APPEAL NO. 778

THE RACING PENALTIES APPEAL TRIBUNAL

REASONS FOR DETERMINATION OF MR D MOSSENSON (CHAIRPERSON)

APPELLANT:	**ANTHONY GLENNY**
APPLICATION NO:	**A30/08/778**
PANEL:	**MR D MOSSENSON (CHAIRPERSON)** **MR R NASH (MEMBER)** **MR W CHESNUTT (MEMBER)**
DATE OF HEARING:	**17 AUGUST 2015**
DATE OF DETERMINATION:	**30 SEPTEMBER 2015**

IN THE MATTER OF an appeal by ANTHONY GLENNY against the determination made by Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing on 29 May 2015 imposing an eighteen month disqualification for breach of Greyhound Rule of Racing AR 86(e).

Mr T Percy QC with Mr G Yin, instructed by D G Price & Co, represented Mr A Glenny.

Mr R J Davies QC represented the Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing.

INTRODUCTION

1. On 3 May 2015, Mr Carlos Martins, Racing and Wagering Western Australia ("**RWWA**") Chief Steward Greyhounds, Mr Phil O'Reilly, RWWA Principal Investigator, and Mr Graham O'Dea RWWA Greyhound Steward, attended Lot 6, Gumley Road, Bakers Hill,

under cover of darkness to observe the activities taking place there. This clandestine operation was undertaken at the training property of the appellant Mr Anthony Glenny, a licensed owner / trainer of some 30 years experience in the greyhound racing industry.

2. This stake out on behalf of RWWA took place following the Four Corners television program which addressed the abhorrent practice which had been exposed in various places in the Eastern States where greyhound trainers were using live baits as part of their training regimes. The purpose of the surveillance was to investigate whether live baiting was taking place at Mr Glenny's training track. In the course of the investigation the three officials ventured onto the property to interview Mr Glenny regarding his knowledge of any live baiting activity and to embark on a closer inspection of the facility. During the recorded interview which followed, Mr Glenny readily admitted to the investigators that some trainers had asked him whether they could use his facility to engage in live baiting. I have viewed a copy of the video recording of this interview with Mr Glenny. It is clear that despite having freely acknowledged that he had indeed received requests to carry out live baiting, which he had not acceded to, Mr Glenny steadfastly refused to reveal who had made such requests. This refusal to cooperate occurred despite the repeated entreaties for the names of the trainers in question to be disclosed. Mr Glenny adopted this stance despite it having been made entirely clear to him by the investigators that his obstinacy was a serious matter and he was obliged under the Rules to supply the information. Further, in the course of the interview, Mr Glenny acknowledged that he was prepared to have his licence withdrawn as a consequence of not divulging the names.

3. Mr Glenny's refusal to name the parties who had sought to use his track for live baiting led to him subsequently being charged with refusing to answer questions during an investigation in breach of Greyhound Racing AR86(e). That Rule reads:

> *"A person (including an official) shall be guilty of an offence if the person:*
>
> ....

being an owner, trainer, attendant or a person having official duties in relation to greyhound racing, refuses or fails to attend or to give evidence or produce a document or other thing in relation to an investigation, examination, test or inquiry held pursuant to these Rules when directed to by the Controlling Body, Stewards or the Committee of a club to do so."

The particulars of the charge which was laid against him were:

"... on Sunday the 3rd of May 2015 at your training property in Bakers Hill, you Mr Anthony Glenny being a registered person with RWWA during an investigation, refused when directed by Stewards to disclose the identity of person or persons who made requests of you to undertake live baiting at your premises."

4. During the investigators' visit to the property, it was also discovered that Mr Glenny was using a lure made of thawed chicken carcass. This later was the subject of the second charge of breaching LR86a(1),(2), namely using a lure which was not free of any animal tissue.

5. Three days after the visit, Mr Glenny was contacted by Mr Martins. In the course of the conversation, Mr Glenny stated words to the effect that he was going to go home and shoot all his dogs. This statement became the subject of the final charge of breaching AR86(o), being improper conduct in relation to a greyhound or greyhound racing.

