

**Decision Number:** 60F [2025] 23016

**IN THE MATTER OF** the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF** an application by **PROGRESSIVE  
RETAILS LIMITED** for a renewal of  
an Off-Licence in respect of  
premises situated at **729 Main  
South Road, Christchurch** and  
known as '**The Bottle-O  
Templeton**'

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE**

Hearing: 28 August 2025 (at Christchurch)

Committee

Chairperson: Mrs M Redstone

Members: Mr D Blackwell  
Mr G Clapp

Appearances:

Ms Pervinder Davies, Counsel for the Applicant

Ms Manpreet Kaur, Director of the Applicant

Mr Lovepreet Singh Minhas, Operations Manager of the Applicant

Mr Mark Peters, Objector

Mr Paul Tweed, Licensing Inspector, to assist

Sergeant David Robertson, New Zealand Police, available to assist

Decision: 08 September 2025

---

**RESERVED DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE**

---

- [1] This is an application by Progressive Retails Limited (the Applicant) for renewal of an Off-Licence. The premises is situated at **729 Main South Road, Christchurch** and known as '**The Bottle-O Templeton**'. The Director and Shareholder of Progressive Retails is Manpreet Kaur. The application was received on 3 February 2025.
- [2] The Applicant seeks to renew with the same terms and conditions as the licence currently in force at the premises. The current trading hours are:

**Monday to Sunday, between the hours of 9:00am and 10:00pm**

These hours are shorter than the default maximum trading hours for Off-Licences.<sup>1</sup>

The application was publicly notified on the Council's website and remained on the website in compliance with statutory regulations.

- [3] There was one public objection received.
- [4] The application was not opposed by the District Licensing Inspector,<sup>2</sup> the New Zealand Police<sup>3</sup> or the Medical Officer of Health (MOH)<sup>4</sup>
- [5] The District Licensing Committee (DLC) members each undertook a site visit on an individual basis.
- [6] A hearing of the application took place on 28 August 2025.

### **Submissions and Evidence**

- [7] Ms Davies opened on behalf of the Applicant. She objected to matters raised by Counsel in the opening submissions for the objector on the basis that some matters related to a renewal application for the Sockburn Bottle-O, previously owned by the Applicant. There were objections to that renewal. However, the matter was not heard as the premises and Licence were sold prior to a hearing being convened. Ms Davies said Counsel, Dr Gordon, therefore only had that documentation because she had been engaged in that matter. Ms Davies submitted it was inappropriate to use reports she had received in relation to that renewal in making submissions on the current matter. The Committee did not make a ruling but said it would reflect on the matter raised. It has placed no weight on those matters in reaching its decision.
- [8] Ms Davies said the Applicant refuted that Mr Minhas was the controlling mind behind the company. She said her client would give evidence of the positions she and her husband undertook in the business.
- [9] Ms Davies noted there was no objection from the Agencies, with the Inspector supporting a renewal of the licence on its current conditions.

### ***Ms Manpreet Kaur***

- [10] Ms Kaur read her evidence, setting out her background, work experience and business operations in New Zealand and how she had built up these businesses herself. She responded to matters raised by the objector and his witness, and questions from the Committee. In response to questions from the Committee, Ms Kaur advised that although Mr Minhas deals with the day-to-day operation of the store, she maintains full control of the business as Director and Shareholder. She hires staff, completes rosters, pays salaries and pays accounts, which she noted, in response to a Committee member's question, as being current. She attends the store regularly, holds a Duty Manager's Certificate, and fills in to cover sick leave. She and her husband have three young children, so much of her work is in the background, but she is available to assist when required.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 43 of the Act.

<sup>2</sup> Inspector's report 12/06/2025

<sup>3</sup> Police notification of non-opposition 15/02/2025

<sup>4</sup> MoH Report 07/03/2025.

