NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

Crime and Justice Statistics

Bureau Brief

Issue paper no. 43

February 2010

THE NATURE OF ASSAULTS RECORDED ON LICENSED PREMISES

Jacqueline Fitzgerald, Amanda Mason and Chloe Borzycki

Nearly ten percent of assaults recorded by police in NSW occur on licensed premises. This paper considers where these incidents occur in relation to the licensed premises and who is involved. In a sample of 352 assault incidents recorded by police in 2007/08, we found 76 percent occurred on the licensed premise; either inside a building on the premises (57%) or on an outdoor location within the grounds of the premises such as in the beer garden or carpark (19%). Another 21 percent of incidents were indirectly linked to the premises; occurring near the premise (such as on the footpath) and involving either premises staff, patrons or people refused entry. Three percent of assaults recorded as occurring on licensed premises could not be clearly connected to the premises. Patrons committed the majority of assaults (57%) followed by evicted patrons (15%), security and other staff (12%) and people refused entry to the premises (5%). Most victims were also patrons (62%) followed by security guards and other staff (22%), evicted patrons (6%) and police (5%).

INTRODUCTION

In March 2008 the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOCSAR) published a ranked list of the top 100 licensed premises for assaults in New South Wales. The list showed those licensed premises with the highest number of assaults recorded by the NSW Police Force (hereafter, the police) in the previous 12 months. At the time the list was released there was considerable media interest in alcohol related violence and the licensed premises with the highest number of assaults were widely reported. In October 2008 the then NSW Premier Nathan Rees announced that from 1 December 2008 the 48 premises with the most assaults would be subject to trading restrictions. These included 2am lock outs and a prohibition on serving drinks in glass after midnight (trading restrictions are further described in Appendix 1).

Despite the publicity surrounding assaults on licensed premises and the fact that information about assaults on licensed premises now plays an important role in liquor license regulation, little is known about the precise nature of assaults on licensed premises. BOCSAR published an earlier analysis of assaults on licensed premises (Briscoe & Donnelly 2001) but that analysis focussed mainly on the distribution of assaults across licensed premises and rather than providing information on the nature of assaults recorded as having occurred on licensed premises. We do not know, for example:

- What proportion of assaults recorded by police as having happened on licensed premises actually occurred on the grounds of the premises
- What proportion of assaults immediately outside licensed premises involve victims and/or offenders who had been drinking on the premises
- What proportion of assaults immediately outside licensed premises involve individuals refused entry or being evicted from the premises
- What proportion of assaults involve staff of licensed premises, either as victims or offenders

These are important issues, both from the vantage point of public safety and from the vantage point of liquor licensing administration. Also included are five examples of assaults on licensed premises.

Each time a crime incident is recorded by police, the attending officer completes a narrative description of the incident. This narrative is recorded on a police database known as the Computerised Operational Policing System (COPS). The present bulletin presents the results of a detailed analysis of narratives on COPS flagged by police as involving assaults on licensed premises. The purpose of our analysis is to shed light on the questions raised above.

METHOD

This study gathered information through a detailed review of a sample of narratives of assault incidents recorded by police as occurring on licensed premises. We randomly selected a total of 381 incidents occurring between 1 July 2007 and 30 June 2008.[1] To ensure the top 48 premises[2] were well represented we over-sampled these with the result that 98 incidents came from these premises.

In order to give a fuller picture of the incidents we classified the assaults in a number of different ways:

1. **Where the incident occurred**

   Incidents were classified as occurring inside the licensed premises, on an outdoor or exterior part of the premises, on the footpath or street outside the premises or somewhere else not near the premises.

2. **Who was involved in the incident**

   Also recorded was the nature of the victim and offender's connection with the licensed premises. The victim and offender categories included: patrons, evicted patrons, people refused entry to the premises, premise security, other premise staff, police, people unconnected with the premises, other and unknown. These are further described below.

