

In the Matter Of:

Indiana Horse Racing Commission

IHRC Meeting

July 15, 2015

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDIANA HORSE RACING COMMISSION
MEETING

HELD ON
JULY 15, 2015

9:00 A.M.

AT

INDIANA STATE LIBRARY
315 W. OHIO STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

TAKEN BY:
ROBIN P. MARTZ, RPR
NOTARY PUBLIC

1 APPEARANCES

2 Thomas Weatherwax, Chairman
 Greg Schenkel
 3 George Pillow
 Susie Lightle
 4 William McCarty

5 Joe Gorajec, Executive Director

6 Lea Ellingwood, Esq.
 Holly Newell, Esq.
 7 INDIANA HORSE RACING COMMISSION
 1302 North Meridian Street, Suite 175
 8 Indianapolis, IN 46202

9 AGENDA

10	1. Consideration of settlement agreement in the matter of IHRC Staff v. Thomas Amoss	3
11	2. Consideration of settlement agreement in the matter of IHRC Staff v. Bradley Moffit	5
12	3. Consideration of settlement agreement in the matter of IHRC Staff v. Salvador Rojas	10
13	5. Consideration of settlement agreement in the matter of IHRC Staff v. Carolyn Murphy	12
14	6. Consideration of ALJ's Proposed Findings of fact, Conclusions of law, and Recommended Order - Mickel Norris	14
15	7. Consideration of ALJ's Proposed Findings of fact, Conclusions of law regarding Russell's Motion to Recuse ALJ in re: IHRC Staff v. Ross Russell	48
16	8. Staff report on equine drug testing matters	73
17	9. Approval of Texas Veterinary Medical Diagnostic Laboratory as split sample lab for 2015	84
18	10. Approval of an waivers on cobalt primary and split laboratories	85
19	11. 2015 Legislative update	86
20	12. Promotions update	90
21	13. Review of Commission rulings	96
22	14. Consideration of emergency rule regarding fair start pole	100
23	15. Consideration of readoption of administrative rules scheduled to expire 12-31-2015	109

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Good morning. Apologize
2 for being late. I would like to call our
3 Commission meeting to order.

4 Do I have my little script here for swearing
5 in?

6 (At this time the oath was administered to the
7 court reporter by Chairman Weatherwax.)

8 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Okay. The agenda, first
9 of all, you've seen and probably had a chance to
10 look at the minutes of our April 16th meeting.
11 Do you have any questions or comments? Have you
12 all looked at them?

13 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I move approval.

14 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: We have a motion of
16 approval. All those in favor, say "aye."

17 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

18 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: The first item on the
19 agenda deals with -- and, Lea, I think you're going
20 to share this us, Indiana Horse Racing Commission
21 versus Thomas Amoss.

22 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Thank you, Chairman. You
23 have before you a settlement agreement in the
24 matter of the IHRC Staff versus Thomas Amoss. You
25 will recall that this matter was before the

1 Commission at the last meeting, at which time the
2 Commission issued a final order regarding a fine
3 and license suspension against Mr. Amoss.

4 Mr. Amoss subsequently timely appealed the
5 Commission's order to a trial court. However,
6 since that time, Mr. Amoss and Commission Staff
7 reached a settlement that includes terms
8 satisfactory to both parties. Those terms are
9 outlined in the agreement before you. The parties
10 respectfully request the Commission approve this
11 settlement agreement. I'm happy to answer any
12 questions that I can, as I imagine are both counsel
13 are present as well.

14 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Have you had a chance to
15 review the findings? Looks like the settlement of
16 this went from a 60 day to a 45 day, and the \$5,000
17 fine still stands.

18 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Yes, sir.

19 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Comments, questions for
20 the staff? Okay. Do I hear a motion to accept
21 this agreement?

22 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: So moved.

23 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: All those in favor say
25 "aye."

1 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

2 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: It's passed. Number
3 two, horse racing commission in consideration of
4 the settlement agreement in the matter of Bradley
5 Moffit. And, Holly, are you going to do that one?

6 MS. NEWELL: Yes, sir. In your packet you
7 have the settlement agreement between Commission
8 Staff and Bradley Moffit. Bradley Moffit is a
9 Standardbred trainer who raced a horse in the
10 seventh race on May 31, 2014. That horse's
11 post-race samples tested positive for darbepoetin
12 alfa. Darbepoetin alfa is also known as DPO.
13 We're going to go with that because it's a lot
14 easier for me.

15 It is a synthetic form of EPO. And EPO is
16 erythropoietin. It's a blood doping agent. Lance
17 Armstrong admitted to using EPO, if that kind of
18 puts it in a separate context for you.

19 DPO is a synthetic form of EPO. And what
20 these drugs do is a regeneration of red blood
21 cells. It's a performance enhancing drug. The RCI
22 classifies this as a 2A drug. A drug with a high
23 potential to affect performance.

24 The executive director issued an
25 administrative complaint last year. And he

1 recommended a \$5,000 fine and a 15-year suspension.
2 However, the parties discussed the matter, and we
3 were able to reach an agreement that has Mr. Moffit
4 suspended for ten years with no fine.

5 To put this in a little bit of context, the
6 Canada commission recommended a \$100,00 fine and a
7 ten-year penalty for a trainer who had horses that
8 tested positive for EPO. And the RCI recommends a
9 \$100,000 fine and a ten-year suspension as well, or
10 at least one of their boards has moved toward that.

11 I think the executive director also wanted to
12 talk a little about this particular drug. It's
13 fairly unique.

14 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Yes, Joe, because I've
15 never seen a penalty or a fine this severe in my
16 life.

17 JOE GORAJEC: And you probably won't see too
18 many. When you look at blood doping agents, EPO
19 and its close cousin DPO, you're looking at the
20 worst of the worst. If there was a pyramid of
21 drugs, EPO would sit at the top as far as the
22 severity of the events. And, of course, the
23 penalty follows the severity of the offense.

24 When you look at the RCI classification
25 guidelines, a Class 1 is, in a Class 1 through 5

1 system, with one being the worst, typically, a
2 first offense would call for a minimum of a
3 one-year suspension. This is a drug kind of in its
4 own category. It's the worst of the worst.

5 We're one of the very few jurisdictions in the
6 country now to have called an EPO positive. EPO
7 positives are very hard to come by because of the
8 fact that it doesn't stay long in the horse's
9 system. It can have performance enhancing effect
10 when the horse competes but not have the drug in
11 its system when the horse competes.

12 So to find a positive for EPO, we have to be
13 either very diligent or very lucky. In this
14 particular case, we were very lucky. But that's
15 not to say we aren't diligent also. We do test for
16 EPO. And, like I said, we are one of the few
17 jurisdictions in the country to have a positive
18 test. You're very unlikely to come across a
19 suspension of this length again unless it is, for a
20 positive test, unless it is EPO or a similar such
21 drug.

22 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Do we test for this all
23 the time?

24 JOE GORAJEC: Yes. We focus our test for EPO
25 in out of competition because EPO is a drug that

1 has a very short detection window, anywhere from 48
2 to 96 hours. But the effects of the drug can last
3 for weeks. So this was a very unusual case because
4 it was actually caught in a post-race sample.

5 Most horsemen who would use this drug would be
6 smart enough not to inject a horse with the
7 substance close to race day. So if they're smart
8 and they are utilizing this drug, they are
9 utilizing it maybe a week or two prior to the
10 horses racing. When they do that, the drug is not
11 in the horse's system when the horse races. So the
12 only way we can find it is when we test horses out
13 of competition, when we go to the barn in the
14 morning and draw blood and send it to the lab for
15 special testing. Or we go to visit a farm or a
16 training center, and we draw blood and send it to a
17 lab to do testing.

18 We have a very aggressive out-of-competition
19 testing program. In fact, of all the commissions
20 that do out-of-competition testing, I think we rank
21 third in the number of samples that we collect.

22 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That's why we would not
23 normally see this type of severity because you
24 would never find this kind of problem. I haven't
25 seen this since I've been here.

1 JOE GORAJEC: No one really knows how often
2 this drug is being utilized. Having said that, the
3 fact that we have an aggressive out-of-competition
4 testing scheme here would make one believe that to
5 the extent it's being abused, it's most likely
6 being abused in other states before Indiana because
7 other states don't have aggressive
8 out-of-competition testing programs.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Questions from our
10 Commissioners regarding this particular item?

11 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I just want to make
12 sure I understand that the revised agreement that
13 you sent us, Lea, shows that this goes from
14 March 18, 2015 to 2025, right?

15 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Yes, there was a
16 typographical error in the original settlement
17 agreement. The parties agreed to the dates.

18 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: Even though this
19 occurred in 2014, and he's been under suspension
20 since then, right?

21 MS. NEWELL: Mr. Moffit was summarily
22 suspended. However, his summary suspension was
23 lifted. He has not being under suspension since
24 the drug was detected.

25 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: He's been allowed to

1 participate?

2 MS. NEWELL: His summary suspension lasted a
3 period of time. And during that time, he sort of
4 closed up his business.

5 JOE GORAJEC: Excuse me, I just want to make
6 this clear. Once his suspension was lifted was
7 after the meet. He was not relicensed in Indiana.
8 So he would be eligible to compete or eligible to
9 receive a license, but we did not license him again
10 this year.

11 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: The other question I
12 have is this is a ten-year suspension. There's no
13 monetary fine.

14 JOE GORAJEC: Correct.

15 MS. NEWELL: Correct.

16 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Questions from our
17 Commissioners? Thank you, Holly.

18 Do I hear a motion to accept this?

19 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: So moved.

20 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: All those in favor say
22 "aye."

23 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

24 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Number three, settlement
25 agreement also with staff and Salvador Rojas.

1 MS. NEWELL: I think it's Rojas.

2 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Who's going to do that
3 one?

4 MS. NEWELL: I will. Mr. Rojas is a
5 Thoroughbred racehorse trainer. He participated in
6 the ninth race on May 17th of last year. His horse
7 tested positive for dexamethasone. Dexamethasone
8 is a Class 4C drug. The uniform guidelines
9 recommend no suspension for a first offense. It is
10 not a drug like EPO that is one that is considered
11 performance enhancing and one that is of grave
12 concern to regulators.

13 However, it was a positive. He did test over
14 the threshold limit. And he did avail himself of a
15 split sample. And the split did confirm he was
16 over that threshold limit. Mr. Rojas has agreed to
17 a \$1,000 fine and a purse redistribution, which is
18 in accordance with the uniform guidelines.

19 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: He's not suspended.

20 MS. NEWELL: No.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: He just has a fine and
22 return back the purse.

23 MS. NEWELL: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Any questions,
25 Commissioners? Do I hear a motion to accept this?

1 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: So moved.

2 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: We have a motion and a
4 second. All those in favor say "aye."

5 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

6 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: It's passed. Item four,
7 I guess, has been removed from the agenda.

8 Item number five, consideration of the
9 settlement agreement in the matter of the horse
10 racing commission staff and Carolyn Murphy. Holly.

11 MS. NEWELL: This is very similar to what we
12 just heard with Mr. Rojas. Carolyn Murphy is
13 another Thoroughbred trainer. She participated in
14 the first race on June 6, 2014 and also had a
15 dexamethasone positive. So it's the same drug we
16 just heard about. She did test over the threshold
17 limit. She declined to have a split sample. We
18 have reached the terms of a \$1,000 fine and purse
19 redistribution that is recommended by the uniform
20 guidelines.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: This points out the
22 fact -- is this a therapeutic medication?

23 MS. NEWELL: It is.

24 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: This is something you
25 give the horse to make it feel better or be

1 healthier.

2 MS. NEWELL: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: But there was just too
4 much given.

5 MS. NEWELL: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: These people know what
7 the threshold is. Do they use this drug regularly?

8 MS. NEWELL: Joe can probably speak to that,
9 but I think Dex is a pretty popular drug.

10 JOE GORAJEC: Yes, it is.

11 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: The world is using it.
12 It's just you can't use too much.

13 JOE GORAJEC: It's usually not a dosage thing
14 that causes people problems as far as using too
15 much. They administer it too close to post time.
16 So it's a timing issue usually more than a dosage
17 issue.

18 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: The settlement was a
19 thousand dollar fine.

20 MS. NEWELL: And purse redistribution.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioners, do you
22 have any other questions regarding the Carolyn
23 Murphy settlement? Do I hear a motion?

24 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: I move to approve the
25 settlement agreement.

1 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: We have a motion and a
3 second. All those in favor say "aye."

4 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

5 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Number six, Lea, I think
6 you and Holly can help us with this one. This one
7 is a little more complicated. It deals with
8 conclusions of law and recommendations for Mickel
9 Norris. Lea.

10 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.
11 Commission Staff issued an administrative complaint
12 against Mike Norris on November 7, 2014. On the
13 26th, Bernard Pylitt was assigned as the ALJ in
14 the matter. Judge Pylitt held a hearing on the
15 matter on May 6th and 7th. And having heard and
16 weighed all the evidence, the ALJ issued proposed
17 findings of fact, conclusions of law, and a
18 recommended order.

19 On June 25th, Norris filed objections to the
20 ALJ's proposed findings. A prehearing order was
21 issued by the Commission, which allowed parties to
22 brief their positions and to make oral arguments in
23 the matter. Those briefs, which were filed on July
24 7th, have been provided to you, and oral arguments
25 will now be heard.

1 Each side will have ten minutes, beginning
2 with Mr. Shanks since he has filed the objections.
3 I will signal when you each have three, two, and
4 one minute left.

5 At the conclusion, the Commission will close
6 the record and begin deliberations. The Commission
7 must either affirm, modify, or dissolve Judge
8 Pylitt's proposed order or remand the matter back
9 to the ALJ for further proceedings.

10 I think if there aren't other questions from
11 you, we can begin.

12 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Very good.

13 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Just to clarify, each party
14 has ten minutes. I think I may have said five.

15 MR. SHANKS: You said 10. I would request
16 that if I do not take the entire ten minutes, that
17 I have at least a couple minutes for rebuttal,
18 Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Sure.

20 MR. SHANKS: I will try to make this
21 relatively brief. Okay. Here we go. Thank you
22 very much.

23 This is a very interesting case, as you've
24 noticed from what you had for bedtime reading. In
25 brief, the staff is making a mountain out of a

1 molehill in this case. There were five positives
2 of hydrocortisone succinate. The first result was
3 not reported by the lab until 70 days after the
4 first positive.

5 Now, the Commission had anticipated things
6 like this by rule and determined that if there were
7 multiple positives, and there was a delay in the
8 lab responding with the results, that those
9 positives would be considered as one. Now, if that
10 rule is followed, then this case would have been
11 done a long time ago. And the Norrises would not
12 have been put in the financial and emotional
13 situation that they find themselves.

14 Had the lab followed the contract and provided
15 the results within five days to the Commission,
16 many of these positives would have been avoided
17 because there would have been an opportunity then
18 for Mr. Norris and the veterinarian to alter the
19 administration of the drug. What the staff is
20 alleging as an aggravating circumstance to justify
21 this, what I think is a horrendous recommendation
22 for penalty, is that there was race-day
23 administration.

24 You are probably familiar with that rule,
25 within 24 hours of the first post time, not the

1 post time of the horse that's running but of the
2 first post time. Well, we had experts testify on
3 that. I had to go to Baton Rouge, as did Holly, to
4 depose the toxicologist down at the University of,
5 Louisiana State University. And we also went to
6 Lexington to depose Doctor Sams, who is the
7 director of LGC. Doctor Waterman was flown in from
8 Denver to testify. As you know, he's a consultant
9 to the Commission.

10 This has been in my opinion blown far out of
11 proportion. The five positives of hydrocortisone
12 succinate in my opinion should have been considered
13 as one. Now, there was a sixth drug, and there was
14 a split test on that. And there is no issue with
15 regard to that.

16 One of the things that is mentioned is that
17 Mr. Norris did not take responsibility for these
18 drugs. Well, he has no choice. Under the terms of
19 his licensure, he is responsible for the welfare of
20 these horses as well as any drugs in their systems.
21 One of the interesting things that came up in the
22 hearing is that we have been trying to find another
23 veterinarian who worked for Doctor Russell, who was
24 their primary veterinarian, Doctor Libby Rees. She
25 was never able to be found. I noticed she was

1 on -- her agreement with the Commission was on the
2 agenda today, but apparently it's been removed.
3 That was a very curious situation.

4 But in brief, the five positives of
5 hydrocortisone succinate should have been treated
6 as one in my opinion. You're going to hear a
7 different story there. And one of the contentions
8 of staff is there was an intention to cheat. Well,
9 anytime there's a positive result, there could be
10 implied an intention to cheat.

11 These drugs, these medication drugs, and
12 hydrocortisone succinate was being administered to
13 this horse or these horses because of hives. It's
14 hard for a veterinarian to predict withdrawal time
15 because of the difference in metabolism of the
16 horses. So it's very difficult for a veterinarian
17 to treat a racehorse without running the risk of
18 that substance being in the horse's body above the
19 threshold level, if there is a drug threshold
20 level.

21 In this case there was no threshold level for
22 this drug. There was for the sixth drug. The
23 tests came back from LGC and also from Denver were
24 a bit different, but the drug was still over the
25 legal threshold.

1 So, again, it's our opinion based upon a
2 standard set by the US Supreme Court with regard to
3 reliable scientific evidence, and that's mentioned
4 in the brief, there was no reliable scientific
5 evidence to support the contention that there was a
6 race-day administration. It's all supposition and
7 opinion.

8 Basically, Doctor Sams was basing his opinion
9 on a study from New Zealand of four horses. We
10 don't know the demographics of the horses. We
11 don't know their ages, their sex, anything about
12 the horses. It's, in my opinion, a pretty flimsy
13 basis for imposing this kind of a sanction based on
14 a theory of race-day administration.

15 I will now have a seat and listen to staff's
16 remarks. And how much time do I have left?

17 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Four minutes.

18 MS. NEWELL: Good morning. Commission staff
19 asks the Commission to affirm the findings of
20 Administrative Law Judge Buddy Pylitt, who issued a
21 well reasoned, appropriate decision that stemmed
22 from a thorough review of the evidence after a
23 two-day hearing. Both parties were given an
24 opportunity to be heard and to offer proposed
25 findings. Commission Staff respectfully requests

1 that the Commission enter a final order consistent
2 with Judge Pylitt's recommendation.

3 Mr. Norris tells us the Executive Director Joe
4 Gorajec has made a mountain out of a molehill. In
5 fact, Norris violated a mountain of rules and now
6 argues that his punishment should amount to a
7 molehill. Throughout this process, he has refused
8 to take responsibility for his actions. He has
9 lied to Commission Staff.

10 The executive director of this agency is
11 tasked with enforcing the Commission's
12 administrative rules. The impermissible medication
13 of horses on race day is one of the most
14 fundamental rules of racing. Regulators know this.
15 Trainers know this. Each of you Commissioners
16 knows this. A horse cannot receive a race-day
17 administration with the exception of furosemide.

18 Last race meet, five Norris horses tested
19 positive for hydrocortisone succinate, five. Later
20 in the meet, another Norris horse tested positive
21 for triamcinolone acetonide in excess of threshold
22 limits. Six Norris horses had drug positives in
23 2014.

24 The Commission Staff filed an administrative
25 complaint. Norris requested a hearing on the

1 matter. He got one. ALJ Pylitt listened to a day
2 and a half of testimony, including complicated
3 testimony from chemists. Judge Pylitt took the
4 matter under advisement and determined that five of
5 the Norris horses, the five that tested positive
6 for hydrocortisone succinate, were injected with
7 the substance on race day.

8 Given the troublesome aspect of this case,
9 specifically that these were race-day
10 administrations, Judge Pylitt concluded that the
11 penalty recommend by Executive Director Gorajec was
12 appropriate.

13 Accordingly, before you today is Judge
14 Pylitt's recommended order which contemplates a
15 three-year suspension and a \$15,000 fine, as well
16 as the required purse redistribution. Norris
17 objects to the recommended penalty. In his
18 objection, he attacks Gorajec, the science, and
19 Judge Pylitt's decisions regarding the
20 admissibility of evidence.

21 Let's talk a little bit about Executive
22 Director Gorajec and Doctor Sams. Gorajec has held
23 his position with the Indiana commission since
24 1989. He is one of the longest-standing executive
25 directors in the industry. He is thought to be the

1 longest-standing agency head in Indiana.

2 Gorajec is a tough regulator. He is a leader
3 in the industry. He expects participants to follow
4 the rules. If they don't and they get caught, it
5 is his job to prosecute them and make a fair
6 determination of penalties. This is exactly what
7 happened in this case.

8 Doctor Sams is the lab director of LGC
9 Science. LGC Science was the Commission's primary
10 testing lab in the first part of 2014. Doctor Sams
11 is an internationally respected racing chemist.
12 His professional qualifications are beyond
13 reproach.

14 The expert that the Norrises paid substantial
15 amount of money to testify on their behalf isn't
16 quite so beyond reproach. His credibility has been
17 questioned by prior courts that have heard his
18 testimony. And ALJ Pylitt expressed similar valid
19 concerns.

20 Doctor Sams reviewed the science and his
21 findings, and he is confident that these horses
22 received race-day administration of hydrocortisone
23 succinate. I challenge you to find any credible
24 racing chemist who wants to question Doctor Sams.

25 Judge Pylitt reviewed the evidence. Norris

1 suggests that much of Doctor Sams' testimony
2 shouldn't have been considered in light of the
3 Supreme Court case on scientific evidence. While
4 that case does apply in administrative hearings, it
5 is not the sole guidance for the issue of
6 admissibility of scientific evidence.

7 Judge Pylitt was clear about the more flexible
8 nature of administrative proceedings with respect
9 to evidence. The judge rightfully and thoughtfully
10 considered Doctor Sams' testimony and the research
11 upon which Doctor Sams relied in reaching the
12 conclusions that the Norris's hydrocortisone
13 succinate positive were a result of race-day
14 injection.

15 Now, let's talk about Norris. He refuses to
16 take responsibility. Yes, there is a trainer
17 responsibility rule that requires that he take
18 responsibility, but he has yet to truly take
19 responsibility. He has changed his story four
20 times. He wants to walk away with a wrist slap,
21 and it's simply not appropriate.

22 Commission Staff notified Norris of the
23 positives last August. At that time he expressed
24 shock that he had drug positives at all, claiming
25 he had no idea how this had happened. Some time

1 passed, and he claimed that the horses had ingested
2 the substance orally via a throat wash. This was
3 the story suggesting he was attempting to treat
4 hives. However, the evidence is very clear that
5 the substance would not survive the GI tract of the
6 horse. And it is specifically formulated to be
7 used as an injectable.

8 Earlier this year, Norris hired an expert who
9 suggested that maybe these horses had eaten their
10 own urine-soaked hay and reingested the
11 hydrocortisone succinate resulting in these
12 positives. This is implausible for the same
13 reason. The substance wouldn't survive the GI
14 tract, assuming the horses would eat urine-soaked
15 hay. Norris's own expert even backed off that
16 opinion at trial and acknowledged the scenario
17 wasn't likely.

18 Finally, Norris apparently told his own expert
19 that the horses had received IV administration of
20 the drug but outside of the 24-hour window. He
21 even gave his expert a specific dosage, one gram.
22 This is an awfully specific recollection of how the
23 drug got in the horse's system from a man who eight
24 months prior was shocked by the positives and had
25 no idea what had happened.

1 Mr. Norris's story changes, but his refusal to
2 accept responsibility is constant. It's time for
3 Mr. Norris to accept responsibility and accept the
4 penalty that has been appropriately recommended by
5 Judge Pylitt.

6 The Norrises also want to focus on lab delays.
7 This Commission has been well advised of the lab
8 delays. Commission Staff was not happy with lab
9 delays. Lab delays really are not at issue here.
10 Lab delays aren't an issue when you have an
11 intention to cheat. Race-day administration is an
12 intention to cheat.

13 Mr. Shanks is correct about the rule he cited.
14 However, that is not a mandatory rule. Positives
15 can be considered as one, but Commission Staff is
16 under no duty to do that, particularly in a case
17 like this.

