

The amendment talks about adding a penalty for the revocation of license at a location, specifically restricting the issuance of Tobacco Licenses at any location where a Tobacco license has been revoked in the past 5 years. I strongly oppose this proposed ordinance for the the following reasons:

1. By making this amendment you would be punishing the property owner not the licensee and it is not fair to attach the restriction to the location. If a license has been revoked then you should restrict the issuance of the license to the license holder not the location. If the location is a rented property and the tobacco license is revoked, that business could soon be closed. Someone else who wants to run a tobacco business won't rent that spot for five years because of this restriction. The property owner wont be able to rent it out and he will be punished for something he did not do.

2. If you deny the license to the person in violation it can go with him wherever he goes otherwise he is free to open a shop in the same locality at some other location. The violator should be denied the license not the location.

I am not in favor of this proposed ordinance which restricting the landlord who is not the party of the violation.

Thanks for the consideration.

Narayan Investments Inc