

RESTRICTED (when complete)

MG11

WITNESS STATEMENT

Statement of: 8686 Rosales

Age (if under 18): Over 18

Occupation: Licensing Officer

This statement (consisting of 2 pages each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated anything in it, which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: REDACTED

Date: 12/06/2026

I am employed by Dorset Police as a Licensing Officer and am responsible for overseeing licensed premises within the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole areas. My role is to ensure that licensed premises uphold the licensing objectives, specifically the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety, and that premises comply with the conditions attached to their premises licence.

I make this statement in support of the Application for Review of the Premises Licence for as submitted by the Home Office Immigration Enforcement.

On 28 May 2026, I visited Wok 2 Go, 13 Holdenhurst Road, Bournemouth BH8 8EH as part of a Bournemouth Day of Action initiative. This multi-agency operation involved officers and representatives from the Neighbourhood Policing Team, the Anti-Social Behaviour Team, Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council, and other partner agencies. The purpose of the operation was to engage with members of the community and local licensed premises to address and reduce anti-social behaviour issues within the Lansdowne area. I was accompanied by my colleague, Licensing Officer Perrin-Parker, together with CSAS Officers Daniel Harvey and Borry Bah.

Upon entering the premises, I observed a male seated at a table near the entrance. There were also 2 customers seated on the right-hand side of the premises eating. As no member of staff was immediately visible, we introduced ourselves to a male seated near the entrance, as we initially believed him to be staff due to the manner in which he stood up and acknowledged our presence.

When asked whether he worked at the premises, he stated that he did not and that he was waiting for a friend. I asked whether he knew who was working at the premises, given that no staff members appeared to be present. He informed us that the chef had "just popped out". When asked when the chef would return and whether there were any other members of staff on site, he was unable to answer. Due to a language barrier, it was not possible to pursue further questioning, and we therefore remained at the premises awaiting the chef's return.

After several minutes had elapsed, I became increasingly concerned that the premises had been left unattended whilst customers remained inside. The premises has an open kitchen layout that is readily accessible from the customer area, with only the serving counter and till separating members of the public from the kitchen.

The Lansdowne area is a hotspot for crime and anti-social behaviour, and the absence of any responsible member of staff created an unacceptable risk. During this period, members of the public could potentially have accessed the till area, entered the kitchen, or obtained kitchen knives.

Leaving the premises unattended in these circumstances represented a significant failure to adequately promote the licensing objective of public safety.

Eventually, the chef returned to the premises. I observed him greet and embrace the male we had spoken to earlier near the entrance, after which that individual left the premises. Introductions were made and the purpose of our visit was explained. The chef identified himself as REDACTED and stated that he was the only member of staff working that day.

I asked REDACTED why he had left the premises unattended. He explained that he had gone out to obtain supplies. I outlined the concerns arising from his actions; however, he did not appear to appreciate the seriousness of the situation or the potential risks created by leaving customers in an operational food premises without staff supervision.

When asked how long he had been absent from the premises, REDACTED stated that it had only been for a few minutes. I advised him that we had been waiting for in excess of seven minutes and asked if he can access the CCTV

system so that the exact duration of his absence could be verified. REDACTED informed us that he did not have access to the CCTV system.

It is deeply concerning and disappointing that a licensed premises would fail to uphold the licensing objective of public safety in such a manner. The events I witnessed during this visit demonstrated poor management, inadequate supervision, a failure to uphold the Licensing objectives in addition to a failure to recognise and mitigate obvious risks to customers and the wider public.

For these reasons and based upon my direct observations during the visit on 28 May 2026, Dorset Police fully support the Application for Review of the Premises Licence submitted by the Home Office Immigration Enforcement and would propose that revocation of the premises licence is the only appropriate and proportionate outcome.

Statement taken by:	8686 Rosales
Signature	
Station	Bournemouth Police Station