

NORTHERN TERRITORY LIQUOR COMMISSION
DECISION NOTICE

MATTER: APPLICATION FOR A LICENCE AND AUTHORITIES

REFERENCE: LC2022/051

APPLICANT: Dassai Darwin Pty Ltd

PREMISES: **Pink Chopstix**
Tenancy 6001, 7 Anchorage Court
DARWIN CITY NT 0800

LEGISLATION: Section 47 and 52 of the *Liquor Act 2019*

HEARD BEFORE: Ms Jodi Truman (Acting Chairperson)
Mr Bernard Dwyer (Health Member)
Ms Christine Hart (Community Member)

DATE OF HEARING: 19 October and 21 December 2022

DATE OF DECISION: 21 December 2022

DECISION

1. For the reasons set out below and in accordance with section 48 of the *Liquor Act 2019* (NT) (the Act) the Northern Territory Liquor Commission (the Commission) has determined to issue a licence to Dassai Darwin Pty Ltd (the Applicant).
2. The licence will be issued with a catering authority and restaurant authority and subject to those authority conditions set out in Part 4, Divisions 1, 5 and 15 of the *Liquor Regulations 2019* (the Regulations).
3. The Commission approves the appointment of Ms Jiayao Lin as the nominee of the licensee.
4. The licensed premises is designated by the area highlighted in yellow on the plan tendered as part of Exhibit One at the hearing of the application in Attachment ZJ.
5. These additional conditions relate to the catering authority only and the catering authority shall cease immediately upon the cessation of the Waterfront Beach Club area:
 - a. Patrons purchasing a light or full meal from the licensee during their existing hours of trade, may purchase liquor for consumption within the Waterfront Beach Club area with their meals;

- b. The sale of liquor per person for consumption in the Waterfront Beach Club area is limited to:
 - i. one (1) 750ml bottle of wine; or
 - ii. six (6) containers of beer, cider or pre-mix spirits with a combined maximum volume of 2250ml, being the equivalent of 6 x 375ml cans or stubbies; or
 - iii. two (2) pre-mixed cocktails (a cocktail being limited to 75ml of alcohol 40% alc/vol each);
 - iv. cocktails may be served in a vessel together (eg. two (2) patrons ordering two meals may order four (4) cocktails in total which may be placed into one container for shared consumption).
 - c. Liquor may only be sold to a person in conjunction with the purchase of a light or full meal. A light or full meal being as defined in regulation 3 of the *Liquor Regulations 2019*.
 - d. An entrée or side order does not constitute a light or full meal.
 - e. The price point for the sale of liquor under this authority shall not be lower than the price at which the licensee sells that liquor for on-premises consumption.
 - f. All patrons must be in possession of a "*Waterfront alcohol with meal permit*" issued under permission by the Darwin Waterfront Corporation.
 - g. The date and times must be specified on the permit and are limited to two (2) hours per person per day. Multiple purchases are not permitted.
 - h. The sale of liquor under this authority is not subject to the provisions of section 130 of the Act relating to the operation of an identification system.
 - i. The sale of liquor is prohibited beyond 23:59 hours.
 - j. The Waterfront Beach Club area is that area identified by the Director of Licensing (or his Delegate) and to be attached to the licence.
6. The licence will be issued immediately following the publication of this decision notice however the licensee shall not be permitted to sell or supply liquor from the premises until such time as it provides written proof to the satisfaction of the Director of Licensing (the Director) or the Director's Delegate that it has obtained a certificate of occupancy and all the necessary safety approvals in respect of the premises.

