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CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good afternoon, everyone. We are back on the record. We now have a Fact-Finding Hearing for Case No. 18-25100123, Cloak \& Dagger, License No. 98733.

Will the parties, please, approach and identify themselves for the record, please? All right. We will start with the Investigators.

INVESTIGATOR PLEITEZ: Investigator Pleitez with ABRA.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good afternoon. INVESTIGATOR PLEITEZ: Good afternoon. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Officer?

SERGEANT SHIPMAN: Sergeant Shipman.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Sergeant Shipman?

SERGEANT SHIPMAN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. Good afternoon.

INVESTIGATOR PUENTE: Kevin Puente, ABRA.

MR. FONSECA: Michael Fonseca on behalf of the licensee.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Fonseca.

MR. TRAN: Sonny Tran.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm sorry?
MR. TRAN: Sonny Tran, managing member.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Tran, can I ask you to take your hat off, please?

MR. TRAN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thank you, sir.
MR. LIU: John Liu, managing member.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Your last name, sir?

MR. LIU: Liu.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Liu? Liu?
MR. LIU: L-I-U.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: L-I-U, good afternoon, Mr. Liu.

All right. This is a Fact-Finding Hearing regarding an incident that occurred at

Cloak \& Dagger on May 5, 2018. The Board thought that it was very important that we brought the parties in to have this Fact-Finding hearing, so we can -- we are concerned about the incident occurred and whether or not management acted/ responded appropriately to the event.

And so we are trying to make some investigative -- some -- we are trying to gather some information outside of this report to give ownership and opportunity to respond and then the Board will determine what further action, if any, will be taken.

So we will just start with -- has, Mr. Fonseca, your client been provided a copy of the case report?

MR. FONSECA: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. Ms. Pleitez, can you tell us, bring us up to speed about this incident as a result of your investigation, ma'am?

INVESTIGATOR PLEITEZ: Okay. I was assigned to investigate an incident that occurred
at Cloak \& Dagger on May 5, 2018 at approximately 10:40 p.m. My investigation determinations were based on MPD CCN No. 18079105. Interviews with the ABC Manager, Mr. Jonathan Liu, the bartender, Ms. Monica de Guzman, and the MPD Officer, Mr. Maxwell Poupart.

On June 1, 2018, I visited Cloak \& Dagger. I identified myself as an ABC -- I'm sorry, as an ABRA Investigator to the ABC Manager, Mr. Liu, and informed him for the reason -- the reason for my visit was to gather information regarding the incident that occurred on May 5, 2018.

Mr. Liu stated that he was the ABC Manager present on the night of the incident. However, the bartender, Mrs. de Guzman, was not present at the time.

Mr. Liu and I scheduled an interview date with Mrs. de Guzman for June 5, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Liu informed me that he forwarded the video footage to MPD and would have that footage available for me for pick-up on June 5, 2018.

During our brief conversation, Mr. Liu mentioned that MPD was not notified on the night of the incident because Mrs. de Guzman did not want to call the police and continued working. I returned to Cloak \& Dagger on June 5th and spoke with Mr. Liu, who advised me that due to Mrs. de Guzman having a full-time job, she was unable, full-time day job, to attend the scheduled interview, but provided me with her contact information.

At that time, I completed a regulatory inspection and took Mr. Liu's statement regarding the incident. Mr. Liu stated that between the hours of 10:00 and 10:40 p.m., three female patrons were upset because they were not being served, as the establishment was busy.

Mr. Liu stated that to his knowledge, a female patron said something to Mrs. de Guzman and threw a checkbook at Mrs. de Guzman, who in turn threw a plastic cup at the patron. Mr. Liu stated that, at that time, another female hit Mrs. de Guzman with a purse and threw a Mason jar
at her head.
Mr. Liu stated that three female patrons -- the three female patrons were escorted out of the establishment, but one female patron managed to throw a barstool over the bar, but didn't hit anyone.

Mr. Liu stated that the establishment had four security members that night. One was located at the front door, one was located at the main entrance by the bar, one was at the top of the steps and the other was at the bottom of the steps on the mezzanine.

Mr. Liu also stated that on the night of the incident, there was three bartenders and one barback. IDs were checked. ID checks were conducted at the front door and all patrons had to be 21 years of age to enter the establishment.

