

CALENDAR NOTICE (to be published 24 March 2016)

Disciplinary Committee Inquiries

The Disciplinary Committee of the GBGB were in attendance at a meeting held on 10 March 2016:

Mr J Akerman (in the chair)

Dr AJ Higgins

Mr H Starte

1. Yarmouth Stadium – MOORHAMM LOCH – Professional Trainer Ms L Brown

Professional Trainer Linda Brown was found in breach of rules 174(i)(b) and 217 of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that a urine sample taken from the greyhound MOORHAMM LOCH at Yarmouth Stadium on 19 November 2015 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of metabolites of stanozolol, namely 6 α -hydroxystanozolol and di-hydroxy metabolites of stanozolol; and that she had in her charge a greyhound that showed the presence of a substance which by its nature could affect the performance of a greyhound or prejudice its wellbeing.

Ms Brown had apologised in advance for her non-attendance at the inquiry due to personal circumstances. Marcus Westgate, racing manager of Yarmouth Stadium also gave apologies for his absence. Adrian Smith (area stipendiary steward) and Professor Tim Morris (independent scientific adviser) were present.

The Director of Regulation advised that Ms Brown had admitted the breach of rule 174(i)(b) and that the GRB would not be proceeding with the case in regard to breaches of rules 152 or 174 (i)(a) of the Rules of Racing. There was no material dispute on the admitted breach but the Director of Regulation said he wished to present some details of the case to the Committee who would also determine whether there had been a breach of rule 217.

Professor Morris gave evidence that stanozolol is a Class C Controlled drug which is not available as a veterinary medicine in the UK or Ireland, the importation of which into the EU would, in his opinion, not be permitted. Stanozolol is a frequently abused anabolic steroid which affects dogs in several ways including building muscle. It has many serious side effects and studies suggest that its effect can be long lasting. It is by its nature a substance that could affect the performance of a greyhound or could prejudice its wellbeing.

At the Local Inquiry held on 7 January 2016 Ms Brown said that she was not involved in the purchase of MOORHAMM LOCH. The greyhound had been purchased in Ireland by one of her greyhound owners, Mr A Blyth, who is also her licensed kennelhand. Mr Blyth delivered the greyhound to Ms Brown on 5 November 2015. A point of registration sample had been collected on 12 November 2015. Following the positive post-trial sample test on 19 November 2015, the point of registration sample was analysed and found to contain 6 α -hydroxystanozolol and di-hydroxy metabolites of stanozolol.

The Committee received no evidence to indicate that Ms Brown or Mr Blyth had made enquiries to assure themselves that the greyhound was free of a prohibited substance prior to its acquisition by Mr Blyth. In oral evidence the Stipendiary Steward said that he had spoken to Mr Blyth who said that

he had enquired of the vendor if MOORHAMM LOCH was sound having seen it advertised on the internet.

The Committee heard that it is widely known that stanozolol may have a protracted excretion rate, and for the metabolites to be detectable for several months following administration to dogs. Professor Morris in his written evidence stated that the findings of metabolites of stanozolol in this case indicated that stanozolol had been administered to MOORHAMM LOCH in the months before the collection of the urine samples. In oral evidence Professor Morris confirmed that, based on an administration study conducted by HFL (now LGC) in 2007 and the sample analysis results in this case, he was of the opinion that the administration of stanozolol within the seven day period between Ms Brown taking charge of the greyhound and arranging the POR test could not be ruled out. This may not have been his opinion if the POR test had been arranged within a shorter timescale after it entered Ms Brown's care.

Having considered the objective scientific evidence, the Committee could not say, on the balance of probabilities, that it was more likely than not that stanozolol was administered to MOORHAMM LOCH in Ireland prior to Mr Blyth acquiring the greyhound and delivering it to Ms Brown. Both eventualities were possible and the Committee could only conclude that stanozolol was administered before the POR sample was taken. There was insufficient evidence to determine who was responsible for its administration.

The Committee noted that the seven day delay in arranging the POR test had exposed Ms Brown to possible suspicion and her absence from the Inquiry had prevented the Committee from asking her questions which may have enabled them to form a view on the likely circumstances surrounding the positive sample. In any event, under rule 217 it is the trainer's responsibility to ensure that a greyhound is free from a prohibited substance when taking part in a race or trial.

The Committee regretted that Ms Brown could not attend the Inquiry to answer their questions and that Mr Blyth was not asked to provide a written statement or asked to attend as a witness to clarify what questions he had posed of the vendor when negotiating the purchase of MOORHAMM LOCH. The Committee also noted that the previous registered owner in Ireland was not asked to provide a statement regarding the history of the greyhound.

The GBGB Rules of Racing impose strict liability on the trainer and the Disciplinary Committee found Ms Brown in breach of rules 174(i)(b) and 217 in that she had in her charge a greyhound that tested positive for a banned substance. The Committee noted that Ms Brown had a previously unblemished disciplinary record but on this occasion she had not made the necessary enquiries prior to the greyhound entering her care. In the circumstances of the case the Committee ordered that Ms Brown be cautioned and fined £100.

