

Minutes

Alcohol, Entertainment & Late Night Refreshment Licensing Committee

Monday, 15 December 2025



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Committee members present

Councillor Robert Leadenhams (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Helen Crawford
Councillor Jane Kingman
Councillor Susan Sandall
Councillor Elvis Stooke

Councillor Paul Fellows, Observer

Officers

Elizabeth Reeve, Licensing Officer
Heather Green, Licensing Manager
Kim Robertson, Legal Advisor, LSL
Lucy Bonshor, Democratic Officer

43. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing, Councillor Pam Bosworth, Councillor Patsy Ellis, Councillor Philip Knowles and Councillor Rhea Rayside.

44. Disclosures of interests

None.

45. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2025 were proposed, seconded and agreed.

46. Exclusion of Press and Public

The Legal Advisor asked those parties present whether there was a need for the press and public to be excluded from the meeting. All parties confirmed that the meeting could remain public.

47. Licensing Act 2003: Review of Premise Licence - Nisa Local (Shiv Sakthi UK Ltd), 12 High Street, Billingborough, Lincolnshire NG34 0QA

Decision

To revoke the Premise Licence for the premises known as Nisa Local (Shiv Sakthi UK Ltd, 12 High Street, Billingborough.

The Vice-Chairman introduced those present and confirmed who would be speaking in respect of the Review before the Committee. Sergeant Amy Adams would be presenting for Lincolnshire Police. Speaking in respect of the premises would be Anil Bhawsar from the Licensing Hub, Vikram Keshwala, Premises Licence Holder and Vishal Ashokbhai Shah, Designated Premises Supervisor were also present.

The Licensing Officer presented the report which concerned a Review of the Premise Licence in respect of Nisa Local (Shiv Sakthi UK Ltd), 12 High Street, Billingborough which had been submitted by Lincolnshire Police under the licensing objective of the Prevention of Crime and Disorder. Lincolnshire Police had advised that they had obtained evidence after visits in September and October 2025 which indicated that the management of the premises had been operating in such a manner that amounted to criminal activity and undermined the licensing objective.

Evidence submitted by the Police included:

- Evidence of an illegal worker on the premises
- Employing an underage individual to serve alcohol without the correct supervision
- Breach of a number of annex 2 premise licence conditions relating to the lack or external CCTV including an inaccessible CCTV system, written training records, required signage and incident and refusal logbooks
- Offences under the licensing Act 2003 and Price Marking Order Act 2004
- Concerns over a lack of management involved in the premises
- Information on fire safety concerns from a Fire Safety Inspector following a visit in October 2025.

The Police had indicated within their application that they wished to disclose some further relevant information within a private session; however it had been determined that the meeting would remain in public session.

During the consultation period a representation had been received from the Home Office in November 2025. The representation supported the Police's application for a Review as the licence holder was not taking suitable measures to prevent crime and disorder. Their representation included evidence of a visit made in September 2025 whereby an individual was located on the premises who subsequently no longer had the right to work in the UK. A civil penalty referral notice was issued to Shiv Sakthi UK Ltd for employing an individual without the right to work. The penalty notice information could be found within the supplementary papers.

During the consultation period, the representative for the Premise Licence Holder submitted documents in response to the review application. The documents included copies of right to work checks, staff training guides, refusal logs, fire safety records and photographs of alcohol pricing and posters on display in the shop. Appendices 3 and 4 of the report.

The current Premise Licence permitted the Sale of Alcohol off the premises from 0:600 to 22:00 Monday to Sunday, with the same opening hours.

The Premises Licence had been initially granted in March 2020. Shiv Sakthi UK Ltd of which Vickram Deva Keshwala is the sole director had been the Premise Licence Holder of the licence since that date. The current Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was Vishal Ashokbhai.

There were no questions from Members or any parties for the Licensing Officer and the Police were asked to make their representation.