REASONS

BACKGROUND

THE APPLICATION

7. An application was lodged by Ms Jiayao Lin (Ms Lin) on behalf of Dassai Darwin Pty Ltd (the Applicant) seeking the issue of a new liquor licence with a restaurant bar authority for premises to be known as “Pink Chopstix” to be located at the Darwin Waterfront. Payment of the application fee was made. The proposed trading hours were sought to be pursuant to those set out within the Regulations.
8. The Applicant is a company registered with ASIC. Ms Lin is listed as Director and Secretary. The company also has 100 shares; with Ms Lin holding 75 and Mr Haodong Yang (Mr Yang) holding 25 shares. The business name “Pink Chopstix” is currently registered with ASIC.
9. In relation to both Ms Lin and Mr Yang, each have provided the following probity documents:
 - a. Copy of photo identification by way of NT Drivers Licence
 - b. Copy of National Police Certificate based on name and fingerprint check
 - c. References.
 - d. Copy of RSA Certificate.
10. Ms Lin has also provided a summary of her work experience and qualifications, noting her experience as a Restaurant Manager since 2019.
11. Ms Lin has never held a liquor licence in the NT and is therefore not known to the Director of Liquor Licensing (the Director) and has no compliance history. It is proposed that Ms Lin will be the nominee.
12. The application was accompanied by;
 - a. Affidavit pursuant to Section 54 of the Act
 - b. Declaration of Associates
 - c. Public Interest Criteria
 - d. Community Impact Assessment Summary
 - e. Financial Report
 - f. Letter from landlord re intent to lease and disclosure statement
 - g. Copy of proposed liquor licensed area
 - h. Concept and site plans
 - i. Draft drinks list

- j. Additional financial documents
- k. Business plan
- l. Documents related to fit out and licensed area

PUBLICATION AND CONSULTATION

13. The application was published in the NT News on Saturday 17 September 2022 and published on the Director's website for the required advertising period. A green advertising sign was erected at the premises for the course of the advertising period.
14. As a result of the publication, no objections were received from any members of the public during the objection period.
15. In accordance with the Act, the following stakeholders were notified of the application:
 - The Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health
 - The Commissioner of NT Police
 - CEO, Darwin Waterfront Corporation.
16. Being a new liquor licence application, the NT Fire & Rescue Service (NTFRS) was also notified.
17. The NT Police replied via email dated 15 September 2022 stating it had no objection. No response was received from the Department of Health, NTFRS or the Darwin Waterfront Corporation.

COMPLIANCE HISTORY

18. As earlier noted, the Applicant has never held a licence before in the Northern Territory and therefore has no compliance history.

THE REFERRAL AND HEARING

19. On 5 October 2022, pursuant to section 59 of the Act, the Director referred this application to the Commission. On 6 October 2022 the Applicant was notified that the matter was listed for public hearing on 19 October 2022.
20. When the matter was mentioned before the Commission on that date, Ms Lin appeared for the applicant and Mr Wood for the Director. The Commission informed Ms Lin that her application was significantly lacking in a number of material respects and that if she wished to proceed at that time, the Commission would be unlikely to be satisfied on the material that a licence should be issued. The Applicant sought an adjournment and the matter was adjourned for further hearing to 16 November 2022 which was the next available date suitable to the Commission and the Applicant.
21. Prior to that date, the Applicant sought a further adjournment in order to prepare the application further and obtain additional documents as well as legal advice. As a result the hearing was further adjourned to the next available date suitable to the Commission and the Applicant being 21 December 2022.

22. Pursuant to section 23 of the Act, the Commission is not bound by the rules of evidence and may inform itself in any manner it considers appropriate. Section 21(2) provides that a hearing must be conducted in public unless the Commission is of the opinion it is not appropriate. No submissions were made to the Commission to this effect.
23. On 21 December 2022, the application proceeded as a public hearing. Mr James Stuchbery of Ward Keller appeared on behalf of the Applicant accompanied by Ms Lin. Mr Wood again appeared for the Director. The Commission thanks them all for their attendance and assistance.
24. The Director's referral brief was tendered into evidence together with additional documents that were provided on behalf of the Applicant on 20 December 2022 forming in their entirety exhibit 1.
25. At the commencement of the hearing, Mr Stuchbery provided brief oral submissions referring to the additional material filed and in particular the financial circumstances of both the Applicant and of Ms Lin.

ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

26. In accordance with section 59 of the Act, the Commission has considered:
 - a. The applicant's affidavit required by section 54;
 - b. The suitability of the premises to be licensed, having regard to any law of the Territory regulating the sale, supply, service or consumption of liquor or the location, construction or facilities of those premises;
 - c. The financial stability and business reputation of the applicant body corporate;
 - d. The general reputation and character of the secretary and executive officers of the applicant body corporate;
 - e. Whether the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a licence; and
 - f. Whether the nominee designated by the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a licence.
27. In accordance with section 49 of the Act, the Commission has also considered whether issuing the licence is in the public interest, and whether the licence will have a significant adverse impact on the community.

