

**Hammersmith & Fulham Council**  
Licensing Team  
Hammersmith Town Hall  
London, W6 9JU  
Tel: 020 8753 1081  
Email: [licensing@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@lbhf.gov.uk)  
Web: [www.lbhf.gov.uk](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk)



**22 September 2025**

Mr Tara Ram Singh  
Best Quality Food and Wine  
333 - 335 Lillie Road London  
SW6 7NR

When telephoning  
please ask for

**Matt Tucker.**

E-mail:  
[licensing@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@lbhf.gov.uk)

Dear Mr Singh

**Licensing Act 2003- Premises Licence Review: 2025/01278/LAPRR**

**Premises name: - Best quality Food and Wine - 333 - 335 Lillie Road London SW6 7NR**

Further to the close of the 28 day public consultation, I have attached copies of the following:

- Updated correspondence from Trading Standards in connection with their Review Application.
- 1 public representation.
- Representation from the Police.
- Representation from Licensing (as a Responsible Authority).

I would be grateful if you could read through these documents. Should, having done so, you wish me to convey any form of response to the parties, by all means feel free to pass these on to me by way of [Licensing@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:Licensing@lbhf.gov.uk) or via post. For the purposes of exchanging timely information, an e-mail address would be much appreciated from you and/or your representatives.

In light of the representations received, we are looking at a Licensing Sub-Committee Hearing for **21 October 2025**, further details of which will be sent in due course.

I hope the above clarifies. However, by all means let me know if you require anything further.

Yours sincerely

**Matt Tucker**  
**Interim Licensing Policy and Administration Team Leader**

Encs. Review Application Paperwork (and Appendices).  
Copies of Representations (3).

**From:** Love Doug: H&F <Doug.Love@lbhf.gov.uk>

**Sent:** 18 September 2025 10:01

**To:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Error in review application

Hi, Matt.

Here's the corrected version: I have only altered the year in that date.

Thanks,

Doug

**Doug Love**

Lead Practitioner, Trading Standards

Hammersmith & Fulham Council

Hammersmith Town Hall, W6 9JU

07771 806 923

[www.lbhf.gov.uk](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk)

[www.lbhf.gov.uk/business/trading-standards](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/business/trading-standards)

Application for the review of a premises licence or club premises certificate under the Licensing Act 2003

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Before completing this form please read the guidance notes at the end of the form. If you are completing this form by hand please write legibly in block capitals. In all cases ensure that your answers are inside the boxes and written in black ink. Use additional sheets if necessary.

You may wish to keep a copy of the completed form for your records.

I Doug Love, Lead Pratitioner, Trading Standards  
(Insert name of applicant)

**apply for the review of a premises licence under section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003, for the premises described in Part 1, below.**

Part 1 – Premises or club premises details

<b>Postal address of premises or, if none, ordnance survey map reference or description:</b>  <b>Best Quality Food &amp; Wine</b> <b>333 Lillie Road</b>	
Post town:  <b>London</b>	Post code:  <b>SW6 7NR</b>

Name of premises licence holder or club holding club premises certificate:  <b>Tara Ram Singh</b>
---

Number of premises licence or club premises certificate:  <b>2023/01187/LAPR</b>
--

## Part 2 - Applicant details

I am

Please tick ✓yes

- 1) an interested party (please complete (A) or (B) below)
- a) a person living in the vicinity of the premises ☐
- b) a body representing persons living in the vicinity of the premises ☐
- c) a person involved in business in the vicinity of the premises ☐
- d) a body representing persons involved in business in the vicinity of the premises ☐
- 2) a responsible authority (please complete (C) below) ☒
- 3) a member of the club to which this application relates (please complete (A) below) ☐

### (C) DETAILS OF RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY APPLICANT

Name and address	
<b>Doug Love Lead Practitioner, Trading Standards Hammersmith Town Hall King Street London W6 9JU</b>	
Telephone number:	<b>07771 806 923</b>
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:doug.love@lbhf.gov.uk">doug.love@lbhf.gov.uk</a>

This application to review relates to the following licensing objective(s)

Please tick one or more boxes

- |                                      |                                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| the prevention of crime and disorder | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| public safety                        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| the prevention of public nuisance    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| the protection of children from harm | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Please state the ground(s) for review** (please read guidance note 1)

This review relates to the alleged failure of the premise licensee to promote the licensing objective relating to the protection of children from harm. Full details of the facts and allegations against the business follows. One recent complaint cannot be conclusively proven, or disproven, due to a crucial failure to comply with licence conditions relating to the CCTV system in use.

