

INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS
RULE 1699. RIDING RULES.

SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF THE REGULATION:

The proposed regulation will amend California Horse Racing Board (Board) Rule 1699, Riding Rules, to allow stewards discretion when issuing penalties for jockeys riding in a manner contrary to this rule and to address a leading horse not crossing over to cause the passing horse to shorten its stride.

PROBLEM:

Board Rule 1699 provides guidelines for the jockey's conduct during the running of the race. Currently, the rule requires a steward to discipline a jockey who rides in a careless or willful manner, or who strikes at another horse or jockey with a minimum penalty of two riding days, and shall issue a suspension greater than the minimum for more than one infraction of this rule by the jockey within a 60-day calendar period or any infraction which in the opinion of the stewards jeopardizes the safety of another horse or jockey.

The language of the regulation is vague regarding subsequent penalties and leads to uncertainty with respect to the applicability of previous rulings, and penalties, or if the stewards are only obligated to increase the penalty above the minimum as described in the rule. In addition, a standard violation followed by a minor infraction may lead to too severe a penalty for the second violation.

Furthermore, interference as defined under the rule does not cover all situations, such as when a leading horse crosses over a passing who has a clear opening, causing it to shorten its stride.

The Board submits these proposed amendments to existing regulation 1699 to allow the stewards to use discretion when issuing a penalty, to address interference where the horse interfered with loses the opportunity to place where it was reasonably expected to finish, and to address a leading horse not crossing over to cause a passing horse to shorten its stride.

NECESSITY:

The proposed amendment to Board Rule 1699 will rename subsection (a) to (b) and add a new subsection (a) which will be added to address that a leading horse is entitled to any part of the course but shall not cross over to force a passing horse to shorten its stride. This is necessary due to subsection (c) defining interference does not address this situation with a leading horse.

Subsection (b) will be renamed (c) and addresses interference occurring in a part of the race where the horse interfered with loses the opportunity to place where it might be reasonably expected to finish. This is necessary because it makes it clear that it is

subjective and thus allows the stewards to utilize their discretion when determining violations.

Subsection (c) will be renamed subsection (d), Subsection (d) will be renamed subsection (e), and subsection (e) will be renamed subsection (f). This is necessary to accommodate the new subsection (a) which addresses a leading horse.

Subsection (f) will be eliminated. This is necessary to remove the confusion caused by this rule and allow the stewards to use their discretion when determining and issuing a penalty for infractions of this rule.

BENEFITS ANTICIPATED FROM THE REGULATORY ACTION:

The addition of addressing a leading horse is beneficial because the definition of interference does not cover the situation where a leading horse crosses over to a passing horse causing it to shorten its stride. By addressing this scenario, it can now be addressed, and stewards may issue a penalty for this infraction.

The change from “better placing” to “reasonably expected to finish” makes it clear that the placement of the disqualified horse is subjective and to acknowledge that the place is only one part of the decision but also includes distance and whether the sufferer of the interference finishes the race or not.

The elimination of subsection (f) will reduce the amount of confusion over the rule. This allows stewards to utilize discretion when issuing a penalty for an infraction of this rule and provide the best penalty as they see fit for the situation.

TECHNICAL, THEORETICAL, AND EMPIRICAL STUDIES, REPORTS OR SIMILAR DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON:

The Board did not rely on any technical, theoretical, and/or empirical studies, reports, or documents in proposing this regulatory action.

RESULTS ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

The results of the Board’s Economic Impact Assessment as required by Government Code section 11346.3(b) are as follows:

- The proposed regulation will not impact the creation or elimination of jobs within the state.
- The proposed regulation will not have an impact on the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses within the state.
- The proposed regulation will not have an impact on the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the state.
- The proposed regulation will not benefit the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety, or the state’s environment.

The Board has made the initial determination that the proposed regulatory action will not have a significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business,

including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed amendment to Board Rule 1699 will allow stewards to use their discretion when issuing a penalty for an infraction of the rule, clarify interference where the horse interfered with loses the opportunity to place where it was reasonably expected to finish, and to address a leading horse not crossing over to cause a passing horse to shorten its stride.

CREATION OR ELIMINATION OF JOBS WITHIN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The proposed amendment to Board Rule 1699 will allow stewards to utilize discretion when issuing penalties, clarify interference, and discuss a leading horse not crossing over to cause a passing horse to shorten its stride. As such, the proposed regulatory action will not result in the creation or elimination of jobs within the state.

CREATION OF NEW BUSINESSES OR THE ELIMINATION OF EXISTING BUSINESSES WITHIN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The proposed amendment to Board Rule 1699 will allow stewards to utilize discretion when issuing penalties, clarify interference, and discuss a leading horse not crossing over to cause a passing horse to shorten its stride. As such, the proposed regulatory action will not result in the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses within the state.

EXPANSION OF BUSINESSES CURRENTLY DOING BUSINESS WITHIN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The proposed amendment to Board Rule 1699 will allow stewards to utilize discretion when issuing penalties, clarify interference, and discuss a leading horse not crossing over to cause a passing horse to shorten its stride. As such, the proposed regulatory action will not result in the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the state.

BENEFITS OF THE REGULATION TO THE HEALTH AND WELFARE OF CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS, WORKER SAFETY, AND THE STATE'S ENVIRONMENT

The proposed amendment to Board Rule 1699 will allow stewards to utilize discretion when issuing penalties, clarify interference, and discuss a leading horse not crossing over to cause a passing horse to shorten its stride. As such, the proposed regulatory action will not result in benefits to the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety, or the state's environment.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED REGULATORY ACTION:

The proposed regulatory action was discussed at the August 21, 2025, Board meeting. No alternatives to the recommendation were proposed by the Board or by any other individual or entity at the meeting. No subsequent alternative recommendations were

made prior to the notice. The Board invites any interested party to submit comments that offer any alternative proposal.