18 Norris has presented no facts of mitigating
19 circumstances. This is a guy who has repeatedly
20 lied to the Commission throughout the process. To
21 give him relief would send a message to the
22 regulated community they don't have to cooperate
23 with Commission Staff, and they can lie about the
24 circumstances of their case. And they can still
25 expect a reduced penalty when all is said and done.

1 His horses were doped on race day. It's a
2 serious offense, and a serious penalty is
3 accordingly appropriate. Commission Staff
4 respectfully requests that the Commission affirm
5 Judge Pylitt's recommended order in all respects.
6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you, Holly. We
8 can ask questions of anybody.

9 MS. ELLINGWOOD: You certainly can.
10 Mr. Shanks has asked for the opportunity to
11 approach the Commission one more time. He has a
12 time limit of four minutes. I don't know if you
13 want to afford Miss Newell the same opportunity.
14 She has three minutes left. You certainly are
15 welcome to ask questions.

16 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I think we need to learn
17 some things here. I think we need to get some
18 questions on the table. You guys can answer them
19 however you wish.

20 It's important, Holly, that you brought up the
21 fact because at first I was very much bothered by
22 this delay in the lab. I know that's not supposed
23 to be the case here that we worry about. But I
24 guess the question is you don't get this level of
25 detection unless you administer the drugs on the

1 day of the race.

2 MS. NEWELL: Exactly.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That's one point. We
4 all know you just can't do that on race day for
5 anything, period.

6 MS. NEWELL: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: The fact that you're
8 saying the lab was 70 days late, which is
9 horrible --

10 MS. NEWELL: It is.

11 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: -- is not going to be a
12 factor which should be weighed in the determination
13 of this case. Is that true?

14 MS. NEWELL: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: You guys are going to
16 get a chance to rebut on that. Other questions
17 from the Commission? That was one question. I
18 know we had problems last year a couple of times.
19 And we've hopefully corrected that so that's not an
20 issue anymore. I have to kind of keep focused on
21 five positives or six positives is quite a few.

22 MS. NEWELL: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Now, dumb question, has
24 that gentleman ever been charged with any problem
25 before?

1 MS. NEWELL: He has had a couple of issues on
2 his RCI. I would not characterize Mr. Norris's RCI
3 penalty report as one that would necessarily raise
4 concern. He's not a problem child prior to last
5 year.

6 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Was this the first time
7 this has ever come before us with this trainer?

8 MS. NEWELL: Joe, did you want to say
9 something?

10 JOE GORAJEC: Just going to when you're
11 looking at this penalty and looking at delays,
12 we've had similar such instances back in our
13 history in the case of a Standardbred trainer named
14 Mark P'Pool. Mark P'Pool was a gentleman who I
15 think he got 11 positive tests over a period of
16 time.

17 And we were doing an investigation on the
18 illicit use of dexamethasone. And we determined
19 that horsemen were using this particular drug on
20 race day. And the lab was testing for this drug
21 and reported a number of positives. And the
22 Commission Staff, in this case meaning me, withheld
23 notification to the trainers in order to determine
24 which trainers were abusing this drug and cheating
25 on race day.

1 That was an intentional act on my part to
2 withhold the notification of the drug positive.
3 And I did it, and I did it for a good reason. And
4 because I did it, we were able to catch several
5 trainers who were doing the same thing, injecting
6 dexamethasone on race day. When it came to the
7 penalties, okay, Mr. P'Pool suffered a six-year
8 suspension and a \$30,000 fine, basically half of
9 what's being proposed now in this particular case.

10 What was interesting though is that case went
11 to an ALJ. It went to the Commission, and then it
12 went to the court. And when the court reviewed it,
13 they made the same argument that there was a delay
14 in contacting the trainer notifying him of the
15 positive. And the court was quite clear. First of
16 all, there's no statutory regulation obligating
17 notification within a certain time period. And for
18 the reason we gave, the judge noted that that was a
19 reasonable reason, okay, to withhold notification.

20 So now we have an actual judge saying that not
21 timely notifying a trainer is not cause for the
22 case being thrown out or reconsidered. I'm not
23 saying the right proper legal term, Chairman
24 McCarty, but I think it's instructive that the
25 court has had a similar such case.

1 This is different in that we did not
2 intentionally withhold notification. We notified
3 the trainer as soon as we got the report from the
4 lab, but the premise is still the same. The fact
5 is that there was a late notification. And the
6 courts have already ruled that that is not only
7 permissible, but in some circumstances, it's a
8 smart thing to do.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I see why you drew that
10 parallel to a planned delay versus a natural
11 mistake or a delay by the lab.

12 JOE GORAJEC: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: This, because it was
14 delayed, cannot looked at or shouldn't be looked at
15 as any lesser of the penalties.

16 JOE GORAJEC: The reason for the delay is
17 different, but the fact in both cases there was a
18 delay. That particular penalty, and we cited it
19 during the hearing, that particular penalty for
20 that trainer. It went all the way up to the court.
21 I think it was to the appellate court because it
22 went through trial court and lost. And then it
23 went to appellate court and lost.

24 But that penalty for that particular case,
25 like I said, six years, \$30,000 is exactly half of

1 what is being proposed by Judge Pylitt for this
2 particular case.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner McCarty.

4 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: My question was what
5 court level did this get resolved.

6 MS. NEWELL: It was the Court of Appeals.

7 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Indiana Court of
8 Appeals?

9 MS. NEWELL: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: I have a question.

11 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner Pillow.

12 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Holly, tell me
13 something. The only concern I have is this 70 days
14 late. I know we kind of got in the middle of all
15 that, and it's been dealt with before. How many
16 different things can happen? How many hands does
17 it go through in that 70-day period?

18 MS. NEWELL: To the extent you're concerned
19 maybe about chain of custody, is that what you
20 mean?

21 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Yeah. Attorney Shanks
22 is saying these should be considered as one in all
23 five. Then we're talking about 70-day delay. I'm
24 trying to make a correlation on that.

25 MS. NEWELL: Doctor Sams testified at the

1 hearing that LGC received these samples. They were
2 in serum, blood. And they sat in their freezer
3 storage until they did the testing they needed to
4 do. So there was no time window during which any
5 additional hands were on the samples.

6 Arguably, the delay helped Mr. Norris because
7 the research indicates that the level of
8 hydrocortisone succinate that can be detected in
9 serum rapidly deteriorates as that blood sits. The
10 levels that LGC found 70 days later were likely far
11 lower than the levels they would have found had
12 they been able to test that blood pursuant to our
13 contract terms, which would have been within a week
14 or so.

15 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Were they above the
16 level of incrimination at that point when they
17 actually tested them?

18 MS. NEWELL: Yes. Hydrocortisone succinate is
19 not a threshold drug. You can have none of this in
20 the horse, period. And the levels of detection for
21 all five horses were -- I don't have the numbers in
22 front of me. But it was every single horse they
23 tested, they found enough for Doctor Sams to be
24 confident that this was the result of race-day
25 administration.

1 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: So if we don't have
2 thresholds, what do we base this on?

3 MS. NEWELL: The lowest limit of detection is
4 how the labs work this out. So it's basically
5 whatever the technology will allow them to find.

6 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: There's no way he should
7 have any of this.

8 MS. NEWELL: Correct.

9 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: That's where I was
10 trying to get to.

11 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Can I ask one more
12 question? Why does Attorney Shanks say all five of
13 these should be considered one?

14 MS. NEWELL: He is pointing to the rule that
15 does state there are circumstances where a trainer
16 may not receive notification. If you have a
17 trainer who is trying to do the right thing -- for
18 instance, let's take Rojas and Murphy. They were
19 the trainers with the settlement agreements you
20 considered earlier. Dexamethasone positives.
21 Therapeutic drug.

22 Neither of them had two positives, but if they
23 had had two positives and hadn't been notified of
24 the second one, you look at that therapeutic drug,
25 and you say they probably would have changed their

1 training regime had they been notified of the first
2 positive. And the second positive wouldn't have
3 happened.

4 But you look at that in light of the fact that
5 it's a therapeutic drug, and it doesn't appear to
6 be an intention to cheat. The distinction here is
7 you have an intention to cheat. You're injecting a
8 horse on race day. It's a violation of one of the
9 most fundamental rules of racing.

10 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: As I understand it,
11 that's a may consider them as one, not a shall.

12 MS. NEWELL: Yes. Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I know that's an
14 important distinction. Thanks.

15 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Okay. That helps me.
16 Any other questions, Commission, before we hear the
17 last closing? Okay, John.

18 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Mr. Shanks, you have four
19 minutes. I'll do the countdown three, two, one.

20 MR. SHANKS: I hope I can address all of these
21 in four minutes. Commission alleges that
22 Mr. Norris has not taken responsibility. I don't
23 know what he has to do to take responsibility. He
24 has responsibility as a licensed trainer. There's
25 no issue there. He has no choice.

1 Doctor Sams, in his deposition, and I believe
2 also at the hearing agreed that de Kock study that
3 was done out of New Zealand years ago on four
4 horses didn't meet the standards of reliable
5 scientific evidence as established by the US
6 Supreme Court in a case called Daubert, which has
7 sort of been ignored.

8 In the beginning, Mr. Norris really was so
9 frustrated. And he really didn't know how the
10 horses got this in their system because he wasn't
11 the one that normally took care of the barn. But
12 he's still responsible.

13 This was a therapeutic drug. And I believe
14 there's a mention in both the brief and the
15 objection about this being a therapeutic drug for
16 the treatment of hives. Now, Doctor Waterman would
17 argue that, well, this isn't a drug that's normally
18 used when treating hives. Well, that's one
19 veterinarian's opinion. It was prescribed by a
20 licensed veterinarian to treat hives.

21 Mr. Norris does not have a history of
22 misbehavior with regard to the administration of
23 drugs. We can look at his RCI record. He's had
24 some very minor violations, as most trainers do.

25 The P'Pool case is completely different on its

1 facts. The fact that there is no rule with regard
2 to when lab results must be disclosed to a trainer,
3 I think is wrong. I think there needs to be
4 integrity in the system so the trainers are
5 notified when there is a positive. A 70 day delay is
6 absolutely unreasonable. It's incompetent.

7 Had Mr. Norris been given the notice -- again,
8 as Mr. Gorajec said, they didn't withhold those.
9 They couldn't give him those even if they wanted to
10 because of the incompetency of the lab. The P'Pool
11 case is completely different. If you look at the
12 Court of Appeals opinion, it doesn't really in my
13 opinion deal with this kind of a situation. They
14 were investigating other trainers based upon the
15 conduct they were seeing out of Mr. P'Pool's
16 horses.

17 There is a history of the Commission treating
18 multiple violations in a completely different
19 manner than this. That is mentioned in the brief
20 and the objection. Much more serious drugs,
21 hydrocortisone succinate is a level three drug,
22 according to RCI, which is one of the drugs that is
23 way down. There are four levels. This is down at
24 the bottom.

25 So I believe there is no evidence of intent to

1 cheat. And the level of the drugs is irrelevant
2 because as was pointed out, there is no threshold.
3 There could have been a picogram of this in their
4 system, and there wouldn't have been a violation.
5 So the level of the drug is irrelevant.

6 Again, our basis for the argument for the
7 Commission Staff taking the position of aggravating
8 circumstances is all based on this unreliable
9 scientific evidence based on a foreign study of
10 four horses, I think, back in 2009.

11 I appreciate your attention. I hope you've
12 read all the materials that have been provided.
13 And am I down to 30 seconds?

14 MS. ELLINGWOOD: You're at ten.

15 MR. SHANKS: Thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you, John. Okay.
17 Commissioners, we've heard pros and cons and
18 background to this particular case. I have one
19 question. And that is: This is a therapeutic
20 drug, correct?

21 JOE GORAJEC: Yes, it's as Class 4.

22 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Maybe this is a dumb
23 question but nobody is supposed to use this, but
24 they do?

25 JOE GORAJEC: If you use it -- first of all,

1 you can't administer any drug other than Salix
2 within 24 hours of the race. Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I know that.

4 JOE GORAJEC: So the point is you can use this
5 drug. This drug can be used, but it can't be used
6 within 24 hours. And the findings both my charging
7 document and the findings of Judge Pylitt are the
8 same in that what was found was that these horses
9 were given this particular drug on race day by
10 injection. And when you're talking about whether
11 it's therapeutic or not, the fact of the matter is
12 in the P'Pool case, it was dexamethasone. That's
13 therapeutic. That's a Class 4 same as this.
14 Penalty was six years and \$30,000 because it was
15 given by injection on race day. And when you give
16 something by injection on race day, that is an
17 intention to cheat.

18 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner Schenkel.

19 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I have a couple
20 questions, I think, Mr. Shanks and Mr. Norris.
21 Make sure I understand here that this was --
22 originally you said you don't know how the drugs
23 were administered and delivered. And then at
24 another point in the process, it was admitted or
25 acknowledged that it was to treat hives. Is hives

1 a common ailment amongst horses, racehorses?

2 MR. SHANKS: My understanding is yes.

3 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I just thought it was
4 kind of unusual.

5 MR. SHANKS: My horses never had hives.

6 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: It struck me that
7 there would have been five horses in a three week
8 period with hives.

9 MR. SHANKS: They had other horses in the barn
10 that were suffering from hives.

11 MRS. NORRIS: Would you permit me to speak?

12 MR. SHANKS: Just relax.

13 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I find that kind of
14 unusual, I guess. And then further in the process
15 then -- well, he said at one point it was not clear
16 how it got in there. Then --

17 MR. SHANKS: It was clarified.

18 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: It was clarified it
19 was in an oral medication.

20 MR. SHANKS: There were several possibilities
21 for administration; one, injection; two, oral
22 injection; and the third was that even if there had
23 been an injection, say, even 48 hours before, that
24 what Doctor Barker was saying based upon another
25 study is that the horse could have injected some

1 more, and it's in the material, through eating hay
2 the horses urinated on. If you have horses, you
3 know they do that. But the fact is, there's no one
4 saw any horse being injected within 24 hours of the
5 race. The whole issue of race-day administration
6 is based upon unreliable scientific evidence all
7 based on supposition.

8 Mr. Norris has been very, very upset by this.
9 He was not represented by counsel at the time of
10 the initial interview, as I recall. I'm second
11 counsel on the case. I came in after the
12 suspension hearing. It's been a very emotional
13 thing for him. So the fact that there may have
14 been some inconsistent testimony, I'm not surprised
15 at that. Okay. But that doesn't change the fact
16 that there is no scientific reliable evidence of
17 race-day administration.

18 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I guess I would say
19 that's a point of contention right there because
20 there were experts that testified.

21 MR. SHANKS: And they tried very hard to
22 discredit our expert, who is very well known, and
23 did a good job trying to discredit him. But the
24 fact is even Doctor Sams agreed that the de Kock
25 study did not meet the standard established by the

1 US Supreme Court.

2 If you look at some of the history of similar
3 cases and really a completely similar case, but I
4 found one case where there had been seven
5 violations, seven drug violations of drugs even
6 more significant to racing than this. And the
7 penalty was very, very small. I think it was maybe
8 \$1,500 and a 90-day suspension or something like
9 that. I don't have it in front of me.

10 MS. NEWELL: I'm going to object to this. He
11 doesn't have it in front of him.

12 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I asked a question,
13 and you answered it. The other point that I noted
14 in your filings in the record was that his own
15 veterinarian testified under oath that he was
16 probably the only trainer in Indiana that used this
17 drug, which I just point that out. I'm not asking
18 you to comment on that or anything. But to me,
19 that's the salient point in this whole process.
20 And it goes, George, to your question too about is
21 this used and so forth.

22 Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

23 MR. SHANKS: If you do wish to hear from Miss
24 Norris to answer that question.

25 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: No, thank you. The

1 final comment I have, Mr. Chairman, is that while
2 we all are chagrined, I guess, at the 70-day delay,
3 the fact is we had a process in place. Seventy-day
4 delay certainly didn't exaggerate the problem. It
5 appears that it probably helped it in some regards
6 or lessened the findings. If it had been five
7 days, it might have even been more significant.

8 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: The fact that we heard
9 that there cannot be any level of detection of this
10 particular drug, I mean, that's kind of a blaring
11 statement. We have five cases or six cases.

12 Okay. Commissioners, you've heard the
13 testimony of the witnesses.

14 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: One more thing. Lea,
15 what was the fine and suspension?

16 MS. ELLINGWOOD: It was \$15,000 fine and a
17 three-year suspension.

18 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: If we vote on this to
19 accept it, that will be the penalty. We can modify
20 it or cancel.

21 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Right. You have got
22 essentially four choices. You can affirm the ALJ's
23 proposed finding of facts. You can modify it. You
24 can dissolve it, or you can remand the matter back
25 to the ALJ for further proceedings. You are

1 essentially deciding how you want to move forward
2 on Judge Pylitt's proposed findings and recommended
3 order.

4 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Judge Pylitt's here,
5 isn't he?

6 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner McCarty.

8 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: What would have been
9 the staff recommendation if it had been a single
10 violation or, let's say, one or even two? How
11 would that have impacted this \$15,000 fine and
12 three-year suspension?

13 JOE GORAJEC: I'm trying to recall the P'Pool
14 case because in the P'Pool case, as I mentioned,
15 there were other trainers. There were other
16 trainers who were involved in the illicit
17 administration of dex that had fewer penalties,
18 excuse me, fewer infractions. I think there were a
19 few that had one. And I think there was one that
20 had maybe two or three. And the penalty was less.

21 I think the minimum penalty was either a year
22 or 18 months for one violation, but there is one
23 significant difference. In that case, initially
24 everyone denied using dexamethasone on race day.
25 That's something that trainers who cheat are not

1 prone to admit readily.

2 In the settlement agreements that we got,
3 other than P'Pool, they all admitted. They ended
4 up telling the truth. They ended up saying that,
5 yes, okay, we get it. We administered dex. We
6 injected it on race day. And that certainly was
7 factored into those penalties.

8 So they were less. I know that they were none
9 less than a year suspension plus a fine, but in all
10 those cases outside the P'Pool case, those trainers
11 took responsibility. When I say taking
12 responsibility, I mean telling the truth. I don't
13 mean to say, well, we got a rule here that says
14 we're responsible, so we're responsible. Taking
15 responsibility is telling the truth. And when we
16 cite someone for not cooperating with the
17 Commission, that means telling the truth.

18 We put in a lot of resources in this case and
19 other cases when people come to us with a story.
20 Okay. They come to us with a story that's really
21 just horse manure. And we have to prosecute that
22 case.

23 It takes us a lot of resources to do that, but
24 we need to protect all the horsemen. And we need
25 to protect them from illicit administration of

1 these drugs. But that gets factored into the
2 penalty. When you cooperate and tell the truth,
3 that gets factored in.

4 I'm sorry, that was a lengthy response to your
5 simple question.

6 MR. SHANKS: Mr. Chairman, may I answer that
7 question?

8 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Okay. Go ahead, John,
9 but I'm going to cut this off because we've got to.

10 MR. SHANKS: I understand. Under 71 IAC
11 8.5-1-7.1(d), and Holly can look it up real quick
12 and confirm what I say is true, the minimum penalty
13 is \$1,000 and no suspension. When you have
14 multiple positives and there's a delay by the lab
15 so that the trainer does not know even about the
16 first one until the last one is over, that's the
17 penalty. That's the minimum penalty, \$1,000 and no
18 suspension.

19 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioners, you have
20 heard more than a little bit of testimony on this
21 case. To answer your question, Commissioner
22 Pillow, we have to accept, modify, change, or send
23 it back to the ALJ. So we have -- those are the
24 options we have.

25 It bothers me that there was no cooperation of

1 telling the truth. That -- hey, John, I'm just
2 telling you the fact that there was five positives,
3 that's not a good thing. Granted, it's a level
4 four drug. But Commissioner Pillow, did you have
5 some thoughts you wanted to offer?

6 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: No, not really. I think
7 one quick question as we go through this. Holly,
8 maybe you can answer this. You stated that
9 Mr. Norris told his expert that he had injected
10 these horses.

11 MS. NEWELL: To be clear, Mr. Norris didn't
12 say he had done it himself. He did say the horses
13 had been injected outside of the 24-hour window,
14 and he gave the specific dosage of the Solu-Cortef
15 that was injected. So Mr. Norris, I'm guessing,
16 would have suggested that his veterinarian did the
17 injecting. Mr. Norris did not say that he did the
18 injection himself.

19 JOE GORAJEC: There is absolutely no
20 veterinarian records to substantiate any of those
21 injections.

22 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: How did we get the
23 expert to tell us this? Was this on the witness
24 stand?

25 MS. NEWELL: Yes, I believe Mr. Norris's

1 expert made that statement in his deposition and,
2 perhaps, again during the hearing.

3 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: But that was
4 contradictory to the original explanation that it
5 was done orally, right?

6 MS. NEWELL: It was.

7 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: There are multiple
8 explanations here.

9 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Okay. Commissioners,
11 questions?

12 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: You've done a good job
13 of asking most of the questions.

14 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I don't know if we can
15 learn any more of what we have to know to make an
16 intelligent decision. The question is do we
17 support the ALJ's opinion and the finding of the
18 penalty and fine? Do you want to modify? That's
19 the case. Do I have a motion?

20 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: If we get it on the
21 floor, I'll move approval.

22 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I will second.

23 Discussion? We have a motion and second.
24 Questions? Call it to a vote. All those in favor
25 of accepting this as recommended, please say "aye."

1 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

2 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Passes. So it's passed.
3 Number seven, much more complicated. This is
4 a case where, pretty serious case because it's a
5 precedent being put before us as far as the ALJ in
6 the matter of Staff versus Ross Russell.

7 So, Lea, do you want to share with us the
8 background music about this?

9 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Sure. I will give you some
10 procedural background. On October 23rd, Commission
11 Staff issued an administrative complaint against
12 Doctor Ross Russell. On November 12, 2014,
13 Chairman Weatherwax assigned Bernard Pylitt as the
14 administrative law judge on the matter.

15 On May 13th, counsel for Russell filed a
16 motion to disqualify the ALJ alleging that he is
17 biased and prejudiced against Russell, and,
18 therefore, unfit to serve as the ALJ in this
19 particular matter. After reviewing the briefs, the
20 ALJ issued a ruling in the form of a proposed
21 finding of fact, conclusion of law, and recommended
22 order that denied Russell's motion to disqualify
23 the ALJ.

24 On June 30th, Russell e-mailed his petition
25 for review of the ruling to the Commission, a hard

1 copy of which followed postmarked July 2nd. The
2 Commission issued a prehearing order allowing
3 parties to file briefs in support of their
4 positions and to present oral arguments. Russell
5 subsequently filed a brief in support of his
6 position, as well as objections to the ALJ's
7 proposed findings on July 10th, that same date
8 Staff issued their brief in support of their
9 position as well. Those filings have been provided
10 to you.

11 Commission will now hear oral arguments in the
12 matter. Again, each party will be limited to ten
13 minutes. I will signal, three, two, and one.

14 The sole issue before the Commission at this
15 time is whether ALJ Pylitt is able to be impartial
16 and unbiased in his adjudication of the Russell
17 matter. He is also here to answer questions the
18 Commission may have.

19 At the conclusion, again, the Commission will
20 close the record and begin its deliberations. The
21 Commission must either affirm the ALJ's order,
22 modify it, or dissolve it, or remand the matter
23 back for further proceedings.

24 If there aren't any preliminary questions, we
25 can go ahead and get started beginning with

1 Russell's counsel, Pete Sacopulos.

2 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Is this the one where
3 you said that the time factor for filing a protest
4 was not quite on time?

5 MS. ELLINGWOOD: There was an issue about it,
6 but I believe each party is going to address it.

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That will be what we are
8 going to hear?

9 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Likely. The issue is also
10 covered in your briefs and the memo I sent you, but
11 I suspect each party will address it.

12 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: After that, it's our
13 position and responsibility to say either we're
14 going to accept this, let this go forward to hear
15 this whole thing today or not.

