

DECISION

Of

Queensland Racing Integrity Commission Stewards

Regarding

Mr Taylor Marshall

Delivered on: 09 September 2025

Date of hearing: 08 September 2025

Panel: Mr Joshua Adams (Chairperson), Mr Paul Zimmermann, Mr Alexander Dowsett.

Appearances: Mr Taylor Marshall (self-represented).

Charge : Australian Rule of Racing ("AR") 229(1)(a) states:

(1) A person must not:

(a) engage in any dishonest, corrupt, fraudulent, improper or dishonourable action or practice in connection with racing;

Particulars of Charge: Mr Taylor Marshall a licensed Jockey with the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, in contravention of Australian Rule of Racing AR 229(1)(a) engaged in fraudulent behaviour in connection with racing.

1. Mr Marshall was at all relevant times a licensed Jockey with the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission.
2. As a requirement of Mr Taylor's Jockey licence with the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, he submitted a fraudulent Health Assessment Results Form for the 2024/2025 season by altering the date on the Health Assessment Results Form completed by his general practitioner from 2023/2024.
3. Mr Taylor's conduct in submitting an altered Health Assessment Results Form was fraudulent and accordingly in breach of AR229(1)(a).

Plea: Guilty

Penalty Submissions:

Stewards were presented with detailed written submissions from Mr Taylor Marshall.

In summary Mr Marshall submitted that:

1. Riding is his sole source of income.
2. Substantial financial commitments.
3. A suspension would significantly impact his ability to earn.
4. Stated the decision was out of character, and not done with the intention to deceive.
5. No physical condition at the time that impacted safety.
6. Has since provided a legitimate medical certificate and holds a current licence.
7. No prior offences of this nature.

Mitigating Factors

1. Early guilty plea.
2. Cooperation with Stewards throughout the inquiry.
3. Expressed genuine remorse and acknowledged wrongdoing.
4. Offence was isolated and not part of a pattern of dishonesty.
5. No safety risk to other riders or horses at the time.
6. Clean disciplinary record in respect of similar conduct.
7. Current licence and medical compliance demonstrate corrective action.

Penalty Submissions

1. Requested consideration of AR 283 alternatives:
 - a. A substantial fine (with part suspended).
 - b. Alternatively, a suspension with all or part suspended under AR 283(5).
2. Comparative / Precedent
3. Referred to the decision of Racing Victoria v Will Gordon: Received a 3-month suspension for importing and selling illegal riding vests. Submitted that offence was more serious and safety-related, whereas his matter was administrative in nature and "victimless"

Stewards' Finding on Penalty:

The Stewards acknowledge Mr Marshall's cooperation, his guilty plea, his personal circumstances, and the remorse expressed. His otherwise unblemished disciplinary record in

relation to similar matters has also been afforded weight. These are genuine mitigating factors which have properly been considered in determining penalty.

That said, Stewards are compelled to address the seriousness of this offence. The submission of falsified documentation in the licensing process strikes at the very heart of racing integrity. The licensing framework is not an administrative technicality; it exists to safeguard both the welfare of participants and the confidence of the wagering public. The system of annual medical certification is designed to ensure that riders are physically and mentally fit to compete in one of the most dangerous professional sports in the world.

Race riding is a uniquely high-risk occupation. Jockeys compete in close quarters at high speeds while surrounded by fellow riders and horses. Split-second misjudgements or the sudden incapacitation of a rider can have catastrophic consequences, not just for the rider involved, but for other jockeys and horses in the field. It is for this reason that strict compliance with licensing and medical requirements is demanded of all jockeys. Any attempt to circumvent these safety mechanisms, even in the absence of an actual health issue, represents an unacceptable risk.

The Stewards also note that jockeys occupy a position of particular trust within the industry. They are the direct participants in races upon which the public invest millions of dollars in wagering each year. The integrity of jockey conduct, and the assurance that only fit and properly licensed persons are permitted to ride, underpins both public confidence and the commercial viability of the sport. Accordingly, jockeys are held to the highest possible standard of honesty and accountability.

As stated by McGill DCJ in *Wallace v Queensland Racing* [2007]:

“Public confidence in racing is easily damaged, and must be protected by imposing penalties when conduct is shown to be prejudicial to the image of the sport.”

In *Waterhouse v Racing Appeals Tribunal* [2002] NSWCA 195, the Court emphasised: “Dishonest conduct in racing is conduct which is blameworthy and capable of undermining confidence in the industry.”

Further, in *Pollett v Racing NSW* (2021) NSWCATAD 152, the Tribunal observed: “It is sufficient if the conduct has a tendency to diminish public confidence in the integrity of racing, whether or not actual prejudice can be shown.”

In respect of comparative authorities, Stewards are satisfied that the appropriate penalty framework is one of disqualification. This is consistent with penalties imposed in cases involving dishonesty and falsification of medical documents:

- *Ross* (2021): 8 months disqualification for falsifying a medical certificate.
- *Sharrock* (2025): 9 months disqualification for repeated falsifications
- *McKay* (2025): 9 months disqualification for multiple falsifications
- *Wright* (2023, VRT): 12 months disqualification for forging a doctor’s signature

- *Schembri* (2025, VRT): 3 years disqualification for repeated falsification and false evidence

Human Rights

In considering this matter, proper consideration is required in respect of human rights, and it is necessary to act compatibly with human rights in accordance with the *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld). The Stewards acknowledge that any penalty imposed upon Mr Marshall may limit or prevent a person from earning a living from the racing industry and subsequently that the imposition of such a penalty may limit a person's human rights to own property (namely a licence), as well as the human right of privacy and reputation. The Stewards further acknowledge that a limitation upon a person's ability to participate in the racing industry, and earn income from that participation, may only be imposed where it is reasonably necessary to achieve the purpose of taking disciplinary action and there is no less restrictive and reasonably available way to achieve the purposes listed above, than to suspend a licence, disqualify a person from holding a licence, or warn a person off.

In the circumstances of this case, Stewards are satisfied that there is no lesser penalty that could be imposed that enables the purposes of taking disciplinary action against a licensee for a contravention of the rules of racing, which are to:

- Maintain public confidence in the racing of animals in Queensland for which betting is lawful;
- Ensure the integrity of all persons involved with racing or betting under the *Racing Integrity Act 2016* or the *Racing Act 2002*; and
- Safeguard the welfare of all animals that are or have been involved in racing under the *Racing Integrity Act 2016* or the *Racing Act 2002*.

Penalty:

Stewards are of the view that a disqualification is warranted in the circumstances. A disqualification for a period of twelve (12) months reduced to eight (8) months in relation to Mr Marshall's disciplinary history and guilty plea, effective from the date of this decision commencing 9 September 2025 concluding 9 May 2026.

Further, stewards draw to the attention of Mr Taylor Marshall Australian Rule of Racing AR 263 and the prohibitions on persons and their conduct while disqualified.

Against this Stewards decision Mr Taylor Marshall is advised of his rights to appeal this decision to the Racing Appeal Panel.