

July 2026 Issue 150

FARRIERS REGISTRATION COUNCIL

Bulletin



REGULATING THE PROFESSION OF FARRIERY



*Reform of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966
– Defra Consultation*

Foreword



In January and February of this year the Government, through the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), conducted a consultation on future veterinary legislation. The notion of successor legislation to the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 is not new and has been considered over the last 10 years or thereabouts. What was new in the consultation was that Allied Veterinary Professionals (AVPs) would be included in the legislation, including farriers who have had discrete legislative provision for the last 50 years. The Council responded in detail to the consultation and the Chair of the Council called on the Minster to set out the Council's views. The Council's observations are set out in detail elsewhere in this edition of the Bulletin so that readers may be clear as to the position taken by the Council, and why. At time of writing this foreword we await the findings of the consultation and perhaps a Government White Paper; such papers serve as a foundation for discussion, debate and consultation with affected groups and the public before a bill is introduced to Parliament. The Council shall continue to monitor developments closely.

The BFBA hosted two meetings during 2025 which were attended by a wide range of stakeholders from across the farriery profession and Skills England; the core of discussion was how the profession may wish to develop the farriery apprenticeship, and how the profession might address both recruitment and training in the years ahead. For the farriery apprenticeship to endure it is fundamental that training farriers are prepared to employ apprentices, and without this the future of the apprenticeship may be uncertain. The role for the regulator is to remain focussed on equine welfare and safeguarding the public interest; put simply the regulator must be in a position where it can assure what the apprenticeship delivers and to be prepared to intervene where it considers it necessary. We expect further engagement on these issues this year.

The audit of CPD attainment in respect of 2025 is currently taking place. The standard of responses suggests a positive approach to CPD learning; encouragingly, the majority of registrants have responded quickly to requests for submissions and demonstrating CPD learning that achieved the mandatory requirements. We take this opportunity to remind registrants that there is no necessity to attend organised CPD events for which a charge is levied; registrants may plan their own learning and undertake self-directed study if they wish. Elsewhere in this edition of the Bulletin there is detailed guidance about the CPD scheme and responses to a number of questions asked by registrants.

Finally, we invite you to note two key dates for later this year:

- **26/27 September 2026** - Farrier Focus, Stoneleigh
- **6/7/8 November 2026** - Your Horse Live, Stoneleigh

David Greenwood, Registrar

Contents

Council Meeting Minutes	
Minutes of the AGM held on Wednesday 29 April 2026	11
Minutes of the Council Meeting held on Wednesday 29 April 2026	12
Featured Article	
Reform of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 – Defra Consultation	3
Council Member Questions with Mr Chris McKell, Deputy Chair of the Council	5
Guidance	
Approved Training Farriers (ATF) diary dates	7
Continuous Professional Development (CPD) - Assistance for Registrants	8
Hearing Updates	
Disciplinary Committee Hearings	15
Notices	
Policy Statement on Abuse, Bullying, Harassment and Intimidation	7
Council Meeting Dates	13
Higher Qualifications Achieved	37
Temporary Licence Applications	37

Featured Article >>>

Reform of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 – Defra Consultation

Readers of the Bulletin will be aware that the Government, through the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), conducted a consultation on reform of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 in January and February of this year. The Farriers Registration Council (FRC) responded to the consultation and also communicated its views directly to the Minister responsible for the consultation, both in person and in writing. The Council's position in respect of the Defra consultation is set out below.

The FRC disagree with reform of the Veterinary Surgeons Act (VSA) as it is proposed in the consultation, but we are open to reform where it delivers better regulation for the benefit of animals and the public. We have set out our detailed observations below: our high-level overview is that what is proposed appears to fly in the face of Government's own desire for better targeted, agile and proportionate regulation. The proposition set out in the consultation amounts to heavyweight regulation, prescriptive in approach and features measures that will deliver at best marginal benefit to the public and in our view less so to the various professions, and notably so in the case of Allied Veterinary Professionals (AVPs). Many of the regulatory proposals set out are disproportionate to the risks that are to be regulated, and, perhaps unsurprisingly, the consultation makes no attempt to cost the proposals. We anticipate a significant increase in costs for registered farriers, and this may push some farriery practitioners to the limits of viability and tempt some to practise unlawfully.

Overview

AVPs should be subject to statutory regulation for the benefit of the animal, its owner and more broadly in safeguarding the public interest. The extent of the regulation should be proportionate to the level of risk, for example a Saddler need not be subjected to the same level of regulatory oversight as a Veterinary Surgeon. The consultation appears not to acknowledge that regulation should be 'scaled' in this way; we suggest that any proposed regulatory measures be graded by risk and probability relative to the various professions and be applied only where there is a compelling case for doing so.

Farriers should remain subject to statutory regulation; however, the measures set out in the consultation are disproportionate and in the case of business regulation amount to regulatory overreach. The proposition that regulation of farriery in Northern Ireland may be achieved only by regulating farriery via a VSA is not correct and is misleading, a minor amendment to the Farriers Registration Act (FRA) (removal of one sentence) will achieve that outcome. The

consultation would benefit from detailed consideration of scope of practise across the animal welfare spectrum, which in our view is key in establishing where responsibility, accountability and authority should lie amongst relevant professionals.

Licence to Practise

The Licence to Practise measures offer no additional benefit to Registered Farriers nor to the public beyond that already delivered by the FRC; some measures operated by the FRC are more advanced than those proposed, such as directed Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for those rejoining the register after a period of absence. The consultation fails to set out arrangements for transfer and grandfather rights, and similarly in respect of differentiation between professionals.

Fitness to Practise

The Fitness to Practise proposals set out a three-stage system (triage, case examination and hearing); this is more bureaucratic, time consuming and expensive than the current two stage system operated by the FRC. What is proposed will almost certainly introduce delay in disposal of cases which is not in the best interests of either registrants or complainants. The two-stage process operated by the FRC allows cases to be disposed of in around 12 months, the three-stage process which is currently operated by many other regulators delivers disposals often measured in numbers of years. The proposals appear to be optimised for internal resolution within veterinary practices, but these options do not appear to be available to sole traders. While undertakings are an attractive sanction, they require a level of oversight/monitoring to ensure compliance, and we consider this will add to the costs of operating the Fitness to Practise scheme.

The notion that removal of licence/removal from the register is subject to an arbitrary period of time flies in the face of natural justice. The sanction should fit the matters found proved, taking note of aggravating and mitigating factors and should be proportionate and reasonable, and considered to be so by the public. The sanction is a matter for a properly constituted tribunal having been advised by its legal assessor, it should not be the product of a templated outcome.

No mention is made of measures, currently in use with the FRC, that are 'sub-referral' such as letters of advice and non-statutory warnings. In our experience these are valuable and proportionate in addressing shortcomings that do not merit referral. While the consultation indicates a belated evolution to the civil standard of proof, the notion of a sanction of 'not able to work alone' is absurd

in the context of farriery where the vast majority of practitioners are sole traders – this may apply also in respect of other AVPs.

Business Regulation

Proportionality is a key principle of regulation; the intrusive regulation of businesses set out in the consultation is not appropriate, and not necessary, for the farriery industry. Farriers are most often sole-traders, working independently from a vehicle at a place of the client's choice such as yard or livery, or at a private home, and at time of writing there may be of the order of 2600 'premises' that would be in scope. Powers of entry and seizure seem disproportionate in respect of a business delivering animal healthcare. Save for where animal cruelty or neglect is suspected it is far from clear why such a measure is considered necessary, and it may fail the test of what is reasonable.

We suggest that the proposals for business regulation breach the principle that regulation should be proportionate to the risk being managed, and the proposal, in respect of farriery, amounts to regulatory overreach. The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), the principal competition regulator in the UK, conducted a market investigation into veterinary services for household pets, but did not examine farriery and nor, to the best of our knowledge any of the other AVPs.

The extension of business regulations, as envisaged in the consultation paper, has the potential to make many farriery businesses unviable by way of increased costs and bureaucratic overload; this will increase costs for the regulator and the regulated. Aside from the risk of reducing the number of farriery practitioners at a time when the profession is contracting with a detrimental effect on equine welfare, it may tempt some to operate outwith regulation, i.e. unlawfully.

Governance

The key benefit of Option 2 would be increased public confidence in the regulator in that it may operate in the best interests of animals, their owners and the public, without interference (real or perceived) from the profession. This approach adheres with key regulatory interventions in the UK: see volume 5 of the public inquiry post Shipman into the operation of the General Medical Council (GMC) (Dame Janet Smith), and the report 'Striking the Balance' by Lord Paul Bew in applying the seven principles of public life to regulation. A lay majority on the regulatory body is key in safeguarding public confidence.

Option 1 (the status quo) appears 'cosy', and the public may take the view that the veterinary profession is 'marking its own homework' and 'looking after its own'. It is of note that no other statutory professional regulator uses this model – given the outcomes of Smith and Bew (above) that should come as no surprise. In our view there must be a clear separation of functions and powers between a Veterinary Regulator and the Veterinary Head of Profession; the two bodies would interact and have a professional relationship but would be mindful of each other's responsibilities.

The role of a professional leadership body might include the ownership of a strategy for the profession: i.e. a vision for where the profession wishes to be in 5 years, and a horizon out to 10 years. Such a body should own a research and development programme to shape the future of the profession, and perhaps also undertake talent management of the profession's brightest and best to encourage them to take up key appointments which will serve the profession's long-term interests.

The regulator shall need to set a fee that enables it to deliver its statutory outputs; separately, policies that are non-statutory (matters of choice) may be the subject of discussion or consultation. In terms of nomenclature and post-nominals there must be differentiation between the various professions, including within AVPs, i.e. Equine Dentist, Saddler, Equine Physiotherapist etc.

The options on offer are few and the consultation favours Option 1. This flies in the face of regulatory best practise and the outcome of a public inquiry. Option 2 will serve the public interest best – that is key and should prevail over other concerns. Other options appear not have been considered and merit consideration, including having a regulator for the AVPs (akin to the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)) attenuated to their regulation and leaving a Veterinary regulator to regulate Vets and Vet Nurses.

The FRC stands ready to engage further in the development of options for modernisation of regulation in the animal welfare sector; options should embrace the key principles of necessity, proportionality and what is reasonable.

A consultation report should be published in due course reflecting Defra's analysis of the consultation; at time of writing the publication date is not known.

Featured Article >>>

Council Member Questions with Mr Chris McKell, Deputy Chair of the Council

Please tell us about your professional background and experience as a Registered Farrier?

My journey toward becoming a farrier first began when I was about fourteen years old, driven by my passion for horse riding and my involvement with the New Forest Pony Club. During that time, I was then inspired by Steve Belasco, a local farrier whose advice - *"if you think that'll do, it probably won't"* - has remained with me ever since. Initially, I had intended to join the Army and eventually train as a farrier there. Unfortunately, in 1992, just before I was set to go to Pirbright, an Army recruitment cutback altered those plans and closed that path.

However, I remained committed to my goal and actively sought an apprenticeship, which led to a fortunate opportunity in 1993 with Phillip Perryman. I did my college training at Hereford College. Working with Phillip I gained valuable experience working with a wide range of equines. Phillip was actively competing in farriery competitions during that time, and I also participated in apprentice classes. Competing not only helped me build confidence but also provided clear insights into areas where I needed improvement. I am not the most natural shoemaker, so I found this really helped. Interestingly, I completed my final DWCF exams at The Defence Animal Training Centre in Melton Mowbray, the same place where Army farriers were trained. Today, after many years in the profession, I continue to shoe a variety of horses and ponies, managing a small but sustainable business. I think when it is going well it is the best job in the world and I never get tired of hearing some of the funny stories' clients like to share.

What impressions about the profession do you take from your work as a Council Member?

Having spent over a year as a Council Member, I have gained a deep appreciation for the complexities involved in managing a regulatory body. Before joining, I admit I took much of this work for granted, unaware of the dedication and effort required behind the scenes. The farriery industry, like many others, faces significant challenges shaped by economic factors, political influences, and the evolving career interests of young people. Despite these pressures, I have witnessed firsthand the unwavering commitment of both FRC members and staff to ensure the Council operates professionally and effectively. Every decision is made thoughtfully and with careful consideration, reflecting the seriousness with which the regulatory duties are approached.



Beyond professionalism, there is a keen sense of camaraderie and respect among everyone involved. The friendly and supportive atmosphere assures me that the industry is in capable hands, with a regulatory team that truly prioritises the well-being and integrity of the profession.