16 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Yes. That's up to you. If
17 the Commission finds that it wasn't timely
18 submitted, you have the opportunity to not hear the
19 petition for review of the ruling, but we're all
20 here, and it's an important issue.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That's what I say. It's
22 my personal opinion if we're going to take the time
23 to listen to this, we might as well say we're going
24 to do it because why would we delay, if that's okay
25 with the Commission. Do you understand?

1 There was a time factor when everybody is
2 supposed to go back and forth. That's why I'm glad
3 you're here, Commissioner McCarty, because this is
4 the square root of law times two. This is the
5 ultimate lawyer's dream.

6 The point is we can't even get to the issue of
7 why the case is here. It's just a matter if we
8 want to hear it or we don't want to hear it. We're
9 not even talking about the merits of the case.

10 MS. ELLINGWOOD: We're not. It's not
11 appropriate for the Commission at this point to
12 discuss the merits of the underlying case with
13 respect to whether Doctor Russell has violated any
14 administrative rules. The only issue before you
15 today is whether or not Judge Pylitt is qualified
16 to continue on this case.

17 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: With that, we'll go
18 forward.

19 MR. SACOPULOS: Thank you. My name is Pete
20 Sacopulos. I'm here on behalf of Doctor Russell
21 today. I want to start by saying that this is
22 somewhat of a prickly situation to be in. I've
23 practiced law in dozens of courts throughout
24 Indiana, in front of administrative agencies. This
25 is the only time I have ever filed something like

1 this and did so because I felt I simply had to on
2 behalf of my client. Doctor Russell's professional
3 career is in the balance. The Commission is
4 seeking a 20-year suspension.

5 By way of background, so you know, this all
6 started with regard to an incident that allegedly
7 occurred on September 19th of last year. The
8 allegation was that Doctor Russell had entered the
9 stall of a horse that was in to race that day and
10 administered some foreign substance other than
11 Lasix to that horse. That is an allegation that
12 Doctor Russell has disputed.

13 You should also note that there were tests
14 taken of that horse, and those were negative. You
15 should also know that everyone else has said that
16 could not occur the way that the one witness who
17 made the allegation says it did.

18 With that as a background, Doctor Russell was
19 suspended the following day, September 20th. And
20 subsequently an administrative complaint was filed
21 by the Indiana Horse Racing Commission staff
22 against Doctor Russell and is pending.

23 Also, you should know the horse in question is
24 a horse named Tam Tuff. Tam Tuff was trained by a
25 trainer named Tony Granitz. And he had an

1 assistant trainer named Richie Estvanko. The horse
2 was owned and is owned by an investment group doing
3 business as Captain Jack Racing Stable.

4 What has happened is that Doctor Russell has
5 been suspended since the 20th of September last
6 year. He remains suspended. He does not -- he has
7 not had a hearing.

8 There was a hearing in the case of
9 Mr. Estvanko and Mr. Granitz. And as counsel has
10 told you, Bernard Pylitt, who is here with us
11 today, was appointed by the Commission to serve as
12 the administrative law judge in Doctor Russell's
13 case. He was also appointed to serve as the
14 administrative law judge in Mr. Estvanko's case.
15 He was also appointed to serve as the
16 administrative law judge in Mr. Granitz's case.
17 And he was also determinative of the outcome in a
18 ruling and proposed order to your panel on the
19 Captain Jack Stable case. All four of these
20 matters were in front of or have been in front of
21 ALJ Pylitt.

22 So on October 31st of last year, there was a
23 hearing by the stewards in the Granitz and Estvanko
24 case. And in that case there was some findings of
25 fact and conclusions of law that were then

1 appealed. Those were appealed, and Judge Pylitt
2 assigned.

3 One of those findings was that, and let me
4 tell you what the issue was in the hearing, the
5 stewards' hearing. The issue was framed, I
6 believe, incorrectly whether or not Ross Russell
7 injected the Granitz-Estvanko trained horse on
8 September 19th with an unknown substance prior to
9 the time of administration for Lasix.

10 I believe the correct issue in that case with
11 the trainer was whether the trainers, Mr. Estvanko
12 and Mr. Granitz, violated the absolute trainer
13 responsibility rule. Be that as it may, the
14 stewards concluded that there had been between the
15 hours of ten and eleven on the morning of
16 September 19th a foreign substance injected into
17 the horse. And that Doctor Russell had entered the
18 stall where this horse Tam Tuff was held and
19 administered an injected substance other than Lasix
20 on race day. Those were the findings of the
21 stewards.

22 That is important because those findings were
23 relied on by Judge Pylitt in deciding a matter that
24 is also before this Commission and argued involving
25 the Captain Jack Racing Stable case. That's where

1 Captain Jack Racing Stable had come before this
2 panel saying their money, their winnings had been
3 taken, and they wanted to be heard on this.

4 The Captain Jack Stable counsel filed a motion
5 to intervene in the Granitz and Estvanko case. And
6 they did so because they felt their rights had been
7 violated. They didn't have due process. They
8 wanted to be heard about why their purse money was
9 being taken away.

10 In preparing a proposed order denying the
11 motion to intervene, Judge Pylitt relied on the
12 findings of fact and conclusions of law in the
13 Estvanko and Granitz case. In doing so, he found
14 there were, that the trainers were found
15 responsible for illegal race-day injections into
16 the horse Tam Tuff. He also found that there was
17 illegal race-day injections.

18 So I would submit to you that he has
19 prejudged, predetermined a critical pivotal point
20 in Doctor Russell's case. Doctor Russell has
21 rejected from the beginning and denied from the
22 beginning there was ever any injection of an in
23 horse on race day. But we now are faced with
24 findings of fact and conclusions of law upon which
25 this exact administrative law judge has relied in

1 making a ruling that has determined in his mind
2 that Doctor Russell has done the deed. And it is
3 our position that based on that, he cannot being
4 fair, unbiased of Doctor Russell.

5 With regard to the law that's applicable here,
6 there is a code provision cited in our brief,
7 4-21.5-3-10, that requires that a judge be
8 disqualified for certain things. One of them is
9 the judge shall disqualify him or herself in which
10 a judge's impartiality might reasonably be
11 questioned, including but not limited to, and part
12 D says, where they've previously presided as a
13 judge over the matter in another court.

14 That is what we believe has happened here.
15 Judge Pylitt has presided over, in essence, the
16 matter of whether or not there was an injection or
17 whether there was not, whether this race-day event
18 occurred or whether it did not in the Granitz and
19 Estvanko hearing.

20 The court in Indiana has weighed in on
21 impartiality. And in the case of State versus
22 Brown, our Indiana Court of Appeals has held that a
23 judge should recuse himself under circumstances in
24 which a reasonable person would have a reasonable
25 doubt of a judge's impartiality. Accordingly, even

1 if there is an appearance of partiality, the judge
2 should recuse him or herself.

3 Judge Pylitt has adopted and verified the
4 stewards' findings in Estvanko and Granitz, and in
5 so deciding has determined that Ross Russell,
6 without a hearing and without due process, has done
7 this deed. Ross Russell has disputed that from the
8 day he was confronted with that, which was the day
9 following on September 20th of last year.

10 The Commission in reviewing this should look
11 closely at the stewards' findings and the relying
12 of Judge Pylitt on this issue.

13 I would like to address briefly the fact that
14 in this case the Indiana Horse Racing Commission
15 Staff is recommending a 20-year penalty. This is
16 really unprecedented. What we have here is a
17 professional's career on the backside as an
18 esteemed veterinarian that has been arrested. His
19 reputation has been irreparably damaged. His
20 financial loss beyond significant.

21 He is entitled to a fair and impartial trial
22 to be conducted by an unbiased administrative law
23 judge who has not prejudged or predetermined or
24 adjudicated a critical issue to his case, just as
25 everyone else is in this process. He simply cannot

1 receive that if Judge Pylitt is allowed to continue
2 to hear this case.

3 I would like to turn very quickly to the
4 second issue, which has been brought up about the
5 timely service of our brief. Our brief was timely
6 filed. The rule in question is Trial Rule 5(B)(2)
7 in the Indiana Rules of Trial Procedure. If you
8 will look, there is a cover letter showing it was
9 posted on the 29th of June of this year. The
10 pleading itself was dated the 29th of June of
11 this year. The certificate of service is the
12 29th of June of this year. The envelope posting
13 it is the 29th of June of this year.

14 You need to realize in Terre Haute, Indiana we
15 really don't have postal service like you all have
16 in Indianapolis. So if I send a letter to my
17 neighbor in Terre Haute, it has to come to
18 Indianapolis to be canceled to go back.

19 And so with that having been said, I have also
20 under the rule, I believe the certificate is
21 confirmative of Trial Rule 5(B)(2), but I have for
22 the Commission's review an affidavit of Rosanna
23 Royer, a member of my staff, who stated under oath
24 this was placed in the US mail in compliance with
25 the service requirement of Trial Rule 5(B)(2) on

1 June 29, 2015. It was subsequently sent again by
2 e-mail the following day.

3 To add to what appears to be some confusion,
4 although I think it's clear it was timely served,
5 the exhibit, and I would offer that both sides of
6 this case inadvertently omitted exhibits and had to
7 send them later. Ours were, we believe, one of the
8 sets did not have all of the exhibits.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I've already said we are
10 going to accept this today. You don't have to go
11 through all of that. I understand.

12 Does that conclude what you want to talk
13 about?

14 MR. SACOPULOS: Other than on behalf of Doctor
15 Russell, we would ask that you reject the ALJ's
16 recommendation.

17 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Right on time.

18 MR. BABBITT: Chair, Commission members,
19 counsel, it is my pleasure to speak to you on
20 behalf of the Commission Staff today. Holly
21 Newell, deputy general of the Commission, is
22 co-counsel on this matter, but in the interest of
23 time, I'm going to speak to it myself.

24 Let me say at first, the particular sanctions
25 against Doctor Russell are at issue. They are not

1 to be decided here today. The only issue is
2 whether Judge Pylitt is biased or prejudiced and
3 whether he can and should move forward as the
4 administrative law judge.

5 Disciplinary cases, no matter what the charge,
6 are important to the person who is being charged.
7 As Commission Staff, we understand that. The fact
8 that we're talking about what those specific
9 charges is really has nothing to do with the issue,
10 which is was Judge Pylitt biased or prejudiced.

11 We believe it is a lawyer's dream because
12 there's a case that Mr. Sacopulos has completely
13 ignored that the Court of Appeals has spoken to an
14 issue that is not a hundred percent on the mark but
15 is so close that I want to speak with you about it
16 in some detail.

17 Before I get there, let me first talk about
18 the time issue. There are rules that are set for
19 filings that are mandatory. There was a ten-day
20 requirement that this matter be filed on
21 June 29th.

22 Now, there was a representation made, two
23 things, one, that the filings were made by
24 electronic mail. If you look at Mr. Sacopulos' own
25 filing, his e-mail was dated June 30th at 8:44.

1 Yet, his representation to you is that he filed it
2 by electronic mail on the 29th.

3 I don't know how you reconcile that. I sent
4 it on the 29th, but it's dated on the 30th at
5 8:44. But that's the context of the
6 representations that are being made to you. It was
7 not e-mailed on the 29th, the day it was due.
8 And we have set forth in our brief the reasons that
9 compliance was not met.

10 We can get into all of those things. And it
11 gets very, very nuanced and detailed, but the fact
12 of the matter is, he's talking about on a letter
13 the franking mark. We're not suggesting they
14 didn't put it in the postage meter on the 29th.
15 That's not what the rule is.

16 The rule is it's the date of electronic
17 mailing, which was the 30th or if you put it in
18 first class mail, it's the date of the postmark on
19 the envelope. It's not the franking mark. It's
20 not whatever Pitney Bowes or Neopost or somebody
21 else says because you could sit there with it, and
22 you could have it sitting there for a number of
23 days, and you've missed the requirement.

24 It either has to be sent registered or
25 certified. It wasn't. Or it has to be sent by

1 third-party commercial carrier like UPS or FedEx
2 with a three-day delivery. Neither of those things
3 happened. It was untimely.

4 Our position is that Doctor Russell should
5 lose this argument because it's untimely. Having
6 said that, we want to talk about the merits because
7 we believe the Commission should deny the request
8 that Doctor Russell is making on both the
9 timeliness and on the substance of the materials.

10 Now, when I got to law school, they told me if
11 the law is on your side, argue the laws. If the
12 facts are on your side, argue the facts. If
13 neither are on your side, pound the table. We've
14 all heard that. All lawyers have heard that.
15 There's a lot of pounding of the table in this
16 particular brief.

17 I want to go through in a very limited amount
18 of time and touch on a couple. In the conclusions
19 to the objections, there is a statement that says
20 "ALJ Pylitt has been appointed assigned the vast
21 majority, if not all, disputes over the past 24 to
22 36 months by the Indiana Horse Racing Commission."
23 First of all, Mr. Sacopulos knows that's not a true
24 statement because on November 19, 2012, which was
25 within three years which was within 36 months, Gary

1 Patrick's case was assigned to Administrative Law
2 Judge Gordon White, and Mr. Sacopulos represented
3 Mr. Patrick.

4 So we're getting fast and loose with the
5 facts. There's a lot of rhetoric in here. That's
6 just the start of it.

7 Now, the vast majority of the cases have gone
8 to Judge Pylitt. We went back and counted just to
9 know what we were dealing with. There were 25
10 cases in this time frame. Eleven of those went to
11 ALJ Lauck. Eleven went to Judge Pylitt. Two went
12 to Gordon White, one of them you decided here this
13 morning, the Amoss case, which was a substantial,
14 substantial matter that took a lot of his time.
15 And one went to Judge Hostetter. Four ALJs, three
16 are currently active with the Commission. And a
17 vast majority to me is something well over
18 50 percent, not even close to 50 percent.

19 So that's what these objections are. These
20 objections make lots of references that cannot be
21 supported.

22 Now, in that same conclusion, Mr. Sacopulos
23 says "ALJ Pylitt, unlike most jurists that are
24 questioned as to prejudice or bias, has summarily
25 refused to disqualify himself." Mr. Sacopulos just

1 sat here and told you today this was the first
2 motion that he had ever filed like this. Now, yet,
3 he says to you in this filing most jurists that are
4 questioned as to prejudice or bias. Where in the
5 world does that come from?

6 The fact is it's pulled out of the air like
7 everything else in this filing. And it's given to
8 you. And it's asking you to do something they want
9 without absolutely any basis to do it.

10 Now, let's talk about the substance of the
11 objections. The first is he is claiming, and this
12 is a very, very tortured interpretation, that Judge
13 Pylitt adopted and verified the stewards' ruling in
14 Estvanko and Granitz, January 19, 2015. Now, that
15 is a separate proceeding. And he did indicate this
16 was the intervention motion.

17 And what Judge Pylitt said was the pleadings
18 support that this is the claim, and that's how I'm
19 going to decide the intervention issue, which came
20 to you and which you affirmed. He did not say I
21 made a finding on the merits as to either Estvanko,
22 Granitz, or Doctor Russell. I know he didn't do
23 that. And Mr. Sacopulos knows he didn't do that
24 because we had a hearing on the merits of that
25 matter on the 23rd and the 24th.

1 Now, if he had really done what Mr. Sacopulos
2 told you he had done, we just wasted our time for
3 over a day putting on multiple witnesses,
4 cross-examining, putting on numerous exhibits to do
5 a matter that Judge Pylitt had already decided.
6 Why? Because he hadn't decided it then, and he
7 still hasn't decided it. There is a
8 misrepresentation that is being made that is the
9 basis of this disqualification motion.

10 And then there is in objection number seven,
11 there's a discussion about the stewards having a
12 footnote, which is not only inaccurate, it's a
13 misstatement. That statement about the stewards
14 is, in fact, a misstatement. Stewards made a very
15 short footnote, which Mr. Sacopulos took three
16 important words out, by the way, in his filing.

17 And it said, Doctor Russell appeared as a
18 witness for the respondents at the October 31, 2014
19 hearing, presumably, but the decision in this
20 matter does not apply to any allegations that are
21 currently pending against Doctor Russell. Okay.
22 Now, what he took out is "but the decision." The
23 fact of the matter is he says that's inaccurate and
24 it's a misstatement. That's not what the Indiana
25 Supreme Court says.

1 With respect to issue preclusion, and this is
2 a nuanced legal argument with respect to issue
3 preclusion, there has got to be a number of things
4 before you can preclude a person from a particular
5 issue that's tried in another case. Number three,
6 and importantly, is the party to be estopped was a
7 party or a privy of a party in prior action. This
8 is National Wine and Spirits versus Ernst and
9 Young, 976 N.E. 2d 699 Indiana 212. Prehearing was
10 denied. The fact of the matter is the stewards
11 were on right on the mark.

12 I told you I was going to get to the case. I
13 have to do it quickly because I'm running out of
14 time. The Jones case is a very important case.
15 And this is a case that was decided by the Indiana
16 Court of Appeals. And, interestingly, it involved
17 two co-defendants who were jointly charged with
18 three counts of possession of narcotics.

19 The judge who sat on that matter convicted one
20 of the defendants while the other one was in
21 Florida. So the other defendant comes back, and
22 this judge is sitting on the case. The
23 co-defendant says same facts, jointly charged, you
24 shouldn't decide the case.

25 Guess what, the Indiana Court of Appeals

1 decided it. And they decided it on virtually the
2 same canon that is at issue here. It's just been
3 updated.

4 What they said was after reviewing all sorts
5 of decisions, including Supreme Court decisions,
6 "Rather, his argument is that the mere fact that
7 Judge Jasper's participation in the prior bench
8 trial of the co-defendant Edelen precluded the same
9 judge from participating in Jones' trial. Such
10 clearly is not the law." It doesn't preclude him
11 at all.

12 What he's talking about in other situations is
13 if a judge goes from the trial court to the Court
14 of Appeals, that judge can't sit on the case he sat
15 in before. He doesn't say you can't sit on the
16 case that has any common facts.

17 This was your determination that Judge Pylitt
18 be assigned to this, the right determination.
19 There has been no showing of actual bias and
20 prejudice. There's nothing in the record to
21 support this.

22 I want to tell a cautionary tale here because
23 the same rules that apply to ALJs apply to this
24 Commission. You have to be careful because if you
25 determine, oh, heck, let's just make it easy and go

1 ahead and disqualify this judge, then you're giving
2 a basis for the Commission to say any common facts
3 that you deal with, you should be disqualified for.
4 And then the argument is that the Commission can't
5 deal with different disciplinary matters that arise
6 under the same common facts.

7 That is not true. It's not true with Judge
8 Pylitt. He's a well-respected jurist. He sat as a
9 judge in Hamilton County. He knows the rules. He
10 was not biased and prejudiced. There is nothing in
11 this record to suggest that he was.

12 We would ask you to affirm his decision on the
13 merits and decide that it was untimely as well.

14 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you, Robin.
15 Counsel.

16 MS. ELLINGWOOD: That concludes the oral
17 arguments from counsel. As I mentioned, Judge
18 Pylitt is here to answer any questions you may
19 have.

20 Again, the sole issue before you today is
21 whether or not Judge Pylitt is biased or prejudiced
22 which makes him unfit to hear the Russell matter.

23 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Judge Pylitt, do you
24 want to offer anything?

25 MR. PYLITT: I think counsel, in briefs,

1 pretty well set forth the issues. I think it would
2 probably be inappropriate for me to comment one way
3 or another.

4 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you. I can't tell
5 you another case that I've heard more about that
6 I'm not supposed to talk about. There's almost
7 nothing in this case that we haven't heard. Yet,
8 we're supposed to pretend we didn't hear it, I
9 think.

10 Commissioner Schenkel, did you have a
11 question?

12 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I just want to make
13 sure I understand the process and procedure here.
14 It's a dumb question, but I want to reiterate it.
15 You're saying we're just discussing today the
16 aspect of whether or not this moves forward with
17 Judge Pylitt as the ALJ. We are not -- we will
18 then at a later time have an actual recommended
19 order to consider in this matter; is that correct?

20 MS. ELLINGWOOD: You will. Like you, I'm in
21 the dark about many of the facts about the case on
22 purpose. My understanding though is that hearing
23 the matter, a trial in the matter, rather, is
24 scheduled for late this year. I want to say
25 December. So there will be a time when a proposed

1 order comes before you that gets to the underlying
2 allegations against Doctor Russell, but that's not
3 today.

4 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: The second part of my
5 question is what is the status of Doctor Russell in
6 the meantime? In other words, from today going
7 forward, he will have an opportunity to have a
8 hearing, and there will be a process. But what is
9 his status in that time frame?

10 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Doctor Russell was initially
11 summarily suspended. He didn't ask for a hearing
12 on the suspension. The suspension was dropped, and
13 then he was excluded, which has the same effect in
14 that he can't go into the regulated area, the
15 backside. He didn't ask for a hearing on the
16 exclusion either. So right now he continues to be
17 excluded. He's not performing his services on the
18 racetrack or any other area regulated by the
19 Commission.

20 MR. PYLITT: Commissioner Schenkel, for your
21 benefit, the hearing on the merits has been
22 continued by agreement of counsel. It's currently
23 set for December 1st for four days in Indianapolis.
24 There are some deadlines for discovery and
25 depositions, which necessitated moving the hearing

1 out to December 1st.

2 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: Not to be
3 oversimplified here, our decision is whether or not
4 that December 1st process is going to be overseen
5 by this administrative law judge or not.

6 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Yeah. Practically speaking,
7 if another administrative law judge is assigned, it
8 likely would be continued so that the judge would
9 have the opportunity to get up to speed.

10 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I understand.

11 MS. ELLINGWOOD: That's not a certainty, but
12 it's very, very, very likely.

13 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Who selects the ALJs?

14 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Your chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I get this opportunity
16 about four times a month. Do you want it?

17 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: No. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: The reason I thought we
19 should hear this today and not just rule on the
20 fact the time factor could be a question, we could
21 literally, you could argue, not hear, not make a
22 decision, not allow this thing to go forward based
23 on this time sequence of proper filing. Or we can
24 say we want this to go forward where you'd have to
25 find yourself trying to disqualify Judge Pylitt for

1 some bias or some other reason. That's the issue
2 before us.

3 That's what the argument is by counsel. This
4 is an argument that they are using to disqualify
5 this judge before we ever get to hear the case. I
6 mean, we've already heard more about this case than
7 I think we're supposed to. But, nevertheless, we
8 had to get to this to understand the ruling to
9 supply the yes or no for Judge Pylitt.

10 It's my recommendation, and I will make this
11 in a motion, we allow this to go forward accepting
12 Judge Pylitt as the attorney or the judge that I've
13 appointed, and we've already been involved with and
14 all this background music on this particular case.

15 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: I second the motion.

16 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: We have a motion and a
17 second. Questions?

18 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Chairman, just to be very
19 specific, it sounds to me as if the motion is to
20 approve the ALJ's proposed findings but deny the
21 motion to disqualify.

22 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That's right. Can we
23 take a vote on that? All those in favor say "aye."

24 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

25 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: It's passed.

1 Number eight, Joe, I guess that's your time.

2 JOE GORAJEC: Yes. When the Commission met in
3 April, at that time the Commission was fully
4 apprised of the selection of Truesdail as our
5 primary lab, and the fact that we had put under
6 contract an audit lab.

7 Since that time a lot has happened. You know
8 by my communications in May that the preliminary
9 findings of the audit lab of Truesdail's work led
10 to us terminating Truesdail's contract for default
11 because at that time they had missed three positive
12 tests that were found by Industrial Lab and
13 confirmed by a third-party lab. So that's where we
14 left off in May.

15 So in the middle of May Truesdail's out.
16 Industrial is our primary lab, but at that time we
17 still had several weeks of testing in the pipeline
18 that Truesdail had done the work on or were doing
19 the work on. So it wasn't until we were able to
20 review all those samples that we know enough to put
21 forth a staff report concluding the findings of all
22 of the 26 days of racing in which Industrial
23 Laboratories served as our audit laboratory.

24 The findings, as you saw in the report -- I
25 won't go into the report in detail, but I will be

1 glad to answer any questions. That from mid May
2 until just a few weeks ago, the audit laboratory
3 and an independent third-party laboratory found
4 four more positive tests. So during the 26 days of
5 auditing, there were seven positive tests that were
6 missed.