**The business**

Best Quality Food & Wine is a small off-licence / convenience store, which is operated by Sweet Food & Wine Ltd., a company of which premises licence holder, Tara Ram Singh, is the sole director. The business has operated for over 10 years. Tara Ram Singh's son, Satnam Singh, is the main employee in the shop. Manpreet Singh, who I believe to be a nephew of Tara Ram Singh, has also worked in the business and was previously the sole director of the company. I have not seen anyone else working at the shop.

**History of the business, in respect of age-restricted sales**

**August 2018:** A 'Challenge 25' test purchase was made at the business. Satnam Singh sold alcohol to a 19-year-old volunteer, without challenging them for proof of age. He said, after the sale, that he believed the volunteer to be 19. The sale is not an offence, per se, although it is a requirement of the premises licence to operate an age verification policy. 'Challenge 25' is standard 'good-practice' for retailers in an urban area with a mixed demographic and many non-regular customers. When used, the seller requires anyone buying age-restricted goods, who the seller believes to be under 25, to provide proof of age before any sale. The proprietor was alerted to and encouraged to attend training for age-restricted goods retailers offered by LBHF Trading Standards after the test purchase, but no booking was received.

A follow-up underage test purchase in **Nov 2018** resulted in no sale being made.

**March 2023:** Two complaints were received about underage sales at Best Quality F&W.

One, from a member of the public was recorded by a colleague:

*"Local person said he was in the shop and three school girls in uniform were sold vapes. Seller didn't ask for ID. Complainant said he has witnessed this at least 3 times",*

The other, from Head of Year 9 at a local school, read:

*"Just wanted to drop a line to let you know that a parent has informed me that a newsagents at 333 Lillie Road is selling underage girls vapes and alcohol and that parent has seen pupils walking out of the store with these items (in casual clothes)".*

**29/03/23:** I visited Best Quality F&W, with two underage volunteers, not known in the shop, who I asked to make separate test purchases. The first volunteer (female, 17y), in plain clothes, was refused. The second (a male volunteer, 16y & 2m), dressed clearly in a (non-local) school uniform was sold a vape by Tara Ram Singh.

When I returned to the shop, minutes after, Mr Singh claimed not to have noticed the school blazer and thought the buyer "18-19", which indicates - at best - that he was not using Challenge 25, or an acceptable age-verification policy, as required by the licence.

I believe that if he looked at the volunteer, to assess his age, it is unlikely that he would not have seen the school uniform and, maybe, chose to sell as he felt 'safe' that it was not a test purchaser, even though the volunteer was not known in the shop.

I strongly suggested that the person responsible for staff training should attend our training courses. No booking was made.

**12/07/23:** A third complaint, via the schools' police, was received. The officer wrote:

*"Just wanted to make you aware of a store on Lillie Road SW6 (Best quality food and wine) who have allegedly sold 4 x 200ml bottles of vodka to 4 female students aged 14-15 years old on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> July. The students were not in uniform. They have then attended school very drunk and 2 of them were admitted to hospital after being sick with concerns for their welfare.*

*"I was informed by the school's designated safeguarding lead, that after she spoke to one of the girls she mentioned to her they got the alcohol from a store located on Lillie/Munster Road. I have spoken to one of the girls and when I showed a picture of the store, she confirmed that this was where the alcohol was brought. She also stated ID was not asked for nor their age challenged for buying alcohol."*

**Mid-to-late July 23:** A check of licensing conditions by an officer of the LBHF Licensing Team, made between the receipt of the complaint and the test purchase at the end of July, revealed that the CCTV system was not working. The premises licence holder was required to take corrective action.

