



**House Liquor Control Committee**  
**HB 1413 Public Hearing Meeting Agenda**

Tuesday February 10, 2026  
1:00 PM G50 Irvis Office Building

**Call to Order**

**Opening remarks:**

House Liquor Control Committee Chairman Dan Deasy

Minority Chairwoman Mindy Fee

**Remarks:**

Rep. Anthony Bellmon and Rep. Joe Hogan- Prime Sponsors of HB1413 PN 1614

Sen. Anthony Williams- Chairman Stop & Go Task Force, Prime Sponsor of SB 21 PN 689

**Panel 1:**

PLCB- Chairman Darrell Clarke; Tisha Albert- Director of Regulatory Affairs; Jason Worley- Chief Legal Counsel

PA State Police Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement-Major Robert L. Bailey, Director & Cpt. John Chapman, Director of Operations

**Panel 2:**

Philadelphia City Council - Councilwoman Cindy Bass, District 8

**Panel 3:**

City of Philadelphia- Frances Healy, Deputy Police Commissioner; Kristin Bray, Chief Legal Counsel to the Mayor and Director of Philly Stat 360

**Panel 4:**

PA Licensed Beverage and Tavern Association- Chuck Moran, President

PA Restaurant and Lodging Association- Lauren Brinjac, Senior Director Legislative Affairs

**Panel 5:**

Pittsburgh Nuisance Bar Task Force (NBTF) Sgt. Philip Lerza, Coordinator for Pittsburgh Police  
Lt. Monticelli - Downtown Public Safety Center, Commander Novosel - Zone 2 Station

**Adjournment**



**House Liquor Control Committee Hearing on HB 1413**

**February 10, 2026**

Testifying on behalf of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board

Darrell Clarke, Board Chairman

Tisha Albert, Director of Regulatory Affairs

Mick Vigoda, Board Secretary/Director of Legislative & Governmental Affairs

Jason Worley, Chief Counsel

Good afternoon Chairs Deasy and Fee and members of the House Liquor Control Committee. I'm Darrell Clarke and I serve as the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB) Chairman. I also served on the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force as the PLCB representative. Joining me today, are my PLCB colleagues Tisha Albert, Director of Regulatory Affairs, Mick Vigoda, Board Secretary and Director of Legislative & Governmental Affairs, and Jason Worley, Chief Counsel. Thank you for this opportunity to speak about House Bill 1413.

I would like to take a moment to commend my fellow Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force members, as well as the working group that supported our efforts, for their hard work on this issue. Also, thank you to Representative Bellmon for introducing this important legislation.

In my previous role as Philadelphia City Council President, I saw first-hand the negative impacts that stop-and-go establishments have on neighborhoods. In my current position as PLCB Chairman, I have learned that the issue of problematic establishments is a concern across Pennsylvania.

As a regulatory agency, the PLCB has two primary tools to protect communities from problematic establishments, the Nuisance Bar Program and Licensee Compliance Program. The Nuisance Bar Program facilitates the PLCB's refusal of a license renewal when a licensee has abused its license privileges through violations or conduct that threatens the health and safety of the community. However, this program has significant limitations since these issues can only be considered at the time of license renewal, which occurs every two years for

restaurant licensees. Also, this is a lengthy process that allows the licensee to continue to operate during the appeal process.

Under the Licensee Compliance Program, the agency may immediately take away a licensed establishment's ability to sell or serve alcohol when a PLCB analyst finds that a licensee doesn't meet certain minimum requirements related to seating, food, square footage, rooms or health license authority. However, a licensee can quickly remedy the deficiency and return to operation after a follow-up inspection.

In recent years our licensing team has faced challenges in evaluating licensees who intentionally take advantage of vague statutory language to stretch the minimum requirements for licensure. This issue has become a notable problem in the initial evaluation of restaurant license transfers.

The continued concern about problematic establishments in communities across Pennsylvania makes it clear that additional legislative changes are necessary to protect our neighborhoods and the vast majority of licensees who are committed to the responsible operation of their licensed establishments.

HB 1413 includes policy recommendations from the Report of the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force that would provide law enforcement and regulatory agencies with improved tools to address licensees who abuse the privilege of their license. The bill also clarifies certain statutory requirements that some problematic establishments have skirted for years. Passing legislation that embraces these recommendations is critical to protecting our communities.

It has been my priority to work collaboratively with all stakeholders and support our neighborhoods across Pennsylvania that are dealing with problematic establishments. My PLCB colleagues and I look forward to continuing to partner with the General Assembly to address this issue.

Good afternoon, I'm Jason Worley and I serve as the Chief Counsel for the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB). Thank you for this opportunity to provide brief background about the current regulatory and enforcement responsibilities established by the Liquor Code and the recommendations of the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force.

The PLCB is statutorily charged with regulating the alcohol industry in Pennsylvania. This includes issuing licenses to businesses that authorize them to sell alcoholic beverages. The agency, through its Bureau of Licensing, conducts investigations to ensure that applicants are eligible to hold the license for which they have applied. As part of that process the Bureau of Licensing confirms that the proposed premises meets certain technical requirements for eligibility. In contrast, the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement (BLCE) is generally responsible for enforcement and issuing citations to those licensees when they violate the Liquor Code and the Board's Regulations. This division of responsibilities was established in 1987 when Liquor Code enforcement was statutorily transferred from the PLCB to BLCE.

The Liquor Code does authorize the PLCB's Bureau of Licensing to review the operational history of licensees at the time of license renewal. As part of a renewal, the Bureau of Licensing may consider the licensee's operational and citation history; incidents of disturbance that occurred, either inside or outside the premises, if there is a causal nexus to those instances of disturbance; the reputations of the officers, managers and owners of the establishment; and other technical non-compliance issues. Through this renewal process the PLCB's three-member board has the authority to impose additional conditions on licensees relative to their operations or, when the circumstances warrant, the PLCB can refuse to renew a license. For most licenses, this renewal review occurs every two years.