7 And to me, two things that are most disturbing
8 about this is that it wasn't seven out of 50. It's
9 not like Truesdail found 50 and missed seven. They
10 found none and missed seven. So their batting
11 average would have been .000. So that was one of
12 the most disturbing things. The other was that
13 although six of the seven were positives for
14 therapeutic medication, one of them was a Class 1
15 drug.

16 And the way the statute and our rules read, in
17 order to prosecute a drug positive, it has to be
18 found by the primary lab. Even though Industrial
19 found it, and even though it was confirmed by LGC,
20 we cannot and could not prosecute that case.

21 So that's the good and the bad. I mean, the
22 bad is that that happened. The good is that we had
23 a program in place to detect it and move on. And
24 we have moved on.

25 Our laboratory, Industrial, we believe is

1 doing a fine job. Since that time, I believe
2 they've called 11 positive tests. Some of those
3 have been fully adjudicated. Some of those are in
4 the pipeline to be adjudicated. They are doing
5 their job. And they're finding positive tests as
6 they should.

7 I want to conclude my remarks to discuss
8 briefly the way we are moving forward because even
9 though this program with the audit has worked well,
10 worked very well, there really is a better, more
11 efficient way of doing it. That is to develop what
12 I refer to briefly in the report as a double-blind
13 sample program. That's a program where we cause,
14 we choose a drug that could be abused on the
15 racetrack.

16 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Is that point nine on
17 the agenda?

18 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: It's eight.

19 JOE GORAJEC: It's the last section of the
20 staff report under number eight.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I have just a question
22 for you because Truesdail was the one that got the
23 contract for the whole year.

24 JOE GORAJEC: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: After even being pointed

1 out that they didn't find it, you gave them a
2 chance to test again, and they still didn't find
3 it?

4 JOE GORAJEC: Correct on four of the samples.

5 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That means their system
6 or standards must not even be adequate to do
7 anything.

8 JOE GORAJEC: One could imply that.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Now it's Industrial.

10 JOE GORAJEC: Now it's Industrial.

11 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: When did we start
12 sending everything to Industrial?

13 JOE GORAJEC: I don't know the exact date.
14 Was it May? I believe it might say here. May 6th.

15 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: So really this year is
16 Industrial Lab.

17 JOE GORAJEC: This year is Industrial Lab.

18 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Go ahead with your
19 double blind.

20 JOE GORAJEC: The double-blind program is a
21 more cost effective way of doing business. What
22 we've done is we've reached out to Purdue. And
23 they have agreed to work jointly with us on this
24 double-blind program.

25 And the way the program works is that we

1 select a number of drugs that we want the lab to
2 receive without knowing that these are special
3 samples. So what will be done is that Purdue,
4 using their research and teaching herd of horses,
5 okay, will inject horses, one horse each, with the
6 drugs that we choose. And blood and urine on those
7 horses will be drawn at specific points in time.

8 Those samples will be sent to the track, and
9 we will disguise those samples. We will camouflage
10 those samples in such a way as when we send our
11 weekly shipment to Industrial, it will look like a
12 normal post-race sample.

13 So they will process it, okay, as they do
14 every other sample. That's very important because
15 the way -- a lot of times the industry will have
16 proficiency tests. When they send out a
17 proficiency test to a lab, they say, hey, here's a
18 sample that's a proficiency test, and we want you
19 to tell us if you find anything in there.

20 But when that's done, the lab is clued in that
21 this is a special sample. So they're going to give
22 it the full monty. They will run everything they
23 can. If it comes back negative, they're going to
24 run it again. And they're going to run it again.
25 And they're going to run it again. And they are

1 going to make a special super-duper effort to find
2 what's in that sample because they know it's a
3 testing proficiency sample. And there is likely
4 something in there.

5 We don't want the lab to know. We want the
6 lab to treat this as a routine sample. So we are
7 going to disguise them.

8 And then once the results are in, I will issue
9 a report. It will be a very public process. The
10 results, good, bad, you'll know what they are.

11 And one thing that has happened since I sent
12 out this report is Purdue has a committee called
13 the ACUC, which is the Animal Care Use Committee.
14 This is a committee that anything that they are
15 going to do with this research herd, someone has to
16 sign off on to make sure that the university is
17 comfortable with the experiment, comfortable with
18 the project, and it's not going to harm the horses.

19 That committee has already signed off since
20 this report was issued. That committee approved
21 the project. So we're basically good to go and
22 good to move forward, other than actually getting a
23 contract with Purdue, but all the other wheels are
24 greased to move ahead.

25 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Very good. So this

1 sounds like a pretty thorough double testing.

2 JOE GORAJEC: It is. It is.

3 CHAIRMAN MCNAUGHT: Are you sharing this with
4 Industrial Labs?

5 JOE GORAJEC: They got the report. They know
6 we're going to be doing double blinds.

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: They already know what
8 we're doing.

9 JOE GORAJEC: They know we're going to have a
10 double-blind program. But as far as they won't
11 know of all the sample they get each week, and
12 we're racing nine races, well, we're racing nine
13 days a week. And we are sending 15 to 20 samples a
14 day. So they're getting well over a hundred
15 samples a week. So buried within those samples
16 will be our proficiency samples.

17 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: None of the things we do
18 on the track with Purdue is being tested against
19 Industrial Labs.

20 JOE GORAJEC: Say that again.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: We are not doing
22 anything to verify the audit on Industrial Labs.
23 Who do we verify against Industrial Labs?

24 JOE GORAJEC: The double-blind program
25 replaces the audit. We operated this under a

1 quality assurance program.

2 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: So Purdue is becoming
3 the audit program.

4 JOE GORAJEC: No. We're changing the nature
5 of our quality assurance program, and we're moving
6 from an audit-based program to a double-blind
7 sample program. But you do mention a good point in
8 that, for example, let's say that we give a horse a
9 drug that is drug A. We disguise it. We send it
10 to Industrial, assuming that they're going to find
11 it. If they can't find it --

12 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That's a problem.

13 JOE GORAJEC: That's an issue. We'll let them
14 know that they need to retest that. But what we'll
15 also do is we'll have an extra sample, a split that
16 will go to an independent lab. You know, there
17 might be something with the time delay, the dosage.
18 And we want to make sure that if Industrial can't
19 find it, that another lab can find it before we
20 call them on it.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner Schenkel.

22 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I want to make sure
23 it's on the record that we expressed, all of us
24 expressed concern about the 70-day delay that
25 occurred in earlier conversation, earlier

1 proceeding. And I think it's fair to note, Joe, am
2 I correct in saying we're not experiencing delays
3 like that. This whole process has helped address
4 that issue as well; is that correct?

5 JOE GORAJEC: Absolutely. Industrial has been
6 right on the, pretty much right on the money. We
7 send our samples to them once a week on a
8 Wednesday. They get them on a Thursday. The
9 following Thursday we know if they have any
10 suspicious samples.

11 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I just want to make
12 sure the public is assured that we saw that as an
13 issue.

14 JOE GORAJEC: It is a concern. That concern
15 has been addressed. Industrial has been on time.

16 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner McCarty.

17 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Who did the testing in
18 2014?

19 JOE GORAJEC: 2014 started with LGC, which is
20 a very prominent laboratory out of Lexington. They
21 did a super fine job quality wise, but they were
22 slow as molasses, and that's what caused the
23 backup.

24 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Then we went to
25 Truesdail.

1 JOE GORAJEC: No, then we went to Industrial
2 for the rest of 2014. What happened is we issued
3 an RFP for a laboratory for 2015. And the State
4 Department of, DOA awarded it to Truesdail.

5 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: The State Department of
6 Administration because is it based on a low cost
7 basis or is it best and low cost?

8 JOE GORAJEC: We would argue that, we would
9 vigorously argue the best, but it was the low
10 bidder.

11 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: Which this is a
12 personal comment, Commissioner McCarty, that
13 troubles me from the standpoint of this, in my
14 mind, should not be a decision made on best or
15 lowest cost. Quality is so important here. And
16 there is not taxpayer money involved in this.
17 These costs are borne by the participants, by the
18 users. So I hope that the Department of
19 Administration, in all due respect, learns
20 something of this process.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: They won't.

22 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Have there been any
23 discussions with the Department of Administration?

24 JOE GORAJEC: The Department of
25 Administration, even though they awarded the

1 contract to Truesdail after we expressed concerns,
2 they've been very good to deal with on the tail end
3 because we had to seek their approval to terminate
4 this contract. And I think they got it. I think
5 they got it. They were very helpful in the
6 termination.

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Next year you'll be on
8 the committee to help select the lab. This will be
9 an experience you will never ask again.

10 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: As you recall,
11 Chairman Weatherwax --

12 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I didn't want it.

13 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: -- when volunteers
14 were sought --

15 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I pointed to you.

16 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: -- the Department of
17 Administration said we don't want any outside
18 opinions.

19 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Yeah, that's true.

20 All right, Joe, thank you. It looks like that
21 is very timely to have that audit lab going on.
22 Otherwise, we would have had a disaster. The case
23 with the one positive, that's a lost case for us.

24 JOE GORAJEC: How we refer to them in the
25 office is we have to eat that.

1 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Number ten. Is that
2 also you, Joe?

3 JOE GORAJEC: I believe we are at nine.

4 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Nine is the Texas
5 Veterinary Medical Diagnostic lab as a split.

6 JOE GORAJEC: The Commission will remember
7 that earlier in the year they approved three
8 laboratories to serve as split laboratories for the
9 Commission. That's the lab that gets the
10 horsemen's sample, the split sample if a trainer
11 gets a positive, and he wants to have the sample,
12 the split sample independently analyzed.

13 The Commission approved three labs. They
14 approved LGC. They each approved UC Davis. And
15 they approved the laboratory at the University of
16 Pennsylvania.

17 What's happened since that time is, at least
18 temporarily, UC Davis and Pennsylvania are not
19 taking split samples. So we only have one lab
20 that's willingly taking split samples. And that's
21 LGC.

22 And we like the horsemen to have a choice in
23 labs. And I know that the horsemen appreciate
24 having a choice in labs. So we would like to add
25 the Texas Veterinary Medical Diagnostic Laboratory

1 as a split sample lab for now into the future.

2 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: So moved.

3 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Motion and second. All
5 those in favor say "aye."

6 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Number ten is Joe.

8 JOE GORAJEC: One thing we spoke of earlier
9 when we were talking about drug testing is that
10 most of the racing laboratories do not have testing
11 equipment for cobalt. Cobalt is not a drug. It's
12 a heavy metal. And because of that, they don't
13 have the equipment to test heavy metal because they
14 are not in the business of doing that. But these
15 laboratories also often have a sister laboratory on
16 the premises. UC Davis has one. The University of
17 Pennsylvania has one. Texas has one.

18 Although we require ISO accreditation for our
19 laboratories, and all of our split laboratories are
20 accredited, the cobalt laboratories are not
21 necessarily accredited by ISO. They may have other
22 certification, but they are not accredited by ISO.

23 I want to get this on the table and to get a
24 blanket approval that these cobalt laboratories
25 that are affiliated with the split laboratories

1 need not be ISO accredited. That would be a waiver
2 on those.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Because there's not
4 enough of them to be able to find, you want to
5 waive the ISO rule because some of these cobalt
6 labs may not be a certified ISO?

7 JOE GORAJEC: I would like the Commission to
8 have a blanket waiver for the testing of cobalt as
9 it relates to that laboratory being ISO accredited.

10 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Or not, you're saying
11 you want them to be.

12 JOE GORAJEC: No, I'm saying that they need
13 not be accredited.

14 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Only on cobalt.

15 JOE GORAJEC: Only on cobalt.

16 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Do I hear a motion?

17 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: I so move.

18 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Second. All those in
20 favor say "aye."

21 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Okay. Now, number 11.

23 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Thank you, Chairman.

24 During this legislative session, there were
25 three bills that had or may have a direct impact on

1 horse racing. Those bills are Senate Bill 252,
2 House Bill 1270, and House Bill 1540. House Bill
3 1540 was a gaming bill that provided the racinos
4 may have table games in 2021, with the permission
5 of the Gaming Commission. That bill potentially
6 impacts horse racing insofar as the future table
7 game revenue will impact Centaur's AGR, which in
8 turn could impact the amount of money to breed
9 development and the horsemen's associations under
10 IC 4-35-7-12.

11 While House Bill 1270 survived the house and
12 the senate, it was vetoed by the Governor. A
13 number of statutory changes that were originally
14 included in that bill, however, ended up in Senate
15 Bill 252, which became effective July 1st of this
16 year.

17 In 252, the legislature requires the
18 Commission to promote the horse racing industry and
19 to make certain reports on promotions in its annual
20 report; increase the Commissioner's minimum per
21 diem salary to the maximum daily amount allowed for
22 federal government employees while in travel
23 status; clarified race date language; altered the
24 way breed development committee members are
25 appointed; increased the percentage of funds used

1 by the Commission for administrative costs from
2 two percent to four percent and allows those funds
3 to be used for promotions; and slightly alters the
4 distribution of the slot funds for Thoroughbred
5 purposes.

6 I believe we will next hear from Jessica
7 Barnes regarding promotions in light of the new
8 statute. But if you have any questions of me with
9 respect to the legislation at this point, I'm happy
10 to answer those.

11 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Should we quit our day
12 jobs because of the per diem increase?

13 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I don't think you better
14 do that.

15 A question for you or John because I don't
16 remember. This was a bouncing ball, no pun
17 intended. But 1540 just simply said they'll look
18 at it but not before 2021.

19 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Mr. Keeler would certainly be
20 able to give you more of the specifics than I can.
21 What I can tell you is it allows them -- I mean,
22 they have the option to do that, but they have to
23 get prior approval from the Gaming Commission.

24 John, are there any other restrictions on
25 that?

1 MR. KEELER: No, it's discretionary with the
2 Gaming Commission.

3 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: Will this come back up
4 next year?

5 MR. KEELER: Commissioner Pillow, you never
6 know what happens in the legislature.

7 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: Good answer.

8 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner McCarty.

9 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: I've been on the road a
10 lot. Let me understand this. So the table games
11 issue can be brought to the Gaming Commission for
12 approval, disapproval beginning in the year,
13 somewhere out in the distant future?

14 MR. KEELER: That's correct, Commissioner
15 McCarty. The statute was amended so that the
16 racetrack casinos may have gambling games if
17 authorized by the Gaming Commission, but we can't
18 apply for that until 2021.

19 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: But even the
20 establishment of, establishing that they would
21 begin in 2021 was vetoed; is that right?

22 MS. ELLINGWOOD: That wasn't. The vetoed bill
23 was House Bill 1270.

24 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: And did not contain
25 that.

1 MS. ELLINGWOOD: Correct.

2 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: So it can be discussed
3 in 2021.

4 MR. KEELER: That's right. It's on the books.
5 And, certainly, Gaming Commission will have
6 discretion. And there are four or five factors
7 they are required to consider, like the economic
8 development that would come from that, number of
9 jobs, tax revenue.

10 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: It's a delay. All
12 right. Lea, thank you so much for that update. It
13 was important because Senate Bill 252 gives us a
14 serious responsibility to help promote the
15 business. Jessica is going to share with us what
16 some of those are and what you're doing.

17 JESSICA BARNES: Thank you. I wanted to start
18 by giving a little bit of history of what we've
19 done promotion wise with the breed development
20 fund. When the slots were approved back in 2007
21 and implemented in 2008, all three of the breed
22 development committees by 2009 had really ramped up
23 what they were doing with marketing and promotions.

24 We felt that our programs were something of
25 value. That people, if they knew about it, would

1 want to participate and would want to come to
2 Indiana. We were really hitting promotions hard
3 and trying to attract new people to Indiana.

4 Unfortunately in 2012, the legislature enacted
5 a change to the statute that capped how certain
6 monies could be spent from the breed development
7 funds. That change said that not more than
8 two percent of the monies deposited into the funds
9 during the previous fiscal year could be used for
10 administrative expenses, including marketing.

11 When you factored in the existing
12 administrative expenses the Commission already had
13 for the administration of those breed development
14 programs, it left very little monies left over for
15 marketing. And it severely limited the amount of
16 money available for us to do any type of marketing.

17 So we fast forward to 2015. The 252 increases
18 the funds available changing from two percent to
19 four percent. The net effect of this is that it
20 will be approximately 430,000 combined from the
21 three breed development programs to be utilized for
22 marketing.

23 I'm extremely excited about this. I truly
24 believe that our three breed development programs
25 are one of the best kept secrets in racing. Each

1 program has great benefits. And they are already
2 producing amazing results. I'm excited to see what
3 we can do if we get awareness out and can really
4 promote the program and continue to build our
5 quality.

6 I think with these funds, we can do even
7 better than what we have been doing. We must
8 continually strive to grow and to improve the
9 programs. Over the past few months, I've been
10 working with different organizations to get a
11 marketing strategy in place. I've met with
12 industry stakeholders, such as the horsemen's
13 groups and racetracks to assess their thoughts on
14 what they see our target should be.

15 Coming from these meetings and discussions, I
16 have determined there are three primary areas we
17 need to focus. Marketing should be aimed at,
18 obviously, increasing the economic impact of the
19 breed development programs to the state of Indiana.
20 And we do this by increasing visibility and
21 awareness of our program, attracting quality
22 training and racing operations.

23 In doing this, we have to account for the
24 various factions of our industry, which gets quite
25 complicated when you look at our overall program as

1 a whole. You have the horsemen, which consist of
2 owners, trainers, breeders, stallion owners. And
3 then you have the racetracks which consist of the
4 product we're putting out there for the bettors and
5 the participants.

6 So we have been carefully considering how to
7 do that. Our approach will include partnerships
8 with the racetracks and horsemen's groups, as well
9 as partnership with other state agencies, such as
10 the Department of Agriculture or Indiana Economic
11 Development Corporation.

12 I feel that we must move our program into the
13 digital era. We have to come into this century.
14 Everybody is digital. We have to have a digital
15 presence, which includes social media sites and
16 digital marketing. I think all of these efforts
17 combined will help us tell the story of our breed
18 development programs and help attract people to
19 Indiana.

20 It's already happening without the marketing
21 out there. I know of two instances this past year
22 where Standardbred racing operations have picked up
23 and moved from Illinois, sold their farms and
24 decided to have Indiana as their home base. These
25 are just racing operations. I think we can move

1 that into breeding farms and get other people here
2 in Indiana.

3 As I said, I'm still working on the entire
4 marketing strategy. That's just a glimpse of where
5 we're going.

6 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Can you share with us
7 things we are working on, specifically on the
8 television side?

9 JESSICA BARNES: Yes. We're looking at a
10 partnership with the racetracks with a program with
11 Wish TV. I'm super excited about that. Brian may
12 want to talk a little about it. I know they have
13 already entered into the agreement with that. I
14 want us to be a part of it so we can get the
15 message out about what else racing is for Indiana.

16 The tracks have very specific -- you know,
17 racing is there on the tracks and going on. I
18 think there's a lot of people that don't understand
19 that it doesn't stop there. That there is a
20 trickle-down effect to breeders, stallion owners,
21 hay producers, veterinarians, truck dealerships,
22 trailer dealerships, all of those things.

23 I think when breed development partners with
24 the tracks on this, we from breed development can
25 send that information also and get that information

1 out there.

2 I know that Wish TV is going to be doing a
3 live broadcast from the Indiana Derby this weekend.
4 And there's also more broadcasts scheduled
5 throughout the year. It also includes appearances
6 on Indy Live, Indy Style, the television show here
7 in Indianapolis, and then also have some digital
8 things for us to do.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Commissioner Pillow.

10 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: I know that we are
11 concentrating on the Wish TV, but are we in the
12 future thinking of maybe buying air time in
13 Illinois, Ohio, Kentucky?

14 JESSICA BARNES: I think that could more than
15 be considered. I think we have to target those
16 states, especially the ones that are having
17 trouble. Indiana's racing industry is facing
18 problems right now. I think they are a great
19 market to look at and to attract people to come
20 here and spend dollars.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: For Commissioner
22 McCarty's benefit, he maybe doesn't know some of
23 this background of what became a part of 252. The
24 General Assembly is watching what we're doing.
25 They're putting some money on the table, and they

1 expect results because this is a real big
2 permission, latitude for us to do everything we
3 can. We have to make the most of what we can with
4 this, I call it money that we can use that's kind
5 of like new money. It's 433,000. But she's got to
6 divide that up between all three breeds.

7 We, the Commission and Jessica, will work
8 together to come up with what's the best use of
9 that money.

10 JESSICA BARNES: I'm trying to look at ways of
11 how can we most maximize those dollars. How can we
12 maximize that and get the most bang for our buck.

13 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: We've already worked,
14 Commissioner Pillow, all of us in trying to
15 cooperate. Maybe do a partnership with the
16 Department of Agriculture, Lieutenant Governor,
17 tourism. Jessica is already working with Centaur
18 to capitalize on their television exposure. They
19 have a huge advertising budget. Ours is peanuts
20 compared to theirs, but we have to make the most of
21 what we have. That's what she's trying to do.
22 Thank you, Jessica.

23 Okay. Number 13, Holly, this is review of the
24 Commission's rulings.

25 MS. NEWELL: Yes, sir. You have the rulings

1 from April through June in front of you. I think
2 the primary thing to note is that this includes ten
3 medication rulings, all of which were generated
4 from Industrial after they took over our drug
5 testing contract. I think it really shows that
6 transition and how effective and successful it has
7 been for us. I'm happy to answer any question you
8 might have about any of the rulings.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: So really --

10 COMMISSIONER PILLOW: One quick question. I'm
11 sorry. Go ahead.

12 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: I was just saying, a lot
13 of these don't deal with drugs, but they deal with
14 whipping, and all kinds of different reasons they
15 can get cited, driving infraction, jockeys
16 requirements. I don't know what that is. What's
17 the word jockey requirements mean?

18 MS. NEWELL: Joe.

19 JOE GORAJEC: Which one are we on?

20 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: There's a number of
21 them.

22 MS. NEWELL: They do failure to honor ride.

23 JOE GORAJEC: That could be, what often
24 happens is they'll accept a mount, then they'll
25 call in and not fulfill their obligation. I'm not

1 sure that's what it is, but that's what it could be
2 because that happens often.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: So how many of these --
4 I don't see that many that are drug related.

5 MS. NEWELL: You have five pages of rulings,
6 and there are ten that are drug related. It's
7 certainly not the majority, but I do think it's
8 telling.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Is that more than you
10 would see by this point in time?

11 JOE GORAJEC: This is pretty much average. We
12 often, we talk so often when we get together about
13 drugs and drug testing, but our rule book is over
14 200 pages. And it reads like the fine type on an
15 insurance policy. And there's a lot of stuff in
16 there.

17 And there are a lot of rules that deal with
18 the running of the race, licensing requirements.
19 And we have three individuals, we've got three
20 judges at the Standardbred track. We have three
21 stewards at the Thoroughbred track. And they're
22 responsible for regulating the race meet on a
23 day-to-day basis. Most of these are relatively
24 small potatoes. When you see a fine, and you see a
25 fine of \$500 or less and no suspension, it's a

1 minor infraction.

2 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: The point is,
3 Mr. Chairman, that we might not have seen as many
4 drug violations had we not had the quality
5 assurance program.

6 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Very good.

7 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: There are two in here
8 of some duration of suspension, one about five
9 months and one for basically a year. Do you
10 remember the fact situation for those?

11 MS. NEWELL: The first one you are referring
12 to was the Ronald Raper. That was a settlement
13 agreement that the Commission approved last
14 meeting, I believe. You were absent.

15 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: The other one is Julio
16 Almanza.

17 JOE GORAJEC: You might remember that one
18 better than I do.

19 MS. NEWELL: Yes. Mr. Almanza is a Quarter
20 Horse trainer. And he violated our rule regarding
21 program training. So what that means is that he
22 was setting himself out as the trainer of horses
23 when he was not, in fact, the trainer of these
24 horses. It's a pretty serious charge.

25 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Well, do we have to do

1 anything, Lea, as far as this?

2 MS. ELLINGWOOD: No, it's just a review.

3 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you, Holly.

