

DECISION

Of

Queensland Racing Integrity Commission Stewards

Regarding

Mr Jay Bellamy

Delivered on: 16 June 2026

Date of hearing: 16 June 2026

Panel: Mr S. Heidke (Chairperson) and Mr R. Jackson

Charge 1: Australian Rule of Racing 252(1)

A person must not have in his or her possession or on his or her premises any medication, substance or preparation which has not been registered, labelled, prescribed, dispensed or obtained in accordance with applicable Commonwealth and State legislation.

Particulars of the charge: You, Jay Bellamy as a licensed trainer on the 23rd May 2026 did possess a opened used bottle of medication/substance/preparation at your registered stable location which was not labelled or prescribed in accordance with applicable Commonwealth and State legislation.

Plea: Guilty

Charge 2: Australian Rule of Racing 104(1)

A trainer must record any medication or treatment administered to any horse in the trainer's care by midnight on the day on which the administration was given.

Particulars of the charge:	You Jay Bellamy as a licensed trainer failed to record medication and or treatment administered to any horse in your care in the form of treatment records.
Plea:	Guilty

BACKGROUND

1. On 16 June 2026, the Stewards' Panel (constituted by Mr S. Heidke (Chairperson) and Mr R. Jackson) conducted an inquiry arising from a routine stable inspection undertaken by Queensland Racing Integrity Commission Compliance and Assurance Team Stewards at the registered stable address of Mr Jay Bellamy.
2. On 23 May 2026, Queensland Racing Integrity Commission Compliance and Assurance Team Stewards attended the stable premises of Mr Bellamy for the purposes of conducting a routine stable inspection. In the course of that inspection, Stewards requested that Mr Bellamy produce his treatment record. Mr Bellamy was unable to produce any treatment record at the time when requested. Stewards also located an open injectable substance contained in an unlabelled and unregistered bottle.
3. At all relevant times, Mr Bellamy was a trainer licensed by the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission.

CHARGES

4. The Stewards determined that Mr Bellamy had one charge to answer under Australian Rule of Racing 252(1) and one charge to answer under Australian Rule of Racing 104(1).

Charge 1

5. Australian Rule of Racing 252(1), reads: "*A person must not have in his or her possession or on his or her premises any medication, substance or preparation which has not been registered, labelled, prescribed, dispensed or obtained in accordance with applicable Commonwealth and State legislation.*"
6. The particulars of the charge were:

You, Jay Bellamy as a licensed trainer on the 23rd May 2026 did possess a opened used bottle of medication/substance/preparation at your registered stable location which was not labelled or prescribed in accordance with applicable Commonwealth and State legislation.
7. Mr Bellamy entered a plea of 'guilty' to the charge. The Stewards accepted Mr Bellamy's guilty plea and formally found Mr Bellamy guilty of the charge.

Charge 2

8. Australian Rule of Racing 104(1), reads: “*A trainer must record any medication or treatment administered to any horse in the trainer’s care by midnight on the day on which the administration was given.*”
9. The particulars of the charge were:

You Jay Bellamy as a licensed trainer failed to record medication and or treatment administered to any horse in your care in the form of treatment records.
10. Mr Bellamy entered a plea of ‘guilty’ to the charge. The Stewards accepted Mr Bellamy’s guilty plea and formally found Mr Bellamy guilty of the charge.

PENALTY SUBMISSIONS

11. In determining penalty, the Stewards carefully considered the submissions provided by Mr Bellamy, including that:
 - a. Mr Bellamy submitted that he has been licensed as a trainer for approximately 11 years and involved within the industry for 16 years.
 - b. Mr Bellamy is reliant on the racing industry to earn a living.
 - c. Mr Bellamy submitted that his personal and financial circumstances also be considered.

DETERMINATION OF PENALTY

12. The primary purpose of imposing sanctions under the Australian Rules of Racing is protective in nature. It is not about punishment. It is about protecting public confidence in, and the integrity of, the sport of thoroughbred racing. Deterrence – both specific and general – is also relevant. This is supported by QRIC’s Thoroughbred Racing Penalty Guidelines (‘Guidelines’), which states that the purpose of a penalty is to provide:
 - a. general deterrence to the industry by ensuring that penalties imposed on an individual for a rule breach are sufficiently serious to discourage other participants from breaching the rule; and
 - b. specific deterrence to the individual contravening the rule, that is the penalty imposed on an individual for a breach must be sufficiently serious to discourage the particular individual from engaging in similar conduct, with the other stated purpose of penalty pursuant to the Guidelines being to maintain standards of integrity and animal care within the thoroughbred racing industry.
13. The Guidelines indicate that the imposition of a penalty involves a balance between the severity of the offence, the need for deterrence to the individual concerned and the industry participants generally, as well as a consideration of any mitigating factors. Each case is to be assessed on its individual merits.