THE APPLICANT

28. The Commission finds that the Applicant complies with section 53(1) of the Act, which requires that a body corporate shall not hold a licence unless it is a corporation.
29. The Applicant has provided appropriate documentation regarding its operations, activities, financial circumstances, and plans. The Commission is satisfied as to the financial circumstances of the Applicant and also of Ms Lin. Where the funds have come from to establish these premises is now adequately identified.

30. Pursuant to section 54 of the Act, Ms Lin has also deposed (as the sole Director and Secretary of the Applicant) in an affidavit that there are no persons who may be able to influence the applicant, or expect a benefit from the applicant, if the licence is granted. The Commission is satisfied that the Applicant has complied with the disclosure requirements of section 54.

THE SUITABILITY OF THE APPLICANT'S PREMISES

31. The premises have not previously operated as licensed premises and appear to have been vacant since construction. The Applicant has a lease agreement in place and has been provided with a lease incentive from the landlord which will be used for the fit out works. The facilities on the premises are appropriate and the proposed fit out is extensive.
32. As with any new premises, the Commission is aware there will remain some issues to be confirmed by the NTFRS for the purposes of occupancy once fit out has been completed, however these issues can be addressed by the Applicant and inclusion of a condition that the Applicant cannot commence selling or supplying liquor from the premises until such time as it provides written proof to the satisfaction of the Director (or it's Delegate) that it has obtained a certificate of occupancy and all the necessary safety approvals in respect of the premises will sufficiently address these outstanding matters.
33. The Commission notes that pursuant to section 91 of the Act, the Applicant will be required to comply with the requirements of the *Fire and Emergency Act 1996* and the associated regulations, including those that prescribe fire safety standards.

THE FINANCIAL STABILITY, GENERAL REPUTATION AND CHARACTER OF THE BODY CORPORATE

34. As earlier noted, the Applicant has now provided appropriate documentation regarding its financial circumstances such that the Commission is satisfied as to the financial circumstances and stability of the Applicant and also of Ms Lin.
35. The Commission notes that the Applicant has been registered as a company since 21 September 2021. It has not operated as a business at all since that time. It therefore does not have an established business reputation. On the material provided the Applicant does appear to have sufficient funds for it to be assessed as financially stable.
36. The Applicant's sole Director, Ms Lin, and the proposed nominee for the licence has provided material to the Commission that establishes she has a good general reputation, is of good character, and is financially stable.
37. Neither the Applicant, nor Ms Lin, have previously held a liquor licence
38. The Commission notes that both Ms Lin and Mr Yang hold current RSA certification.

THE QUESTION OF “FIT AND PROPER”

39. Pursuant to section 49(1)(a) the Commission may only issue a licence or an authority if satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person. Where the applicant is a body corporate, it must designate an individual to be the licensee’s nominee. In this application, Ms Lin has been designated as the nominee.
40. Section 59(3)(i) of the Act provides that when considering an application for a licence or authority the Commission must consider whether “the applicant, *including the nominee* designated by the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a licence” (emphasis added).
41. Section 59(3)(j) requires the Commission to consider whether each associate of the applicant is a fit and proper person to be an associate of the licensee. The mechanism established to enable the Commission to inform itself in relation to an applicant’s associates is established by sections 54 and 55, which require licence applicants to disclose their associates.
42. In the view of the Commission, in this instance to determine whether a body corporate person is fit and proper the Commission must consider whether the executive officers of the body corporate are fit and proper to hold the licence, whether the designated nominee is fit and proper to hold the licence, and whether the associates of the body corporate are fit and proper to be associates of the licensee, having regard to the relationships between these individuals and the respective roles they propose to play in the operation of the licence.
43. In this matter, the sole Director and Secretary of the applicant, Ms Lin, has deposed as to the relevant associates and the Commission has no evidence to suggest that those persons deposed to are not fit and proper person to be an associate of the licensee of the premises.
44. In relation to the second question, the Commission has previously considered the meaning of the expression “fit and proper”, as follows¹:

The term “fit and proper” is not defined by the Act.

