

**LICENSE APPEAL COMMISSION  
CITY OF CHICAGO**

Roy’s Food & Liquor, Inc.	)	
Applicant (Packaged Goods)	)	
Abdullqader Saleh, President	)	
for the premises located at	)	
1156 North Pulaski Road	)	
	)	Case No. 20 LA 01
v.	)	
	)	
Department of Business Affairs and Consumer Protection	)	
Local Liquor Control Commission	)	
Shannon Trotter, Commissioner	)	

**ORDER**

**DECISION OF CHAIRMAN FLEMING JOINED BY COMMISSIONER GIBBONS AND  
COMMISSIONER BERG**

On or about October 6, 2019, Roy’s Food & Liquor, Inc. applied for a Packaged Goods liquor license in connection with a convenient store with food for the premises located at 1156 N. Pulaski.

On December 18, 2019, the Applicant was informed by letter and by email to the Applicant’s representative, Justin Kugler, that Local Liquor Control Commissioner Shannon Trotter denied the Packaged Goods license application based on “Law enforcement concerns of the 11<sup>th</sup> District police commander.” The denial letter cited Section 4-60-040(h) of the Chicago Municipal Code which states in relevant part:

...the local liquor commissioner may deny an application for a city liquor dealer’s license if the issuance of such license would tend to create a law enforcement problem...”

## **APPEARANCES**

Assistant Corporation Counsel Ronnie Farhat represented the City of Chicago and Attorneys David R. Kugler and Justin B. Kugler represented the Applicant.

## **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

Prior to the start of evidence, the Applicant's objection to introducing into evidence City Exhibits 1-6, not as substantive evidence, but as the documents reviewed by Commissioner Trotter. They were allowed in evidence not as substantive evidence but as the documents reviewed by Commissioner Trotter.

Bryan Knipper has been the Business Consultant Supervisor with the Hospitality Licensing Group of the Department of Business Affairs and Consumer Protection. In that capacity, he works with the Local Liquor Control Commission and its Commissioner, Shannon Trotter, in processing liquor applications. If a business in Chicago wishes to obtain a liquor license for packaged goods they need to file an application. In this process, the business information sheet, site plans, floor plan, and zoning is usually provided. If zoning is approved, the application moves forward. The consultant puts together all the submitted documentation and submits a summary for review. If the business consultant recommends approval that has no weight on a final determination and is just to state all needed documents have been provided. The review could be completed before any objection letters from an Alderman or the police have come back.

In the next step of the application process, the witness reviews the application for documentation to determine if document review is ready for approval. The final determination lies with the

Local Liquor Control Commissioner, Shannon Trotter. In order for a liquor license to issue, everything must be approved and then the Local Liquor Control Commissioner makes the approval decision.

The witness related the Department received an application for a packaged goods liquor license from Roy's Food & Liquor, Inc. at 1156 N. Pulaski. City Exhibit 3, in evidence, then identified as the application and supplemental documents submitted for the application of Roy's Food & Liquor, Inc. The business activities listed is a convenience store with food, tobacco, and packaged goods liquor. After the application was filed the various stages of the review process transpired.

The Commissioner then takes into account different inputs in deciding whether to approve or deny a liquor license. These include approved fingerprints, finance checks on large debts, and the past history of the owner and the location as well as the commander's input, alderman's input, and community input. An applicant's past business disciplinary history is reviewed by the Department based on a search of places owned in the past by the business owner. Each legal entity has ownership history information to know what timeframe an owner was involved with that business. This review shows the level or the degree that an establishment was run in compliance with the law. The witness identified City Exhibit 4 as a brief sheet for 8900 Commercial Food and Liquor, Inc. which listed Abdullqader Saleh as President of that corporation. It shows a failure to display or produce dram shop in November of 2012 and three sales of alcohol to a minor in 2006, 2007, and 2010. The 2006 sale to a minor may not have been attributable to Mr. Saleh. This exhibit was part of the packet reviewed by the Commissioner.

City Exhibit 5, in evidence, was described by the witness as the Applicant's site plan which showed a convenience store with about 50% food and liquor.

Mr. Knipper testified the Local Liquor Control Commissioner denied the application for packaged goods based on a law enforcement objection. Since it was a law enforcement denial the past disciplinary history of the Applicant would have been reviewed.

