

FARRIERS REGISTRATION COUNCIL

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

HELD AT THE FARRIERS REGISTRATION COUNCIL, 14 SWAN COURT,

FORDER WAY, CYGNET PARK, HAMPTON, PETERBOROUGH PE7 8GX

INQUIRY RE:

MR ROSS CORDERY DIPWCF

1. THE CHARGE

1.1 “That, being registered under the Farriers Registration Act 1975 (as amended) (the Act)

1. On 23 April 2025, at the Taunton Magistrates Court, you were convicted, following guilty pleas, of:
 - a) using threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, with intent to cause harassment, alarm or distress, contrary to section 4A (1) and (5) of the Public Order Act 1986, more particularly in that on 15 April 2024 at [Redacted], Highbridge, Somerset, you used threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour or disorderly behaviour with intent to cause VC harassment, alarm or distress, thereby causing that person or another harassment, alarm or distress; and
 - b) assault by beating, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988, more particularly in that on 21 April 2024, at Bridgwater, Somerset, you assaulted VC by beating her.
2. With regards to the above offences, on 2 June 2025, at the Taunton Magistrates’ Court, you were sentenced to a 12-month Community order with a requirement to complete 125 hours of unpaid work, a 12-month Restraining order, and ordered to pay prosecution costs of £350 and a victim surcharge of £114.

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”

1.2 Mr Michael Collis appeared on behalf of the Council; Mr Peter Binder appeared on behalf of the Respondent.

2. ADMISSIONS

2.1 The Registrant admitted the convictions alleged and further admitted serious professional misconduct.

3. **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- 3.1 The Committee found the facts Proved by reason of the Respondent's admissions. The Committee also had sight of the requisite Certificate of Conviction.

4. **SERIOUS MISCONDUCT IN A PROFESSIONAL RESPECT**

- 4.1 Mr Collis submitted that the Respondent had been guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect. He drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 95 of the *Farrier, Approved Training Farrier & Apprentice Code of Professional Conduct 2024* [*the Code*] which provides that "*Serious criminal offences will usually amount to a matter of serious misconduct*" particularly where offences "*endanger the public or bring the profession into disrepute*". Mr Collis also referred the Committee to the principle in *Remedy (UK) Ltd v General Medical Council* [2010] EWHC 1245 (Admin) that conduct of a morally culpable or disgraceful kind outside professional practice may prejudice the reputation of the profession and thereby attract regulatory sanction.
- 4.2 Mr Binder made no submissions at this stage as the Respondent had accepted that the convictions amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect.
- 4.3 The Committee accepted the advice of the legal assessor.
- 4.4 The Respondent was convicted following two episodes of violent conduct. In each case his wife, from whom he was separated, was present and stated that she was extremely frightened.
- 4.5 In the first episode she and her partner took refuge in her partner's mobile home and the Respondent attempted to gain forcible entry. During this episode he taunted the Respondent's partner with a view to provoking him to leave the mobile home and fight him and attempted to prise open windows while holding a hammer. The Respondent's wife called the police and the Respondent left before their arrival. His wife said of the incident "*During this incident I was petrified. It made me feel sick to my stomach. It felt like he came from nowhere and then had a hammer which frightened me even more.*"
- 4.6 During the second episode the Respondent gained access to a Toyota truck in which his wife and her partner had taken refuge. He got into the truck and tried to push past his wife to get at her partner. In attempting to do so he recklessly caused his wife injury. She suffered a bruised cheek, a slight black eye and a bruised elbow and wrist. During this fracas he was screaming, swearing and threatening to kill his wife's partner, cut his face off and throw it at her. At one point he was on the roof of the vehicle, kicking and stamping. His wife's partner was moving the vehicle backwards and forwards to try and dislodge the Respondent and the front end of the truck ended up in a ditch. His wife believes that the presence of a farmer caused the Respondent to leave the scene. Of this incident the Respondent's wife said "*This incident left me feeling so anxious. I felt as though I couldn't breathe properly, and I had a panic attack. The whole situation was petrifying.... I couldn't stop shaking like a leaf afterwards*".
- 4.7 The Respondent's behaviour has had an impact upon his wife's health and way of life. She has stated that she is anxious and "*constantly looking over my shoulder for him in case he is there. I don't want to go out or go to horse shows in case I run into him. I have had to change the way I live my life because I am so afraid of running into him*".
- 4.8 The Committee noted that the Respondent had been convicted, on the basis of his Guilty pleas, of two serious criminal offences, both involving violent conduct which was frightening to those in the vicinity, in particular Mrs C.