To enhance my own understanding of regulatory practices, I took the initiative to enroll in Regulation training with The London School of Economics. Completing the course last year was daunting but a rewarding experience. I felt I needed to do this to be more knowledgeable about regulation as a Council Member.

Tell us about your duties as a Council Member and how you carry them out.

On the Registration Council, I serve as Deputy Chair and participate as a committee member on both the Policy and Finance Committee and the Approvals Committee. Each committee is responsible for distinct functions that are integral to the overall operations of the Council. Through my involvement, I contribute to the development, oversight, and approval of policies and financial matters.

I regularly attend Council meetings and strongly prefer to do so in person. Meeting face-to-face allows for better engagement and facilitates easier, more effective

conversations with fellow members. This personal connection is important for discussing complex issues and reaching thoughtful decisions as a group.

Preparation ahead of meetings is essential. I make it a priority to read all relevant material multiple times, because I am too afraid that I might miss something. Fortunately, I enjoy reading and find Council materials genuinely interesting, especially since they relate to our profession.

What do you think your experience as a Registered Farrier brings to the Council?

As a Registered Farrier on the Council this allows me to offer my professional insights to fellow Council Members, likewise the presence of other farriers on the Council ensures that our perspectives are consistently considered during discussions and decision-making processes. The Council itself is composed of individuals from a variety of fascinating backgrounds and experiences, each bringing their unique viewpoints and expertise. This diverse range of experiences enriches our conversations and strengthens the Council's ability to address the regulation needs of the profession from multiple angles.

How do you interact with the other Council Members, and particularly the lay members?

I make a point of arriving at Council meetings way too early, it's surprising how much you can learn whilst at the urn making a cup of tea. I tend to be more of a listener than a talker (though I do have plenty to say) but I enjoy catching up with colleagues and hearing about their recent activities. This informal approach serves as an ice breaker, helping everyone, including me, to feel more at ease and create a relaxed atmosphere as we start the meeting itself. Outside of meetings, I also maintain contact with the Chair of the Council through occasional phone calls, ensuring ongoing communication. From time to time, I socialize with lay members prior to meetings, which I find beneficial for getting to know the team on a more personal level. The Council includes highly competent individuals from other industries, whose views, and opinions I deeply respect. These opportunities further enhance teamwork and understanding within the Council. Your Horse Live is a fantastic opportunity to promote the use of Registered Farriers to horse owners and a chance to get to know other Council Members.

Do you think Registered Farriers understand their professional responsibilities, and if not why?

I think broadly speaking yes, most farriers understand their professional responsibilities, because everything is well communicated out to registrants, and as a small industry farriers often communicate to each other what is expected, so it doesn't take long to get the message. CPD has been one of the changes in recent years and I think overall this has been really well received.

What advice would you give to farriers given the knowledge you have gained from being a Council Member?

The FRC are a very friendly dedicated group of people who are highly motivated by animal welfare and public protection. I had absolutely no idea before how well the office is run, and I can honestly say, they are pretty slick.

Annual Report

The Annual Report for 2025 is now available to view on the Council's website www.farrier-reg.gov.uk

Hard copies of the Annual Report are available for Registered Farriers upon request from the FRC Office.



Notices >>>

ATF Training Days and Train the Trainer Farrier Award (TTFA) - 2026

ATF Annual Training Days

Approved Training Farrier (ATF) Policy states that to retain a position on the ATF list an ATF must be compliant with FRC policies and procedures. This includes attending a College ATF training day each year and is irrespective of whether the ATF has an apprentice currently in training or not.

The following dates have been confirmed, please contact the Colleges directly to confirm a place.

■ Myerscough College: Wednesday 2 December 2026

The FRC will publish information on future ATF training days when details become available.

Please check the FRC website at www.farrier-reg.gov.uk/news-events/events/ for updates or contact the Colleges directly.

Train the Trainer Farrier Award (TTFA)

Registered Farriers interested in applying to become an Approved Training Farrier (ATF) are required to complete the Train the Trainer Award (TTFA). Please contact the Colleges directly for further information.

For further information on scheduled ATF Annual Training Days or TTFA courses please contact the Colleges directly:

**Herefordshire, Ludlow and North
Shropshire College (Holme Lacy)**

www.hlcollege.ac.uk

Tel: 01432 870316

Myerscough College

www.myerscough.ac.uk

Tel: 01995 640611

**Warwickshire College Group
(Moreton Morrell)**

www.warwickshire.ac.uk

Tel: 0330 135 6849

Registrants are reminded that an equivalent coaching or training certificate or qualification may be considered as part of an ATF application. The suitability of any such qualification will be a matter for the consideration of the FRC; please contact the FRC for further information.

Policy Statement on Abuse, Bullying, Harassment and Intimidation

The FRC staff are committed to providing you with the highest level of service on behalf of your regulatory body at all times; the FRC staff have the right to provide that service in a safe environment.

The FRC will not tolerate abuse, bullying, harassment and intimidation aimed at the FRC staff. This includes threats of violence and includes actions made in person, on the telephone or via any electronic means. Should such behaviour take place the FRC staff may refer the incident to appropriate law enforcement or civil authorities, and staff may refer the incident to the Investigating Committee of the FRC.

Thank you for your consideration.

Continuous Professional Development (CPD) - Assistance for Registrants

The third audit of CPD since the extension of the CPD programme in January 2023 is now underway. Letters have been sent to those selected for audit requesting CPD records for 2025; the FRC is pleased to see an encouraging uptake of the CPD programme in the majority of cases.

As a mandatory requirement registrants will be aware that in instances of non-compliance either by failing to make a submission or by failing to achieve the prescribed CPD levels, the audit panel may direct that a referral be made to the Investigating Committee (IC) as a matter of serious professional misconduct. It is important therefore that registrants are clear on the requirement; initial assessment of some records submitted for audit highlights areas where registrants appear unclear of the requirement, and what may or may not be considered to be CPD.

We take this opportunity to address some of these areas and matters arising:

Queries relating to the age of a registrant selected for audit	<i>All those on the Register are required to undertake CPD regardless of age, qualification, experience or current farriery activity. An individual planning to retire imminently will still be expected to undertake CPD and could possibly be selected for audit; those who have left the Register will not be selected for audit.</i>
Queries relating to registrants on the register but no longer actively shoeing	<i>Unless a registrant has formally resigned from the register, they are still required to undertake CPD. There are exceptions such as unable to work due to medical problems or maternity leave. Those individuals who wish to claim exception for these reasons should provide written evidence to the FRC. Farriers overseas are still expected to achieve CPD and make their submissions online.</i>
Complaints about being selected for audit	<i>Registrants should be aware that selection for CPD audit is made on a random basis and that any repeated selection is random not intentional. By virtue of their role ATFs should be aware that they will be subject to an audit of their CPD record every year.</i>
Registrants not submitting their CPD records	<i>In line with requirements listed in the Farrier, Approved Training Farrier & Apprentice Code of Professional Conduct which states that a registrant must respond promptly and constructively to any request from the FRC, registrants must submit details of their annual CPD record when requested to do so.</i>
Recording but not submitting points online	<i>For those registrants using the online CPD tools within My FRC (www.farrier-reg.gov.uk) it is important to read the instructions and ensure that you have completed the necessary steps to submit your records to the FRC. Please note that recording CPD activities alone does not constitute submission to the FRC and that submission of the year's CPD activities is a separate step.</i>

Submitting illegible handwritten records	<i>For those registrants who do not wish to use the FRC's online facilities, typed or handwritten CPD records are acceptable and should be supplied to the FRC upon request. It is important to note that illegible records will not be accepted and will not count towards meeting the requirement.</i>
Omitting information / providing too much information	<i>All records must contain a registrant's full name and address, event/activity details, date, duration and a good description as to the learning benefit of the activity. It is important to include the number of CPD points claimed for each activity and a total over the year. Registrants should note that the FRC will not calculate the number of points claimed for a particular activity; registrants are required to do this.</i> <i>Registrants should note that there is no necessity to provide copies of certificates of attendance at events and photographs of work undertaken.</i> <i>Lengthy correspondence describing successes and experiences throughout a long career are not relevant and do not constitute CPD.</i>
Not recording enough CPD activity	<i>Registrants must record a minimum of 20 hours CPD activity annually (10 CPD points). Where a registrant can demonstrate 60 hours (30 CPD points) over the last 3 years the FRC will accept this when the annual requirement is not achieved.</i>
Failing to provide a description of what was learnt	<i>In addition to the event/activity name or title CPD returns must include a description of the learning benefit. It is important that you provide sufficient detail about what was learned by taking part in the activity. Registrants are encouraged to think about the phrase "by taking part in this activity I learnt". An activity or event titled 'shoeing' will not be considered to have enough detail and may be disallowed.</i>
Claiming CPD for teaching activities	<i>Teaching others does not necessarily constitute CPD learning. Where you are teaching a subject that is new and necessitates learning and preparation to do so, that time may be considered a learning activity and therefore CPD. Subsequent repetitions of that activity may involve preparation but will not be considered to provide a registrant with a learning opportunity.</i>
Claiming CPD for taking part in farriery competitions or acting at a steward/duty farrier at a show.	<i>If a farrier is required to do something they have not done before when participating in a competition or show, perhaps with feedback being provided, then there is a learning benefit which will count as CPD. The key criteria is learning benefit and including this learning benefit in a submitted CPD record; where a farrier makes a shoe, they have made many times before and receives no learning benefit then this does not constitute CPD.</i>
Claiming CPD for non-farrier related activities	<i>The CPD Guide states that to be relevant, CPD has to be relevant to the farrier in their professional role or to the running of their farriery business. Therefore, there may be opportunities to gain CPD that is not equine based e.g. learning a new accounting system, updating yourself on Health and Safety, First Aid, or employment legislation. Instances of learning which are not relevant, such as learning to ride a motor bike or attending a speed awareness course in lieu of penalty points or a fine, will be disqualified as irrelevant when assessed at audit.</i>



Council Meeting Minutes >>>

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting (AGM) held on Wednesday 29 April 2026

1. Apologies for Absence and Welcome

Apologies were received from Operations Superintendent K Colman, Mr D Harman and Mr D Mountford.

It was noted that Ms J Bryan, appointed by Lantra had resigned from the Council.

The British Equestrian Federation had confirmed their appointment of Ms G Stanford, who has yet to complete her induction.

2. Declarations of Interest

Council Members declared possible conflicts of interest as follows:

Dr J Sutton - appointed by the RCVS, FEI Anti-Doping Official and Equine Insurance Underwriter

Mr A B Charlwood - appointed by the WCF, WCF Liveryman and Honorary Assistant to the Court of the WCF

Mr I Davidson - appointed by Scottish Enterprise

Mr S Green - working farrier, member of BFBA and horse owner

Mr B J Howson - working farrier, member of BFBA and horse owner

Mr A Jordan - appointed by the WCF and WCF Liveryman

Mr R A Kearn - working farrier

Mr C D McKell - working farrier

Mr H Price - appointed by WCF, member of WCF and BFBA, horse owner and working farrier

Mr J Sim - working farrier, member of the BFBA and BFBA Executive Committee

Mr L Williams - appointed by British Horseracing Authority

3. Minutes of the Annual General Meeting – 30 April 2025

The approved minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 30 April 2025 were noted.

4. Matters Arising from the AGM which are not Agenda items and which have not been progressed at ordinary Council Meetings

There were no matters arising.

5. To Approve:

5.1 Committee Membership 2026

The Council considered membership of its committees for 2026 and decided as follows:

- Policy and Finance Committee (P&FC) – The Council **APPROVED** the continued appointment of Mr A Charlwood as Chair and the membership of the P&FC.

- Approvals Committee (AC) – The Council **APPROVED** the appointment of Mr T Smith FWCF GradDip ELR as Chair and the membership of the AC.

A list of Council Committee membership and Council representatives to the Farriery Apprenticeship Steering Group (FASG) set out at Appendix A to these Council minutes was considered and **APPROVED** by the Council.

5.2 2025 Audited Accounts

Mr Charlwood presented the Audited Accounts for 2025 for Council approval. Mr Charlwood reported that 2025 had been another good year for financial control and thanked Mrs N Finck and Mr K Denman for their efficient collation of the accounts. The Auditors had given the FRC a clean bill of health with no recommendations. The Registrar reminded Council Members that the Auditors did not just check numbers, they also checked the Council's continued compliance with its own policies and other regulations.

The Council **APPROVED** the Audited Accounts for 2025.

5.3 2025 Annual Report

The Council considered the draft Annual Report for 2025.

The Council **APPROVED** the draft Annual Report for 2025 for publication. The Council was reminded the report, including the audited accounts, would be published on the FRC website and hard copies made available on request.