City Exhibit 6, in evidence, was then identified as an objection letter and documentation from the 11<sup>th</sup> District Commander Darrell Spencer dated November 8, 2019. City Exhibit 7, in evidence, was identified as an objection letter sent by Alderman Emma Mitts on November 4, 2019. City Exhibit 8, in evidence, is the final denial letter addressed to the Applicant on December 18, 2019.

On cross-examination, Mr. Knipper reviewed Tab 6 and agreed it was an applicant summary created by Daniel Correa on October 23. His signature is on the document dated December 13, 2019, and it reflects no community response. The witness stated that the document was not correct. There were responses but the document had not been updated. It was correct as of Mr. Correa's signature on October 23. The notation *APP* is the date the application has been received and finalized and that begins the 60-day clock. The number of voters notified as 185 is system generated within 250 feet. There were no voter objections at the time Mr. Correa wrote his report.

The witness explained the first page of Tab 6 is the Public Notice to be posted on the door for 30 days. There is also a Sun-Times notice that goes out. Mr. Knipper agreed there are no notices in the file from the public objecting to this location.

He then stated Roy's Liquor was applying for a Packaged Goods license in a B3-1 zoning district which required the packaged goods liquor license to be an accessory to the food license application. The food license application for this location was approved but the packaged goods license was denied.

Mr. Knipper approved this application on December 13, 2019, and prepped the case before submitting it to the Liquor Control Commissioner. He sat with her as she reviewed these documents. He had not reviewed the documents based on the input of the police commander, the alderman, or the community. He was not certain when he found out about the Alderman's letter. He was approving the documents as correct, not the case. He does not believe he saw the Alderman's or the Commander's letter prior to the date of review.

Miguel Campos was identified as a Supervisor of the Business Affairs and Consumer Protection Business Compliant Enforcement. He oversees investigators that do onsite investigations to see if a location qualifies to be a grocery store selling packaged goods. This site was approved as a grocery store selling packaged liquor. To the best of Mr. Knipper's knowledge, this application was approved by everybody but Shannon Trotter.

The witness stated he did not do any investigation into the Commander's letter or the 45 incidents referenced; that was reviewed by the Commissioner and deemed to be sufficient for denial.

Mr. Knipper agreed the ordinance states written notice was to be sent to all voters within 250 feet and that any objection to the granting of the license shall be signed and delivered to the Local Liquor Control Commissioner within 35 days after the license fee is paid. That would be 35 days after October 10. There are no registered voter objections in the application.

The witness stated the business consultant searched the prior history of the Applicant. Besides 8900 Liquors, he has three other filling stations with tobacco and retail food licenses. That would have been reviewed in his approval of the Applicant.

On redirect, Mr. Knipper reiterated Shannon Trotter is the ultimate decision-maker. The business consultant would not have seen the objection letters from the Alderman and Police Commander because they had not been issued when he signed off on the application on October 23, 2019. They were issued prior to the date Shannon Trotter denied the license on December 13, 2019.

The witness explained the application does not need to be in a final complete form before it goes to Shannon. She may need to deny because of the 60-day deadline. He also remembered printing out the food license for this application and possibly telling Mr. Kugler to talk to Shannon as to the liquor license denial.

Terri Conway has been a Chicago Police Officer for twenty-five years and is the Business Officer for the 11<sup>th</sup> District for four years. In that position, she is the liaison between businesses and the police department. She has specific meetings for liquor businesses and reviews crimes regarding a business. She was sent to testify by the 11<sup>th</sup> District Commander Darrell Spencer and is authorized by the Commander to speak on his behalf. She has spoken with Commander Spencer about his position regarding the issuance of a Packaged Goods liquor license at 1156 N. Pulaski. The establishment, 1156 N. Pulaski, is within the boundaries of the 11<sup>th</sup> District.

1156 N. Pulaski is included in Beat 1112 which is the busiest, if not second busiest beat in the city. The area is near two busy corners, Cicero and Division. There are other liquor stores within that beat but not on that street. She is aware that Roy's Food & Liquor, Inc. filed an application for a Packaged Goods liquor store for the premises located at 1156 N. Pulaski.

Officer Conway explained the department uses the I-CLEAR system to keep a database that allows one to request a report of police incidents and calls for service relative to a particular location. The information in I-CLEAR is entered by police officers when there is a service call or incident or an arrest. These records are kept in the ordinary course of business.