The Liquor Code prescribes very specific administrative hearing and appeals processes for enforcement citations and objections to license renewals. Citation cases are initially heard by an administrative law judge and then appeals may be pursued to the PLCB's three-member board. Following that,

there's an opportunity to appeal to the respective County Court of Common Pleas and then ultimately to Commonwealth Court. License renewal cases are initially heard by board hearing examiners and then decided upon by the PLCB's three-member board. There is an opportunity to appeal to the County Court of Common Pleas, followed by subsequent appeal to Commonwealth Court. In all cases where a review is conducted by the Court of Common Pleas, the standard of review that's applied is *de novo*, which basically means that the entities involved get a second opportunity to present their case in full, and that the reviewing court is not bound by the determinations that were made at the lower levels. While important, these various appeals and administrative processes can be very lengthy, and they can cause significant delays in the imposition of penalties, which makes it somewhat challenging to effectively address the most problematic businesses.

Unfortunately, over the years, some businesses have learned how to navigate between the established enforcement citation process and the license renewal process to avoid compliance. Perhaps the best example of this is what has commonly become known as stop-and-go establishments. These are generally businesses that hold restaurant liquor licenses or eating place retail dispenser licenses that after becoming licensed, fail to continue to maintain the minimum requirements for licensure. Most often, this involves the failure to maintain compliance with minimum square footage, seating, food or health permit requirements. In many instances, these non-compliant businesses also become hot spots for larger issues that adversely impact the communities in which they operate.

Act 44 of 2017 authorized the creation of a Licensee Compliance Program, which was intended to help state officials to more effectively address non-compliant businesses. This program allows legislators, community members and other stakeholders to submit complaints to the PLCB regarding licensees they believe to be out of compliance with certain minimum licensing requirements. When a complaint is received, a PLCB analyst investigates the matter in collaboration with the BLCE and local authorities. If the investigation substantiates the complaint, the PLCB has the authority to immediately suspend the operating privileges of the license. Within five to 10 days, the

licensee may request a reinvestigation to demonstrate their compliance with the licensing requirements and have their operating authority reinstated.

While the current Licensee Compliance Program has proven helpful in some respects, there remains substantial room for improvement. What we have seen is that for some licensees, after their operating authority has been restored, they repeat their previous behavior and again become non-compliant. Because of that, some businesses continue to be able to navigate between the existing processes and avoid more substantial penalties. While these persistently non-compliant businesses are more prevalent in certain areas of the Commonwealth, this has become a statewide issue.

As a result, the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force was created by Act 49 of 2023 to review the laws and issues surrounding stop-and-go establishments and to make recommendations to more effectively regulate them. Our Board Chairman Darrell Clarke, served as an ex officio member and PLCB representative on the task force. PLCB staff also assisted the task force through the work group that was formed to support its efforts. Between April and September 2024, the task force and the work group engaged in extensive discussions to assess the underlying issues, which included studying and analyzing current state laws, hosting public hearings with stakeholders and reviewing testimony.

The task force and the work group collectively produced a report that includes a series of policy recommendations to provide a road map for legislative action, which formed the basis for HB 1413. To briefly summarize, the recommendations of the task force included: streamlining the enforcement citation process, strengthening the Licensee Compliance Program, informing the process for license renewal with other citations and information, increasing penalties and fines for all citations, removing *de novo* review from the Courts of Common Pleas, highlighting the PLCB compliance process, increasing recruitment efforts for BLCE agents and requiring the payment of city taxes and fully adjudicated city fines before a liquor license may be received or renewed.

The PLCB remains committed to doing whatever we can to assist in addressing this important issue impacting the health, safety and welfare of citizens across the Commonwealth. My PLCB colleagues and I would be pleased to answer any questions from the committee members.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE

TESTIMONY

STOP-AND-GO LEGISLATION (HOUSE BILL 1413)

PUBLIC HEARING

FEBRUARY 10, 2026



Good afternoon, Chairman Deasy, Chair Fee, and members of the House Liquor Control Committee. My name is Major Robert Bailey of the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) and I currently serve as the Director of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement (BLCE). I am accompanied by Captain John Chapman, Director of the Operations Division of BLCE. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to provide remarks on enforcement experiences and challenges regarding stop-and-go establishments.

Stop-and-go establishments are businesses that hold restaurant-type liquor licenses; the same type of license as a typical restaurant or eating place that offers prepared food for customers to sit down to enjoy. Unlike typical restaurants, stop-and-go establishments operate under a business model similar to a convenience store, e.g., selling various items, such as candy, snack foods, and offering limited to no prepared food. Bottles and cans of beer are sold "to go" and liquor, if the establishment holds an R license, is often served in disposable cups and served "to go." Additionally, many of these establishments circumvent square footage and seating requirements by having some or all the required 30 chairs folded up or chained in a corner or in back rooms not commonly accessible to the public and only made available during inspections. Stop-and-go establishments

use their liquor license for the privilege of selling alcohol, even though they do not function as the law requires for a restaurant or eating place.

Pursuant to the Liquor Code, the BLCE investigates and issues citations primarily for violations of Pennsylvania's liquor laws. The BLCE does not have the authority to cite for other issues that may be observed at a licensed establishment which are enforced by another state or local entity, such as health code issues, sanitation issues, or local ordinance violations. The most common Liquor Code violations occurring at stop-and-go establishments include:

- Insufficient food for 30 patrons at one time.
- Insufficient tables and seating for 30 patrons at one time.
- Failure to maintain minimum square footage required for a serving area.
- Expired Department of Health permit.
- Sale of liquor at retail dispenser (i.e., beer only) locations
- Sale of liquor "to go."
- Operating another business or selling products without the approval of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (Board).

The BLCE has made enforcement of violations typically associated with stop-and-go establishments a priority and continues to devote considerable resources to address these violations within Philadelphia and throughout the Commonwealth. These types of violations impact the quality of life and safety of residents and the communities surrounding stop-and-go establishments.

Each complaint received from the public by the BLCE is investigated. The BLCE works closely with the Philadelphia Police Department, Philadelphia Health Department, Philadelphia Licensing & Inspection, and the Board to address stop-and-go establishment locations. In addition to enforcement, BLCE officers attempt to educate licensees who may be first-time offenders.