6. Following the stakeout, a Stewards' inquiry was convened on 18 May 2015 to deal with the issues. The inquiry resulted in these three charges being laid. Mr Glenny pleaded guilty to each charge. On 29 May 2015, Mr Glenny was penalised by being disqualified for 18 months in relation to charge 1 and fined $1,500 and $200 respectively in relation to the other two charges. This fairly lengthy period of disqualification was imposed despite Mr Glenny's plea of guilty which had fast tracked the inquiry and the fact that Mr Glenny was acknowledged by the Stewards in their reasons to be a significant contributor to the greyhound industry. Mr Glenny to his credit had participated in greyhound racing virtually from its inception and was more recently on the Greyhound Racing Association

Committee. The Stewards also took into account the fact that Mr Glenny's property had a full sized track and mechanical lure system where breaking in of greyhounds took place both for himself and others. This was one of the few such facilities and services. The Stewards recognised any penalty which impacted on Mr Glenny's ability to continue to undertake those services would have far reaching industry wide implications. In their reasons the Stewards noted, however, that Mr Glenny in the early years had in fact been associated with live baiting practices.

7. On 12 May 2015, a notice of appeal against the harshness of the penalty imposed in relation to the first charge was filed. The other charges were not appealed. In the appellant's written submissions which were produced for the appeal hearing, the five grounds of appeal were summarised under the following headings:

7.1 Manifest excess.

7.2 Manifest excess having regard to previous penalties imposed in other States.

7.3 Failure to consider penalties imposed in other States.

7.4 Dealing with the requirement for a licensed person to report a breach of the rules.

7.5 Failure to answer questions aggravated by the possibility it may implicate appellant.

APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT

8. Mr Percy QC argued the penalty was manifestly excessive having regard to penalties imposed for similar offences in Western Australia bearing in mind the appellant's age, his character, immediate guilty plea, prior record, circumstances of offending and the customary sentences for this offence.

9. It was submitted this was a case of failure to answer questions which might implicate others in offending rather than one in relation to any offending or alleged offending on the part of the appellant himself. Consequently it was further submitted that this placed the

offending conduct into a different category from the other decided cases on this point. In relation to the cases referred to by the Stewards (at paragraph 24 of their reasons) of local offenders, it was argued it was patently clear that each offence had a clear and tangible benefit to be gained by the accused from the offending rather than concerning an investigation into others. For example, *Evans* (Appeal 350), related to the refusal to answer questions in an inquiry into a positive swab in respect of a winning greyhound owned and trained by Mr Evans. Mr Evans had not entered a plea of guilty. His disqualification was halved on appeal to 12 months. It was submitted Mr Evans' case was more serious than Mr Glenny's for a number of reasons including the fact that the failure to answer questions took place in an actual inquiry, rather than at a preliminary stage with investigators. It was conceded that Mr Evans was acting on legal advice which tended to mitigate his conduct. *Gladwin* was a case involving failing to disclose the source of a urine sample which resulted in a disqualification of 6 months. In *Lavin* (Appeal 211), the appellant was convicted both of refusing to provide information and willfully supplying false information to the Stewards. Mr Lavin pleaded not guilty to the refusal charge and was sentenced to 6 months disqualification. *Lindsay* (Appeal 262) concerned the failure to permit the inspection of the accommodation of the greyhound in question under Mr Linday's control following a positive swab. In this case, which again involved a not guilty plea, a penalty of 3 months disqualification was imposed.

10. As to ground 2, the very recent Queensland case of *K Hoggan* (23 April 2015) was relied on. In that case the accused had pleaded guilty to refusing to answer numerous questions relating to an investigation into her involvement into improper practices concerning live baiting at her premises. It was argued this conduct was far more serious than Mr Glenny's conduct, yet only a suspension of two months was imposed.

