



# City of Milwaukee

City Hall  
200 East Wells Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53202

## Meeting Minutes

### LICENSES COMMITTEE

**ALD. JOCASTA ZAMARRIPA, CHAIR**  
**Ald. Lamont Westmoreland, VICE-CHAIR**  
**Ald. Scott P. Spiker, Ald. Andrea M. Pratt, and Ald. Peter Burgelis**

**Staff Assistant, Yadira Melendez, 414-286-2775**  
**Fax: 414-286-3456, [Yadira.Melendez@milwaukee.gov](mailto:Yadira.Melendez@milwaukee.gov)**  
**Legislative Liaison, Jeffrey Osterman, 414-286-2262, [joster@milwaukee.gov](mailto:joster@milwaukee.gov)**

---

Friday, January 31, 2025

9:00 AM

Room 301-B, Third Floor, City Hall

---

### Special

*The meeting was called to order at 9:20 am*

**Present** 5 - Jackson, Zamarripa, Burgelis, Spiker, Westmoreland

1. [240903](#) Motion relating to the revocation of the Extended Hours, Filling Station, Food Dealer and Weights & Measures licenses of Gurinder Nagra, agent for "4295 N Teutonia Ave Inc" for the premises located at 4295 N Teutonia Ave doing business as Teutonia Gas and Food in the 1st aldermanic district, following reversal of previous revocation by the Milwaukee Circuit Court.

**Sponsors:** THE CHAIR

*The applicant was present and Atty. Emil Obviagele appeared on his behalf.*

*The police report was read.*

*Atty. Obviagele said that the summons that he received are primarily about the shooting that took place in August 16, 2023 and that there was a revocation hearing prior and that his client did not have the chance to present a comprehensive plan in terms of what he intended to do address the safety concerns. He added that one of the things that they are willing to offer today is to close at midnight in the summer months and at 2am the rest of the year to remove the congregations aspect going forward. He said that in addition his client is ready to hire licensed and bonded security guard from 9pm to close time.*

*Individuals also present:*

*Ald. Spiker asked regarding the June 22 incident report who called the police because the nuisance designation references the shots fired and that no employee on duty called.*

*Atty. Obviagele said that he was under the impression that they made the call but he knows that they employee made the attempt and that when MPD showed up, they were very cooperative.*

*Ald. Spiker read for the record the third paragraph of the PA33 dated 9/19/2023 and*

asked if employees are not instructed to call the police and what is the protocol when shots are fired.

Atty. Obviagele said that they disputed that police report that the employee did not call and that he is under the impression that they have always worked with the police on this issue to have it rectified. He said that he believes that for the 8/16 incident; the employee made the call and that is not the overall practice.

Mr. Nagra said that he tells his employees to call the police always.

Ald. Spiker said that it seems to be that the person involved on the June 22 incident is the same as the one on August 16.

Atty. Obviagele said that it is unclear because the police report has not been released to them because the shooter is being prosecuted and that he was supposed be sentenced around January 23 but it was postponed to February. He added that is why Atty. Gresham and he agreed to be here today with the idea that there was going to be a resolution for that case.

Ald. Burgelis asked the applicant if the person was an employee and happened to be at the store when he was not supposed to be there or if he was not employed at the moment.

The applicant said that he was an employee but he was not on the clock at the time of the incident.

Ald. Pratt, the local alderperson was sworn in. She did not have any questions at the moment.

Ald. Westmoreland said that it seems that the employee was not working at the time. The applicant said that the employee was not working at the moment but he was waiting for his medical transportation.

Ald. Westmoreland at what time Mr. Pinkin finished working.

The applicant said that at midnight.

Ald. Westmoreland asked at what time was the shooting.

The applicant said at 6am

Ald. Westmoreland asked what Mr. Pinkin was doing at 6am when he was finished at midnight and he was not employed as a security but just to clean.

The applicant said that he was waiting to be picked up by DaVita.

Atty. Obviagele said that his client explained that Mr. Pinkin was a 55 years old man who approached the business saying that he lived in the community, that he needed a job and that he started to work there helping with the language barrier, cleaning up and monitoring around. He added that Mr. Pinkin was receiving services from DaVita and that he arranged to be picked up at the gas station. Atty. Obviagele also said that as described on the police report, Mr. Pinkin was sitting down at the back of the store and that is not where security normally sits.

Ald. Westmoreland asked for a clarification of Mr. Pinkin's duties

Atty. Obviagele said that he was hired to clean up and that there is an element of security with every job at the gas station but that he was not hired as one and that his primary obligation was to clean up the premises.

Ald. Westmoreland asked if he was armed.

