

STEWARDS INQUIRY DECISION

Date of Decision: 4 June 2020
Stewards Panel: L Lord (Chair), M Hoyle, H Edgecombe
Name: Mr. Richard Hall
Date: 13 February.2020
Rule no: GAR84A(1); GAR105(4)(i); GAR86(o);
Charge(s): Charge 1 GAR84A(1)

Mr. Hall as the trainer and responsible person for the greyhounds at his registered kennel address, failed to maintain a treatment logbook which contains the treatment records detailing all vaccinations, antiparasitics and medical treatments administered to a greyhound from the time the greyhound enters their care and for a minimum of two years when requested by Stewards at a kennel inspection on the 13th of February 2020

Charge 2 GAR105(4)(i)

Mr. Hall as the trainer and responsible person for the greyhounds at your registered kennel address, failed to notify the controlling body (ORI) that 6 greyhounds had left his care and custody within the prescribed timeframe of three days,

Charge 3 GAR86(o)

Mr. Hall as a licenced greyhound participant misconducted himself in the way he spoke to Stewards at an inspection of his registered kennel address on the 13th of February 2020. Stewards are of the opinion that the foul language used and the way it was directed towards Stewards constitutes misconduct.

Inquiry Decision: Mr. Hall was reprimanded for the breach of GAR84A(1).

Mr. Hall was reprimanded for the breach of GAR105(4)(i).

Mr. Hall was fined \$500.00; of which \$250 was suspended for a period of two years provided there are no further breaches of a similar nature; for the breach of GAR86(o).

FACTS:

Mr. Hall did not produce a satisfactory treatment logbook when requested by Stewards at a kennel inspection on the 13th of February 2020

Mr. Hall failed to lodge with the Controlling Body (ORI) the required notice of greyhounds having left his registered kennel address within the required timeframe of three days,

Mr. Hall used foul language towards Stewards at a kennel inspection on the 13th of February 2020

INQUIRY:

On the 4th of June 2020, Stewards heard evidence from licenced greyhound participant Mr. Richard Hall as to his practices of recording treatment(s) of greyhounds in his care. Mr. Hall stated he was unaware of the requirement for all greyhounds in his care and custody to have treatments recorded, noting that he had maintained records

for racing greyhounds previously. As Mr. Hall stated that he had no greyhounds in work at the kennel inspection of the 13th of February 2020. Mr. Hall was under the impression that he did not need to produce any records for Stewards to inspect.

Stewards heard evidence from Mr. Hall as to his record keeping regarding the transfer of greyhounds to and from his registered kennels.

Stewards heard evidence from Mr. Hall as to his misconduct at a kennel inspection on the 13th of February 2020. Mr. Hall spoke of his remorse for his actions and assured Stewards that he would not act in the same manner at any further kennel inspections.

DECISION:

After taking into consideration that at a previous inspection on 31st of October 2019. Mr. Hall had produced a treatment logbook with reasonable detail, showing an attempt to comply with the rules, and on the occasion of the 13th of February 2020 Mr. Hall was confused by Steward's request, Stewards charged Mr. Hall with the breach of GAR 84A(1).

Mr. Hall was reprimanded for the breach of GAR84A(1) with Stewards noting that this rule applies to all greyhounds in a registered person's care and custody.

Mr. Hall was charged with the breach of GAR105(4)(i) due to the late lodgement of kennel notices. Mr. Hall pleaded guilty to the charge. After taking into consideration that Mr. Hall attempted to rectify the breach by lodging the required notices once notified by Stewards on their inspection of the 13th of February 2020. Mr. Hall was reprimanded for this breach.

Mr. Hall was charged with the breach of GAR86(o) for his misconduct toward Stewards at a kennel inspection on the 13th of February 2020. Mr. Hall pleaded guilty to the charge.

Stewards took into consideration Mr. Hall's guilty plea, his remorse for his actions, his assurances that such an action would not re-occur and the serious nature of such misconduct. After taking all of these factors into consideration, Mr. Hall was fined \$500.00; of which \$250 was suspended for a period of two years provided there are no further breaches of a similar nature.