Challenge 21).

For the avoidance of doubt, we would not agree:

Revocation or suspension of the licence.

Removal of the DPS.

Any variation to permitted activities nor permitted hours.

We would however be open to discuss any further amendments to the licence that the Police might request.

Mrs Rogers: Please can you include this email with the papers for members of the sub-committee, together with the skeleton argument that I attach.

Both: Please acknowledge safe receipt.

Regards

Philip

**Philip Day** | Consultant Solicitor

**LACEYS** SOLICITORS

**From:** GOSLING Gareth 2551

**Sent:** 02 June 2025 15:24

**To:** Philip Day .Licensing <[Licensing@Dorset.PNN.Police.uk](mailto:Licensing@Dorset.PNN.Police.uk)>; Sarah Rogers - Licensing <

**Cc:** Lacey's Solicitors Licensing <[Licensing@laceysolicitors.co.uk](mailto:Licensing@laceysolicitors.co.uk)>; SUJEEVAN

MURALIMOCHAN <BUSFIELD Louise 8952 <

**Subject:** RE: Hillside Stores Licensing Review (MU300/2)

Good Afternoon,

This is the first opportunity that I have had to look at any of the vast amounts of correspondence and evidence that has been submitted to Dorset Police today. I have yet to review all of the materials due to other commitments and will unlikely do so until late afternoon tomorrow owing to other commitments.

A request has been sent to HM Immigration to assist with the enquiries made by Mr Day, however, the Officer in Charge is on Annual Leave and not due to return until Wednesday, when they are taking a break from their annual leave to hopefully be in attendance at the hearing. They may not be able to provide the full details requested by Mr Day within such a short timescale. The reasonableness of seeking mediation 2 days in advance of the hearing, expecting an immediate response and then suggesting that an adjournment might be sought will be for the members of the Sub-Committee to determine.

Dorset Police have been available for mediation for several weeks and have had some contact with Mr Mulalimohan in that time.

Dorset Police can confirm that there have been no visits since the date of the visit made by HM Immigration. I'm unsure whether it is relevant as to whether any other responsibility has conducted visits as only Dorset Police have made a representation.

The addition/amendment of conditions that are unrelated to the concerns that have been highlighted are of limited benefit and as Mr Day has made his position clear in respect of alternative disposals, I can see no starting point or likelihood of successful mediation in this matter, though we welcome any proposals that will address the concerns identified.

Finally, Dorset Police have been available for mediation and have served no new evidence other than to respond to the document that Mr Muralimohan submitted following receipt of the Review Application. Dorset Police note that CCTV evidence is being produced 2 days in advance of the hearing in addition to a variety of other documentation which will take significant time to review. Any response to the submission of Mr Day may occur shortly before the hearing.

Regards,

Gareth



**DORSET  
POLICE**

**Gareth Gosling 2551**

Police Sergeant

**From:** Philip Day

**Sent:** 02 June 2025 16:38

**To:** Gosling, Gareth Dorset Police Licensing Sarah Rogers - Licensing

**Cc:** Lacey's Solicitors Licensing <Licensing@laceysolicitors.co.uk>; SUJEEVAN MURALIMOHAN Busfield, Louise ;Licensing Com <licensing@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Hillside Stores Licensing Review (MU300/2)

Dear Sgt Gosling

With the greatest of respect, there has not been a "vast amount of correspondence and evidence that has been submitted to Dorset Police today". I have sent you CCTV footage which was referred to by my client in earlier correspondence and which confirms his earlier statements; his response to the additional statement that you provided to him on Thursday last week (which in turn refers to my client's email of 23<sup>rd</sup> April), two other documents (an affidavit and a copy of a Court Order ) a skeleton argument and a mediation proposal. I would add that the links to the CCTV footage were in fact sent to you on Friday last week and I am sorry that your systems prevented you from downloading the same – as soon as you told me that, I sent the same in a different format.

My client has made it clear for some time that he does not accept what the Immigration Officers have to say and a request for their notes of interview is not unreasonable (but we can do without those if need be as I accept that it is not for the sub-committee to determine whether or not he committed an offence under the Immigration legislation).

I note what you say regarding mediation but given your stance - repeated in your additional material served on Thursday last and in this email chain - it is perhaps unlikely to succeed

unless perhaps you suggest what steps my client might be able to take to “address the concerns identified” (beyond those that I have sought to address).

I also note that the Police have not undertaken any further visits but the Licensing Authority have kindly confirmed that they have visited and found no breaches of licence conditions or other matters of concern. They have also confirmed that Trading Standards have no concerns (regarding the NOS containers, the “raffle” etc.).

This is relevant in that the sub-committee are entitled if not indeed obliged to take into account any matter of concern (or lack thereof) that might have arisen since the review proceedings were instigated and that is particularly relevant here given the assertions made both in the original application and the document you served last Thursday regarding alleged breaches of licensing conditions (all of which are denied).

I appreciate the constraints on your time and your workload. However, my client’s livelihood is at stake here and having (unsuccessfully) attempted to deal with the matter himself, he cannot be blamed for making a (belated) decision to seek legal advice.

I would only add that if, instead of a long email exchange you could have found the time to telephone me, we could at least have agreed to narrow down the issues that the sub-committee will need to consider on Wednesday. In this respect, I trust that my skeleton argument is of assistance and perhaps you would do me the courtesy of letting me have sight of whatever it is that you intend to say at the hearing?

Regards

Philip