The applicant said that he did not know that Mr. Pinkin was armed.

Ald. Spiker asked regarding the June 22, 2023 incident why Mr. Pinkin stepped out as the security guard and confronted the guys trying to steal the bag of chips.

Atty. Obviagele said that Mr. Pinkin was not hired as a security guard but that he was providing security services but not in the traditional sense. He added that he was supposed to clean up, make his rounds to make sure that the store was clean.

Ald. Spiker said that the applicant needed to make sure to take the proper steps if things were going in the direction of needing a professional security guard (according to the police report) because as a business owner he also wants to make sure that no one steps in like one as happened with this employee who was not hired as one. He added that no steps were taken to secure the safety.

Atty. Obviagele said his client do not carry nor allows his employees to carry guns, that his client has operated this gas station since 2000 and this happened when there was a rise of crime in the city and that on 2022 and 2023 we were dealing with crime issues at many other businesses and that this incident was nothing that anyone could have anticipated.

Ald. Spiker said that his question was about having someone more professional taking care of the security as they are offering right now or talk about the hours. He asked what steps were taken after the June 22 incident.

Atty. Obviagele said he does not have any evidence of any counseling done with Mr. Pinkin after that incident but that his client did not have the chance to put up a comprehensive plan after the 8/16/23 incident. He added that somethings have to be done and put in place and that one of the things that he is also recommending is to reach out to MPD and have them to install one its monitoring cameras so they can see what happens in real time.

Ald. Spiker said that Atty. Obviagele is talking about the steps that they are willing to take now to mitigate the risk but that unfortunately those steps were not taken in place back in June, 2023 when the previous nuisance designation was in March, 2023.

Atty. Obviagele said that there was a nuisance designation in March, 2023 and that a plan was put together in collaboration with MPD which his client completed and passed in May, 2023.

Ald. Zamarripa asked what plan was put in place after June 22, 2023 to protect his business and employees and that she heard Ald. Spiker asking the same

The applicant said that he instructed Mr. Pinkin not to go after someone for a bag of chips and to put their lives in danger. He added that he does not know why a person from the same community shuts another one.

Ald. Zamarripa asked if he is talking about Mr. Pinkin because he was there as an employee.

The applicant said that Mr. Pinkin was the one on the incident.

All people offering testimony were sworn in at the same time.

The revoking party:

Natalie Easter Allen – 4345 N 24th Pl – said that Mr. Pinkin was the security guard on the June incident per police report. She added that at the last renewal, Mr. Nagra was supposed to change the hours, update the surveillance system and to hire a security guard. She said that if the applicant would have hired a professional guard, her son would have been here. She said that she does not believe him because he said the same thing before and that her son had to pay a price. She added that she has lived across the street since 1973 and that she can see where her son was murdered from her window. She also said that since the gas station is closed, the neighborhood is peaceful, that no police have come ever since, no reckless driving and no one is getting robbed.

Ald. Spiker asked if there was an amendment on record to check what Mrs. Easter Allen just testified that happened at the renewal hearing.

Mrs. Lopez said that there is note in the committee tab that from April 2023 that says that there was an amendment to have a security guard during the hours of operation and that the application was approved with a warning letter as amended.

Ald. Spiker said that not having security guard would be a plan of violation as the application was amended.

Steven E. Pryor – 2225 W Olive St – he said that he has been a resident of the community for 54 years and that what he saw that day was the most ruthless in the last 35 years. He said that he was there before the police arrived, that the kid was bleeding from the head while the clerks were still taking customers. He said that he asked the tenant 4 times to call the police and that he told the police that the security guard lived across the street when he came back after 1pm. He also said that there was a person applying for a liquor license on 27th St and that with two objections and was

denied, he said that he does not want these people in his neighborhood because they are trying to clean the neighborhood. He said that he asked the clerks to call the police 4 times and to shut the store down and that he was the one who closed the store not the clerks.

Mrs. Easter 1858 N Commerce St – she said that she moved in 1971 and she moved out in 2019. She said that her grandkids and children went to the gas station when it was owned by a man who was respectful to the neighborhood. She added that there was no trouble, no shootings, no robberies and that things changed when this owner came and started to disrespect the community and were treated like if they were not human beings. She said that the gas station has going down hill because people are not respected and that if what happens at this gas station would have happened in Franklin, the gas station would be shut down in minutes. She added that at the previous hearing, Mr. Nagra said that his employees have to notify him before calling the police and that he admitted before the committee that he was not notified. She said that she understands that Mr. Nagra hired Mr. Pinkin to give him a second chance but that he should be responsible for what his employees do and that his employee was carrying a gun and the owner must be held accountable because he did not run a background check.