- [11] With respect to staffing, Ms Kaur said she has three full time duty managers and one part time. She has two staff working on a Tuesday, which is delivery day, and two on Fridays and Saturdays.
- [12] Ms Kaur answered questions as to the chronology of Off-Licences that had been applied for, saying one in Lincoln Road was refused due its location close to sensitive sites, and explaining that the Licence in Prestons, although granted, did not go ahead due to lengthy compliance issues. She estimated her company had lost approximately \$200,000 in rental and other payments having to be made during the time that they were unable to set up and commence operation. As a result of this she decided to sell that lease and licence. She said currently her company owns the Bottle-O Templeton and has been granted a licence for a Bottle-O in Culverden, although that decision has been appealed to the Alcohol Regulatory & Licensing Authority (ARLA). ARLA has yet to hear that matter and make a decision.
- [13] Ms Kaur said there were two A1 sized advertising sheets in the window. She said she would be happy to abide by a condition as to no outward facing advertising. She disagreed with the Objector's witness that the advertising of Bottle-O on the front of the building was excessive, saying it was the same size as advertising for all the other businesses in the block of shops. There are no outside flags or sandwich boards.
- [14] Ms Kaur said she had already responded to objections about pricing in that she was observing the DLC Practice Note in that regard and had already raised prices to meet that requirement, even though the store is not located in a Decile 8 or 9 highly deprived area.

***Witness - Mr Lovepreet Singh Minhas***

- [15] Mr Minhas explained his role as operations manager and certified duty manager at the store, supervising day-to-day operation, ordering stock, sourcing new products, ensuring all equipment is working properly. He assists his wife with staff training as he is at the store on a daily basis. This is in conjunction with staff training given by the Bottle-O franchise. He disputed that there were any issues with staff training, as raised by Ms Prasad.
- [16] Mr Minhas explained the layout of the premises and advised that there is no access to the store from the yard next to it. He said that space is cleaned regularly, and that orders, which normally come on a Tuesday, are brought inside as quickly as possible. In response to Ms Prasad's contention that there was only one person on duty and the stock was not being moved, Mr Minhas showed a CTV image of a further staff member, who he said had been on a break at the time of the delivery, bringing stock into the premises. He said it is not in his interest to have stock on the footpath outside the store.
- [17] In response to a question, Mr Minhas said they do not sell through any online website. They do take phone orders, which he delivers to ensure ID, and satisfy himself that he is not selling to intoxicated persons. He said he has on occasions refused to hand over a delivery, and in particular refuses to deliver to the nearby Mental Health Hospital premises.
- [18] Mr Minhas explained his involvement as a Director and Shareholder in P M Liquors, the liquidation and how that came about, and agreements reached with the liquidators. He produced documents from the Liquidators showing payments made and the amount

required to settle. He acknowledged the failed CPOs and selling alcohol to an intoxicated person which resulted in suspension of the licence. He was not on duty at the relevant times.

- [19] Mr Minhas said this liquidation, together with family matters in India, had had a detrimental effect on his mental health at the time and he decided he no longer wanted the responsibility of being a director of a company. He said his wife, who had previously run her own business, was keen to proceed with ownership of bottle stores as a means of earning family income and she took it upon herself to take that responsibility. He was adamant he was not hiding behind her ownership to avoid objections to any perceived ownership on his part.
- [20] He said it was "disheartening" that an objector would seek to have him penalised for events that happened so many years ago, and that he had worked now in his wife's business since 2117 with no regulatory issues arising.
- [21] Mr Minhas was questioned about selling single cans from broken packaging and selling cheap outdated/almost outdated stock. He said he was unable to return broken packing. He said he also breaks up six packs and sells in 2's. It is recommended that he take this matter up with suppliers as Mr Minhas told the hearing in the Prestons Bottle-O matter that suppliers did accept returns and he would not be selling from broken packages. He undertook that he would not purchase outdated/almost outdated stock and sell it at a reduced price. He undertook that he would not sell singles from broken packages and that these would be re-packaged for sale as multiples.
- [22] In the course of questioning by the Committee Mr Minhas said that he was working unpaid in his wife's business. Although the Committee commented on the pros and cons of this approach in the course of the hearing, the Committee is not tasked under the Act to investigate employment related matters, except as they may affect alcohol-related harm, staffing, and the manner in which an Off-Licence operates. Any employment related matters fall within the jurisdiction of the Employment Relations Authority.

### **Inspector Paul Tweed**

- [23] Mr Tweed spoke to his report. He advised that the premises had been visited on a regular basis, in conjunction with other Christchurch premises, without incident. There had not been any failed CPO's and he raised no issues with the way in which the Off-Licence was operated.
- [24] In response to a question from the Committee the Inspector said he did not consider the variety of high strength beer is a lot in comparison to similar outlets. He noted that Inspectors discourage the purchase of near-dated stock for on-sale.