Liquor Code violations by stop-and-go establishments which result in citations follow the same procedural process as any other Liquor Code violation. The citation goes before an Office of Administrative Law Judge (OALJ) for adjudication. A licensee may waive a hearing and accept a recommended penalty or proceed with a hearing. After a hearing is conducted, an appeal may be sought by the licensee or BLCE, first with the Board, then with the appropriate Court of Common Pleas, then with the Commonwealth Court. Any of these procedural steps may result in a delay

of the penalty. Further, the penalty for the types of violations noted above is a monetary fine ranging from between \$50 to \$1,000. While suspension or revocation of the license is possible, it is infrequently imposed for these types of violations.<sup>1</sup>

The BLCE also participates in compliance checks conducted by the Board, pursuant to Act 44 of 2017, when a licensing analyst inspects whether an establishment is compliant with applicable statutory requirements. If it is determined a licensee is not compliant with the statutory requirements for the type of license held, the Board is authorized to immediately suspend the licensee's authority to sell alcohol for a period of time until the licensee is found to have corrected the deficiencies upon re-inspection. However, a licensee who regains the privilege to sell alcohol may, and often does, become non-compliant again shortly thereafter, requiring yet another compliance check by the Board and BLCE under current law.

Moreover, even if a citation for non-compliance is adjudicated or a licensee's operating privileges are suspended under the Licensee

---

<sup>1</sup> Without significant penalties for violations when they are uncovered, most licensees will likely view any potential penalty that may result as merely the cost of doing business. Act 14 of 1987 created the fine structure associated with violations of the Liquor Code (\$50 to \$1,000 for most violations, and \$1,000 to \$5,000 for major violations, including sales/furnishing to minors), and it remains in effect today. While license suspensions may be imposed, they are not mandatory for such types of offenses, even for repeat offenses.

Compliance Program, the Liquor Code only permits the Board's Bureau of Licensing to object to the renewal of such a liquor license every two years. Additionally, the Board may only consider adjudicated citations, not pending citations, when making its final decision regarding license renewal.

As noted above, there are limitations with what the enforcement process may accomplish. House Bill 1413 represents a good attempt to address many of these limitations. For example, the proposed legislation clarifies what minimum food offerings a licensee must make available for customers which align with what would typically be expected at a licensed restaurant or eating place. The measure also increases the range of penalties for both tiers of Liquor Code violations which have remained the same for several decades: \$250 - \$2,000 for most violations, and \$2,000 - \$10,000 for the most serious types of offenses, including sales to minors and intoxicated patrons. For "stop and go" related violations, the proposed legislation imposes mandatory fines and suspension periods which are increased for repeat offenses, serving as a more effective deterrent.

Finally, the proposed legislation streamlines the appeal process for enforcement actions by removing a court of common pleas from the process, allowing decisions of the OALJ to be appealed first to the Board and subsequently to the Commonwealth Court.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with information on this topic today as well as during working group meetings organized by the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force.



TESTIMONY OF CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL TO MAYOR CHERELLE L. PARKER AND  
DIRECTOR OF PHILLY STAT 360, KRISTIN K. BRAY, ESQ.  
BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
HOUSE LIQUOR CONTROL COMMITTEE  
REGARDING HOUSE BILL 1413 SESSION OF 2025

Good Afternoon Chair Member Deasy, Co-Chair Member Fee, and other members of the Committee on Liquor Control. My name is Kristin Bray and I am Chief Legal Counsel to Mayor Cherelle L. Parker and Director of Philly Stat 360. On behalf of Mayor Parker, thank you for allowing the City of Philadelphia to voice its overall support for Bill 1413 making certain amendments to the Pennsylvania Liquor Code to enhance enforcement against nuisance liquor establishments, including those colloquially known as Stop & Go liquor establishments, in Pennsylvania.

House Bill 1413 recognizes a reality that Philadelphia has experienced for decades: while most licensed businesses are good neighbors, a small number repeatedly violate the law and create disproportionate harm. In particular, these establishments known as “Stop & Gos,” do not follow basic requirements of the law such as maintaining adequate seating or serving food. They, in turn, become hotspots for nuisance and potentially criminal activity which is a drain on police resources, frustrates residents, and diminishes public confidence in our government and enforcement systems.

The City of Philadelphia commends the Sponsor of this this bill, Representative Anthony Bellmon, and his co-sponsors for confronting this issue head-on. The stakes are not abstract. When nuisance establishments persist, they destabilize communities, invite disorder, drive away responsible investment, place strains on City services, and, most importantly, make residents feel unsafe in their homes and where their children play and go to school.

Over the past several years, Philadelphia has taken a comprehensive, data-led approach to address nuisance businesses to help eradicate the harm these non-compliant businesses cause. Through the Nuisance Business Committee that I lead, Philadelphia routinely reviews neighborhood complaints and businesses with chronic violations. Philadelphia’s nuisance enforcement model uses the data it has to engage in a comprehensive enforcement strategy and coordinate efforts across multiple departments: Health, Licenses and Inspections, Police, 311, Commerce, and Law – to name a few. Using every enforcement tool available to us, we work with businesses to prioritize voluntary compliance. We emphasize business education, use warnings, and encourage businesses to voluntarily engage in corrective action when there are behaviors that are harming communities.

When those tools geared at gaining voluntary compliance fail, the City is prepared to engage in robust enforcement that can include the imposition of fines, the imposition of cease operation orders that close a business until compliance occurs, the revocation of business licenses, taking business owners to court, physically sealing off buildings, and/or cutting off utilities to businesses that repeatedly flout the laws of Philadelphia. Collectively, these efforts have helped more businesses become good neighbors while ensuring that long-standing nuisance businesses cease to operate recklessly in Philadelphia.

The lessons learned from Philadelphia's experience are simple: a comprehensive, cohesive enforcement strategy that allows reliance on every enforcement tool available to address long-standing nuisance problems in communities works. However, there is one enforcement tool that Philadelphia does not have and it holds us back. Aside from having to bring a complicated, timely lawsuit in the Courts, Philadelphia has no ability to directly and timely enforce the Liquor Code's requirements. Instead, we are reliant on the Pennsylvania State Police Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and the Liquor Control Board, both of which are understaffed and overworked, to enforce. This results in spotty and untimely enforcement, which, in turn, has led to significant non-compliance with Liquor Code requirements in Philadelphia and, in turn, has allowed nuisance businesses to persist without consequences.

