

DECISION

Of

Queensland Racing Integrity Commission Stewards

Regarding

SPELLHOUND – Stuart Kendrick

Delivered on: 5 November 2025

Panel: Mr J Williamson (Chairperson), Mr G Goold, Mr P Zimmermann

Queensland Racing Integrity Commission (QRIC) Stewards have concluded inquiries into analyst reports from the Racing Science Centre (RSC) and Racing Analytical Services Limited that the prohibited substance Tapentadol was detected in a post-race urine sample taken from SPELLHOUND after it competed in Race 2 at Rockhampton on 22 April 2025.

After considering the analyst reports and the witness evidence, Stewards preferred the following charge.

Charge

AR 240 (2) states the following:

Subject to subrule (3), if a horse is brought to a racecourse for the purpose of participating in a race and a prohibited substance on Prohibited List A and/or Prohibited List B is detected in a sample taken from the horse prior to or following its running in any race, the trainer and any other person who was in charge of the horse at any relevant time breaches these Australian Rules

The specifics of the charge being:

- 1: You, Mr Stuart Kendrick, are, and were at all relevant times, a trainer licensed by the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission (QRIC).
- 2: You were at the relevant time the licensed trainer of SPELLHOUND.
- 3: On 22 April 2025 SPELLHOUND was brought to the Rockhampton Jockey Club for the purpose of competing in a race, that being Race 2 the TAB Maiden Plate over 1200 metres.
- 4: A prohibited substance was detected in analysis of the post-race urine sample collected from SPELLHOUND, that substance being Tapentadol.

5. Tapentadol is a prohibited substance pursuant to Division 1 of Part 2 of Schedule 1 of the Australian Rules of Racing (Prohibited List B).

Plea: Not Guilty

Charge Defence Submissions:

Stewards considered written submissions from Mr Kendrick in relation to the charge:

1. Sample Spillage, Constituting Procedural Failures and Sample Contamination

Whilst Stewards accept that urine was spilt from the pan following the collection of the sample, as confirmed by the evidence taken during the inquiry, Stewards do not accept that this spillage supports the suggestion of any form of sample contamination. No evidence was tabled that suggested that either the pan or the sample itself were compromised. Stewards also accept that on the evidence of Dr Stanley, a spillage of a sample does not constitute a procedural failure and would be an “unremarkable event”. Dr Stanley also indicated that the Tapentadol was found to be at a “notable level”, which in the Stewards’ opinion does not support the suggestion that the sample was contaminated via an external source. In the view of the Stewards, there is no credible evidence capable of displacing the *prima facie* evidentiary value of the certificates of analyses. The hypothesis of contamination is speculative and unsupported by any substantiating evidence. Accordingly, the integrity of the sample is not shown to have been compromised, and the certificates of analyses retain their full evidentiary weight.

2. Human Sourced Contamination – Staff Medication

Stewards note that two staff members had been, at various times, prescribed Tapentadol, however no evidence supported that either staff member was consuming or in possession of Tapentadol during the relevant time leading up to SPELLHOUND being presented to race and being sampled. Therefore, Stewards do not accept that contamination could have occurred from this source.

3. The Absence of any Tapentadol Metabolite

Stewards were not satisfied that the lack of a reported Tapentadol metabolite supports the assertion that the sample was contaminated as there is no requirement under the Rules of Racing to report whether the Tapentadol was present as a parent drug or a metabolite, or that the metabolite of a substance must also be present to confirm detection of the presence of the substance.

4. Documentation errors in chain of custody

Stewards were not satisfied that the evidence supports any documentation errors.

Penalty Submissions:

Stewards found Mr Kendrick guilty of this charge and considered written submissions from Mr Kendrick in relation to penalty, which are summarised below:

Charge 1:

1. Career record and credibility.
2. SPELLHOUND had not been treated with Tapentadol and Mr Kendrick had no knowledge as to how Tapentadol was found in the sample.
3. Impact on reputation, business and finances.

Stewards Finding on Penalty:

Stewards considered Mr Kendrick's personal circumstances and the impact that a penalty may have upon himself and his business.

The penalty issued by Steward must act as both a general deterrent to the wider industry and as a specific deterrent to Mr Kendrick.

Mr Kendrick's not guilty plea and conduct during the inquiries was considered, along with his personal circumstances and disciplinary history.

Relevant precedents were also considered, particularly matters that were similar in nature, being:

QRIC Decision Greg Kilner 17/8/23. Fine \$4000

QRIC Decision Leigh-Ann Derecourt 20/2/25. Fine \$4000

QRIC Decision Colin Godden 14/10/23. Fine \$5000

QRIC Decision Alan Donohoe 3/7/23. Disqualification 6 Months

RWWA Decision Ross Olivieri 7/12/22. Disqualification 6 Months

Harness Racing NSW Decision Paul Tonkin 28/10/24. Disqualification 18 Months

Racing NSW Decision Peter Korn 8/7/19. Fine \$4000

The Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) was also considered, particularly the human right of privacy and reputation, and the impact that any penalty may have on Mr Kendrick. Stewards determined that the imposition of a monetary penalty was reasonably necessary to achieve the purpose of taking disciplinary action.

Mr Kendrick's record shows one previous offence under this rule during 35 years as a licensed Trainer:

20 May 2025 (Ipswich): ZOULAR – Meloxicam, Flunixin. Fined \$3000.

This demonstrates that Mr Kendrick has a good record as it relates to breaches of this nature. Mr Kendricks disciplinary history is therefore considered a mitigating factor that must be taken into account when considering penalty.

Penalty: Fine \$4000.

Horse Disqualification:

AR 240 Prohibited substance in sample taken from horse at race meeting:

(1) Subject to subrule (3), if a horse is brought to a racecourse and a prohibited substance on Prohibited List A and/or Prohibited List B is detected in a sample taken from the horse prior to or following its running in any race, the horse must be disqualified from any race in which it started on that day.

Acting under the provisions of AR 240 Stewards ordered SPELLHOUND be disqualified from 1st place in Race 2, the TAB Maiden Plate 1200m conducted at Rockhampton Jockey Club April 22, 2025.

Against this Stewards decision Mr Kendrick was advised of his rights to appeal this decision to the Racing Appeal Panel within three (3) business days pursuant to section 252AB(2) of the Racing Integrity Act 2016.