**28/07/23:** During a further test purchase, Tara Ram Singh sold alcohol to 16y & 6m female volunteer. A few minutes after the sale, he stated that he believed the volunteer (who was not present) to be "over 25".

A record of refusals that was in use showed 62 refusals had, apparently, been made in 46 days.

**23/08/23:** At a PACE interview, Tara Ram Singh revised this opinion when shown a photograph of the volunteer as she looked at the time of the purchase stating the girl looked "20". He stated he had not realised that the CCTV system was not working.

**Outcome:** In retrospect, it seems clear that a review application should have been made at this time and we are sorry that Trading Standards did not submit one, as the subsequent events may have been averted if we had.

However, they were given the benefit of the doubt after Tara Ram Singh and the company agreed to accept cautions, which were administered after

- Tara Ram Singh and Manpreet Singh (then sole director of Sweet Food & Wine Ltd) both attended the Trading Standards training;
- further underage test purchases were made on **03/08/23**, **07/01/24** & **27/02/24** and had resulted in no further sales; &
- a further visit by Licensing revealed good compliance with the licence conditions.

**05/07/24:** Another underage test purchase resulted in no sale.

### **Events prompting this application**

**10/04/25:** A complaint was referred to LBHF Trading Standards by the Citizens' Advice Consumer Helpline. The complainant, a member of the public, was recorded as saying that

- her 17-year-old son had purchased a vape from Best Quality F&W;
- she knew the business to have sold to 16-year-olds, also; and
- that the business was known as the place to go for underage children to buy vapes.

When questioned by an officer, she stated that she believed her son (or his then 16-y-o girlfriend) had purchased vapes from the shop on several occasions; that no ID checks were made; that "all three" staff (believed to be a reference to Tara Ram, Satnam and Manpreet) sold.

**30/05/25:** An underage test purchase was carried out by a 17-year-old male volunteer. No sale resulted.

**17/07/25:** A complaint was received, by e-mail, from a member of the public. She stated:

*"I wish to report the selling of alcohol and vapes on multiple occasions over the last few months to a 15-year-old girl, my daughter and her friend over the last few months. No ID is requested. On the 12th July, 2025. My daughter aged 15, and her friend aged 15 together with a third girl visiting from Scotland who only just turned 16, went in around 8.20 pm. The 15-year-old bought a vape. The 16-year-old then asked for a bottle of Smirnoff vodka, for which she paid 20 pounds in cash. My daughter tried to get her not to buy this, as an adult in the queue look concerned. Yet the shop salesperson sold this without requesting any id.*

*"The girl then went home to Edinburgh, and unknown to either myself or her mother took the bottle of vodka with her. Her mother found her unconscious on Monday night, and she spent two days in the hospital, including in intensive care. As her parents did not know what had happened, the doctor had to treat her for multiple possible causes, and she was heavily sedated and intubated. Please note this shop has been reported - please realise this is not just a case of girls trying vapes or having a drink to party, but in this case a girl with poor mental health being able to buy vodka to drink alone and nearly dying."*

The complainant later identified two other dates – 30<sup>th</sup> June 2025 and 5<sup>th</sup> July 2025 - when the two 15-year-olds were alleged to have bought age-restricted goods.

I have subsequently been provided with letters from the doctors treating the hospitalised girl, but as, I understand, that this girls' parents intend to make a representation in support of this review, I will leave them the discretion to produce these. Suffice to say, it appears that the girl was severely affected by consuming the alcohol.

**23/07/25:** Licensing Officer, Bill Masini, and myself conducted a visit to Best Quality F&W. No mention was made of the recent complaints, but routine checks were made. From a Licensing perspective, Mr Masini noted that

- the CCTV coverage was incomplete, with no coverage of the counter area, so that no transactions were shown, and it could not be proven whether or not ID was required and checked. This is, I believe, a breach of licence condition 17, which requires the system should be "...installed and maintained to Police recommendations..."
- that alcoholic drinks were not clearly labelled or marked with the name of the premises, contrary to licence condition 25; and
- that refusals records indicated that just five refusals made on three days had been noted since 27<sup>th</sup> March 2025 – nearly four months earlier – and none since 11<sup>th</sup> April.