11. In the Racing Appeals Tribunal of New South Wales in 2010, Mr Greg Elliott was sentenced to 6 months disqualification for a breach of AR 86(e) due to his failure to attend and give evidence at an inquiry. In that matter the Honourable Justice Haylen commented:

Attention was then directed to similar provisions in other racing codes (thoroughbred and harness racing in New South Wales) showing penalties ranging from a suspension of two months, two decisions imposing a three month disqualification with the top end of the range represented by a decision to disqualify a licensed person for eighteen months. In relation to the eighteen month disqualification, that breach was part of a course of conduct that warranted other heavy penalties being imposed and where the licensed person had, on three separate occasions, failed to attend an Inquiry leading to the Inquiry being prolonged for up to six months.

12. It was submitted that in Mr Glenny's case, where the same penalty as Mr Elliott's was imposed, reflects the fact that Mr Glenny's equivalent penalty was manifestly excessive.

13. In relation to the next ground, senior counsel argued that as the subject matter involved a breach of a national rule, there is an interest and requirement for penalties across Australian racing jurisdictions to be consistent unless there are good reasons for imposing greater penalties in a certain jurisdiction. If this be the case, the Stewards as well as the Tribunal are required to provide reasons for doing this. The local case of *McPherson v RPAT* (1995) 79 A Crim R 256, was relied on to support this proposition where Rowland J commented (with Ipp J and Steytler J (as he then was) agreeing) at 261-262:

If there is some reason why penalties for this type of offence should exceed those given in another State when the Rules of Racing seem to be similar, then one might expect that reason to be exposed… If it be the fact that there is a range of penalties which has been imposed in this State, which is greater than those which apply in New South Wales, then it seems to me that both that fact and the reasons for such a large discrepancy should be identified. The failure to give the type of reasons I have indicated, in the circumstances, discloses error of law.

It was argued in Mr Glenny's case, the Stewards did not even appear to turn their minds to penalties imposed in other States of Australia and it is submitted that this was an error.

14. In support of ground 4, it was alleged Stewards fell into error by treating the failure of the appellant to report a breach of the Rules of Racing as an aggravating factor. The Rules prescribe a requirement for a licensed person to answer questions posed by the Stewards (AR86(e)). It was conceded a licensed person who witnesses a breach of the relevant Rules relating to luring and baiting, report the same (AR86B(2)). However, it did not follow that the Rules import a requirement on a licensed person to report any other breach of the Rules, including a request to commit a serious breach of the Rules. There was no requirement for Mr Glenny proactively to report a breach of the Rules. The error it was argued is compounded by the fact that the Stewards appeared to treat this failure as an aggravating feature of the case.

15. Finally, it was submitted there was no basis for the Stewards to find that this failure to disclose the names of the relevant persons might be in order to protect the appellant from an investigation into any offence which he might have committed. It was not open to the Stewards to find that the appellant, in failing to answer questions, was protecting himself from a live baiting investigation and to treat this as an aggravating situation.

STEWARDS' RESPONSE

16. Mr Davies QC argued in relation to the cases of both *Lavin* and *Gladwin*, the trainers were already culpable due to the detection of prohibited substances in the samples so that the refusals to answer were merely side issues or collateral to the main offence.

17. The Tribunal was told by senior counsel that the consequences of the exposure of the live bait activities has had dramatic impacts on the greyhound industry elsewhere, including the closure of industry boards and officials having been retrenched. Indeed, "the whole of the Eastern Seaboard was swept clean because of this." It was submitted the industry was at cross roads as a consequence of the exposure of this malpractice. In other words, the consequences were far wider than simply protecting the supplier of a sample.

18. Senior counsel also submitted *McPherson's* case only addressed the situation involving comparing penalties imposed for like offences relating to prohibited substances, whereas this live baiting case was a totally different scenario.