4 Number 14, is that Jessica again?

5 JOE GORAJEC: I'll start 14 off, but I would
6 like to have presiding judge Mike Hall appear
7 because 14 is --

8 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That's the emergency
9 rule regarding fair start pole, which I had to
10 learn what that was because that's an important
11 part of the race, I guess.

12 JOE GORAJEC: I've been very reluctant over
13 the last few years to bring a rule amendment to the
14 Commission mid race meet. Our routine is to try to
15 get those knocked off during the off-season so we
16 start fresh, and everyone knows what the rules are
17 before the meet begins.

18 I made an exception of putting this one on the
19 agenda based upon input I received from our judges
20 and the horsemen and the track. This particular
21 rule is the brain child of this gentleman here,
22 presiding judge Mike Hall. He came to me and said
23 we really need this. It's a good thing.

24 And after he said that, I said, well, how does
25 the rest of the industry feel about it? And it

1 turns out that the horsemen are for it. The track
2 is for it.

3 I thought I would make this one an exception
4 to our policy about putting things on mid racing
5 season for a rule just because it's one that I
6 think helps the betting public. And there's going
7 to be, as far as I know, no objections from the
8 industry, in fact, nothing but support. So that's
9 why you are looking at something that's a rule
10 amendment in July.

11 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Judge, can you please
12 tell us what this means as far as fair start.

13 MIKE HALL: I'll try to. First of all, I just
14 wanted to ramble on a second before I got started
15 on that. Anyone that knows me knows I like to
16 ramble.

17 Regardless, I was last here in March and met
18 all of you before we started our meet. We are
19 halfway through the meet. I can say I have worked
20 in many other jurisdictions; New York,
21 Pennsylvania, Ohio, Canada, Florida, Maryland. And
22 so far, this is the most progressive and
23 forward-looking racing commission and executive
24 director and staff that I have ever worked with.

25 I've been told a few times that something I

1 say is from the east coast bias. I'm trying to get
2 less of beeping the horn at people and maybe
3 yelling out the window. Anyway, I'm acclimating
4 very well to Indiana.

5 And for myself and the other two judges, we
6 are very, very happy that we are here. And we feel
7 very fortunate to be here and working with the
8 racing commission and staff that's as good as it
9 is.

10 So that being said, the fair start pole, it's
11 a policy that I first learned about when I was
12 working in Canada. And just to give a quick
13 history review of how racing goes with breaking
14 horses, Standardbreds, you know they have to stay
15 on their particular stride, either pacing or
16 trotting.

17 Years ago there used to be a rule that said if
18 a horse goes off its stride when they're behind the
19 gate before they reached a certain pole, which is
20 called the recall pole, they would basically start
21 over. So what they would do is they get all the
22 horses behind the gate, and they would be heading
23 towards the start. And before they got to the
24 recall pole, number two goes off stride. So the
25 starter turns the lights on on the gate. They all

1 have to turn around and go back.

2 So it might not seem like much of a deal, but
3 first of all, the horse that ran made the break in
4 the first place gets another chance to go. But it
5 upsets three or four of the other horses because
6 they're ready to go at that time. So what you have
7 then is in the old days, it might be two or three
8 or four recalls all started by the first horse.

9 So years ago they decided to take that rule
10 out. There would be no more recalls for breaking
11 horses. Well, that was all right except for some
12 of the people that bet on the horses said, well,
13 why should you take that away from us. We are
14 getting a bad deal.

15 So Canada came up with the fair start pole in
16 Ontario. And I think it originated from they had a
17 big stake race. And a horse caused a recall
18 because it was running and acting crazy. Then they
19 turned the field. And by the time they got it
20 started, two or three of horses and one of the
21 favorites was so wound up that they were crazy, and
22 they couldn't race.

23 So they devised a plan of we'll put a pole a
24 certain distance before the starting line. And if
25 any horse is off stride and doesn't reach that

1 particular pole before the horses are released at
2 the start, then it wouldn't be a recall in turning
3 the whole field. That horse would just be refunded
4 and declared a non-starter for wagering purposes.

5 I hope you all can understand what I'm saying.
6 When they get to this proposed fair start pole, if
7 the horse hasn't reached that before the starting
8 gate gets to the start pole, which in the case of
9 this will be 330 feet back, then that horse would
10 be refunded. And everyone that wagered on them
11 gets their money back. And the rest of the horses
12 aren't affected by it.

13 There's two big concerns. One is that the
14 bettors think they are getting a fair deal, which
15 they are. It's a fair deal. To be 330 feet back,
16 the horse really has to do something stupid.
17 Sometimes you'll see a horse coming to the gate,
18 it'll just be hopping like a rabbit. And in that
19 case, now we can just go. Before this, the starter
20 would say we've got to turn them. We have a bad
21 acting horse. Now that horse is out and the rest
22 of the horses aren't affected so that everyone gets
23 their money back.

24 The only push back that you would ever see, I
25 think, is maybe from management, but the management

1 at Hoosier Park -- and I'm speaking for them now --
2 they love racing. And Rick Moore, he's up there
3 every night. And he loves racing. And he wants to
4 give the bettor a fair chance.

5 So when I spoke to him about it, I said, you
6 know, there's going to be some refunds. Yeah. I
7 said but in my mind whenever you refund somebody
8 \$10, they bet 20 back because, wow, we got a good
9 deal on that. Rick had the same thoughts and so
10 did the horsemen's organization with Jack. They
11 all thought that it's a good idea because it
12 doesn't disrupt the rest of the race, and it gives
13 the betting public a fair shake.

14 And I believe that the publicity from it will
15 be tremendous for Indiana racing. We can put up a
16 big story in the trade magazine, the fairest state
17 of all Indiana, something like that.

18 I don't see any problems with it. And I think
19 it's a really good thing for racing. I don't think
20 there is anyone that will have an objection.

21 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: That's why it's an
22 emergency rule because you want to do this as soon
23 as possible.

24 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: So would this start
25 tonight?

1 JOE GORAJEC: No, it starts -- Lea can speak
2 to when it starts.

3 MS. ELLINGWOOD: It starts as soon as it's
4 filed with Legislative Service Agency so usually
5 the next day.

6 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: You're trying to do it
7 before this big weekend?

8 MIKE HALL: I don't know about that.

9 JOE GORAJEC: We have to get the pole in.

10 MIKE HALL: The pole's there, but we need to
11 paint it and put fair start pole.

12 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: It will be within
13 days.

14 MIKE HALL: Yeah, it will be within days. And
15 what we don't want is we had a case earlier this
16 year where a horse wouldn't trot so they had a
17 recall for him. They turned him around. You can
18 see a couple of the other ones are getting pretty
19 hot. They went to the gate again, and he wouldn't
20 trot again. So there's two times.

21 He scratched. He's gone off the track. Then
22 they line them up again. First two favorites went
23 off stride at the start because they were disrupted
24 by the two recalls. That's what we don't want to
25 happen.

1 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: So I understand this,
2 this will be before the starting gate point, but
3 those horses have to be on gait before they get to
4 the starting gate pole?

5 MIKE HALL: Not on gait, they just have to
6 reach it. Before the starter says go, they have to
7 be within 330 feet of the start line or else they
8 are not going to be refunded.

9 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: All these people know
10 this. They know the rules of the fair start pole,
11 all the horsemen, all the drivers.

12 MIKE HALL: We'll give them a lesson on it.

13 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: They maybe don't know
14 about all about it yet?

15 MIKE HALL: No, I don't think they do. Some
16 of them that have raced in Canada would know it,
17 but it's fairly simple.

18 JOE GORAJEC: Mike, do you know of any other
19 state in the country that has a rule that applies
20 to fair start?

21 MIKE HALL: No. I proposed this five years
22 ago in Pennsylvania. It just sat there. I
23 actually wrote an article about it. I got a lot of
24 responses back that that's a great idea, when are
25 you going to put it in.

1 JOE GORAJEC: You can sit down and work with
2 Jessica on the press release this afternoon.

3 MIKE HALL: Yes.

4 JOE GORAJEC: Put the fairest of all in there.

5 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: This will be a pole big
6 enough that spectators will see it?

7 MIKE HALL: Yeah, I mean, if we have any extra
8 yellow paint, something bright that everyone can
9 see it. Immediately if a horse doesn't make it to
10 that pole, we'll put up the inquiry sign on the
11 board so people aren't throwing their tickets on
12 the ground. The people, the bettors are going to
13 learn that, oh, that horse might not have made the
14 pole. Sometimes they're going to be happy, and
15 sometimes they're not when he's five feet past it,
16 but you have to have a point somewhere.

17 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: It sounds like a unique
18 idea.

19 COMMISSIONER SCHENKEL: I move approval.

20 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: I love it as a former
21 owner of Standardbreds.

22 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Do you want to make a
23 second?

24 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: Yes, I will make a
25 second. I think it's a great idea.

1 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Questions? All those in
2 favor say "aye."

3 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

4 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you, Mike.

5 Last but not least, consideration of
6 readopting administrative rules scheduled to
7 expire. I thought we had reviewed every rule
8 possible.

9 MS. ELLINGWOOD: It seems like that. There
10 were 900 some but magically, no. Administrative
11 rules automatically expire on the first day of the
12 seventh year after they're adopted. In Indiana
13 Code 422 established a process that allows an
14 agency to readopt rules, those rules that are
15 expiring without changes. That's the process we
16 followed for these two rules.

17 This year the following rules are scheduled to
18 expire: 71 IAC 6-1-2 regarding prohibitions on
19 claims, and 71 IAC 14-1-2 regarding the definition
20 of Indiana sired. There is one other rule that's
21 scheduled to expire, but staff anticipates there
22 will be a change made to the rule before it expires
23 so we're holding off on readopting that rule at
24 this point.

25 Accordingly, we respectfully request that the

1 Commission adopt without changes 71 IAC 6-1-2 and
2 71 IAC 14-1-2. As always, I'm happy to answer any
3 questions you may have.

4 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you. There will
5 be no public policy changes to those rules.

6 MS. ELLINGWOOD: No, the rules will stay
7 exactly the same.

8 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Without further
9 discussion, do I hear a motion?

10 COMMISSIONER MCCARTY: I move for said rules
11 71 IAC 6-1-2 and 71 IAC 14-1-2 readoption without
12 changes.

13 COMMISSIONER LIGHTLE: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: All those in favor say
15 "aye."

16 THE COMMISSION: "Aye."

17 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: They passed. I don't
18 know of any old business. New business, I don't
19 think there is anything else left to talk about.

20 MS. ELLINGWOOD: There is one thing I forgot
21 to mention. The Commission has been lucky enough
22 to have two really good interns this summer. One
23 of them is here today. I wanted to recognize both
24 of them. The first is Tim Mills, who is a
25 first-year student at Indiana law school in

1 Indianapolis. And the second, who is with us
2 today, is Dale Pennycuff, who is a second-year
3 student. Both have been exceptionally helpful.
4 Most of the research you see before you that
5 originated from me has actually originated from
6 them.

7 CHAIRMAN WEATHERWAX: Thank you for your help.
8 Okay. If there is no other further business to
9 come before the Commission, we are adjourned.

10 (The Indiana Horse Racing Commission meeting
11 was adjourned at 11:32 a.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF INDIANA
2 COUNTY OF JOHNSON
3

4 I, Robin P. Martz, a Notary Public in and for
5 said county and state, do hereby certify that the
6 foregoing matter was taken down in stenograph notes
7 and afterwards reduced to typewriting under my
8 direction; and that the typewritten transcript is a
9 true record of the Indiana Horse Racing Commission
10 meeting;

11 I do further certify that I am a disinterested
12 person in this; that I am not a relative of the
13 attorneys for any of the parties.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
15 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 30th day of
16 July 2015.

17 *Robin P. Martz*



18
19
20
21 Job No. 98514
22
23
24
25

<hr/> \$ <hr/>	1st 70:23 71:1,4 87:15	31 5:10 65:18
\$1,000 11:17 12:18 45:13,17	<hr/> 2 <hr/>	31st 53:22
\$1,500 41:8	20 79:13 105:8	330 104:9,15 107:7
\$10 105:8	20-year 52:4 57:15	36 62:22,25
\$100,00 6:6	200 98:14	<hr/> 4 <hr/>
\$100,000 6:9	2007 90:20	4 37:21 38:13
\$15,000 21:15 42:16 43:11	2008 90:21	4-21.5-3-10 56:7
\$30,000 29:8 30:25 38:14	2009 37:10 90:22	4-35-7-12 87:10
\$5,000 4:16 6:1	2012 62:24 91:4	422 109:13
\$500 98:25	2014 5:10 9:19 12:14 14:12 20:23 22:10 48:12 81:18,19 82:2	430,000 91:20
<hr/> 0 <hr/>	2015 9:14 59:1 64:14 82:3 91:17	433,000 96:5
000 74:11	2021 87:4 89:18,21 90:3	45 4:16
<hr/> 1 <hr/>	2025 9:14	48 8:1 39:23
1 6:25 74:14	20th 52:19 53:5 57:9	4C 11:8
10 15:15	212 66:9	<hr/> 5 <hr/>
10th 49:7	23rd 48:10 64:25	5 6:25
11 28:15 75:2 86:22	24 16:25 38:2,6 40:4 62:21	5(B)(2) 58:6,21,25
11:32 111:11	24-hour 24:20 46:13	50 63:18 74:8,9
12 48:12	24th 64:25	<hr/> 6 <hr/>
1270 87:2,11 89:23	25 63:9	6 12:14
13 96:23	252 87:1,15,17 90:13 91:17 95:23	6-1-2 109:18 110:1,11
13th 48:15	25th 14:19	60 4:16
14 100:4,5,7	26 73:22 74:4	699 66:9
14-1-2 109:19 110:2,11	26th 14:13	6th 14:15 76:14
15 79:13	29 59:1	<hr/> 7 <hr/>
15-year 6:1	29th 58:9,10,12,13 60:21 61:2,4, 7,14	7 14:12
1540 87:2,3 88:17	2A 5:22	70 16:3 27:8 31:13 32:10 36:5
16th 3:10	2d 66:9	70-day 31:17,23 42:2 80:24
17th 11:6	2nd 49:1	71 45:10 109:18,19 110:1,2,11
18 9:14 43:22	<hr/> 3 <hr/>	7th 14:15,24
19 62:24 64:14	30 37:13	
1989 21:24	30th 48:24 60:25 61:4,17	
19th 52:7 54:8,16		

8

8.5-1-7.1(d) 45:11**8:44** 60:25 61:5

9

90-day 41:8**900** 109:10**96** 8:2**976** 66:9

A

a.m. 111:11**absent** 99:14**absolute** 54:12**absolutely** 36:6 46:19 64:9
81:5**abused** 9:5,6 75:14**abusing** 28:24**accept** 4:20 10:18 11:25 25:2,3
42:19 45:22 50:14 59:10 97:24**accepting** 47:25 72:11**acclimating** 102:3**accordance** 11:18**account** 92:23**accreditation** 85:18**accredited** 85:20,21,22 86:1,9,
13**acetone** 20:21**acknowledged** 24:16 38:25**act** 29:1**acting** 103:18 104:21**action** 66:7**actions** 20:8**active** 63:16**actual** 29:20 67:19 69:18**ACUC** 78:13**add** 59:3 84:24**additional** 32:5**address** 34:20 50:6,11 57:13
81:3**addressed** 81:15**adequate** 76:6**adjourned** 111:9,11**adjudicated** 57:24 75:3,4**adjudication** 49:16**administer** 13:15 26:25 38:1**administered** 3:6 18:12 38:23
44:5 52:10 54:19**administration** 16:19,23 19:6,
14 20:17 22:22 24:19 25:11
32:25 35:22 39:21 40:5, 43:17
44:25 54:9 82:6,19,23,25 83:17
91:13**administrations** 21:10**administrative** 5:25 14:11
19:20 20:12,24 23:4,8 48:11,
51:14,24 52:20 53:12,14,16
55:25 57:22 60:4 63:1 71:5,7
88:1 91:10,12 109:6,10**admissibility** 21:20 23:6**admit** 44:1**admitted** 5:17 38:24 44:3**adopt** 110:1**adopted** 57:3 64:13 109:12**advertising** 96:19**advised** 25:7**advisement** 21:4**affect** 5:23**affected** 104:12,22**affidavit** 58:22**affiliated** 85:25**affirm** 15:7 19:19 26:4 42:22
49:21 68:12**affirmed** 64:20**afford** 26:13**afternoon** 108:2**agencies** 51:24 93:9**agency** 20:10 22:1 106:4
109:14**agenda** 3:8,19 12:7 18:2 75:17
100:19**agent** 5:16**agents** 6:18**ages** 19:11**aggravating** 16:20 37:7**aggressive** 8:18 9:3,7**AGR** 87:7**agreed** 9:17 11:16 35:2 40:24
76:23**agreement** 3:23 4:9,11,21 5:4,7
6:3 9:12,17 10:25 12:9 13:25
18:1 70:22 99:13**agreements** 33:19 44:2**Agriculture** 93:10 96:16**ahead** 45:8 49:25 68:1 76:18
78:24 97:11**ailment** 39:1**aimed** 92:17**air** 64:6 95:12**alfa** 5:12**ALJ** 14:13,16 15:9 21:1 22:18
29:11 42:25 45:23 48:5,16,18,
20,23 49:15 53:21 62:20 63:11,
23 69:17**ALJ'S** 14:20 42:22 47:17 49:6,
21 59:15 72:20**ALJS** 63:15 67:23 71:13**allegation** 52:8,11,17**allegations** 65:20 70:2**allegedly** 52:6**alleges** 34:21**alleging** 16:20 48:16**allowed** 9:25 14:21 58:1 87:21**allowing** 49:2**Almanza** 99:16,19**alter** 16:18

altered 87:23
alters 88:3
amazing 92:2
amended 89:15
amendment 100:13 101:10
Amoss 3:21,24 4:3,4,6 63:13
amount 20:6 22:15 62:17 87:8, 21 91:15
analyzed 84:12
Animal 78:13
annual 87:19
anticipated 16:5
anticipates 109:21
anymore 27:20
anytime 18:9
Apologize 3:1
apparently 18:2 24:18
appealed 4:4 54:1
Appeals 31:6,8 36:12 56:22 60:13 66:16,25 67:14
appearance 57:1
appearances 95:5
appeared 65:17
appears 42:5 59:3
appellate 30:21,23
applicable 56:5
applies 107:19
apply 23:4 65:20 67:23 89:18
appointed 53:11,13,15 62:20 72:13 87:25
apprised 73:4
approach 26:11 93:7
appropriately 25:4
approval 3:13,16 47:21 83:3 85:24 88:23 89:12 108:19
approve 4:10 13:24 72:20
approved 78:20 84:7,13,14,15 90:20 99:13

approximately 91:20
April 3:10 73:3 97:1
area 70:14,18
areas 92:16
Arguably 32:6
argue 35:17 62:11,12 71:21 82:8,9
argued 54:24
argues 20:6
argument 29:13 37:6 62:5 66:2 67:6 68:4 72:3,4
arguments 14:22,24 49:4,11 68:17
arise 68:5
Armstrong 5:17
arrested 57:18
article 107:23
asks 19:19
aspect 21:8 69:16
Assembly 95:24
assess 92:13
assigned 48:13 54:2 62:20 63:1 67:18 71:7
assistant 53:1
associations 87:9
assuming 24:14 80:10
assurance 80:1, 99:5
assured 81:12
attacks 21:18
attempting 24:3
attention 37:11
attorney 31:21 72:12
attract 91:3 93:18 95:19
attracting 92:21
audit 73:6,9,23 74:2 75:9 79:22, 25 80:3 83:21
audit-based 80:6
auditing 74:5

August 23:23
authorized 89:17
automatically 109:11
avail 11:14
average 98:11
avoided 16:16
awarded 82:4,25
awareness 92:3,21
aye 3:16,17 4:25 5:1 10:22,23 12:4,5 14:3,4 47:25 48:1 72:23, 24 85:5,6 86:20,21 109:2,3 110:15,16

B

BABBITT 59:18
back 11:22 15:8 18:23 28:12 37:10 42:24 49:23 51:2 58:18 63:8 66:21 77:23 89:3 90:20 103:1 104:9,11,15,23,24 105:8 107:24
backed 24:15
background 37:18 48:8,10 52:5,18 72:14 95:23
backside 57:17 70:15
backup 81:23
bad 74:21,22 78:10 103:14 104:20
balance 52:3
ball 88:16
bang 96:12
Barker 39:24
barn 8:13 35:11 39:9
Barnes 88:7 90:17 94:9 95:14 96:10
base 33:2 93:24
based 19:1,13 36:14 37:8,9 39:24 40:6,7 56:3 71:22 82:6 100:19
basically 29:8 33:4 78:21 99:9 102:20
basing 19:8

- basis** 19:13 37:6 65:9 68:2 82:7 98:23
- Baton** 17:3
- batting** 74:10
- bedtime** 15:24
- beeping** 102:2
- begin** 15:6,11 49:20 89:21
- beginning** 15:1 35:8 49:25 55:21,22 89:12
- begins** 100:17
- behalf** 22:15 51:20 52:2 59:14, 20
- bench** 67:7
- benefit** 70:21 95:22
- benefits** 92:1
- Bernard** 48:13 53:10
- bet** 103:12 105:8
- betting** 101:6 105:13
- bettor** 105:4
- bettors** 93:4 104:14 108:12
- bias** 63:24 64:4 67:19 102:1
- biased** 48:17 60:2, 68:10,21
- bidder** 82:10
- big** 96:1 103:17 104:13 105:16 106:7 108:5
- bill** 87:1,2,3,5,11,14,15 89:22,23 90:13
- bills** 86:25 87:1
- bit** 6:5 18:24 21:21 45:20 90:18
- blanket** 85:24 86:8
- blaring** 42:10
- blind** 76:19
- blinds** 79:6
- blood** 5:16,20 6:18 8:14,16 32:2,9,12 77:6
- blown** 17:10
- board** 108:11
- boards** 6:10
- body** 18:18
- book** 98:13
- books** 90:4
- borne** 82:17
- bothered** 26:21
- bothers** 45:25
- bottom** 36:24
- bouncing** 88:16
- Bowes** 61:20
- Bradley** 5:4,8
- brain** 100:21
- break** 103:3
- breaking** 102:13 103:10
- breed** 87:8,24 90:19,21 91:6,13, 21,24 92:19 93:17 94:23,24
- breeders** 93:2 94:20
- breeding** 94:1
- breeds** 96:6
- Brian** 94:11
- briefly** 57:13 75:8,12
- briefs** 14:23 48:19 49:3 50:10 68:25
- bright** 108:8
- bring** 100:13
- broadcast** 95:3
- broadcasts** 95:4
- brought** 26:20 58:4 89:11
- Brown** 56:22
- buck** 96:12
- Buddy** 19:20
- budget** 96:19
- build** 92:4
- buried** 79:15
- business** 10:4 53:3 76:21 85:14 90:15 110:18 111:8
- buying** 95:12
-
- C**
-
- call** 7:2 47:24 80:20 96:4 97:25
- called** 35:6 75:2 78:12 102:20
- camouflage** 77:9
- Canada** 6:6 101:21 102:12 103:15 107:16
- cancel** 42:20
- canceled** 58:18
- canon** 67:2
- capitalize** 96:18
- capped** 91:5
- Captain** 53:3,19 54:25 55:1,4
- care** 35:11 78:13
- career** 52:3 57:17
- careful** 67:24
- carefully** 93:6
- Carolyn** 12:10,12 13:22
- carrier** 62:1
- case** 7:14 8:3 15:23 16:1,10 18:21 21:8 22:7 23:3,4 25:16,24 26:23 28:13,22 29:9,10,22,25 30:24 31:2 35:6,25 36:11 37:18 38:12 40:11 41:3,4 43:14,23 44:10,18,22 45:21 47:19 48:4 51:7,9,12,16 53:8,13,14,16,19, 24 54:10,25 55:5,13,20 56:21 57:14,24 58:2 59:6 60:12 63:1, 13 66:5,12,14,15,22,24 67:14,16 69:5,7,21 72:5,6,14 74:20 83:22, 23 104:8,19 106:15
- cases** 30:17 41:3 42:11 44:10, 19 60:5 63:7,10
- casinos** 89:16
- catch** 29:4
- category** 7:4
- caught** 22:4
- caused** 81:22 103:17
- cautionary** 67:22
- cells** 5:21
- Centaur** 96:17
- Centaur's** 87:7
- center** 8:16
- century** 93:13