No illicit goods were found.

**27/07/25:** A test purchase was attempted by three female volunteers. I have seen and photographed each girl's passport and can confirm that they are aged between 16 years and 16 years and four months. None of the volunteers were local and none had previously been in the shop.

Given the nature of the complaints, I asked them to deviate slightly from how we would normally ask our volunteers to undertake a test purchase, specifically to be challenging if they were refused, by showing that they were aware of other sales to young people.

Satnam Singh sold the girls two lost Mary nicotine vapes and a 35cl bottle of Smirnoff vodka (a 'half-bottle'). The volunteers reported the events as follows:

- *Two vapes were requested first.*
- *The seller, who was on the phone, took the two vapes from behind him and then asked "How old are you?"*
- *Volunteers responded "18" (I had asked them to do this with a grin – as if it were the expected response, rather than necessarily a true one)*
- *The seller asked "Do you have ID? I can't sell unless you have".*
- *Volunteers responded along the lines "The older man always sells".*
- *The vapes were then supplied.*

- *The volunteers asked for some Smirnoff*
- *The seller asked “Big or small bottle?”*
- *They responded small and the seller completed the sale, giving them a bag and saying “Make sure you keep it in the bag”.*

I went into the shop, very briefly, after the sale to ensure I saw who was working there and identified Satnam. He was the only person working in the shop at the time. When I asked why he had sold the items to the girls, he responded that he’d known them from previous occasions.

I have attached photographs of the underage volunteers who were able to purchase age-restricted goods in March and July 2023, and in the recent incident as Appendix 1. ***These photographs should not appear in the publicly accessible papers, or be shown at the hearing.***

**31/07/25:** CCTV footage was provided by the business, as requested, for the test purchase and the three recent occasions where they were alleged to have sold.

- On footage from 12/07/25, the three girls appear at the time indicated by the complainant. As there is no footage from cameras covering the counter, it cannot be seen what was purchased or whether ID was produced.
- On footage from 05/07/25, the two girls appear at the time indicated by the complainant. As there is no footage from cameras covering the counter, it cannot be seen what was purchased or whether ID was produced.
- On 30/06/25, no specific time was indicated by the complaint – merely that the girls went to the shop ‘after school’. I have looked at footage from between 1530 and 1730 and was unable to identify the girls in that time.

**11/08/25:** Both Tara Ram Singh and Satnam Singh attended interviews under caution. Both produced prepared statements, which I have added as Appendices 2 & 3, respectively, and then chose to offer ‘no comment’ to all subsequent questions.

Tara Ram’s statement denies culpability for the offences and he concludes by saying that he is “...happy to work with the Council and consider implementing any measure that the council feel is necessary”. I do not find this reassuring, given the clear evidence that he is breaching his licence conditions, and his choice to offer no comment to questions intended to give a full picture of the events.

Satnam’s statement is, I believe, dishonest. He states that he did not challenge the ‘customers in question’, by whom he clearly means the volunteers, even though he refused to confirm this when shown their pictures later in the interview, because he believed that they looked over 25 and that they did not say they were 18.

The reasons I believe this to be false are:

- I do not believe that any reasonable person would truly believe the three girls were (all) over 25;
- the volunteers reported that they did say they were 18 and that they were challenged for ID; &
- when I went into the shop after the sale, I asked Satnam why he had sold and he did not mention their appearance, or believed age: he told me that they had been in the shop before.

## **Recommendations**

I believe that it is appropriate and necessary to revoke the premises licence.

The complaints – five, from different sources, in little over two years - about the business and the failed test purchases paint a picture of a business which is willing to sell age-restricted items to persons that must be known, or strongly suspected, to be underage. This is done, it should be assumed, for financial reasons, with the potentially tragic consequences to young customers’ health either considered and ignored, or disregarded entirely.