Mr. Liu agreed to email me the surveillance footage. He stated that the footage is controlled through wifi and could be a little spotty, but would forward what he sent to MPD as the video footage was deleted.

On June 6th I reviewed the footage and I observed the following: At 10:37 a female patron who will be known as S1 attempted to get Mrs. de Guzman's attention. A couple of seconds later, the female patron, S1, walked around to the other side of the bar or the counter.

Another female patron, S2, approached -- I'm sorry, appeared to be arguing with Ms. de Guzman and knocked over a beverage caddy. A few seconds after that, Mrs. de Guzman threw a plastic cup at $\mathbf{S 2}$.

Another female patron, S3, walked over to the bar and hit Mrs. de Guzman with her purse.

After further review of the footage, I observed that $\mathbf{S 2}$ threw what appeared to be two cups at Mrs. de Guzman.

At approximately 10:38, while the female patrons, S1, S2 and S3, were being escorted out of the establishment, S2 threw a barstool over the bar counter.

On June 7, 2018, I telephonically contacted Mrs. de Guzman. Mrs. de Guzman stated
that the incident occurred between the hours of 10:00 and 11:00 p.m. She stated that the cash register system crashed and that she was unable to close out any open tabs.

Mrs. de Guzman stated that the group of females wanted to close out their tabs and were waiting for about an hour. She stated that she asked the group of female patrons or I'm sorry, she advised the group of female patrons that the system crashed and she could not close out their tabs until the system came back up.

Mrs. de Guzman stated that she was only servicing customers that had cash. Mrs. de Guzman stated that $\mathbf{S 2}$ knocked over a beverage caddy and she advised them that they had to leave. Another female patron charged at the bar and hit Mrs. de Guzman with a purse, which caused her to hit her stomach on the pour spout and lacerate her stomach.

Mrs. de Guzman then stated that one of the female patrons picked up a Mason jar and threw it at her hitting her in her head.

Mrs. de Guzman stated that she attempted to walk around the bar, but was stopped by a female patron, at which time they had a brief conversation about the register being out of service.

Mrs. de Guzman stated that she picked up a plastic cup and threw it at one of the patrons, but was not attempting to hurt the female patron.

Mrs. de Guzman then advised me that Mr. Liu asked her if she needed medical attention and she informed him that she felt fine. She stated that she stepped out of the establishment to catch her breath and began to vomit. She stated that she had a couple of friends at the establishment and decided to continue working.

Mrs. de Guzman stated that after visiting her primary care physician, she discovered that she sustained a concussion and then decided to file the police report about a week after the incident occurred.

On June 22, 2018, I telephonically
spoke with MPD Officer Poupart, who reiterated what the 251 stated, but added that the establishment did not notify MPD and that Mrs. de Guzman did not file the police report until 11 days after the incident occurred.

After reviewing ABRAs records, Cloak \& Dagger does not have a security plan or a settlement agreement. I did advise Mr. Liu the two times that I saw him that MPD must be contacted if any incidents occur at the establishment and suggested that they look into obtaining a security plan with their security company.

## CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Based on your

 investigation, were there any obvious violation to you that you believed that the establishment might have?INVESTIGATOR PLEITEZ: When I spoke to the MPD Officer, he -- because it was May 5th, which is Cinco de Mayo, it's kind of like a holiday, there were a lot of police outside of the establishment and I think they probably
should have called the police.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
Sergeant Shipman, do you have anything to add to what occurred at this -- or just your -- I know you are here today, so I know you are here to say something, so what, if anything, can you add?

SERGEANT SHIPMAN: I am --
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Or tell me why you are here then, sir.

SERGEANT SHIPMAN: -- here, because I was requested to be here.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: To do what?
SERGEANT SHIPMAN: I was requested to be here.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay.
SERGEANT SHIPMAN: Well, are you familiar with Cloak \& Dagger and what goes on in the general vicinity of this place?

SERGEANT SHIPMAN: I have actually
only been on my current role for about two months.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay.