Describing victims and offenders

Parties were recorded as *patrons* if they were on the licensed premises as a customer at the time of, or prior to, the assault. *Patrons* were usually customers of the bar or restaurant facilities in the licensed premises although a small number were using hotel accommodation or sports facilities. No *patron* had been evicted from the licensed premises prior to the assault (these would have been recorded as *evicted patrons*), but some *patrons* had voluntarily left the licensed premises. Customers who voluntarily left the premises and were then refused re-entry are recorded as *patrons* rather than *people refused entry to the premises* in order to reflect their prior connection to the premises.

Evicted patrons were grouped separately since eviction appears to be a trigger for many assaults on licensed premises. This category included people who were evicted and were then involved in an assault (often while being evicted). It does not include people who were evicted *after* the recorded assault. Drunkenness was the primary reason for eviction but some patrons were removed from the premises due to their offensive language, clothing, harassment of other patrons, threatening behaviour or because they were banned from the premises due to past behaviour.

The category of *people refused entry to the premises* relates to people arriving at the premises and attempting to enter. In most cases the assault occurred after the person was refused entry, usually due to intoxication. This group does not include people who had previously been drinking on the premises, left voluntarily and were refused re-entry (*patrons*). In other words *people refused entry to the premises* had not been drinking at the named licensed premises prior to the assault.

All security staff were recorded as *security guards*. *Other staff* includes bar staff, licensees, bar managers, cleaners and restaurant staff.

People *Unconnected to the premises* were either walking past or engaged in another activity near the premises. For instance, the offenders and victims in one incident were buying food near the licensed premises. Another victim was on his way to the premises but had not yet arrived.

The *Other* group includes a taxi driver (the victim) who picked up a patron departing from the premises, a thief who broke into a bottle shop (the offender), a person who jumped out of a van (the offender) and assaulted a security guard and two victims and one offender who only used the carpark of the licensed premises either to park in or to walk through. The narratives make no suggestion that any of the victims or offenders categorised as *other* had been drinking at the premises prior to the assault.

There were two circumstances in which an offender or victim were classified as *unknown*. Firstly, some narratives lacked sufficient detail or clarity to identify the types of people involved. Alternatively, in some instances those involved in the incident could not provide police with any information about the offender. This occurred when the victim didn't see the person who assaulted them or because they were too intoxicated to provide an account. *Unknown* does not necessarily mean that the victims and offenders were unknown to each other.

Assault 1: Patron assaulted patron on the premises

The male victim was with a group of friends at the licensed premises to celebrate a birthday. The birthday group had paid to secure a booth for their use over the course of the evening. Around 12:30am an argument broke out between the birthday group and another group of patrons who had started sitting in the booth. The victim was sitting in the booth when he was punched by a male from the other group. The victim suffered a broken jaw.

A small number of incidents involved several victims or offenders of different types, such as where a patron assaulted another patron and then a staff member. In these cases we prioritised the recording of staff members over patrons.

RESULTS

Where the incidents occurred

Before we consider the results it is important to note that, of the 381 narratives, there were 29 (8% of the original total) which could not be attributed to a location. This was because the narratives were either brief or ambiguous. In some cases the victim refused or was unable to provide the police with information. It was decided to omit these incidents from the analyses. Note that this does not suggest a problem with police record keeping. The narrative records are intended for police internal use and are not obliged to contain information about the precise location of incidents. They are helpful in processes such as the one we are performing, but it is not their main purpose. Table 1 shows where the remaining 352 assault incidents occurred.

Table 1. Where the assault took place in relation to the licensed premises

	Number	*Percentage (%)*
On licensed premises - indoors	201	57.1
On licensed premises - outdoors	67	19.0
On footpath outside premises	62	17.6
Near premises	15	4.3
Not near premises	7	2.0
Total	**352**	**100.0**

Among the incidents that could be ascribed a location, 201 or 57 percent occurred at an indoor location within the licensed premises such as the entrance (18 of the 201), bar, restaurant, pool or games room, toilet, function room or on the dance floor. One assault occurred in a rented hotel room.

Another 67 or 19 percent took place outdoors but within the grounds of the licensed premises such as in the beer garden, car park, drive though bottle shop, at external tables served by the premises, the racecourse or at a music festival.