- certainty** 71:11
- certificate** 58:11,20
- certification** 85:22
- certified** 61:25 86:6
- chagrined** 42:2
- chain** 31:19
- Chair** 59:18
- chairman** 3:1,7,8,15,18,22
4:14,19,24 5:2 6:14 8:22 9:9
10:16,21,24 11:2,19,21,24 12:3,
6,21,24 13:3,6,11,18,21 14:2,5,
10 15:12,18,19 26:7,16 27:3,7,
11,15,23 28:6 29:23 30:9,13
31:3,11 33:6,11 34:15 37:16,22
38:3,18 42:1,8,18 43:4,7 45:6,8,
19 47:10,14,22 48:2,13 50:2,7,
12,21 51:17 59:9 68:14,23 69:4
71:14,15,18 72:16,18,22,25
75:16,21,25 76:5,9,11,15,18
78:25 79:3,7,17,21 80:2,12,21
81:16 82:21 83:7,11,12,15,19
84:1, 85:4,7 86:3,10,14,16,19,
22,23 88:13 89:8 90:11 94:6
95:9,21 96:13 97:9,12 98:3,9
99:3,6,25 100:3,8 101:11 105:21
106:6 107:1,9,13 108:5,17,22
109:1, 110:4,8,14,17 111:7
- challenge** 22:23
- chance** 3:9 4:14 27:16 76:2
105:4
- change** 40:15 45:22 91:5,7
109:22
- changed** 23:19 33:25
- changing** 80:4 91:18
- characterize** 28:2
- charge** 60:5 99:24
- charged** 27:24 60:6 66:17,23
- charges** 60:9
- charging** 38:6
- cheat** 18:8,10 25:11,12 34:6,7
37:1 38:17 43:25
- cheating** 28:24
- chemist** 22:11,24
- chemists** 21:3
- child** 28:4 100:21
- choice** 17:18 34:25 84:22,24
- choices** 42:22
- choose** 75:14 77:6
- circumstance** 16:20
- circumstances** 25:19,24 30:7
33:15 37:8 56:23
- cite** 44:16
- cited** 25:13 30:18 56:6 97:15
- claim** 64:18
- claimed** 24:1
- claiming** 23:24 64:11
- claims** 109:19
- clarified** 39:17,18 87:23
- clarify** 15:13
- class** 6:25 11:8 37:21 38:13
61:18 74:14
- classification** 6:24
- classifies** 5:22
- clear** 10:6 23:7 24:4 39:15 46:11
59:4
- client** 52:2
- close** 6:19 8:7 13:15 15:5 49:20
60:15 63:18
- closed** 10:4
- closely** 57:11
- closing** 34:17
- clued** 77:20
- co-counsel** 59:22
- co-defendant** 66:23 67:8
- co-defendants** 66:17
- coast** 102:1
- cobalt** 85:11,20,24 86:5,8,14,15
- code** 56:6 109:13
- collect** 8:21
- combined** 91:20 93:17
- comfortable** 78:17
- comment** 41:18 42:1 69:2
82:12
- comments** 3:11 4:19
- commercial** 62:1
- commission** 3:3,17,20 4:1,2,6,
10 5:1,3,7 6:6 10:23 12:5,10
14:4,11,21 15:5,6 16:5,15 17:9
18:1 19:18,19,25 20:1,9,24
21:23 23:22 25:7,8,15,20,23
26:3,4,11 27:17 28:22 29:11
34:16,21 36:17 37:7 44:17 48:1,
10,25 49:2,11,14,18,19,21
50:17,25 51:11 52:3,21 53:11
54:24 57:10,14 59:18,20,21
62:7,22 63:16 67:24 68:2,4
70:19 72:24 73:2,3 84:6,9,13
85:6 86:7,21 87:5,18 88:1,23
89:2,11,17 90:5 91:12 96:7
99:13 100:14 101:23 102:8
109:3 110:1,16,21 111:9,10
- Commission's** 4:5 20:11 22:9
58:22 96:24
- Commissioner** 3:13,14 4:22,
23 9:11,18,25 10:11,19,20 12:1,
2 13:24 14:1 31:3,4,7,10,11,12,
21 32:15 33:1,9 34:10,13 38:18,
19 39:3,6,13, 40:18 41:12,25
42:14 43:7,8 45:21 46:4,6,22
47:3,7,9,12,20 51:3 69:10,12
70:4,20 71:2,10,13,17 72:15
75:18 80:21,22 81:11,16,17,24
82:5,11,12,22 83:10,13,16 85:2,
3 86:17,18 88:11 89:3,5,7,8,9,
14,19,24 90:2,10 95:9,10,21
96:14 97:10,20 99:2,7,15 105:24
106:12 108:19,20,24 110:10,13
- Commissioner's** 87:20
- Commissioners** 9:10 10:17
11:25 13:21 20:15 37:17 42:12
45:19 47:10
- commissions** 8:19
- committee** 78:12,13,14,19,20
83:8 87:24
- committees** 90:22
- common** 39:1 67:16 68:2,6
- communications** 73:8
- community** 25:22
- compared** 96:20
- compete** 10:8
- competes** 7:10,11

competition 7:25 8:13**complaint** 5:25 14:11 20:25
48:11 52:20**completely** 35:25 36:11,18
41:3 60:12**compliance** 58:24 61:9**complicated** 14:7 21:2 48:3
92:25**concentrating** 95:11**concern** 11:12 28:4 31:13 80:24
81:14**concerned** 31:18**concerns** 22:19 83:1 104:13**conclude** 59:12 75:7**concluded** 21:10 54:14**concludes** 68:16**concluding** 73:21**conclusion** 15:5 48:21 49:19
63:22**conclusions** 14:8,17 23:12
53:25 55:12,24 62:18**conduct** 36:15**conducted** 57:22**confident** 22:21 32:24**confirm** 11:15 45:12**confirmative** 58:21**confirmed** 73:13 74:19**confronted** 57:8**confusion** 59:3**cons** 37:17**consideration** 5:3 12:8 109:5**considered** 11:10 16:9 17:12
23:2,10 25:15 31:22 33:13,20
95:15**consist** 93:1,3**consistent** 20:1**constant** 25:2**consultant** 17:8**contacting** 29:14**contemplates** 21:14**contention** 19:5 40:19**contentions** 18:7**context** 5:18 61:5**continually** 92:8**continue** 51:16 58:1 92:4**continued** 70:22 71:8**continues** 70:16**contract** 16:14 32:13 73:6,10
78:23 83:1,4 97:5**contradictory** 47:4**conversation** 80:25**convicted** 66:19**cooperate** 25:22 45:2 96:15**cooperating** 44:16**cooperation** 45:25**copy** 49:1**Corporation** 93:11**correct** 10:14,15 13:5 25:13
33:8 34:12 37:20 54:10 69:19
76:4 81:2,4 89:14 90:1**corrected** 27:19**correlation** 31:24**cost** 76:21 82:6,7,15**costs** 82:17 88:1**counsel** 4:12 40:9,11 48:15
50:1 53:9 55:4 59:19 68:15,17,
25 70:22 72:3**countdown** 34:19**counted** 63:8**country** 7:6,17 107:19**counts** 66:18**County** 68:9**couple** 15:17 27:18 28:1 38:19
106:18**court** 3:7 4:5 19:2 23:3 29:12,
15,25 30:20,21,22,23 31:5,6,7
35:6 36:12 41:1 56:13,20,22
60:13 65:25 66:16,25 67:5,13**courts** 22:17 30:6 51:23**cousin** 6:19**cover** 58:8**covered** 50:10**crazy** 103:18,21**credibility** 22:16**credible** 22:23**critical** 55:19 57:24**cross-examining** 65:4**curious** 18:3**custody** 31:19**cut** 45:9

D

daily 87:21**Dale** 111:2**damaged** 57:19**darbepoetin** 5:11,12**dark** 69:21**date** 49:7 61:16,18 76:13 87:23**dated** 58:10 60:25 61:4**dates** 9:17**Daubert** 35:6**Davis** 84:14,18 85:16**day** 4:16 8:7 20:13 21:1,7 27:1,4
28:20,25 29:6 34:8 38:9,15,16
43:24 44:6 52:9,19 54:20 55:23
57:8 59:2 61:7 65:3 79:14 88:11
106:5 109:11**day-to-day** 98:23**days** 16:3,15 27:8 31:13 32:10
42:7 70:23 73:22 74:4 79:13
103:7 106:13,14**de** 35:2 40:24**deadlines** 70:24**deal** 36:13 68:3,5 83:2 97:13
98:17 103:2, 104:14,15 105:9**dealerships** 94:21,22**dealing** 63:9**deals** 3:19 14:7

dealt 31:15
December 69:25 70:23 71:1,4
decide 64:19 66:24 68:13
decided 60:1 63:12 65:5,6,7
66:15 67:1 93:24 103:9
deciding 43:1 54:23 57:5
decision 19:21 47:16 65:19,22
68:12 71:3,22 82:14
decisions 21:19 67:5
declared 104:4
declined 12:17
deed 56:2 57:7
default 73:10
defendant 66:21
defendants 66:20
definition 109:19
delay 16:7 26:22 29:13 30:10,
11,16,18 31:23 32:6 36:5 42:2,4
45:14 50:24 80:17,24 90:11
delayed 30:14
delays 25:6,8,9,10 28:11 81:2
deliberations 15:6 49:20
delivered 38:23
delivery 62:2
demographics 19:10
denied 43:24 48:22 55:21 66:10
Denver 17:8 18:23
deny 62:7 72:20
denying 55:10
Department 82:4,5,18,23,24
83:16 93:10 96:16
depose 17:4,6
deposited 91:8
deposition 47:1
depositions 70:25
deputy 59:21
Derby 95:3
detail 60:16 73:25
detailed 61:11
detect 74:23
detected 9:24 32:8
detection 8:1 26:25 32:20 33:3
42:9
deteriorates 32:9
determination 22:6 27:12
67:17,18
determinative 53:17
determine 28:23 67:25
determined 16:6 21:4 28:18
56:1 57:5 92:16
develop 75:11
development 87:9,24 90:8,19,
22 91:6,13,21,24 92:19 93:11,18
94:23,24
devised 103:23
dex 13:9 43:17 44:5
dexamethasone 11:7 12:15
28:18 29:6 33:20 38:12 43:24
Diagnostic 84:5,25
diem 87:21 88:12
difference 18:15 43:23
difficult 18:16
digital 93:13,14,16 95:7
diligent 7:13,15
direct 86:25
director 5:24 6:11 17:7 20:3,10
21:11,22 22:8 101:24
directors 21:25
disapproval 89:12
disaster 83:22
disciplinary 68:5
disclosed 36:2
discovery 70:24
discredit 40:22,23
discretion 90:6
discretionary 89:1
discuss 51:12 75:7
discussed 90:2
discussing 69:15
discussion 47:23 65:11 110:9
discussions 82:23 92:15
disguise 77:9 78:7 80:9
disputed 52:12 57:7
disputes 62:21
disqualification 65:9
disqualified 56:8 68:3
disqualify 48:16,22 56:9 63:25
68:1 71:25 72:4,21
disrupt 105:12
disrupted 106:23
dissolve 15:7 42:24 49:22
distance 103:24
distant 89:13
distinction 34:6,14
distribution 88:4
disturbing 74:7,12
divide 96:6
DOA 82:4
Doctor 17:6,7,23,24 19:8 21:22
22:8,10,20,24 23:1,10,11 31:25
32:23 35:1,16 40:24 48:12
51:13,20 52:2,8,12,18,22 53:4,
12 54:17 55:20 56:2,4 59:14,25
62:4,8 64:22 65:17,21 70:2,5,10
document 38:7
dollar 13:19
dollars 95:20 96:11
doped 26:1
doping 5:16 6:18
dosage 13:13,16 24:21 46:14
80:17
double 76:19 79:1,6
double-blind 75:12 76:20,24
79:10,24 80:6
doubt 56:25
dozens 51:23

DPO 5:12, 6:19
draw 8:14,16
drawn 77:7
dream 51:5 60:11

drew 30:9
drivers 107:11

driving 97:15

dropped 70:12

drug 5:21,22 6:12 7:3,10,21,25
 8:2,5,8,10 9:2,24 11:8,10 12:15
 13:7,9 16:19 17:13 18:19,22,24
 20:22 23:24 24:20,23 28:19,20,
 24 29:2 32:19 33:21,24 34:5
 35:13,15,17 36:21 37:5,20 38:1,
 5,9 41:5,17 42:10 46:4 74:15,17
 75:14 85:9,11 98:4,6,13 99:4

drugs 5:20 6:21 17:18,20 18:11
 26:25 35:23 36:20,22 37:1 38:22
 41:5 77:1,6 98:13

due 55:7 57:6 61:7 82:19

dumb 27:23 37:22 69:14

duration 99:8

duty 25:16

E

e-mail 59:2 60:25

e-mailed 48:24 61:7

earlier 24:8 33:20 80:25 84:7
 85:8 106:15

easier 5:14

east 102:1

easy 67:25

eat 24:14 83:25

eaten 24:9

eating 40:1

economic 90:7 92:18 93:10

Edelen 67:8

effect 7:9 70:13 91:19 94:20

effective 76:21 87:15 97:6

effects 8:2

efficient 75:11

effort 78:1

efforts 93:16

electronic 60:24 61:2,16

eleven 54:15 63:10,11

eligible 10:8

ELLINGWOOD 3:22 4:18 9:15
 14:10 15:13 19:17 26:9 34:18
 37:14 42:16,21 43:6 48:9 50:5,9,
 16 51:10 59:17 68:16 69:20
 70:10 71:6,11,14 72:18 86:23
 88:19 89:22 90:1 100:2 106:3
 109:9 110:6,20

emergency 100:8 105:22

emotional 40:12

employees 87:22

enacted 91:4

end 83:2

ended 44:3,4 87:14

enforcing 20:11

enhancing 5:21 7:9 11:11

enter 20:1

entered 52:8 54:17 94:13

entire 15:16 94:3

entitled 57:21

envelope 58:12 61:19

EPO 5:15,17,19 6:8,18,21 7:6,
 12,16,20,24,25 11:10

equipment 85:11,13

era 93:13

Ernst 66:8

error 9:16

erythropoietin 5:16

essence 56:15

essentially 42:22 43:1

established 35:5 40:25 109:13

establishing 89:20

establishment 89:20

esteemed 57:18

estopped 66:6

Estvanko 53:1,9,23 54:11 55:5,
 13 56:19 57:4 64:14,21

Estvanko's 53:14

event 56:17

events 6:22

evidence 14:16 19:3,5,22 21:20
 22:25 23:3,6,9 24:4 35:5 36:25
 37:9 40:6,16

exact 55:25 76:13

exaggerate 42:4

exception 20:17 100:18 101:3

exceptionally 111:3

excess 20:21

excited 91:23 92:2 94:11

excluded 70:13,17

exclusion 70:16

excuse 10:5 43:18

executive 5:24 6:11 20:3,10
 21:11,21,24 101:23

exhibit 59:5

exhibits 59:6,8 65:4

existing 91:11

expect 25:25 96:1

expects 22:3

expenses 91:10,12

experience 83:9

experiencing 81:2

experiment 78:17

expert 22:14 24:8,15,18,21
 40:22 46:9,23 47:1

experts 17:2 40:20

expire 109:7,11,18,21

expires 109:22

expiring 109:15

explanation 47:4

explanations 47:8

exposure 96:18

expressed 22:18 80:23,24 83:1
extent 9:5 31:18
extra 80:15 108:7
extremely 91:23

F

faced 55:23
facing 95:17
fact 7:8 8:19 9:3 12:22 14:17
 20:5 26:21 27:7 30:4,17 34:4
 36:1 38:11 40:3,13,15,24 42:3,8
 46:2 48:21 53:25 55:12,24 57:13
 60:7 61:11 64:6 65:14,23 66:10
 67:6 71:20 73:5 99:10,23 101:8
factious 92:24
factor 27:12 50:3 51:1 71:20
factored 44:7 45:1,3 91:11
factors 90:6
facts 25:18 36:1 42:23 62:12
 63:5 66:23 67:16 68:2,6 69:21
failure 97:22
fair 22:5 56:4 57:21 81:1 100:9
 101:12 102:10 103:15 104:6,14,
 15 105:4,13 106:11 107:10,20
fairest 105:16 108:4
fairly 6:13 107:17
familiar 16:24
farm 8:15
farms 93:23 94:1
fast 63:4 91:17
favor 3:16 4:24 10:21 12:4 14:3
 47:24 72:23 85:5 86:20 109:2
 110:14
favorites 103:21 106:22
federal 87:22
Fedex 62:1
feel 12:25 93:12 100:25 102:6
feet 104:9,15 107:7 108:15
felt 52:1 55:6 90:24
fewer 43:17,18

field 103:19 104:3
file 49:3
filed 14:19,23 15:2 20:24 48:15
 49:5 51:25 52:20 55:4 58:6
 60:20 61:1 64:2 106:4
filing 50:3 60:25 64:3,7 65:16
 71:23
filings 41:14 49:9 60:19,23
final 4:2 42:1
Finally 24:18
financial 16:12 57:20
find 8:12,24 16:13 17:22 22:23
 33:5 39:13 71:25 76:1,2 77:19
 78:1 80:10,11,19 86:4
finding 42:23 47:17 64:21 75:5
findings 4:15 14:17,20 19:19,25
 22:21 38:6,7 42:6 43:2 49:7
 53:24 54:3,20,22 55:12,24 57:4,
 11 72:20 73:9,21,24
finds 50:17
fine 4:2,17 6:1,4,6,9,15 10:13
 11:17,21 12:18 13:19 21:15 29:8
 42:15,16 43:11 44:9 47:18 75:1
 81:21 98:14,24,25
first-year 110:25
fiscal 91:9
flexible 23:7
flimsy 19:12
floor 47:21
Florida 101:21
flown 17:7
focus 7:24 25:6 92:17
focused 27:20
follow 22:3
footnote 65:12,15
foreign 37:9 52:10 54:16
forgot 110:20
form 5:15,19 48:20
formulated 24:6
fortunate 102:7

forward 43:1 50:14 51:18 60:3
 69:16 70:7 71:22,24 72:11 75:8
 78:22 91:17
forward-looking 101:23
found 17:25 32:10,11,23 38:8
 41:4 55:13,14,16 73:12 74:3,9,
 10,18,19
frame 63:10 70:9
framed 54:5
franking 61:13,19
freezer 32:2
fresh 100:16
front 32:22 41:9,11 51:24 53:20
 97:1
frustrated 35:9
fulfill 97:25
full 77:22
fully 75:3
fund 90:20
fundamental 20:14 34:9
funds 87:25 88:2,4 91:7,8,18
 92:6
furosemide 20:17
future 85:1 87:6 89:13 95:12

G

gait 107:3,5
gambling 89:16
game 87:7
games 87:4 89:10,16
gaming 87:3,5 88:23 89:2,11,17
 90:5
Gary 62:25
gate 102:19,22,25 104:8,17
 106:19 107:2,4
gave 24:21 29:18 46:14 76:1
general 59:21 95:24
generated 97:3
gentleman 27:24 28:14 100:21

- George** 41:20
- get all** 102:21
- GI** 24:5,13
- give** 12:25 25:21 36:9 38:15
48:9 77:21 80:8 88:20 102:12
105:4 107:12
- giving** 68:1 90:18
- glad** 51:2 74:1
- glimpse** 94:4
- good** 3:1 15:12 19:18 29:3
40:23 46:3 47:12 74:21,22
78:10,21,22,25 80:7 83:2 89:7
99:6 100:23 105:8,11,19 110:22
- Gorajec** 6:17 7:24 9:1 10:5,14
13:10,13 20:4 21:11,18,22 22:2
28:10 30:12,16 36:8 37:21,25
38:4 43:13 46:19 73:2 75:19,24
76:4,8,10,13,17,20 79:2,5,9,20,
24 80:4,13 81:5,14,19 82:1,8,
83:24 84:3,6 85:8 86:7,12,15
97:19,23 98:11 99:17 100:5,12
106:1,9 107:18 108:1,4
- Gordon** 63:2,12
- government** 87:22
- Governor** 87:12 96:16
- gram** 24:21
- Granitz** 52:25 53:9,23 54:12
55:5,13 56:18 57:4 64:14,22
- Granitz's** 53:16
- Granitz-estvanko** 54:7
- Granted** 46:3
- grave** 11:11
- greased** 78:24
- great** 92:1 95:18 107:24 108:25
- ground** 108:12
- group** 53:2
- groups** 92:13 93:8
- grow** 92:8
- guess** 12:7 26:24 39:14 40:18
42:2 66:25 73:1 100:11
- guessing** 46:15
- guidance** 23:5
- guidelines** 6:25 11:8,18 12:20
- guy** 25:19
- guys** 26:18 27:15
-
- H**
-
- half** 21:2 29:8 30:25
- halfway** 101:19
- Hall** 100:6,22 101:13 106:8,10,
14 107:5,12,15,21 108:3,7
- Hamilton** 68:9
- hands** 31:16 32:5
- happen** 31:16 106:25
- happened** 22:7 24:25 34:3 53:4
56:14 62:3 73:7 74:22 78:11
82:2 84:17
- happening** 93:20
- happy** 4:11 25:8 88:9 97:7
102:6 108:14 110:2
- hard** 7:7 18:14 40:21 48:25 91:2
- harm** 78:18
- Haute** 58:14,17
- hay** 24:10,15 40:1 94:21
- head** 22:1
- heading** 102:22
- healthier** 13:1
- hear** 4:20 10:18 11:25 13:23
18:6 34:16 41:23 49:11 50:8,14,
18 51:8 58:2 68:22 69:8 71:19,
21 72:5 86:16 88:6 110:9
- heard** 12:12,16 14:15,25 19:24
37:17 42:8,12 45:20 55:3,8
62:14 69:5,7 72:6
- hearing** 14:14 17:22 19:23
20:25 30:19 32:1 35:2 40:12
47:2 53:7,8,23 54:4,5 56:19 57:6
64:24 65:19 69:22 70:8,11,15,
21,25
- hearings** 23:4
- heavy** 85:12,13
- heck** 67:25
- held** 14:14 21:22 54:18 56:22
- helped** 32:6 42:5 81:3
- helpful** 83:5 111:3
- helps** 34:15 101:6
- herd** 77:4 78:15
- hey** 46:1 77:17
- high** 5:22
- hired** 24:8
- history** 28:13 35:21 36:17 41:2
90:18 102:13
- hitting** 91:2
- hives** 18:13 24:4 35:16,18,20
38:25 39:5,8,10
- holding** 109:23
- Holly** 5:5 10:17 12:10 14:6 17:3
26:7,20 31:12 45:11 46:7 59:20
96:23 100:3
- home** 93:24
- honor** 97:22
- Hoosier** 105:1
- hope** 34:20 37:11 82:18 104:5
- hopping** 104:18
- horn** 102:2
- horrendous** 16:21
- horrible** 27:9
- horse** 3:20 5:3,9 7:10,11 8:6,11
11:6 12:9,25 17:1 18:13 20:16,
20 24:6 32:20,22 34:8 39:25
40:4 44:21 52:9,11,14,21,23,24
53:1 54:7,17,18 55:16,23 57:14
62:22 77:5 80:8 87:1,6,18 99:20
102:18 103:3,8,17,25 104:3,7,9,
16,17,21 106:16 108:9,13
111:10
- horse's** 5:10 7:8 8:11 18:18
24:23
- horsemen** 8:5 28:19 44:24
84:22,23 93:1 100:20 101:1
107:11
- horsemen's** 84:10 87:9 92:12
93:8 105:10
- horses** 6:7 8:10,12 17:20 18:13,
16 19:9,10,12 20:13,18,22 21:5
22:21 24:1,9,14,19 26:1 32:21

