

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 GREGORY DODD DIPWCF

1. THE CHARGES

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

1. On 8 July 2025, in the Staffordshire Magistrates' Court, sitting at the North Staffordshire Justice Centre, were convicted following a guilty plea, of:
 - (i) driving a motor vehicle when your alcohol level was above the limit, contrary to section 5(1) (a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, namely on 19 June 2025 at Meir Heath in the County of Staffordshire drove a Ford Transit Connect on a road, namely Grindley Lane, 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;
 - (ii) driving a motor vehicle otherwise than in accordance with a licence, contrary to section 87(1) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, namely on 19 June 2025 at Meir Heath in the County of Staffordshire drove a Ford Transit Connect on a road, namely Grindley Lane, otherwise than in accordance with a licence authorising you to drive a motor vehicle of that class;
 - (iii) using a motor vehicle on a road/public place without third party insurance, contrary to section 143 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, namely on 19 June 2025 at Meir Heath in the County of Staffordshire drove a Ford Transit Connect on a road, namely Grindley Lane, when there was not in force in relation to that use such a policy of insurance as complied with the requirements of Part VI of the Road Traffic Act 1988;

In relation to which offences, on 18 August 2025, in the Staffordshire Magistrates' Court, sitting at the North Staffordshire Justice Centre you were disqualified from driving for a period of 40 months, required to comply with a Community Order, required to have treatment for alcohol dependency, required to comply with a maximum of 20 rehabilitation activity days, and ordered to pay costs of £85 and a surcharge of £114; and/or

2. On 22 June 2025 at Blythe Bridge, you committed the offence of criminal damage to property valued under £5000, more particularly in that, without lawful excuse, you damaged a window to the value of £90 belonging to CR, intending to destroy or damage such property or being reckless as to whether such property would be destroyed or damaged, contrary to sections 1(1) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971 and on the 22 September 2025 at the Staffordshire Magistrates Court, sitting at the North Staffordshire Justice Centre, in relation to that offence, you were conditionally discharged, ordered to pay £200 in compensation, costs of £85 and a surcharge of £26; and /or

3. Failed to submit any or all Annual Returns to the Council for the following years:

- (i) 2016;
- (ii) 2017;
- (iii) 2018;
- (iv) 2019;
- (v) 2020;
- (vi) 2021;
- (vii) 2022;
- (viii) 2024; and
- (ix) 2026;

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 Collis appeared on behalf of the Council; the Respondent was present via video link.
- 1.3 The Respondent admitted all of the charges and further admitted Serious Misconduct in a Professional Respect.
- 1.4 The Committee found the charges Proved by reason of the Respondent's admissions.

2. SERIOUS MISCONDUCT IN A PROFESSIONAL RESPECT

- 2.1 On 19 June 2025 at about 19.44 the Respondent was observed leaving a white Ford Transit van and making his way towards a convenience store. He was stumbling and could hardly walk. He later drove off in the Transit van. He was located by police in the vicinity, sitting in the driver's seat with the keys in the ignition. He was arrested and subjected to a roadside breath test. He was found to be almost three times in excess of the prescribed limit for alcohol in breath. He told the police that he had been working as a farrier that day, had drunk 2-3 cans of Jack Daniels and Coke to control his shakes and, upon finishing work at 5.30 pm, he had drunk two pints of cider at a pub. His driving licence had expired, and this invalidated his policy of motor insurance.
- 2.2 On 22 June 2025 the Respondent had been having a day out with his former partner and their two children, aged four and 18 months. His former partner suspected that he had been drinking during the day and, on their return to her house, asked him to dispose of some alcohol that she had found. He did not do so, and he was asked to leave the house. He later returned, and punched and broke a window in the bathroom while his former partner was bathing their children.
- 2.3 The Respondent has only completed two Annual Returns since 2016, despite reminder letters being sent. Nine years passed without any Annual Return being submitted, notwithstanding reminders.
- 2.4 Mr Collis referred the Committee to the *Farrier, Approved Training Farrier & Apprentice Code of Professional Conduct 2024* ("the Code") and in particular to paragraph 95 which provides that serious criminal offences will usually amount to a matter of serious misconduct and that offences which endanger the public or bring the profession into disrepute may fall into this category. Mr Collis reminded the Committee of the principle in *Remedy (UK)Ltd v General Medical Council* [2010] EWHC 1245 (Admin) that conduct which is morally culpable or otherwise disgraceful may warrant action from an individual's professional regulator on the basis that such conduct may be liable to bring the profession into disrepute.