The remaining 24 percent of incidents occurred somewhere beyond the perimeter of the premises. Within this group, there was a considerable range. Eighteen per cent of all incidents occurred on the footpath outside the premises.[3] Four per cent occurred somewhere near the premises but not on the footpath, such as on the street or across the road. Seven incidents (2%) occurred at a location that was not near the premises.

The four percent of incidents occurring near the licensed premises were not directly out the front but in the vicinity of the licensed premises. These incidents occurred in the following locations near the licensed premises: on the road, across the street, in a park, in a car park (not that of the licensed premises) or outside the address next door to the licensed premises.

Seven of the 352 narratives reviewed (or 2%) contained incidents that did not occur on or near the premises. These incidents occurred either on the street some distance away from the premises (2 incidents), in a police station (2 incidents) or at a private residence (3 incidents).

Who was involved?

A richer picture of assaults on licensed premises can be gathered by considering who was involved. Table 2 shows the victims and offenders involved in the 352 assault incidents included in the narrative review (Appendix 2 contains an expanded version of this table including the raw numbers).

Who were the offenders?

The offenders in most incidents were patrons (57% of all incidents) followed by evicted patrons (15%), security guards and staff (12%) or people refused entry to the premises (5%). In 27 (8%) of incidents the offender/s were unknown. Six offenders had no connection with the premises prior to the assault and these people were mostly passing by when they committed the assault. There was no evidence in the narrative that these people had been drinking on the licensed premises.

Who were the victims?

Most incidents also involved a patron as a victim (62% of all incidents) followed by security guards and other staff (22%), evicted patrons (6%) or police (5%). Two victims had no clear relationship with the premises and the narratives did not indicate that they had been on the premises prior to the incidents. One of these incidents occurred in a food outlet next door to the licensed premises. Another victim was assaulted in the street while walking to the licensed premises.

The relationship between victims and offenders

Half the incidents of assault on licensed premises involved patrons assaulting other patrons (50% of all incidents). Seven percent of incidents involved patrons assaulting security guards, other staff or police. Other scenarios were: evicted patrons assaulting security guards or other staff (11% of incidents), or police (2%). The narratives also indicated that security guards and staff assaulted evicted patrons (4% of incidents), general patrons (4%) or people refused entry to the premises (3%). In nine per cent of assault incidents sampled, either the offender or victim type was unknown.

Assault 2: Patron assaulted patron on the premises

The female victim was dancing on the dance-floor of the licensed premises with a group of friends. At about 1:30am the victim saw a girl she knew from high school (the offender) walking towards her. Both women had apparently previously been in a relationship with the same man. The victim's friends tried to shield the victim from the offender. After several attempts the offender pushed past the victim's friends and punched the victim in the jaw with a closed fist. The victim reported the incident to police the next day. Despite CCTV footage not giving a clear view of the events on the dance-floor the offender was issued a field court attendance notice to appear in court for common assault.

Table 2. Incidents of assault occurring on licensed premises by type of offenders and victims (percentage)

	Offender (%)					
Victim (%)	*Patron*	*Evicted Patron*	*Person refused entry*	*Security / other staff*	*Unknown / Unconnected to premises / other*	*Total*
Patron	50.0	1.4	-	3.7	6.8	61.9
Evicted Patron	0.3	0.6	-	4.3	1.1	6.3
Person refused entry	-	-	-	2.6	-	2.6
Security/ Other staff	4.8	10.8	4.3	1.1	0.6	21.6
Police	1.7	2.3	0.9	-	0.3	5.1
Unknown/ Unconnected to premises / other	0.6	-	0.3	0.3	1.4	2.0
Total	**57.4**	**15.1**	**5.4**	**11.9**	**10.2**	**100.0**

Notes: Some incidents involved multiple victims and/or offenders. Appendix 2 shows the raw numbers for this table

Table 3. Incidents of assault occurring on licensed premises by type of offender and victim (percentage)

