QUEENSLAND RACING INTEGRITY COMMISSION

# DECISION

**The Rules of Racing of Racing Queensland – Greyhounds**
**Part 6 – Breeding And Identity;**
**Division 1 - Rules in relation to breeding females, sires, and litters**

**Inquiry Number:** G-27-017

**Participant:** Reginald Hazelgrove

**Stewards:** Wesley Maher (Chairperson)
Paul Sawtell (Panel)
Rachel Pedersen (Panel)

**Code:** Greyhounds

**Rule:** GAR 57 Limit on the age at which a *breeding female* can be *serviced*

(1) The *owner* of a *breeding female*, or person with authority to breed that female, must not cause any *breeding female* to be *serviced* if she is over eight years of age, except if, prior to each *service*:

(a) veterinary certification of appropriate health and fitness of the *breeding female* which confirms that it is appropriate for her to whelp is obtained (which must be done within 120 days prior to the date of the further *service*); and

(b) the written approval of a *Controlling Body* is obtained.

**Penalty Notice:** PN-013726

**Hearing Date:** 30 October 2026

**Decision Date:** 30 October 2026

**Charge:** That Mr Reginald Hazelgrove, being a person registered with the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission and bound by the Greyhound Australasia Rules, did cause or permit the breeding female Gypsy Wild, being over eight years of age, to be serviced when the veterinary certification required under GAR 57(1)(a) had not been obtained within 120 days prior to that service, with the certification having been obtained 148 days prior to the service, and thereby breached GAR 57(1)(a).

**Plea:** Guilty

**Penalty:** $250 fine

## Reasons for Decision

### Background & Charge

1. The Queensland Racing Integrity Commission (QRIC) Stewards convened this inquiry following the reported service of the breeding female greyhound Gypsy Wild. This service was referred to the Stewards for investigation due to the timing of the veterinary certification conducted as required under exemption process for greyhound breeding females over the age of eight (8) years old and the subsequent service.

2. During the inquiry the Stewards reviewed several pieces of evidence, including a satisfactory veterinary certificate that was completed for Gypsy Wild on the 17th of March 2025, a breeding exemption approval from QRIC Licensing and Registration department on the 27th of May 2025, and the final service notice indicating service on the 12th of August 2025.

3. Greyhounds Australasia Rule (GAR) 57(1)(a) provides that for a breeding female greyhound to be served after the age of eight (8) then that service must be conducted with 120 days of veterinary certification. The above timeline established in evidence demonstrated that Gypsy Wild was served 148 days since the veterinary certification was completed.

4. After considering all the available evidence, and the provisions of GAR 156(a), the Stewards determined that Mr Hazelgrove had a charge to answer under GAR 57(1)(a), which states:

   *GAR 156 (a) An offence is committed if a person (including an official) contravenes any of the Rules.*

   *GAR 57 (1) The owner of a breeding female, or person with authority to breed that female, must not cause any breeding female to be serviced if she is over eight years of age, except if, prior to each service:*

   *a) veterinary certification of appropriate health and fitness of the breeding female which confirms that it is appropriate for her to whelp is obtained (which must be done within 120 days prior to the date of the further service); and*

   *b) the written approval of a Controlling Body is obtained.*

5. The specifics of the charge were:

   *That Mr Reginald Hazelgrove, being a person registered with the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission and bound by the Greyhound Australasia Rules, did cause or permit the breeding female Gypsy Wild, being over eight years of age, to be serviced when the veterinary certification required under GAR 57(1)(a) had not been obtained within 120 days prior to that service, with the certification having been obtained 148 days prior to the service, and thereby committing an offence under the Rules.*

6. Mr Hazelgrove stated that he understood the charge and pleaded guilty.

### Penalty Submissions

7. Mr Hazelgrove made submissions regarding the circumstances leading up to the service, including:

   a. that he was aware of the relevant rules, however, he believed the greyhound was within the required timeframe for breeding services, and that the breach was simply a mistake on his behalf regarding when the 120 days commenced.

b. that he has been participating in the racing industry for approximately 54 years, with no prior breaches of similar rules.

