

NSW Independent Liquor & Gaming Authority

Mr Kamaljit Singh Licensee Porters Liquor Woronora Heights	Superintendent Donald Faulds Commander Sutherland Shire Police Area Command
Section 140(3) – Third parties CARRARD TRANSPORT PTY LTD Business Owner Porters Liquor Woronora Heights	Section 140(3) – Third parties LE LAI RETIREMENT PTY LTD Premises Owners Porters Liquor Woronora Heights

Our ref: DOC26/075858

20 March 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

Decision regarding a complaint about Mr Kamaljit Singh under section 139 of the *Liquor Act 2007*

Ground of complaint

The grounds of the complaint are that:

- Section 139(3)(b) of the *Liquor Act 2007* (the **Act**) – the licensee has failed to comply with any of the conditions to which the licence is subject
- Section 139(3)(e) of the Act – the licensee has failed to comply with a direction or other requirement of the Authority, the Secretary or the Commissioner of Police under the Act (or of the Secretary or the Commissioner under the former Act)
- Section 139(3)(i) of the Act – the licensee is not a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence (whether for the same reason as that set out in section 45(5) or otherwise); and
- Section 139(3)(s) of the Act – the licence has not been exercised in the public interest.

Our decision

We are satisfied that the grounds of the complaint are established and have determined to:

1. **disqualify** Mr Kamaljit Singh (**Mr Singh**) from holding a licence, or from being the manager of licensed premises or the close associate of a licensee, for a period of two years under section 141(2)(f) of the Act.

Background

Mr Kamaljit Singh is the licensee of Porters Liquor Woronora Heights (LIQP770016656) located at Shop 5/67 Warrangarree Dr Woronora Heights, NSW, 2233 (the **venue**). The complaint was made under section 139 of the Act. On 28 April 2023, Licensing Police conducted a covert operation at the venue and Mr Singh was found to have sold alcohol to multiple minors in quick succession. Police suspended the operation and intervened to prevent more sales of alcohol to minors. Mr Singh was issued six infringement notices for the sale of liquor to four minors; failure to display correct signage and failure to comply with a licence condition, namely not being an active member of a local liquor accord as per a condition on the liquor licence.

Following this incident Mr Singh accumulated two demerit points and remedial action was taken against him by the Authority under part 9A of the Act. On 30 September 2024 the Authority imposed several licence conditions on the venue requiring all staff to undertake Responsible Service of Alcohol (**RSA**) training, Mr Singh to undertake advanced licensee training, a plan of management (**POM**) to be in place and available for inspection, and CCTV to be installed and available for inspection.

Between April 2024 and June 2025, Licensing Police attended the venue multiple times and identified multiple compliance issues and breaches relating to:

- a staff member without an RSA competency card selling alcohol
- incorrect signage
- non-compliant CCTV system
- no plan of management on site
- a staff member working alone exhibited a significant lack of training around operations of the venue
- Mr Singh's failure to be an active participant in his local liquor accord as per a condition on the liquor licence.

Mr Singh was issued two penalty notices for multiple infringements during this period relating to the above breaches as well as several warnings from Police. This is in addition to the penalty notice for six infringements issued following the April 2023 event.

On 14 March 2025 Mr Singh applied to the Authority seeking the removal of the 2 demerit points incurred from the 28 April 2023 incident. The Authority determined to refuse the application to remove the demerit points, noting that it was not satisfied that the compliance issues at the venue had been adequately addressed to reduce risk to the community.

Disciplinary complaint

On 2 July 2025, a disciplinary complaint under section 139 of the Act was made to the Independent Liquor and Gaming Authority (the **Authority**) from Mr Don Faulds, Superintendent Commander of Sutherland Shire Police Area Command (**Police**), as a delegate of the Commissioner of Police about Mr Kamaljit Singh as the licensee of the venue.

Licence details

Mr Singh is the current licensee of the venue and is noted as the licensee at the time of the Police operations. He has held this position since 1 April 2021.

The premises is owned by LE LAI RETIREMENT PTY LTD, with CARRARD TRANSPORT PTY LTD and Kamaljit Singh being the business owners.

Police provided the Authority with a copy of the venue's liquor license dated 24 June 2022. Conditions of note on the liquor licence include a liquor accord condition, and a social impact condition, both dated 26 September 2013.