SERGEANT SHIPMAN: I do supervise the officers who mainly cover that area where Cloak \& Dagger are and they are probably the ones who were in front of the establishment.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay.
SERGEANT SHIPMAN: That's about as far as I know.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Puente, is there anything you can add regarding --

INVESTIGATOR PUENTE: Yeah, just one thing. ABRA was notified by MPD that another incident occurred on September 2nd. On September 2, 2018, where an altercation occurred inside.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I think the problem with that, Mr. Puente, is that if a report was written, I'm not sure if they have been provided a copy of it, so I think that they are at a disadvantage, so they can't respond to another incident that occurred after.

Because -- yeah, because since if the
report was written, it has not been shared with them, so they would be at a disadvantage to respond to that today --

INVESTIGATOR PUENTE: All right.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: -- at this
hearing. Okay. So I appreciate what you have to offer, but we kind of discussed this today in our Supplemental Agenda and it -- yeah, we haven't -the Board didn't really consider that, because the report was not available. And I'm -- I know that -- all right.

So what can you -- Mr. Fonseca, what, if anything, can you add or provide some clarification to the incident that occurred?

MR. FONSECA: Well --
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And I guess if this is true, this is -- and we are just talking about this incident that occurred on May 5th. And if this is true, just something that kind of came out to me, so maybe you can respond to this. Why did an employee of the establishment allegedly throw an object to a patron?

Because I think Ms. Pleitez, in her report, she stated that she saw that on the video and she also -- I think Miss -- the employee it appears also admitted to doing that, too. So I'm just curious if that happened, why and maybe we can -- you can provide some context to that.

MR. FONSECA: Maybe. I'll let Mr. Liu respond to that as the manager.

In general, you know, there are no police not immediately in front, they are within 50 feet. And often times when incidents do happen, you know, security is doing what they are supposed to do and it ends up that the police officers have then come down and so there is reporting that way.

This incident, and Mr. Liu will
ultimately tell you, this is one that he allowed an employee to make a managerial decision, because -- and she was the one that was hit with the Mason glass and decided that she wanted to continue to work and informed them that, you know, she wasn't hurt or injured.

And frankly, only when he read this report did he know that she went out and actually had vomited, so the issue about throwing the cup, I'm going to turn over and let Mr. Liu answer this.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
MR. LIU: So I think the issue with throwing the cup is that the situation escalated. Typically, that would never happen. We don't advise our employees to escalate anything. If there was a situation where even there is a remote possibility of escalation, we advise them to talk to a security guard and have the security guard escort the person out and diffuse the situation.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Now, is this person still working at the establishment?

MR. LIU: She is still working at the establishment.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And so you saw the report. I assume you saw the video? Did you see the video, sir?

MR. LIU: I did see the video.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So what steps, if any, did the establishment take based on the activity of your employee?

MR. LIU: We did a full review of the policy with our bartenders, as far as dealing with customers and dealing with situations of that nature.

And we actually took her off of shift for about two weeks.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Anything else you have to add regarding this incident? And I guess the bottom line is that who was aware outside of Ms. de Guzman, who was aware of this incident?

Who else knew that this happened that night, as far as management is concerned? Who knew about this incident?

MR. LIU: As far as management was concerned, $I$ was aware of it and two of my security were aware of it. So my head of security and the other security that escorted the
females out.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So that's all?
So what is the normal -- I mean, what's the normal policy that your establishment has when an incident occurs such as this?

MR. LIU: So typically when an incident like this occurs, MPD is contacted and we file a report. It's either between myself or my head of security to file the report. In this instance, my decision making was a little bit skewed because there was an employee involved. I acknowledge that we definitely should have contacted MPD.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, I guess I'm trying to figure the difference, because an employee -- I mean, there is an allegation that a Mason jar, so a Mason jar is some -- a Mason -and it's not even the employee throwing a cup, but a Mason jar, that's much heavier, that can actually hurt someone. So do you want to say something, Mr. Fonseca?

MR. FONSECA: Yeah, I just want to
make sure the Mason jar struck the employee. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, I -MR. FONSECA: The employee didn't throw the Mason jar.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, no. I know, but I'm trying to find out at what point does the establishment believe that it's important to call the police. So that's where I'm -- so that's why I'm asking. You are talking about a Mason jar was -- the head of security was aware of it, you are aware of it.