### **Objector:**

- [25] Dr Gordon's opening submissions were taken as read and she highlighted a number of matters for the Committee. She likened this business to Nekita<sup>5</sup>, noting the concerns of ARLA in that matter.

---

<sup>5</sup> CCC Alcohol Licensing Inspector v Nekita Enterprises Limited NZARLA [2021]

**Mr Mark Peters - Objector**

- [26] Mr Peters objected to Mr Minhas being involved in the business, suggesting that Ms Kaur was merely a front for him. This was on the grounds that Mr Minhas was a joint owner of P M Liquors, which operated in Dunedin and was placed into liquidation in 2018 and Mr Minhas had not been making any payments to reduce the debt owing.
- [27] Mr Peters said in his view the formation of Progressive Retails Limited (which included Mr Minhas as a Director and Shareholder) and the removal of Mr Minhas as a Director and Shareholder was suspicious and was used to hide the involvement of Mr Minhas following the failure of his Dunedin Company. He said it was his further view that Mr. Minhas should be paying more than the minimum amount towards repayment of the company debt for P M Liquors albeit he accepted the evidence that Mr Minhas had met the agreed payments as set out in the Liquidators' Report.
- [28] Mr Peters said he was astounded to learn that Mr Minhas is not paid as an employee and does not have an employment agreement.
- [29] Mr Peters said he also objected "on all relevant grounds" under ss.105 and 131 of the Act" and that those matters would be raised by his witness. In response to a question from the a Committee member "What is illegal now that could be improved?", he was unable to identify any issues, saying he relied on Ms Prasad's evidence. The Committee raised with Mr Peters that in its view, as a matter of natural justice, it was insufficient to make such a wide-sweeping objection, without being specific, as an applicant should be fairly and fully informed to enable it to respond to objections received to an application. Mr Peters said he would take this on board for the future.

**Witness Ms Prasad:**

- [30] Ms Prasad said she was a law student and an intern with Communities Against Alcohol Harm. She said she was not asked by that organisation, Mr Peter's Counsel, or Mr Peters to visit the applicant's store. She said that as part of her work she was taking an interest in licensed premises. She said she just happened to go to Templeton when she was taking her boyfriend to an event and they chose to stop at the Bottle-O Templeton to purchase alcohol. She claimed to have noted a number of what she perceived as issues in relation to sales and staff training. She said she rang Mr Peters and offered to be a witness for him at the hearing. She produced a number of photos she took while at the store and also a receipt showing five products she and her boyfriend had purchased. Three of these she produced at the hearing.
- [31] Ms Prasad noted that extremely high ABV products (e.g. brightly coloured Moonshine") was displayed prominently next to confectionary products.
- [32] She raised issues as to the number of high strength beers, alcohol being sold at a cheap price, and staff training issues. When asked by the Chair how the strengths of beers, and prices, compared with other premises she had visited in the area, she admitted she had not visited any other premises and this was the first one. Furthermore, her criticism of staff training related to not being asked for ID. Ms Prasad is 24 years old and, in the view of the Committee, there was no reason to think she is under 18 years of age.
- [33] Ms Prasad's evidence was found by the Committee to be unreliable and at times unbelievable.

### ***Closing Submissions:***

#### **For the Objector:**

- [34] On behalf of the Objector, Dr Gordon submitted that having heard the evidence the Objector remained of the view that Mr Minhas was the controlling mind behind the business.
- [35] Counsel referred to the Liquidation that was canvassed fully at the hearing. It is Counsel's submission that the Applicant Company is not suitable to hold a licence due to the liquidation of a company of which the Applicant Director's husband was one of the directors, the other being an unrelated individual.
- [36] Counsel raised in her final submissions the employment related matters. No evidence was brought to the hearing of any wrongdoing in this regard. Any such legal issues have not been investigated by this Committee and, if the Objector wishes to do so, should be raised in the appropriate jurisdiction.
- [37] Matters raised as "harmful practices" were addressed in the course of the hearing and certain undertakings given, which will be outlined below.