		Offender (%)					
Where the incident occurred	*Victim (%)*	*Patron*	*Evicted Patron*	*Person refused entry*	*Security / other staff*	*unknown / unconnected to premises / other*	*Total*
On premises* (n=268)	Patron	59.0	1.5	-	3.4	6.7	70.5
	Evicted Patron	0.4	0.4	-	4.5	0.4	5.6
	Person refused entry	-	-	-	0.4	-	0.4
	Security/ other staff	4.9	9.7	1.5	1.1	0.4	17.5
	Police	2.2	1.5	0.7	-	-	4.5
	unknown/other	0.4	-	0.4	-	0.7	1.5
	Total	**66.8**	**13.1**	**2.6**	**9.3**	**8.2**	**100.0**
On footpath outside premises (n=62)	Patron	12.9	1.6	-	3.2	8.1	25.8
	Evicted Patron	-	1.6	-	3.2	4.8	9.7
	Person refused entry	-	-	-	12.9	-	12.9
	Security/ other staff	6.5	17.7	17.7	-	1.6	43.5
	Police	-	1.6	1.6	-	1.6	4.8
	Unknown	-	-	-	1.6	1.6	3.2
	Total	**19.4**	**22.6**	**19.4**	**21.0**	**17.7**	**100.0**
Near premises (n=15)	Patron	40.0	-	-	13.3	6.7	60.0
	Evicted Patron	-	-	-	6.7	-	6.7
	Security/ other staff	-	6.7	-	6.7	-	13.3
	Police	-	6.7	-	-	-	6.7
	Unconnected to premises	-	-	-	-	13.3	13.3
	Total	**40.0**	**13.3**	**-**	**26.7**	**20.0**	**100.0**
Not near premises (n=7)	Patron	57.1	-	-	-	-	57.1
	Police	-	28.6	-	-	-	28.6
	Other	14.3	-	-	-	-	14.3
	Total	**71.4**	**28.6**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**100.0**

Notes: Some incidents involved multiple victims and/or offenders. Appendix 2 shows the raw numbers for this table.

* *includes incidents occurring on interior and exterior parts of the licensed premises.*

Victims and offenders by location

The nature of assaults recorded on licensed premises differs depending on where they occur. The analysis below compares the people involved in assaults occurring inside and outside the premises.

Table 3 shows the type of victims and offenders involved in assaults by incident location (Appendix 2 contains an expanded version of this table including the raw numbers). Incidents occurring in exterior and interior parts of the licensed premises are combined here.

On licensed premises

Most assaults that occurred within the actual venue (either inside the building or in an exterior location such as a beer garden or carpark) were between patrons (59%). About half of whom knew each other (either directly or indirectly).

Patrons in the process of being evicted were also frequently involved in incidents on the premises either as victims (6% of incidents on premises) or offenders (13% of incidents on premises. A number of evicted patrons reported an assault against them by a security guard (4% of incidents). Most commonly the evicted patron refused to leave the licensed premises when requested and was then forcibly removed by security. In the most serious of these incidents the victims were left with broken bones by over-zealous security guards. In one case, four security guards forcibly removed an intoxicated patron who had refused a request to leave. The patron suffered a broken elbow in the incident. In other cases assaults were minor, resulted in no injury and some police accounts indicated that they were of the belief that the degree of force used by security was probably reasonable.

Patrons being evicted also frequently assaulted security guards, premises staff or police (11% on incidents on premises). It was also not uncommon for a patron who had not been evicted to assault security guards, staff or police (7%). These incidents commonly occurred when patrons were issued with a request or direction from staff or police which they objected to, such as to stop drinking or fighting. In other cases the patron was protesting against the eviction of another person.

On footpath outside premises

Of the 18 per cent of assault incidents occurring on the footpath outside the licensed premises, a third involved people refused entry to the premises (either as a victim or offender). In 19 per cent of incidents on the footpath, a person refused entry assaulted either a security guard, another staff member or police. In 13 per cent of incidents a security guard assaulted someone refused entry to the premises. It was also common for assaults between patrons (13%) and by evicted persons against staff or police (19%) to occur on the footpath.

