

## **CALENDAR NOTICE (to be published 23 September 2016)**

### **Disciplinary Committee Inquiries**

The Disciplinary Committee of the GBGB were in attendance at a meeting held on 8 September 2016:-

Mr H Starte (in the Chair)

Mr R Coughlan

Mr K Salmon

#### **1. Kinsley Stadium – LIVE ANNIE – Professional Trainer Mr Seamus Cahill**

Professional Trainer Seamus Cahill was found in breach of rules 152 (i) & (ii) and 174 (i) (a) and 217 of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that a urine sample taken from the greyhound LIVE ANNIE at Kinsley Stadium on 20 April 2016 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of dexamethasone.

Professional Trainer Mr Seamus Cahill was in attendance. Mr David MacDonald, Coral Head of Stadia, was in attendance. Stipendiary Steward Peter Rosney could not attend. Area stipendiary steward Lorraine Sams and Professor Tim Morris, independent scientific adviser, were in attendance.

The Disciplinary Committee heard evidence from Professor Morris that dexamethasone is a corticosteroid available as a veterinary medicine in a variety of formulations. It is a potent anti-inflammatory, with a range of side effects including metabolic disturbances and reduction in the body's response to infection, which by its nature could affect the performance and/or prejudice the wellbeing of a greyhound.

In his evidence to the local inquiry and to the Committee, Mr Cahill said that after the semi-final of the Betfred Gymcrack competition run on 10 April 2016 he had noticed redness and irritation and what looked like a cold in the eye of LIVE ANNIE. Mr Cahill said he had previously taken another dog to a vet, Mr Rikus Harmse at Kings Road Vets, when it had arrived from Ireland with very similar symptoms. A letter from Mr Harmse confirmed that on 23 October 2015 he had dispensed Maxitrol eye drops for a greyhound with conjunctivitis and keratitis, to be administered as a week-long course of treatment. Mr Cahill said that after treating the greyhound in October 2015, he had kept the bottle of Maxitrol drops in a drawer at his kennels. On the evening of 10 April 2016, he decided to treat LIVE ANNIE with those eye drops. He had administered one drop in each eye on 10 April, and then on the next two days, 11 and 12 April, he had administered one drop to each of the greyhound's eyes in the morning and again in the evening.

Mr Cahill said in deciding to treat the dog in this way he had in mind that it would still be able to run in the Betfred Gymcrack final on 20 April without infringing the rule that a dog may not race or trial for 7 days after any substance is administered or applied to it. He knew the dog would be tested at that race. He told the local inquiry he had not realised the eye drops contained "a prohibited substance" and that he would not have used them had he known this. He also told the local inquiry and the Committee that he had believed the medication would have been eliminated from the dog's system before the race on 20 April, which was 7 days after he said the last dose of eye drops had been administered. Mr Cahill insisted that

he did not treat the dog after 12 April, arguing that it would have made no sense for him to do so when he knew it would be tested at the final.

The local inquiry and Committee were shown Mr Cahill's treatment book, which contained an entry dated 10 April 2016, said by Mr Cahill to have been written by his wife, recording the condition for which treatment had been administered as "Cold in Eye", recording the details of treatment as "Maxitrol eye drops, 2 x daily x 3 days" and recording the prescribing veterinary surgeon as "Kings Rd".

Mr Cahill said LIVE ANNIE's eyes appeared fine after the last treatment on 12 April. He had taken the dog to Mr Ron Mills for routine massage on 13 April. He had not consulted Mr Mills about the dog's eyes, but suggested that if the dog had still been suffering from an eye condition, Mr Mills would have noticed it and raised it with him.

Mr Cahill told the Committee he did not make a practice of keeping or using leftover medication on his greyhounds. He just happened to keep the eye drops in this case and to be able to find them when he remembered another greyhound being treated for similar symptoms five months previously. He insisted to the local inquiry and to the Committee that he had treated LIVE ANNIE with the eye drops on 10, 11 and 12 April because he believed that he was thereby doing the best for the wellbeing of the dog.