The Committee requested the Director of Regulation to remind Ms Brown and all trainers of their responsibilities for ensuring that greyhounds that enter their care are free from prohibited substances. In particular they should make proper enquiries of vendors and sales agents particularly when purchasing greyhounds from Ireland or from vendors and agents of whom they have limited knowledge or past dealings.

2. Kinsley Stadium – SENSIBLE MINNIE – Professional Trainer Mr G Douglas

Professional Trainer Geoffrey Douglas was found in breach of rules 174(i)(b) and 217 of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that a urine sample taken from the greyhound SENSIBLE MINNIE at Kinsley Stadium on 27 June 2015 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of dorzolamide; and that he had in his charge a greyhound that showed the presence of a substance which by its nature could affect the performance of a greyhound or prejudice its wellbeing.

Mr Douglas had apologised in advance for his non-attendance at the inquiry citing work commitments. Craig Hunt, racing manager of Kinsley Stadium also gave apologies for his absence. Paul Illingworth (senior stipendiary steward) and Professor Tim Morris (independent scientific adviser) were present.

Professor Morris gave evidence that dorzolamide is a human medicine for the treatment of raised pressure within the eye. Whilst not licenced, it is also recognised for use in dogs. Dorzolamide affects dogs as it does humans by inhibiting the production of fluid within the eye. It is also a diuretic if given systemically (by mouth or injection) but with lesser effects if applied directly onto the eye (when a potential side effect is stinging). Given its diuretic properties dorzolamide is by its nature a substance that could affect the performance of a greyhound. Diuretics may also be abused as masking agents for other prohibited substances.

During the Local Inquiry held on 9 November 2015 Mr Douglas produced a statement in which he said that enquiries had been made with the previous trainer of SENSIBLE MINNIE in Ireland, Ted Curtin, who said that he suffered with a medical condition that was treated with eye drops that contained dorzolamide. The Committee received a statement from Mr Curtin in which he confirmed his use of eye drops and offering the explanation that food ingested by SENSIBLE MINNIE had been contaminated with dorzolamide as a result of him not washing his hands thoroughly after applying the drops.

The Committee noted that SENSIBLE MINNIE entered Mr Douglas's care on 11 April 2015 and a point of registration sample had been collected on the same day. Following the positive post-race sample test on 27 June 2015, the point of registration sample was analysed and found to contain dorzolamide.

The Committee received evidence from Professor Morris from clinical studies of dorzolamide given to humans for 14 days when it was subsequently detected in whole blood for 150 days with excretion via urine. This is due largely to the accumulation of the drug in red blood cells. Professor Morris added that the maximum life span of red blood cells (135 days) is similar for humans and dogs. LGC had also stated that the concentration of dorzolamide in the urine of SENSIBLE MINNIE was 34ng/ml in the POR sample on 11 April 2015 and had reduced to 2ng/ml in the race sample on 27 June 2015.

The Committee noted that the scientific evidence was not inconsistent with dorzolamide being administered to SENSIBLE MINNIE before the greyhound entered Mr Douglas's care. The findings of

dorzolamide were compatible with both accidental and deliberate exposure of the substance, and more recent secondary exposure also remained a possibility. Having considered the evidence the Committee found the explanation given by Mr Curtin of accidental contamination following the application of eye drops to be implausible, particularly as no corroborative evidence, such as an active prescription, had been forthcoming to support his version of events.

The Committee noted the evidence of Mr Douglas that he asked the sales agent if SENSIBLE MINNIE was free of prohibited substances and this had been confirmed to him. The purchaser of the greyhound, Mr J Leach said in his written evidence that he had agreed the sale of the greyhound with Mr Curtin after seeing it advertised on the internet. He did not refer to any enquiries that he had made regarding its history. In the absence of Mr Douglas at the Inquiry the Committee was unable to obtain further clarification about the measures that he had taken to assure himself that the greyhound was free of a prohibited substance prior to its acquisition by Mr Leach.

Having considered the scientific evidence, the Committee was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that dorzolamide was administered to SENSIBLE MINNIE in Ireland, before the greyhound entered Mr Douglas's care. However, under rule 217 it is the trainer's responsibility to ensure that a greyhound is free from a prohibited substance when taking part in a race or trial.

The GBGB Rules of Racing impose strict liability on the trainer, and the Disciplinary Committee found Mr Douglas in breach of rules 174(i)(b) and 217 in that he had in his charge a greyhound that tested positive for a banned substance. The Committee accepted that Mr Douglas did not administer dorzolamide but were not convinced that he had made sufficient enquiries prior to the purchase of the greyhound. The Committee noted that Mr Douglas had a previously unblemished disciplinary record and noted the character reference provided by Andrew Mascarenhas, Kinsley racing manager. In the circumstances of the case the Committee ordered that Mr Douglas be cautioned and fined £100.