Two incidents were perpetrated by offenders who had no obvious connection to the premises. One offender walking past the premises threw a beer bottle that hit a uniformed police officer who was on the premises. In another case, without warning, a person walking past the licensed premises assaulted an intoxicated patron who was leaving the premises.

Near the premises

Fifteen (4%) of incidents occurred close to the licensed premises but not on the footpath. Six of these incidents (40%) involved a patron assaulting another patron. In each of these assaults at least one of the patrons was intoxicated. In one case an intoxicated patron was behaving in an obnoxious manner towards other patrons on the licensed premises. When the intoxicated patron left the premises some other patrons followed him and assaulted him.

Three incidents (13%) were recorded as being perpetrated by security against patrons. In one case a security guard broke up a fight between patrons out the front of the licensed premises. A patron involved in the fight was then assaulted by the security guard when leaving. The licensed premises' CCTV supported the victim's account of the incident.

The circumstances of two incidents involving people unconnected with the premises were varied. One victim was assaulted in the street while he was on his way to the premises. The other incident occurred between customers of a food outlet next door to the licensed premises. In none of these cases was there information in the narrative that the victims or offenders had been on the licensed premises prior to the assault.

Not near the premises

In each of the seven incidents that did not occur near the premises either the victim, the offender or both had been drinking at the premises prior to being removed or having left. In each case a certain amount of time had elapsed between leaving the venue and the assault. The assault that was proximately closest to the licensed premises was a domestic assault in which the victim and offender had been drinking together at the licensed premises. The couple left the premises arguing but a physical altercation did not occur until the offender prevented the victim from getting into a taxi about 300 metres from the premises. In another case the victim (a taxi driver) and offender (a patron of the licensed premises) left the premises in separate vehicles at the same time. After driving for a period the two cars stopped at an intersection where a verbal, then physical, altercation occurred. Three other assaults occurred at residential premises after the victims and offenders had left the licensed premises. These were all domestic violence matters. The two other assaults occurred at police stations against police officers. In these two incidents the intoxicated offenders had been removed from the licensed premises and taken to the police station because of their drunkenness and refusal to leave the premises. The victims in both these assaults were police.

Assault 3: Security guard assaulted patron in premises carpark

The male victim and his friend arrived at the premises at 12:20am where they consumed three alcoholic drinks. At about 1:50am the victim's friend was evicted from the premises because he did not comply with dress regulations. Security guards escorted the victim's friend out the rear door towards the venue carpark and the victim followed. Once outside the victim was pushed to the ground by a security guard and kicked in the chest and head. The victim was repeatedly knocked down each time he tried to get up. The victim suffered two broken teeth, a broken nose and a small facial laceration in the assault. The victim was given first aid at the scene by the hotel manager and conveyed home in the venue's courtesy bus. The victim reported the assault to police the next day. Police obtained CCTV footage of the incident which clearly showed the security guard assaulting the victim. The accused was dismissed from his employment and charged with assault.

Assault 4: Person refused entry assaulted police near the premises

An intoxicated male (the offender) arrived at the premises at 3:30am on Sunday morning. The offender was refused entry due to his intoxication. Shortly after security noticed the offender entering the premises through an emergency exit and directed him to leave the premises. The offender kicked the security guard, was evicted and sat on a brick wall outside the premises. The venue called police. A male and female police officer attended speaking first to security and then to the offender. The offender was immediately aggressive towards police standing close to their faces, pointing and gesturing. The offender was warned to desist and a police officer placed their hand on the offender's to remove it from the vicinity of their faces. The offender then pushed the police officer. Police told the offender to leave the vicinity as he had been refused entry. The offender began swearing and abusing the female police officer. When he continued swearing after being asked to stop the male supervising police officer, who had arrived by then, told the offender he was under arrest for offensive language. The offender tried to push the police supervisor but was restrained, taken to the ground and handcuffed. During the restraint the offender suffered lacerations to his forehead from the ground and a piece of glass from the ground became lodged in his cheek. When the accused was later allowed to sit up he immediately kicked both police officers in the legs. The offender was charged with assault.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to answer a number of questions surrounding the nature of assaults recorded by police as having occurred on licensed premises. These were:

- **What proportion of assaults recorded by police as having happened on licensed premises actually occurred on the grounds of the premises?**

  Fifty seven percent of incidents occurred inside the premises and 19 percent in an outdoor area of the premises (such as in the beer-garden or carpark) giving a total of 76 percent.