The failure to comply with licence conditions may be co-incidental. However, one may legitimately wonder whether the failures are designed to obscure the truth. The absence of CCTV coverage at the counter



denies the opportunity to verify what was purchased by customers, or whether ID was examined; and ignoring the condition to label all alcoholic drinks with the name of the shop, denies the opportunity to link the purchased alcohol to the shop.

Lastly, I have no faith in the current PLH to improve. He has already had the opportunity to do this, and, despite signing cautions to admit underage sales, and attending the trading standards training, and having the knowledge that further transgressions were most likely to lead to a licence review and a prosecution, he is still not following best practice advice.

I invite the Licensing Sub-Committee to agree with these recommendations and to revoke this licence.

Have you made an application for review relating to this premises before      No

If yes please state the date of that application

**Day      Month      Year**

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

If you have made representations before relating to this premises please state what they were and when you made them

N/A

**Please tick ✓ yes**

I have sent copies of this form and enclosures to the responsible authorities and the premises licence holder or club holding the club premises certificate, as appropriate

☒

I understand that if I do not comply with the above requirements my application will be rejected

☒

**IT IS AN OFFENCE, LIABLE ON CONVICTION TO A FINE UP TO LEVEL 5 ON THE STANDARD SCALE, UNDER SECTION 158 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003 TO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT IN OR IN CONNECTION WITH THIS APPLICATION**

**Part 3 – Signatures** (please read guidance note 3)

**Signature of applicant or applicant's solicitor or other duly authorised agent (See guidance note 4). If signing on behalf of the applicant, please state in what capacity**

**Signature:**



**Date:**      14<sup>th</sup> August 2024

**Capacity:**      Lead Practitioner, Trading Standards

**Contact name (where not previously given) and postal address for correspondence associated with this application** (please read guidance note 5)

**Post town**

**Post Code**

**Telephone number (if any)**

**If you would prefer us to correspond with you using an e-mail address your e-mail address (optional)**

**From:** Love Doug: H&F <Doug.Love@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 September 2025 11:01  
**To:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Reference: 2025/01278/LAPRR- Best Quality Food & Wine

Hello, Matt.

This rep was intended to be made to licensing, but, due to the unnoticed typo in the e-mail address, I understand it was not received.

If it cannot be formally classified as a representation, could it be included as additional evidence by me? I don't think that [REDACTED] was intending to speak to it, in any case.

Kind regards,

Doug

**Doug Love**

Lead Practitioner, Trading Standards  
Hammersmith & Fulham Council  
Hammersmith Town Hall, W6 9JU

07771 806 923

[www.lbhf.gov.uk](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk)  
[www.lbhf.gov.uk/business/trading-standards](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/business/trading-standards)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 August 2025 10:11  
**To:** [licensing@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@lbhf.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** Love Doug: H&F <Doug.Love@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Reference: 2025/01278/LAPRR- Best Quality Food & Wine

Reference: 2025/01278/LAPRR- Best Quality Food & Wine  
Case officer: Matt Tucker

I am writing to raise concerns regarding repeated underage sales of vapes and alcohol to my daughter, aged 15 J and her friend E at:

Best Quality Food and Wine  
333-335 Lillie Road,  
London, SW6 7NR

I have reported events, below, as they have been told to me by J and E. I have no reason to believe anything is untrue, as they have admitted buying products they should have no access to and there is no reason for them to lie about which shop sold them, and I

have seen CCTV footage and transactions. Further, J has been very upset about the consequences of the vodka sale to her friend, C.

### **No Identification requested**

These products were sold without any request for identification. The sellers have included both the older gentleman and the younger man working at the counter. On the most recent occasion, 12th July 2025, a third friend, C, visiting from Edinburgh, who had just turned 16, led to a serious incident of hospitalisation. Each time, no identity, whether digital or physical, has been requested, usually by the older gentleman but also the younger seller.

### **Clearly underaged**

Both J and E are clearly underage. J, aged 15, could be mistaken for 16 at the very most, but is clearly not fully developed weighing under 50Kg, typical of a teenage girl rather than that of an adult aged 18 or 25 year old. E is petite, and has a young face, so looks even younger 14 or 15 years of age. Those who have seen the CCTV footage can clearly see and verify this.