The witness stated the Commander's position is that he would not want a liquor license issued at that location because it has a history of violence and gang activity. He feels a liquor license would bring more need for resources to the area; resources not available. The district is one of the worst districts and the beat is one of the worst beats. The Commander also based his position in part on the high number of service calls for that location. She identified City's Exhibit 6 as the

Commander's objection letter and incidents on the 1100 to 1200 block of North Pulaski from November 2018 to November 2019. Police incidents are responses to calls that could range from homicide to a traffic incident. 601 calls for police service are calls that went through OEMC. The document reflects incidents including a bunch of narcotics calls, traffic accidents, batteries, and motor vehicle thefts. The calls for service show robberies. This location also is on the database for troubled buildings which means the property was a drug and gang house unit.

The witness identified City Exhibit 9 as a record of the incidents and service calls for the 1100 to 1200 block of North Pulaski from 2016 to 2017, and then 2017 to 2018. It shows 52 incidents and 531 service calls for 2016-2017 and 43 incidents and 516 service calls from 2017-2018.

There is a little bit of every crime in those documents from homicide to narcotics to traffic. The last Thursday there was a gang-related homicide on that same block. That incident alone took a lot of resources and another liquor store would cause the use of more resources that the police do not have. She opined that 1156 N. Pulaski is a busy area for law enforcement to handle and the 11<sup>th</sup> District is a high resource, intensive area compared to other districts in Chicago. This is the busiest beat in the 11<sup>th</sup> District. It is her opinion and the Commander's opinion that a new liquor license would exacerbate these problems. It would keep units in an area where there are already stacked calls. They do not have the resources to answer calls presently. This area has loitering without a liquor store and her experience with liquor stores is that they have a history of narcotic activity and loitering. The Chicago Police Department responds to all police incidents and service calls which depletes the department. Every day the 11<sup>th</sup> District's policing resources are stretched to the limit. The Commander believes the introduction of the liquor license at this



location would be a drain on police resources and would create a law enforcement problem in the district.

On cross, the witness agreed the premises has been closed from 2018 and that crime existed without a liquor license at that location. She does not know specifically if a liquor license will increase crime or if he will be a good or bad operator or if he will hire security. These are her submissions that this will happen for this location. She disagreed that the Commander's objection was based on the proposed hours of operation but agreed the hours of operation are listed in the Commander's objection letter. The building code violations were from the previous owner and are not with the new owner.

The witness again agreed the business was closed during the timeframe mentioned in the Commander's objection letter. There are two liquor law violations noted in the 45 incidents and while she cannot say there will be more calls if a liquor license is granted, her history of working with liquor establishments in the district is that the number of calls increases in those areas.

Officer Conway stated she did not count the number of calls for service but it was a high number of calls with a lot directly out front at that address. She added she was not saying that calls for service would stop if there is no liquor store but that each of these calls require a police response. Some of these calls are regarding guns, narcotics, and gang violence. These are calls that could become serious. There are problems in that area and they believe liquor establishments do contribute to the problems because a lot of the problems happen in the area of liquor establishments.

On redirect, Officer Conway testified that in her over twenty years as a police officer, she has never seen a neighborhood where a new liquor license lowered crime rates or where incidents or service calls went down after a liquor store was added to an area. The fact there had been a gang and drug case with the prior owner at the time of the prior liquor license indicated there were gang and drug activity at this location where it had a liquor license. There is more likelihood of this activity returning.

On recross, the witness agreed there were less calls for service and incidents in 2016 when there was an open establishment than when closed.

On further redirect, the witness stated that fact did not change her opinion.

Emma Mitts has been the Alderman of the 37<sup>th</sup> Ward twenty plus years. The address of 1156 N. Pulaski is in the 37<sup>th</sup> Ward. That area is encompassed by the 11<sup>th</sup> District and the 25<sup>th</sup> District with Division being the dividing line. There is a daycare center on the north side of the street and residents on the south side of the street. There is a liquor store a couple of blocks east on Division.

She is not opposed to liquor stores generally but there had been a problem in the same location with the previous owner. There had been a shooting across the street. The police eventually were able to shut down the place. When she learned the previous owner had applied for a liquor license at that establishment, she sent a letter to the City saying the community opposed the license. The community then circulated a petition. It was the establishment that created the

problem at this specific location. In this instance, people were allowed to stand outside in front of the business which caused the problem. The past and current police commander object to this license.