On 30 September 2024, the Authority took remedial action against Mr Singh as a result of him incurring demerit points, and the Authority imposed new conditions on the venue license including a CCTV condition, an RSA training condition, a POM condition and an Advanced Licensee training condition.

Submissions and consultation

On 18 September 2025, the Disciplinary Committee determined to issue a show cause notice to Mr Singh, the business and premises owners of the venue, and Police.

Submission from Mr Singh, dated 28 November 2025, as summarised below:

- The proposed disciplinary action was not necessary or proportionate as the offences referenced in the grounds of the complaint were “historical breaches” which have since been rectified.
- Mr Singh acknowledged and showed remorse for the past non-compliance issues and stated these occurred during a period of significant personal hardship related to caring responsibilities for a sick family member between 2023 and 2025.
- Mr Singh attempted to comply with the liquor accord licence condition and sought his solicitor’s assistance in March 2025 to arrange membership, but his solicitor went overseas which delayed the process. The Sutherland Shire Liquor Accord confirmed Mr Singh’s membership on 3 July 2025 and noted that previous correspondence from the venue came from an alternate email address, which Mr Singh states was the previous owner’s email address which he did not have access to. Mr Singh attributed the delay in complying with his liquor accord condition to an administration error rather than deliberate or reckless non-compliance.
- Mr Singh states that he has consistently endeavoured to promptly comply with his licence conditions and provided an email chain with Police relating to the venue’s POM as evidence of compliance. The email chain Mr Singh relies on to demonstrate his compliance with the POM condition demonstrates that Mr Singh communicated with Police between 18 June 2025 and 1 July 2025 discussing the development of the POM document. Police provided feedback around some deficiencies in the POM and suggested more detail was required on how the venue would have a continuing approach to manage compliance issues.

Note 1: The Authority imposed a POM condition on the venue licence in September 2024 and the POM was not provided to the Authority within 2 months of the decision date as required. Mr Singh provided a copy of the POM to the Authority on 7 July 2025 after the Authority requested it while assessing Mr Singh’s demerit removal application.

Note 2: COPS events demonstrate that Police attended the venue on 18 June 2025 and requested to view the POM, however the staff member present was unfamiliar with the document and unable to produce it.

- Mr Singh states that he is a “fit and proper person” as he has taken the following steps to improve compliance at the venue:
 - completed advanced licensee training
 - attended a “RSA on the frontline” webinar hosted by L&GNSW (19 November 2025)
 - attended the Sutherland Shire Liquor Accord AGM (15 July 2025)
 - installed CCTV systems
 - adopted “Check 25” procedures for age verification purposes
 - audited staff RSA compliance
 - updated signage and ensured Mr Singh personally manages and supervises all shifts.

Mr Singh asserts that there is “no ongoing risk” at the venue as there have been no further incidents of sales of alcohol to minors, and no further category 1 or 2 demerit offences since the original April 2023 offences.

- Mr Singh cited the 3 December 2024 disciplinary complaint decision by the Authority for Mark Bylsma (Colyton Hotel) to demonstrate that the Authority accepted that substantial compliance improvements after a breach justified a reprimand rather than severe sanctions.

Note: The Mark Bylsma matter is substantially different to this matter, namely the venue had undertaken significant compliance improvements following the offence and the licensee had left the business.

- Mr Singh used the 13 August 2025 decision by the Authority on his application to remove demerit points as evidence of his compliance in “uphold[ing] all statutory objectives”.

Note: Mr Singh appears to have misunderstood the framing of this decision as the Authority noted that while Mr Singh had partially complied with the remedial actions imposed by the Authority, there were still ongoing issues with the venue operations. The Authority noted concerns that the venue had not adequately addressed the risks associated with selling liquor to minors since the demerit points were incurred and had refused his application to remove a demerit point.

- Mr Singh refuted the Police assertion that he has shown disregard for compliance at the venue. He stated that he had made multiple efforts to improve compliance at the venue, amid personal hardship and communication challenges.

