

COMMISSION HEARING

TORONTO, ONTARIO – APRIL 10, 2012

IN THE MATTER OF THE RACING COMMISSION ACT S.O. 2000, c.20;

AND IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL AND REQUEST FOR HEARING BY STANDARDBRED LICENSEE DWAYNE JACKSON

On February 29, 2012, standardbred licensee Dwayne Jackson, ("JACKSON") (Licence #M6619), appealed Judges' Ruling SB43643, dated February 21, 2012, wherein he was ordered to comply with the Judges' direction to refrain from warming up horses at racetracks where his spouse is employed in an official capacity, other than those horses trained by his regular employer, in accordance with Rules 1.09 and 5.11 of the Rules of Standardbred Racing.

On April 10, 2012, a Panel of the Ontario Racing Commission ("ORC") consisting of Chair Rod Seiling, was convened to hear the appeal.

Rick Rier appeared as agent for the Administration. JACKSON attended the hearing in person and was represented by Dave Boughton.

Upon hearing the testimony of Judge William Maertens, and JACKSON, upon reviewing the exhibits filed and upon hearing the submissions of Rick Rier and Anthony Boughton, the Panel dismissed the appeal.

A transcript of the Panel's Oral Decision is attached to this Ruling.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this 19th day of April 2012.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

John L. Blakney Executive Director

ONTARIO RACING COMMISSION

STANDARDBRED HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AND REQUEST FOR HEARING OF

DWAYNE JACKSON

Held Before:		
Rod Seiling,	Chairman	
These are an excerpt of the proceedings in the above mentione matter held before The Ontario Racing Commission, Re: DWAYNE JACKSON , taken before Toronto Court Reporters, Suite 1410, 65 Queen Street West, Toronto, Ontario, at 10 Carlson Court, Suite 400, Toronto, Ontario, on the 10th day of April, 2012.		
Appearances:		
Rick Rier,		agent for the Ontario Racing Commission Administration
Dave Boughtor	1,	agent for the Appellant Jackson

Hearing continued ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: All rise. Please be seated. The issue before us today is
should the appellant Dwayne Jackson be allowed to warm up horses for licensees
other than those of his employer when his wife is employed as a paddock judge at
that track. After carefully listening to the testimony and reviewing the evidence and
documents filed the panel denies the appeal. The standard of proof is on a balance
of probabilities with the onus of proof on the Administration of the ORC. Based on
the evidence it is reasonable to conclude that there is a conflict of interest as Mr.
Jackson is using the ORC office as his de facto office. As well, there exists the
perception of preferential treatment. For racing to exist it must not only ensure its
integrity is being looked after it has to be seen to be doing that. Allowing such a close
business relationship to exist within an integral part of racing could lead to a variety of
possible unfavourable outcomes. There is no question concerning the appellant's
quality of service, hence the support letters. Although supporting Mr. Jackson, they
are only concerned with keeping his valued service. They are not taking into account
the mandate of the ORC to protect the public interest. The ORC is the king of
integrity; because of this responsibility it sometimes has to make tough decisions
which sometimes includes counter-ruling a previous Commission decision. On a
balance of probabilities there is a pecuniary conflict of interest and for the good of
racing the appeal must be denied. Thank you. Any questions?

MR. RIER: No, sir.

MR. BOUGHTON: No, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

	Hearings April 10, 2012 (excerpts)	4
1		
2		
3		
4		
5 6 7	CERTIFIED CORRECT RAYMOND P. MACDONALD, B.A., CVR Commissioner of Oaths	