#### **For the Inspector:**

- [38] Inspector, Mr Tweed, submitted that the criteria for consideration of a renewal application is set out in Section 102(4) and (4A) of the Act and may not relate to any matter other than the suitability of the Applicant. Whilst the Act is open to interpretation, with respect, the Committee's view is that S.102(4) and (4A) refers to new applications for a premises where a licence is already in place. It prefers to focus on s.105(a) to (g) and (j) and (k) together with Section 106 which "considers the effects of issue or renewal of licence on amenity and good order of locality".
- [39] Mr Tweed noted that the application was not opposed by the Inspector, the Police or the Medical Officer of Health. In his view the original objection of Mr Peters met the criteria, but the subsequent brief of evidence introduced matters outside of that criteria.
- [40] Mr Tweed submitted that Counsel for the Objector raising the *Nekita* decision was inappropriate as, in his opinion, in the current application there was no history of the type of offending that led to the *Nekita* decision.
- [41] Mr Tweed submitted that the Applicant had been investigated for a number of previous licences, both new and renewals. With the exception of one which was not refused on the grounds of suitability, all other applications had been granted.
- [42] Mr Tweed submitted that there was no evidence presented to support the assertion that the manner in which alcohol has been sold is not "safe and responsible", or that the Applicant cannot meet the object of the Act. In his view the applicant is suitable to hold a licence and therefore it should be renewed.

#### **For the Applicant:**

- [43] Counsel, Ms Davies, reiterated in her final submissions that Ms Kaur, who has extensive experience in managing her own companies and multiple bottle store businesses, is the

sole director of the Applicant company and demonstrated her capability and commitment to operating its premises within the regulatory framework.

- [44] Mr Davies submitted that Mr Minhas is an experienced operator within the alcohol industry, well able to support the day-to-day operations. She submitted that Counsel for the Objector was incorrect in her assertion that the liquidation of P M Liquors was as a result of any wrongdoing. She said there has never been a finding of misconduct, breach of any laws, or regulatory concerns arising from that liquidation. It was the result of financial strain. She noted the finding of the High Court addressing the issue of a licensee's suitability in *D T Hayford v Christchurch District Licensing Agency*, as set out in her submissions.
- [45] Ms Davies submitted the Committee must focus on the current application before it, which is an entirely different entity to the company in liquidation.
- [46] Ms Davies submitted that the current hours of operation should remain pending the Local Alcohol Policy coming into effect in October.
- [47] Undertakings agreed:
- i) No single sales of high strength beers, ciders, or RTDs under \$6.00 per unit.
  - ii) No external advertising of alcohol products, including but not limited to posters, signs, banners, flags, or digital displays visible from the outside of the premises.
  - iii) No purchasing of alcohol products that are past their best-before or expiry date.

### **Considerations of the Committee**

- [48] Having considered the Application together with Agency Reports and Objections placed before it, together with the oral evidence and submissions received today, the Committee must now stand back and determine whether the application for renewal of the Licence should issue.
- [49] The Committee notes the Police, the Inspector and the Medical Officer of Health offered no objection to the renewal of the licence.
- [50] The Committee cannot ignore public objections simply because the Agencies have not raised any opposition to the granting of the licence. We have to be able to identify facts that are directly relevant from the material presented. As the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority said in *Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board v Level Eighteen Ltd* [2014] NZARLA PH 627-228:

“The decision of the DLC must be based upon some material that tends logically to show the existence of facts consistent with the finding and that the reasoning is supportive of the finding. The reasoning of the DLC and the inferences drawn from the facts, need to be logically available to the DLC.”

## Evaluation and findings under s.105(1)(a) to (g), (j) and (k) and s.106 of the Act

[51] The role of s.105 and how it is to be approached in relation to applications has received plenty of judicial attention.<sup>6</sup> The approach, when considering the licence application, is succinctly summarised as follows:<sup>7</sup>

“the decision maker must actively and thoughtfully consider the relevant matters”

[52] The duty to “have regard to” requires that we turn our mind to the listed criteria. We are required to give them “genuine attention and thought”. The weight to be attached to each is a matter for us to decide.<sup>8</sup> In *Medical Officer of Health (Wellington Region) v Lion Liquor Retail Limited* [2018] NZHC 1123, Clark J summarised the applicable principles in respect of the renewal of a licence.

[53] Further, the evaluative function is an assessment of risk.<sup>9</sup> Clark J said at [43]

“The factors to be considered in the course of assessing an application for a licence or for renewal, as the appellants submitted, stand to be assessed in terms of their potential impact upon the prospective risk of alcohol-related harm”.

