

Mailing Date: February 4, 2009

Formatted: Header distance from edge: 0.33", Footer distance from edge: 0.67"

PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD
HARRISBURG, PA 17124-0001

PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, : Citation No. 067-26240982X
BUREAU OF LIQUOR CONTROL :
ENFORCEMENT :

vs. :

THE BLUE COMET, INC. : License No. R-~~AP-SS~~-234
106 S. Easton Road :
Glenside, PA 19038-4001 :

Counsel for Licensee: John J. McCreesh, IV, Esquire
~~McCreeshMcCreesh~~, ~~McCreeshMcCreesh~~,
~~McCreesh-McCreesh~~ & Cannon
7053 Terminal Square
Upper Darby, PA 19082

Counsel for Bureau: Roy Harkavy, Esquire
Pennsylvania State Police,
Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement
8320 Schantz Road, Second Floor
Breinigsville, PA 18031

OPINION

Formatted: Space After: 12 pt, Line spacing: single

The Blue Comet, Inc. ("Licensee") appealed nunc pro tunc from the ~~Second~~ Supplemental Order of Administrative Law Judge Tania E. Wright ("ALJ"), wherein the ALJ ~~sustained the citation and~~ revoked the license since Licensee had failed to pay a previously imposed fine.

Formatted: Font: Italic

The citation charged that Licensee violated section 493(26) of the Liquor Code [47 P.S. § 4-493(26)], in that Licensee, by its servants, agents or employees, issued checks or drafts dated ~~July 14, 28, August 11, 25,~~ September 1 and 22, 2006, in payment for purchases of malt or brewed beverages, when

there was insufficient funds in, or credit with, the institution upon which drawn for the payment of such checks.

On ~~February~~ ~~September~~ 20~~6~~, 2007, Licensee submitted an Admission, Waiver and Authorization (“waiver”) to the Office of the Administrative Law Judge (“OALJ”), in which Licensee admitted to the violation charged in the citation and waived the right to appeal the adjudication. (Adjudication, p.1). ~~(Admin. Notice).~~ The waiver form was signed by Scott Acker, Licensee’s sole corporate officer, ~~, on September 20, 2007~~(Admin. Notice).

On ~~May~~ ~~October~~ 18, ~~3~~, 2007, the ALJ issued an Opinion and Adjudication, sustaining the citation, ~~— and~~ imposing a fine in the amount of ~~seven~~ ~~five~~ hundred dollars (\$5700.00). ~~(Admin. Notice).~~—The ALJ’s Order provided that, “[i]n the event ~~—~~ the fine is not paid within 20 days, ~~from the mailing date of this Order,~~ Licensee’s license ~~will~~ ~~shall~~ be suspended or revoked.” (Admin. Notice).

On ~~June~~ ~~December~~ 21~~8~~, 2007, the fine having not been paid, the ALJ issued a Supplemental ~~Opinion and Order For Failure to Pay A Fine imposing a one (1) day license suspension¹ to continue thereafter until the fine was paid.~~ (Admin. Notice). ~~The Order further stated that, if the fine was not paid within sixty (60) days from the mailing date of June 21, 2007, the suspension would be reevaluated, and revocation of the license would be considered.—(Admin. Notice).~~

On or about October 21, 2008, Licensee, through its new counsel, John J. McCreesh, IV, filed a Petition for Appeal Nunc Pro Tunc (“Petition”) with the Board.

Pursuant to section 471 of the Liquor Code [47 P.S. § 4-471], the appeal in this case must be based solely on the record before the ALJ. The Board shall only reverse the decision of the ALJ if the ALJ committed an error of law or abused his-her discretion, or if his-her decision was not based upon substantial evidence. The Commonwealth Court defined "substantial evidence" to be such relevant evidence as a reasonable person might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. Joy Global, Inc. v. Workers' Compensation Appeal Bd. (Hogue), 876 A.2d 1098 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2005); Chapman v. Pennsylvania Bd. of Probation and Parole, 86 Pa. Cmwlth. 49, 484 A.2d 413 (1984).

