

Auckland RC 5 March 2016 - R 9 - Chair, Mr A Dooley

Rules:

[638\(1\)\(d\)](#)

Name(s):

Mr M Coleman - Rider of THE HASSLER
Mr G Cooksley - Rider of SPLENDIDO
Ms S Spratt - Rider of WHAT'S THE STORY
Mr A Coles - Stipendiary Steward

Charge:

Facts:

denied

Following the running of race 9, BMW NZ Derby Group 1, an Information was filed pursuant to Rule 638(1)(d). The Informant, Mr Oatham, alleged that near the 1800 metres Mr Coleman permitted his mount THE HASSLER to shift inwards when not clear of WHAT'S THE STORY which was crowded inwards into the line of SPLENDIDO which was badly checked, with several other runners also being badly affected.

Mr Coleman acknowledged that he understood the Rule and confirmed that he denied the breach.

Rule 638(1) (d) provides: *A Rider shall not ride a horse in a manner which the Judicial Committee considers to be careless.*

Mr Oatham told the Committee he would be calling 3 witnesses namely Stipendiary Steward Mr Coles, and riders Mr Cooksley and Ms Spratt.

The following are the salient points of the hearing.

Mr Coles demonstrated the incident by using the available video films. He identified that near the 1800 metres Mr Coleman permitted his mount to shift in when only $\frac{3}{4}$ of a length clear of Ms Spratt. He said in doing so Ms Spratt's mount was crowded inwards into the running line of Mr Cooksley's mount who was severely checked. He said as a consequence of this several other horses that were racing behind Mr Cooksley were badly hampered.

Mr Coleman questioned Mr Coles as to whether he thought Ms Spratt had turned her horse's head out leading up to the incident because things were getting a "little tight". Mr Coles acknowledged that leading up to the incident Ms Spratt's mount did race ungenerously. However, he said when the interference occurred at the 1,800 metres Ms Spratt's mount was racing in a tractable manner.

Mr Cooksley was then called as a witness. He stated that he was racing $\frac{1}{2}$ a length behind Ms Spratt adjacent to the running rail when he received pressure from his outside. He said this resulted in him going into the fence.

Mr Coleman asked Mr Cooksley if the interference was abrupt, he replied in the affirmative.

Ms Spratt was then called as the next witness. She said that prior to the incident her mount was pulling a little bit and running away from Mr Coleman's mount. She said when the interference occurred Mr Coleman had shifted inwards into her running line which forced her into Mr Cooksley on the rails. She said Mr Coleman was about $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 length clear of her and she was fully aware that Mr Cooksley was racing on her inside at that point.

Mr Coleman had no question of Ms Spratt.

Mr Coleman stated that he did not agree that he permitted his mount to shift in, he believed the horse got in on its own accord. He said he had no intention of being closer than 3 wide as he was following Mr Riddell. He advised the Committee that his mount was having its first start in a Norton bit and it was slow to react and in his opinion the horse reacted poorly. He said he only moved in $\frac{1}{2}$ a horse width and his mount changed ground for 2 strides.

Mr Oatham in summing up stated that it was clear that Ms Spratt was racing in a 2 wide position and Mr Coleman was racing in a lose 3 and $\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 wide position before shifting in. He said the Stewards can't see at any point where Mr Coleman has straightened his

mount prior to the interference occurring. He acknowledged that Mr Coleman did make an attempt to straighten his mount but it was too late because there was insufficient room for 2 runners on his inside. He said Ms Spratt always had her horse's head turned out and Ms Spratt was unable to relieve the pressure she received from Mr Coleman. He concluded by saying the video films supported the evidence of all 3 witnesses.

Mr Coleman in summing up said that he made every effort to straighten his mount. He stated that he can't correct his mount until it has done something wrong. He added the horse shifted in on its own accord and there was no intent on his part.

Decision:

The Committee carefully considered all the evidence and submissions as presented. Having reviewed the video films several times we established that passing the 2,000 metres Ms Spratt's mount was racing ungenerously with its head turned outwards and Mr Coleman was racing in a 4 wide position. Shortly after that point Mr Coleman allowed his mount to shift in for 2 strides when only ½ a length clear of Ms Spratt. This resulted in Ms Spratt's mount being crowded inwards into the rightful running line of Mr Cooksley who was racing ½ a length behind Ms Spratt. This resulted in Mr Cooksley's mount being severely checked near the 1,800 metres. The consequences of this were extensive with 7 horses that were racing behind Mr Cooksley having to be checked to varying degrees. We note the worst affected horse apart from SPLENDIDO was GOBSTOPPER.

The evidence presented by Mr Oatham, Mr Coles and Mr Cooksley and Ms Spratt was compelling and supported by the video footage.

We accept there was no intent on Mr Coleman's part and he did attempt to correct his mount but it was too late.

For the reasons detailed above we find the charge against Mr Coleman proved.