### ▪ **The object of the Act**

[54] The object of the Act is that -

- a) The sale, supply, and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly; and
- b) The harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimized.

The Act further states that the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol includes -

- a) Any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behavior, illness, or injury, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol; and
- b) Any harm to society generally or the community, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behavior, illness, or injury of a kind described in a) above.

We keep those objects to the forefront of our minds in considering the application.

[55] There are two arms to the Object of the Act and both must be met. In terms of the first arm we need to be satisfied that the sale and supply of alcohol by the applicant should be undertaken safely and responsibly. The second arm requires that harm caused by

---

<sup>6</sup> *Christchurch Medical Officer of Health v J & G Vaudrey Ltd* [2015] NZHC 2749, [2016] 2 NZLR 382 per Gendall J at [78].

<sup>7</sup> *Re Venus NZ Limited* at [20] and *Auckland Medical Officer of Health* at [60] see Westlaw NZ, SA 105.02

<sup>8</sup> *Foodstuffs (South Island) Ltd v Christchurch City Council* (1999) 5 ELRNZ 308, [1999] NZRMA 481 (HC).

<sup>9</sup> *Medical Officer of Health (Wellington Region) v Lion Liquor Retail Limited* [2018] NZHC 1123.



excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised. 'Minimised' means reduced to the smallest amount, extent or degree. It does not mean eliminate altogether.<sup>10</sup> In *Lion Liquor Retail Limited*, Clark J held that "the legislative framework enacted by the 2012 Act was intended to restrict rather than relax drinking laws. The legislative measure proceeded on the basis of clear evidence showing a link between availability of alcohol and alcohol-related harm."

[56] 'Harm caused by excessive and inappropriate consumption' is defined broadly in section 4(2) of the Act to include harm in the form of crime, damage, disorderly behavior, illness or injury to individuals and to society generally and includes direct and indirect cause or contribution to harm.

[57] We now make assessments, based on the evidence before us and the various reports received, on each of the criteria contained in section 105 of the Act.

▪ ***The suitability of the applicant***

[58] We find that the Applicant is a suitable entity to hold a Licence and has considerable experience in holding Off-Licences, having been granted new applications and renewals without objection. Neither the Inspector nor the Police could point to any problems that had arisen in respect to the operation of those premises.

[59] The objection to Mr Minhas having any role in the business was noted and given serious consideration by the Committee. He is not a Director of the Applicant company. There is nothing in the Act that prevents a family member assisting in the operation of a business, whether paid or unpaid. It was clear from the evidence that Mr Minhas works closely with his wife in the running of this business, and this has been done without any events coming to the attention of the Agencies in the last seven or so years.

[60] The Committee notes in this regard that many Off-Licence owners take no part in the day-to-day running of their businesses and rely on their Operation Managers to ensure that the business runs smoothly, many to the point of paying salaries, accounts, and other managerial responsibilities. In addition, many family businesses are supported by family members working in unpaid positions.

▪ ***Any relevant local alcohol policy***

▪ The Christchurch Local Action Policy will come into effect over the next few months and it is noted, in particular, that as from October the closing time for all Off-Licences will be 9:00pm.

▪ ***The days on which and the hours during which the applicant proposes to sell alcohol***

[61] The Applicant seeks hours of 9:00am to 10:00pm 7 days a week. Those hours are within the national default hours for an Off-Licence of 7:00am to 11:00pm.

▪ ***The design and layout of any proposed premises***

---

<sup>10</sup> See Shorter Oxford Dictionary; *Re Peony Spirits Limited* [2014] NZARLA 696 at [19]; *Linwood Food Bar Ltd v Davison* [2014] NZHC 2980 at [18] and *Auckland Medical Officer of Health v Birthcare Auckland Limited* [2015] NZHC 2689 at [115].

[62] The Plan showing the layout was criticized by the witness for the Objector as being cramped, with narrow aisles and a lot of stock. However, the Inspector commented that while the premises were reasonable small, he did not see any issue with the current layout. The Committee expresses concern about the high ABV brightly coloured "Moonshine" currently displayed next to confectionary items and requires that these be moved to a more appropriate location.

- ***Whether the applicant is engaged in, or proposes on the premises to engage in, the sale of goods other than alcohol, low-alcohol refreshments, non-alcoholic refreshments, and food, and if so, which goods and services:***

[63] The Applicant sells a limited quantity of tobacco and vaping products which are hidden from view and only be made available on specific request.