35:4,10 36:16 37:10 38:8 39:1,5,
7,9 40:2 46:10,12 77:4,5,7 78:18
99:22,24 102:14,22 103:5,11,12,
20 104:1,11,22 107:3

Hostetter 63:15

hot 106:19

hours 8:2 16:25 38:2,6 39:23
40:4 54:15

house 87:2,11 89:23

huge 96:19

hundred 79:14

hydrocortisone 16:2 17:11
18:5,12 20:19 21:6 22:22 23:12
24:11 32:8,18 36:21

I

IAC 45:10 109:18,19 110:1,2,11

IC 87:10

idea 24:25 105:11 107:24
108:18,25

IHRC 3:24

illegal 55:15,17

illicit 28:18 43:16 44:25

Illinois 93:23 95:13

imagine 4:12

Immediately 108:9

impact 86:25 87:7,8 92:18

impacted 43:11

impacts 87:6

impartial 49:15 57:21

impartiality 56:10,21,25

impermissible 20:12

implausible 24:12

implemented 90:21

implied 18:10

imply 76:8

important 26:20 34:14 50:20
54:22 60:6 65:16 77:14 82:15
90:13 100:10

importantly 66:6

imposing 19:13

improve 92:8

inaccurate 65:12,23

inadvertently 59:6

inappropriate 69:2

incident 52:6

include 93:7

included 87:14

includes 4:7 93:15 95:5 97:2

including 21:2 56:11 67:5
91:10

incompetency 36:10

incompetent 36:6

inconsistent 40:14

incorrectly 54:6

increase 87:20 88:12

increased 87:25

increases 91:17

increasing 92:18,20

incrimination 32:16

independent 74:3 80:16

independently 84:12

Indiana 3:20 9:6 10:7 21:23
22:1 31:7 41:16 51:24 52:21
56:20,22 57:14 58:7,14 62:22
65:24 66:9,15,25 91:2,3 92:19
93:10,19,24 94:2,15 95:3 102:4
105:15,17 109:12,20 110:25
111:10

Indiana's 95:17

Indianapolis 58:16,18 70:23
95:7 111:1

individuals 98:19

Industrial 73:12,16,22 74:18,25
76:9,10,12,16,17 77:11 79:4,19,
22,23 80:10,18 81:5,15 82:1
97:4

industry 21:25 22:3 77:15
87:18 92:12,24 95:17 100:25
101:8

Indy 95:6

information 94:25

infraction 97:15 99:1

infractions 43:18

ingested 24:1

initial 40:10

initially 43:23 70:10

inject 8:6 77:5

injectable 24:7

injected 21:6 39:25 40:4 44:6
46:9,13,15 54:7,16,19

injecting 29:5 34:7 46:17

injection 23:14 38:10,15,16
39:21,22,23 46:18 55:22 56:16

injections 46:21 55:15,17

input 100:19

inquiry 108:10

instance 33:18

instances 28:12 93:21

instructive 29:24

insurance 98:15

integrity 36:4

intelligent 47:16

intended 88:17

intent 36:25

intention 18:8,10 25:11,12
34:6,7 38:17

intentional 29:1

intentionally 30:2

interest 59:22

interesting 15:23 17:21 29:10

interestingly 66:16

internationally 22:11

interns 110:22

interpretation 64:12

intervene 55:5,11

intervention 64:16,19

interview 40:10

investigating 36:14

investigation 28:17**investment** 53:2**involved** 66:16 72:13 82:16**involving** 54:24**irrelevant** 37:1,5**irreparably** 57:19**ISO** 85:18,21,22 86:1,5,6,9**issue** 13:16,17 17:14 23:5 25:9,
10 27:20 34:25 40:5 49:14 50:5,
9,20 51:6,14 54:4,5,10 57:12,24
58:4 59:25 60:1,9,14,18 64:19
66:1,2,5 67:2 68:20 72:1 78:8
80:13 81:4,13 89:11**issued** 4:2 5:24 14:11,16,21
19:20 48:11,20 49:2,8 78:20
82:2**issues** 69:1**item** 3:18 9:10 12:6,8**IV** 24:19

J

Jack 53:3,19 54:25 55:1,4
105:10**January** 64:14**Jasper's** 67:7**Jessica** 88:6 90:15,17 94:9
95:14 96:7,10,17,22 100:4 108:2**job** 22:5 40:23 47:12 75:1,5
81:21**jobs** 88:12 90:9**jockey** 97:17**jockeys** 97:15**Joe** 6:14,17 7:24 9:1 10:5,14
13:8,10,13 20:3 28:8,10 30:12,
16 37:21,25 38:4 43:13 46:19
73:1,2 75:19,24 76:4,8,10,13,17,
20 79:2,5,9,20,24 80:4,13 81:1,
5,14,19 82:1,8,24 83:20,24 84:2,
3,6 85:7,8 86:7,12,15 97:18,19,
23 98:11 99:17 100:5,12 106:1,9
107:18 108:1,4**John** 34:17 37:16 45:8 46:1
88:15,24**jointly** 66:17, 76:23**Jones** 66:14**Jones'** 67:9**judge** 14:14 15:7 19:20 20:2
21:3,10,13,19 22:25 23:7,9 26:5
29:18,20 31:1 38:7 43:2,4 48:14
51:15 53:12,14,16 54:1,23
55:11,25 56:7,9,13,15,23 57:1,3,
12,23 58:1 60:2,4,10 63:2,8,11,
15 64:12,17 65:5 66:19,22 67:7,
9,13,14,17 68:1,7,9,17,21,23
69:17 71:5,7,8,25 72:5,9,12
100:6,22 101:11**judge's** 56:10,25**judges** 98:20 100:19 102:5**Julio** 99:15**July** 14:23 49:1,7 87:15 101:10**June** 12:14 14:19 48:24 58:9,10,
12,13 59:1 60:21,25 97:1**jurisdictions** 7:5,17 101:20**jurist** 68:8**jurists** 63:23 64:3**justify** 16:20

K

Keeler 88:19 89:1,5,14 90:4**Kentucky** 95:13**kind** 5:17 7:3 8:24 19:13 27:20
31:14 36:13 39:4,13 42:10 96:4**kinds** 97:14**knew** 90:25**knocked** 100:15**knowing** 77:2**Kock** 35:2 40:24

L

lab 8:14,17 16:3,8,14 22:8,10
25:6,7,8,9,10 26:22 27:8 28:20
30:4,11 36:2,10 45:14 73:5,6,9,
12,13,16 74:18 76:16,17 77:1,
17,20 78:5,6 80:16,19 83:8,21
84:5,9,19 85:1**laboratories** 73:23 84:8 85:10,
15,19,20,24,25**laboratory** 73:23 74:2,3,25
81:20 82:3 84:15,25 85:15 86:9**labs** 79:4,19,22,23 84:13,23,24
86:6**Lance** 5:16**language** 87:23**Lasix** 52:11 54:9,19**lasted** 10:2**late** 3:2 27:8 30:5 31:14 69:24**latitude** 96:2**Lauck** 63:11**law** 14:8,17 19:20 48:14,21 51:4,
23 53:12,14,16,25 55:12,24,25
56:5 57:22 60:4 62:10,11 63:1
67:10 71:5,7 110:25**laws** 62:11**lawyer's** 51:5 60:11**lawyers** 62:14**Lea** 3:19 9:13 14:5,9 42:14 48:7
90:12 106:1**leader** 22:2**learn** 26:16 47:15 100:10 108:13**learned** 102:11**learns** 82:19**led** 73:9**left** 15:4 19:16 91:14 110:19**legal** 18:25 29:23 66:2**legislation** 88:9**legislative** 86:24 106:4**legislature** 87:17 89:6 91:4**length** 7:19**lengthy** 45:4**lessened** 42:6**lesser** 30:15**lesson** 107:12**letter** 58:8,16 61:12**level** 18:19,20,21 26:24 31:5
32:7,16 36:21 37:1,5 42:9 46:3

levels 32:10,11,20 36:23**Lexington** 17:6 81:20**LGC** 17:7 18:23 22:8,9 32:1,10
81:19 84:14,21**Libby** 17:24**license** 4:3 10:9**licensed** 34:24 35:20**licensing** 98:18**licensure** 17:19**lie** 25:23**lied** 20:9 25:20**Lieutenant** 96:16**life** 6:16**lifted** 9:23 10:6**light** 23:2 34:4 88:7**LIGHTLE** 10:20 14:1 47:12
72:15 86:17 89:7 108:20,24
110:13**lights** 102:25**limit** 11:14,16 12:17 26:12 33:3**limited** 49:12 56:11 62:17 91:15**limits** 20:22**listen** 19:15 50:23**listened** 21:1**literally** 71:21**live** 95:3,6**long** 7:8 16:11**longest-standing** 21:24 22:1**looked** 3:12 30:14**loose** 63:4**lose** 62:5**loss** 57:20**lost** 30:22, 83:23**lot** 5:13 44:18,23 62:15 63:5,14
73:7 77:15 89:10 94:18 97:12
98:15,17 107:23**lots** 63:20**Louisiana** 17:5**love** 105:2 108:20**loves** 105:3**low** 82:6,7,9**lower** 32:11**lowest** 33:3 82:15**lucky** 7:13,14 110:21

M

made 20:4 29:13 47:1 52:17
60:22,23 61:6 64:21 65:8, 82:14
100:18 103:3 108:13 109:22**magazine** 105:16**magically** 109:10**mail** 60:24 61:2,18**mailing** 61:17**majority** 62:21 63:7,17 98:7**make** 9:4,11 10:5 12:25 14:22
15:20 22:5 31:24 38:21 47:15
63:20 67:25 69:12 71:21 72:10
78:1,16 80:18,22 81:11 87:19
96:3,20 101:3 108:9,22,24**makes** 68:22**making** 15:25 56:1 62:8**man** 24:23**management** 104:25**mandatory** 25:14 60:19**manner** 36:19**manure** 44:21**March** 9:14 101:17**mark** 60:14 61:13,19 66:11**market** 95:19**marketing** 90:23 91:10,15,16,
22 92:11,17 93:16,20 94:4**Maryland** 101:21**material** 40:1**materials** 37:12 62:9**matter** 3:24,25 5:4 6:2 12:9
14:14,15,23 15:8 21:1,4 38:11
42:24 48:6,14,19 49:12,17,22
51:7 54:23 56:13,16 59:22 60:5,
20 61:12 63:14 64:25 65:5,20,23

66:10,19 68:22 69:19,23

matters 53:20 68:5**maximize** 96:11,12**maximum** 87:21**Mccarty** 3:14 4:22 12:2 29:24
31:3,4, 43:7,8 51:3 81:16,17,24
82:5,12,22 89:8,9,15,19,24 90:2,
10 99:7,15 110:10**Mccarty's** 95:22**MCNAUGHT** 79:3**meaning** 28:22**means** 44:17 76:5 99:21 101:12**meantime** 70:6**media** 93:15**Medical** 84:5,25**medication** 12:22 18:11 20:12
39:19 74:14 97:3**meet** 10:7 20:18,20 35:4 40:25
98:22 100:14,17 101:18,19**meeting** 3:3,10 4:1 99:14
111:10**meetings** 92:15**member** 58:23**members** 59:18 87:24**memo** 50:10**mention** 35:14 80:7 110:21**mentioned** 17:16 19:3 36:19
43:14 68:17**mere** 67:6**merits** 51:9,12 62:6 64:21,24
68:13 70:21**message** 25:21 94:15**met** 61:9 73:2 92:11 101:17**metabolism** 18:15**metal** 85:12,13**meter** 61:14**Mickel** 14:8**mid** 74:1 100:14 101:4**middle** 31:14 73:15

Mike 14:12 100:6,22 101:13
106:8,10,14 107:5,12,15,18,21
108:3,7 109:4

Mills 110:24

mind 56:1 82:14 105:7

minimum 7:2 43:21 45:12,17
87:20

minor 35:24 99:1

minute 15:4

minutes 3:10 15:1,14,16, 19:17
26:12,14 34:19,21 49:13

misbehavior 35:22

misrepresentation 65:8

missed 61:23 73:11 74:6,9,10

misstatement 65:13,14,24

mistake 30:11

mitigating 25:18

modify 15:7 42:19,23 45:22
47:18 49:22

Moffit 5:5,8 6:3 9:21

molasses 81:22

molehill 16:1 20:4,7

monetary 10:13

money 22:15 55:2,8 81:6 82:16
87:8 91:16 95:25 96:4,5,9
104:11,23

monies 91:6,8,14

month 71:16

months 24:24 62:22,25 99:9

monty 77:22

Moore 105:2

morning 3:1 8:14 19:18 54:15
63:13

motion 3:15 4:20 10:18 11:25
12:3 13:23 14:2 47:19,23 48:16,
22 55:4,11 64:2,16 65:9 72:11,
15,16,19,21 85:4 86:16 110:9

mount 97:24

mountain 15:25 20:4,5

move 3:13 13:24 43:1 47:21
60:3 74:23 78:22,24 86:17

93:12,25 108:19 110:10

moved 4:22 6:10 10:19 12:1
74:24 85:2 93:23

moves 69:16

moving 70:25 75:8 80:5

multiple 16:7 36:18 45:14 47:7
65:3

Murphy 12:10,12 13:23 33:18

music 48:8 72:14

N

N.E. 66:9

named 28:13 52:24,25 53:1

narcotics 66:18

National 66:8

natural 30:10

nature 23:8 80:4

necessarily 28:3 85:21

necessitated 70:25

needed 32:3

negative 52:14 77:23

neighbor 58:17

Neopost 61:20

net 91:19

Newell 5:6 9:21 10:2,15 11:1,4,
20,23 12:11,23 13:2,5,8,20
19:18 26:13 27:2,6,10,14,22
28:1,8 31:6,9,18,25 32:18 33:3,
8,14 34:12 41:10 46:11,25 47:6
59:21 96:25 97:18,22 98:5
99:11,19

night 105:3

ninth 11:6

non-starter 104:4

normal 77:12

Norris 14:9,12,19 16:18 17:17
20:3,5,18,20,22,25 21:5,16
22:25 23:15,22 24:8,18 25:3,18
32:6 34:22 35:8,21 36:7 38:20
39:11 40:8 41:24 46:9,11,15,17

Norris's 23:12 24:15 25:1 28:2

46:25

Norrises 16:11 22:14 25:6

note 52:13 81:1 97:2

noted 29:18 41:13

notice 36:7

noticed 15:24 17:25

notification 28:23 29:2,17,19
30:2,5 33:16

notified 23:22 30:2 33:23 34:1
36:5

notifying 29:14,21

November 48:12 62:24

nuanced 61:11 66:2

number 5:2 8:21 10:24 12:8
14:5 28:21 48:3 61:22 65:10
66:3,5 73:1 75:20 84:1 85:7
86:22 87:13 90:8 96:23 97:20
100:4 102:24

numbers 32:21

numerous 65:4

O

oath 3:6 41:15 58:23

object 41:10

objection 21:18 35:15 36:20
65:10 105:20

objections 14:19 15:2 49:6
63:19,20 64:11 101:7

objects 21:17

obligating 29:16

obligation 97:25

occur 52:16

occurred 9:19 52:7 56:18 80:25

October 48:10 53:22 65:18

off-season 100:15

offense 6:23 7:2 11:9 26:2

offer 19:24 59:5 68:24

office 83:25

Ohio 95:13 101:21

- omitted** 59:6
one-year 7:3
Ontario 103:16
operated 79:25
operations 93:22,25
opinion 17:10,12 18:6 19:1,7,8,
12 24:16 35:19 36:12,13 47:17
50:22
opinions 83:18
opportunity 16:17 19:24 26:10,
13 50:18 70:7 71:9,15
option 88:22
options 45:24
oral 14:22,24 39:19,21 49:4,11
68:16
orally 24:2 47:5
order 3:3 4:2,5 14:18,20 15:8
20:1 21:14 26:5 28:23 43:3
48:22 49:2,21 53:18 55:10 69:19
70:1 74:17
organization 105:10
organizations 92:10
original 9:16 47:4
originally 38:22 87:13
originated 103:16 111:5
out-of-competition 8:18,20
9:3,8
outcome 53:17
outlined 4:9
overseen 71:4
oversimplified 71:3
owned 53:2
owner 108:21
owners 93:2 94:20
-
- P**
-
- P'pool** 28:14 29:7 35:25 36:10
38:12 43:13,14 44:3,10
P'pool's 36:15
pacing 102:15
packet 5:6
pages 98:5,14
paid 22:14
paint 106:11 108:8
panel 53:18 55:2
parallel 30:10
Park 105:1
part 22:10 29:1 56:11 70:4 94:14
95:23 100:11
partiality 57:1
participants 22:3 82:17 93:5
participate 91:1
participated 11:5 12:13
participating 67:9
participation 67:7
parties 4:8,9 6:2 9:17 14:21
19:23 49:3
partners 94:23
partnership 93:9 94:10 96:15
partnerships 93:7
party 15:13 49:12 50:6,11 66:6,
7
passed 5:2 12:6 24:1 48:2
72:25 110:17
Passes 48:2
past 62:21 92:9 93:21 108:15
Patrick 63:3
Patrick's 63:1
peanuts 96:19
penalties 22:6 29:7 30:15 43:17
44:7
penalty 6:7,15,23 16:22 21:11,
17 25:4,25 26:2 28:3,11 30:18,
19,24 38:14 41:7 42:19 43:20,21
45:2,12,17 47:18 57:15
pending 52:22 65:21
Pennsylvania 84:16,18 85:17
101:21 107:22
Pennycuff 111:2
people 13:6,14 44:19 90:25
91:3 93:18 94:1,18 95:19 102:2
103:12 107:9 108:11,12
percent 60:14 63:18 88:2 91:8,
18,19
percentage 87:25
performance 5:21,23 7:9 11:11
performing 70:17
period 10:3 27:5 28:15 31:17
32:20 39:8
permissible 30:7
permission 87:4 96:2
permit 39:11
person 56:24 60:6 66:4
personal 50:22 82:12
Pete 50:1 51:19
petition 48:24 50:19
picked 93:22
picogram 37:3
Pillow 12:1 31:10,11,12,21
32:15 33:1,9 42:14 45:22 46:4,6,
22 47:9 71:13,17 85:3 88:11
89:3,5 95:9,10 96:14 97:10
pipeline 73:17 75:4
Pitney 61:20
pivotal 55:19
place 42:3 74:23 92:11 103:4
plan 103:23
planned 30:10
pleading 58:10
pleadings 64:17
pleasure 59:19
point 27:3 32:16 38:4,24 39:15
40:19 41:13,17,19 51:6,11 55:19
75:16 80:7 88:9 98:10 107:2
108:16 109:24
pointed 37:2 75:25 83:15
pointing 33:14
points 12:21 77:7
pole 100:9 102:10,19,20,24
103:15,23 104:1,6,8 106:9,11
107:4,10 108:5,10,14

- pole's** 106:10
- policy** 98:15 101:4 102:11 110:5
- popular** 13:9
- position** 21:23 37:7 49:6,9
50:13 56:3 62:4
- positions** 14:22 49:4
- positive** 5:11 6:8 7:6,12,17,20
11:7,13 12:15 16:4 18:9 20:19,
20 21:5 23:13 28:15 29:2,15
34:2 36:5 73:11 74:4,5,17 75:2,5
83:23 84:11
- positives** 7:7 16:1,7,9,16 17:11
18:4 20:22 23:23,24 24:12,24
25:14 28:21 33:20,22,23 45:14
46:2 74:13
- possession** 66:18
- possibilities** 39:20
- post** 13:15 16:25 17:1,2
- post-race** 5:11 8:4 77:12
- postage** 61:14
- postal** 58:15
- posted** 58:9
- posting** 58:12
- postmark** 61:18
- postmarked** 49:1
- potatoes** 98:24
- potential** 5:23
- potentially** 87:5
- pound** 62:13
- pounding** 62:15
- Practically** 71:6
- practiced** 51:23
- precedent** 48:5
- preclude** 66:4 67:10
- precluded** 67:8
- preclusion** 66:1,3
- predetermined** 55:19 57:23
- predict** 18:14
- prehearing** 14:20 49:2 66:9
- prejudged** 55:19 57:23
- prejudice** 63:24 64:4 67:20
- prejudiced** 48:17 60:2, 68:10,
21
- preliminary** 49:24 73:8
- premise** 30:4
- premises** 85:16
- preparing** 55:10
- prescribed** 35:19
- presence** 93:15
- present** 4:13 49:4
- presented** 25:18
- presided** 56:12,15
- presiding** 100:6,22
- press** 108:2
- pretend** 69:8
- pretty** 13:9 19:12 48:4 79:1 81:6
98:11 99:24 106:18
- previous** 91:9
- previously** 56:12
- prickly** 51:22
- primary** 17:24 22:9 73:5,16
74:18 92:16 97:2
- prior** 8:9 22:17 24:24 28:4 54:8
67:7 88:23
- privy** 66:7
- problem** 27:24 42:4 80:12
- problems** 13:14 105:18
- procedural** 48:10
- procedure** 58:7 69:13
- proceeding** 64:15 81:1
- proceedings** 15:9 23:8 42:25
49:23
- process** 20:7 25:20 38:24 39:14
41:19 42:3 55:7 57:6,25 69:13
70:8 71:4 77:13 78:9 81:3 82:20
109:13,15
- producers** 94:21
- producing** 92:2
- product** 93:4
- professional** 22:12 52:2
- professional's** 57:17
- proficiency** 77:16,17,18 78:3
79:16
- program** 8:19 74:23 75:9,13
76:20,24,25 79:10,24 80:1,3,5,6,
7 92:1,4,21,25 93:12 94:10 99:5,
21
- programs** 9:8 90:24 91:14,21,
24 92:9,19 93:18
- progressive** 101:22
- prohibitions** 109:18
- project** 78:18,21
- prominent** 81:20
- promote** 87:18 90:14 92:4
- promotion** 90:19
- promotions** 87:19 88:3,7 90:23
91:2
- prone** 44:1
- proper** 71:23
- proportion** 17:11
- proposed** 14:16,20 15:8 19:24
29:9 31:1 42:23 43:2 48:20 49:7
53:18 55:10 69:25 72:20 104:6
107:21
- pros** 37:17
- prosecute** 22:5 44:21 74:17,20
- protect** 44:24,25
- protest** 50:3
- provided** 14:24 16:14 37:12
49:9 87:3
- provision** 56:6
- public** 78:9 81:12 101:6 105:13
110:5
- publicity** 105:14
- pulled** 64:6
- pun** 88:16
- punishment** 20:6
- Purdue** 76:22 77:3 78:12,23
79:18 80:2

purpose 69:22**purposes** 88:5 104:4**purse** 11:17,22 12:18 13:20
21:16 55:8**pursuant** 32:12**push** 104:24**put** 6:5 16:12 44:18 48:5 61:14,
17 73:5,20 103:23 105:15
106:11 107:25 108:4,10**puts** 5:18**putting** 65:3, 93:4 95:25 100:18
101:4**Pylitt** 14:13,14 19:20 21:1,3,10
22:18,25 23:7 25:5 31:1 38:7
48:13 51:15 53:10,21 54:1,23
55:11 56:15 57:3,12 58:1 60:2,
10 62:20 63:8,11,23 64:13,17
65:5 67:17 68:8,18,21,23,25
69:17 70:20 71:25 72:9,12**Pylitt's** 15:8 20:2 21:14,19 26:5
43:2,4**pyramid** 6:20

Q

qualifications 22:12**qualified** 51:15**quality** 80:1,5 81:21 82:15 92:5,
21 99:4**Quarter** 99:19**question** 10:11 26:24 27:17,23
31:4,10 33:12 37:19,23 41:12,
20,24 45:5,7,21 46:7 47:16
52:23 58:6 69:11,14 70:5 71:20
75:21 88:15 97:7,10**questioned** 22:17 56:11 63:24
64:4**questions** 3:11 4:12,19 9:9
10:16 11:24 13:22 15:10 26:8,
15,18 34:16 38:20 41:22 47:11,
13,24 49:17,24 68:18 72:17 74:1
88:8 109:1 110:3**quick** 45:11 46:7 97:10 102:12**quickly** 58:3 66:13**quit** 88:11

