

GREYHOUND WELFARE & INTEGRITY COMMISSION
DISCIPLINARY ACTION DECISION

Date of decision:	7 May 2025
Decision-makers:	Senior Steward Zane Turner and Senior Steward Kevin Adams
Name of relevant person:	Patricia Chaker
Rule no(s):	Rule 165(c)(ii)
Charge(s):	Ms Chaker did a thing which, in the opinion of the Controlling Body, constitutes an offence, by engaging in unseemly and improper conduct towards Officers of the Controlling Body.
Plea:	Guilty
Disciplinary action taken:	To issue a fine of \$2000, as well as impose a 2-month suspension, of which the 2-month suspension is wholly suspended conditional upon Ms Chaker not offending under the same or similar rules within a 12-month period.

DECISION:

1. Ms Chaker was, at all relevant times, a registered Public Trainer and Breeder with the Greyhound Welfare and Integrity Commission ("**Commission**").
2. On 5 February 2025, Inspectors with the Commission conducted a kennel inspection at Ms Chaker's registered kennel address ("**Property**").
3. During the inspection Ms Chaker engaged in conduct or behaviour that is unseemly and improper towards officers of the controlling body.
4. On 10 April 2025 a notice of charge and proposed disciplinary action ("**Notice**"), was issued to Ms Chaker. The Notice issued one charge, alleging a breach of the following Greyhound Racing Rule:

Rule 165(c), Rules

An offence is committed if a person (including an official):

...

(c) engaged in contemptuous, unseemly, improper, insulting or offensive conduct or behaviour in any manner or form towards, or in relation to:

...

(ii) any officer, employee or member of a Controlling Body;

5. The Notice invited Ms Chaker to provide written submissions in response to the charge and proposed disciplinary action. The penalty proposed in the notice was a 4-month suspension.
6. On 23 April 2025, Ms Chaker entered a plea of guilty and provided written submissions in respect of the charge and proposed disciplinary action. Included in the submissions was medical evidence that decision makers determined warranted a degree of leniency in any penalty imposed.
7. Following consideration of Ms Chaker's guilty plea and submissions, the decision makers found the charge proven and determined to impose the following disciplinary action upon her:

Charge Rule 165(c)(ii) – To issue a fine of \$2000, as well as impose a 2-month suspension, of which the 2-month suspension is wholly suspended conditional upon Ms Chaker not offending under the same or similar rules within a 12-month period.

8. Normally a penalty for such an offence would warrant a period of suspension or disqualification, therefore the disciplinary action taken in this decision should not act as a precedent for participants in a similar situation to Ms Chaker, due to the unique circumstances of the case and the degree of mitigation that was determined.
9. In taking this disciplinary action, the decision-makers had regard to all relevant evidence and material, including:
 - Ms Chaker's Guilty plea (25% reduction);
 - Ms Chaker's written submissions;
 - Medical evidence provided by Ms Chaker, which decision makers determined warranted a degree of leniency;
 - Ms Chaker's disciplinary history over a 35-year registration period, which shows no significant breaches of the rules and in which decision makers determined warranted a degree of leniency;
 - Ms Chaker's personal and professional circumstances; and
 - The objective seriousness of the offence.

.....End.....