- **What proportion of assaults immediately outside licensed premises involve victims and/or offenders who had been on the premises?**

  Eighteen percent of incidents occurred on the footpath outside the premises. Of these, 64 percent involved a patron of the premises (including evicted patrons) as either victim or offender.

- **What proportion of assaults immediately outside licensed premises involve individuals refused entry or being evicted from the premises?**

  Sixty three percent of incidents occurring on the footpath outside the premise involved an individual refused entry or evicted from the premises as either the victim or offender. Evicted persons and individuals refused entry each comprised 50 percent of these incidents.

- **What proportion of assaults involve staff of licensed premises, either as victims or offenders?**

  Staff and security guards were victims or offenders in 26 percent of incidents which occurred on the licensed premises and 65 percent of incidents which occurred on the footpath outside the premises.

These data reveal that among incidents of assault recorded as occurring on licensed premises 76 percent were directly related to the premises, having occurred either inside the premises building or on the exterior grounds of the premises. Another 21 percent of incidents occurred in the vicinity of the premises and involved either departing patrons, evicted patrons, premises staff, premises security or people refused entry to the premises; these can be considered to be indirectly related to the premises. This leaves three percent of incidents (11 incidents) which were recorded as occurring on a licensed premise but which were not obviously connected to the premises. These include seven incidents which occurred some distance from the premises after patrons had departed and four incidents which occurred near the premises but which involved both victims and offenders who had no obvious connection to the premises (that is, they were neither patrons or staff).

This analysis shows that assaults which police record as occurring on licensed premises overwhelmingly do have a link to those premises. However, in some cases the link is stronger than in others.[4]

Assault 5: Person refused entry assaulted security guard at premises entrance

At 11:45pm on Saturday night an intoxicated male (the offender) arrived at the licensed premises with a group of friends. The security guard (the victim) at the door allowed the offender's friends into the premises but the offender was refused entry due to his level of intoxication. The offender protested against his refusal and began swearing at the security guard. The offender was asked to move away from the hotel as he was not welcome. The offender was standing facing the victim when he raised his left arm and punched the security guard with a closed fist in the face. The two fell on the ground and the offender continued to punch the security guard until other security staff restrained the offender. Police were called and took the offender into custody. CCTV footage showed the unprovoked assault. The offender was issued a future court attendance notice to appear in court for common assault.

NOTES

1. We originally sampled 400 assault narratives, however, our analysis revealed that 19 of these narratives were considered to be 'doubtful' by police, meaning that the police believe these incidents did not occur. BOCSAR does not generally report 'doubtful' incidents so for consistency these were removed from the analysis. Six of the 19 doubtful incidents occurred on one of the Top 48 premises.
2. The Top 48 licensed premises are the ones subject to the trading restrictions outlined in the Appendix.
3. The narrative review showed that 52% (32 of 62) of incidents occurring on the footpath outside the licensed premises took place near the entrance.
4. The number of violent incidents recorded by police on licensed premises are used by the NSW government to determine whether venues have high levels of violence and, if they do, whether they should be subject to trading restrictions designed to reduce violence. Communities NSW advise that while the police data are the basis for these decisions a review process exists which considers advice from police and submissions from licensees about the appropriateness of classifications.

REFERENCES

First announcement about trading restrictions by Nathan Rees, 30 October 2008 http://www.premier.nsw.gov.au/Newsroom/Articles/2008/October/081030_New_measures_to_get_tough_with_alcohol_related_violence.html accessed 28 September 2009.