14. In determining the appropriate penalty, Stewards considered the evidence presented, the submissions made by Mr Bellamy, coupled with the following factors identified in the Guidelines as relevant considerations:

- a. Mr Bellamy entered a plea of ‘guilty’ to the charges.
- b. Mr Bellamy cooperated with Stewards.
- c. Mr Bellamy has participated in the racing industry for approximately 16 years.

Mr Bellamy’s disciplinary history, noting that he has no prior breaches of a similar nature.

- d. The nature, circumstances and objective seriousness of the offending, noting that the maintenance of the integrity of thoroughbred racing as a fair sport naturally requires that negligence and carelessness be eliminated so far as possible. This is achieved by rule designed to promote vigilance through proper husbandry practices such as AR 252(1) and AR 104(1). The penalty imposed must be sufficient to encourage trainers to put in place the appropriate standards of proper care and vigilance, which is required at all times.
- e. The requirement for any penalty to act both as a specific deterrent to Mr Bellamy, and as a general deterrent to make it clear to participants, the wider thoroughbred industry, and the community that any breach under AR 252(1) and AR 104(1) will not be tolerated.
- f. The following comparable penalty determinations:
 - i. Jamie McConachy (2024) – Rule *AR 252* - \$500 Fine
 - ii. Adam Simpson (2024) – Rule *AR 252* - \$400 Fine
 - iii. Tom Smith (2023) - Rule *AR 252* - \$300 Fine
 - iv. Ian Prizeman (2026) – Rule *AR 104* - \$200 Fine
 - v. James Healy (2025) – Rule *AR 104* - \$100 Fine
 - vi. Nick Walsh (2024) – Rule *AR 104* - \$300 Fine

PENALTY DECISION

15. The Stewards’ Panel, having considered the above factors, determined the appropriate penalty for the charges to be:

- a. Charge one (1) a monetary fine of \$500.
- b. Charge two (2) a monetary fine of \$200

HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS

16. In considering this decision, proper consideration is required of Mr Bellamy's human rights, and the necessity to act compatibly with human rights in accordance with the *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld).
17. The Stewards acknowledge that penalties imposed under the Australian Rules of Racing may significantly affect a person's capacity to earn a livelihood within the racing industry. In particular, the decision to impose a fine may limit the property rights of the person. The Stewards recognise that such penalties may also affect certain human rights, including the right to own property (including a licence), as well as rights relating to privacy, reputation, equality before the law, and the ability to participate in public life.
18. However, the Stewards also recognise that any limitation on these rights must be reasonable, justified, and proportionate in the circumstances. A restriction on a person's ability to participate in the racing industry or to earn income from that participation may only be imposed where it is necessary to achieve the legitimate purposes of disciplinary action, and where no less restrictive and reasonably available alternative penalty would adequately achieve those purposes.
19. In the circumstances of this case, the Stewards are satisfied that there is no lesser penalty available that would adequately meet the objectives of disciplinary action. Those objectives include maintaining public confidence in the integrity of racing in Queensland; ensuring the integrity and accountability of all persons involved in racing or betting activities under the relevant legislative framework; and safeguarding the welfare of all animals that are, or have been, involved in racing under the provisions of the *Racing Act 2002* (Qld) and the *Racing Integrity Act 2016* (Qld).
20. The balance between the purposes of the disciplinary system in the thoroughbred racing industry and the impacts upon Mr Bellamy's human rights weigh in favour of the need to impose a monetary fine to promote public confidence in the sport of thoroughbred racing.
21. For these reasons, the Stewards consider that the penalty imposed is necessary and appropriate to uphold the integrity of the racing industry and to maintain public confidence in the regulatory framework governing racing in Queensland.

REVIEW

22. Please note that Chapter 6 of the *Racing Integrity Act 2016* (Qld) provides the right for a review of a racing decision of a steward. Please find all relevant information regarding the review process at <https://www.racingappealspanel.qld.gov.au/applications-for-review> noting any application for review must be made within three (3) business days from the date of notification of the decision.