Sergeant Adams made the representation on behalf of Lincolnshire Police. The Review had been submitted on the grounds that the management of the premise indicated that it had been operating in such a manner that amounted to criminal activity and undermined the licensing objective of the prevention of crime and disorder. Mr Vikram Keshwala, the sole director of Shiv Sakthi UK Ltd had held the premises licence since it was granted in March 2020.

At a visit to the premises by Police and Home Office Immigration Officers in September 2025 an illegal worker was found to be employed at the premise. The person had no right to work in the UK and their visa had been cancelled in June 2024. The person had not been paid and was working for free accommodation and food, more information was shown in Appendices 1 and 2 of the Police evidence pack. A second female shop assistant working in the shop was found to be 17 years of age and had been selling alcohol without the correct supervision which constituted an offence under s.136 Licensing Act 2003 – unauthorised licensable activity. Neither of the females present had any knowledge of who the DPS was and there was no written DPS authority in existence.

The Premises Licence Holder (PLH) and DPS, Vishal Ashokbhai were not present and the Police questioned why the age of the female had not been

checked. The Police referred to the civil penalty notice which had been issued for £45,000 for employing an illegal worker.

Employing illegal workers undermined the economy and left those working illegally with no rights or benefits, often working excessive hours with no pay and was a form of modern day slavery. It was a major concern for the Police about how a business was run. Also during the visit the premise was found to be in breach of its annex 2 premise licence conditions which included:

- The supply of alcohol without authorisation
- Failure to display a valid premises licence summary
- Failure to present a valid full premises licence for inspection
- The absence of any written staff training records
- The absence of external CCTV camera and presence of an inaccessible CCTV system
- The absence of an incident log book
- The absence of any shop signage
- The absence of a refusals book

It was also noted that there was a large number of alcohol products for sale on the shop floor that were not price marked. This was an offence under the Price Marking Order Act 2004.

A further visit to the premise was undertaken on 23 October 2025 by the Police again to conduct further compliance checks. Two new members of staff were encountered and Mr Keshwala was once again not present. Several areas of non-compliance were highlighted as listed within the report. Further issued encountered included:

- Insecurities to the rear of the premises where large volumes of alcohol were stored
- A large amount of non-priced alcohol on the shop floor
- Staff being unable to explain their procedures and responsibilities around the Challenge 25 policy adequately.

A fire safety inspection was carried out by Fire Safety Inspection Officers on 7 October 2025 where fire safety concerns were noted including a faulty fire alarm panel and two separate issues regarding the obstruction of a fire escape route from the flat above the premise. Although the issues had now been resolved by the PLH the visit highlighted the PLH's inability to follow safe practices and the Fire Safety Officer stated that again Mr Keshwala was not present.

An Environmental Health Officer visited on 9 October 2025 to conduct an inspection and it was noted that staff training was something "they needed to work on" and a lone female staff worker was encountered and was "quite new and not necessarily fully trained in food safety".

On 22 October 2025 the Police received an email from the Senior Security Officer working on behalf of the National Lottery. The Officer updated the Police and stated that they had met with individuals described as "relatives" of Mr Keshwala and in light of the previous Police and Immigration findings the Officer suspended Mr Keshwala's National Lottery contract and all scratch cards were removed.

Although Mr Keshwala had claimed to the Police that he was the usual person to work in the shop this was not the case as he had not been present at the four visits referred to.

On the second visit although some improvement had been found there were still issues of non-compliance and the Police had no confidence in either the DPS Mr Ashokhai or the PLH Mr Keshwala to uphold the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder and protection of children from harm. That training had not been carried out; there was no awareness of the Challenge 25 requirement by those encountered by the Police working at the premise. Reference was made to the evidence contained within the agenda pack, the checking of right to work documents, the lack of training and breaches to the CCTV requirements. The Police had no confidence in the PLH and asked the Committee to seriously consider revocation of the Premise Licence.

At this time there were no questions for the Police.