So how is it that a determination is made that we are going to call MPD? That's what I'm -- that's where I'm going to to say a Mason jar was -- or you had -- it was large enough in the sense that your security escorted the person out of the establishment.

So when is it that -- who makes the decision and when is this decision made that you know what, we need to bring this to the attention of MPD.
incident, so typically in incidents, MPD is contacted regardless. But my judgment was a little bit skewed because there was an employee involved. So my first instinct was to talk to the employee to make sure that she was okay and then I did ask her and it was the incorrect process. I did ask her if she wanted to finish the shift and if she wanted to contact MPD and if she needed medical attention. All of which she said she wanted to finish the shift and she did not want medical attention or to contact MPD.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So do you know if she was injured?

MR. LIU: She did go to a doctor. She had a minor concussion, so this was about a week after the incident. And at that point, she contacted me and we filed a police report.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Any questions by any Board Members? Go ahead, Mr. Short.

MEMBER SHORT: Excuse me, your name again, sir?

MR. LIU: I'm sorry, my name is John
last name is Liu, L-I-U.
MEMBER SHORT: Okay. Mr. Liu, have you ever had any experience with or any training in medical emergencies, such as someone getting hit with a Mason jar on the head?

MR. LIU: No, I haven't had any training with that.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay. Do you know that could have caused some internal injuries that you can't see and that she is lucky she didn't get some blood clots before she went and reported to the hospital with a concussion. Even in the NFL now, they Football League, they -- someone gets a concussion, they take action right away. So if you have -- don't have any training, as an owner, you would have had total responsibility had something or still might have some responsibility if she has some lingering issues.

So I would advise you or I would say to you as a Board Member anyone gets hurt or injured, you call for medical assistance and you call MPD and make a report.

People that have alcohol liquor licenses are required by law to have good judgment. You admitted today that you didn't have good judgment, correct?

MR. LIU: (No audible answer.)
MEMBER SHORT: You said you were
skewed.
MR. LIU: Correct. I think my judgment was skewed at that point.

MEMBER SHORT: And so that means your judgment was not good.

MR. LIU: I agree.
MEMBER SHORT: Okay. So this won't happen again, will it?

MR. LIU: This definitely will not happen again.

MEMBER SHORT: Anybody gets injured in your establishment, what will you do from now on?

MR. LIU: Contact MPD.
MEMBER SHORT: What about EMS?
MR. LIU: And EMS if they require medical attention.

MEMBER SHORT: You keep a log or a journal in your establishment?

MR. LIU: We keep one in-house for the establishment and then security also keeps a log. MEMBER SHORT: Did anyone write this down that this incident happened with the bartender?

MR. LIU: We did. The incident report was actually submitted to the inspecting officer.

MEMBER SHORT: Was it put out the same night of the incident or later?

MR. LIU: Same night.
MEMBER SHORT: So you --
MR. FONSECA: I believe --
MEMBER SHORT: Go ahead.
MR. FONSECA: -- it is Exhibit 3 to
the --
INVESTIGATOR PLEITEZ: Yeah.
MEMBER SHORT: Okay.
MR. FONSECA: -- case report.
MEMBER SHORT: I'm just trying to get
some facts, so that I can follow-up with my
questions, Mr. Fonseca, and I understand where you want to defend it, but we have -- his testimony today is that his memory or his decision making was skewed. And so I wanted to make sure it went on the record that if he ever comes in again and gives a representation that his judgment was skewed, maybe we would have to look at his license a little closer.

This is a very serious incident and we can't take it lightly. I'm looking at the history of your club here, the investigative history and I see where a lot of things have happened and we have had no further action or no action was ever taken by this Board.

And so with those no further actions, please, don't take that too lightly or you will find yourself before this Board with some situations that will cause us to make some decisions that we wouldn't like to make and you would not like for us to make.

So I have your assurance that you will handle injuries or incidents of violence in your
establishment a lot differently from now on?
MR. LIU: Oh, definitely moving forward, we are going to take all the right steps in the process.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay.
MR. FONSECA: And Member Short, I have had -- we have had many discussions and this was at the forefront is we always report to the police, you always call 911 or ask the police if they are there to contact EMS if somebody was injured or if it's questionable. So that's part of showing up this operation here.