Mr. Moore – 901 W Winnebago – said that he lived in the community for 50 years, that he is working in the community to establish the culture from when he grew up and that this business from the time that the applicant took ownership has failed in responsibility and to the community and continued to endanger the community. He explained that since this business is closed and the revocation of the license from Hot Spot, the community has found peace, that you see people walking again, you do not hear gun shots and that you do not see people there because there is no place to hang out any more. He added that Mr. Pinkin was a convicted murderer and he was hired as a security guard in a gas station and to him was like putting a pedophile in a daycare. He also said that the police did their job, that they put up a nuisance, the community and people outside the community have spoken, that they collected more than 10,000 signatures demanding that this business be revoked. He said that the City needs a break from these businesses that go around the law for their profit. He asked the committee to give them an opportunity to live, to reestablish the culture of black people coming to this area to start a better life.

Ald. Spiker asked Mr. Moore to elaborate more on the congregation that happened before the gas station was shutdown.

Mr. Moore said that there were drug dealers, boys that wanted to rob the drug dealers, the robbers and that an employee who worked at the gas station stayed in the building and knew who were the robbers. He added that he has been an organizer in the community for 29 years and that he knows what is going on.

Atty. Obviagele objected on the basis of speculation.

The chair noted the objection.

Mr. Moore said that from 18th to 29th and from Roosevelt to Hope it has been peaceful since the gas station closed and the Hot Spot licenses were taken away.

Atty. Obviagele asked Mr. Moore what he thinks that could have been done to prevent this incident from happening.

Mr. Moore said that if the applicant would have put in place the amendment he agreed to follow at the previous renewal hearing, his family would not be mourning the loss of his nephew.

Ald. Burgelis said that there was a commitment prior the incident to have a security guard during the hours of operation so he asked the applicant what he did to have a security guard during the hours of operation and who was on duty to fulfill that obligation with the plan of operations.

Mr. Nagra said that in August they were closed from 2am to 5am.

Ald. Burgelis pointed out that the plan of operation states to have a security guard

during the hours of operations and that he was open at the time of the shooting and it is clear that it was not Mr. Pinkin because he was not in the clock. He asked who was protecting the building at the moment other than the store clerk.

The applicant answered "no"

Ald. Burgelis said that he just wanted to confirm that there was a plan of operations that was not followed up and that the result was very tragic.

Atty. Obviagele called the police officers to testify.

Officer Klein – District 5 – answering Atty. Obviagele's questions he said that he was one of the officers dispatched on 8/16/2023, that he was there few times before, that this was one of the hot spots at the time, that he cannot attribute the problems in the area to the gas station, that it is his belief that the clerk of the gas station called MPD, that during the investigations he was not able to determine that Mr. Pinkin had a reason to be at the gas station at the time, that he had no prior interaction with the gas station, that he was not involved in the investigation of June 22 and that he has not worked as a community liaison police officer and that based on his experience, he believes that the gas station could have nothing to prevent Mr. Pinkin from committing the murder.

Officer Klein responded Ald. Zamarripa questions as follows: He was not the first on the scene, that he did not see any signs if the store was open or close, that he saw the victim on the ground and that he tried everything they could to save his life.

Ald. Burgelis asked if it is common for residents to carry guns in that neighborhood for self protection.

Officer Klein answered "yes" and answering to his other question said that other business have surveillance cameras and good lights as security measures and some gas stations have security on duty while other don't and that sometimes the security starts at 6am.

Officer Klein said that the gas stations cameras were working and that he believes that the entire scene was caught answering Atty. Obviagele's questions.

Officer Parks – District 6 – answering to Atty. Obviagele's questions said that he is not familiar with the business, that he was there only the day of the incident and that they were dispatched to support and that he did not participate in the investigation.

Officer Cabral – District 5 – answering to Atty. Obviagele's questions said that he was one of the initial responders until the investigation team arrived, that he has 18 years of service and that he is not familiar with the business.

The police officers were released after Atty. Obviagele had no further questions.

Ald. Burgelis asked the applicant if he was aware of or if he had any indication that Mr. Pinkin had a firearm in the store.

The applicant said that he had no indication of Mr. Pinkin having a weapon in the premises

Ald. Westmoreland asked the applicant if he knew where Mr. Pinkin lived.

The applicant said that he did not know and that he had a friend selling bbq across the street who lives there.

Ald. Westmoreland asked when Mr. Pinkin was hired.

The applicant said June 2023.