In *Australian Broadcasting Tribunal v Bond* [1990] HCA 33; (1990) 170 CLR 321, the High Court considered the meaning of the expression “fit and proper” in relation to licensees under *the Broadcasting Act 1942* (Cth).

Mason CJ stated, at 349:

[A] licensee has a responsibility to exercise the power conferred by the licence with a due regard to proper standards of conduct and a responsibility not to abuse the privilege which it enjoys... A licensee which lacks a proper appreciation of those responsibilities or does not discharge them is not, or may be adjudged not to be, a fit and proper person.

¹ Bojangles Restaurant Saloon - Disciplinary action LC2020/058 (28 January 2021) at [37] – [44]

Gaudron and Toohey JJ stated, at 380:

The expression “fit and proper”, standing alone, carries no precise meaning. It takes its meaning from its context, from the activities in which the person is or will be engaged and the ends to be served by those activities...

In *Qadir v Department of Transport* [2015] NTSC 86, Kelly J stated, at [52]:

A decision about whether an applicant is a “fit and proper person” for a particular role or purpose requires a consideration of the qualities necessary to fulfil the role or purpose. It would also generally require some consideration of the person’s moral integrity and rectitude of character as well as the applicant’s knowledge, ability and honesty as it relates to the role in question.

...

The question whether a person is a fit and proper person to hold a liquor licence is one of value judgment (*Australian Broadcasting Tribunal v Bond* [1990] HCA 33; (1990) 170 CLR 321, 388 per Toohey and Gaudron JJ).

45. In this matter the Commission has found that Ms Lin is a person of good character and general reputation, however, more is required. The Commission is of the view that it also has to consider whether Ms Lin has the knowledge and ability² and a proper appreciation of the responsibilities required to fulfil the role³ of being the licensee of the premises and in particular of a licence with a restaurant bar authority as is being sought.
46. In this regard, the Applicant proposes to operate a “mainly Chinese cuisine” restaurant for consumption on premises and take away. The Applicant stated that the basis for seeking a liquor licence was:

“... so that the Restaurant may better serve the patrons and enhance the dining experience of its patrons ...”⁴.

Further:

“Our service will be waiter service, also commonly known as sit-down service, so once you enter our restaurant our waiter to take care of everything...”⁵.

47. The Applicant provided examples of the food to be provided at the premises and it is clear that what is proposed are full meals in the main with a focus on the food. Ms Lin’s experience in hospitality is also limited to operating as a restaurant manager.
48. Whilst the Commission is willing to accept (based on Ms Lin’s experience) that she is fit and proper to hold a licence with a restaurant authority commensurate with her experience in restaurant management, the Commission is not able to be satisfied on the current state of the evidence to make a finding that Ms Lin is fit and proper to hold a licence with a restaurant bar authority. This is not to say that the Commission finds

² See *Qadir v Department of Transport* [2015] NTSC 86, at [52], per Kelly J

³ See *Australian Broadcasting Tribunal v Bond* [1990] HCA 33; (1990) 170 CLR 321 at 349, per Mason CJ

⁴ P.148 of exhibit 1

⁵ *Ibid*, p.149

Ms Lin is not fit and proper, simply that there is not sufficient evidence to support a finding that she is fit and proper in relation to a licence with a restaurant bar authority.

49. The business plan that has been lodged on behalf of the Applicant relates clearly to the operation of a restaurant with the focus on food and service and supply of alcohol being to enhance the dining experience. Ms Lin's experience is in restaurant management, not bar management. The evidence as to her skills, experience and knowledge is therefore limited to restaurant management. On the evidence before the Commission, the standard of knowledge and abilities of Ms Lin is also thus limited to restaurant management and this is a relevant matter as to whether a licence with a restaurant bar authority should be issued by the Commission.
50. The Commission also considers it relevant that the risk classification for a restaurant bar authority is different to that of a restaurant authority. A restaurant bar authority has a "moderate risk" classification whereas a restaurant authority has a "low risk" classification. This needs to be considered in relation to whether Ms Lin has the relevant knowledge and ability and a proper appreciation of her responsibilities for such a risk classification.
51. The Commission will return to this issue later in these reasons.