Announcement about trading restrictions by Nathan Rees, July 2009 http://www.premier.nsw.gov.au/Newsroom/Articles/2009_Articles/090708_Restrictions_continue_to_curb_alcohol_violence.html accessed 28 September 2009.

Briscoe, S, & Donnelly, N. 2001, 'Assaults on licensed premises in inner-urban areas', *Alcohol Studies Bulletin*, no 2, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Dr Don Weatherburn and Jessie Holmes for each making an extremely valuable contribution to this publication.

APPENDIX 1

Restrictions placed on the Top 48 premises

In October 2008 NSW Premier Nathan Rees announced that from 1 December 2008 licensed premises ranked in the top 48 of the top 100 list would be subject to trading restrictions. In July 2009 the Premier modified the restrictions announcing that from 1 December 2009 there would be three levels of trading restrictions which would still be based on the number of assaults recorded on the premises in a year. The three bands of restrictions were as follows:

Level 1: Premises with 19 or more assaults

- 10 minute time out or the provision of free water and food for 10 minutes every hour after midnight
- Service of alcohol to cease 30 minutes before closing time
- Drinks not served in glass after midnight
- 2am lockout after which patrons cannot enter the premises
- No shots, no doubles, no ready to drink beverages with an alcohol volume of over 5 per cent and no more than four alcoholic drinks per customer per order
- Extra security measures

Level 2: Premises with 12 to 18 assaults

- 10 minute time out or the provision of free water and food for 10 minutes every hour after midnight
- Service of alcohol to cease 30 minutes before closing time
- Drinks not served in glass after midnight

Level 3: Premises with 8 to 11 assaults

- Lower risk premises will be given help by the NSW Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing to strengthen alcohol and security management

APPENDIX 2

Expanded version of Table 2. Incidents of assault occurring on licensed premises by type of offenders and victims

	Offender								
Victim	*Patron*	*Evicted Patron*	*Person refused entry*	*Security guard*	*Other staff*	*Unconnected with premises*	*Other*	*Unknown*	*Total*
Patron	176	5	-	9	4	2	-	22	218
Evicted Patron	1	2	-	15	-	-	1	3	22
Person refused entry	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	9
Security guard	11	21	11	-	-	-	2	-	45
Other staff	6	17	4	-	4	-	-	-	31
Police	6	8	3	-	-	1	-	-	18
Unconnected to premises	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2
Other	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
Unknown	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	5
Total	**202**	**53**	**19**	**34**	**8**	**6**	**3**	**27**	**352**

Note: Some incidents involved multiple victims and/or offenders.

Expanded version of Table 3. Incidents of assault occurring on licensed premises by type of offender and victim

Where the incident occurred	*Victim*	*Offender*								
		Patron	*Evicted Patron*	*Person refused entry*	*Security guard*	*Other staff*	*Unconnected with premises*	*Other*	*Unknown*	*Total*
On premises*	Patron	158	4	-	5	4	1	-	17	189
	Evicted Patron	1	1	-	12	-	-	1	-	15
	Person refused entry	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Security guard	7	13	3	-	-	-	1	-	24
	Other staff	6	13	1	-	3	-	-	-	23
	Police	6	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	12
	Other	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Unknown	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	3
	Total	179	35	7	18	7	2	2	18	268
On footpath outside premises	Patron	8	1	-	2	-	1	-	4	16
	Evicted Patron	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	3	6
	Person refused entry	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	8
	Security guard	4	7	8	-	-	-	1	-	20
	Other staff	-	4	3	-	-	-	-	-	7
	Police	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	3
	Unknown	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
	Total	12	14	12	13	-	2	1	8	62
Near premises	Patron	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	9
	Evicted Patron	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Security guard	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Other staff	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Police	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Unconnected to premises	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2
	Total	6	2	-	3	1	2	-	1	15
Not near premises	Patron	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	Police	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	Other	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Total	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

Note: Some incidents involved multiple victims and/or offenders.

* *includes incidents occurring on interior and exterior parts of the licensed premises.*