In addition, C is petite and also very slim with a build that is typical of a teenage girl aged 15/16 rather than a 25 year old.

More worryingly, on the most recent incident 12.7. 25, J clearly stated to C not to buy the alcohol, thus not only are all three girls look underage. Despite J telling C not to purchase alcohol, and despite a member of the public in the queue behind them expressing concern whilst at the counter, the older gentleman still sold a 750ml bottle of Smirnoff vodka to C. This can be verified from the CCTV. Thus, any excuse of the children looking older cannot be accepted, the selling of vapes and alcohol and the failure to protect children particularly vulnerable ones seems to be deliberate.

### **Incident on 12th July 2035**

My daughter J aged 15, and her friend E aged 15, together with a third girl C visiting from Scotland who had only just turned 16 entered the shop around 8pm. The 15-year-old E bought a vape. C then asked for a large bottle of Smirnoff vodka bottle (later verified to be 700ml), which she paid using 20 pounds in cash. My daughter, J asked C not to do buy this and an adult in the queue also expressed concern. Yet the shop salesperson, the older gentleman, sold this without requesting any identification. I was able to verify my daughter's J presence at the shop via the Life360 tracking app, and both I and Mr. Love from the council have reviewed CCTV footage confirming all the presence of all 3 girls (J,C and E). If the shop provides the correct CCTV footage, the vodka sale will also be visible.

C then travelled back to Edinburgh with the vodka concealed in her tote bag, thus neither myself or her parents were aware of the alcohol sale. C drunk the alcohol alone, when she had left London. On 14 July 2025, her mother contacted me after C was found unconscious and admitted to intensive care, at which point I became aware of the alcohol. The details of the impact of the incident are outlined in C father's representation

My daughter J later explained that she had warned C not to buy the alcohol, and that an adult in the queue had also voiced concern. This took place in front of the seller. J had

not initially disclosed the incident to me, as I had explicitly asked them not to drink alcohol, until she realised the seriousness of what had happened.

When I spoke to J, her and E where both cooperative and supplied transactions and dates of other occasions as outlined below.

This is not simply a case of teenagers experimenting. In this instance, a vulnerable young person with existing mental health challenges was able to buy a large bottle of vodka and consume it alone, resulting in hospitalisation. The consequences for her and her family have been devastating, and also impacted my own family has also been severe, as this happened while she was visiting us.

### **Previous incidents**

I am aware of other occasions where vapes or alcohol were sold without ID checks, including the following dates. I have supplied copies of the relevant transactions and can provide them. CCTV footage of the counter would corroborate these events:

- 12 July 2025: E bought a vape; C bought large bottle of vodka
- 5 July 2025: J and E bought a small bottle of vodka. Two transactions seen by me and supplied.
- 30 June 2025: E bought a vape. The transaction was seen by me and supplied.

The repeated failure of this shop to uphold age-restriction laws and protect vulnerable children is extremely serious. The evidence demonstrates that these sales were not accidental, but deliberate.

I urge Hammersmith & Fulham Council to take immediate and robust action to safeguard children, in particular vulnerable children and prevent further harm.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED] ( PLEASE REDACT IN PUBLIC DOCUMENTS)

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 29 August 2025 16:54  
To: Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>  
Subject: Re: FW: Representation for case

Dear Matt,

Thanks for confirming receipt, and for safeguarding the distribution of the photograph.  
As for my residential address it is:

16/6 Spottiswoode Street  
Edinburgh EH9 1ER

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 24 August 2025 21:46  
To: Licensing HF: H&F <[licensing@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@lbhf.gov.uk)>  
Cc: Love Doug: H&F <[Doug.Love@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:Doug.Love@lbhf.gov.uk)>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Subject: Representation for case

Dear Licensing Team,

Reference: 2025/01278/LAPRR

I am writing in order to make a representation for my daughter, 'C', born 29/06/09. I have included a photograph of C, taken on 23/08/25, as Appendix 1 (attached). **Please ensure that this photograph does not appear in the public papers.** My wife took our two children to London to stay with family friends in July 2025 while I was out of the country for work. On 12 July, according to my wife, C and our friend's two daughters went out by themselves and entered the premises of Best Quality Food and Wine. Despite our friends' daughters' advice not to, C bought a 700ml bottle of Smirnoff vodka with money given by her mother for food. My wife had no idea this had happened, as C kept the bottle in her bag. I have seen a screen capture of CCTV footage of C in that shop with her soft material bag and her friends.