19. In addition, Mr Davies referred the Tribunal to a number of recent Queensland cases that were not known to the Stewards at the time they imposed the penalty. They included that of Miss Hoggan, a licensed trainer who refused to answer numerous questions pertaining to her involvement into the allegations of improper practices of live baiting. Miss Hoggan pleaded guilty and was suspended for two months. This case was in stark contrast to that involving Mr Paull who was warned off for life. The Racing Disciplinary Board on appeal concluded that despite the legal advice he received to claim privilege against self-incrimination and not answer questions that would tend to incriminate him, Mr Paull was obliged to answer questions properly regarding participating in training where a live possum was used on a lure, put to him by Stewards in the course of their investigations. The Board concluded a life sentence was too severe and imposed a 10 year ban.

20. Mr Glenny's case was not a "run of the mill type matter". In support of this proposition, Mr Davies quoted those parts of the Stewards' reasons where they had evaluated the gravity of the situation and put it into perspective, namely:

> *This was pivotal information being requested that related to matters of the highest importance. When a licensed person makes a direct enquiry of another licensed person to undertake an activity that is a serious breach of the rules, there arises an onus on that person to inform the authorities. A licensed person serious about the best interest of the industry and a desire to ensure it is a sport of integrity and fairness should have no hesitation in exposing malpractices. We would have expected that a long time participant of the industry such as yourself would have been strongly motivated to do all in their power to keep the sport they participate in clean and viable. Instead, having cast the aspersion that you did by confirming that licensed people had requested of you to undertake these practices of live baiting, you then choose*

to keep that a secret from the authorities. That is completely unacceptable and strikes at the very heart of the proper control of the industry. (Para 20).

To this point in time the Stewards still do not know who are these licensed trainers, or how many of them there are, that have approached another licensed trainer, who was at the time a Committee member no less, to directly ask you to live-bait their greyhounds. Whilst it is of some comfort that you say you refused them, that they are even contemplating such matters raises concern. These practices, and even anyone contemplating such things, should be stamped out of the industry and not protected. By choosing to protect these people's identities from the Stewards you not only limit the possibility that they may provide information contrary to your personal interests but also enables them to continue to operate in the shadows. (Para 21).

Neither was your refusal a temporary situation or a spur of the moment decision where you acted spontaneously and later co-operated. Even before this panel you had the opportunity to volunteer to provide the information but instead have not made any suggestions that you would now provide the information. By that stage it was too late. Providing names now or days after the initial question would be of significantly lesser value when you have had the time to alert those you were originally so eager to protect and opportunity to agree upon a version of events that might be told were they to be questioned. It was precisely the reason why an answer should have been given at the first opportunity. To afford you the time to recover from the "shock" of the Stewards suddenly appearing at your property on Sunday morning, it is clear to this panel that the Chief Steward did contact you for the purposes of obtaining an answer to his question. It would be logical to expect such a phone call after he had told you on the Sunday they would be considering the situation. (Para 22).

21. According to Mr Davies, the refusal of Mr Glenny to respond to the questioning and reveal his live bait requesters actually struck at the heart of the industry. "By contrast,

the refusal by Gladwin to divulge who supplied the sample struck at nothing". In their reasons the Stewards expressed this sentiment in the following terms:

> *Dealing first with Charge 1, this arises from a matter that strikes at the very heart of the future of greyhound racing and the proper control and regulation of it. Recent events concerning live game, mass graves and other welfare considerations have brought into strong question the industries public right to continue to operate. There are at this time several independent inquiries on foot in other states being conducted in relation to these matters. The regulation of the industry is being closely examined and called into question. If the industry is to exist into the future it must ensure that these matters of animal welfare are manifestly maintained at the highest levels. The social licence for this industry to operate and exist must ensure at all levels that the confidence of the public is maintained. The Stewards have a vital role to play in leaving no stone unturned in ensuring the rules are being adhered to by participants. They must use all resources and powers at their disposal to maintain the confidence of the industry and public that greyhound racing is properly conducted and controlled. Any actions that impinge the authority's ability to discharge its statutory powers of regulation of this industry, particularly in relation to these matters, cannot be viewed as anything other than very serious. Penalties that follow must therefore properly reflect the seriousness that applies and send a clear message of deterrence to both the offender and others that such offences will not be accepted and severe consequences will flow. (Para 9).*
>
> *To properly regulate the industry the Stewards, through the RWWA Act 2003 and the RWWA Rules of Greyhound racing are afforded broad and far reaching powers. Licensed persons, bound to the rules as prescribed by Section 45(6) of the RWWA Act are obliged to cooperate with the Stewards and answer questions when asked. As was recognised in Appeal 350 in the case of P. Evans (1997) it is not an exaggeration to say that a failure to give evidence*