Based solely on the waiver executed by Mr. Acker, Licensee's sole corporate officer, this appeal must be dismissed. ~~Mr. Acker waived~~ Licensee's right to appeal the substance of the violation and the penalty imposed were expressly waived. Therefore, the appeal must be dismissed. Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement v. Wilner, 687 A.2d 1216 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1997); Pennsylvania Liquor Control Bd. v. Dentici, 117 Pa. Cmwlth. 70, 542 A.2d 229 (1988). Therefore, the appeal must be dismissed.

Even if Licensee's right to file an appeal was not waived, and the Board considered the appeal nunc pro tunc, under the circumstances the appeal would be dismissed.

~~Although section 17.21(c) of the Board's Regulations [40 Pa. Code § 17.21(c)] sets forth that appeals from decision of the ALJ shall be filed or postmarked within thirty (30) calendar days of the mailing date of the adjudication of the ALJ, because the October 26, 2007 Second Supplemental Order of the ALJ sets forth the final adjudication as automatic revocation, Licensee had up to thirty (30) days after the October 26, 2007 date to file a timely appeal with the Board.~~

The Board finds that Licensee has failed to adequately satisfy the first factor of the Cook criteria. Licensee has not set forth circumstances surrounding the lateness of this appeal which suggest fraud or breakdown in the operation of the OALJ, nor has it alleged that the appeal was late because of non-negligent conduct by Licensee or its attorney. ~~Licensee's counsel fails~~ Although it is alleged that Licensee was initially unaware at the revocation of the license, Licensee's counsel failed to specify exactly when ~~Mr. Acker~~ Licensee learned of the revocation and when ~~he~~ it contacted counsel. Further, Bbeyond mentioning that during some unspecified period of time Mr. Acker's mother became ill and Mr. Acker became distracted, there is no detailed explanation as to how the mother's illness impacted Mr. Acker's responsibility to the licensed premises on a day-to-day basis. In addition, Licensee has not provided an explanation for why Licensee did not appoint a responsible party to act on his behalf regarding ~~the~~ his licensed business after his mother became ill ~~;~~ ; ~~n~~ nor did Licensee offer any explanation for why it did not contact the ALJ or the Board to determine the status of the license after the waiver was executed. ~~Unfortunately,~~ Licensee has thus failed to provide

- Formatted: Font: Italic, No underline
- Formatted: Font: Italic
- Formatted: Font: Italic, No underline
- Formatted: Font: Italic
- Formatted: Font: Italic, No underline

any explanation sufficient to rise to the level of non-negligent circumstances as described in the Cook case.

Relative to the second and third Cook factors, the appeal was filed on October 21, 2008, but should have been filed about nine (9) months earlier, by January 17, 2008~~within ten (10) months of the time it was due; however,~~ he was contacted by Mr. Acker~~Licensee~~, the Board is unable to determine whether the appeal was filed within a short time after Licensee learned of and had the opportunity to address the untimeliness,~~or whether the time period was of very short duration.~~ The passage of nine (9) months from the date the appeal should have been filed, the third Cook factor, is not of very short duration and, thus, the Licensee does not meet the factor.

Relative to the final factor of the Cook criteria, the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement (“Bureau”) has not claimed prejudice by the delay in filing of this appeal. ~~The Board sees no harm to the Bureau, whether or not this appeal is granted nunc pro tunc.~~

Accordingly, ~~the appeal of Licensee must be dismissed even if the waiver were not in effect, the Board would not have accepted this appeal nunc pro tunc.~~

Formatted: Font: Italic

ORDER

The decision of the ALJ is affirmed.

The appeal of Licensee is dismissed.

It is hereby ordered that Licensee’s Restaurant Liquor License No. R-234 remains revoked as of November 19, 2007.

Licensee must adhere to all conditions set forth in the ALJ’s Orders in this matter.

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Board Secretary

|

Formatted: Line spacing: single