The Committee requested the Director of Regulation to remind Mr Douglas and all trainers of their responsibilities for ensuring that greyhounds that enter their care are free from prohibited substances and that they should make proper enquiries of vendors and sales agents.

3. Pelaw Grange Stadium – MATCHING ROBBIE – Professional Trainer Mrs J Moss

Professional Trainer Joyce Moss was found in breach of rules 174(i)(b) and 217 of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that a urine sample taken from the greyhound MATCHING ROBBIE at Pelaw Grange Stadium on 29 November 2015 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing di-hydroxy metabolites of stanozolol; and that she had in her charge a greyhound that showed the presence of a substance which by its nature could affect the performance of a greyhound or prejudice its wellbeing.

Mrs Moss had apologised in advance for her non-attendance at the inquiry due to personal circumstances. David Gray, racing manager of Pelaw Grange Stadium, Paul Illingworth (senior stipendiary steward) and Professor Tim Morris (independent scientific adviser) were present.

Professor Morris gave evidence that stanozolol is a Class C Controlled drug which is not available as a veterinary medicine in the UK or Ireland the importation of which into the EU would, in his opinion, not be permitted. Stanozolol is a frequently abused anabolic steroid which affects dogs in terms of building muscle. It has many serious side effects and studies suggest that its effect can be long lasting. It is by its nature a substance that could affect the performance of a greyhound or could prejudice its wellbeing.

At the Local Inquiry held on 9 January 2016 Mrs Moss said that she picked the greyhound MATCHING ROBBIE up from a transporter on 16 July 2015 on behalf of an owner, Mr J Brown, who had purchased the dog from Ireland over the internet. A point of registration sample had been collected on 18 July 2015. Following the positive pre-race sample test on 29 November 2015, the point of registration sample was analysed and found to contain di-hydroxy metabolites of stanozolol.

The Committee noted that Mrs Moss believed that Mr Brown had inquired of the vendor (Mr Murty Ahern of Co Limerick) if MATCHING ROBBIE had any injuries or had been on any medication. Mr Brown stated in his written evidence that he had contacted Mr Ahern and asked if the greyhound had any injuries or had any injections. He was told by Mr Ahern that it had only had "normal injections". Mr Ahern stated in his written evidence that MATCHING ROBBIE appeared to be dehydrated after a trial at Tralee and he gave the greyhound a 2ml injection of stanozolol from an "old bottle" at the beginning of May 2105. He did not seek veterinary advice before administering the drug. Mr Ahern also stated that he could not recall the conversation with Mr Brown and did not remember if Mr Brown had asked him if the greyhound had been on any medication. Mr Ahern added that he did not inform Mr Brown of the stanozolol as he thought it would be out of the greyhound's system in 3-4 weeks.

After considering the written evidence Committee concluded that, while some enquiries had been made of the greyhound's history prior to its purchase by Mr Brown, it was not clear whether Mr Brown had asked specifically if the greyhound was free of prohibited substances prior to its acquisition by him.

The Committee heard that it is widely known that stanozolol may have a protracted excretion rate and laboratory studies have shown its metabolites can be detectable for least six months after administration to dogs. Professor Morris in his written evidence stated that the findings of di-hydroxy metabolites of stanozolol in this case indicated that stanozolol was not administered to the MATCHING ROBBIE in the period from 16 July 2015, when the dog came into the care of Mrs Moss, to 18 July 2015 when it was subject to point of registration urine sampling. The findings indicated that stanozolol had been administered to the greyhound in the months before collection of the urine samples and before it came into Mrs Moss's care.

Having considered the scientific evidence and the admission by Mr Ahern, the Disciplinary Committee was satisfied that stanozolol was administered to the greyhound MATCHING ROBBIE in Ireland prior to Mrs Moss taking charge of the greyhound. However, under rule 217 it is the trainer's responsibility to ensure that a greyhound is free from a prohibited substance when taking part in a race or trial.

The GBGB Rules of Racing impose strict liability on the trainer, and the Disciplinary Committee found Mrs Moss in breach of rules 174(i)(b) and 217 in that she had in her charge a greyhound that tested

positive for a banned substance. The Committee accepted that Mrs Moss did not administer stanozolol but were not convinced that she had made sufficient enquiries prior to the purchase of the greyhound. They took into account Mrs Moss's good recent disciplinary record and the very supportive comments in her favour made by Mr Gray, who said he had never had reason to question the performance of her greyhounds or her integrity. In the circumstances of the case the Committee ordered that Mrs Moss be cautioned but imposed no fine.

The Committee requested the Director of Regulation to remind Mrs Moss of her responsibility for ensuring that greyhounds that enter her care are free from prohibited substances and that she should make proper enquiries of vendors and sales agents.

The Committee also noted that the Director of Regulation had notified the IGB of this case in the context of Mr Murty Ahern's admission that he administered stanozolol to MATCHING ROBBIE.