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SUBJECT: HEARING RESULT – TRAINER: RODNEY DOUGLAS

Panel
Mr Brian Forrest (Deputy Chair), Mr Bill Knights, Mr Stephen Curtain

Appearances
Mr Mark Hill, Senior Stipendiary Steward, appeared on behalf of the RVL Stewards. Dr Cliff Pannam QC appeared on behalf of Mr Douglas.

Charge
Breach of AR 175A – [conduct prejudicial to the image and interests of racing].

The charge relating to comments made by Mr Douglas during a TVN interview on Wednesday, 17 February 2010 at Mornington racecourse.

Plea
Not Guilty

Decision
The Board finds the charge proved.

Mr Douglas fined the amount of $1000 – fine due on or before 31 March 2010.
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DECISION

TRAINER: RODNEY DOUGLAS

MELBOURNE

TUESDAY, 2 MARCH 2010

MR M. HILL appeared on behalf of the Stewards
DR C.L. PANNAM QC appeared on behalf of Mr R. Douglas
DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In the view of the Board, the charge has been proven. We accept, as Dr Pannam has eloquently put, that Mr Douglas is a colourful character in the Mornington environment of the racing industry. We have got to consider whether in the mind of a reasonable person they would objectively regard his comments to a television audience as prejudicial to the image of racing.

It is the view of the Board that a reasonable person could draw a clear inference, having regard to Mr Douglas's comments, that racing is run by incompetent people and we so find.

DISCUSSION

The Board has considered that the nature and circumstances of the offence make it appropriate that a fine rather than a reprimand be imposed in this matter. Trainers are at the forefront of the industry and have a certain responsibility to the industry with their public comments.

We have taken into account what Dr Pannam and Mr Hill have said in regard to the matter. We have noted that Mr Douglas has a prior offence of a similar nature or a similar charge. We accept that in the circumstances, this is at the lower end of the scale, as Dr Pannam has indicated. We also take into account that when, in the cool light of day, Mr Douglas was interviewed by stewards again, he did apologise for his behaviour and we take those matters into account.
The decision of the Board is to impose a fine of $1000, payable by 31 March 2010.

END OF EXTRACT