APPEAL PANEL OF RACING NEW SOUTH WALES

IN THE MATTERS OF THE APPEAL OF
LICENSED JOCKEY JAKE PRACEY-HOLMES

Appeal Panel:	**Mr L Gyles SC – Principal Member;**
	Mr J Murphy; Mr P Losh
Representatives:	**Racing NSW – Mr Moxon**
	Appellant – Mr Crisafi
Date of Decision:	**7 July 2026**

REASONS FOR DECISION

L GYLES SC: Principal Member

The Appellant was charged by the Stewards with careless riding for his ride on *Nothing Finer* in Race 2 at Dubbo on Sunday 28 June 2026. The basis of the charge was that he permitted his mount to shift out when insufficiently clear of *Adamana* which lost its rightful running and was checked. The Appellant was found guilty of the charge and suspended for five meetings.

The Appeal was heard on Monday 6 July 2026. Mr Moxon appeared for the Stewards and Mr Crisafi for the Appellant. The Appellant attended, and gave evidence, by AVL.

Mr Moxon sought to maintain the finding of guilt and the five meeting suspension. He noted that Mr Crisafi's submissions before the Panel accepted that *Adamana* had suffered interference and lost its rightful running, and he relied upon that admission. He submitted that the interference was caused by the Appellant allowing his mount to shift out in the straight and relied upon the front on footage as evidence of that.

Mr Moxon submitted that the Appellant should have straightened once his mount started shifting out, into the running of *Adamana*. He submitted that the shifting out was not caused by any outward movement of Grant Buckley's mount on the inside of him, and contended that at the relevant time it was open to the Appellant to stop riding the horse and to take steps to straighten it. Mr Moxon submitted that the failure to do so was the cause of the checking of *Adamana*, and exhibited a lack of care on the Appellant's part.

Mr Crisafi took the Panel to the footage of the race to seek to make good the submission that the relevant interference and checking of *Adamana* was not caused by the Appellant's mount, but rather was attributable to an incident which took place prior to that. He submitted that at the time that the horse was checked, Grant Buckley's mount had moved outwards pushing the Appellant's mount to the left, and at the same time Donovan Dylan's runner shifted inward causing *Adamana* to shift inwards also, away from that horse. Mr Crisafi submitted that prior to the outward movement of Grant Buckley's mount and the inward movement of Donovan Dylan's mount, there was sufficient room for four horses to make a run in the race, but the combined effect of those two actions narrowed the gap and only permitted three horses to do so. He said this was the real reason why *Adamana* was checked in the way that it was. He submitted that the jockey with the greatest responsibility for the narrowing of that gap was Grant Buckley and said that if any jockey was to be charged for careless riding it should have been him.

The Panel accepts that the footage establishes that the Appellant's mount did hang out and move to its left in the straight, but also accepts the submission of Mr Cristafi that this occurred after the relevant interference had taken place. The footage clearly establishes that Grant Buckley's mount did shift outwards, and Donovan Dylan's mount did move inwards, narrowing that space. At that point, the Panel accepts that the Appellant was carried along with the outward movement of the horse on his inside and finds that to the extent that this narrowed the gap and contributed to the interference that he had little choice and therefore that no fault on his part properly contributed to that interference. His line of riding at that point was essentially dictated by the movement of the horse on his inside.

To the extent that the Appellant permitted his mount to hang out after that and failed to straighten it, even if accepted, the Panel finds that it did not cause or contribute to the earlier interference which was the subject matter of the Steward's charge, and therefore is not relevant to it.

The Panel therefore finds that the Stewards fell into error in charging the Appellant for causing that interference.

The following Orders are made:

1. The Appeal is upheld.
2. The suspension imposed by the Stewards be set aside.
3. The Appeal deposit may be returned.

6 July 2026