when requested to do so by the Stewards "strikes at the heart of the control and regulation of the industry". (Para 10).

The Rules of greyhound racing squarely place the role and responsibility for the regulation of the industry and the control and conduct of it in the hands of the duly appointed Stewards (Rule 20). The powers vested in Stewards extend beyond the immediacy of the actual running and controlling of races to cover all facets of the industry. The Stewards are vested with wide powers to inquire into anything in connection with greyhound racing and require any person participating in or associating with greyhound racing to give evidence who in their opinion may have knowledge of any matters which is subject of an inquiry. "Greyhound Racing" is broadly defined to be all encompassing to include any matter of thing connected with the industry. As was recognized by the Chairman of RPAT (Appeal 746 – B. Cook) the rules are designed to specifically empower the Stewards to conduct such investigations into matters such as these before us and to enforce the Rules with punishments for breaches. (Para 11).

CONCLUSION

22. I do readily agree that the abhorrent practice of blooding greyhounds with live bait unquestionably does seriously offend against community standards in relation to the proper and humane treatment of animals. Further, it is an unfair and totally improper training practice. Consequently, such misconduct has far wider implications even than drug offending in racing. Drug offending is extremely detrimental in a sport where wagering by the public does depend on the outcome of races which must be run and won based on fair and proper practices. However, it does not take too much evidence or argument to be convinced that the cruel practice under consideration in the present case, which is designed to excite trained animals to condition them to run faster, not only impacts on greyhounds' performances in races but also has the real prospect of actually destroying the greyhound racing industry. Nothing was presented to suggest the

Stewards were wrong in concluding the industry's right to continue to operate is put at risk by live baiting which makes this a matter of the highest importance.

23. I am not persuaded by the arguments which are summarised above at paragraph 9. When a licensed person who is obliged to answer questions has already admitted to the official investigators that there are people in the industry contemplating live baiting, but then refuses to reveal the names, does I believe, strike at the heart of the proper control and regulation of the industry. This unsatisfactory situation was made worse by Mr Glenny's deliberate and ongoing refusal to answer as distinct from it simply having been a spur of the moment decision on his part.

24. Mr Glenny's refusal, which was a breach of the Rules and a dishonouring of the obligations of his trainer's licence, prevented the Stewards from pursuing a vital line of inquiry in order to determine whether this State too was blighted by this flagrant rule breach which had been occurring elsewhere in Australia. Mr Glenny's intransigence prevented the Stewards from properly addressing an extremely serious issue. The investigators were denied the ability to pursue the matter further. Consequently, one will never know the true situation regarding the possible practice of blooding racing dogs in this State, whether offending had in fact been occurring or whether the appellant himself too may have had some involvement in such offending.

25. In the particular circumstances of this case, occurring as it did shortly after the bombshell of the Four Corners program and the grave and far reaching fall out that accompanied it, I consider it hardly matters that Mr Glenny's breach of AR 86(e) occurred at the investigation rather than at an inquiry stage. In the highly unusual and very serious nature of this case I have concluded that it does not make this particular breach any less severe or deserving of a lighter sentence.

26. *McPherson* (supra) relates to distinguishing the imposition of different penalties occurring outside of the local jurisdiction in respect of the same types of offences. The nature of Mr Glenny's offence and the consequences that potentially flow from it are clearly

distinguishable from Mr McPhersons' offence which related to the serious but relatively mundane issue of a prohibited substance.