Submission from NSW Police, dated 15 December 2025, as summarised below:

- Police rejected Mr Singh’s assertion that the compliance issues identified were ‘historical [and] isolated’, noting that Mr Singh had only been the licensee of the venue since 2021 (4-year period) and the breaches identified by police had occurred between April 2023 and June 2025. Police stated that the breaches were contemporary in nature and the multiple serious breaches demonstrate that these incidents are not standalone or ‘isolated’.
- While Police were empathetic to Mr Singh’s personal hardship, they noted that Mr Singh did not show effective operation of the venue during this period by appointing an interim manager to ensure the venue was being operated effectively.
- Additionally, COPS events show that during the same period when Mr Singh was experiencing personal hardship, he was also working at a bottle shop in Western Sydney owned by his wife. Police submitted that Mr Singh did not provide any evidence to support his claim that he ‘personally manages or supervises all shifts’ at the venue, noting that both visits to his wife’s venue in September 2025 and December 2025 occurred during the operating hours of Porters Liquor Woronora Heights and it is therefore improbable that Mr Singh was personally supervising and managing ‘all shifts’ at the venue.
- Police rejected Mr Singh’s assertion that his lack of compliance with the liquor accord condition was due to ‘an administrative error outside [his] control’ and that he ‘acted promptly to rectify the issue once aware’. Police stated that Mr Singh failed to do due diligence at the commencement of his role as licensee, in that he made no attempts to comply with the existing liquor accord condition when joining the business in 2021. Additionally, he did not comply with this licence condition until March 2025, following Police intervention on two occasions in April 2023 and June 2025.
- Police noted that the POM was not sent to Police until 24 June 2025 and that the condition imposed by the Authority required the POM to be submitted by 30 November 2024 (a delay of approximately 7 months). Police stated that Mr Singh only provided the document to Police for review following Police intervention and the delay cannot be attributable to Police consultation and feedback.
- Police responded to Mr Singh’s statement that he is a ‘fit and proper person’ based on the operational improvements made at the venue. Police stated that while these improved policies and procedures are positive, the improvements were made by the venue solely as the result of Police enforcement action or conditions imposed by the Authority. Police also had concerns around the delays in the implementation of these improvements.

- Police rejected Mr Singh's assertion that the current operations of the venue now 'uphold all statutory objectives' as noted in the demerit point removal decision dated August 2025. Police note that the Authority was not satisfied that the risks at the venue had been adequately addressed and Mr Singh's submission did not reveal significant changes to the operation of the venue.
- Police stated that despite Mr Singh's assertions, the compliance issues are not trivial or historical. Compliance improvements made at the venue were substantially as a result of Police intervention and Police were concerned that after informing Mr Singh of the compliance issues, there were significant delays to comply and this is evidence of disregard for the conditions. They submit that Mr Singh has not demonstrated significant remorse or rehabilitation and that his submission attempts to blame others for the failures.

Reply submission from Mr Singh, dated 16 January 2026, as summarised below:

- Mr Singh stated that he works as a manager at the licenced premises owned by his wife, who is the licensee. Mr Singh states that his wife's venue was visited by licensing Police who advised him to display the current liquor licence and informed him of the venue name change (which he was unaware of). Mr Singh stated that he was warned by Police to change the signage to the correct licensee name and with the correct venue particulars and he has since complied.
- The allegations made against Mr Singh in relation to three offences of 'Licensee fail to comply with conditions of licence' were adjudicated on at the Local Court at Sutherland on 2 December 2025 and Mr Singh was found guilty without proceeding to conviction and directed to enter into a Conditional Release Order for 12 months.
- Mr Singh stated that he remains committed to operating the Porters Liquor Woronora Heights venue safely, lawfully, and in a manner that supports community amenity and the Objectives of the Act.

Our findings

We are satisfied that the grounds of the complaint under section 139(3) of the Act have been established. The following instances of Mr Singh's conduct which form the substance of the complaint, and are detailed further below, support our findings:

- breaching several conditions on the venue's licence, including conditions that relate to staff RSA training, CCTV, POM, liquor accord participation
- providing inaccurate and misleading statements in submissions to the Authority
- persistently failing to rectify instances of non-compliance brought to his attention in a timely manner
- selling liquor to minors and failing to check minors' identification
- failing to display correct licence particulars and signage
- leaving a staff member exhibiting a significant lack of training around lawful operations of the venue alone and in charge of the licensed premises.

Section 139(3)(b) of the Act – that the licensee has failed to comply with several of the conditions to which the licence is subject

We are satisfied that the ground under section 139(3)(b) has been established.

Mr Singh failed to comply with several conditions on the venue's licence, including:

- a condition requiring staff to undertake RSA training
- a condition requiring the licensee to maintain a CCTV system
- a condition requiring a plan of management
- a condition requiring the licensee to be an activate participant in the local liquor accord.