Explicitly authorizing Philadelphia to co-enforce the Liquor Code with state agencies would only serve to enhance the Commonwealth's statewide enforcement scheme; would ensure faster, and more consistent accountability; and would allow Philadelphia to better protect its neighborhoods. We recognize that our colleagues at the Pennsylvania State Police Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and the Liquor Control Board have been good and willing partners with us; however, their resources are limited and spread thin across many municipalities. Permitting Philadelphia to supplement their efforts can only lead to stronger, more consistent enforcement, which, in turn leads to safer communities.

As you will hear from my colleague, the City of Philadelphia, by and through its Police Department, stands ready contribute significant resources to this enforcement effort by providing video and other evidence gathered at non-compliant businesses. When our Police and enforcement agencies see a non-compliant business, we need to be able to act quickly and enforce. We cannot wait weeks or months, while the community is destabilized, to await an inspection to occur. Allowing the local enforcement agencies in Philadelphia to concurrently enforce the Liquor Code, closes enforcement gaps, protects compliant businesses, and ensures accountability for those who repeatedly and flagrantly disregard the law.

To that end, I would like to address House Bill 1413's language on requiring tax compliance. I believe it goes without saying that compliance with local tax obligations is not an extraordinary burden – it is a basic expectation for every person and every business in this Commonwealth that they pay their taxes and pay those taxes on time. Further, it is our experience that nonpayment of taxes often indicates broader management or compliance issues. Holding a liquor license is a privilege and not a right. Ensuring that all licensees are current on taxes or enrolled and keeping up with payment agreements helps uphold fairness and prevents habitual offenders from gaining a competitive edge.

In conclusion, as you will hear from my colleague, House Bill 1413 moves in the right direction by tightening up loopholes in the Liquor Code. However, I urge this Committee to strengthen this bill to explicitly allow the City of Philadelphia to concurrently enforce the Liquor Code alongside our partners at the Pennsylvania State Police Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and the Liquor Control Board. Allowing local enforcement will ensure chronic violators face real accountability. Philadelphians deserve neighborhoods where responsible businesses thrive and bad operators face consequences. We can give Philadelphians just that by

allowing Philadelphia, which has the infrastructure, experience, coordinated enforcement strategy, the ability to directly police and protect its communities.

This concludes my testimony. I would be happy to answer any questions at this time.



TESTIMONY OF CITY OF PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT  
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FRANCIS T. HEALY, ESQ.  
BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
HOUSE LIQUOR CONTROL COMMITTEE  
REGARDING HOUSE BILL 1413 SESSION OF 2025

Good afternoon Chair Member Deasy, Co-Chair Member Fee, other members of the Committee on Liquor Control and Bill Sponsors. My name is Deputy Commissioner Francis Healy from the Philadelphia Police Department. I am the Deputy Commissioner of Legal Affairs and the Chief of Staff for Police Commissioner Bethel. First on behalf of the Commissioner, thank you allowing the Philadelphia Police Department to voice its overall support for Bill 1413 making certain amendments to the Pennsylvania Liquor Code to address the issues surrounding Stop & Go Liquor establishments in Pennsylvania.

As we know, “Stop & Go” establishments refer to businesses operating under R or E licenses that disregard the requirements to serve prepared food, maintain at least thirty seats for on-premises dining, and provide restroom access to customers. These establishments are not functioning restaurants or eateries. Rather, they operate primarily as take-out alcohol outlets, selling beer, wine, or small quantities of liquor “to-go,” with little consideration for the surrounding community. These businesses are disproportionately concentrated in economically disadvantaged, densely populated neighborhoods, particularly in cities such as Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

This illicit business model has a direct and harmful impact on nearby communities. Patrons frequently consume alcohol immediately outside these establishments and in adjacent residential areas, contributing to loitering, public intoxication, disorderly conduct, public urination, and other criminal activity. These conditions erode quality of life for residents, exacerbate existing inequities, threaten community safety, and place an ongoing burden on families, local businesses, and public resources.

As such, Mayor Parker, the City of Philadelphia, and the Philadelphia Police Department sincerely appreciate the sponsors of this legislation for their leadership and willingness to address an issue that significantly impacts our communities. This bill represents a meaningful step toward improving quality of life in some of our most distressed neighborhoods. While the PPD fully supports the intent of this legislation, from a law enforcement perspective we respectfully offer several recommendations that we believe would enhance its effectiveness and strengthen its impact.

I will address these provisions slightly out of order by first discussing Section 3 of House Bill 1413, and then returning to certain definitions that are critical for effective enforcement. Section 3 directly addresses the core of the Stop & Go business model by clearly establishing minimum requirements related to seating, food service, and other operational standards, along with immediate consequences for failure to meet those requirements.

While these requirements already exist, they are often embedded within licensing definitions reviewed during the approval process, rather than articulated as enforceable provisions with clear and immediate penalties. Section 3 importantly bridges this gap between licensing and enforcement, a change that is greatly appreciated from a law enforcement perspective. The inclusion of immediate suspension authority is essential and will significantly alter the behavior of these establishments by creating real and timely accountability.

Strengthening enforcement of minimum requirements is commendable; however, its effectiveness depends on whether the enforcement authority reflects on-the-ground realities. In Section 3, only the *LCB Bureau of Licensing* is authorized to inspect and enforce this new provision, while neither the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement nor local law enforcement is mentioned. This represents an excellent opportunity to foster collaboration between licensing authorities and law enforcement, creating a synergy that would maximize the effectiveness of this Bill. For the City, this is a critical and necessary component of enforcement.

The number of LCB Licensing Agents is understandably limited, and physical inspections by this small workforce can be time-consuming, potentially undermining the purpose of this bill, which is to impose immediate consequences for deficiencies in minimum requirements. By contrast, Philadelphia Police officers are routinely on scene responding to calls for service related to disorderly crowds, noise complaints, assaults, and other incidents directly tied to Stop & Go establishments. Most importantly, all PPD officers are equipped with body-worn cameras, providing objective, time-stamped video evidence that can clearly document violations of licensing requirements. Officers can easily record the interiors of these establishments.

This evidence could be securely shared with the LCB Bureau of Licensing within hours, eliminating the need for licensing agents to rely solely on physical inspections at each establishment. The Bureau would still make final determinations regarding deficiencies and suspensions, but the process could be greatly expedited. Officers who recorded the violations would be available to testify to authenticate the video for administrative hearings or appeal panels. As such, we would respectfully recommend considering amending the current language to provide explicit authority for the LCB Bureau of Licensing to accept evidence from the Philadelphia Police Department in addition to on-scene inspections by licensing investigators, allowing enforcement decisions to be timely, efficient, and directly tied to observed violations thereby fulfilling the core purpose of this legislation: ensuring immediate accountability for noncompliance with minimum licensing requirements.

