STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS REGULATION JOHN O. PASTORE COMPLEX 1511 PONTIAC AVENUE CRANSTON, RI 02920

Ada's Creations, Inc.

Appellant,

v.

DBR No.: 13LQ056

The City of Providence Board of Licenses,

Appellee.

RECOMMENDATION AND INTERIM ORDER GRANTING STAY PENDING APPEAL

On May 24, 2013, the City of Providence Board of Licenses ("Board") issued a liquor licensing decision imposing an eight thousand dollar (\$ 8,000) fine and a three day (3) suspension on Ada's Creations, Inc. for alleged violations of the liquor laws and regulations (the "Decision"). Ada's ("Appellant") filed a Notice of Appeal of the Decision to the Department of Business Regulation ("Department") on May 28, 2013. The Appellant simultaneously made a Motion for Stay, requesting that the Department stay the Decision to allow the Appellant to remain open during the pendency of the appeal.

The Department has jurisdiction over appeals of local liquor licensing decisions under R.I. Gen. Laws § 3-7-21. That section gives the Department the broad authority to "confirm or reverse the decision of the local board in whole or in part." As the state "superlicensing authority," the Department reviews the decisions of local boards "de novo." *Hallene v. Smith*, 98 R.I. 360, 363, 365 (R.I., 1964)("[w]hen § 3-7-21 is read in

its entirety, it discloses by necessary implication a legislative intent to provide licensees with a de novo hearing of the cause rather than an appellate review of the decision.") R.I. Gen. Laws § 3-7-21 furthers empowers the Department "to make any decision or order," including an order staying the decision of the liquor licensing authority while the appellant awaits a *de novo* hearing and Department decision. *See Burton v. Lefebre*, 53 A.2d 456, 460 (R.I., 1947)(the stay is not automatic, but requires a Department order).

In considering a motion for a stay, effectively postponing the implementation of the disciplinary measures set forth in the local board's decision until a Department decision is rendered, the Department has broad discretion and flexibility to balance the interests of the local authority and the general public against the interests of the licensee. In the instant case, the interests of the licensee in avoiding the Board's disciplinary measures during the pendency of its de novo appeal outweigh the interests of the Board and the public in immediate closure and fines. While the alleged incidences occurred on January 19 and February 22, 2013, the Board did not hold a Show Cause Hearing until May 2, 2013 and did not render its Decision until May 28, 2013, at which time the Board determined to impose a three-day closure at the future dates of June 13-15, 2013. This delay, coupled with the fact that the Board did not invoke its emergency powers, can be reasonably construed as evidencing that immediate closure is not necessary to protect the public interest. The interest of the Appellant in a de novo hearing prior to imposition of disciplinary measures is significant because the economic harm that may otherwise result could be irreparable in light of the complex issue of governmental immunity and the difficult quantification of damages.

In its Notice of Appeal and Motion for Stay, the Appellant also raises the suspension of its entertainment license. However, the Department lacks jurisdiction to stay the Board's decision as it pertains to the Appellant's separate entertainment license. Appellant cites R.I. Gen. Laws § 3-7-7.3; however, that provision only confers jurisdiction when the restrictions on entertainment imposed on Class B licensees are structured as liquor license conditions. It is without application to the issuance of a separate entertainment license under R.I. General Laws § 5-22-1 et seq. ("city councils may license, regulate, and in those cases specifically set forth in 5-22-5, may prohibit and suppress ... shows and performances in their respective towns, conforming to law.") A licensing authority's decision to revoke, deny, or otherwise take action on a separate entertainment license under § 5-22-5 is not appealable to the Department. See R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-14-1 (listing the chapters with which the Department is charged with enforcing to the exclusion of chapter 5-22).

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the forgoing, the undersigned recommends issuing the stay of the Decision as it pertains to the liquor license, pending the outcome of the Department's de novo review of the case.

Date: 6 6 2013

Louis A. DeQuattro Jr Esq

Hearing Officer

Deputy Director & Executive Counsel

INTERIM ORDER

I have read the Hearing Officer's recommendation and take the following action **ADOPT**

___REJECT ___MODIFY

Date: 6 fm 2013

Paul McGreevy

Director

Entered as an Administrative Order No.: 1361 this day of June, 2013.

NOTICE OF APPELLATE RIGHTS

THIS ORDER IS REVIEWABLE BY THE SUPERIOR COURT PURSUANT TO R.I. GEN. LAWS § 42-35(a) WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS DECISION. SUCH APPEAL, IF TAKEN, MUST BE COMPLETED BY FILING A PETITION FOR REVIEW IN SUPERIOR COURT. THE FILING OFA PETITION DOES NOT ITSELF STAY ENFORCEMENT OF THIS ORDER.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify on this day of June, 2013 that a copy of the within Order and Notice of Appellate Rights was sent by e-mail and first class mail, postage prepaid to -

Peter Petrarca, Esq.
Petrarca & Petrarca
330 Silver Spring Street
Providence, RI 02904
Peter330350@gmail.com

Sergio Spaziano City of Providence, Law Department 444 Westminster Street, Suite 220 Providence, RI 02903 sspaziano@providenceri.com

and by email to Maria D'Alessandro, Deputy Director, Securities, Commercial Licensing and Racing & Athletics