Professor Morris's evidence was that while the dexamethasone found in this case could have come from Grade 2 ABP meat, there was nothing to indicate this had been fed to LIVE ANNIE or that the substance had come from any source other than the Maxitrol eye drops Mr Cahill said had been administered to the dog. Maxitrol eye drops contained 1 mg/ml of dexamethasone. Studies in other animals showed that 50-100% would be absorbed into the system by application to the eye. The timescale for elimination of the substance would be similar to the timescale for elimination of doses administered by injection. Three studies available to Professor Morris for elimination of injected doses showed that: when 1mg was injected into 30 kg dogs, levels in urine had fallen to below 2.5ng/ml after 30 hours; when 1mg/kg was injected into 12 kg dogs, levels in blood had fallen to below 2ng/ml after one hour; and when 0.1mg/kg was injected into 30kg dogs, levels in urine had fallen to less than 0.1ng/ml after 72 hours.

LGC laboratories had reported to Professor Morris an estimated level of 1.5ng/ml of dexamethasone in the sample taken from LIVE ANNIE. In Professor Morris's opinion that level more likely than not arose from an administration less than the 8 days previously that Mr Cahill said was when he had last administered the eye drops to the dog. Even assuming systemic absorption from the eye drops at 50%, Professor Morris would not expect to have found that level of the substance more than 72 hours after the last administration of one drop in each of the dog's eyes. He would be very surprised to find that level 7 days after the last administration. If the eye drops were from a bottle first opened and used in October 2015, being used long after expiry of the 28 day limit after opening stipulated by the manufacturer, the level would tend to be less, indicating more recent rather than less recent administration. It was unlikely that the level detected in LIVE ANNIE's sample was higher as a result of an accumulation of the substance because it had been administered over three consecutive days. As for LGC laboratories' estimate of the level in the sample, Professor Morris said that even if that estimate was inaccurate by 50% and the actual level was 0.75ng/ml, it was still more likely than not that the latest administration had been less than 7 or 8 days before the sample was taken and more likely 3 days or less.

Professor Morris also advised that the use of an out-of-date medicine left over from use medicating another dog, without any specific diagnosis or any direct or indirect contact with a vet, had carried risks for the welfare of LIVE ANNIE. In addition to Mr Cahill not being qualified to diagnose and prescribe, there was a two-fold risk. Firstly, the efficacy of the medication would decline with age. Secondly, there was a risk that fungal or viral contaminant had been introduced into the drops when they were administered to the dog for which they had been prescribed. This contamination could have been cultivated in the bottle. In any event, there had been a risk of introducing infection into LIVE ANNIE's eyes, inhibiting the healing of any ulceration that the drops might be intended to assist and potentially worsening the dog's condition.

The Committee found that the scientific evidence in this case overwhelmingly showed that Mr Cahill's account of when and how dexamethasone came to be in the sample taken from LIVE ANNIE was untrue. The only explanation offered or realistically possible for the presence of dexamethasone found in the sample was that the Maxitrol eye drops Mr Cahill had kept from October 2015 were administered to the dog. It was Mr Cahill's case that only he could and would have administered those eye drops. The scientific evidence established that he must have administered that medication to LIVE ANNIE at least once after the last date on which he claimed he put drops in the dog's eyes, doing so at least one or two days later, if not more, and within 7 days of the dog racing in the Betfred Gymcrack final.

It followed that the entry in Mr Cahill's treatment book was untrue and misleading, as he must have known, by falsely suggesting that LIVE ANNIE had been treated with a prescription medicine that had been prescribed for the dog by a vet and by falsely suggesting that medication had only been administered to LIVE ANNIE on 10, 11 and 12 April 2016 and not at a later date, less than 7 days before the Betfred Gymcrack final.

The Committee found that Mr Cahill was in breach of Rule 152 (i) and (ii). He had acted in a manner prejudicial to the integrity, proper conduct and good reputation of greyhound racing by putting the welfare of LIVE ANNIE at risk by improperly administering an out of date prescription medicine without veterinary advice and when it had not been prescribed to treat LIVE ANNIE and by knowingly making a false and misleading entry in his treatment book and giving a false account to this Committee, concealing when and how LIVE ANNIE had actually been treated in an attempt to conceal the true extent of his culpability in this matter.

Mr Cahill was also in breach of Rule 174 (i) (a) by his administration to LIVE ANNIE of a substance which by its nature could affect the performance and prejudice the wellbeing of the greyhound, and Rule 217 by failing to ensure the greyhound was free when racing of any substance which by its nature could affect the performance and prejudice the wellbeing of the greyhound.

The Committee accepted that Mr Cahill had genuinely acted with the welfare of LIVE ANNIE in mind, believing that he was doing his best for the greyhound. However his conduct in treating the greyhound without veterinary advice and with long out of date medicine prescribed for and administered to another dog had been seriously unprofessional. He had jeopardised the welfare of LIVE ANNIE. He had been dishonest in his treatment book entry and in his explanation of what had happened, seeking to conceal what had actually happened and to minimise his true culpability.