MEMBER SHORT: So this won't happen again?

MR. FONSECA: I hope not. We are trained not to do this now.

MEMBER SHORT: You're trained now.
MR. FONSECA: Yeah.
MEMBER SHORT: Who was training.
MR. FONSECA: Well, we have got the head of security and as he told you, they have -they met with staff about things like don't
escalate.
MEMBER SHORT: Okay. For the record, who is this person who was the head of security? His name?

MR. FONSECA: Fine. Come on up.
MR. TIRADO: Michael Tirado.
MR. FONSECA: Michael Tirado, T-I-R-A-D-0.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay. You will need to put his name on the witness list, so that he is here today. And does -- okay. Does he, head of security or anyone on your staff have any medical training?

MR. TIRADO: Yes, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: You do?
MR. TIRADO: They all are. They are all BLL-certified and they are CPR-certified. So they are all training with military level.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Sir, why don't you bring a chair with you.

MR. TIRADO: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Come up and
just identify your name for the record and also write -- there is a sign-in sheet, also sign your name in. But just identify your name for the record, please.

MR. TIRADO: Yes, sir. Michael Tirado.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And there is a sign-in sheet. Okay. You can go ahead, sir.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay. Mr. Tirado, so you are saying that everyone who works for you in security in this establishment has --

MR. TIRADO: Yes, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: -- for the record again, what do they have?

MR. TIRADO: Through American Heart. So they are all -- all are basic lifesaver trained certified, that involves CPR-certified for all ages.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay. So were any of your persons working the night this happened in the establishment?

MR. TIRADO: Yes.

MEMBER SHORT: Were any of them consulted about the injury to the person who wound up with a concussion?

MR. TIRADO: I'm sorry, I missed your question.

MEMBER SHORT: Did anyone from your staff with the training that they have know this incident that happened with the person who wound up with the concussion?

MR. TIRADO: Yes.
MEMBER SHORT: Did they do any -- take any action?

MR. TIRADO: The incident had occurred so quickly that given our security layout, that the security guards were stationed where they were supposed to be stationed properly and the incident had occurred and within 2 or 3 minutes of it occurring or so, the attacker, $I$ can attest to, left the property. So they left the room. The room that the alleged incident occurred happened was right there right by the door.

So as soon as the incident happened,
they turned, you know, the fight happened or the altercation occurred, and they turned out and left through that door.

MEMBER SHORT: Now, I guess so my question --

MR. TIRADO: Walked right past that. Oh, yeah, there so, you know, security had asked for medical attention, asked for -- and they assessed her there. And then they even asked her if she was okay and she had identified to the owner, to security and everybody that she was okay and she just needed a moment to get herself together.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay. And so if someone is hit with a Mason jar on their head, you would take just their word that they are okay? I mean, you --

MR. TIRADO: No, we just -- me personally, how we are trained for, we would assess and we would look for signs of disorientation, you know, motor function issue, obvious signs of blood and things of that nature,
none of were the situation at that time. These were all symptoms that occurred that were stated to after the fact, after her shift.

So and it's very possible that her adrenaline could have been running and that could have tooken over, so none of those symptoms could have actually had occurred during that time, until later on. And that was right close to closing after she had gotten herself together and she may have not felt, you know, of these symptoms until the next morning. And that happens with trauma, traumatic incidents.

MEMBER SHORT: Yes, that's a great answer and thank you very much. All right.

Thank you very much and I'm glad to hear you have security that are trained there and so we will handle things differently the next time should something like this happen. Yes, sir?

MR. TIRADO: And the paperwork of these guys, like we went over this, so they -- we are very serious about documenting. You just -just to add on to it, they are very serious about
it.
MEMBER SHORT: It was documented?
MR. TIRADO: Yes, the documentation we beat this topic to death to make sure that MPD used -- their badge numbers are recorded and everything is taken even more serious for every situation now.

MEMBER SHORT: I do thank you very much for your testimony. Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

MR. TIRADO: All right.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Just a quick question, Mr. Fonseca. Is there any reason why this establishment does not have a security plan?