6. To Note:

6.1 Annual Declarations and Confidentiality

It was noted that in accordance with the 'Countering Financial Crime Risks' policy, Council Members and Council employees had completed an Annual Declaration for 2026. Additionally, Council Members had submitted annual confidentiality statements.

Any Other Business (AOB)

There were no matters of AOB.

The meeting concluded at 10.46

Annex A: FRC Policy and Guides **APPROVED** during this meeting

- 2025 Audited Accounts
- 2025 Annual Report

Council Meeting Minutes >>>

Minutes of the Council Meeting held on Wednesday 29 April 2026

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Operations Superintendent K Colman, Mr D Harman and Mr D Mountford.

2. Declarations of Interest

Council members declared possible conflicts of interest as follows:

Dr J Sutton - appointed by the RCVS, FEI Anti-Doping Official and Equine Insurance Underwriter

Mr A B Charlwood - appointed by the WCF, WCF Liveryman and Honorary Assistant to the Court of the WCF

Mr I Davidson - appointed by Scottish Enterprise

Mr S Green - working farrier, member of BFBA and horse owner

Mr B J Howson - working farrier, member of BFBA and horse owner

Mr A Jordan - appointed by the WCF and WCF Liveryman

Mr R A Kearns - working farrier

Mr C D McKell - working farrier

Mr H Price - appointed by WCF, member of WCF and BFBA, horse owner and working farrier

Mr J Sim - working farrier, member of the BFBA and BFBA Executive Committee

Mr L Williams - appointed by British Horseracing Authority

3. Notification of any items to be raised under 'Any Other Business' (AOB)

No matters had been submitted by Council Members ahead of the meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 October 2025, and the Extra Ordinary meeting held on 17 February 2026 were noted for reference purposes only; the minutes had previously been approved by the Council out of committee.

5. Matters Arising which are not Agenda Items

There were no matters arising to be considered.

6. To Receive and Consider the following Reports and Associated Papers:

6.1 Defra Consultation on new Veterinary Legislation

The Council noted that the FRC response to the Defra consultation on reform of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 was submitted through the online portal as

requested by Defra on 13 March 2026. A summary of the Council's submission was subsequently posted on the FRC Website on 19 March 2026. Additionally, the Council had acted as a joint signatory together with 16 other Allied Veterinary Professionals (AVPs) on an agreed position statement that was also submitted to Defra.

In discussion the Chair set out that he had attended a positive meeting with the Minister to discuss the proposals; the Minister had made clear that there was not presently any parliamentary time allocated for the progression of new veterinary legislation. The proposals had been considered contentious and would probably need significant time to be properly considered and progressed.

Council members commended the Registrar on the summary paper that condensed the Council's position; some members were keen to maintain momentum and use the document proactively to identify reforms to farriery regulation, noting that such reforms may require legislation.

[The Chair concluded the open session of the Council Meeting]

7. THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12 and 7.13 WERE CONDUCTED IN CLOSED SESSION OF THE COUNCIL TO CONSIDER MATTERS OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COMMERCIAL SENSITIVITY

7.1 Report of the Approvals Committee

7.2 Minutes of the Policy and Finance Committee (P&FC) Meeting of 25 March 2026

7.3 Rules of FRC

7.4 The Register of Farriers and Registration Policy and Procedures

7.5 Policy and Procedures for Council Meetings

7.6 Financial Policy and Procedures

7.7 Countering Financial Crime and Risks Policy

7.8 Financial Crime - Money Laundering Risk Assessment

7.9 Investigating Committee Manual

7.10 Disciplinary Committee Manual

7.11 Remuneration Statement for Statutory Committees

7.12 Disciplinary Committee Remuneration Policy

7.13 Council Member Expense Policy

8. Any Other Business:

There were no matters of AOB.

The meeting concluded at 11.44am

Date of Next Meeting – Wednesday 21 October 2026

Annex A: FRC Policy, Guides and Reports APPROVED during this meeting

- Risk Register
- Rules of the FRC
- Register of Farriers and Registration Policy and Procedures
- Policy and Procedures for Council Meetings
- Financial Policy and Procedures
- Countering Financial Crime and Risks Policy
- Financial Crime – Money Laundering Risk Assessment
- Investigating Committee Manual
- Disciplinary Committee Manual
- Remuneration Statement for Statutory Committees
- Council Member Expense Policy

Approved: James Sutton 22/05/2026

Council Meeting Dates for 2026

The Farriers Registration Council (FRC) meets twice a year.

The next Council Meeting for 2026 is scheduled for **Wednesday 21 October 2026.**

Agendas will be posted on the FRC website at www.farrier-reg.gov.uk





Disciplinary Committee Hearings

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE (DC): MR H LYMER DIPWCF
Set out below is the determination and decision of the DC in respect of Mr Lymer; the determination and decision may be read on the FRC website at www.farrier-reg.gov.uk

THE CHARGE

"That being registered under the Farriers (Registration) Act 1975 (as amended) ("the Act"), you:

1. On 13 February 2025, while a horse named Blue, owned by Mrs JP, was being tended to by another person, you used unnecessary force towards Blue by:
 - a) striking Blue to his face with your hand twice; and/or
 - b) twisting and/or pulling Blue's ear with your hand.

And that in relation to the facts alleged above, whether individually or in any combination, you are guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect."

Preliminary matters

Ms Nicole Curtis appeared on behalf of the Farriers Registration Council ("FRC"). Mr Jonathan Buckle appeared on behalf of Mr Lymer, who was also present.

Consideration for part of the hearing to be held in private

At the outset of the hearing, Mr Buckle made an application that part of the hearing be heard in private where mention is made of matters relating to Mr Lymer's personal and family life. Ms Curtis supported the application.

The Committee considered the matter with care and accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor, who referred to Rule 11 of the Farriers Registration Council Disciplinary Committee (Procedure) Rules 1976 ("the Rules"). In accordance with Rule 11 hearings before the Committee ordinarily take place in public so that the public are aware of the functions being carried out by the Regulator. However, Rule 11(3) does allow for the hearing, or part of the hearing, to be heard in private where it is in the interests of justice to do so. The interests of justice include compliance with Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects an individual's right to respect for their private and family life. Accordingly, the Committee agreed that, if and when any reference were made to Mr Lymer's health or family matters, the public would be excluded in order to protect his private life and any reference

to such matters in this determination will be marked private.

Admissions

Mr Lymer formally admitted all the Charges and the Committee, therefore, found them proved in their entirety, on the basis of his admissions, as supported by the unequivocal video evidence.

Background

Ms JP owned a rescue horse named Blue, acquired in 2003. At the time of the incident Blue was 22 years old. Blue was kept at [Redacted] Yard ("the Yard") in the West Midlands. Many of the people who used the Yard relied on Mr Lymer to shoe and trim their horses' feet and Ms P was not aware of any concerns about Mr Lymer, having spoken to other owners. She said she had also met him on a couple of occasions when he had been at the Yard to see other clients and also, she said, when he trimmed Blue in October 2024, together with another horse owned by Ms P.

Ms P said Blue's feet were usually trimmed every three to four months, so this was next due around February 2025. Ms P learned that Mr Lymer was due to be at the Yard on 13 February 2025 and so arranged for him to trim Blue while he was there. Ms P was not able to be at the Yard on that day due to work commitments but, as Mr Lymer had trimmed Blue's feet before (and many other horses at the Yard), Ms P said she did not have any concerns that there might be an issue if she were not present. Ms P was aware that the owner of the Yard was also not present because she had been called away on an emergency.

The day after, on 14 February 2025, Ms P went to the Yard to see Blue. On seeing Blue she said, "*Blue was not his usual self and he was not allowing me to put his head collar on. I also noticed that Blue seemed to be sensitive when I touched his face over the next few days. By sensitive, I meant that he reacted to indicate that he did not want me to touch his face.*"

Ms P said that it was standard procedure for the owner of the Yard to review the CCTV footage of the Yard from time-to-time. The owner informed Ms P that she had observed on the CCTV footage Mr Lymer hitting Blue on 13 February 2025. Ms P was provided with a copy of the footage. Ms P described what she saw on the footage as follows:

"In this footage I can see Mr Lymer holding Blue by his head. Mr

Hearing Updates >>>

Lymer is wearing a blue hooded top, a baseball cap, grey trousers and chaps. There is another person in the video behind Mr Lymer. He is wearing a light grey hooded top, dark trousers and chaps. I understand this man is an apprentice. I do not know this other man's name. Mr Lymer appears to be holding Blue's reins with his left hand while the other man in the light grey top works on Blue's feet. Shortly after the video starts, Mr Lymer punches Blue twice on the side of his face using his right hand. I can also see Mr Lymer pull hard at Blue's left ear in an aggressive manner. When he pulls on Blue's ear, he appears to twist the ear as well."

After she watched the footage, Ms P contacted Mr Lymer via a message platform to ask him why she was watching footage of him hitting Blue. She said Mr Lymer replied with words to the effect of 'can we sort this out between ourselves'. She replied no, saying that Mr Lymer had no excuse for hitting Blue or any horse. Ms P said that she was very angry at the time of these messages. In her formal complaint to the FRC, Ms P said she was horrified when she watched the video. She said Blue was a rescue horse and she had *"devoted many years of supporting him back to a happy and stable living environment ..."* She added, *"to observe Harvey Lymer, who is in such a trusted position as a Farrier, carrying out such a horrific act on such a vulnerable, gentle horse is an act of abuse which I find unbearable."*

The Committee was provided with the video footage and the Committee Members were able to confirm that the description given by Ms P reflected what was seen on the video, although it was not clear if the hitting was with a closed fist or an open hand (Mr Lymer was later to say in evidence that it was with an open hand).

In a letter to the FRC, dated 14 April 2025, from the solicitors representing Mr Lymer, it was said *"Our client strongly denies that he acted in any way that constituted animal abuse, criminality, or misconduct. He is a registered farrier of longstanding good reputation who conducts himself in accordance with the 2024 Code of Professional Conduct for Registered Farriers. He is well aware of his duty, under paragraph 12(a), to treat horses humanely and with welfare as the primary consideration."*

The letter went on to say that on the day in question Ms P was not present and nor was the Yard owner. The solicitor said that no information was provided to Mr Lymer in advance about the horse's temperament or background. Crucially, it was said, Mr Lymer was not informed that the horse was a sensitive rescue animal, or that it had previously demonstrated

behavioural difficulties during farriery.

The solicitor went on to say:

"It is noted that, in circumstances where a horse is known to be reactive or challenging to shoe or trim, particularly as a rescue, it is incumbent upon the owner to either be present or arrange for someone familiar with the horse to assist. Section 13(g) of the Code is clear: "Farriers must not attend to trim or shoe a horse in the absence of the client, or other person responsible for that animal, without prior arrangement." This raises an important question: why did Ms. P, with knowledge of the horse's behavioural issues, consent and arrange for Mr Lymer to attend to trim the Horse knowing that no one would be present?"

Mr Lymer denied having knowingly worked on Blue before, saying he believed this was the first time.

The solicitor went on to explain what happened, stating:

"On the day in question, our client was assisting a colleague who was trimming the horse's feet. The front feet were trimmed without issue, but the horse became increasingly difficult and agitated when his hind feet were being trimmed, threatening to kick out. The horse's feet were very overdue to be trimmed and in poor condition, showing signs of cracking that posed a potential risk of infection and future lameness. As the horse began kicking out aggressively, the situation became dangerous for both the farriers and the horse, especially as there was no one available who knows the horse to assist. Our client was however mindful that leaving the horse's hooves in their current condition could amount to a welfare concern. Our client's decision to proceed with treatment was driven by the horse's welfare, not convenience. His professional judgement, as permitted under paragraph 13(i) of the Code, required him to balance his own welfare and the wishes of the client."

Mr Lymer subsequently provided a witness statement for these proceedings, dated 23 February 2026. He described what happened on 13 February 2025 (albeit wrongly referred to as 19 February 2025) as follows:

"On 19 February 2025, I was at [Redacted] Yard in Enville assisting a colleague who was trimming a horse's feet.

The front feet were completed without issue. However, when the hind feet were attempted, the horse became increasingly agitated and began kicking out aggressively.

The horse's hooves were severely overgrown and showed signs of cracking and seedy toe (white line disease), which posed a risk of infection and potential lameness if left untreated.

As attempts were made to lift and trim the hind feet, the horse kicked out repeatedly, narrowly missing both myself and my colleague on several occasions. The situation became increasingly dangerous.

I attempted to reassure the horse through calm verbal communication, scratching and patting.

