



GREYHOUND WELFARE & INTEGRITY COMMISSION
DISCIPLINARY ACTION DECISION

Date of decision:	9 June 2022
Decision-makers:	Director of Race Day Operations & Integrity, Wade Birch, and Steward, Jason Hodder.
Name of relevant person:	Trent Wrigley
Track:	N/A
Date:	17 February 2022, 18 February 2022, 23 March 2022
Rule no.:	Rule 86(f)(iii) x 2
Charge(s):	(1) Mr Wrigley used contemptuous, unseemly, improper, insulting or offensive language towards or in relation to a GWIC staff member on 17 and 18 February 2022. (2) Mr Wrigley used contemptuous, unseemly, improper, insulting or offensive language towards or in relation to a GWIC staff member on 23 March 2022.
Disciplinary action taken:	Charge 1: To issue Mr Wrigley a reprimand Charge 2: To issue Mr Wrigley a reprimand

BACKGROUND:

1. At all relevant times Mr Wrigley was a registered Owner Trainer and Breeder.
2. On 17 February 2022 Mr Wrigley telephoned the Commission and spoke with a Commission staff member.
3. On 18 February 2022 Mr Wrigley emailed the same Commission staff member. The email contained words to the effect of:
 - a. *"I don't deal with secretary's [sic] about matters that does not concern them..."*
 - b. *"...again you can't complete a simple job asked of you..."*
 - c. *"...no wonder people are disillusioned with the incompetence of GWIC..."*
 - d. *"I look forward to not having to deal with u [sic] again."*
4. On 23 March 2022 Mr Wrigley was contacted by a Commission staff member. During the telephone conversation, Mr Wrigley said words to the effect of:

- *“...if youse can’t read – if youse can’t see how someone would be annoyed to-it’s just a press of a button...it’s just a press of a button to send it through and she didn’t want to do it...”*
- *“All she had to do was press a button. And that, you can’t say that’s not the truth...because that’s all it is, mate. Press of a button.”*
- *“I gave as good as I got that day and if she didn’t like the email she got, maybe that was a little wake up call to say maybe I shouldn’t be such a bitch to people...”*

5. The decision makers issued a Notice of Charge and Proposed Disciplinary Action (“**Notice**”) to Mr Wrigley on 24 May 2022, which issued two charges under Rule 86(f)(iii)¹ of the GWIC Greyhound Racing Rules. Rule 86(f)(iii) reads:

A person (including an official) shall be guilty of an offence if the person-

(f) engages in, publishes or causes to be published, broadcasts or causes to be broadcast, the use of any contemptuous, unseemly, improper, insulting or offensive language, conduct or behaviour in any manner or form towards, or in relation to-

...

(iii) the Controlling Body, or a member of the Controlling Body.

6. On 9 June 2022 Mr Wrigley attended a hearing with the decision makers held via audio-visual software.
7. The decision makers considered all of the evidence before them, including Mr Wrigley’s evidence and submissions made.
8. The decision makers found the Charges proven and took the following disciplinary action against Mr Wrigley:

Charge 1 (Rule 86(f)(iii)): To issue Mr Wrigley with a reprimand;

Charge 2 (Rule 86(f)(iii)): To issue Mr Wrigley with a reprimand.

9. In taking this disciplinary action, the decision makers considered all evidence, including:
 - Greyhound racing penalty precedents in NSW;
 - The length of time Mr Wrigley has held a registration, being since 2011, a period of approximately 10 years;

¹ This is the applicable rule in force at the time of the offence. Rule 165(b) of the Greyhound Racing Rules as published 1 May 2022 is the comparative rule.

- Mr Wrigley’s disciplinary history – he has no like matters on his record;
- The submissions made by Mr Wrigley in relation to the circumstances of the offending.

10. The decision-makers noted the penalties imposed for misconduct under the same rule include disqualifications but also had regard to the varying factual circumstances of each matter. The decision-makers distinguished between matters where a staff member is directly abused in person and where direct in-person threats and/or abuse are made. Misconduct directed at staff via telephone are matters that the Commission take seriously but are still required to impose a penalty balanced against other factors.

11. It was noted that the conduct referred to above was the use of condescending language and an expression of an opinion that was clearly not sought nor appropriate. Offences of misconduct can vary widely in their factual circumstances and this was a consideration of the decision-makers who were able to distinguish this matter from other matters.

12. A particular factor in mitigation was Mr Wrigley’s acceptance of the decision makers request of him to make an apology to the relevant staff members who took his phone calls. Imposing appropriate penalties will always involve a balance of several factors and whilst on this occasion it was considered appropriate to issue reprimands, it will always be a consideration of the individual circumstances of each matter that lead to the appropriateness of the penalties.

.....End.....