

APPEAL PANEL OF RACING NEW SOUTH WALES

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF LICENSED JOCKEY REECE JONES

Heard at Racing NSW Offices

Appeal Panel: **Mr L. Vellis - Convenor; Mrs J. Foley; Mr C. Tuck**
Representatives: **Racing NSW – Mr T. Moxon, Deputy Chairman of Stewards**
Appellant – Self-represented
Date of Hearing: **18 September 2024**
Date of Reasons and Orders: **18 September 2024**

REASONS FOR DECISION

1. On 12 September 2024, licensed jockey Mr Reece Jones (**Appellant**) was charged with a breach of the careless riding rule (AR 131(a)) following his ride of *Copacabana* in race 5 at Hawkesbury on that day in the Dentavision Class 1 Handicap run over 1600 metres. The particulars of the charge were as follows:

“you did permit your mount to shift out near the 200 metres when insufficiently clear of Pasima, which was taken out across the rightful running of In Iso, which had to be checked.”

2. The Appellant pleaded not guilty to a breach of the rule. The Stewards graded his carelessness as “medium”, and the consequences as “checked and/or lost rightful running”. The application of the Careless Riding Penalty Template (**Template**) resulted in a seven-meeting suspension of the Appellant’s licence to ride, which was reduced to three meetings having given consideration to certain elements, such as the Appellant’s recent good record, an upcoming feature race meeting and the contribution of Jason Collett on *Cristal Clear*. The Appellant has appealed to the Panel against the severity of penalty.
3. At the hearing the Panel was shown film of the race multiple times, from two angles. The main issue on the appeal was whether the carelessness should be assessed as “low” or “medium”. The Appellant contended that while he did not dispute he had breached the rule, he had corrected his mount from shifting out as soon as possible, as some of the other horses, including *Pasima*, had overreacted.
4. The Appellant also submitted that Molly Bourke on *In Iso* did not check her mount but was instead hampered. On this basis, Mr Jones submitted that the grading of carelessness should

be low. Mr Jones also submitted that Mr Collett's shift on *Cristal Clear* was a significant contributing factor to the Appellant shifting out.

5. Having watched the film and listened to the submissions of the Appellant, the Panel is of the view that:
 - a. the Appellant shifted out when insufficiently clear of *Pasima* (i.e., definitely less than two lengths clear of *Pasima*);
 - b. *Pasima* was taken out across the rightful running of *In Iso*, which had to be checked and lost its rightful running; and
 - c. the Appellant made an error of judgement when shifting out, having conceded in the inquiry that Ms Bourke was closer than he expected.
 - d. while the Appellant reacted quickly to the incident, he did fail to properly check before making his initial move; and
 - e. any contribution of Mr Collett on *Cristal Clear* was correctly attributed as minor and attracting a 10% discount.
6. The Panel sees no basis upon which to adjust the contribution mitigation applied by the Stewards and are comfortable with the manner in which the template was applied. In fact, through rounding down, it could be said that the Appellant was treated very fairly by the Stewards.
7. In these circumstances the appeal must be dismissed.
8. The orders of the Panel are:
 - a. appeal dismissed;
 - b. finding of a breach of AR 131(a) confirmed;
 - c. penalty of a three-meeting suspension of the Appellant's licence to ride confirmed, commencing on Sunday, 22 September 2024 and expiring on Sunday, 29 September 2024, on which day the Appellant may resume riding; and
 - d. appeal deposit to be forfeited.