Attempts were also made to distract and settle the horse with feed, hay and licks, but these measures were unsuccessful.

There was no person present who was familiar with the horse to assist in handling it.

I intervened as I could see my colleague struggling to complete the hoof care safely.

In a brief window of approximately 30 seconds, actions were taken by me in an attempt to regain control of the situation and enable the hoof care to be completed. These actions are visible in the video footage.

I accept that my actions on that occasion were inappropriate and fell below the standards expected of a registered farrier.

My intention at the time was to ensure the safety of those present and to complete necessary hoof care which, in my judgement, was important for the horse's welfare. However, I recognise that my actions were not the correct or appropriate way to manage the situation.

Following the incident, the horse settled and the hoof care was completed. I praised the horse afterwards."

Mr Lymer went on to say that at the time of the incident he was feeling under pressure. He was concerned about the welfare of the horse given the condition of its hooves and he was concerned for the safety of his colleague.

PRIVATE

[redacted]

PUBLIC

Mr Lymer went on to say that he had reflected considerably about this incident. He said he deeply regretted his actions, which were out of character and inconsistent with the professional standards he has maintained throughout his 11 years as a qualified Farrier. He offered his *"sincere apology to the horse's owner, to the Committee, and to the profession."* He added, *"I recognise that my conduct has the potential to undermine public confidence in the profession and the regulatory body."*

If faced with a similar situation again, Mr Lymer said that he would insist upon the presence of someone familiar with the horse; decline to proceed and rearrange the appointment; seek veterinary assistance where appropriate; or refuse to carry out the work if it could not be done safely and appropriately. Mr Lymer added that since the incident, he has undertaken additional training in horse behaviour to ensure he is better equipped to manage challenging situations appropriately in future. He said he has learned that if a situation escalates beyond safe and appropriate handling, he must step away rather than attempt to resolve it under pressure.

Mr Lymer gave details about his family situation and how he is the sole breadwinner and thus any period of suspension or removal from the Register would have a direct financial impact on him and his family.

Mr Lymer provided a significant number of character references from long-standing clients, fellow Farriers and veterinary professionals. His clients described his professionalism, expertise and caring approach and his particular skill and patience when dealing with challenging horses that can be difficult to shoe. Reference was made to the obvious pride Mr Lymer takes in his work and how he treats every horse as an individual and in a relaxed way. To quote one stable owner, *"I have only ever seen Harvey be extremely professional and compassionate around my horses and I completely trust him around them; he does an amazing job with our Thoroughbreds who aren't always the easiest. I am more than happy to provide any further information should it be needed to support Harvey. Good farriers are worth their weight in gold and Harvey is one of those good ones who doesn't just do a job, he genuinely wants to provide the best possible care for the horses he is responsible for."*

Hearing Updates >>>

Mr Lymer also works as the Team Farrier for the British Young Riders Endurance Team and one of his current clients is a retired FEI (Fédération Équestre Internationale) Endurance Judge. She provided a reference in which she described Mr Lymer as a *"fantastic addition to the Team"*, having been recommended as someone who was extremely caring and knowledgeable of horse care and farriery. She has never had any concerns about the way in which Mr Lymer treats her horses and said that even when they have had issues with older horses that struggle to stay still, Mr Lymer has *"never lost his cool"*. Consequently, she was shocked to hear of what happened in this case, since she had never known Mr Lymer to exhibit any such behaviour when looking after her horses.

Another stable owner who has been involved with horses the majority of her life said of Mr Lymer, *"I have used a number of fairers over this period of time and i can honestly say that Mr Harvey Lymer is by far the best fairer i have encountered, he has been providing exceptional hoof care for all of my personal horses and those of my liverys for the last decade, i would never have any intention of replacing him due to the exceptional standard of his work, i would, and have recommended him to a number of people over the years and would always recommend him without hesitation. He is a very knowledgeable, skilled, professional and patient fairer and is always at hand to help whenever or wherever needed, i have personally experienced this in general and also in emergencies situations alike."* (sic)

Veterinary Surgeons with whom Mr Lymer has worked alongside were equally praiseworthy, describing his professionalism, warmth and empathy. One Vet said of him, *"His professional yet warm friendliness naturally seemed to foster long-term trust with the Horses and the clients, and they trusted him implicitly and are in my witness very relaxed with Harvey as the Farrier. Harvey has appeared to me to show a profound Dedication to Animal Welfare and above all, his work is driven by a profound and evident love for Horses and other animals. This isn't just a career for him it appears to me to be his way of Life. This "patient-first" philosophy ensures that animal welfare is always the priority, and it is a quality that I have seen as a colleague and his clients that I know of, deeply admire."* In summary, that Vet said, *"Harvey Lymer is a reliable, hardworking, and exceptionally kind and compassionate Farrier who would be an asset to any Horse/ Client fortunate enough to have him as their Farrier, and I fully recommend him as a professional Farrier without reservation."*

Mr Lymer also provided a Certificate from The Horse Trust for his recent attendance on 'The Redwings and Horse Trust Online CPD (Continuing Professional Development) for Farriers: Equine Welfare and Legislation' and was awarded 4 credits.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE ON THE FACTS

Rule 6 only requires the Committee to deliberate and decide any facts that are not admitted. Since all the facts were admitted, as indicated above, it was not necessary for the Committee to decide any of the facts. Accordingly, the Committee found all the Charges proved.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES ON SERIOUS MISCONDUCT IN A PROFESSIONAL RESPECT

Ms Curtis submitted that Mr Lymer was guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect. She drew the Committee's attention to the Code and in particular the guiding principle that Registered Farriers are expected to:

"make horse welfare their first consideration, with due regard to a safe working environment, and to fulfil their professional responsibilities by upholding the following guiding principles:

- ensure that all horses under your care are treated humanely and with respect
- uphold the good reputation of the Farriery profession"

Ms Curtis also referred to the declaration made by farriers on graduating, which is stated to apply to all farriers and includes a solemn declaration that *"...my constant endeavour will be to ensure the welfare of horses committed to my care."*

In addition, Ms Curtis referred to paragraphs 12(a) and 16(c) of the Code, which state that:

12 (a) Farriers must treat all horses humanely, with respect, and with welfare as the primary consideration.

16 (c) Farriers must not engage in any activity or behaviour that would be likely to bring the profession into disrepute...

Ms Curtis invited the Committee to consider the risk of injury to an animal as an aggravating factor and also the fact that the conduct was repeated in that there were two blows and also a twisting/pulling of the ear.

In a letter to the Council, dated 23 February 2026, those representing Mr Lymer stated he accepted his actions were inappropriate and that they amounted to misconduct in a professional respect. The representative went on to say that Mr Lymer expressed genuine remorse for his conduct and acknowledged that his actions did not meet the professional standards required of him as a Registered Farrier.

The letter went on to say, *“However, the actions occurred in the context of a rapidly escalating and potentially dangerous situation, where the horse was kicking aggressively and there were concerns regarding both safety and the horse’s hoof condition. These matters are not advanced as an excuse but will be relied upon by way of explanation and mitigation.”*

Mr Lymer told the Committee that he accepted his behaviour crossed the threshold for serious misconduct in a professional respect.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE ON SERIOUS MISCONDUCT IN A PROFESSIONAL RESPECT

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor who referred to the principles to be applied when considering serious misconduct in a professional respect. The Committee took into account Mr Lymer’s candid acceptance that his behaviour amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect, but nevertheless came to its own independent decision on this matter.

As a Registered Farrier, Mr Lymer was duty bound to abide by the Guiding Principles set out in the relevant provisions in the Codes of, and Guide to, Professional Conduct.

The Committee found the following parts of the Code to have been breached in this case:

- 12 (a) Farriers must treat all horses humanely, with respect, and with welfare as the primary consideration.
- 16 (a) Farriers must promote responsible horse management.
- 16 (c) Farriers must not engage in any activity or behaviour that would be likely to bring the profession into disrepute...
- 16 (e) Farriers must not exhibit behaviour that is at variance with the core values of a Registered Farrier ...

The Committee also considered what action a Farrier should take when dealing with a difficult horse. Paragraph 24 of the Code provides guidance, that was not followed in this case, such as not continuing to work with an animal if it is felt that the present temperament of the horse is unfavourable to a successful outcome and/or the health and safety of the farriers or others, including the horse, may be compromised by proceeding.

The Committee considered there to be the following aggravating factors present in this case:

- risk of injury to an animal, albeit low;
- breach of client trust in that there would be an expectation from the client that their horse would be treated well and without the use of unnecessary force;
- risk of undermining public confidence in the farriery profession.

The Committee considered there to be the following mitigating factors specific to the actual conduct:

- the circumstances of the incident, including the welfare of an animal;
- single and isolated incident;
- decision taken without the opportunity for full reflection;
- the absence of the horse owner or anyone else at the Yard to assist with Blue.

The Committee was also mindful that Blue had not been trimmed for over four months and was overdue a trimming. Three of the four feet had been done and it was important for the last hoof to have been completed. However, the action taken by Mr Lymer was not necessary and was not the appropriate way to have dealt with matters, as he readily admits.

Mr Lymer admitted, and the Committee found proved, that during the course of the appointment on 13 February 2025, he used unnecessary force by deliberately striking Blue’s head with his hand on two occasions and that he twisted or pulled Blue’s ear. Such behaviour was directly contrary to the guiding principle that Farriers are expected to ensure that all horses under their care are treated humanely and with respect, as echoed in Code 12(a), which emphasises that the welfare of horses is the primary consideration. It is also a clear breach

Hearing Updates >>>

of, in particular, Code 16(c), namely Farriers must not engage in any activity or behaviour that would be likely to bring the profession into disrepute. The Committee was satisfied that Mr Lymer's conduct in striking Blue and twisting or pulling his ear was conduct that fell far below the standard expected of a Registered Farrier and amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE AS TO SANCTION

The Legal Assessor reminded the Committee of the Indicative Sanctions Guidance and of the need for proportionality when considering sanction. The purpose of any sanction was not to punish but to arrive at a proportionate outcome to the case, having regard to the Committee's responsibility to protect animal welfare and to promote and maintain proper standards of conduct for Registered Farriers.

Mr Lymer gave evidence under affirmation at the sanction stage. He confirmed that the contents of his statement were true and acknowledged that the date of the incident referred to as 19 February 2025 may be wrong. He did not dispute that it was in fact 13 February 2025, as reported by the complainant. He told the Committee that before the clip seen on the video, he and his colleague had been working with Blue for between 20 and 30 minutes and had completed the trimming of three hooves, with just the one remaining. He said Blue was trying to strike out and he was concerned because the trimming was very overdue. Trimming should be done every 6-8 weeks, he said, whereas Blue had not been trimmed for four months. This meant his hooves needed much more trimming than should be the case and it took that much longer. Mr Lymer referred to the signs of fungal infection and the issues that can arise when hooves are left untrimmed for too long, which would have resulted in Blue being in discomfort at the time of the trimming. Mr Lymer said he was trying to *"make it safer for my colleague and to get the job finished and that was why the incident happened."*

Mr Lymer told the Committee that before hitting Blue, he had tried a number of ways to comfort him. Blue had been tied up, but he untied him and held his reins instead, to try and give some reassurance. He had also given him hay and licks to comfort him, but Blue continued to thrash and kick out, even before having his foot picked up. Mr Lymer described how Blue had kicked out narrowly missing his colleague the moment before he hit him. He said how he hit Blue with an

open hand, not a fist, followed by the twisting of Blue's ear. He had not thought about it or processed it at the time, it was not anger, he said, but rather *"frustration and maybe a bit of retaliation"* due to Blue kicking out at them. He said this was no excuse and his behaviour was unacceptable. Thereafter, they were then able to finish the last foot, although none of this was shown on the CCTV, which was just a very short clip. Mr Lymer said he had been unaware that there was CCTV at the Yard.

Mr Lymer spoke of personal pressures at the time that resulted in him being particularly tired, but made it plain he was not providing an excuse, but rather an explanation for his out-of-character behaviour. He said how much he regretted his conduct that day and said it was something he had never done before and would never do again. He had attended a course that provided insight into legislation and difficult situations that might be encountered with horses and the appropriate behaviour in such circumstances. He said he would now take a step back, remove himself from the situation and, if necessary, get another professional involved such as a Veterinary Surgeon, who could sedate the horse, if needed. He referred to a recent incident where he had done just that.

Mr Lymer was asked why his account had changed from the initial response provided on his behalf by his solicitors, when he did not accept his behaviour amounted to misconduct, to that within his statement where he accepted his behaviour was wrong. He said that he had reflected on the matter and having done so accepted that he had used unnecessary force on Blue.

