

GREYHOUND WELFARE & INTEGRITY COMMISSION
DISCIPLINARY ACTION DECISION

Date of decision:	16 July 2025
Decision-makers:	Acting Chief Steward Paul Van Gestel and Senior Inspector Shelley Hancock
Name of relevant person:	Richard Anderson
Rule no(s):	Rule 148(2), Rule 156(o) and Rule 165(c)(ii)
Charge(s):	<p>Charge 1 – R148(2) Not Proven</p> <p>Charge 2 – R156(o) Not Proven</p> <p>Charge 3 – R165(c)(ii) Mr Anderson did something, which in the opinion of the Controlling Body, constitutes an offence, by engaging in unseemly or improper conduct towards an Officer of the Controlling Body</p> <p>Charge 4 – R165(c)(ii) Mr Anderson did something, which in the opinion of the Controlling Body, constitutes an offence, by engaging in unseemly or improper conduct towards an Officer of the Controlling Body</p>
Plea:	<p>Charge 1 - Guilty</p> <p>Charge 2 – Not Guilty</p> <p>Charge 3 - Guilty</p> <p>Charge 4 - Guilty</p>
Disciplinary action taken:	Charge 3 – \$2000 fine and two month suspension, with the suspension wholly and conditionally suspended for a period of

24 months conditional on Mr Anderson not breaching this, or any like, rule in this period;

Charge 4 – \$250 fine and one month suspension, with the suspension wholly and conditionally suspended for a period of 12 months conditional on Mr Anderson not breaching this, or any like, rule in this period

DECISION

1. Mr Anderson was, at all relevant times, a registered Public Trainer with the Greyhound Welfare and Integrity Commission (“**Commission**”).
2. On Friday 4 April 2025, Inspectors with the Commission conducted a kennel inspection at Mr Anderson’s registered kennel address.
3. During the inspection several breaches of the GWIC Greyhound Racing Rules (“**Rules**”) were observed.
4. During the inspection Mr Anderson engaged in conduct or behaviour that is unseemly and improper towards an Officer of the Controlling Body.
5. On 21 April 2025 Mr Anderson, by way of a Data Query created on the eTrac platform, engaged in conduct or behaviour that is unseemly or improper towards an Officer of the Controlling Body
6. On Wednesday 2 July 2025, Mr Anderson was issued with a Notice of Charge and Proposed Disciplinary Action (“**Notice**”), containing four charges, pertaining to breaches of the Rules, which read:

Rule 148(2)

(2) A person must not provide, possess, acquire, attempt to acquire, administer, attempt to administer or allow to be administered to a greyhound, any prohibited substance, exempted substance or other substance (including any other medication, medicine, injectable substance, supplement, herbal product or therapeutic good), that is not labelled, prescribed, dispensed and obtained in accordance with relevant Commonwealth, state and territory legislation.

Rule 156(o)

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

(o) makes a false or misleading statement in relation to or during an investigation, inspection, examination, test or inquiry (or at any other disciplinary process, hearing or appeal proceeding) or makes or causes to be made a falsification in a document in connection with greyhound racing or the registration of a greyhound.

Rule 165(c)(ii)

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;

7. The Notice invited Mr Anderson to attend a hearing on Wednesday 16 July 2025 at which time he would have the opportunity to enter a plea and make submissions in relation to the Charges.
8. On Tuesday 15 July 2025, Mr Anderson contacted decision makers and;
 - Entered written submissions
9. On Wednesday 16 July 2025, Mr Anderson attended a hearing held at the Richmond Greyhound Club where he provided verbal and written submissions and entered the following pleas:

Charge 1 –	Guilty
Charge 2 –	Not Guilty;
Charge 3 –	Guilty;
Charge 4 –	Guilty
10. Following consideration of Mr Anderson's pleas and submissions in respect of the charges, the decision makers found Charges 3 and 4 proven and found Charges 1 and 2 to not be proven and accordingly determined to withdraw Charges 1 and 2. At that time in the hearing, decision makers provided Mr Anderson with a Notice of Proposed Penalties, which outlined the penalties that they were considering imposing in relation to each offence. Mr Anderson was invited to make submissions in respect of the proposed penalties.
11. Following consideration of Mr Anderson's submissions in respect of the proposed penalties, the decision makers determined to take the following disciplinary action against Mr Anderson:

Charge 3 –	\$2000 fine and two month suspension, with the suspension wholly and conditionally suspended for a period of 24 months conditional on Mr Anderson not breaching this, or any like, rule in this period;
Charge 4 –	\$250 fine and one month suspension, with the suspension wholly and conditionally suspended for a period of 12 months conditional on Mr Anderson not breaching this, or any like, rule in this period
12. 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 Mr Anderson's, due to the unique circumstances of the case and the degree of mitigation that was determined.

13. In taking this disciplinary action, the decision-makers had regard to all relevant evidence and material, including:

- Mr Anderson's Guilty pleas to charges 3 and 4;
- Mr Anderson's verbal submissions made in respect of the charges;
- Medical evidence provided by Mr Anderson, which decision makers warranted a degree of leniency;
- Mr Anderson's extensive registration period;
- Mr Anderson's personal and professional circumstances; and
- The objective seriousness of the offences.

.....End.....