MR. FONSECA: Not that -- it hasn't been ordered.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm sorry?
MR. FONSECA: The security company pretty much, you know, handles things and they are trained well, so --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: But the
establishment does not have --

MR. FONSECA: Does not have a security plan. Not one that ABRA has required.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. Any questions by any other Board Members? How -- I guess the concern I'm having is that how do we know or how can -- and we are at -- ABRA is at 14th and $U$ and this is at 13th and $U$, the location of 13th and $U$.

MR. FONSECA: It's actually almost 14th.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: 14th?
MEMBER SHORT: Yeah, it's right in the middle of the block 1359.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So I just
wanted to make sure when $I$ cross the street, $I$ - when $I$ cross the street from ABRA, then that's the place $I$ see. This is a -- it appeared to be a very busy area, especially on the weeknights.

And I know you don't have a security plan. Of course, we can't order you to have one at a Fact-Finding Hearing, but I'm just asking. It would not be beneficial to -- because I don't
-- I'm not quite sure if I know when something happens the manager and Mr. Liu had said that well, $I$ didn't necessarily do the right thing tonight, but $I$ want to -- how can we hold management accountable to say if you have these incidents occur, this is the proper procedures to follow.

If there is -- if -- at least we don't know. And I know, sir, that you have a security company. You might have something, but ABRA doesn't know what you have. Go ahead, sir.

MR. TIRADO: I was just hoping to clarify on that. I don't think Mr. Liu used the correct terminology when he said he was like disoriented.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No, well, I -he didn't say he was disoriented.

MR. TIRADO: I don't know when I heard that. He was --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No.
MR. TIRADO: -- concerned for his
staff.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yeah. No, I didn't think he was disoriented. I just think that as he -- from what I gathered from him if it was a customer that was injured, I'm giving him the benefit of the doubt, that he would have immediately called MPD. But because it was an employee, he utilized a different standard, that's how I'm taking it. He utilized a different standard.

But I don't want a different standard to be utilized. It should be a uniform standard, whether or not it's an employee or -- although, yes, you are being held to a higher standard if, both also from a legal perspective, an invitee comes into your place and gets injured, of course if the employee gets injured, that's a different situation.

But as far as ABRA is concerned, I mean, it should be the same standard, so right now we don't have anything to hold you as -- when I asked Ms. Pleitez, I mean, it doesn't appear that as far as their investigation, that there
was any violation.
And so you come here and an incident occurred and you don't have a security plan, so the Board could vote NFA. But the Board doesn't have anything to say how to prevent this incident from occurring again. And $I$ guess by having a security plan, at least we could say you have a security plan. We look to see what it is that it says and we could hold you accountable and so therefore whether or not it is -- whether or not the incident occurred to an employee or an invitee, then there is one standard that we know this is what we have to do.

And if -- from what $I$ see from this area on the weekends, it appears that there is always police within -- I'm not even going to suggest RDO, so that would be -- don't -- so I'm not there, Mr. Fonseca. I'm not there.

But I'm just saying though, it appears that there is a lot of police presence in the area, that it wouldn't be that difficult that you would have for police to come from across town to
show up. So that's something that -- so I'm going to ask you and I try not to put people -because I can't order it, but would it -- I believe that it would be beneficial for this establishment to have a security plan.

And is that something that the -- and I'm not going to force you and I'm not going to take it whichever way or the other, but I mean, would it be beneficial for this establishment to have a security plan?

MR. FONSECA: I think we can memorialize both current and refined procedures, much as Mister Member Short brought out. And it could be done, yes.

## CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So then go

 ahead, Mr. Fonseca.MR. FONSECA: I would like to state, you know, the two points that are really important is the interplay here of the employee, and you focused on it immediately, tossing, you know, a plastic cup at a patron, which, you know, took it to another level.

And then frankly to the level where you have the 3-on-1 situation. So once that happened, it got quickly out of control. So that has been tamped down. That training is going on. You call security. I mean, she should have called security. At that point, you know, she was being attacked verbally. There was no reason for her to get into that interplay.

And none of this would have happened. And security is not that far away. I mean, this is an establishment that has two floors and a mezzanine. It's 99 capacity. So security is never that far away. That's why things when they do happen, you know, you could say three minutes, I'll bet you this thing was done in a minute and 10 seconds, you know.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So then would you -- on behalf of -- would your client be agreeable to provide ABRA within the next 30 days with a legally sufficient security plan?