It is apparent that Mr Lymer has many very happy clients (he provided 39 testimonials) who hold him in the highest regard. In particular, they refer to his kindness and compassion when dealing with challenging horses and none have any concerns about the way in which he has behaved with their horses, indeed quite the opposite. In the face of such praise the Committee was prepared to accept that Mr Lymer's behaviour on this occasion was out of character and could be treated as an isolated incident in an otherwise unblemished career as a Farrier.

The Committee first considered the aggravating and mitigating factors present in this case.

The Committee found there to be the following aggravating factors:

- risk of injury to an animal, albeit low;
- breach of client trust in that there would be an expectation from the client that their horse would be treated well and without the use of unnecessary force;
- risk of undermining public confidence in the farriery profession.

The Committee found there to be the following mitigating factors:

- the circumstances of the incident, including concern for the welfare of an animal;
- decision taken without the opportunity for full reflection;
- the absence of the horse owner or anyone else at the Yard to assist with Blue;
- a challenging situation, with a horse overdue a trimming, which thus took longer;
- Blue had just kicked out at the apprentice and Mr Lymer was concerned for his colleague's welfare;
- three of the four hooves had been trimmed and the fourth was completed without further incident;
- previous good character and no repeat of the behaviour in the year since;
- an isolated incident in an otherwise long and unblemished career;
- admissions at the hearing to the matters alleged and that his behaviour amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect;
- significant demonstration of insight, taking full responsibility for his actions;
- proactive steps taken to prevent a recurrence, including attendance on a relevant course and counselling;
- genuine remorse and apologies to Blue's owner, the profession, his family and the FRC;
- some personal stressful circumstances that may have influenced his behaviour at the time;
- a significant number of very positive testimonials making clear this behaviour was out of character.

The Committee noted that the footage of the incident provided was a short snapshot of just 33 seconds and began at the moment when the blows were struck. Accordingly, whilst it showed the crucial moments, the Committee was not able

to see how Blue was behaving immediately before the strikes, or in the 20 or 30 minutes before the incident, or indeed the time after when the last hoof was completed, which may have provided more in the way of context. It was Mr Lymer's evidence that immediately prior to the hits, Blue had kicked out and Mr Lymer had been concerned for his colleague's safety. It would have been helpful to have had more of the CCTV footage to show the whole incident: however, the Committee accepted Mr Lymer's account, having found him to be a frank and honest witness and there being no evidence to the contrary.

The Committee also noted that Blue was well overdue trimming. Mr Lymer said that trimming should be done every six to eight weeks, whereas this interval had been four months: the result being that there was much more hoof to be trimmed on a horse that was old and no doubt stiff. The Committee accepted that this was a contributory factor.

Having seen and heard from Mr Lymer, the Committee considered he gave honest, contrite and meaningful evidence. He made no attempt to avoid responsibility for his behaviour and did not seek to blame others. He was clearly deeply remorseful for his actions and genuinely sorry for the distress he recognised he must have caused Blue and Blue's owner. He admitted acting out of frustration and candidly also accepted his behaviour may have been to some extent retaliatory, following Blue kicking out. The Committee accepted that this behaviour was out of character, there had been no previous such incidents and nothing in the year since. Mr Lymer had demonstrated good insight and taken relevant online training, and counselling and was able to describe coping strategies that would help prevent a recurrence of such behaviour. In all the circumstances the Committee considered the risk of such behaviour being repeated to be very low.

The Committee considered each sanction in ascending order.

The Committee considered the case was too serious to take no further action, as Mr Lymer's action involved striking a horse, which is directly contrary to the guiding principle that Farriers are expected to ensure that all horses under their care are treated humanely and with respect. It was fortuitous that the behaviour was captured on CCTV, since otherwise it would almost certainly never have come to light. The behaviour occurred in the presence of a more junior member of the profession and, whilst not Mr Lymer's apprentice, he ought

Hearing Updates >>>

nevertheless to have been setting a good example. To take no action would not send the clear message to members of the profession that such behaviour is not to be tolerated, nor would it satisfy the public interest.

The Committee did not consider any purpose would be served by postponing sanction.

The Committee next considered whether the case could be addressed by means of a reprimand and/or warning. The Council's sanctions guidance states:

"Where the Disciplinary Committee is minded to issue a reprimand or warning as to future conduct, it will consider whether a reprimand or warning provides adequate protection to animals, the reputation of the profession and the wider public interest, bearing in mind that a reprimand or warning has no direct effect on the right to practise. A reprimand might be appropriate if the serious professional misconduct is at the lower end of the spectrum of gravity for such cases and, for example, there is no risk to animals or to the profession's reputation or to the wider public interest that requires registration to be restricted."

The guidance goes on to say:

A reprimand or warning may be appropriate where:

- *the misconduct is at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness and;*
- *there is no future risk to animals or the public, and;*
- *there is evidence of insight.*

Although the misconduct in this case was undoubtedly serious, it had to be viewed in context and it was the context that meant the Committee could view this misconduct as not being at the higher end of the spectrum of seriousness. That is in no way to downplay or excuse the behaviour, but the Committee has to act proportionally, taking into account the context and extensive mitigation referred to above. This in no way excused Mr Lymer's behaviour and, importantly, he did not seek to excuse his behaviour, accepting that it was unacceptable.

However, Mr Lymer has demonstrated significant and genuine insight and remorse into his misconduct and the Committee was satisfied he would be unlikely to behave in this way in the future. He has given evidence about how he would act

differently now, by stepping away, getting assistance and not resorting to violence. This demonstrated both insight and a commendable level of maturity. He had also been on an appropriate, targeted course and was able to say what action he would now take, and has taken, in similar situations. Many clients and witnesses speak very highly of Mr Lymer's professionalism, care and dedication as a Farrier and the absolute trust they place in him to care for their animals, notwithstanding the issues raised by this case. Everything said by the authors of the testimonials pointed toward this being very much out of character behaviour by Mr Lymer and the Committee was satisfied this was not a case where there were any deep-seated attitudinal problems.

In all these circumstances the Panel considered the public interest could be served by a reprimand. Such a sanction would send the clear message to the Profession and the public that this sort of behaviour is wholly unacceptable, not to be tolerated and must not be repeated.

However, before making a decision, the Committee first considered the next sanction, that of suspension. There was no doubting that the misconduct in this case is serious, as stated above: however, the Committee did consider a lesser sanction to be appropriate. In addition, the Committee has already found there to be significant evidence of insight.

The Committee therefore concluded that a period of suspension would be unduly punitive in this case and thus disproportionate. It is fair to say, however, that Mr Lymer came close to having his registration suspended and had it not been for the context, the extensive mitigation and most importantly his insight and remorse, that would most likely have been the outcome for a Farrier who had deliberately struck a horse.

The Committee thus decided that a reprimand is the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this matter. There was nothing else before the Committee to suggest that Mr Lymer was anything other than a very competent, hard-working Farrier. He behaved very badly on one day resulting in an appearance before his regulatory body, a finding of serious misconduct in a professional respect and a reprimand, thereby learning a salutary lesson. He has demonstrated remorse, shown good insight and the risk of repetition is low. In such circumstances the Committee considered it would be disproportionate to order a more severe sanction that would prevent Mr Lymer from working as a Farrier.

The Committee decided that because the risk of repetition was low, it was not necessary to include a warning in this case.

The Order of this Committee is, therefore, that Mr Lymer be reprimanded.

Mr Lymer should be in no doubt that any finding of serious misconduct in a professional respect by his regulatory body is a serious matter and he should not take this reprimand lightly. Members of the profession must be in no doubt that this kind of behaviour is completely unacceptable, whatever the circumstances.

That concludes this case.

Disciplinary Committee **17 March 2026**

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE (DC): MR P PEACOCK DIPWCF
Set out below is the determination and decision of the DC in respect of Mr Peacock; the determination and decision may be read on the FRC website at www.farrier-reg.gov.uk

THE CHARGE

"That, being registered under the Farriers (Registration) Act 1975 (as amended) (the Act), you:

1. *On or around 16 April 2025, sent via social media to Ms A, a client or former client, a message or messages which were abusive and/or intimidating and/or offensive and/or unprofessional;*

And that, in relation to the facts alleged above, whether individually or in any combination, you are guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect."

Ms Nicole Curtis appeared on behalf of the Council. The Respondent appeared and represented himself.

ADMISSIONS

The Respondent admitted the factual charge, confirming that he had sent the messages and that they were abusive, offensive, intimidating and unprofessional. The Committee, having heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor, therefore found Charge 1 proved on the basis of his admission and having regard to the screenshots of the social media

messages themselves, which had been provided to it.

HEARING PARTS OF THE CASE IN PRIVATE

During the course of the Respondent's evidence, he made reference to personal and sensitive matters regarding his private life and the Committee considered whether it should hear those parts of his evidence in private. Ms Curtis did not object to that course.

Having heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor, the Committee was satisfied that it should hear those parts of the Respondent's evidence relating to his private life, in private. The Committee was satisfied that this was justified under Rule 11 in order to protect the Respondent's private life.

BACKGROUND UNDERLYING THE CHARGE

On 16 April 2025, the Farriers Registration Council (the Council) received a complaint from Ms A, regarding text messages which had been sent to her by the Respondent over the course of one evening and the following morning.

Ms A sent screenshots of the messages sent by the Respondent, which were as follows:

Message One:

*"...I will speak to every farrier in the area and say you owe me. There wont be many that will do your work im afraid. And il speak to the yard owner saying that your happy to do a flit and not pay bills!
I will make a mockery of you and your family!! You take the f*****g p**s and unfortunately in the showing world your name is "s**t" everyone told me to be careful but i find the best in ev 1!!
So actually you have f*****d it!!"*

Message Two (apparently sent at 01:41)

*"You will as a family name now never walk in a ring again!! You f*****g idiot!! Every 1 will laugh at you, f**k the money, just to know that you think you can go through life like that is laughable!! Il be on to your husband, your a f*****g waste of space no morals and a waste of society! I hate people like you, i tried to help !! But you were that f*****g dull you couldn't even see it !! I dont wish bad luck on people , but i hope the f**k your unfortunate daughter you have no time for gets the f**k out of your grips cos shes 100% better off (actually il take her on as last time when your moaning like f**k "you cant have your crisps yet" f**k off let her have them! Be proud enough to even have the standards to make her a jam sandwich!! Stop trying to keep up with the Jones's! Shes*

Hearing Updates >>>

*a lovely girl, asking me questions all the way through shoeing her pony !! Put some f*****g effort in you useless t**t!! Dont tell her to shut up!! Shes a kid !! She needs attention! I would not put a gold fish with you! No wonder most your horses are scared, your an absolute shit!! Hope you live a nice life, oh and il adopt your daughter cos she deserves something even your partner got no f*****g b***s!!?"*

Message Three (apparently sent at 07:31)

"Just forgot about you owed me when you moved yards? No msg to say il meet you pat or can I transfer it? Just an overdraft of every 1s account aren't I? I even offered to do it cheaper for you !! To help! But you have done this ! Im really upset by it all now, full set , pair of fronts and a trim it was , why do people think they can go through life not paying? Its a luxury having horses its not a necessity? If you cant afford it dont ask someone to do the work, if i asked you to look after our horses and then didnt pay you for 6 months you would be knocking my door ? Yea because you would want the money! Its how life works."

On receipt of the complaint, the Council asked the Respondent for any comments. He replied on 6 May 2025, admitting that he had sent the messages and that he was embarrassed for his actions.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE ON SERIOUS MISCONDUCT IN A PROFESSIONAL RESPECT

Ms Curtis, on behalf of the Council, submitted that the conduct amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect. She drew the Committee's attention to the Farrier, Approved Training Farrier & Apprentice Code of Professional Conduct (the Code) and the guidance contained within it as to what may constitute "serious misconduct in a professional respect."

"The circumstances in which serious misconduct in a professional respect may be considered to have occurred are so varied that it is impossible to catalogue or to even envisage them all. Generally speaking, a minor breach of this Code of Professional Conduct might well not amount to serious professional misconduct. Repeated minor breaches in aggregate could well do so. However, a single, serious breach might also lead to such a finding."

Ms Curtis submitted that the Respondent's actions breached a number of sections of the Code, such as those regarding interactions with the general public and those specifically dealing with farriers' use of social media:

"Farriers and the General Public..."

- b. Farriers must be courteous and professional in communications with members of the public, including when communicating online.
- c. Farriers must not engage in any activity or behaviour that would be likely to bring the profession into disrepute."