The Alderman expressed her objection to the issuance of this license to the Local Liquor Control Commission. The letter, in evidence as City Exhibit 7, is dated November 4, 2019, and addressed to Local Liquor Control Commissioner Shannon Trotter. That letter documented the previous liquor license at 1156 N. Pulaski was “a problem neighbor that attracted loitering, noise, littering and traffic issues.” They were standing outside loitering and parents felt unsafe with their children. There was loud noise and random littering. Closing the liquor store that was previously located there helped the situation.

The Alderman has received complaints from the community objecting to this liquor application. She identified City Exhibit 10 as a petition she received from one of the residents. The area is described as “the residents of the 4000 block of South Division and surrounding neighborhood residents.” These petitions were signed by concerned citizens in her ward but some may not be within the ward.

The Alderman stated she represents the residents of the 37<sup>th</sup> Ward and she is representing them now in saying they do not want a liquor license. Their concerns stem from worries that a liquor license in this area will bring bad crime and other safety issues to the area.

On cross-examination, the Alderman identified the Applicant as the owner of a gas station on Laramie and Division. She does not frequent that station which sells groceries. She believes him to be a law-abiding citizen. At the time she wrote the objection letter she did not know who was applying. She refers to this license as a liquor license but is aware that the sale of liquor is to be incidental to the liquor license. At the time she wrote the objection letter she did not know Mr. Saleh was the applicant.

After reviewing City Exhibit 10, the Alderman stated 49 voters from her ward. The pages in this exhibit state “for the purpose of safety of our community” or “no liquor store – safety of our community.”

The Alderman was not aware of any of the investments of Mr. Saleh made in the store since applying. She never had a conversation with Mr. Saleh about this location until after the objection letter. She told him the community would not support a liquor license given the problem in the past. Mr. Saleh told her he bought the building and spend \$600,000 in that building. She never wrote another letter to the Commission and never called Ms. Trotter on the phone.

On redirect examination, Alderman Mitts repeated she believed Mr. Saleh to be a law-abiding citizen and that opinion would not change if she learned of other business disciplinary actions with the City. The issues would come up regardless of whether the Applicant was a law-abiding citizen. The concerns she listed in her objection letter are concerns the police have to deal within the community.

Venus Jackson has lived at 3938 W. Potomac for thirty-three years. She considers the neighborhood to be residential. She is the Program Coordinator for Nobel Neighbors which is a neighborhood community group. In that position, she works closely with the Alderman and the congressman on community concerns. 1156 N. Pulaski is a liquor store about a block from where she lives. She opposes a liquor license being issued at this location because there was violence on the corner due to an open liquor store. It was crowded with trouble and residents were scared. People were standing there fighting and cussing with loud words. It is quiet now that it is not open but there were problems day and night when the location had a liquor license.

The witness identified City Exhibit 10 as a petition she and another started. It contains signatures from parents of the daycare center and residents in the community. Some do not live in the area but are concerned because they visit their loved ones. They were circulated about around 1156 N. Pulaski but the numbers on some of the petition are in the area. She is not against all liquor licenses but is against this particular corner because they fought so hard to get the one closed. There are enough liquor stores in the area. If a place sells food and liquor the people would focus more on the liquor. If there was food it would not be fresh food in a liquor store but there is no healthy food in the liquor store. The witness believes issuing a liquor license would bring back the same problems that they fought so hard to get rid of it in the community.

On cross-examination, the witness agreed one of the addresses on the petition was 9101 S. Cottage Grove which is very far away. She explained some of the people that signed were concerned about their mother or sister. She disagreed 526 N. St. Louis was that far way but explained people, not in the community, signed out of concern for their loved ones. She agreed

the petitions she circulated referred to a “liquor store” and was not aware this would be a food store with liquor as an accessory. She would not reject a food store with healthy foods. She was not aware that in certain areas for a license liquor has to be incidental to food with liquor as an accessory.

Rosetta Guy has lived in the neighborhood forty-eight years and has lived at 821 N. Kedvale for the last eight years. She has been a security officer at Chase Bank for eight years. She has been the owner of CW Community Lawyers which is a nonprofit organization for a year. She is familiar with 1156 N. Pulaski which is currently vacant. She is opposed to the issuance of a liquor license because it would be unsafe for children and seniors. She opposes this application at this location and opposed to liquor licenses in general. There are more crime issues with liquor licenses. The stores with liquor attract more crime because there is more hanging out. If a liquor license is granted at the location the people that used to be attracted to the old liquor store would likely come back and hang out.

Ms. Guy identified City Exhibit 10 as several pages of signatures from people opposed to the liquor license that she circulated. She listed “no liquor store” for the safety of the community. The people in the neighborhood know about the situation at 1156 N. Pulaski because they call her about a problem with people hanging out. A liquor store is just not good for the neighborhood.