**Penalty Considerations & Findings**

8. In determining the appropriate penalty in this matter, the Stewards gave careful and balanced consideration to all relevant circumstances surrounding the breach and Mr Hazelgrove's personal and professional circumstances.

9. The Stewards noted Mr Hazelgroves's plea of guilty to the charge, which was entered at the earliest opportunity. This plea was afforded weight as a mitigating factor, particularly when considered alongside Mr Hazelgrove's forthright manner and cooperative approach throughout the inquiry process. Mr Hazelgrove provided clear and honest evidence, and there was no attempt to minimise or deflect responsibility for his actions.

10. The Stewards further considered Mr Hazelgroves's experience within the greyhound racing industry, noting that he has participated for approximately fifty-four (54) years. During that time, Mr Hazelgrove has maintained a disciplinary record with no prior breaches recorded under GAR 57(1)(a). This absence of relevant prior offending was considered as a mitigating factor.

11. Consideration was also given to Mr Hazelgrove's personal circumstances, including his reliance on the greyhound racing industry as his primary source of income. While the Stewards acknowledged that any penalty imposed may have a financial impact, they remained mindful that personal hardship cannot outweigh the need to uphold the integrity of the regulatory framework governing greyhound racing.

12. In determining penalty, the Stewards emphasised the importance of maintaining public confidence in the integrity of the greyhound racing industry. Compliance with breeding requirements is fundamental to ensuring transparency, traceability, and confidence in the administration of the sport. The Stewards also recognised the need for general deterrence, noting that penalties imposed in matters of this nature must send a clear message to industry participants regarding the importance of strict adherence to the Rules of Racing.

13. The Stewards reviewed relevant penalty precedents relating to breaches involving breeder registration requirements. Reference was made to the matter involving Mr Drew Pearce (2026), who pleaded guilty to an offence regarding breeding without the correct breeder's license, resulting in a $250 fine. Additionally, Stewards considered the matter of Ms Michelle Sultana (2026), who pleaded guilty to a breeding offence for acting as a breeder without holding the necessary breeder's licence, resulting in a $250 fine. Both prior matters were considered comparable and provided appropriate guidance in assessing penalty in the present matter.

**Human Rights**

14. The Stewards gave due consideration to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld), recognising that the imposition of any penalty may engage Mr Hazelgrove's rights, including rights relating to property and livelihood. The Stewards were satisfied that any limitation of those rights by the imposition of a monetary penalty is reasonable, justified, and proportionate to achieve the legitimate objectives of maintaining industry integrity, ensuring compliance with the Rules of Racing, and protecting public confidence in greyhound racing.

15. The Stewards considered that the purpose of imposing a monetary penalty for a breach of the Rules of Racing is to maintain public confidence in the conduct of greyhound racing in Queensland, ensure the

integrity of all persons involved in racing and betting under the Racing Integrity Act 2016, and safeguard the welfare of all animals involved in the sport.

16. Having considered whether less restrictive disciplinary options, such as a caution or reprimand, would be sufficient, the Stewards determined that such outcomes would not adequately enforce compliance or achieve the objectives outlined above. The imposition of a monetary penalty was considered necessary and proportionate, serving both as a personal deterrent to Mr Hazelgrove, and as a general deterrent to the wider industry.

**Penalty Decision**

17. Having weighed all the relevant considerations, including mitigating factors, applicable precedents, and the need for deterrence, the Stewards determined that the appropriate penalty in this matter was a monetary fine in the amount of $250.00.

**Right Of Review**

18. Mr Hazelgrove was advised that pursuant to Chapter 6 of the Racing Integrity Act 2016 (Qld), the right for a review of a racing decision of a steward is provided, noting any application for review must be made within three (3) business days of this decision.