

## **CALENDAR NOTICE (to be published 18 May 2018)**

### **Disciplinary Committee Inquiries**

The Disciplinary Committee of the GBGB were in attendance at a meeting held on 8 May 2018:-

Dr AJ Higgins (in the chair)

Mr H Starte

Mr M Elks

#### **1. Sheffield Stadium – DIXIES QUEST / DRIVE TO DOON / ASHGROVE MILLY – Professional Trainer Mr P Miller**

Professional Trainer Paul Miller was found in breach of rules 152 (i) & (ii) and 217 of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that urine samples taken from the greyhounds DIXIES QUEST on 1 May 2017, DRIVE TO DOON on 26 June 2017 and ASHGROVE MILLY on 29 June 2017 at Sheffield Stadium were analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of tetramisole.

Mr Miller was not in attendance. David Brayshaw, Racing Manager of Sheffield Stadium, apologised for his non-attendance. Peter Rosney, Stipendiary Steward, and Professor Tim Morris, Independent Scientific Adviser, were in attendance.

The Committee was told by Mr Rosney that Mr Miller did not feel he needed to attend the Inquiry. The Director of Regulation confirmed that Mr Miller had received the Calling-in letter and documents associated with the case. The Committee agreed to proceed with the Inquiry in the absence of Mr Miller.

The case concerned three greyhounds that had tested positive to tetramisole between 1 May and 29 June 2017, all at Owlerton stadium. For the sake of clarity, Professor Morris explained that tetramisole has two isomers with the same chemical composition, one of which is called levamisole. The LGC method does not distinguish between the isomers.

At the Local Inquiry, Mr Miller had stated that he had purchased via an on-line store a worming tablet called Fido's Closasole® containing levamisole for use on his retired greyhounds. He stated that the drug had been given in error to some of his racing dogs including DIXIES QUEST, DRIVE TO DOON and ASHGROVE MILLY. He also stated that he gave another wormer, Drontal® (that does not contain levamisole), routinely to his racing dogs and was obtained from a veterinary practice ('Prince Bishop Vets'). Mr Miller said he did not take veterinary advice about buying and administering Fido's Closasole®. At the Local Inquiry, Mr Miller had said that he was not aware that he should not run the dogs within 7 days of administering this medication.

The Committee considered the Treatment Book and noted that DIXIES QUEST and ASHGROVE MILLY had been entered as having been given Fido's Closasole® (stated as sourced from the 'Internet') on 29 April 2017, and DRIVE TO DOON recorded as receiving Drontal® (entered as sourced from 'Prince Bishop Consett' – understood to be the veterinary practice) on 23 June 2017. ASHGROVE MILLY was entered as receiving Drontal® ('Prince Bishop Consett') on 26 June 2017. It was unclear to the

Committee whether the entries in the Treatment Book had been made at the time of administration or subsequently.

There were clear inconsistencies between these entries, Mr Miller's evidence and the positive tests that were recorded: DIXIES QUEST tested positive for tetramisole on 1 May 2017, DRIVE TO DOON on 26 June 2017 and ASHGROVE MILLY on 29 June 2017.

The scientific evidence indicated that the tetramisole found in the urine of the three greyhounds was consistent with the administration to DIXIES QUEST, DRIVE TO DOON and ASHGROVE MILLY of Fido's Closasole® on the dates 29 April, 23 June, and 26 June, respectively. On the balance of probabilities, the Committee concluded that Fido's Closasole® and not Drontal® had been administered to DRIVE TO DOON and ASHGROVE MILLY and that the Treatment Book entries were false regarding these two dogs.

There was no scientific evidence presented to indicate that tetramisole was a substance that by its nature would affect performance or prejudice the well-being of a greyhound. Tetramisole/levamisole is not, however, licensed for use in dogs in UK, and Professor Morris advised that the import, purchase and holding of tetramisole in this formulation for use in dogs without authorisation and veterinary prescription would appear to be an offence under the Veterinary Medicines Regulations.

The Committee was most concerned that Mr Miller had felt that he need not attend the Inquiry as there were several matters on which they would have sought clarification, particularly in connection with the entries in the Treatment Book. The Committee was unable to determine whether the incorrect entries were made in error or were a deliberate attempt at falsification. There had been an apparent breach of the Veterinary Medicines Regulations. Moreover, Mr Rosney advised that Mr Miller kept very few retired dogs and at the 2017 Inspection there had been 90 racing dogs and only 7 retired dogs in the kennels. The Committee was unclear why Mr Miller would wish to purchase a different wormer for so few retired dogs.

In all the circumstances of the case, the Disciplinary Committee ordered that Mr Miller be reprimanded and fined £750 (£250 for each greyhound).

The Committee recommended that GBGB look at the Guidance given to trainers on the use of anthelmintics as permitted medications and whether the 7-day rule requires clarification in this respect. They also suggested that Stipendiary Stewards may be able to guide trainers more on the use of anthelmintics when they reviewed and signed off the Treatment Books.

## **2. Shawfield Stadium – AULD REEKIE – Greyhound Trainer Mr W Moffat**

Greyhound Trainer William Moffat 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 AULD REEKIE at Shawfield Stadium on 13 January 2018 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of dexamethasone.

Mr Moffat was unable to attend but participated by audio call to Shawfield Stadium, in the presence of Alex McTaggart, Stipendiary Steward, and Daniel Rankin, Racing Manager of Shawfield Stadium. Professor Tim Morris, Independent Scientific Adviser, was in attendance.