This brings me to our second recommendation, which concerns the current definitions of "Eating Place" and "Restaurant" in Section 1 and the terms "Accessible" and "Available." These terms are intended to clarify the table and chair requirements, and to most people, they may seem sufficient. However, in our experience in Philadelphia, Stop & Go owners have intentionally structured their operations to exploit ambiguities in the current liquor code. While the general public might understand what is required, we believe these terms are still vague enough to create opportunities for abuse.

From an enforcement perspective, an officer entering an establishment should be able to immediately determine whether it is operating in compliance. Chairs and tables must not merely be “accessible” or “available” in a technical sense, they must be properly arranged so that patrons can walk in and immediately sit at a table. Stacking chairs in a corner or leaving tables unusable could arguably meet the current definitions of “accessible” and “available,” creating loopholes that these business operators can exploit. To ensure clarity and prevent confusion, we recommend removing the terms “accessible” and “available” from these definitions and replacing them with explicit language that requires tables and chairs to be properly set up and ready for immediate use by patrons. So, in the relevant sections of both the Eating Place and Restaurant definitions in Section 1, we would recommend deleting “accessible” and “available” with the following:

*“Such tables and chairs shall be physically present on the premises, fully assembled, and arranged for immediate use by patrons during all hours in which alcoholic beverages are served.”*

In conclusion, House Bill 1413 is an important step toward addressing the challenges posed by Stop & Go establishments and improving the quality of life in our most impacted communities. The Philadelphia Police Department fully supports the intent of this legislation and greatly appreciates the thoughtful work of its sponsors. From a law enforcement perspective, we have offered recommendations, particularly around clarifying definitions and incorporating timely, enforceable mechanisms that leverage police-obtained evidence, that we believe could help strengthen the bill’s effectiveness and ensure immediate accountability.

This concludes my testimony, and I would be happy to answer any questions at this time.



## **Testimony: Philadelphia's Stop-and-Go Problem and HB 1413**

**Provided by Chuck Moran, Executive Director  
Pennsylvania Licensed Beverage and Tavern Association**

**February 10, 2026**

Chairman Deasy. Chairwoman Fee. Members of the House Liquor Control Committee, thank you for inviting the Pennsylvania Licensed Beverage and Tavern Association to provide testimony on a concerning issue and related legislation. That issue is what we all know as "Stop and Go's." We commend the chair and members for taking this problem seriously and working to do something to take state action to get these places under control or closed where appropriate.

The PLBTA, often just called the Pennsylvania Tavern Association, represents Pennsylvania's small business, family-owned taverns, bars, and licensed restaurants.

It wasn't long ago that we testified in Philadelphia in front of the Stop and Go Legislative Task Force. Most of what I'm about to say we included in that testimony. This time I will focus our testimony on specific parts of HB 1413.

But, since this issue originates in Philadelphia, I want to first mention another growing issue that I'm hearing about from my Philadelphia Members. There is growing concern about the use of fake IDs that are so good that they can trick a scanning device. We're no longer talking about your father's fake ID that were easy for bouncers and bartenders to identify. One of my Members is so concerned that they could be tricked into serving a minor that they no longer allow anyone under the age of 25 in their establishment. This establishment took that measure to protect their community and their license, while turning away legal business from those age 21 to age 24. It's simply too easy for an 18-year-old to get a fake ID through websites. I hope at some point the legislature will look at this issue.

Now, back to the stop-and-go issue.

In a nutshell, stop-and-go's are businesses, often a convenience store or deli, that somehow found a way to qualify for and purchase a liquor license. We only hear about this issue in Philadelphia. They regularly violate well-known and established parts of the liquor code such as food requirements and seating, and it's not unusual for them to serve minors and VIPs. Furthermore, there has been a history of health and safety issues within these businesses despite the requirement that they have current and valid health licenses. The negative things happening inside these establishments act like a magnet to bring the wrong crowds that can be associated with criminal activity such as illegal drugs and gang activity, negatively impacting nearby neighborhoods.

As an association representing small business bars, taverns, and licensed restaurants, we wonder how these businesses ever qualified for a liquor license in the first place. For sure, they're giving all R, H, and E licensees a black eye and that needs to change.

HB 1413 would make changes in several areas that could be helpful.

First, HB 1413 will strengthen the compliance program, essentially reinforcing what R licenses across the state are already doing.

For example, the overwhelming majority of R, H, and E licenses have food menus with many options, and offer plenty of seating to serve no less than 30 individuals. These are base standards for the industry in Pennsylvania that seem to be regularly violated by stop-and-go locations. And again, we wonder how those establishments ever qualified for a liquor license.

HB 1413 tweaks the liquor code to require substantial food offerings to constitute a meal. It also reinforces seating for 30 patrons when alcohol is sold. Since law-abiding R, H, and E licensees are already doing that, we don't see this as a problem, and can support it.

This bill also increases fines for all citations. At the moment, fines can be as low as \$50 and as high as \$5,000 for the most serious violations such as serving minors. That range was probably considered high when those levels were decided a long time ago, so it's understandable that those fines should be under consideration for increases. So, we can support those changes.

The one area of HB 1413 where we remain cautious is the proposal to eliminate de novo review at the County Court of Common Pleas.

Under current law, local judges have the ability to hear these cases fresh — to consider new evidence, listen to local law enforcement, neighborhood residents, and licensees, and make independent findings of fact based on conditions in their communities.

That local perspective matters.

Common Pleas judges understand the unique dynamics of communities across the state in a way that a statewide appellate court simply cannot. Removing this step does not just change a legal process — it removes a layer of community-based accountability.

While we appreciate the desire to streamline enforcement and reduce delays, efficiency should not come at the expense of due process or local decision-making. Licensees would lose an established legal right, and communities would lose a forum where local impacts can be fully heard.

We also note that either party already retains the ability to appeal to Commonwealth Court, meaning there is already a mechanism for statewide consistency.

For these reasons, we remain neutral on this provision and respectfully suggest continued dialogue on alternatives — such as expedited Common Pleas timelines or targeted application to chronic violators — that preserve local authority while improving enforcement efficiency.