On cross-examination, the witness stated the liquor store has been closed for more than a year but there are still incidents in the area. People do not hang around because there is no liquor store

but there is still crime in the area. She heard that he was getting a food license but wanted a liquor license.

The City rested its case.

Abdullqader Saleh is a resident of the city of Chicago and owns two Marathon gas stations in the 11<sup>th</sup> District at 5201 W. Division and 801 N. Cicero. He owns a third gas station at 8058 S. Cottage Grove. He sells gas, food, and tobacco at these locations. He previously had a liquor store from 2006 through 2015. This liquor store received a violation for an employee selling liquor to a minor. The licenses for the gas stations have never been revoked or suspended.

The witness purchased the property at 1156 N. Pulaski in 2019 to open for liquor and food. When he met with the City of Chicago Dept of Business Affairs he was told there was nothing to stop him from getting a liquor license. He bought the property because everything was okay. In the application process, he needed to make changes to the store in the amount of \$70,000. He bought the building for \$600,000 with \$16,000 in closing costs and \$50,000 for a cooler and shelving. Dept of Business Affairs and the Liquor Commissioner said there were no violations or objections and he could have his liquor license. After the closing on the building and food and liquor inspections, he was told to pick up the liquor license. He went to Room 800 and was told the food license was okay but there was a hold on the liquor license. He then spoke with the Alderman who said she wrote a letter in opposition because she thought the old owner was coming back. She told him he was a great owner. The Alderman tried to call the Commissioner

and the Commander but there was no answer. The Alderman said she would call them and release the hold.

The witness also then spoke to the Commander who would not take back his letter of opposition but said he would not oppose the license in court.

The witness then explained he would sell 60% food and 40% liquor. The food would be snacks and cans.

On cross-examination, the witness stated he lives at 6322 N. Lowell in Chicago which is about fifteen minutes away from 1156 N. Pulaski. He had employees at the liquor store he owned and assumed he would have employees at 1156 N. Pulaski. He would be there personally in the morning and sometimes at night. He knew there had been a liquor store at 1156 N. Pulaski but the previous owner canceled the lease for that store. The Alderman said she would help with the liquor license. He met with the Alderman and the Commander after this case was filed. The Commander probably sent someone to testify because of the community and the Alderman did not want to upset the community.

At this point in the proceedings, Mr. Kugler made an offer of proof as to what his testimony would be. The Commission ruled he could make the offer of proof but would not consider it as substantial evidence. If a reviewing court felt it was relevant it would be in the record.



If called to testify, Mr. Kugler would state he was told to talk to Shannon about the liquor license because she denied it. On December 18, 2019, Commissioner Trotter gave him the denial letter based on the letters from the Alderman and the Commander. When he stated no one had mentioned these letters, she gave him copies of letters dated November 4 and November 8.

The following Respondent Exhibits were allowed in evidence:

1. Summarization of calls
2. Freedom of Information response on liquor violations in a three-year period in the 11<sup>th</sup> District.
3. List of packaged goods licenses in the 11<sup>th</sup> District

### **ANALYSIS**

Counsel for the Applicant objected to the testimony of the neighborhood witnesses based on the fact that these witnesses did not send letters objecting to the issuance of the license within the time period set out in the application process. The City has set out an application process that includes a requirement that notice of the liquor license application is given to nearby voters. That process then sets a timeframe in which objection letters can be submitted. The Applicant's position is that since these witnesses did not file any written objections in the application process, they should be banned from testifying at this hearing. There is nothing set out in the application process stating a failure to object in writing during the application process bars a witness from testifying at a de novo hearing before the License Appeal Commission.

Counsel for the Applicant has also argued that the scope of evidence allowed in this hearing is limited to the documents that the Local Liquor Control Commissioner reviewed in making the

denial of the license. Counsel provided no case law to support this position and this Commissioner is unaware of any such case law. In cases in which the License Appeal Commission reviews suspensions or revocations of existing liquor licenses our jurisdiction is limited to a review of the record of the proceedings before the Local Liquor Control Commissioner. Those proceedings are contested hearings before a Deputy Hearing Commissioner who makes findings of fact and a recommendation to the Local Liquor Control Commission. In essence, in those proceedings there has been a trial.