- "70. It is recognised that social media may form part of everyday life for some. Such media can be valuable communication tools and enhance a farrier's personal and professional life. However, the use of social media is not without risk and farriers should be mindful of the consequences that may arise from its misuse.
- 71. Farriers have a responsibility to behave professionally and responsibly when offline and online, whether as themselves or in a virtual capacity (e.g. as an avatar or under an alias). Farriers may put their registration at risk if they demonstrate inappropriate behaviour when using social media including any form of abuse, bullying, coercion, discrimination, exploitation or harassment, intimidation or offensive language. This list is not exhaustive. The standards expected of farriers in the real world are no different to the standards they should apply online, and farriers must always uphold the reputation of the farriery profession. Farriers should remember that social media activity outside of work may still reflect on the public perception of the profession. Similarly, posts or comments made on a shared on-line space may have an adverse impact on the reputation of the profession even if the number of participants in that space is limited/not open to the general public.
- 72. When using social media farriers should:
 - a. remember that the Code of Professional Conduct must be followed at all times, even under the anonymity of social media
 - ...
 - c. be respectful and protect the privacy of others
 - ...
- 73. When using social media farriers should avoid making, posting or facilitating, such as reposting or forwarding, statements, images or videos that:

-
- a. may cause undue distress...*
 - b. are offensive, false, inaccurate, misleading or unjustified....*
 - c. abuse, bully, victimise, harass, threaten or intimidate or make derogatory comments about clients, colleagues, other equine professionals, staff or others..."*

The Respondent accepted that his conduct amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect. He apologised for having sent them; informed the Committee that he was extremely embarrassed by them and that he understood that his actions had brought disrespect on the profession.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor who referred to the principles to be applied when considering serious misconduct in a professional respect.

In the Committee's judgement, the Respondent's actions had breached the professional standards to be expected of a farrier, as set out in the Code and identified by Ms Curtis. It considered that the content of the messages contained explicit swearing and their tone was aggressive such that the recipient would find them intimidating.

Although the Committee did not consider that the Respondent's conduct related to equine welfare, it was satisfied that it would prejudice the reputation of the profession and bring it into disrepute. It considered that fellow farriers would consider such manner of communication with clients to be deplorable and totally unacceptable.

The Committee was satisfied that the Respondent's conduct was a serious departure from the standards expected, such that it amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE AS TO SANCTION

Ms Curtis confirmed that the Respondent was first registered as a farrier on 10 March 2008. She also confirmed that he had no previous findings against him from the Disciplinary Committee and therefore was of good character.

The Respondent gave oral evidence to the Committee. In

addition, he provided two references from clients attesting to his usual high standards and professionalism.

The Legal Assessor advised the Committee of the Indicative Sanctions Guidance (the Guidance) and of the need for proportionality when considering sanction. She advised that the purpose of any sanction was not to punish a farrier, but to arrive at a proportionate outcome to the case, having regard to the Committee's responsibility to maintain proper standards of conduct for Registered Farriers.

The Committee considered whether there were any aggravating factors in this case, as identified in the Guidance. The Committee identified recklessness as an aggravating factor, in that the Respondent had been impulsive in sending messages of such a tone, without pausing to reflect on the potential consequences on the recipient or on the reputation of the farriery profession.

The Committee considered the context in which the Respondent's misconduct occurred. He told the Committee that he had allowed himself to become frustrated at the persistent non-payment of fees by the client and that he nevertheless continued to shoe the client's ponies, concerned about animal welfare and hoping that he would ultimately be paid. The Respondent acknowledged that this in no way excused the content and tone of his messages. Whilst the Committee did not consider that this mitigated the seriousness of the sending of such messages, it was relevant in providing context as to why he may have acted out of character.

The Committee then considered the mitigating factors. It considered that the following were evident in this case:

- a. In the Committee's judgement, the misconduct could properly be viewed as a single and isolated incident. Although there had been three messages, they had been sent to a single client over the course of one night and the following morning;*
- b. The Respondent had a previously unblemished career of some 18 years as a farrier. He had provided two positive testimonials from clients demonstrating to the Committee that his actions had been out of character;*
- c. The Respondent had been open and frank in his admissions*

Hearing Updates >>>

to the Committee. At the outset he had admitted the facts and that they amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect;

- d. The Respondent had subsequently taken steps to reduce the risk of repetition. He now switched his telephone off at night and he had adopted a new system of accounting through "Xero" software, which automatically sent out weekly reminders for payment to clients;*
- e. The Committee considered that the Respondent had been sincere in his evidence and that his remorse and embarrassment regarding his actions was genuine;*
- f. The Committee considered that the Respondent had demonstrated in his evidence that his insight was genuine and profound;*
- g. The Committee considered that the Respondent had demonstrated a commitment to equine welfare, in that he continued to shoe horses, while waiting for late payments;*
- h. The Committee considered from all the mitigation that the risk of repetition was very low.*

The Committee considered each sanction in ascending order.

The Committee noted that it had identified a very low risk of repetition, given the Respondent's insight and steps to prevent recurrence and that there were no concerns regarding equine welfare. Nevertheless, the Committee did not lose sight of the nature and tone of the language used in the texts themselves, which had been unprofessional, abusive, offensive and intimidating. Given the detrimental impact the Respondent's misconduct would have on the reputation of the profession and the damage to public confidence, the Committee was of the view that a sanction was required in order to mark its seriousness.

The Committee did not consider any purpose would be served by postponing sanction, given a very low risk of repetition had been identified and there were no issues with his professional skills.

The Committee next considered whether the case, and in particular the public interest considerations of maintaining confidence in the profession and upholding expected

professional standards, could be addressed by way of a reprimand and/or warning. The Committee had regard to the specific Guidance in respect of when a reprimand and/or warning may be appropriate as follows:

A reprimand and/or or warning may be appropriate, where:

- *the misconduct is at the lower end of the spectrum seriousness and;*
- *there is no future risk to animals or the public, and;*
- *there is evidence of insight.*

The Committee was satisfied that the misconduct, whilst serious, was nevertheless at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness, given that it was a single and isolated incident. The Committee also considered that there are no animal welfare or public protection issues in this case, and the Respondent had demonstrated genuine and profound insight.

The Committee was satisfied that a reprimand would send the appropriate message to the farriery profession that such language and manner of communication was wholly unacceptable, whatever the frustrations being experienced by a farrier. The reprimand would admonish the past behaviour of the Respondent and mark its seriousness. The Committee did not consider that a warning as to future conduct was required, given the low risk of repetition it had identified.

In order to satisfy itself that a reprimand was proportionate and sufficient to address the public interest aspect in this case, the Committee went on to consider suspension. It noted the Guidance which states that:

Suspension may be appropriate, where the misconduct is sufficiently serious as to warrant more than a reprimand, but not sufficiently serious to justify removal from the Register.

In the particular circumstances of this case, the Committee considered that suspension would be disproportionate and unduly punitive. Given the genuine and profound insight and steps taken to avoid repetition, leading the Committee to conclude that there was a low risk of repetition, it was satisfied that the single and isolated misconduct did not warrant more than a reprimand. The Committee was satisfied that public confidence in the profession and the declaring of proper standards would be addressed by way of a reprimand.

Accordingly, the Committee determined to impose a reprimand.

Disciplinary Committee
18 March 2026

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE (DC): MR O HIRON DIPWCF
Set out below is the determination and decision of the DC in respect of Mr Hiron; the determination and decision may be read on the FRC website at www.farrier-reg.gov.uk

THE CHARGE

"That, being registered under the Farriers (Registration) Act 1975 (as amended) (the Act):

1. *On 27 July 2023, at Oxford Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of on 8 July 2023 at Banbury in the County of Oxfordshire, driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 103 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988;*

And that in relation to the above, you received a community order of 80 hours of unpaid work, disqualification from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 24 months, a surcharge of £114, and costs of £85.

2. *You failed to submit any or all of the Annual Returns to the Council for the following years:*
 - a) 2016;
 - b) 2018;
 - c) 2019;
 - d) 2020;
 - e) 2021;
 - f) 2022;
 - g) 2023;
 - h) 2024;

And that, in relation to the facts alleged above, whether individually or in any combination, you are guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect."

Ms Nicole Curtis, of Counsel, appeared on behalf of the Council. The Respondent appeared and was represented by Mr Matthew Corrie of Counsel.

ADMISSIONS

The Respondent admitted the factual charges in their entirety. The Committee, having heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor, therefore found them proved on the basis of his admission and having regard to the documentary evidence provided to the Committee. This included the memorandum of conviction, relevant documentation from Thames Valley Police and a witness statement with accompanying exhibits from the Professional Conduct Assistant at the Farriers Registration Council (the Council).

HEARING PARTS OF THE CASE IN PRIVATE

The Committee, having been provided with the Respondent's bundle in advance of the hearing, enquired of Mr Corrie whether he wished to apply for any references to personal and sensitive matters regarding the Respondent's private life, to be heard in private. Mr Corrie confirmed that he applied for such matters to be heard in private. Ms Curtis did not object to that course.

Having heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor, the Committee was satisfied that it should hear any evidence relating to the Respondent's private life, in private. The Committee was satisfied that this was justified under Rule 11 in order to protect his private life.

BACKGROUND

On 27 July 2023, at the Oxford Magistrates' Court, following a guilty plea, the Respondent was convicted of driving a vehicle when the level of alcohol in his system was above the legal limit. The certificate of conviction shows that the Respondent was sentenced to a Community Order, consisting of 80 hours' unpaid work to be completed within a year, and was disqualified from driving for 24 months, to be reduced on successful completion of a course.

The Respondent declared the conviction on an Annual Return for 2025, which was received by the Council on 18 July 2025. He also provided comments on the conviction in a letter to the Council dated 20 August 2025.

Hearing Updates >>>

Facts underlying the conviction

Documents obtained from the Police relating to the offence leading to the conviction, show that, during the evening of 8 July 2023, Police Officers were with their unmarked car in a petrol forecourt in Banbury when they heard a crash. They saw that a Toyota pick-up truck had driven onto a roundabout, by mounting the roundabout's curb, and had collided with road signs and become stuck. The driver of the vehicle was the Respondent. The Police Officers called for further police to attend and they assisted the Respondent out of the car. They saw that there were no other passengers in the vehicle, but there was a puppy on the backseat.

Officers undertook a roadside breath-test which indicated that the Respondent had alcohol in his system over the prescribed limit for driving. They arrested him and took him to the Accident and Emergency department of the Horton General Hospital in Banbury where he was examined at shortly after midnight. He was then taken by Officers to Banbury Police station, where he gave two specimens of breath, shortly after 01:00 on 9 July 2023. These showed that he had 103 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 ml of breath. The legal limit is 35 microgrammes.

Facts relating to non-submission of Annual Returns

Since January 2016, all Registered Farriers have been required to complete and submit an Annual Return to the Council. On the Annual Return, Farriers are asked to disclose any unspent police cautions or criminal convictions since their last disclosure to the Council. They are also asked to check that the contact information held by the Council is correct, indicating any required corrections, and to confirm that they hold Professional Indemnity Insurance ("PII").

This requirement is set out in the Code of Professional Conduct (the Code). Versions of the Code in 2017, 2021 and 2024 have all included provisions relating to this, whether by reference to annual declarations (2017) or Annual Returns (2021 and 2024).

The Annual Return and a covering letter are printed with the contact details held by the Council for each Registered Farrier and sent to them every year in the autumn, with a request that the Farrier complete and return the form. In some years, where no response has been received from the Farrier, the

Council has sent a further copy of the Annual Return in the following spring. Farriers are asked to either complete and return the printed paper form to the Council by post, or to complete their Annual Return online via a personal "MyFRC" account. All completed returns sent by post are logged on their receipt at the Council's office.

In September 2025, the Respondent submitted an Annual Return for 2025, in which he declared the conviction. It was noted by the Council that the Respondent had not submitted Annual Returns to the Council for 2016, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024. He did submit an Annual Return for 2017.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE ON SERIOUS MISCONDUCT IN A PROFESSIONAL RESPECT

Ms Curtis, on behalf of the Council, submitted that the conduct amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect. She directed the Committee's attention to those parts of each of the respective Codes in force at the relevant time.

In respect of the conviction, Ms Curtis submitted that the farriery profession often involves its members driving to locations in order to shoe and tend to horses; and that it is important that members of the public can be confident that those professionals are safe and compliant with their legal obligations when they do so. The Council submits that the conduct had particular cause to bring the profession into disrepute given the integral nature of driving with regards to the profession.

