

APPEAL COMMITTEE

In the matter of Jockey Manoel Nunes Da Silva (the "Appellant")

DECISION

1. The Appellant was charged under Rule 414(b) of the Rules of Racing for his ride of Unsung Hero in Race 7 of the 11th meeting of the 2026 racing season.
2. The Appellant is reproached of not riding to the satisfaction of the Racing Stewards in that leaving the 900metre mark, when his horse had changed lead and was not hanging out anymore and the pace was still a slow one and there was an opportunity for him to let his mount race in its space, he instead continued to over-restrain his mount, this being counterproductive to its chances in the race.
3. The Appellant pleaded not guilty to the above charge. He was suspended from riding in races for three Mauritian race meeting and was fined Rs 30,000.
4. The Appellant appealed against both his conviction and sentence.
5. At the hearing of the appeal on the 14th of September 2026, the Appellant was assisted by counsel, Mr Mikash Hassamal. The Racing Stewards were represented by Ms. Julia Keevy and Mr Yahia Nazroo, assisted by Mr Ivan Jean Louis, SC.
6. The Appellant raised two preliminary grounds of appeal which were not seriously pursued during the appeal. The Appellant challenged his conviction on 16 grounds and his sentence of 2 grounds. The Committee does not find it important to reproduce the grounds of appeal here in its decision.
7. The Committee is now giving the written reasons for the decision which was read out following the hearing of the appeal.
8. The film of the race under consideration was viewed by all and the Committee benefited from the readings of the race by both the Appellant and the Racing Stewards.
9. The Appellant explained that the distance of 1365 meters is long for his horse, Unsung Hero and he had to ride him conservatively. Unsung Hero has a bad mouth and should not have been wearing blinkers on that distance. The Appellant was still fighting his horse at the 1000 meter mark, he was putting his body weight to the left in an attempt to prevent his horse from hanging badly. Leaving the 900 meter mark, the Appellant did not take the opportunity to let his mount race because, in his view, Jockey Taka who was riding That'll b the day and who was the favourite of the race, would probably go together with him. Then, they would be going head to head and they would both be in trouble.
10. After having viewed the film of the race and listened to the explanations of the Appellant, the Committee finds that the Appellant is indeed to be blamed for not having allowed his mount to race in his space upon leaving the 900 meter mark, as by this point his mount was no more hanging and the film shows that the Appellant had been restraining his mount. The explanations that the Appellant gave, that he did not allow his mount to race in his space in view of his anticipation of what Jockey Taka could have reacted, did not find favour with the committee as the Appellant should not have adapted his ride in function of the favourite of



APPEAL COMMITTEE

the race. Moreover, the Committee finds it useful to reproduce the following extract of the inquiry in which the Appellant admitted what was being reproached of him.

SDC: No, the way the Stewards read the race, Mr Nunes, is that yes, on the first bend, the horse does give you some trouble because he is pulling and as soon as you want to bring him back, he wants to go out. Obviously, if you leave him, if you let him go, at that stage, there is every chance that he is going to run off the course. We agree with that but we believe that leaving the 900 meters, your horse change, leads. There was an opportunity for you to just let him race in your hands so that he drops, he drops a bit and he stops pulling; that you fail to do so. Okay?

Jockey Manoel Nunes

Okay.

11. For the reasons given above, the Committee finds to no reason to interfere with the conviction.
12. On the issue of sentence inflicted on the Applicant, given the fact that the Appellant had a rough race and taking into account, that the Racing Stewards themselves considered that the latter had a clean record, the Committee finds that the sentence of three weeks is not warranted and that the Appellant should instead be sanctioned with a period of suspension of two horse race meetings which is the minimum under this charge. Therefore, the Committee quashes the sentence of three horse race meetings with a fine of Rs 30,000 with substitutes it with a suspension of two horse race meetings and a fine of Rs 30,000

This 16th of September 2026

Nandkishore Ramburn SC

Ravi Bhookhun

Harry Ramasawmy

APPEAL COMMITTEE