

APPEAL RESULT

DISTRIBUTION: Chief Executive
Group Integrity Services
Group Racing and Group Racing Development
ARB, ATA, TVN, VJA
Office of Racing
T Moxon – National Drug Register
Racing Press

FROM: Registrar – Racing Appeals and Disciplinary Board

DATE: 4 July 2014

SUBJECT: **APPEAL HEARING RESULT – JOCKEY: JACK HILL**

Panel Judge Russell Lewis (Chair), Mr Brian Forrest (Deputy), Mr Ron Taylor.

Appearances Mr Des O’Keeffe appeared on behalf of Mr Hill.
Mr Wade Hadley appeared on behalf of the Stewards.

At Mildura on Monday 30 June 2014, jockey Jack Hill was found guilty of a charge of careless riding on his mount *Resumethegame* in Race 7 the *Betfair MMWS Sprint Heat 3* (1300m).

The careless riding being that he allowed his mount to shift ground inwards when insufficiently clear of *Maphelane*, resulting in that horse being checked and losing its rightful running.

Mr Hill was suspended from riding in races for a period to commence at midnight Wednesday 2 July 2014 and to expire at midnight Tuesday 15 July 2014 - a total of 13 race meetings (3 Metro and 10 Provincial).

In arriving at penalty stewards took into account Jack Hill’s recent record in relation to careless riding, the fact that he had reserved his plea and that the carelessness was deemed to be in the mid-range.

A Notice of Appeal against **the severity of the penalty** was lodged on Tuesday, 1 July 2014.
A stay of proceedings was not requested.

DECISION: **Appeal allowed.**

Penalty varied so that the period of suspension will expire at midnight on Saturday, 12 July 2014 (10 race meetings).

**TRANSCRIPT OF
PROCEEDINGS**

RACING APPEALS AND DISCIPLINARY BOARD

**HIS HONOUR JUDGE R.P.L. LEWIS, Chairman
MR B. FORREST, Deputy Chairman
MR R. TAYLOR**

EXTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS

DECISION

**IN THE MATTER OF THE BETFAIR MMWS SPRINT
HEAT 3 OVER 1300 METRES AT MILDURA ON 30/6/14**

JOCKEY: JACK HILL

MELBOURNE

FRIDAY, 4 JULY 2014

MR W. HADLEY appeared on behalf of the RVL Stewards

MR D. O'KEEFFE appeared on behalf of the Appellant

CHAIRMAN: This is an example of an appeal which is troublesome, in that in the end, the Board must exercise a measure of judgment as to the level of carelessness involved.

The Board is satisfied that the level of carelessness in this case was not at the top of the mid-range but was somewhere in between the top of the low range and the bottom of the mid-range. It is not a mathematical calculation. In the end, it comes down to a question of judgment, taking all the circumstances into account.

Accordingly, the Board feels that the penalty is too high and that it should be varied, so that the period of suspension expires at midnight on 12 July 2014.