The only way we knew about this surreptitious purchase was because of the consequences. On 15 July, while her mother was at work, I was looking after both children and I encouraged C to leave the house and get some fresh air. This is a common request. She said she would go to the garden. Her brother and I went further afield but, when we returned and saw her in the garden, she was acting very strangely, giggling and stumbling around. In conversation she seemed very amused by things and I remember saying to both children that she was either intoxicated or playacting (she loves performance and art). I made a mental note to keep an eye on her, and went inside

to cook dinner for us all. After about an hour or so, I called out to both children that dinner was ready. But I couldn't find C anywhere, and eventually her brother called out that C was lying behind the bed on the floor.

When I went in, she was there, completely unresponsive, and despite my loud communication her eyes opened briefly but remained closed. It was then that I started to panic and assumed she had taken some drugs and this was an overdose, so called the ambulance and followed instructions, putting her in the recovery position. The paramedics arrived shortly afterwards and flushed her system with IV (anti-opiates plus saline), after a failed attempt to insert a canula they finally managed this in her foot. This was rather disturbing to watch. The paramedics were also very worried about her, wondering about an overdose or maybe encephalitis given some of the behaviour she previously exhibited.

At no stage did we think this was alcohol: one of the first things I did when I discovered her in that state was to smell her breath, and the paramedics did the same shortly after they arrived. There was no smell (of course, in retrospect this would be the case with vodka). C spent that night and the following night in hospital, in the Intensive Care Unit, and put under heavy sedation to stop seizures. She was finally discharged on 18 July. After waking the morning after admission, she explained to her mother about the vodka, and told her where it was being kept. I then retrieved it from her wardrobe, and there was only a fifth of a bottle remaining.

This event has had a very disturbing effect on the family, with her 10 year-old brother finding her on the floor unresponsive in the first place, the panic for my wife and I, and for all of us witness to the visit by the paramedics and her being placed in the ambulance and taken to hospital. C has also been disturbed by this, hence the redacted copies of letters from her GP at Bruntsfield Medical Practice and her psychiatrist Dr. Evans from Edinburgh Psychiatry (see appendices 2 & 3).

C does look young for her age. In addition, she has a history of mental health issues that have disturbed her schooling, and exhibits anxiety in unfamiliar and especially public settings. She is extremely unconfident, unlike some other teenagers. Therefore I, for one, am amazed that anyone could believe she was of an age where it was legal to sell her alcohol.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



Ref:  
04 August 2025

To whom it may concern,

Re: Miss [REDACTED]

Tel: / [REDACTED]

I am writing to confirm that this patient experienced a severe outcome after ingesting alcohol on 15/07/2025.

She was found unresponsive after ingesting approximately 500ml of vodka, resulting in an ambulance being called, emergency attendance at the Accident and Emergency department (Royal Infirmary Edinburgh), and subsequent intubation and intensive care stay.

This is on a background of psychiatry input, low mood and regular fluoxetine (antidepressant) prescribing.

It has been alleged that the alcohol was provided to her by a retailer outwith their licensing permit (the patient is 16 years old and not legally permitted to purchase alcohol) – I would be grateful if you could take in to consideration the severity of the outcome above in regards to this matter.

Yours sincerely

Dr Kiran Jayaprakash  
GP





Edinburgh Psychiatry  
10A St Colme Street  
Edinburgh  
EH3 6AA

Tel: 07498465326

<https://www.edinburghpsychiatry.com>

Date written: 01/08/2025

Date typed: 08/08/2025

Admin: JC

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN  
PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Re: [REDACTED]  
DOB: 29/06/2009  
Address: [REDACTED]

I am writing this letter in my capacity as the treating psychiatrist for [REDACTED] who is a patient under my care.