In respect of the failure to submit Annual Returns, Ms Curtis submitted that as a result of the Respondent's failure to provide Annual Returns, the Council was unable to comply with its public interest duties to ensure that it held current, accurate information for all its registrants, and that its registrants were all adequately insured so as to provide financial protection for their clients. She submitted that these form part of the Council's duty to uphold public confidence in the profession and in the proper regulation of the profession. Ms Curtis stated that the Council's position with regard to public confidence in its regulatory processes was therefore potentially undermined as a result of the Respondent's conduct.

Mr Corrie, on behalf of the Respondent, informed the Committee that the Respondent recognised that his conduct

was likely to be considered by the Committee as amounting to serious misconduct in a professional respect and did not seek to make submissions to the contrary.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor who referred to the principles to be applied when considering misconduct in a professional respect.

The Committee considered that the admitted facts were very different to each other and so initially considered the conviction and the failure to submit Annual Returns separately.

At this stage, in response to Ms Curtis' request to do so, the Committee considered the aggravating factors and concluded that the following were present in this case, relevant to the conduct itself:

Conviction for driving with excess alcohol

- a. There was a risk of injury to both animal and human. In this case, the Committee noted that there had been a puppy in the vehicle at the time, and, although no actual injury had been caused to either animal or human, there was an inherent risk of serious injury by virtue of driving when three times over the legal limit;
- b. The Committee considered that the Respondent had been reckless in his decision to drive while suspecting he was likely to be over the legal limit, without stopping to think of the potential risk of injury or worse to the public;

Failing to submit Annual Returns

- c. The Committee considered that the Respondent's failures had been sustained in the light of annual requests and reminders from the Council to submit the returns and had been repeated over a period of around eight years; and
- d. The Committee considered that the Respondent's failures amounted a blatant and wilful disregard of the role of the Council and the systems that regulate the farriery profession.

Although the Committee recognised that there may be personal mitigation in this case, it did not consider that

personal mitigation was relevant in its assessment of whether the conduct itself amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect. Aside from the fact that there was no actual harm to animal or human, the Committee did not identify any other mitigating factors at this stage relevant to the assessment of whether the conduct itself amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect.

In relation to the conviction for driving with excess alcohol, the Committee was of the view that although there was no actual harm caused, it was particularly serious as there was a high risk of very serious harm to others by taking the decision to drive when three times over the legal limit. The Committee was of the view that such conduct would be regarded as morally disgraceful, dishonourable and would attract opprobrium from members of the public. It would also be considered as deplorable by members of the profession.

In relation to the failure to submit Annual Returns, the Committee considered that this was serious as it had the potential to undermine the integrity of the Farriers' Register. The Committee considered that the public would expect to be able to rely on farriers meeting their professional obligations by making regular declarations in respect of their details, character and holding of PII. The Committee was of the view that sustained and repeated failures to submit returns, blatantly disregarding professional obligations would be regarded as deplorable by the public and members of the public.

In the Committee's judgement, the Respondent's conduct in respect of both matters was a serious departure from the standards expected such that it amounted both individually and in combination, to serious misconduct in a professional respect.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE AS TO SANCTION

Ms Curtis confirmed that the Respondent was first registered as a Farrier on 1 March 2010. She also confirmed that he had no previous findings against him from the Disciplinary Committee and therefore was of good character.

The Respondent gave oral evidence to the Committee, as well as calling a character witness on his behalf. In addition, he provided a bundle of documents which included:

Hearing Updates >>>

- a. His signed witness statement, dated 10 March 2026 together with accompanying exhibits; and
- b. Recent testimonials from clients for whom he provided farriery services, all of whom had been made aware of his conduct and the ongoing proceedings at the Council.

The Legal Assessor advised the Committee of the Indicative Sanctions Guidance (the Guidance) and of the need for proportionality when considering sanction. The purpose of sanction was not to punish for past conduct, but to arrive at a proportionate outcome to the case, having regard to the Committee's responsibility to protect equine welfare, to uphold public confidence in the profession and to maintain proper standards of conduct for Registered Farriers.

The Committee had regard to the aggravating features in relation to the Respondent's conduct itself, that it had identified at the stage of finding serious misconduct in a professional respect. It did not identify any additional aggravating factors.

The Committee next considered the relevant mitigating factors, and was of the view that the following were evident:

- a. The Respondent had a previously unblemished career of some 16 years as a farrier, and the wealth of testimonials he had provided attested to his usual skill and professionalism in that role;
- b. The Respondent had been open and frank about his conduct at an early stage. He admitted driving whilst under the influence to the police at the scene and he had pleaded guilty to driving with excess alcohol at the Magistrates' Court. At the outset of this hearing before the Disciplinary Committee, he had admitted the facts and that they amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect;
- c. The Respondent had subsequently taken practical steps to reduce the risk of repetition in respect of both driving with excess alcohol and submitting Annual Returns;
- d. Whilst the Committee did not consider that there was a significant lapse of time since either aspect of the misconduct, it did note that the Respondent's licence

had since been returned and he had been driving without apparent incident for approaching one year. He had also submitted the latest two Annual Returns without having to be reminded to do so;

- e. The Committee considered that the Respondent had demonstrated a good level of insight in respect of both aspects of the misconduct. In respect of the conviction, it was clear to the Committee that he took full responsibility for his actions and understood the potential impact on the public and the reputation of the profession. In respect of the Annual Returns, the Committee considered that whilst the Respondent may not have fully appreciated the importance of submitting his returns at the time, he now demonstrated a good understanding of their importance to the effective regulation of the profession. It also noted that he had adapted the way he responded to the requests and met his professional obligations;
- f. The Respondent has demonstrated a commitment to the farriery profession and equine welfare by maintaining his business throughout the period of his ban, including when at financial cost to himself.

In respect of the misconduct underpinning the conviction, given all the mitigation, the Committee considered that the risk of repetition was unlikely. In respect of the failure to submit Annual Returns, the Committee considered that the risk was relatively low, given the steps the Respondent had put in place and his good insight into the importance of submitting them. The Committee considered that nevertheless there was still an identifiable risk based on the Respondent's previous failure to submit Annual Returns despite repeated prompts to do so over a number of years.

The Committee considered each sanction in ascending order of seriousness.

Given the adverse impact of the serious misconduct on the reputation of the profession, the Committee considered that the case was too serious for the Committee to take no further action. The Committee was of the view that taking no action would be insufficient to mark the seriousness of the case.

The Committee did not consider any purpose would be served by postponing sanction. The Respondent had provided a

significant number of references to demonstrate that there were no issues with his professional skills.

The Committee next considered whether the case, and in particular the public interest considerations of maintaining confidence in the profession and upholding expected professional standards, could be addressed by way of a reprimand and/or warning. The Committee had regard to the specific Guidance in respect of when a reprimand and/or warning may be appropriate as follows:

A reprimand and/or or warning may be appropriate, where:

- *the misconduct is at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness and;*
- *there is no future risk to animals or the public, and;*
- *there is evidence of insight.*

Given that the Committee had concluded that the risk of repetition in respect of driving with excess alcohol was unlikely, and the failure to submit Annual Returns did not directly impact on animal welfare or public safety, it considered that there was no future risk to animals or the public. Furthermore, the Committee was satisfied that the Respondent had demonstrated good insight in his written and oral evidence.

However, the Committee did not consider that either the conviction for driving with excess alcohol or the repeated failure to submit Annual Returns could properly be categorised as misconduct which was at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness. In relation to the conviction, the Respondent had been some three times over the limit and his recklessness in choosing to drive could have caused really serious injury or worse. In relation to the failure to submit Annual Returns, the Committee bore in mind that it had found such conduct to be sustained, repeated and in blatant disregard of the regulatory systems of the Council. The Committee also had regard to its view that whilst the risk of repetition in failing to submit an Annual Return was relatively low, there was nevertheless an identifiable risk.

The Committee therefore carefully considered whether this ruled out a reprimand and/or a warning as an appropriate and proportionate sanction, or whether such a sanction would be able to address the significant public interest issues and the relatively low but still identifiable ongoing risk in this case.

In the Committee's judgement, the extensive insight, remorse, remediation and commitment to the profession demonstrated by the Respondent were such that his misconduct could appropriately be met through a reprimand and a warning. The Committee also had regard to the wealth of positive testimonials attesting to the Respondent's usual high standards of professionalism and noted that there was a public interest in retaining an otherwise highly regarded farrier in the profession.

The Committee was of the view that a reprimand would serve to mark both aspects of the misconduct and send the message that such conduct was wholly unacceptable for a farrier. In addition, the Committee considered that a warning as to future conduct would be appropriate and sufficient to address the relatively low but identifiable risk of repetition of failing to submit future Annual Returns.

In order to satisfy itself that a reprimand was proportionate and sufficient to address the public interest aspect in this case, the Committee went on to consider suspension. In the particular circumstances of this case, the Committee was of the view that a suspension would be disproportionate and unduly punitive. The Committee was satisfied that public confidence in the profession and the declaring of proper standards would be addressed by way of a reprimand and a warning. It was also satisfied that the relatively low, but nevertheless identifiable risk of repetition in respect of the Annual Returns would be addressed by way of a warning as to future conduct.

Accordingly, the Committee determined to impose a reprimand and a warning in the following terms:

You must have regard to your Code of Professional Conduct and must have regard to all of your future professional obligations.

Disciplinary Committee
19 March 2026

Hearing Updates >>>

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE (DC): Mr M SLOSS

Set out below is the determination and decision of the DC in respect of Mr Sloss; the determination and decision may be read on the FRC website at www.farrier-reg.gov.uk

THE CHARGE:

"That, being registered under the Farriers (Registration) Act 1975 (as amended) ("the Act") and in respect that on 1 November 2024 you were convicted at Glasgow High Court of 10 separate sexual offences, all as set out in Schedule A to this notice, for which you were sentenced to 13 years' imprisonment and requirement to register under Part 2 of the Sexual Offences Act for an indefinite period was imposed.

And in relation to the facts alleged you are guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect."

The offences set out in Schedule A to the notice of inquiry comprise six charges of rape, one charge of indecent assault, one charge of sexual assault, one charge of communicating indecently with a young child, and one charge of lewd and libidinous practices and behaviour.

Introduction

This is the decision of the Disciplinary Committee ("the Committee") of the Farriers Registration Council ("the Council") in the case of Malcolm Sloss ("the defender"), following a hearing by video link on 20 March 2026. At that hearing, the Council was represented by Ms Catriona Watt ("the Solicitor"). The defender did not attend, nor was he represented.

Service

The Solicitor produced copies of three letters, all of which were sent to the defender at HMP Barlinnie. The first, dated 6 November 2025, advised the defender of the date fixed for the hearing of the Committee, asked the defender to confirm whether he intended to attend or be represented, and offered assistance with arranging a video link. The second, dated 15 January 2026, enclosed a copy of the notice of inquiry and reiterated the date fixed for the hearing and the request that the defender confirm whether he intended to attend or be represented. The third, dated 16 February 2026, again repeated the date fixed for the hearing, asked the defender to let the Solicitor know if he would need a video link set up, warned him that the hearing may proceed in his absence, and advised that he may wish to seek legal advice. All three letters were accompanied by recorded delivery slips and tracked

delivery slips with signatures confirming delivery to HMP Barlinnie.

The Legal Adviser advised the Committee that Rule 2 of the Farriers Registration Council Disciplinary Committee (Procedure) Rules 1976 ("the Disciplinary Rules") provides that the Solicitor shall serve a notice of inquiry upon the defender, and that the Committee "shall not hold an inquiry unless a notice of inquiry has been served ... in accordance with these Rules".

Rule 15 provides that "where a document is required by these rules to be served upon ... any person, it shall be sent by post to his last known address".

The Committee were satisfied that the notice of inquiry had been served in accordance with the Disciplinary Rules.

Proceeding in absence

The Solicitor advised the Committee that the defender had not responded to her letters of 6 November 2025, 15 January 2026 and 16 February 2026, or to earlier letters (dated 6 and 10 October 2025) advising him that his case had been referred to the Committee. She submitted that there was no known good cause for his non-attendance. By reference to the case law¹, she submitted that the defender had deliberately and voluntarily absented himself and had therefore waived his right to be present and represented at the hearing; that the Committee had the discretion to allow the hearing to proceed in his absence, and that the public interest in public protection and confidence in the profession and regulator required the hearing to proceed. She submitted that fairness was of primary importance that the Committee could have regard to the defender's deliberate and voluntary failure to attend; the absence of any suggestion from him that he wished to be represented; the absence of any disadvantage to him in not being able to give his account of events, given the fact of his conviction; the absence of any real risk of the Committee reaching an improper conclusion in the defender's absence, given the fact of the conviction; the nature and seriousness of the offences and the period of time over which they had been committed; the public interest in upholding professional standards, and in maintaining confidence in the profession and regulator; and the need for a decision on the defender's registration to be taken without further delay.