- 2.5 Mr Collis also referred the Committee to Paragraph 85 of the Code which provides that “*Registered Farriers must complete an Annual Return.*”
- 2.6 Mr Collis submitted that the matters before the Committee amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect.
- 2.7 The Respondent said that he was ashamed of his conduct which had been caused by his reliance on alcohol. As his business had grown he had become increasingly reliant on alcohol. His drinking had caused him to lose his business as well as his family life. In relation to the failure to submit Annual Returns he said that he had left paperwork to his former partner and had assumed, wrongly, that she had submitted the Returns. He told the Committee that he was now sober, and doing a job which he disliked. He had been passionate about farriery but was now resigned to leaving the profession.
- 2.8 The Committee accepted the advice of the legal assessor.
- 2.9 The Committee had regard to Paragraph 95 of the Code which provides as follows:
- “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”*
- 2.10 The Committee considered that the Respondent's driving offences amounted to serious misconduct in a professional respect. Driving was an integral part of any farrier's work and to drive a vehicle while almost three times over the legal limit for alcohol in breath endangered the public and was liable to bring the profession into disrepute. The further offences involving the absence of a driving licence which was in date and the consequent absence of insurance compounded the seriousness of the matter.
- 2.11 The Committee also considered the offence of criminal damage to be serious misconduct in a professional respect. The breaking of a window must have been frightening to the Respondent's former partner and their very young children. The seriousness of this misconduct was compounded by the fact that the Respondent was actually on bail in respect of the driving offences at the time of this further offence.
- 2.12 In relation to the failures to submit Annual Returns the Committee noted that these failures extended over a period of nine years. A farrier's Annual Return is a very important document. The requirement to declare any convictions or cautions and to declare that professional indemnity insurance is in place plays a crucial role in protecting the public. The Respondent had a personal responsibility to ensure that Annual Returns were properly submitted, and he was sent many reminders. His repeated failures to comply with this aspect of his responsibilities as a Registered Farrier amount, in the Committee's view, to serious misconduct in a professional respect.

3. SANCTION

- 3.1 Mr Collis told the Committee that the Respondent had joined the Register on 1 March 2007 and there were no previous regulatory findings. He reminded the Committee of the Indicative Sanctions Guidance. In relation to aggravating factors, he referred to the risk of injury in relation to the driving offence of driving with excess alcohol and the repeated failure to submit Annual Returns. In relation to potential mitigation, he referred to the Respondent's long career and pointed out that the misconduct did not involve any financial gain.
- 3.2 The Respondent said that he had come to terms with leaving the profession of farriery and that he wanted closure in respect of these matters.

- 3.3 The Committee accepted the advice of the legal assessor.
- 3.4 The Committee identified the following aggravating factors. The Respondent's driving of a motor vehicle when far over the prescribed limit for alcohol had created an obvious risk of injury to others. His conduct in relation to the driving offences and the offence of criminal damage had been reckless. His failure to submit Annual Returns was repeated and amounted to a blatant disregard for the role of the FRC and the systems that regulate the farriery profession.
- 3.5 The Committee identified the following mitigating features. The Respondent had had a long and previously unblemished career. His skill as a farrier was not in question. He had made full admissions. He was genuinely remorseful and had now developed full insight into the nature of his condition and the seriousness of his misconduct.
- 3.6 The Committee first considered whether to take no further action but concluded that this was much too serious a case for such a course to be appropriate.
- 3.7 The Committee did not consider that any useful purpose would be served by postponing sanction.
- 3.8 The Committee did not consider that a Warning or Reprimand was a proportionate response to the seriousness of the Convictions and the offence of criminal damage, nor to the repeated failures to provide Annual Returns.
- 3.9 The Committee next considered suspension. While it concluded that the Respondent had developed insight into the consequences of his previous reliance on alcohol, it did not consider that it was able to conclude, at this stage in the Respondent's journey of recovery, that the Respondent would be fit to return to practice after a period of suspension. The Committee also considered, looking at all of the matters which were before it that a period of suspension would not be a proportionate response to the misconduct, which included long-standing disregard for the need to submit Annual Returns.
- 3.10 The Committee had come to the view that the misconduct in this case was so serious that Removal from the Register was the only proportionate response. The Respondent's reliance on alcohol had placed others at risk of serious harm and his repeated failures over many years to submit an Annual Return were inconsistent with membership of a regulated profession.
- 3.11 In reaching this decision the Committee wishes to make it clear that it has not been influenced by the Respondent's expressed intention to leave the farriery profession. Intentions of that kind may change and if the Respondent's recovery continues he may come to change his mind and seek to return to a role for which, at one time, he was very well-suited. If so, he will be at liberty to apply for restoration to the Register in the usual way.
- 3.12 Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Respondent's name is removed from the Register of Farriers.

Disciplinary Committee

24 July 2026