The Premise License Holder representative, Anil Bhawsar from the Licensing Hub then made their representation. He began by stating that both the PLH and DPS were deeply sorry for the events that had taken place and that they had taken on board all that had been said and addressed the issues that had been found. Measures had been put in place in regard to right to work checks, the pricing of products, the recommendations put forward by the Fire Safety Officer. He referred to the papers that had been forwarded showing the training carried out and checks that had been put in place for the staff that now work at the premises. No staff were employed at the premises who should not be there. Reference was made to the previous checks made where mistakes had been made.

Background information in respect of the premise was given and the work done by Mr Keshwala to bring the building up to standard and the work that he did within the community and the letters of support that had been circulated. Confirmation was given that going forward all records and training manuals were in place and completed as required by the conditions and there were no staff working at the premise who shouldn't be there.

Further information was given for the reasons behind why there were issues with the CCTV system and the pricing of alcohol on the shop floor. Apologies were given again in respect of the mistakes made in carrying out the right to work checks and reference was made to previous checks undertaken by Immigration Officers at a visit in 2022 when no issues were raised. Reference was made to

Mr Keshwala's whereabouts when the Police had visited the premises and the community work and help given to those in the community. Mr Keshwala understood that he had made an error and it was a serious matter and would make sure that processes were followed as he had worked hard to make the business successful. There had been no failed test purchases on the premise and nothing illegal was sold on the premise.

Members questioned both the PLH representative and the PLH in respect of what had transpired with employing a 17 year old in the shop and the illegal worker found at the premise and the lack of training carried out which was a requirement of a Premise Licence. Reference was also made to the lack of payment made to staff, the failures in respect of the fire safety checks, the lack of necessary training, which was a requirement of a Premise Licence, lack of required right to work checks. Although Members acknowledged the work undertaken by the PLH in the community it was the lack of adherence to the requirements for holding a Premises Licence which the PLH should know as he had held a licence for five years.

The Police then questioned the PLH and his representative and raised issues in respect of the completion of a refusal book, incident book and training manual and that these records could not be found when they had visited the premise. That alcohol had been served by an underage person with no authorisation to do so. The Police asked how often the DPS visited the premise to which the response was every 15 days as required. Further questions were asked in respect of staff training and who actually carried out the training was it the DPS or PLH also, why after the first visit changes had not been made straight away before the next visit by the Police was carried out. The Police also questioned the PLH's statement that he was always in the premise when on at least the four visits referenced, Mr Keshwala had not been present. Mr Keshwala stated that he had been concentrating on the stock side of the business and had been in Leicester when the first visit had taken place. Mitigation was put forward stating that Mr Keshwala had been having family issues in the last few months and had been suffering with his mental health.

The Licensing Officer then gave her closing statement reminding Members that each application was to be determined on its own merits. Members must take such steps as they considered appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives. Options open to the Committee were:

- To modify the conditions of the licence
- Exclude a licensable activity from the licence
- Remove the DPS
- Suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months
- Or revoke the licence.

The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 stated:

“In deciding which of these powers to invoke, it is expected that licensing authorities should, so far as possible, seek to establish the cause or causes of the concerns which the representations identify. The remedial action taken should generally be directed at these causes and should always be no more than an appropriate and proportionate response” (Paragraph 11.20 of the guidance issued under S182 of the Act).

The Police then gave their closing statement and referred to their second visit at which there were still breaches to the Premise Licence outstanding and there was no evidence that the business was now fully compliant. They felt that the Premise Licence Holder, having held a licence since 2020 should know how the premise should be managed. They highlighted the fact that he had not checked the age of the female worker who had been allowed to serve alcohol unsupervised, he had employed an illegal worker and not carried out the necessary right to work checks as required. The incidents were serious and undermined the licensing objectives and they asked the Committee to consider the revocation of the Premise Licence.