R

rabbit 104:18**race** 5:10 8:7 11:6 12:14 20:13,
18 21:7 27:1,4 28:20,25 29:6
34:8 38:2,9,15,16 40:5 43:24
44:6 52:9 54:20 87:23 98:18,22
100:11,14 103:17,22 105:12**race-day** 16:22 19:6,14 20:16
21:9 22:22 23:13 25:11 32:24
40:5,17 55:15, 56:17**raced** 5:9 107:16**racehorse** 11:5 18:17**racehorses** 39:1**races** 8:11 79:12**racetrack** 70:18 75:15 89:16**racetracks** 92:13 93:3,8 94:10**racing** 3:20 5:3 12:10 20:14
22:11,24 34:9 41:6 52:21 53:3
54:25 55:1 57:14 73:22 79:12
85:10 87:1,6,18 91:25 93:22,25
94:15, 95:17 101:4,23 102:8,13
105:2,3,15,19 111:10**racinos** 87:3**raise** 28:3**ramble** 101:14,16**ramped** 90:22**ran** 103:3**rank** 8:20**Raper** 99:12**rapidly** 32:9**RCI** 5:21 6:8,24 28:2 35:23
36:22**reach** 6:3 103:25 107:6**reached** 4:7 12:18 76:22 102:19
104:7**reaching** 23:11**read** 37:12 74:16**readily** 44:1**reading** 15:24**readopt** 109:14**readopting** 109:6,23**readoption** 110:11**reads** 98:14**ready** 103:6**real** 45:11 96:1**realize** 58:14**reason** 24:13 29:3,18,19 30:16
71:18 72:1**reasonable** 29:19 56:24**reasoned** 19:21**reasons** 61:8 97:14**rebut** 27:16**rebuttal** 15:17**recall** 3:25 40:10 43:13 83:10
102:20,24 103:17 104:2 106:17**recalls** 103:8,10 106:24**receive** 10:9 33:16 58:1 77:2**received** 22:22 24:19 32:1
100:19**recognize** 110:23**recollection** 24:22**recommend** 11:9 21:11**recommendation** 16:21 20:2
43:9 59:16 72:10**recommendations** 14:8**recommended** 6:1,6 12:19
14:18 21:14,17 25:4 26:5 43:2
47:25 48:21 69:18**recommending** 57:15**recommends** 6:8**reconcile** 61:3**reconsidered** 29:22**record** 15:6 35:23 41:14 67:20
68:11 80:23**records** 46:20**recuse** 56:23 57:2**red** 5:20**redistribution** 11:17 12:19
13:20 21:16

reduced 25:25
Rees 17:24
refer 75:12 83:24
references 63:20
referring 99:11
refund 105:7
refunded 104:3,10 107:8
refunds 105:6
refusal 25:1
refused 20:7 63:25
refuses 23:15
regard 17:15 19:2 35:22 36:1
52:6 56:5
regeneration 5:20
regime 34:1
registered 61:24
regularly 13:7
regulated 25:22 70:14,18
regulating 98:22
regulation 29:16
regulator 22:2
regulators 11:12 20:14
reingested 24:10
reiterate 69:14
reject 59:15
rejected 55:21
related 98:4,6
relates 86:9
relax 39:12
release 108:2
released 104:1
reliable 19:3, 35:4 40:16
relicensed 10:7
relied 23:11 54:23 55:11,25
relief 25:21
reluctant 100:12
relying 57:11
remains 53:6
remand 15:8 42:24 49:22
remarks 19:16 75:7
remember 84:6 88:16 99:10,17
removed 12:7 18:2
repeatedly 25:19
replaces 79:25
report 30:3 73:21,24,25 75:12,
20 78:9,12,20 79:5 87:20
reported 16:3 28:21
reporter 3:7
reports 87:19
representation 60:22 61:1
representations 61:6
represented 40:9 63:2
reproach 22:13,16
reputation 57:19
request 4:10 15:15 62:7 109:25
requested 20:25
requests 19:25 26:4
require 85:18
required 21:16 90:7
requirement 58:25 60:20 61:23
requirements 97:16,17 98:18
requires 23:17 56:7 87:17
research 23:10 32:7 77:4 78:15
111:4
resolved 31:5
resources 44:18,23
respect 23:8 51:13 66:1,2 82:19
88:9
respected 22:11
respectfully 4:10 19:25 26:4
109:25
respects 26:5
respondents 65:18
responding 16:8
response 45:4
responses 107:24
responsibility 17:17 20:8
23:16,17,18,19 25:2,3 34:22,23,
24 44:11,12,15 54:13 90:14
responsible 17:19 35:12 44:14
55:15 98:22
rest 82:2 100:25 104:11,21
105:12
restrictions 88:24
result 16:2 18:9 23:13 32:24
resulting 24:11
results 16:8,15 36:2 78:8,10
92:2 96:1
retest 80:14
return 11:22
revenue 87:7 90:9
review 4:15 19:22 48:25 50:19
58:22 73:20 96:23 100:2 102:13
reviewed 22:20,25 29:12 109:7
reviewing 48:19 57:10 67:4
revised 9:12
RFP 82:3
rhetoric 63:5
Richie 53:1
Rick 105:2,9
ride 97:22
rightfully 23:9
rights 55:6
risk 18:17
road 89:9
Robin 68:14
Rojas 10:25 11:1,4,16 12:12
33:18
Ronald 99:12
root 51:4
Rosanna 58:22
Ross 48:6,12 54:6 57:5,7
Rouge 17:3
routine 78:6 100:14

Royer 58:23**rule** 16:6,10,24 23:17 25:13,
33:14 36:1 54:13 58:6,20,21,25
61:15,16 71:19 86:5 98:13 99:20
100:9,13,21 101:5,9 102:17
103:9 105:22 107:19 109:7,20,
22,23**ruled** 30:6**rules** 20:5,12,14 22:4 34:9 51:14
58:7 60:18 67:23 68:9 74:16
98:17 100:16 107:10 109:6,11,
14,16,17 110:5,6,10**ruling** 48:20,25 50:19 53:18
56:1 64:13 72:8**rulings** 96:24,25 97:3,8 98:5**run** 77:22,24,25**running** 17:1 18:17 66:13
103:18**Russell** 17:23 48:6,12,15,17,24
49:4,16 51:13,20 52:8,12,18,22
53:4 54:6,17 55:20 56:2,4 57:5,7
59:15,25 62:4,8 64:22 65:17,21
68:22 70:2,5,10**Russell's** 48:22 50:1 52:2 53:12
55:20

S

Sacopulos 50:1 51:19,20 59:14
60:12 62:23 63:2,22,25 64:23
65:1,15**Sacopulos'** 60:24**salary** 87:21**salient** 41:19**Salix** 38:1**Salvador** 10:25**sample** 8:4 11:15 12:17 75:13
77:12,14,18,21 78:2,3,6 79:11
80:7,15 84:10,11,12 85:1**samples** 5:11 8:21 32:1,5 73:20
76:4 77:3,8,9,10 79:13,15,16
81:7,10 84:19,20**Sams** 17:6 19:8 21:22 22:8,10,
20,24 23:11 31:25 32:23 35:1
40:24**Sams'** 23:1,10**sanction** 19:13**sanctions** 59:24**sat** 32:2 64:1 66:19 67:14 68:8
107:22**satisfactory** 4:8**scenario** 24:16**scheduled** 69:24 95:4 109:6,
17,21**scheme** 9:4**Schenkel** 3:13 4:23 9:11,18,25
10:11,19 34:10,13 38:18,19
39:3,6,13, 40:18 41:12,25 47:3,
7,20 69:10,12 70:4,20 71:2,10
75:18 80:21,22 82:11 83:10,13,
16 85:2 86:18 97:20 99:2 105:24
106:12 108:19**school** 62:10 110:25**science** 21:18 22:9,20**scientific** 19:3,4 23:3,6 35:5
37:9 40:6,16**scratched** 106:21**script** 3:4**season** 101:5**seat** 19:15**second-year** 111:2**seconds** 37:13**secrets** 91:25**section** 75:19**seek** 83:3**seeking** 52:4**select** 77:1 83:8**selection** 73:4**selects** 71:13**senate** 87:1,12,14 90:13**send** 8:14,16 25:21 45:22 58:16
59:7 77:10,16 80:9 81:7 94:25**sending** 76:12 79:13**separate** 5:18 64:15**September** 52:7,19 53:5 54:8,
16 57:9**sequence** 71:23**serum** 32:2,9**serve** 48:18 53:11,13,15 84:8**served** 59:4 73:23**service** 58:5,11,15,25 106:4**services** 70:17**session** 86:24**set** 19:2 60:18 61:8 69:1 70:23**sets** 59:8**setting** 99:22**settlement** 3:23 4:7,11,15 5:4,7
9:16 10:24 12:9 13:18,23,25
33:19 44:2 99:12**seventh** 5:10 109:12**Seventy-day** 42:3**severe** 6:15**severely** 91:15**severity** 6:22, 8:23**sex** 19:11**shake** 105:13**Shanks** 15:2,15,20 25:13 26:10
31:21 33:12 34:18,20 37:15
38:20 39:2,5,9,12,17,20 40:21
41:23 45:6,10**share** 3:20 48:7 90:15 94:6**sharing** 79:3**shipment** 77:11**shock** 23:24**shocked** 24:24**short** 8:1 65:15**show** 95:6**showing** 58:8 67:19**shows** 9:13 97:5**side** 15:1 62:11,12,13 94:8**sides** 59:5**sign** 78:16 108:10**signal** 15:3 49:13**signed** 78:19

significant 41:6 42:7 43:23 57:20	specific 24:21,22 46:14 60:8 72:19 77:7 94:16	starter 102:25 104:19 107:6
similar 7:20 12:11 22:18 28:12 29:25 41:2,3	specifically 21:9 24:6 94:7	starting 103:24 104:7 107:2,4
simple 45:5 107:17	specifics 88:20	starts 106:1,2,3
simply 23:21 52:1 57:25 88:17	spectators 108:6	state 17:5 33:15 56:21 82:3,5 92:19 93:9 105:16 107:19
single 32:22 43:9	speed 71:9	stated 46:8 58:23
sir 4:18 5:6 96:25	spend 95:20	statement 42:11 47:1 62:19,24 65:13
sired 109:20	spent 91:6	states 9:6,7 95:16
sister 85:15	Spirits 66:8	status 70:5,9 87:23
sit 61:21 67:14,15 108:1	split 11:15 12:17 17:14 80:15 84:5,8,10,12,19,20 85:1,19,25	statute 74:16 88:8 89:15 91:5
sites 93:15	spoke 85:8 105:5	statutory 29:16 87:13
sits 32:9	spoken 60:13	stay 7:8 102:14 110:6
sitting 66:22	square 51:4	stemmed 19:21
situation 16:13 18:3 36:13 51:22 99:10	Stable 53:3,19 54:25 55:1,4	stewards 53:23 54:14,21 65:11, 13,14 66:10 98:21
situations 67:12	staff 3:24 4:6,20 5:8 10:25 12:10 14:11 15:25 16:19 18:8 19:18,25 20:9,24 23:22 25:8,15,23 26:3 28:22 37:7 43:9 48:6,11 49:8 52:21 57:15 58:23 59:20 60:7 73:21 75:20 101:24 102:8 109:21	stewards' 54:5 57:4,11 64:13
six-year 29:7	staff's 19:15	stop 94:19
sixth 17:13 18:22	stake 103:17	storage 32:3
slap 23:20	stakeholders 92:12	story 18:7 23:19 24:3 25:1 44:19,20 93:17 105:16
slightly 88:3	stall 52:9 54:18	strategy 92:11 94:4
slot 88:4	stallion 93:2 94:20	stride 102:15,18,24 103:25 106:23
slots 90:20	stand 46:24	strive 92:8
slow 81:22	standard 19:2 40:25	struck 39:6
small 41:7 98:24	Standardbred 5:9 28:13 93:22 98:20	student 110:25 111:3
smart 8:6,7 30:8	Standardbreds 102:14 108:21	study 19:9 35:2 37:9 40:25
social 93:15	standards 35:4 76:6	stuff 98:15
sold 93:23	standpoint 82:13	stupid 104:16
sole 23:5 49:14 68:20	stands 4:17	Style 95:6
Solu-cortef 46:14	start 51:21 63:6 76:11 90:17 100:5,9,16 101:12 102:10,20,23 103:15 104:2,6,8 105:24 106:11, 23 107:7,10,20	submit 55:18
sort 10:3 35:7	started 49:25 52:6 81:19 101:14,18 103:8,20	submitted 50:18
sorts 67:4		subsequently 4:4 49:5 52:20 59:1
sought 83:14		substance 8:7 18:18 21:7 24:2, 5,13 52:10 54:8,16,19 62:9 64:10
sounds 72:19 79:1 108:17		substantial 22:14 63:13,14
speak 13:8 39:11 59:19,23 60:15 106:1		
speaking 71:6 105:1		
special 8:15 77:2,21 78:1		

substantiate 46:20**successful** 97:6**succinate** 16:2 17:12 18:5,12
20:19 21:6 22:23 23:13 24:11
32:8,18 36:21**suffered** 29:7**suffering** 39:10**suggest** 68:11**suggested** 24:9 46:16**suggesting** 24:3 61:13**suggests** 23:1**summarily** 9:21 63:24 70:11**summary** 9:22 10:2**summer** 110:22**super** 81:21 94:11**super-duper** 78:1**supply** 72:9**support** 19:5 47:17 49:3,5,8
64:18 67:21 101:8**supported** 63:21**supposed** 26:22 37:23 51:2
69:6,8 72:7**supposition** 19:6 40:7**Supreme** 19:2 23:3 35:6 41:1
65:25 67:5**surprised** 40:14**survive** 24:5,13**survived** 87:11**suspect** 50:11**suspended** 6:4 9:22 52:19
53:5,6 70:11**suspension** 4:3 6:1,9 7:3, 9:19,
22,23 10:2,6,12 11:9 21:15 29:8
40:12 41:8 42:15,17 43:12 44:9
45:13,18 52:4 70:12 98:25 99:8**suspicious** 81:10**swearing** 3:4**synthetic** 5:15,19**system** 7:1,9, 8:11 24:23 35:10
37:4 76:5**systems** 17:20

T

table 26:18 62:13,15 85:23 87:4,
6 89:10 95:25**tail** 83:2**takes** 44:23**taking** 37:7 44:11,14 84:19,20**tale** 67:22**talk** 6:12 21:21 23:15 59:12
60:17 62:6 64:10 69:6 98:12
110:19**talking** 31:23 38:10 51:9 60:8
67:12 85:9**Tam** 52:24 54:18 55:16**target** 92:14 95:15**tasked** 20:11**tax** 90:9**taxpayer** 82:16**teaching** 77:4**technology** 33:5**television** 94:8 95:6 96:18**telling** 44:4,12,15,17 46:1,2
98:8**tells** 20:3**temporarily** 84:18**ten** 6:4 15:1,14,16 37:14 49:12
54:15 84:1 85:7 97:2 98:6**ten-day** 60:19**ten-year** 6:7,9 10:12**term** 29:23**terminate** 83:3**terminating** 73:10**termination** 83:6**terms** 4:7,8 17:18 32:13**Terre** 58:14,17**test** 7:15,18,20,22,24 8:12 11:13
12:16 17:14 32:12 76:2 77:17,18
85:13**tested** 5:11 6:8 11:7 20:18,20
21:5 32:17,23 79:18**testified** 31:25 40:20 41:15**testify** 17:2,8 22:15**testimony** 21:2,3 22:18 23:1,10
40:14 42:13 45:20**testing** 8:15,17,19,20 9:4,8
22:10 28:20 32:3 73:17 78:3
79:1 81:17 85:9,10 86:8 97:5
98:13**tests** 18:23 28:15 52:13 73:12
74:4,5 75:2,5 77:16**Texas** 84:4,25 85:17**theory** 19:14**therapeutic** 12:22 33:21,24
34:5 35:13,15 37:19 38:11,13
74:14**thing** 13:13 29:5 30:8 33:17
40:13 42:14 46:3 50:15 71:22
78:11 85:8 97:2 100:23 105:19
110:20**things** 16:5 17:16,21 26:17
31:16 56:8 60:23 61:10 62:2
66:3 74:7,12 79:17 94:7,22 95:8
101:4**thinking** 95:12**third-party** 62:1 73:13 74:3**Thomas** 3:21,24**Thoroughbred** 11:5 12:13 88:4
98:21**thought** 21:25 39:3 71:18 101:3
105:11 109:7**thoughtfully** 23:9**thoughts** 46:5 92:13 105:9**thousand** 13:19**three-day** 62:2**three-year** 21:15 42:17 43:12**threshold** 11:14, 12:16 13:7
18:19,21,25 20:21 32:19 37:2**thresholds** 33:2**throat** 24:2**throwing** 108:11

thrown 29:22
Thursday 81:8,9
tickets 108:11
Tim 110:24
time 3:6 4:1,6 7:23 10:3 13:15
 16:11,25 17:1,2 18:14 19:16
 23:23,25 25:2 26:11,12 28:6,16
 29:17 32:4 40:9 49:15 50:3,4,22
 51:1,25 54:9 59:17,23 62:18
 63:10,14 65:2 66:14 69:18,25
 70:9 71:20,23 73:1,3,7,11,16
 75:1 77:7 80:17 81:15 84:17
 95:12 98:10 103:6,19
timeliness 62:9
timely 4:4 29:21 50:17 58:5 59:4
 83:21
times 23:20 27:18 51:4 71:16
 77:15 101:25 106:20
timing 13:16
today 18:2 21:13 51:15,21
 53:11 59:10,20 64:1 68:20 69:15
 70:3,6 71:19 110:23 111:2
told 24:18 46:9 62:10 64:1 65:2
 66:12 101:25
tonight 105:25
Tony 52:25
top 6:21
tortured 64:12
touch 62:18
tough 22:2
tourism 96:17
toxicologist 17:4
track 77:8 79:18 98:20,21
 100:20 101:1 106:21
tracks 94:16,17,24
tract 24:5,14
trade 105:16
trailer 94:22
trained 52:24 54:7
trainer 5:9 6:7 11:5 12:13 23:16
 28:7,13 29:14,21 30:3,20 33:15,
 17 34:24 36:2 41:16 45:15 52:25
 53:1 54:11,12 84:10 99:20,22,23

trainers 20:15 28:23,24 29:5
 33:19 35:24 36:4,14 43:15,16,25
 44:10 54:11 55:14 93:2
training 8:16 34:1 92:22 99:21
transition 97:6
travel 87:22
treat 18:17 24:3 35:20 38:25
 78:6
treated 18:5
treating 35:18 36:17
treatment 35:16
tremendous 105:15
trial 4:5 24:16 30:22 57:21 58:6,
 7,21,25 67:8,9,13 69:23
triamcinolone 20:21
trickle-down 94:20
trot 106:16,20
trotting 102:16
trouble 95:17
troubles 82:13
troublesome 21:8
truck 94:21
true 27:13 45:12 62:23 68:7
 83:19
Truesdail 73:4,18 74:9 75:22
 81:25 82:4 83:1
Truesdail's 73:9,10,15
truth 44:4,12,15,17 45:2 46:1
Tuff 52:24 54:18 55:16
turn 58:3 87:8 103:1 104:20
turned 103:19 106:17
turning 104:2
turns 101:1 102:25
TV 94:11 95:2,11
two-day 19:23
type 8:23 91:16 98:14
typically 7:1
typographical 9:16

U

UC 84:14,18 85:16
ultimate 51:5
unbiased 49:16 56:4 57:22
underlying 51:12 70:1
understand 9:12 34:10 38:21
 45:10 50:25 59:11 60:7 69:13
 71:10 72:8 89:10 94:18 104:5
 107:1
understanding 39:2 69:22
unfit 48:18 68:22
uniform 11:8,18 12:19
unique 6:13 108:17
university 17:4,5 78:16 84:15
 85:16
unknown 54:8
unlike 63:23
unprecedented 57:16
unreasonable 36:6
unreliable 37:8 40:6
untimely 62:3,5 68:13
unusual 8:3 39:4,14
update 90:12
updated 67:3
UPS 62:1
upset 40:8
upsets 103:5
urinated 40:2
urine 77:6
urine-soaked 24:10,14
users 82:18
utilized 9:2 91:21
utilizing 8:8,9

V

valid 22:18
vast 62:20 63:7,17

verified 57:3 64:13**verify** 79:22,23**versus** 3:21,24 30:10 48:6
56:21 66:8**veterinarian** 16:18 17:23,24
18:14,16 35:20 41:15 46:16,20
57:18**veterinarian's** 35:19**veterinarians** 94:21**Veterinary** 84:5,25**vetoed** 87:12 89:21,22**vigorously** 82:9**violated** 20:5 51:13 54:12 55:7
99:20**violation** 34:8 37:4 43:10,22**violations** 35:24 36:18 41:5
99:4**virtually** 67:1**visibility** 92:20**visit** 8:15**volunteers** 83:13**vote** 42:18 47:24 72:23

W

wagered 104:10**wagering** 104:4**waive** 86:5**waiver** 86:1,8**walk** 23:20**wanted** 6:11 36:9 46:5 55:3,8
90:17 101:14 110:23**wash** 24:2**wasted** 65:2**watching** 95:24**Waterman** 17:7 35:16**ways** 96:10**Weatherwax** 3:1,7,8,15,18
4:14,19,24 5:2 6:14 8:22 9:9
10:16,21,24 11:2,19,21,24 12:3,
6,21,24 13:3,6,11,18,21 14:2,515:12,19 26:7,16 27:3,7,11,15,
23 28:6 30:9,13 31:3,11 33:6,11
34:15 37:16,22 38:3,18 42:8,18
43:4,7 45:8,19 47:10,14,22 48:2,
13 50:2,7,12,21 51:17 59:9
68:14,23 69:4 71:15,18 72:16,
22,25 75:16,21,25 76:5,9,11,15,
18 78:25 79:7,17,21 80:2,12,21
81:16 82:21 83:7,11,12,15,19
84:1, 85:4,7 86:3,10,14,16,19,22
88:13 89:8 90:11 94:6 95:9,21
96:13 97:9,12 98:3,9 99:6,25
100:3,8 101:11 105:21 106:6
107:1,9,13 108:5,17,22 109:1,
110:4,8,14,17 111:7**Wednesday** 81:8**week** 8:9 32:13 39:7 79:11,13,
15 81:7**weekend** 95:3 106:7**weekly** 77:11**weeks** 8:3 73:17 74:2**weighed** 14:16 27:12 56:20**welfare** 17:19**well-respected** 68:8**wheels** 78:23**whipping** 97:14**White** 63:2,12**willingly** 84:20**window** 8:1 24:20 32:4 46:13
102:3**Wine** 66:8**winnings** 55:2**wise** 81:21 90:19**withdrawal** 18:14**withheld** 28:22**withhold** 29:2,19 30:2 36:8**witnesses** 42:13 65:3**word** 97:17**words** 65:16 70:6**work** 33:4 73:9,18,19 76:23 96:7
108:1**worked** 17:23 75:9,10 96:13
101:19,24**working** 92:10 94:3,7 96:17
102:7,12**works** 76:25**world** 13:11 64:5**worry** 26:23**worst** 6:20 7:1,4**wound** 103:21**wow** 105:8**wrist** 23:20**wrong** 36:3**wrote** 107:23

Y

year 5:25 10:10 11:6 24:8 27:18
28:5 43:21 44:9 52:7 53:6,22
58:9,11,12,13 69:24 75:23
76:15,17 84:7 87:16 89:4,12
91:9 93:21 95:5 99:9 106:16
109:12,17**years** 6:4 30:25 35:3 38:14
62:25 100:13 102:17 103:9
107:21**yelling** 102:3**yellow** 108:8**York** 101:20**Young** 66:9

Z

Zealand 19:9 35:3