MR. FONSECA: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.

Thank you.
Now, let me ask you this. Just let me ask a question. Is it that the customer was not being served, because they did not have cash or was it that the bartender was unable to close out their tab and they were waiting an hour and wanted to -- I mean, what was it? Yes?

MR. LIU: From what I gather, and I'm not the bartender, but from what I gather, it was a combination of everything. It was a combination of the wifi going in and out, so our systems were in and out. They were serving some customers with credit, because I know customers upstairs were being serviced, but when wifi is spotty like that, so is service.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No, well, but I guess what I'm trying to find out is that are you telling me that -- and this part of it which -- that someone was basically trapped in your establishment for an hour because they need to leave, but because you couldn't close their tab, they had to stay? Am I hearing that?

MR. LIU: I believe that they wanted to serve -- they wanted more drinks served as well. And I believe that because they were being rude, my bar -- my employee did not give them the best service. And because the wifi was spotty as well, she utilized what service she was able to serve the other customers that were not being rude.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, one of the things that I would suggest then, you need to have some written policies and procedures about-now that you are aware that your -- the wifi might be spotty, and you are aware that issues might occur because of this fact, how is it that -- as far as your employee training, I'm not saying in the security agreement, but as far as the employee training, that you are now aware that these are problems that could occur and so how are we going to address this if it occurs again, because as you stated, the wifi it's not a one -- it doesn't appear that this has never happened before.

MR. TIRADO: Right.
MR. LIU: I mean, in those types of situations, we reset the router and it's about a 15 minute reset. I think it comes down more so to when we are able to identify a situation like that where there is a rude customer, we don't escalate the situation. And we just serve them and send them on their way.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, I'll say, Mr. -- not that I go out that often, but if I'm in the bar and I'm -- and if the bar is not -even if it's crowded and I have to wait 15 minutes for my drink, 1 think that I might get a little irritated. All right. So but reasonable people can disagree.

Are there any other questions by any other Board Members? All right.

Ms. Pleitez, do you have any final comments that you want to make?

INVESTIGATOR PLEITEZ: No.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Sergeant
Shipman, I know that you are new to this area, is
there anything or any improvements, any suggestions you can provide to this licensee based on your role, sir?

SERGEANT SHIPMAN: Because my officers, I know there is two officers in that block all the time, so that shouldn't be a concern when it comes to finding a police officer.

MR. LIU: Okay.
SERGEANT SHIPMAN: Therein, it seems
like they just need to work with the security since they already have a plan, why not just integrate that with what their policy is?

MR. LIU: All right.
SERGEANT SHIPMAN: That way they are on the same page.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. All right. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Fonseca, I'll just put it out there. It's my understanding that there is some -- another incident. When was this incident, Mr. Puente?

INVESTIGATOR PUENTE: September 2nd.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: That it's my understanding there is a September 2nd incident. I don't know what it is and I can't ask you about it, because $I$ don't know what it is, but it appears there is a September 2nd incident.

MR. FONSECA: Um-hum. Do we want to resolve it and --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, I don't know what it is, so I can't talk about it, because I just -- I'm being told there was another incident and I don't know what the incident is. So I mean if you want, I don't know if Mr. Puente can talk about it, because you don't know what it is.
So we can't -- no, so we can't talk about it. I'm just saying to you that that's something for you to try to figure out, because it was something that if of concern, I guess. Whatever it is so far.

But right now, are there, regarding this specific incident, is there any -- I always give you the final word, sir.

MR. FONSECA: No. We will be able to provide a security plan within that 30-day period probably sooner.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. All
right. We are going to take this under advisement, but since -- we will take this under advisement. I'm not sure what, if anything, the Board can do since, as Ms. Pleitez says that she didn't -- there are no obvious violation that came out of this report.

Okay. So thank you.
MR. FONSECA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Hold on. 30 days form today. All right. Okay. So thank you for being here today.

MR. FONSECA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And have a good day. Thank you. Thank you, sir. You have a good day.
(Whereupon, the Fact-Finding Hearing was concluded at 2:22 p.m.)
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