Finally, while Liquor Code reform is an important step, Stop-and-Go locations reflect broader challenges involving community health, crime, and illegal drug activity. Simply removing a liquor license may not fully resolve these problems. Without strong local policing and coordinated neighborhood interventions, bad actors often resurface elsewhere.

We thank the Committee for including the Tavern Association in this discussion and reaffirm our commitment to working collaboratively with the General Assembly and the PLCB on solutions that clean up problem locations while protecting responsible small businesses across Pennsylvania.





**Testimony on House Bill 1413**  
**Lauren Brinjac, Senior Director of Legislative Affairs**  
**Pennsylvania Restaurant & Lodging Association**

Good morning, Chairman Deasy, Chairwoman Fee, and members of the House Liquor Control Committee. My name is Lauren Brinjac, and I am the senior director of legislative affairs for the Pennsylvania Restaurant & Lodging Association. PRLA represents thousands of liquor licensees across the Commonwealth, from local taverns and pizzerias to large brands, to the small-town diner that just secured its first liquor license and is looking to grow its footprint in Pennsylvania. Thank you for hearing our testimony today regarding House Bill 1413.

PRLA appreciates the intent of HB 1413, and we share the General Assembly's goal of addressing the proliferation of "stop-and-go's" which we know are problematic for the communities in which they exist. We are concerned, however, that this legislation as drafted will do more to complicate operations for licensees who are trying to comply with the Liquor Code than to stop these nuisance establishments, many of which are already operating outside of the law and violating numerous provisions of the Liquor Code. To this point, during a joint informational hearing on stop-and-go's last year with the Senate Law & Justice Committee and this committee, much of the conversation centered around the need for more personnel and resources to enforce the existing law. PRLA continues to believe that effective enforcement of existing statutes is the most direct way to address chronic problem establishments without creating new compliance traps for responsible operators and licensees.

Regarding HB 1413, we respectfully request the committee consider the following:

Under the current draft of this legislation, the definition of "eating place" and "restaurant" would be amended to add language regarding seating and food and menu requirements that we believe would prohibit licensees, especially smaller operators, from engaging in common industry practices such as closing all or some of a dining room area during the later hours of operation, as well as closing or significantly limiting kitchen operations before closing the bar. These changes would translate into real operational changes for licensees, including increased staffing, and operational costs for legitimate operators, while still failing to address the nuisance establishments that have never maintained true dine-in accommodations in the first place.

Secondly, HB 1413 proposes a restructuring of the appeal process to the disadvantage of the licensee by eliminating involvement by local Courts of Common Pleas and sending any appeal of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board's determination regarding the refusal or withholding of a license, renewal or transfer directly to the Commonwealth Court. This has the potential to significantly limit a licensee's ability to pursue or challenge the Board's decision about a license objection/renewal, creating a due process issue for licensees.

In addition, this legislation would impose immediate and mandatory license suspension for failure to maintain seating, food and other requirements. While PRLA certainly supports all licensees adhering to the requirements for licensure, these penalties fail to account for mitigating or unintentional circumstances that are the result not of attempts to evade the law, but rather operational challenges. Take, for example, a small restaurant that had to reconfigure its dining room after significant damage to its building, and for a period of time failed to have the correct number of seats. Under this new language, that licensee would have had, at a minimum, a mandatory license suspension of 10 days, been forced to have an administrative hearing, and potentially be subject to additional penalties. We feel this is overly harsh for situations that are accidental or circumstantial, rather than ongoing, intentional efforts to subvert the Liquor Code.

Finally, this legislation adds a local requirement with respect to obtaining the tax clearances necessary to renew, transfer, or otherwise maintain a license, and we are troubled by the addition of another layer that could delay a license renewal. As it stands now, our licensees often face significant difficulty and confusion obtaining tax clearance even when they are up to date on their taxes. Additional local requirements risk compounding delays that can threaten the continued operation of otherwise compliant businesses.

In closing, PRLA appreciates this committee's time and attention to this issue and respectfully urges careful consideration of this legislation to avoid unintended consequences that penalize responsible, compliant licensees while failing to meaningfully address chronic bad actors.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



*Advocating for a diverse membership of grocers, manufacturers, convenience stores, wholesalers, distributors, retailers and service providers across the food and beverage industry*

**Testimony submitted by the Pennsylvania Food Merchants Association**

**House Liquor Control Committee**

**Public Hearing on HB 1413 (Bellmon)**

**February 10, 2026**

The Pennsylvania Food Merchants Association has advocated for the food and beverage industry across the Commonwealth since 1952. Today the association represents almost 500 member companies from across the globe that operate thousands of retail food stores, production facilities and distribution centers, and collectively employ more than 350,000 Pennsylvanians.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our perspective on this important issue.

For decades, the operation of stop-and-go establishments has blighted communities in Pennsylvania - chiefly Philadelphia, and increasingly elsewhere in the state as well. These establishments, as characterized by the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force, operate outside both the spirit and intent of the liquor licenses they hold, often engaging in unlawful sales of liquor by-the-shot for off-premises consumption, while failing to operate as a bona fide restaurant or eating place. They have proven stubborn to eradicate using the processes and resources available to state regulators thus far.

To be clear - PFMA supports efforts in principle to curb these nuisance businesses. Their operations exploit vulnerable populations, defraud the commonwealth, and undermine the efforts of legitimate businesses that comply with the rules and regulations on the books. The recommendations of the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force include some proposals we agree are viable, including increasing recruitment for BLCE agents. Fundamentally, we think the solution to effectively tackling stop-and-gos lies in bolstering enforcement efforts that target the establishments we all know are acting outside the bounds of licensure.

By contrast, we think HB 1413 will not effectively correct the bad behavior of the intended targets, while significantly burdening the legitimate businesses who find themselves out of compliance. As drafted, the bill would be challenging to enforce and have operational impacts on many of the responsible actors in the marketplace.

Our concern is that true stop-and-gos will continue on as they always have, restrained only according to the enforcement capacity of the board, and not by any of the new provisions in place.

In short, we don't see how this proposal enhances efforts to address this nuisance activity.

