

APPEAL RESULT

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

FROM: Registrar – Racing Appeals and Disciplinary Board

DATE: 6 November 2015

SUBJECT: **APPEAL HEARING RESULT – JOCKEY: JAMIE MOTT**

Heard By Judge John Bowman (Chair).

Appearances Mr John Didham appeared on behalf of Mr Mott.
Mr Brett Wright appeared on behalf of the stewards.

At Mornington on Sunday 1 November 2015, jockey Jamie Mott pleaded guilty to a charge under the provisions of AR 137(a) for careless riding in Race 3 the *Orbit Fitness Plate* (1000m).

The careless riding being that passing the 300 metres, when half a length behind *Keep Courting*, he rode *Nitro Nick* out into a run where there was insufficient room between that *Keep Courting* and *Calabah Flame*, which resulted in him making contact with *Keep Courting's* hindquarters badly unbalancing that horse until he took up that filly's position, four wide near the 200 metres.

Mr Mott had his licence to ride in races suspended for a period to commence at midnight on Sunday, 1 November 2015 and to expire at midnight on Friday, 13 November 2015 – a total of 14 race meetings. In assessing penalty the Stewards were of the view that the incident qualified for the high-range category of carelessness and took into account his guilty plea and good record.

A Notice of Appeal was received on Tuesday, 3 November 2015. A stay of proceedings was not requested.

DECISION: Appeal dismissed. Penalty to remain standing.

**TRANSCRIPT OF
PROCEEDINGS**

RACING APPEALS AND DISCIPLINARY BOARD

HIS HONOUR JUDGE J. BOWMAN, Chairman

EXTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS

DECISION

**IN THE MATTER OF THE ORBIT FITNESS PLATE
OVER 1000 METRES AT MORNINGTON ON 1/11/15**

JOCKEY: JAMIE MOTT

MELBOURNE

FRIDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2015

MR B. WRIGHT appeared on behalf of the RVL Stewards

MR J. DIDHAM appeared on behalf of the Appellant

CHAIRMAN: On Sunday, 1 November 2015, the Stewards suspended Jamie Mott for a period of 14 meetings commencing at midnight, 1 November. The appeal is against the severity of this penalty. Mr Wright, on behalf of the Stewards, showed video of the incident which basically occurred at the turn into the straight. Mr Mott effectively forced a run between a horse ridden by Jason Benbow and one ridden by Luke Currie.

The Stewards' case is that whilst there may earlier have been a run partly caused by Benbow's mount, a first starter, drifting or hanging out, that run had closed due to Benbow straightening his horse before Mr Mott had arrived. It is alleged that Mr Mott then forced a run, bumping the hindquarters of Benbow's horse.

The Stewards considered the level of carelessness to be high. Mr Didham, for Mr Mott, argued that Nitro Nick, Mr Mott's mount, was going particularly well. Indeed, it went on to win the race. Benbow had moved out, presenting the run. Nitro Nick was ridden forward, moving out past one horse in order to obtain the run. The run closed when there was little else Mr Mott could do, save for checking severely or running into the back of Currie's mount which had complicated the situation by moving out a short distance.

Mr Didham argued that Benbow was able to continue riding his horse and was in no danger. Overall, Mr Didham submitted that the level of carelessness was low and that the penalty should be reduced accordingly.

In my opinion, Mr Mott forced a run that was not legitimately there. The run had gone and was closing as he arrived. The video does not show him making any attempt to check or ease his mount. Rather, he rode his horse into the narrow space available. In order to do this, he bumped the hindquarters of Benbow's mount, causing it to sprawl a little and turn towards the rails. I agree with Mr Wright that forcing a run in this fashion cannot be condoned. It represents a high level of carelessness.

By way of contrast, I note that the rider wearing the jacket with red sleeves, apparently Ben Melham, is held up behind two horses on the rails from before the turn to the winning post. As Mr Mott was forcing his run out wider, Melham was actually standing in the irons on the rails and continues to be held up all the way to the winning post but the run never came. Quite properly, he did not attempt to force a run by bumping horses out of the way. The contrast is quite marked.

Mr Mott has a good record, although not fully unblemished. However, for a busy jockey, it is a good record. He also pleaded guilty virtually immediately. I take this into account. However, despite Mr Didham's forceful arguments, I am of the view that the level of carelessness was high and that the Stewards have imposed a suitable penalty. The appeal is dismissed.