Ald. Pratt said that she has no recommendation and that she will leave it up to committee. That this is also her neighborhood and that she sees this location every time she leaves home. She added that she received several complaints about this business and the bbq stand, that the plan at the renewal in April 2023 was to mitigate the issues and that is why the amendment was made on the table in front of the committee because the applicant said that he had a security guard in a vehicle parked outside.

Ald. Spiker asked Ald. Pratt what is her experience after the gas station was shut down since she drives around the premises everyday.

Ald. Pratt said that there is no congregation anymore and that community groups and

partnerships are working to improve the area which is composed of two neighborhoods. Ald. Buregis asked Ald. Pratt if it is common to have nuisance properties at her district.

Ald. Pratt said that is not common.

Atty. Obviagele asked his client what he is trying to do to mitigate the problem moving forward if he is given the chance to get the license back.

The applicant said that he will be open until to 12am during the summer months and at to 2am the rest of the year and that he will have a security guard from 9pm to close time. He also said that he was caught out of guard when he made the amendment at the table to have the security guard at all times, because he did not know the cost and he cannot afford it.

Atty. Obviagele said that no business can afford licensed and bonded security 24hr/day under the market conditions and that the amendment that the applicant accepted was not feasible and that those changes on the table does not lead the clarity.

Ald. Zamarripa said that his client was asked if he wanted to make the amendment and he accepted and that she does not know understand how all of the sudden he has problems with that procedure.

Mrs. Lopez read the minutes from the April 25, 2023 hearing and that the applicant said that he had a security guard in a parked vehicle and he was asked to add it to the plan.

Ald. Zamarripa asked Atty. Obviagele if he represented his client on that hearing.

Atty. Obviagele said that it was his partner Atty. Samatha Huddleston but what was proposed and accepted was no feasible and that there was no a timeline to implement it.

Ald. Pratt said that what was amended was because the applicant said that he had the security in place and nor because she asked for.

The applicant said that he got confused and that he thought that was what he was required to do.

Ald. Zamarripa said that they are contradicting with the counsel opening remarks about safety measures.

Ald. Westmoreland asked if there was an attempt to reach out Ald. Pratt to inform her that he could not do it or afford to have security during the hours of operations after the April's hearing.

The applicant said that he reached out to Ald. Pratt 3/4 days later but that he does not know where it ended.

Ald. Westmoreland asked if closing earlier would have made security affordable because it was necessary.

Atty. Obviagele said that when tragedy strikes it is always easy to point fingers and some instances to police department for to being funded and that we have people suffering from actions or inactions. He added that his client started operations 20 years ago, that nothing changed on the plan of operations, and that what happened was a premediated crime that could happened everywhere. He also said that his client gave a second chance to a person and that Mr. Pinkin failed. He also explained that behind business are lives in the same way as the affected families. He said that his client has been closed for more than 400 days, that is paying rent and that closing the business is not the answer. He also said that what the family is calling for a deeper change and 20 years with no disciplinary actions all the way to a revocation with no income and fulfilling obligations has been a severe punishment. He added that the police officers who testified said that they did not see a problem with the store and that there are other businesses that have been in worse situations and have not been revoked. He mentioned that the facility has been affected with substantial damages and that they are asking for a chance.

Ald. Spiker said that things have been complicated, that the applicant testified that he

*had security and that he was asked to get the record straight, and this is business as usual because they are trying to make the record reflect reality. He added that it was not a misunderstanding and that what is concerning to him is given the pattern of armed robbery, of issues testified by the residents and the alderperson a security was needed prior August 16 and that was not supplied. He said that instead someone was playing a roll of primarily cleaning and on the side protecting the place but that it was not the proper reaction when guns are involved. He said that in addition, if someone was threatened with a weapon, you have to take it very seriously and the fact that was no action taken, it is not a great surprise that someone would get armed and a disaster happened. He said that with the gas station operating, there was a clear threat to health, safety and welfare and that based on the testimony heard today, he does not think that it would have been corrected prior the June 22 robbery.*

*Ald. Spiker moved revocation of the Extended Hours Establishments, Filling Station, Food Dealer and Weights & Measures based upon the preponderance of the evidence in the police report, neighborhood, MPD, aldermanic, applicant and counsel testimony that demonstrates the operation would result in a threat to the health, safety and welfare of the public specially relating to guns fired in the premises, loitering, the illegal drug activity, problematic area, parcel and failure to comply with the approved plan of operations. There were no objections. (Prevailed 5-0)*

**RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL**

**Aye** 5 - Jackson, Zamarripa, Burgelis, Spiker, and Westmoreland

**No** 0

*The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm*

*Yadira Melendez  
Staff Assistant*

*This meeting can be viewed in its entirety through the City's Legislative Research Center at <http://milwaukee.legistar.com/calendar>.*