

# Tasracing Integrity Unit

Prospect Government Offices, 171 Westbury Road, PROSPECT TAS 7250 - PO Box 1329 LAUNCESTON TAS 7250

Telephone: (03) 6777 1900 Email: [stewards@tasracingintegrity.com.au](mailto:stewards@tasracingintegrity.com.au)

## STEWARDS DECISION

TASRACING INTEGRITY UNIT

and

GLENN STEVENSON

Date of Decision: 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2025

Stewards Panel: Mr M Castillo (Chair), Mr N Finnigan, Mr R Brown and  
Miss E Morice-Smith

Respondent: Mr Glenn Stevenson

Rule: Australian Rules of Racing AR240(2)

AR 240 Prohibited substance in a sample taken from a horse at a race meeting

*(2) Subject to subrule (3), if a horse is brought to a racecourse for the purpose of participating in a race and a prohibited substance on Prohibited List A and/or Prohibited List B is detected in a sample taken from the horse prior to or following its running in any race, the trainer and any other person who was in charge of the horse at any relevant time breaches these Australian Rules.*

Charge: Mr Glenn Stevenson, the trainer of FIRST ACCUSED, presented that horse to compete in Race 8 at the Tasmanian Racing Club on Sunday 11<sup>th</sup> February 2024, when a post-race blood sample taken from the gelding revealed the presence of a prohibited substance, namely, TRIAMCINOLONE ACETONIDE, a synthetic corticosteroid.

Plea: Guilty

## 1. Background

- (a) The respondent, Glenn Stevenson, is an Open Permit licensed trainer under the Australian Rules of Racing.
- (b) Mr Stevenson is 57 years of age and has held a trainer's licence for 24 years.
- (c) FIRST ACCUSED was correctly entered for and presented to race in Race 8 at the Tasmanian Racing Club's meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February 2024.
- (d) FIRST ACCUSED placed 2<sup>nd</sup> in the event earning \$22,500 in stake money.
- (e) FIRST ACCUSED started second favourite, with a starting price of \$5.00.
- (f) FIRST ACCUSED was subjected to post-race swabbing, where a blood sample was taken. The procedure was witnessed by Office of Racing Integrity Steward Miss Brittany Hine and the sampling process was witnessed by Miss Grace Stalker. The sampling process was not contested.
- (g) The collection of the sample was concluded at 4:48pm, with the sample being allocated the unique number V686902.
- (h) On the 18<sup>th</sup> of March 2024, Racing Analytical Services Limited (RASL) issued a Certificate of Analysis reporting that the prohibited substance TRIAMCINOLONE ACETONIDE had been detected in sample V686902, taken from FIRST ACCUSED on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February 2024.
- (i) RASL advised the reserve portion of the sample had been forwarded to the Australian Racing Forensic Laboratory in New South Wales for referee analysis.
- (j) Office of Racing Integrity Stewards presented the initial results to Mr Stevenson at his racing facility at Wesley Vale to advise him of the irregularity.
- (k) The outcome of the reserve sample was provided by the Australian Racing Forensic Laboratory on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April 2024. The Report confirmed TRIAMCINOLONE ACETONIDE had been detected in sample V686902.
- (l) Mr Stevenson had previously breached the prohibited substance rules in December 2017.
- (m) Mr Steveson was contacted by Tasracing Integrity Stewards in March 2025, regarding upcoming inquiry into the Laboratory's findings.

## 2. Submissions of the Respondent

- 2.1 When asked to explain the irregularity, Mr Stevenson submitted that FIRST ACCUSED was treated for soreness by Dr Andrea Boland of Nara Equine Veterinary Services, by way of administering, via injection, 6mg of TRIAMCINOLONE ACETATE into both medial femoropatellar joint spaces of FRIST ACCUSED's stifles.
- 2.2 The above claim was supported by a document signed by Dr Boland.
- 2.3 Stevenson stated that he was advised that an eight-day withholding period should be given before returning to racing.
- 2.4 Mr Stevenson stated that he had acted on the Veterinary advice and consequently did not start FIRST ACCUSED for 11 days after the treatment.

## 3. Penalty Considerations

### 3.1 Principles

- 3.1.1 Penalties are designed to punish the offender for their wrongdoing. Penalties are not meant to be retributive in the sense that the punishment is disproportionate to the offence, but nonetheless, the offender must be met with a punishment.
- 3.1.2 Penalties imposed upon those offending the prohibited substance rules should reflect the industry's disapproval of drugs being detected in horses.