WHETHER ISSUING THE LICENCE IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

52. Pursuant to section 49(1)(b) of the Act, the Commission may only issue a licence or authority if satisfied that it is in the public interest. To determine whether the issue of the licence is in the public interest, the Commission is required to consider how the issue of the licence would advance the following objectives set out in section 49(2) of the Act:
 - (a) Minimising the harm or ill-health caused to people, or a group of people, by the consumption of liquor;
 - (b) Ensuring liquor is sold, supplied, served and consumed on or in licensed premises in a responsible manner;
 - (c) Safeguarding public order and safety, particularly when large numbers of people would be attracted to licensed premises or an area adjacent to those premises;
 - (d) Protecting the safety, health and welfare of people who use licensed premises;
 - (e) Increasing cultural, recreational, employment or tourism benefits for the local community area;
 - (f) Promoting compliance with this Act and other relevant laws of the Territory;
 - (g) Ensuring each person involved in the business conducted at licensed premises receives training suitable to the person's role in the business;
 - (h) Preventing the giving of credit in sales of liquor to people;
 - (i) Preventing practices that encourage irresponsible drinking;
 - (j) Reducing or limiting increases in anti-social behaviour.

53. The Commission has considered each of these objectives and has also had regard to section 50(3) of the Act which provides:

The mere addition of a new licence or licensed premises in a community is not taken to be a benefit to the community.

54. The onus is on the Applicant to establish that issuing the licence and proposed restaurant bar authority is in the public interest. As earlier noted, the evidence before the Commission indicates that the proposed business model is that of a restaurant with a significant focus upon food. The sale and supply of liquor is only proposed as a supplementary offering to such meals.
55. The Commission finds on the evidence before it that a restaurant of the nature proposed by the Applicant in the area proposed, would increase cultural, recreational, employment and tourism benefits for the local community area. There is however *no* evidence before the Commission that would satisfy a finding that there is any additional benefit to the local community area of another restaurant bar authority. This may change over time, however it is not established on the current evidence before the Commission.

WHETHER THE ISSUE OF THE LICENCE WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY

56. To determine whether it is satisfied that the issue of the licence will not have a significant adverse impact on the community, the Commission must have consider the following matters set out at section 49(3) of the Act:
- (a) The risk of undue offence, annoyance, disturbance or inconvenience to persons who reside or work in the vicinity of the proposed licensed premises or who are using, or travelling to or from, a place of public worship, a hospital or a school;
 - (b) The geographic area that would be affected;
 - (c) The risk of harm from the excessive or inappropriate consumption of liquor;
 - (d) The people or community who would be affected;
 - (e) The effect on culture, recreation, employment and tourism;
 - (f) The effect on social amenities and public health;
 - (g) The ratio of existing liquor licences and authorities in the community to the population of the community;
 - (h) The effect of the volume of liquor sales on the community;
 - (i) The community impact assessment guidelines issued under section 50.
57. The community impact assessment guidelines previously published under section 6A of the *Liquor Act 1978* and in force immediately before the commencement of the Act remain the community impact assessment guidelines issued under section 50, which are as follows:

Criteria	Matters to be considered
<p>The potential harm or health impact that may be caused to people, or any group of people within the local community area, due to the availability and accessibility of an additional liquor outlet.</p>	<p>Are there any 'at-risk' groups or sub-communities within the locality? This may include –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children and young people; • Aboriginal people normally resident within the locality and those Aboriginal people that might be likely to travel to the locality from a dry community; • migrant groups from non-English speaking countries; • people in low socio-economic areas; and/or • communities that experience high tourist/visitor numbers. <p>Are there any community buildings, facilities and areas within the locality? Such facilities would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • schools and educational institutions; • hospitals, drug and alcohol treatment centres; • accommodation or refuges for young or disadvantaged people; • child care centres; • recreational areas; • dry areas; and • any other area where young people may congregate or be attracted to. <p>What policies and procedures will the applicant implement to minimise any potential harm or health impacts to these 'at-risk' groups or sub-communities?</p>
<p>Information about the location and area in which the premises is proposed to be so as to assess any social impact on the community. This includes information about the</p>	<p>This may include crimes statistics, social profile information and the location of existing licensed premises.</p>