Indeed, while it's hard to assess how HB 1413 might solve the problem of stop-and-gos, it is easy to lay out how it will make life more difficult for legitimate businesses, including restaurants, convenience and grocery stores across the state. What we view as a series of compliance traps are outlined below:

**Food Offerings**

HB 1413 adds additional requirements granting the PLCB significant power to interpret what constitutes food under the term "substantial food offerings." The definition for menu requirements and what defines an entrée and two sides is overly

vague and vulnerable to misinterpretation. Language stipulating a main dish/entrée “may not consist solely of sealed prepacked food items” is fraught. The bill as written may rule out a huge amount of bona fide food options that are obviously not being used by stop-and-gos to skirt current rules, including items ranging from pre-prepared sushi trays to salad bowls.

There is also a lack of clarity on language dealing with menus. The bill requires the aforementioned substantial food offerings to be set forth specifically on printed menus. Are digital menu boards non-compliant? Are shelf tags that appear in front of items on display non-compliant? Not all restaurants, fast casual or full service, have printed menus. Would these premises be required to maintain up-to-date printed menus to remain in compliance? It would appear so.

Candidly, we have provided feedback on companion legislation in the Senate and have offered suggestions to improve the provisions as they relate to menu and food requirements. While not present in HB 1413 as it is written, we hope they would be considered for amendments if the bill moves forward. Without them this section of the bill remains deeply flawed and would overnight render many licensees in violation of the law.

### **Seating**

The bill codifies strict seating requirements. Tables and chairs accommodating at least 30 persons at one time must be "accessible and available for use during any hour alcoholic beverages are served." While on its face this seems reasonable, if a licensee has a chair break and it cannot be replaced for a day or two, that licensee is technically out of compliance and could be cited for a violation.

It is important to emphasize that there are already seating requirements in statute and regulation. According to the PLCB, R- and E- licensees must have at least 30 seats, immediately available and accessible by the public, not concealed or locked behind doors or walls, etc., nor stacked.

Given these already exacting requirements, it seems impossible to escape the question of how the new language does anything other than make life harder for responsible licensees who find themselves in circumstances that are beyond their control.

### **Appeals Process**

The challenge of the traps detailed above is compounded by the bill's changes to the appeals process. By shifting appeals from local Courts of Common Pleas to Commonwealth Court and explicitly changing the standard of review, HB 1413 significantly elevates the costs and burdens associated with appealing a decision, on everything from paperwork to travel to representation. It also curbs the opportunity for good-faith remedies on the part of licensees.

As a point of emphasis – we are not just talking about appeals of violations, but all licensing decisions, including issuance and renewal of permits. While it is important to acknowledge the frustrations with nuisance businesses appealing citations, it is also critical to understand that appeals serve as an important protection against excessive power being concentrated in one state agency. Eliminating the *de novo* standard of review effectively establishes a system for licensing and enforcement in which the PLCB determines the game, the rules and the outcome, with little in the way of checks and balances.

Under the current system, a licensee may appeal a violation and have the opportunity to cure a particular defect. Under HB 1413 and its appellate standard of review, defects become fatal snapshots in time. For example, if a licensee is non-renewed because an inspection found they only had 28 chairs available, with two currently broken and awaiting replacement, under the current *de novo* review, the licensee could appeal and tell a Common Pleas judge they have

replaced the chairs and rectified the issue. The judge will see that the defect is cured, and order the license renewed. Under the process required by HB 1413, Commonwealth Court would be limited only to hearing evidence presented at the PLCB hearing - in which the fact was that there were 28 chairs available at the time of inspection is incontrovertible. The licensee's testimony that they have since replaced the two chairs cannot be heard because it is outside the record. Commonwealth Court would uphold the non-renewal because the Board was technically correct at the time of its decision.

While its intent may be to deter nuisance businesses from appealing their citations, and generally decrease the chances of success in the event they do appeal, this change has the effect of throwing the baby out with the bath water by also making it more difficult for legitimate licensees to appeal what is likely to be a vastly greater number of technical – not intentional - violations.

So while this bill offers no assurance that it will effectively address the stop-and-go issue, what it does guarantee is setting food retailers a complicated series of compliance traps, while simultaneously granting PLCB broader oversight authority and making the appeals process more difficult and expensive.

In sum, we want to support targeting bad actors through efforts like allowing better coordination of law enforcement, and more funding for these entities to carry out compliance checks and enforcement actions, but not by changing definitions in such a way that responsible businesses could find themselves outside of the law or needlessly challenged by complex requirements on food offerings, tax compliance, and more. Thus far, Pennsylvania food retailers have enjoyed a productive partnership with the state when it comes to responsible alcohol sales. HB 1413 would risk fracturing that partnership, punishing consumers and risking commonwealth revenues at a time it can least be afforded.

We appreciate the interest of the committee in this important issue. The association stands ready to serve as a resource as you continue your work.



**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE BILL ANALYSIS**

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	HB1413 PN1614	<b>Prepared By:</b>	Lynn Benka-Davies (717) 783-4009,6492
<b>Committee:</b>	Liquor Control	<b>Executive Director:</b>	Lynn Benka-Davies
<b>Sponsor:</b>	Bellmon, Anthony		
<b>Date:</b>	1/16/2026		

---

**A. Brief Concept**

HB1413 would amend the Liquor Code to implement recommendations from the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force, as provided for by Act 49 of 2023. It provides for enhancements to the PLCB's compliance program, streamlines the citation process, increase penalties and fines, and addresses current court review standards.

**C. Analysis of the Bill**

HB1413 would amend the Liquor Code to implement recommendations from the Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force, as provided for by Act 49 of 2023.