- ***Whether (in its opinion) the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be reduced, to more than a minor extent, by the effects of the issue of the licence:***

[64] Section 106 requires the Committee to consider whether the amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be reduced, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of the renewal of this licence:

(a) The following matters (as they relate to the locality):

- (i) Current, and possible future, noise levels;
- (ii) Current, and possible future, levels of nuisance and vandalism;

[65] The objectors did not produce any significant evidence specific to this application to support that amenity and good order of the locality would be likely to be reduced, by more than a minor extent, by the effects of the renewal of this Licence.

- ***Whether the applicant has appropriate systems, staff, and training to comply with the law:***

[66] The Applicant has appropriate systems and employs sufficient staff and provide training to comply with the law. The Applicant provided information as to the wages paid to employees, a roster, and a Host Responsibility Plan attached to its application.

## **Decision**

[67] Accordingly, having regard to the matters in sections 105 and 106 of the Act together with the evidence and submissions of the Applicant, the Agencies and the Objectors we are satisfied that licence should be renewed for a period of **3 years** subject to the following conditions is consistent with the object of the Act.

## **The Licensed Premises**

(a) The premises are identified on the plan provided with the application for a licence.

## **Restricted and Supervised Areas - section 147(2)**

(b) The licensed area is designated as a supervised area.

### **Discretionary conditions – section 116 (1)**

- (c) The following steps must be taken to ensure that the provisions of the Act relating to the sale of alcohol to prohibited persons are observed:
  - (i) Display of appropriate signs adjacent to every point of sale detailing the statutory restrictions on the supply of alcohol to minors and the complete prohibition on sales to intoxicated persons.
- (d) The following steps must be taken to ensure that the provisions of the Act relating to the management of the premises concerned are observed:
  - (i) Alcohol must only be sold and supplied within the area marked on the plan submitted with the application.

### **Compulsory conditions – section 116 (2)**

- (e) No alcohol is to be sold or supplied on the premises on Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Christmas Day, or before 1pm on Anzac Day.
- (f) Alcohol may only be sold or delivered the following days and during the following hours:

**Monday to Sunday, between the hours 9:00am and 10:00pm.**
- (g) Drinking water is to be freely available to customers, while alcohol is being supplied free as a sample on the premises.

### **Section 117 – Other Discretionary conditions**

- (h) The licensee must implement and maintain the steps proposed in The Bottle O Templeton Host Responsibility Policy<sup>11</sup> aimed at promoting the reasonable consumption of alcohol.
- (i) There shall be low alcohol, and alcohol free, products prominently displayed to promote responsible consumption of alcohol.
- (j) There will be no sales of single-serve RTDs (or Beers from broken cartons). Products packed as 4's, 6's or 12's will be sold in those configurations and not broken apart and sold as lesser quantities. Items from broken packages may be re-packaged as near as possible to their original format at relevant pricing.
- (k) No sales will be made to young persons in school uniform regardless of their ability to produce ID.
- (l) The applicant will not purchase alcohol products that are close to their use-by date for resale.
- (m) There shall be no advertising of alcohol products attached to the exterior of, or visible from outside, the premises.
- (n) No sandwich boards or flags shall be used to advertise the premises or goods for sale.

---

<sup>11</sup> Attached to the application

### **Conditions applying to all remote sales and supply of alcohol**

- (o) The following information must be displayed on the internet site in a prominent place, in any catalogue used by the licence holder and on every receipt issued for any alcohol sold via the internet site.
  - (i) The licence holders name, the licence number, and the date on which the licence expires.
  - (ii) A copy of the licence or a clearly identified link to such image must be displayed in a prominent place on the internet site.
- (p) The following steps must be taken to verify that people are over the purchase age:
  - (i) In the case of an order made using an internet site, telephone order, or physical order –The prospective buyer must declare that he is she is 18 years of age or over (and where the prospective receiver is involved that the prospective receiver is also 18 years of age or over) -
    - Once, when the prospective buyer first commences the order process; and
    - Again, immediately before the sale of alcohol is completed

### **Other restrictions and requirements**

- (q) Section 56 – Display of signs
- (r) Section 57 – Display of licences
- (s) Section 59 – Requirements relating to remote sales by holders of off-licences.
- (t) Section 214 – Manager to be on duty at all times and responsible for compliance

[68] The licence shall be issued for 3 years.