density of licensed premises within the community area.	This could also include traffic and pedestrian impact and any plans developed to address these potential issues.
Volume	This may include projected sales volumes and marketing analysis, liquor type and customer demographic (where applicable this should be provided for both on and off premises sales). The Commission will consider information available to it about the current alcohol consumption rates for the community area.
Any cultural, recreational, employment or tourism benefits for the local community area.	Will the proposed licensed premises provide economic benefits, cultural, recreational or tourism benefits or any additional employment opportunities and to what level?
Why the grant of a relevant application is in the public interest and how the additional liquor outlet will benefit the local and broader community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What additional services will be provided other than simply an additional outlet for the sale of liquor – this may include accommodation or dining? • Will the proposed licensed premises provide additional choices of service or products that are no available in the area? • Will the proposed premises provide liquor in a manner known to be safe and to minimise adverse impacts? • Will it use existing premises improve or add to existing premises or is it a new premises?

58. The applicant bears the onus of satisfying the Commission of the relevant matters. Even if there are no objections, the applicant must still satisfy this Commission of those matters.

59. As can be seen from the above, there are numerous matters the Commission must consider and the applicant must address (and satisfy the Commission of) under the public interest and community impact test and guidelines. The guidelines do state however that:

"...the Commission has the authority to consider a broad range of issues specific to each application and flexibility exists to assess each individual application on its merits".

60. In addition, section 50(4) provides that the guidelines “may have general, limited or varied application”. Although there are many matters for the Commission to consider, like any application, some of the matters are more relevant to this application than others.
61. This application was a difficult one for the Commission to assess. On the one hand there is a proposal for a premises that has a focus on food that is different to that offered in the local area and in a location that appeals to locals and tourists alike. On the other hand, the proposal is related to premises which have been vacant since construction and are to be operated by an Applicant and nominee who have no experience in operating premises with a licence authority of the nature being sought (i.e. restaurant bar) in a location that already has a large number of such licences in the local community area.
62. With the provision of food being the focus, the fact that the Applicant has never held a licence, nor has the proposed nominee ever held a licence, and that this is a business that is just starting out for the very first time, it was indicated by the Commission during the course of the hearing to Mr Stuchbery on behalf of the Applicant that the Commission was concerned there was insufficient evidence to establish it was in the public interest for a restaurant bar authority to be issued.
63. The Commission indicated however that it was willing to find it established on the evidence that a restaurant authority would be in the public interest given the nature of what was being proposed. The Commission also indicated that whilst it may be the Applicant’s desire to ultimately trade as a restaurant bar, the Applicant had simply **not** provided any evidence whatsoever to establish that it is in the public interest for there to be another restaurant bar in that local area. There is certainly evidence to support a further restaurant, but **not** a restaurant bar on the current evidence.
64. Upon being advised by the Commission that there was little prospect of a restaurant bar authority being granted, Mr Stuchbery requested on behalf of the Applicant that the application be treated as one for a restaurant authority instead.
65. On the basis of the evidence, the Commission is satisfied that a licence can be issued to the Applicant with a restaurant authority. Given the nature of the premises and its location, the Commission is also satisfied that a catering authority can be issued to the Applicant in line with the authority granted to other premises at the Waterfront.
66. The Commission therefore grants a licence in accordance with the terms set out at the commencement of this decision notice.

EXTENSION OF TIME

67. Section 62 of the Act requires the Commission to make its decision 28 days after the expiration of the objection period that commenced with public notification of the application. As set out above, although the Commission listed the matter for a hearing promptly following its referral, adjournments were then sought by the Applicant. It was therefore impracticable for the Commission to comply with the time limitation period and to do so would have meant the Commission had no alternative but to refuse the application.

68. As a result, and pursuant to section 318 of the Act, the Commission extends the time for the making of this decision in accordance with section 60 until the date of this decision.

NOTICE OF RIGHTS

69. Section 31(1) read with section 60(3) of the Act provide that the decision set out in this decision notice is reviewable by the Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal (**NTCAT**). Section 94(3) of the *NTCAT Act 2014* provides that an application for review of a reviewable decision must be lodged within 28 days of the date of the decision.

70. In accordance with section 31(2) of the Act, the persons who may apply to NTCAT for a review of the decision are the Applicant and Director.



JODI TRUMAN

ACTING CHAIRPERSON, NORTHERN TERRITORY LIQUOR COMMISSION

21 December 2022

On behalf of Commissioners Truman, Dwyer, and Hart