The Legal Assessor advised the Committee² that whilst it

had the discretion to proceed in the defender's absence, the interests of justice required that it exercise the utmost care and caution, and that fairness was the paramount consideration. The following factors would be relevant to the Committee's decision whether or not to proceed in the defender's absence: the reason for his non-attendance (was there known good cause, or had he deliberately and voluntarily absented himself); whether he had requested an adjournment; whether it was likely that he would engage and appear or be represented at a later date if an adjournment was granted; the seriousness of the charge and the possible consequences for the defender if the hearing were to proceed in his absence; whether the defender would suffer a disadvantage in not being able to give his account of events to the Committee; whether there was a risk of the Committee reaching the wrong conclusions if they were to proceed in his absence; whether public protection concerns would arise if the hearing was adjourned; and whether there was a public interest in the expeditious determination of the case.

The Committee determined that the hearing should proceed in the defender's absence. They considered that there was no known good cause for his failure to attend or be represented and that he had deliberately and voluntarily absented himself from the hearing. Given the seriousness of the charge, there was a public interest in the expeditious determination of the case and in protecting the reputation of the profession and the regulator. Given the fact of the conviction, the defender would not be significantly prejudiced by the case proceeding in his absence; his position (that he was an innocent man) was known to the Committee. The Committee concluded that the balance of fairness tipped in favour of the hearing proceeding in the defender's absence.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE ON THE FACTS

After reading the charge³, the Solicitor submitted that the charge against the defender was proved. She referred the Committee to the extract conviction and noted the nature of the offences – which she described as being of “the utmost gravity” – and that they were committed over a period of around 30 years. She drew the Committee's attention to the remarks of the sentencing judge, who condemned the defender's behaviour “in the strongest possible terms” and imposed “a significant prison sentence to punish [him] for his behaviour and to mark to [him] and to others the consequences which will follow this type of serious sexual

abuse”. She advised the Committee that the defender continued to maintain his innocence and drew attention to letters received from him (in response to the Council advising him that his case was to be referred to the Investigating Committee) to this effect. She submitted that the Committee should find the charge against the defender proved.

The legal adviser reminded the Committee that the onus was on the Council to prove the case against the defender, and that the standard of proof was on balance of probabilities. She advised that the extract conviction was sufficient proof of the fact of the conviction. She advised that, although the defender continued to protest his innocence, it was only in exceptional circumstances that the Committee should “look behind” a conviction⁴.

The Committee was satisfied that the extract conviction was sufficient to prove the charge on balance of probabilities. The defender's protestations of innocence did not constitute “exceptional circumstances” that would permit the Committee to “look behind” the conviction. The Committee found the charge against the defender proved.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE ON SERIOUS MISCONDUCT IN A PROFESSIONAL RESPECT

The Solicitor drew attention to the nature of the defender's conviction and submitted that “disgraceful conduct outside professional practice” could be sufficient to bring the profession into disrepute and call for action by the regulator⁵; but that in any event it was clear from the remarks of the sentencing judge that the defender came into contact with one of his victims through his work as a farrier – as such, it could not be said that his offending behaviour was entirely unconnected with his work. She submitted that there could be no circumstances in which a farrier on the Council's Register, convicted of such a number of serious sexual assaults over such a long period of time, could be anything other than guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect.

The Legal Adviser reminded the Committee that whether or not serious misconduct in a professional respect was established was a matter of judgement – no burden or standard of proof applied. The Disciplinary Committee Manual provides that the Committee may consider aggravating and mitigating factors that relate to the conduct itself; and may take account of breaches of the Farrier, Approved Training Farrier & Apprentice Code of Professional Conduct (“the

Hearing Updates >>>

Code")⁶. The Code sets out the "guiding principles" that farriers are expected to uphold. These include upholding the good reputation of the farriery profession and avoiding situations, both within and outwith the professional context, that could be in breach of the law.⁷ The Code also sets out professional responsibilities. These include: "farriers must not engage in any activity or behaviour that would be likely to bring the profession into disrepute"; and "farriers must not exhibit behaviour that is at variance with the core values of a registered farrier, including any form of abuse, bullying, coercion, discrimination, exploitation, harassment, intimidation or offensive language"⁸. With regard to criminal convictions, the Code says this:

Serious criminal offences will usually amount to a matter of serious misconduct ... Not every criminal offence will necessarily be notified to the FRC or referred to the DC, but as a guide, offences which are likely to affect the farrier's ability to practise, call their honest and integrity into question, endanger the public or bring the profession into disrepute – these examples are not exhaustive – may amount to serious misconduct.⁹

The Committee considered the defender's conviction was in respect of offences of the utmost gravity and that there had been a clear breach of the standards and responsibilities set out in the Code.

The Committee considered that the fact that the defender had encountered one of his victims through his work as a farrier was an aggravating factor. The Committee did not identify any mitigating factors.

The Committee concluded that the defender was guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect.

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE AS TO SANCTION

The Solicitor submitted that a number of aggravating features were present and should be taken into account by the Committee: the nature and extent of the defender's offending behaviour; the fact that at least one victim was a young woman he had come in contact with through his work as a farrier; his continued denial of guilt; and the risk he poses to women and girls – both clients, and members of the public at large. The only mitigating factor was his lack of any previous regulatory history. The Solicitor submitted that the Committee should impose a sanction at the highest end of the scale.

The Legal Assessor reminded the Committee¹⁰ that the purpose of imposing a sanction is not punitive but rather is to protect the public and the public interest, and the reputation of the profession and the regulator. The Committee should have regard to both aggravating and mitigating factors. The sanction imposed required to be proportionate. The Committee should consider the sanctions available to it in ascending order of severity, considering the least restrictive sanction first. Sanction was ultimately a matter for the Committee's judgement: no burden or standard of proof applied.

The Committee had regard to the non-exhaustive lists of aggravating and mitigating factors published within the Indicative Sanctions Guidance.¹¹ It concluded that a number of aggravating factors were present: actual injury to humans; risk of injury to humans; premeditated misconduct; breach of client trust; the involvement of a vulnerable client; sexual misconduct; breach of a position of trust; misconduct sustained or repeated over a period of time; blatant or wilful disregard of the values and standards of the farriery profession; lack of insight into the offence; and the number of victims, the harmful impact of the offences on them, and the period of time over which the offences were committed. The Committee did not identify any mitigating factors, beyond the absence of any previous regulatory history.

The Committee considered, in turn, and in ascending order, the various outcomes and sanctions available to it. It considered that the seriousness of the defender's conviction was such that no sanction other than removal from the Register was sufficient to protect the public, protect the reputation of the profession and regulator and the wider public interest. The Committee considered that the defender's offending behaviour (as proved by the extract conviction) was fundamentally incompatible with him being a Registered Farrier.¹²

Accordingly, and in accordance with section 15 of the Act and Rule 7 of the Procedure Rules, the Committee directs that the defender's name shall be removed from the Register.

Decision of:
The Disciplinary Committee of the Farriers Registration Council
20 March 2026

¹ *R v Hayward, Jones and Purvis* [2001] QB 862 CA; *R v Jones* [2002] UKHL 5; *Adeogba v GMC* [2016] EWCA Civ 162.

² *By reference to the cases listed above and referred to in the Solicitor's submission, and to page 10 (para 11) of the Disciplinary Committee Manual*

³ *As required by Rule 5 of the Disciplinary Rules*

⁴ *Stannard v General Council of the Bar* [2006] LTL 30.1.2006; *Shepherd v Law Society* [1996] EWCA Civ 977; *Smith v Linskill* [1996] 2 All ER 253

⁵ *Remedy (UK) Ltd v GMC* [2010] EWHC 1245 (Admin)

⁶ Disciplinary Committee Manual, chapter 8

⁷ As set out on page 3 of the Code

⁸ As set out on pages 12 and 13 (para 16) of the Code

⁹ As set out on page 33 (para 95) of the Code

¹⁰ By reference to page 10 (para 12) of the Disciplinary Committee Manual and to the Indicative Sanctions Guidance contained within the Disciplinary Committee Manual (from page 19 onwards)

¹¹ At pages 19 and 20 (para 16) of the Disciplinary Committee Manual

¹² Page 24 (para 21) of the Indicative Sanctions Guidance (contained within the Disciplinary Committee Manual) provides that removal from the Register may be appropriate where behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a Registered Farrier and may involve offences of a sexual nature





Higher Qualifications Achieved

The following farrier has gained a higher level qualification and is warmly congratulated:

Mr N J Grooby AWCF

Temporary Licence Applications

The Council has received applications for Fixed Term Temporary Licences as follows:

- **Ms M Malmqvist**, a Swedish national with professional working experience gained in Sweden, was granted a temporary licence from 13 January to 7 February 2026, under the supervision of the ATF, Mr S Cox-Rusbridge AWCF Class I.
- **Mr T Groeneveld**, an Australian national with professional working experience gained in Australia, was granted a temporary licence from 2 March to 2 September 2026, under the supervision of the ATF, Mr D Newall AWCF.
- **Mr V Castillo Moore**, a British national with professional working experience gained in Spain was granted a temporary licence from 7 May to 11 May 2026, under the supervision of the ATF, Mr S Crompton DipWCF BSc Hons for the purposes of his participation in the Nottinghamshire County Show.





Instruction to your bank or building society to pay by Direct Debit

Please fill in the whole form including official use box using a ball point pen and send it to:

Farriers Registration Council
14 Swan Court
Forder Way
Cygnet Park
Hampton
Peterborough
PE7 8GX

Name(s) of account holder(s)

Bank/building society account number

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Branch sort code

--	--	--	--	--	--

Name and full postal address of your bank or building society

To: The Manager	Bank/building society
Address	
Postcode	

Reference

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Service user number

6	3	0	1	8	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

FOR FARRIERS REGISTRATION COUNCIL OFFICIAL USE ONLY
This is not part of the instruction to your bank or building society.

If you are not the farrier but wish to make payments on their behalf, please add your address details here:

Instruction to your bank or building society

Please pay Farriers Registration Council Direct Debits from the account detailed in this Instruction subject to the safeguards assured by the Direct Debit Guarantee. I understand that this Instruction may remain with Farriers Registration Council and, if so, details will be passed electronically to my bank/building society.

Signature(s)

Date

Banks and building societies may not accept Direct Debit Instructions for some types of account

DDI1

This guarantee should be detached and retained by the payer.

The Direct Debit Guarantee



- This Guarantee is offered by all banks and building societies that accept instructions to pay Direct Debits
- If there are any changes to the amount, date or frequency of your Direct Debit the Farriers Registration Council will notify you ten working days in advance of your account being debited or as otherwise agreed. If you request the Farriers Registration Council to collect a payment, confirmation of the amount and date will be given to you at the time of the request.
- If an error is made in the payment of your Direct Debit, by the Farriers Registration Council or your bank or building society, you are entitled to a full and immediate refund of the amount paid from your bank or building society
 - If you receive a refund you are not entitled to, you must pay it back when the Farriers Registration Council asks you to
- You can cancel a Direct Debit at any time by simply contacting your bank or building society. Written confirmation may be required. Please also notify us.

Appointed Members of the Farriers Registration Council (as at May 2026)



Chair of the Council

Dr J Sutton
BVetMed, Cert EP, FRCVS

Appointing Body:

Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

Appointee Name:	Appointing Body:
Mr A B Charlwood	The Worshipful Company of Farriers (WCF)
Operations Superintendent K Colman	Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA)
Mr I Davidson	Scottish Enterprise
Mr S Green AWCF	Appointed by Election Scheme
Mr D Harman AWCF GradDipELR	The British Farriers and Blacksmiths Association (BFBA)
Mr B J Howson AWCF	Appointed by Election Scheme
Mr A Jordan	The Worshipful Company of Farriers (WCF)
Mr R A Kearn DipWCF	Appointed by Election Scheme
Mr C D McKell DipWCF (Deputy Chair)	Appointed by Election Scheme
Mr D Mountford MA VetMB MRCVS	Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS)
Mr H Price DipWCF GradDipELR	The Worshipful Company of Farriers
Mr J Sim AWCF	The British Farriers and Blacksmiths Association (BFBA)
Ms G Stanford	British Equestrian Federation
Mr L Williams	Bristish Horseracing Authority
Vacancy	Lantra