Mr Singh only provided evidence of compliance of many of the conditions after applying for the removal of a demerit point, and after he was prompted to supply this evidence of compliance by the Authority.

Section 139(3)(e) of the Act - that the licensee has failed to comply with a direction or other requirement of the Authority, the Secretary or the Commissioner of Police under this Act

Mr Singh has repeatedly failed to comply with requirements from the Authority, namely providing a copy of the plan of management to the Authority within 2 months of the decision date, failing to join a liquor accord as per the licence condition imposed by the Authority, and failing to have a compliant CCTV system in place as per the licence condition. Mr Singh also received multiple verbal and email requests from Police under the Act to which he has failed to comply within a reasonable period. While some compliance improvements have been implemented, they have not significantly improved the poor operation of the venue. We are satisfied that these breaches and the significant delays in rectifying compliance issues demonstrates that Mr Singh has failed to comply with a requirement under section 139(3)(e) of the Act.

Section 139(3)(i) of the Act - that the licensee is not a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence (whether for the same reason as that set out in section 45(5) or otherwise)

In determining whether Mr Singh is a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence, we considered the following factors:

- Mr Singh was personally responsible for the sale of alcohol to five minors in April 2023. Four of the minors were aged 17 years and one minor was aged 15 years. As the licensee of the venue, Mr Singh failed in his responsibilities to uphold the Objects of the Act to control the sale and consumption of alcohol in a way consistent with the expectations of the community, namely, preventing the sale of alcohol to minors.
- The number of compliance issues at the venue, and the long delays in rectifying issues. This demonstrates that Mr Singh has a cavalier attitude toward compliance of the venue. In his various submissions to the Authority, he has also attempted to attribute the breaches to administrative oversights or due to challenges with engaging with other agencies. This demonstrates a lack of awareness or disregard for his legal obligations and a lack of accountability inherent in Mr Singh's conduct as licensee.
- Mr Singh attributed the many breaches at the venue as a result of his being distracted by caring responsibilities for a sick family member and the personal hardship this caused him. It is noted that Mr Singh made no attempts to make alternate management arrangements while he was experiencing this hardship, and during the same period Mr Singh worked at another licensed venue owned by his wife. This demonstrates that Mr Singh failed to take responsibility for the compliance of his own venue while also attempting to work as manager at his wife's venue. Additionally, further compliance issues were identified by Police at the second venue and Mr Singh was found guilty of three offences relating to failing to comply with licence conditions and was directed to enter into a Conditional Release Order for 12 months. This demonstrates that Mr Singh exhibits a fundamental inability to operate a venue in line with the Objects of the Act.

On balance, we are satisfied that for the above reasons Mr Singh is not a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence under section 139(3)(i) of the Act.

Section 139(3)(s) of the Act - that the licence has not been exercised in the public interest

Mr Singh's conduct has been the subject of the multiple infringement notices and warnings issued by Police including failing to display the correct licence particulars and signage, not checking the ID of young persons purchasing liquor, employing staff without an RSA competency card and failing to comply with licence conditions. This conduct is inconsistent with encouraging responsible attitudes and practices towards the promotion, sale, supply and consumption of liquor as required of licensees by the Objects of the Act. For this reason, we are satisfied that the licence has not been exercised in the public interest under s139(3)(s) of the Act.

Relevant legislation

Part 9 of the Act.

Prescribed grounds of complaint

We are satisfied that the complaint was made validly and that the established grounds of the complaint are prescribed under sections 139(3)(b), 139(3)(e), 139(3)(i) and 139(3)(s) of the Act.

The material we considered

In determining the disciplinary complaint, the following material was considered:

- disciplinary complaint from Police, received 2 July 2025
- a submission from Mr Singh, received 28 November 2025
- a submission from Police, received 15 December 2025
- a final submission from Mr Singh, received 16 January 2025

If you are dissatisfied with this decision

The respondent or complainant may apply to NCAT for a review of this decision under the *Administrative Decisions Review Act 1997*.

For more information, please contact the NCAT Registry at 1300 006 228 or visit the NCAT website.

This decision may be published on the website.

If you have any questions

Please contact the Office of ILGA at office@ilga.nsw.gov.au if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely



Jeff Loy
Chair, Disciplinary Matters Committee
NSW Independent Liquor and Gaming Authority