The breaches were admitted, and Mr Moffat confirmed that he understood the GBGB's strict liability rules. The Committee nevertheless decided to proceed to a full Inquiry to determine the facts of the case.

At the Local Inquiry held on 17 February 2018, Mr Moffat had explained that AULD REEKIE had been receiving veterinary treatment for an ear infection. The Treatment Book indicated that treatment had commenced in August 2017. On 15 November 2017, the Treatment Book showed an entry for Aurizon® ear drops (5 drops per day) plus a steroid injection (unspecified). A note had been added that the dog was not to run for 14 days following this treatment. On 4 January 2018, the dog was re-examined by the veterinary surgeon who prescribed a further course of treatment with Aurizon®.

Evidence was presented that Aurizon® contains dexamethasone, and that the drug when applied into the ear canal enters the dog's body. The finding of dexamethasone in the urine of AULD REEKIE was consistent with the administration of the drops as stated by Mr Moffat. Dexamethasone possesses potent anti-inflammatory activity and side-effects and is a substance that could affect the performance of a greyhound or prejudice its well-being.

In his evidence, Mr Moffat stated that he realised that the treatment would require a 7-day period before running the dog. As such, he said he had discussed the course of treatment with the veterinarian, and Mr Moffat decided to administer the drops once weekly after racing so allowing a clear week to elapse before the dog next ran. He said he had administered the first of these weekly treatments on 6 January 2018, and this was confirmed by an entry in the Treatment Book. Nevertheless, despite the 7-day interval, the dog had tested positive to dexamethasone on 13 January 2018.

The Committee accepted that Mr Moffat did not deliberately administer dexamethasone to influence the performance of AULD REEKIE and indeed he had regularly sought veterinary advice for the dog's persistent ear infection. They noted that Mr Moffat had rigorously followed the 7-day withdrawal advice and considered that he might reasonably have expected the drug to have cleared from the dog's system after 7 days.

The Committee suggested that GBGB should warn trainers about the likely presence in blood and urine of corticosteroids such as dexamethasone following topical administration of ear drops.

Some of the GBGB Rules of Racing impose strict liability on the trainer or registered sales agent. In all the circumstances of the case, the Disciplinary Committee ordered that there be no further action.

### **3. Poole Stadium – RIVERSIDE OSCAR – Greyhound Trainer Mr P Browne**

Greyhound Trainer Patrick Browne was found in breach of rules 174 (i)(b), 214 and 217 of the GBGB Rules of Racing in that a urine sample taken from the greyhound RIVERSIDE OSCAR at Poole Stadium on 29 January 2018 was analysed by LGC Health Sciences as containing the presence of hydroxyphenylbutazone.

Mr Browne was in attendance. Mark Sheppard, Racing Manager of Poole Stadium, apologised for his non-attendance. Meriel France, Stipendiary Steward, and Professor Tim Morris, Independent Scientific Adviser, were in attendance.

The breaches were admitted, and Mr Browne confirmed that he understood the GBGB's strict liability rules. The Committee nevertheless decided to proceed to a full Inquiry to determine the facts of the case.

A pre-trial sample had been collected from RIVERSIDE OSCAR at Poole Stadium on 29 January 2018 and the presence of hydroxyphenylbutazone had been detected. A Local Inquiry had been held on 20 March 2018 and at this Inquiry Mr Browne had stated that the positive sample could only be explained by the feeding of contaminated food. In his evidence, Mr Browne rejected any suggestion that he or his family had directly administered phenylbutazone to the dog.

The Trial Results had indicated that the dog was 'xLame' at the trial on 29 January 2018 but Mr Browne challenged that entry and stated that the dog was only subsequently treated for a wrist injury on 3 February 2018, initially by the track veterinary surgeon and again on 7 February 2018 by his own veterinary practice. These treatments had been duly entered in the Treatment Book.

Evidence was presented that hydroxyphenylbutazone is a pharmacologically active metabolite of the non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug phenylbutazone. Phenylbutazone is licensed and available as a Prescription Only Medicine for use in horses and dogs, but because of side-effects it was now less commonly used in dogs. Both phenylbutazone and hydroxyphenylbutazone were substances that could affect the performance of a greyhound or prejudice its welfare. After exposure of greyhounds to phenylbutazone, hydroxyphenylbutazone has been found in urine for around 40 hours. The scientific evidence also showed that the hydroxyphenylbutazone may also have arisen by ingesting meat from the carcass of a horse that had been treated with phenylbutazone. Mr Browne stated that he routinely purchased his meat from a large scale supplier widely used by trainers and he provided certificates stating that the meat so supplied was ABP3. He told the Inquiry that at the time of the test, he was running low on meat and, as this regular supplier only delivered monthly, he bought a quantity of raw meat from a petfood retailer, but he did not retain receipts. Professor Morris advised that such retail sellers of petfood are only authorised to use Category 3 animal by-products (ABP3) which means carcasses contain no residues from authorised treatments. Category ABP2 meat, which can contain residues, should not have been available from such authorised retail petfood suppliers.

The Committee found Mr Browne to be a credible and honest witness. On the balance of probabilities, the Committee concluded that contaminated meat was the likely source of the hydroxyphenylbutazone found in RIVERSIDE OSCAR. Large scale meat suppliers may in turn acquire meat from other suppliers and the Committee advised GBGB to look very critically at certification provided by such suppliers and to caution trainers again about the sourcing of their red meat supplies.

Some of the GBGB Rules of Racing impose strict liability on the trainer or registered sales agent. In all the circumstances of the case, the Disciplinary Committee ordered that there be no further action.