### 3.2 Stewards Approach

- 3.2.1 The Stewards have resolved to approach the matter of penalty from the perspective of the desirability of consistency with previous penalties in dealing with similar offenders committing similar offences in similar circumstances.
- 3.2.2 We are guided in our approach to penalty by those imposed, not only in Tasmania but also within other Australian jurisdictions.
- 3.2.3 With respect to this matter, Stewards have adopted a \$6000 fine as a starting point. This is consistent with penalties handed down for similar breaches Australia-wide.
- 3.2.4 With all cases, even though they may on the surface seem similar, they all need to be assessed on an individual basis with the consideration of all circumstances.

#### 4. Respondents Penalty Submissions

- 4.1 Mr Stevenson submitted that in considering penalty, Stewards should consider his honesty and cooperation when dealing with the matter.
- 4.2 Mr Stevenson submitted that his involvement in the industry stretches for a significant period and with a large number of horses having been subjected to testing, with no irregularities over the past 7 years.
- 4.3 Mr Stevenson submitted the swab irregularity was brought about through the need for Veterinary care for a horse under his supervision, and his subsequent actions were based on the advice of Veterinary Surgeon Dr Andrea Boland.

#### Penalty Discussion:

- 4.4 The Prohibited Substance Rules impose an absolute obligation on trainers to ensure that they present their runners free of prohibited substances.
- 4.5 In consequence, trainers must take all reasonable steps and must take proper care, always, to avoid presenting a horse that could give rise to an adverse test result.
- 4.6 Resultantly, where there is a breach of the drug rules, trainers must expect substantial penalties, because every time a racing animal is presented to race with a prohibitive substance in its metabolism, then the integrity of not only, as in this case, Thoroughbred Racing, but racing, in general, is compromised.
- 4.7 In this matter we approach the imposition of penalty on the basis that the cause of the findings was not intentional. However, the onus under AR 240(2) is on the trainer to present a horse free of any prohibited substance, the rule is absolute. Hence, the respondent's admission of the breach.
- 4.8 In fixing penalties, we have regard to the need to uphold the integrity of racing, not only in Thoroughbred Racing but in all codes of racing. Penalty precedents have long been at the forefront of disciplinary decision-making, albeit with each case being decided on its own merits. It is wrong to suggest otherwise. Accordingly, the penalty that is imposed upon the respondent must be at a level that protects the public by encouraging the highest of standards of professional behaviour and that the respondent is dealt with in a fair and just manner.

## 5. Factors in consideration of penalty.

In determining the appropriate penalty, the Stewards recognise the following factors:

- 5.1 Mr Stevenson has admitted to a charge of presenting FIRST ACCUSED to race with the prohibited substance TRIAMCINOLONE ACETATE in its system.
- 5.2 Stewards believe it to be most probable that Mr Stevenson did not intentionally present FIRST ACCUSED to race with the prohibited substance TRIAMCINOLONE ACETATE in its system.
- 5.3 However, every time a horse is presented to race with a prohibitive substance in its metabolism then the integrity of not only Thoroughbred Racing, but racing in general, is compromised.
- 5.4 The Stewards have identified no aggravating factors that would necessitate an increase from the starting point, but it was noted by the stewards that Mr Stevenson has offended under this rule within the last ten years.

## 6. Outcome

Mr Stevenson is to be fined pursuant to the Australian Rules of Racing AR 240(2). The particulars of the fine being one of \$6000, with Stewards directing that \$3000 of the fine be suspended for a period of 24 months, pending another breach AR240(2) of the Australian Rules of Racing

## 7. Disqualification Of Horse

It is mandatory under the Australian Rules of Racing that if a horse competes in a race, and is found to have competed with a prohibited substance in its system, it must be disqualified from that race.

AR240(1) reads ....

*Subject to subrule (3), if a horse is brought to a racecourse and a prohibited substance on Prohibited List A and/or Prohibited List B is detected in a sample taken from the horse prior to or following its running in any race, the horse must be disqualified from any race in which it started on that day.*

Consequently, the placings for Race 8 at the Tasmanian Race Club's meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February 2024 are to be adjusted to reflect the disqualification of FIRST ACCUSED.

**Decision Date:** 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2025