4.9 The Committee had regard to Paragraph 95 of the Code which provides:

“Serious criminal offences will usually amount to a matter of serious misconduct, but not every offence shall be viewed as serious. 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 honesty and integrity into question, endanger the public or bring the profession into disrepute - these examples are not exhaustive- may amount to serious misconduct”

4.10 The offences of which the Respondent was convicted were offences, liable to endanger the public and bring the profession into serious disrepute. Farriers had to be trusted to work in relatively isolated locations with individual horse owners, who were often both young and female. Two occasions of violent conduct of this kind were bound to bring the profession into disrepute. The Committee considered it particularly reprehensible that at the time the Respondent was an Approved Training Farrier.

4.11 Accordingly the Committee had no hesitation in concluding that the Respondent had been guilty of serious misconduct in a professional respect.

5. SANCTION

5.1 Mr Collis, on behalf of the Council, reminded the Committee of the Indicative Sanctions Guidance. The Respondent had been a Registered Farrier since 1 March 2003 and there were no previous regulatory findings.

5.2 Mr Binder submitted that there were a number of mitigating features. In outline these were:

- (i) the Respondent’s previously unblemished career which included working at a high level of proficiency and the successful training of a number of apprentices
- (ii) the fact that the Respondent had taken full responsibility for his conduct
- (iii) that he had successfully completed the sentence passed by the criminal court
- (iv) the particular background to the offences which involved significant emotional upheaval
- (v) the fact that there was a period of only six days between the two episodes which resulted in convictions so that all the offending occurred at a time when emotions were running high and
- (vi) that the risk of repetition was now very low, as the Respondent had successfully moved on from the circumstances which occasioned his behaviour.

5.3 Mr Binder emphasised the particular circumstances in which the offending had arisen, stressing the emotional turmoil occasioned by the end of a 21-year marriage which had produced three children and the fact that a previously close friend was now in a relationship with his wife. All parties lived and worked in the same village.

5.4 Mr Binder submitted that a reprimand would be a proportionate outcome.

5.5 The Respondent added a few words of his own in which he apologised for his behaviour, showed remorse and emphasised to the Committee the importance of farriery to him.

5.6 The Committee accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

5.7 The Committee considered the following to be aggravating features of the case. The Respondent’s conduct had caused injury to his wife and a risk of injury to others. The conduct had, on each occasion, been reckless and there were two separate incidents. Although both could be said to have

occurred during a period of emotional turmoil, the Committee considered that there was time for reflection following the first incident and before the second incident.

- 5.8 The Committee identified the following mitigating features. The offences had occurred during a period of emotional turmoil. The Respondent had had a long and unblemished career and the testimonial evidence submitted on his behalf demonstrated that he had made an exceptional contribution to the profession. He had been open and frank in his dealings with the FRC and he had made appropriate efforts to avoid any repetition of his misconduct.
- 5.9 Importantly, the Committee judged that he had now attained an appropriate level of insight into the seriousness of his misconduct and was genuinely remorseful for it. The risk of repetition was, in the Committee's judgment, minimal.
- 5.10 The Committee reminded itself that the purpose of any sanction in a case of this kind was to arrive at an outcome which was proportionate and effective in maintaining the reputation of the profession and so protecting the public interest.
- 5.11 The Committee first considered whether it would be appropriate to take no further action. It concluded that the convictions and the misconduct upon which they were based was much too serious to justify such a course.
- 5.12 No useful purpose would be served by postponing sanction.
- 5.13 The Committee next considered a Reprimand and/or Warning. Although the Committee recognised that the Respondent had developed insight and future risk to the public was minimal, the Committee did not consider the Respondent's misconduct to be at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness. In the Committee's assessment this level of misconduct needed to be marked by a more restrictive sanction. A Reprimand and /or Warning was not proportionate to the circumstances of the offences.
- 5.14 The Committee next considered a period of Suspension. The Committee considered that the matters identified in the Indicative Sanctions Guidance as potentially meriting a period of suspension were met in this case. The misconduct was serious; the Respondent had insight and was fit to return to practice after a period of suspension. In the Committee's judgment a relatively short period of suspension was sufficient to mark the seriousness of the misconduct, to uphold proper standards of behaviour in Registered Farriers and to maintain the reputation of the profession. The Committee considered that a period of suspension of three months was sufficient to achieve these objectives.
- 5.15 In accordance with its usual practice the Committee also considered whether a more serious sanction, that of Removal from the Register, was appropriate. It concluded that in all the circumstances this would be disproportionate and punitive. A suspension of three months was sufficient to satisfy the public interest.
- 5.16 Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Respondent's registration is suspended for a period three months.

Disciplinary Committee

23 July 2026