**Strengthen the Compliance Program** -The bill would move the Compliance Program from the Fiscal Code to the Liquor Code and make the following changes:

- Requires hotel, restaurant and eating place licenses provide sufficient food and seating for 30 patrons at all times alcohol is sold, provide menus and be in compliance with any minimum food requirements imposed by state and local authorities in order to obtain a health or food permit.
  - Amends the definition of *Eating Place, Hotel & Restaurant* to require substantial food offerings to constitute a meal which must be accessible and available for use during any hour alcoholic beverages are served.
  - Adds the term *Substantial food offerings sufficient to constitute a meal* - shall mean two or more entrée options and at least two or more side options set forth on a printed menu and made readily available for selection and purchase by at least thirty persons at any one time whenever alcoholic beverages are actively being served, or compliance with any minimum food requirements imposed by other State or local licensing authorities in order to obtain a health or food permit. An entrée may consist of a wide variety of food items but many not consist solely of sealed prepacked food items.
  - provides the licensees must maintain minimum requirements to hold and operate a license including but not limited to seating, square footage, food, rooms and health and sanitation permits.
- It would ensure minimum requirements are being met by licensees and permit the PLCB Bureau of Licensing upon inspection and declared deficiency to administratively suspend a license for 10 days.
  - The Bureau of Licensing is authorized to conduct inspections to assess whether licensees are maintaining the minimum requirements based on complaints made by the public, on the initiative of the Bureau of Licensing or upon notification by the enforcement bureau or a county or municipal public health and safety official as to a potential deficiency. If the Bureau of Licensing, determines that a license no longer meets the minimum requirements the Bureau shall administratively suspend the license for a period of at least 10 days pending the outcome of an administrative hearing, which may result in imposition of further penalties.
- The bill imposes additional fines and requires corrective action by licensee to maintain minimum standards. If the licensee is in violation of meeting minimum standards a second time within a year they face additional fines and revocation of their license.
  - Following issuance of deficiency, the matter is scheduled for an administrative hearing before a board hearing examiner within 10 days. The Bureau of Licensing

shall have the burden of presenting evidence to support administratively suspending the license.

- First offense for failing to maintain the minimum requirements for licensure is two thousand dollars (\$2,000) and a suspension of at least 30 days.
- Upon a second failure to maintain the minimum requirements for licensure within a 12-month period, the board shall impose a fine of \$4,000 and either further suspend for a period of 60 days or permanently revoke the license.
- The license may file an appeal of the board's decision within 30 days to Commonwealth Court which shall apply an appellate standard of review.
- If a notice of deficiency letter has been issued, the licensee may elect to waive the right to a hearing and obtain immediate authority to operate by demonstrating that any issues of noncompliance have been corrected and paying a fine of \$2000. If the licensee fails to maintain the minimum requirements for licensure a second time within 12 months, they would be required to pay a \$4000 fine and agree to enter into a conditional license agreement (CLA) which would require the license to immediately place the licensee's license into safekeeping to be transferred to a bona fide third-party purchaser.
- The conditional licensing agreement under this subsection, if not violated, shall **automatically expire** twelve months from the date of execution. The waiver process does not apply where a licensee's license has been administratively suspended by the Bureau of Licensing for a second time within the same 12-month period.
- Creates a routine inspection schedule for any licensee whose license has been administratively suspended through the Compliance Program but has subsequently regained operating authority. These inspections shall continue for a period of 12 months following the most recent administrative suspension period.

#### **Streamline the Citation Process -**

- Permits the Board to contract with up to 7 hearing examiners (currently there are five).
- Eliminates the Notice of Violation requirement to allow the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement to immediately cite a licensee upon a liquor enforcement officer finding a violation.
- Imposes a time constraint on the issuance of adjudications for all violations of the Liquor Code, to ensure that penalties are aligned with the violation and may be considered when the Board reviews license renewals.
  - Upon receiving notification of citation, licensees shall appear before an administrative law judge, not less than 10 nor more than 60 days from the date the citation was sent to licensee. Continuance requests may be considered and granted by an administrative law judge upon reasonable cause being shown if a continuance request is granted, the matter shall be rescheduled as soon as reasonably practicable. Once a hearing has been held, the administrative law judge shall issue an adjudication and order no more than 6 months after the date of the hearing.

#### **Inform the Process for License Renewal with Other Citations and Information -**

- Allows any citations or violations issued by police departments, department of public health or department of licenses and inspections be forwarded to the BLCE/PLCB to be considered in the judicial process.

#### **Increase Penalties and Fines for All Citations:**

- Increases the penalties and fines for all citations.
  - Non-enhanced violations would range from \$250-2,000 - currently \$50-1,000. These violations include: discounting alcohol practices, tap system cleanings, inducements etc. )
  - Enhanced violations (ex. sales to minors, visibly intoxicated persons (VIP's) would range from \$2,000-10,000 - currently \$1,000-5,000
  - violations of sales to minors or VIPS but in compliance with RAMP and preceding violations for 4 years would range from \$250-2,000 - currently \$50-1,000

**Remove De Novo Review from Common Pleas Court:**

- Removes the de novo review of the court of common pleas from the appeals process to allow an appeal of the Boards decision (in both licensing and enforcement matters) to go directly to the Commonwealth Court under the appellate error of law/abuse of discretion standard.
- Currently appeals are made to Court of Common Pleas in the county which the proposed premise is located.

**Require the Payment of City Taxes and Fully Adjudicated City Fines Before a Liquor License May be Received or Renewed:-**

- Expands the Liquor Code to require local tax clearances for licensure and renewal of a license.
- Requires local tax authorities to share tax clearance information with the PLCB for purposes of determining eligibility for licensure and renewal.
  - Amends Section 470 & 477 related to Renewal of Licenses

**Effective Date:**

This act shall take effect in 60 days.

**G. Relevant Existing Laws**

The Stop-and-Go Legislative Task Force, as provided for by Act 49 of 2023, was tasked with examining the issues related to stop-and-gos and recommending solutions. The report and recommendations were released on October 2, 2024. The recommendations were made by the task force after extensive review of current law, the convening of hearings to receive input from the public and other elected officials, tours of stop-and-go establishments, and the integral work provided by the task force workgroup. [Stop & Go Legislative Task Force Recommendations](#)

PLCB Compliance Program as provided for by Act 44 of 2017 (Fiscal Code) allows the PLCB to immediately take away a licensed establishment's ability to sell or serve alcohol when PLCB analysts find that a licensee doesn't meet requirements in law or regulation related to seating, food, square footage, rooms and health license authority. [Licensee Compliance Program](#)

Section 464 of the Liquor Code - Appeals to the PLCB's decision on license renewals and under the compliance program are made to the Court of Common Pleas which applies a de nova standard of review, treating the case as if it had never been heard before.

**E. Prior Session (Previous Bill Numbers & House/Senate Votes)**

n/a

This document is a summary of proposed legislation and is prepared only as general information for use by the Democratic Members and Staff of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. The document does not represent the legislative intent of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and may not be utilized as such.