Since this case arises from a denial of an application for a liquor license the Illinois Liquor Control Act states that the License Appeal Commission shall try de novo the propriety of the decision of the Local Liquor Control Commission.

The next issue to be analyzed concerns what must be proved by the City to establish issuing this license would cause a law enforcement problem that would justify the denial of the license.

In the case of *Vino Fino Liquors v. License Appeal Commission of the City of Chicago, et al.* the Second Division of the Illinois Appellate Court, First District, addressed this definition. In *Vino Fino*, the applicant for the liquor license had an existing liquor license that had an established negative license history. Specifically, it had a history of two sales to a minor. The court reviewed the City's ordinance that allowed the City to deny an applicant if the issuance would tend to create a law enforcement problem and determined...

to deny a license to an applicant who would "tend to create a law enforcement problem" is to deny a license to an applicant who would not obey liquor control laws and the law generally or who would impede enforcement

of those laws.

Under the *Vino Fino* approach, the focus is on whether the applicant would violate liquor control laws or the law in general.

Evidence presented at this hearing shows that the Applicant did have a violation for a sale to minor at the liquor establishment he previously operated. He also had some violations of improper sales of tobacco at his gas stations. This evidence would be insufficient to establish the issuance of this liquor license to this Applicant at this location would tend to create a law enforcement problem.

After the *Vino Fino* decision, left open was the question of whether an applicant's history was the only factor to consider in determining if the issuance of a license would tend to create a law enforcement problem. That question was answered in the Sixth Division of the First District Appellate Court in *Move N Pick Convenience, Inc. v. Rahm Emanuel, et al.*

In the *Move N Pick* case, an application for a packaged goods liquor license was denied based on the fact that its issuance would tend to create a law enforcement problem. The background investigation revealed no criminal incidents or history of disobeying liquor laws or other laws by the applicant. No such evidence was introduced at this hearing before the License Appeal Commission.

At the hearing before the License Appeal Commission, the 13<sup>th</sup> District Police Commander testified regarding crime incidents and calls for service. He also testified that calls for service

related to liquor are substantial and allowing a liquor license would tend to increase calls for service that tie up officers as opposed to their being on patrol working on robberies and gang conditions. In addition to the Commander, local residents testified in support of denial of the liquor license application and cited past crime associated with stores that sold liquor in the neighborhood.

The *Move N Pick* court acknowledged the municipal ordinance does not define the term “tend to create a law enforcement problem.” It noted that the *Vino Fino* court did not state in its opinion that an applicant’s history was the only factor to consider when deciding whether the issuance of a liquor license would “tend to create a law enforcement problem.” The testimony of Commander Gross was sufficient to establish a tendency to create a law enforcement problem.

In this case, 11<sup>th</sup> District Business Officer Terri Conway testified she was authorized to testify on behalf of the 11<sup>th</sup> District Commander’s opposition to the issuance of this liquor license based on the fact that issuance of this license would tend to create a law enforcement problem. The 11<sup>th</sup> District Commander feels the location has a history of violence and gang activity. The 11<sup>th</sup> District is one of the worst districts and this beat is one of the worst beats. A liquor license would require additional resources that are not available. Officer Conway relayed the Commander’s opinion that a new liquor license would tend to more calls and a be a drain on police resources which would create a law enforcement problem. Officer Conway also testified in her individual capacity as a twenty-five-year police officer that this area has loitering without a liquor license and liquor stores have a history of narcotic activity and loitering.

Alderman Mitts and the community witnesses all testified that there were problems with crime and loitering when this location previously had a liquor license. They feel the problem would return if the liquor license is issued.

The evidence in this case from the City's witnesses mirrors the evidence in the Move N Pick case that was sufficient for the Appellate Court to deny that license. The evidence, in this case, is sufficient to establish that the issuance of this liquor license would tend to create a law enforcement problem.

### **DECISION**

The denial of the application for a Packaged Goods liquor license for the premises located at 1156 North Pulaski Road is Affirmed.

Pursuant to Section 154 of the Illinois Liquor Control Act, a petition for rehearing may be filed with this Commission within TWENTY (20) days after service of this order. The date of the mailing of this order is deemed to be the date of service. If any party wishes to pursue an administrative review action in the Circuit Court, the petition for rehearing must be filed with this Commission within TWENTY (20) days after service of this order as such petition is a jurisdictional prerequisite to the administrative review.

Dated: September 17, 2020

Dennis M. Fleming  
Chairman

Thomas W. Gibbons  
Member

Cynthia A. Berg  
Member