The Committee ordered that Mr Cahill receive a severe reprimand and be fined £1,750.

The Committee also recommended that the Board consider publishing a Calendar Notice on the question of the disposal of unused prescription medicines and the dangers and unacceptability of using out of date and/or leftover prescription medicines.

2. **Central Park Stadium – REACHING FORWARD – Registered Sales Agent Mr Christopher Hayes**

Registered Sales Agent Mr Christopher Hayes was found in breach of rules 152 (i) and 174 (i) (b) of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that a urine sample taken from the greyhound REACHING FORWARD at Central Park Stadium on 27 April 2016 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of morphine, codeine and oripavine.

Registered Sales Agent Mr Christopher Hayes was in attendance. Area stipendiary steward Lorraine Sams and Professor Tim Morris, independent scientific adviser, were in attendance.

The Committee heard that Mr Hayes had told the local inquiry that he had transported REACHING FORWARD and another greyhound, ROCKMOUNT DUKE, to the trial from his kennels in Ireland, leaving on 24 April 2016 and arriving at Holyhead early on the morning of 25 April. He had travelled with his greyhounds that morning to retired greyhound trainer Mary Kimberley at Atherstone, then on 26 April travelled on to his sister's home in Edgware. He had left there at about 2.30am on 27 April to arrive early at Central Park Stadium so that the dogs could exercise.

In evidence to the local inquiry and the Committee, Mr Hayes said that at home in Ireland his greyhounds were fed Alpha Racer dog food, bread supplied by "George the Bread Man" from Birmingham (all of which was said to be unseeded bread and which he had fed to his dogs for years without any problems) meat and sunflower oil. On some mornings, mainly in winter, he also fed cereal and milk. Travelling to the trial, on 25 April he had fed REACHING FORWARD nuts brought from home, Aldi own-brand Earls Superchunks and Meaty Chunks and Kingsmill medium slice wholemeal brown bread bought from Aldi. On 26 April for breakfast he had fed weetabix and milk purchased from Aldi and had fed tinned sardines to some dogs. About 4pm REACHING FORWARD was again fed nuts and the Aldi own-brand dog food. The greyhound had not been fed before its 11am trial on 27 April. Mr Hayes told the Committee that he had checked the ingredients of the Kingsmill sliced loaf on the packaging.

Professor Morris advised the Committee that morphine was used as veterinary medicine to relieve severe pain and codeine was used as a veterinary medicine to reduce pain and coughing. Oripavine was an alkaloid found in the straw of the opium poppy with pain reducing properties, but not used as a medicine. All three are Controlled Drugs, though codeine in lower amounts is not controlled. All three drugs can cause either sedation or excitement, constipation and other adverse effects. Oripavine was highly toxic and caused seizures. All three were substances that by their nature could affect the performance of a greyhound or prejudice the wellbeing of a greyhound.

Professor Morris explained that morphine, codeine and thebaine, of which oripavine was a metabolite produced when thebaine was processed in the greyhound's body, were all natural alkaloids occurring in poppy straw and/or poppy seeds. The fact that all three (morphine, codeine and oripavine) had been found led him to conclude that the likely source was poppy straw and/or poppy seeds in the greyhound's food. The level of morphine found by LGC laboratories, estimated at 900ng/ml, was consistent with a food source fed in the previous few days, more likely after the greyhound had left Ireland on 24 April 2016.

Professor Morris explained that poppy seeds were not only used whole to flavour or decorate bread. Ground poppy seed was also used as an aroma enhancer. Grain used as a constituent of dog meat products could be contaminated with poppy straw.

Of the food said to have been fed to REACHING FORWARD, Professor Morris thought the most likely source had been the sliced wholemeal loaf. It was unlikely that the baker intentionally included ground poppy seed as a flavour enhancer in what was a product at the standard end of the bread market. But poppy seed flour could have been transferred from other bread in the production process. However Professor Morris said he would not exclude either the Alpha Racer or Aldi own-brand dog foods as the source, although of these the Alpha Racer was less likely. It was a fixed ingredient product used by many to feed greyhounds. If it was the source in this case, he would have expected these substances to have been detected in many more tested greyhounds.

The Committee accepted that the most likely source of the morphine, codeine and oripavine in this case was the food given to REACHING FORWARD on 25 or 26 April 2016, coming from grain contaminated by poppy straw being included in the dog food or from ground poppy seed introduced into the bread.