[69] The Applicant's attention is drawn to section 259 of the Act which makes it an offence not to comply with certain requirements and restrictions imposed by or under the Act. Specifically, sections 46 to 63 and 231(1). The Applicant must comply with all conditions specified on a licence.

**DATED** at CHRISTCHURCH this 8th day of September 2025



Merelyn Redstone  
Chairperson  
**Christchurch District Licensing Committee**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF** an application by **PROGRESSIVE RETAILS LIMITED** for renewal of an **Off-Licence** in respect of premises situated at **729 Main South Road, Christchurch** to be known as '**The Bottle O Templeton**

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT LICENSING COMMITTEE**

Chairperson: Mrs M S Redstone

---

**ADDENDUM TO DECISION**

---

- [1] Following consideration of its decision on Progressive Retails Limited's application in respect of Bottle-O Templeton ("Templeton") and prior to it issuing, the Committee received a Submission from Counsel for the Objector seeking a delay in the issue of the decision until after ARLA has issued its decision on matters relating to Progressive Retailers Limited in respect of Bottle-O Culverden ("Culverden") on the grounds of certain evidence presented to the ARLA hearing. It is stated that in particular ARLA heard evidence from the agencies regarding:
- a. The status of Lovepreet Singh Minhas as a director or alternatively as Operations Manager for Progressive Retails Limited;
  - b. The acceptance by Mr Minhas that there is a debt arising from the liquidation of PM Liquors Limited;
  - c. The absence from the Culverden hearing of any information or details regarding the company's financial position or its past trading record;
  - d. A consideration of the liquidation debt as a "family debt", notwithstanding arguments (also heard at the hearing at Bottle O Templeton) that the liquidation was a matter 'in the past' and related to a different company; and
  - e. Issues regarding the financial and staffing matters arising from the new Culverden operation.
- [2] In response the Committee received an email setting out the position on behalf of the Medical Officer of Health supporting the view that the Committee "hold off their decision on the Bottle-O Templeton matter and wait for the Authority to make their decision in regards to Culverden".
- [3] The Committee has met and considered these requests and responds as follows:

- (a) The decision in Culverden issued on 14 April 2025, the application having been received by the Hurunui Licensing Committee in July 2024. The Templeton application was received by the Agencies on 3 February 2025. The Agencies therefore had the evidence to support their opposition to Culverden available to them when they reported on Templeton. They chose not to raise similar issues. The Inspector set out in his report a chronology of licences applied for by Progressive Retails Limited. He noted that there had been previous renewal applications for Templeton with no opposition or objections raised. He noted "No opposition or concerns have been raised by any of the reporting agencies".

The Committee notes that both NZ Police and the Medical Officer of Health asked to be excused from attending the hearing, saying they had nothing to add and relied on their reports and Briefs of Evidence filed, but would be available should the Committee have any questions.

The Committee expresses its surprise that the Agencies chose not to raise their concerns with respect to Culverden, the Applicant having the same Director and the same Operations Manager as Templeton. However, it is a matter for the Agencies how they investigate and report on applications and no opposition was raised by the Agencies to renewal of the Templeton Off-Licence.

- (b) Ms Kaur and Mr Minhas were questioned at some length at the Templeton hearing.
- (i) Ms Kaur and Mr Minhas were questioned about Mr Minhas's position as day-to-day operations Manager and the staffing of the Templeton Store. Ms Kaur said Mr Minhas would be appointed Operations Manager at the Culverden Store if that licence is granted, and she would work additional hours at Templeton. They will hire further staff as required.
- (ii) Mr Minhas's involvement in the P & M Liquors business and his past trading record were questioned at length at Templeton and considered by the Committee. There was found to be no evidence of wrongdoing in respect to Mr Minhas's response to the liquidation. The COP failure in 2017 was noted and balanced against the fact there had been no issues in the ensuing eight years.
- (iii) Ms Kaur was questioned in relation to financial matters and confirmed that all accounts were paid current and staff paid above the minimum rate.

[4] A DLC Committee must make a decision based on the reports received and the evidence produced at a hearing. This Committee has followed that process and sees no reason to hold the issue of its decision.

**Dated** at Christchurch this 11th day of September 2025



M S Redstone  
Chairperson  
Christchurch District Licensing Committee

