11 November 2019

**DECISION**

**GREYHOUND RACING VICTORIA**

**and**

**MR GREG DOYLE**

**Date of hearing:** 7 November 2019

**Panel:** Judge John Bowman (Chairperson), Ms June Smith and Mr Josh Bornstein.

**Appearances:** Mr Paul Searle appeared on behalf of the Stewards.

 Mr Greg Doyle represented himself at the hearing.

**Charge:** GAR71(1)Where a greyhound fails to perform to the satisfaction of the Stewards, or has been determined, by the officiating veterinary surgeon or other authorised person, to have cramped during the running of an Event, the Stewards may:

(1) order that it complete a satisfactory trial before being eligible to compete further or be nominated for any Event;

**Particulars of charge:** Stewards spoke to Mr Greg Doyle, the trainer of Han Solo regarding its performance in this event. Stewards deemed the performance unsatisfactory, acting in accordance with GAR71, Han Solo must perform a Satisfactory Trial (all tracks) before any future nomination will be accepted.

**Plea:** Not Guilty

**DECISION**

Mr Greg Doyle you have appealed against a Stewards decision following race 6 at Sandown Park on Sunday, 27 October 2019. Han Solo trained by you competed in that race. The dog was found guilty of an unsatisfactory performance pursuant to Rule 71. The penalty imposed was that the dog must perform a satisfactory trial before racing again. You argued that the penalty was not warranted and was too severe.

The video of the race in question was shown several times and you also showed a video of a similar race over the same distance on 3 January 2019. Essentially your argument was that the dog was in fact injured either before or during the race and that the injury was not detected by the officiating track veterinarian on the day.

A subsequent veterinary examination, not on the day, from a different veterinarian surgeon revealed an injury. You argued that this accounted for the dog’s performance.

As stated, the video was shown to us several times and we are of the view that the Stewards were entitled to reach the conclusion that the dog had not performed satisfactorily.

On the corner out of the straight the dog was about 6 lengths behind the leader and we could see nothing unusual about its action. By the time the field reached the back straight it was so far behind the second last dog that it had disappeared from the screen. It must have been at least 10 lengths behind, probably more. However, in the home straight it ran on and effectively caught the second last dog. We could see nothing wrong or unusual about its action at that stage.

In summary, its action looked normal in the turn out of the home straight. It then dropped back so far that it disappeared from view. However, it later ran on in a normal fashion. We are of the opinion that the veterinary surgeon was entitled to come to the conclusion that was reached. We are also of the opinion that in the circumstances the penalty imposed of a satisfactory trial before Han Solo can compete was a fair and reasonable one. The appeal is dismissed.

Mark Howard
Registrar, Victorian Racing Tribunal