The Committee was satisfied that Mr Hayes had been an entirely honest witness and that he had also been perfectly conscientious in his choice of feed for his greyhounds. Mr Hayes had no reason to believe that any of these foods would contain poppy seed or anything else that would introduce into his greyhounds' systems either morphine, codeine or oripavine or any other substance that was likely by its nature to affect their performance or wellbeing.

Rule 174 (i) (b) imposed strict liability, so that Mr Hayes was necessarily in breach of this Rule and Rule 152 (i). However in the circumstances of this case, the Committee ordered that there be no further action.

### **3. Henlow Stadium – SAVANA HUGO – Professional Trainer Mrs Kim Taylor**

Professional Trainer Mrs Kim Taylor was found in breach of rules 152 (i) and 174 (i) (b) of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that a urine sample taken from the greyhound SAVANA HUGO at Henlow Stadium on 27 April 2016 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of cimetidine.

Professional Trainer Mrs Kim Taylor was in attendance. Racing Manager of Henlow Stadium Paul Mellor apologised for his non-attendance. Area stipendiary steward Lorraine Sams and Professor Tim Morris, independent scientific adviser, were in attendance.

The Disciplinary Committee heard evidence from Professor Morris that cimetidine is a veterinary medicine that reduces gastric acid production and is used for the treatment of gastritis in dogs. It would not by its nature directly affect the performance of a greyhound and would be of benefit to a dog requiring treatment. However it could by its nature indirectly affect a greyhound's performance by relieving the adverse effect of any gastritis.

Professional trainer Mrs Kim Taylor told the local inquiry and the Committee that SAVANA HUGO had been vomiting bile after racing. When this happened on 25 May 2016, she had taken the greyhound to veterinary surgeon Mr Stefano Malegori. He had prescribed Zitac (cimetidine), with one 200mg tablet to be given three times a day for five days. Mrs Taylor said she had given SAVANA HUGO one tablet on 25 May, then one tablet three times on the next four days and two tablets on the fifth day, 30 May 2016. Mrs Taylor told the Committee

the vet had recommended the dog should not race for seven days after concluding the treatment. It had been 10 days before SAVANA HUGO trialled on 9 June 2016.

In his written evidence prepared for the Committee Professor Morris reported there were no definitive studies showing levels of cimetidine in a dog's urine following administration. The information he had was that three packs of 10 tablets had been dispensed for the dog. Mrs Taylor said only 15 had been administered, the last on 30 May. On the studies available to him and on the basis of LGC laboratories' estimate of a level of 34ng/ml of cimetidine in the dog's urine, he estimated that either a smaller, sub-clinical dose had been administered very recently before 9 June or a larger clinical dose had been administered in the preceding days, but maybe not as many as the 10 days that Mrs Taylor said passed between the last administration and the sample being taken.

At the meeting, the Committee and Professor Morris saw an email dated 9 August 2016 from the vet Mr Stefano Malegori and practice records of Zitac being prescribed for SAVANA HUGO on 25 May. These confirmed that only 15 tablets had been dispensed and that Mr Malegori had recommended Mrs Taylor should wait 7 days after treatment had ended before racing the greyhound.

In his evidence to the Committee, Professor Morris clarified that it was not his opinion that it was more likely than not that the last administration of Zitac to SAVANA HUGO had been 7 days or less before the trial on 9 June. Having seen the evidence that Mrs Taylor had only received 15 tablets (and not 30) and in the light of his experience of prolonged periods of excretion of similar drugs in horses and humans and bearing in mind the phenomenon of enterohepatic recirculation, neither would he now say that it was more likely than not that the last administration had been more recent than the 9 or 10 days claimed by Mrs Taylor.

Director of Regulation Mr Mark Bird said it was accepted that Mrs Taylor was a very credible witness and that, on the evidence, it was now accepted that the presence of cimetidine was due to Mrs Taylor administering Zitac as prescribed by her vet and on the days that she said. The Board recommended no further action be taken.

The Committee found Mrs Taylor a compellingly honest witness. It too accepted that she had treated SAVANA HUGO as she had been advised by her vet, as she had recorded in her treatment book and on the dates she said.

Rule 174 (i) (b) imposed strict liability, so that Mrs Taylor was necessarily in breach of this Rule and Rule 152 (i). However in the circumstances the Committee ordered that there be no further action.