This letter is to confirm that [REDACTED] is a vulnerable 16-year-old with pre-existing mental health conditions. She recently required hospitalisation following an acute episode. The sale of alcohol to a vulnerable minor with these underlying conditions poses a significant risk to her health and wellbeing.

I wholeheartedly support the case being brought against the establishment that sold her alcohol. Enforcing the law in this instance is crucial for protecting vulnerable young people in our community.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further information.

Kind regards

Dr Franciske Evans  
Consultant Psychiatrist  
MBChB, MRCPsych  
GMC: 4387879

**From:** [Charlotte.Bennett@met.police.uk](mailto:Charlotte.Bennett@met.police.uk) <[Charlotte.Bennett@met.police.uk](mailto:Charlotte.Bennett@met.police.uk)>  
**Sent:** 04 September 2025 21:44  
**To:** Licensing HF: H&F <[licensing@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@lbhf.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Masini Bill: H&F <[Bill.Masini@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:Bill.Masini@lbhf.gov.uk)>; Love Doug: H&F <[Doug.Love@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:Doug.Love@lbhf.gov.uk)>; Environmental Protection: H&F <[noise@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:noise@lbhf.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Police Representation in Support of Trading Standards Review of Premises Best Quality Food and Wine, 333 Lillie Road, SW6 7NR - 2023/01187/LAPR

Dear Licensing,

**RE: Review of Premises Best Quality Food and Wine, 333 Lillie Road, SW6 7NR - 2023/01187/LAPR**

I am writing on behalf of the Metropolitan Police to support the application from Trading Standards, to review the premises licence for Best Quality Food and Wine.

My support is based on evidence provided by Trading Standards of sales of age restricted products to children.

The evidence provided by Trading Standards was:

- Test purchases where under 18 volunteers were sold vapes.
- Complaints from multiple sources, including parents, school staff, and members of the public.
- They have also evidenced that staff have failed to apply an effective age verification policy and under 18 volunteers were sold alcohol.

The incidents demonstrate a failure to uphold two licensing objectives; those being:

- The Protection of Children from Harm
- The Prevention of Crime and Disorder

Our support is solely in relation to the unlawful sales to children.

In my view the unlawful sales represent a disregard to the law and they are not demonstrating care or responsibility to the welfare of their customers.

Previous advice and recommendations do not appear to have been completed and the repeated complaints suggests that the premises has chosen not to comply and has not attempted to be responsible operators.

For these reasons I support the review of the premises.

Kind Regards,  
Charlotte

**PC Charlotte Bennett 3234AW | Hammersmith and Fulham | Police Licensing | Metropolitan Police**  
Email: [Charlotte.Bennett@met.police.uk](mailto:Charlotte.Bennett@met.police.uk)

**From:** Overton Adrian: H&F <Adrian.Overton@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 September 2025 13:09  
**To:** Simms Fabien: H&F <Fabien.Simms@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Best Quality Food and Wine, 333 - 335 Lillie Road, SW6 7NR- Reference: 2025/01278/LAPRR  
**Importance:** High

Dear Mr Simms,

Please take this email as a representation from the Licensing Authority in support of this review application.

We are aware of multiple breaches of conditions at this premises over a prolonged period of time, along with the sale of alcohol to a child. We believe that the following licensing objectives have been undermined :

- The prevention of crime and disorder
- The protection of children from harm

Further details on our representation will follow in due course.

Kind regards

**Adrian Overton**  
Licensing Team Manager  
Licensing  
Place Department  
Hammersmith & Fulham Council  
020 8753 3081  
07931 530 309

[adrian.overton@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:adrian.overton@lbhf.gov.uk)  
[www.lbhf.gov.uk](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk)



Have you signed up to our email notifications to receive alerts of relevant applications received by this department? If you would like to sign up, please click the link below:  
[email notification service](#)