The PLH representative gave their closing statement and stated that all breaches that had been highlighted had now been addressed with video footage available to view if required. The PLH had admitted that he had made a mistake and losing the Premise Licence would be devastating to the business. He did understand the seriousness of what had transpired but would make sure that this did not happen again and he asked that his licence not be taken away.

(11:20 the Licensing Officers, Police and all parties left the meeting)

Members considered the Review application before them having regard to the representations made, the relevant parts of the Council’s Licensing Policy, the Licensing Act 2003 and the statutory guidance. Members expressed concern about how the business had been managed and breaches that had been found during the visits to the premises which in some cases hadn’t been addressed when the second visit had taken place some four weeks later. Members acknowledge the work the Premise Licence Holder did in the community but felt that did not negate how the premise had been operated. Members also noted the safety concerns raised by a fire inspection and the suspension of the national lottery contract. All sanctions available to the Committee were considered but it was not felt that these would not address the issues at the premise and promote the licensing objectives. Due to the serious nature of employing an illegal worker, the breaches found at the premises and having regard to the s.182 guidance, it was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed to revoke the Premise Licence.

(11:40 the Licensing Officer, Police and other parties returned to the meeting)

The Legal Advisor read out the Committees decision. The Committee had read all the paperwork before them. They have heard from the Licensing Officer, Lincolnshire Police and the Premises licence holder and their representative.

Lincolnshire Police presented their application as set out in their evidence pack. They noted a female working on the premises who did not have a right to work. A further worker who did have the right to work was under 18 and had been serving alcohol without the correct authorisation. In addition, there were numerous non-compliances with licence conditions. They also noted fire safety concerns found during a fire safety inspection, concerns from an environmental health officer who attended an inspection at the premises and an email from a senior security officer working on behalf of the national lottery advising they had suspended the national lottery contract. Further concerns were expressed regarding the completion of documents that had been provided. The Police had no confidence in the DPS, the staff were not aware of him, and he had not been on site. They had no confidence in the Premises Licence Holder who had allowed an illegal worker and an underage person to serve alcohol without the correct authorisation. The measures put in place were still not sufficient and some non-compliances had continued following the first visit. The Police advised that a civil penalty notice was to be served on the licence holder and written confirmation was provided by the immigration authority.

The Premises Licence Holder's representative advised that everything now had been implemented in respect of the licence conditions. There were now no persons working there that shouldn't be. The Premises Licence Holder confirmed that he had miscalculated the age of the underage worker and that was a mistake. The Premise Licence Holder advised of his involvement in the community and how he had helped people. They also confirmed they had had a previous visit from immigration in 2022 and the paperwork at the time was fine. They advised that they had never failed any test purchases. The Premises Licence Holder advised he had had a lot of family issues in the last few months and was suffering with some mental health issues.

The Committee considered all options available to them. They did not consider that they should leave the licence as is due to the information before them. They considered whether there were any additional conditions that could be included but were of the view that the conditions already on the licence were sufficient and there was evidence they had not been complied with. With that in mind they did not consider additional conditions would address their concerns.

The Committee considered whether it was appropriate to remove a licensable activity from the licence, but noted as there was only one licensable activity on the licence this would have the same effect as revoking the licence.

The Committee considered removing the DPS but noted the information from all parties that the DPS was not on the premises regularly and it was the Licence holder who was usually at the premises. The Committee therefore considered that removal would not sufficiently address their concerns or adequately promote the licensing objectives.

The Committee considered a suspension but noted the length of time and breadth of issues that had been found at the premises, some of which had

continued despite a previous visit. The Committee therefore did not consider this would address their concerns or adequately promote the licensing objectives.

The Committee having considered the information before them and whilst noting the apology from the Premises Licence Holder, considered that revocation of the Premise Licence was the most appropriate step for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

There was a right of appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of the licence decision being received.

48. Any other business which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, decides is urgent.

None.

49. Close of meeting

The Vice-Chairman thanked everyone for attending the meeting and wished everyone a Happy Christmas and a Happy New Year and closed the meeting at 11:45am.