27. Rule AR 86(e) is designed to ensure that all industry participants play their part in allowing Stewards to undertake their essential duties in keeping the industry offence free, maintaining confidence in the way it runs, ensuring that racing is conducted both fairly, humanely and otherwise according to law and does not offend community standards.

28. There is no question that the Stewards fairly summed up the gravity of the situation and seriousness of the matter in paragraph 9 of their reasons. Some specific Rules do ensure that very tough penalties shall apply in a case involving the use of both live animals and animal carcasses in greyhound racing. Rule AR 86B states:

> *"(1) A person who, in the opinion of the Stewards or Controlling Body:*
>
> *(a) uses in connection with greyhound training, education or preparation to race, or racing, any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal whether as bait, quarry or lure, or to entice, excite or encourage a greyhound to pursue it or otherwise; or*
>
> *(b) attempts to possess, or has possession of, or brings onto, any grounds, premises or within the boundaries of any property where greyhounds are, or are to be trained, kept or raced, any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal for the purpose of being, or which might reasonably be capable of being, or likely to be, used as bait, quarry or lure to entice or excite or encourage a greyhound to pursue it; or*
>
> *(c) causes, procures, permits or allows a greyhound to pursue or attack any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal;*

(d) fails to use reasonable endeavours to prevent a greyhound pursuing or attacking any live animal, animal carcass or any part of an animal; or

(e) is in any way directly or indirectly involved in committing, or is knowingly concerned with, such conduct as set out in (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this Rule; or

(f) aids, abets, counsels or procures any person to commit such conduct as set out in (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this Rule; or

(g) is convicted in any Court of an offence in relation to the use of, or having in their possession, any live animal, animal carcass or part of an animal in connection with greyhound training, education or preparation to race, or racing,

shall be disqualified for a period of not less than 10 years and, in addition shall be fined a sum not exceeding such amount as specified in the relevant Act or Rules, unless there is a finding that a special circumstance exists, whereupon a penalty less than the minimum penalty may be imposed.

(2) A person who witnesses conduct as set out in (1)(a), (1)(b), (1)(c) or (1)(d) above but fails to report that conduct to the Controlling Body as soon as reasonably practicable shall be disqualified for a period of not less than 5 years and/or fined a sum not exceeding twenty thousand ($20,000) dollars."

Rule LR 86B states:

"A person who breaches any part of Rule 86B shall be disqualified for not less than 10 years and shall also be fined not less than $50,000."

29. It is a condition of any trainer's licence that the Rules must be obeyed. The Rule in question is essential to enable the proper administration, policing and enforcing of the Rules.

30. Mr Glenny was clearly informed of the consequences of failing to comply. In view of the serious implication of the matter the Stewards were entitled to impose a different and more stringent level of penalty than in most, if not all the other cases that have been referred to or relied on in argument relating to this Rule.

31. I reject the general proposition that the decision in this case does not fall strictly in line with the penalties imposed elsewhere, particularly when there is such a range and divergence of harshness in the sentences which have been imposed in the different States at different times. In the cases referred to, there is no discernable consistent pattern but rather a wide range of outcomes from what may be described as fairly mild to rather heavy penalties. This situation is compounded by the fact that circumstances in different jurisdictions are not necessarily compatible. Further, most of the cases relied on involved different types of offences in that they were ancillary to the refusal to respond to fair questioning by a racing official.

32. At T71 Mr Glenny admitted to the Stewards that his particular refusal to answer questions relating to live baiting, compared to not answering as to where a person obtained a urine sample from (K Gladwin who was penalised 6 months disqualification), and not answering a question regarding a positive swab (P Edwards who received 12 months disqualification) *"... places it at a very high level"* and *"potentially compromises the industry surviving"*. Clearly Mr Glenny fully appreciated the seriousness of the situation and its grave potential implications.

33. I agree with the Stewards in their reasons where they stated they must use all of their resources and powers to maintain public confidence by imposing penalties reflecting the seriousness of the situation. At the same time they need to send clear messages to both offenders and others. The 18 months disqualification imposed on Mr Glenny for his wrongful stance meets these appropriate descriptions.

34. In all of the circumstances of this case, I do not consider it has been shown that the penalty is manifestly excessive. I do not believe it has been demonstrated the Stewards have fallen into any error in the way they have dealt with Mr Glenny.

35. I would for these reasons dismiss each of the grounds of appeal.

DAN MOSSENSON, CHAIRPERSON

APPEAL NO. 778

THE RACING PENALTIES APPEAL TRIBUNAL

REASONS FOR DETERMINATION OF MR W CHESNUTT (MEMBER)

APPELLANT:	**ANTHONY GLENNY**
APPLICATION NO:	**A30/08/778**
PANEL:	**MR D MOSSENSON (CHAIRPERSON)** **MR R NASH (MEMBER)** **MR W CHESNUTT (MEMBER)**
DATE OF HEARING:	**17 AUGUST 2015**
DATE OF DETERMINATION:	**30 SEPTEMBER 2015**

IN THE MATTER OF an appeal by ANTHONY GLENNY against the determination made by Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing on 29 May 2015 imposing an eighteen month disqualification for breach of Greyhound Rule of Racing AR 86(e).

Mr T Percy QC with Mr G Yin, instructed by D G Price & Co, represented Mr A Glenny.

Mr R J Davies QC represented the Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing.

I have read the draft reasons of Mr D Mossenson, Chairperson.

I agree with those reasons and conclusions and have nothing further to add.

WILLIAM CHESNUTT, MEMBER

Seal of the Racing Penalties Appeal Tribunal of W.A.

APPEAL NO. 778

THE RACING PENALTIES APPEAL TRIBUNAL

REASONS FOR DETERMINATION OF MR R NASH (MEMBER)

APPELLANT:	**ANTHONY GLENNY**
APPLICATION NO:	**A30/08/778**
PANEL:	**MR D MOSSENSON (CHAIRPERSON)** **MR R NASH (MEMBER)** **MR W CHESNUTT (MEMBER)**
DATE OF HEARING:	**17 AUGUST 2015**
DATE OF DETERMINATION:	**30 SEPTEMBER 2015**

IN THE MATTER OF an appeal by ANTHONY GLENNY against the determination made by Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing on 29 May 2015 imposing an eighteen month disqualification for breach of Greyhound Rule of Racing AR 86(e).

Mr T Percy QC with Mr G Yin, instructed by D G Price & Co, represented Mr A Glenny.

Mr R J Davies QC represented the Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing.

I have read the draft reasons of Mr D Mossenson, Chairperson.

I agree with those reasons and conclusions and have nothing further to add.

ROBERT NASH, MEMBER

Seal of the Racing Penalties Appeal Tribunal of W.A.

APPEAL NO. 778

THE RACING PENALTIES APPEAL TRIBUNAL

DETERMINATION

APPELLANT:	**ANTHONY GLENNY**
APPLICATION NO:	**A30/08/778**
PANEL:	**MR D MOSSENSON (CHAIRPERSON)** **MR R NASH (MEMBER)** **MR W CHESNUTT (MEMBER)**
DATE OF HEARING:	**17 AUGUST 2015**
DATE OF DETERMINATION:	**30 SEPTEMBER 2015**

IN THE MATTER OF an appeal by ANTHONY GLENNY against the determination made by Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing on 29 May 2015 imposing an eighteen month disqualification for breach of Greyhound Rule of Racing AR 86(e).

Mr T Percy QC with Mr G Yin, instructed by D G Price & Co, represented Mr A Glenny.

Mr R J Davies QC represented the Racing and Wagering Western Australia Stewards of Greyhound Racing.

By unanimous decision of this Tribunal, the appeal by Mr Anthony Glenny against penalty under Greyhound Racing Rule AR 86(e) is dismissed.

Dan Mossenson

DAN MOSSENSON, CHAIRPERSON

Seal of the Racing Penalties Appeal Tribunal of W.A.