

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**  
**ZVI KRIPLE, Appellant,**

**v.**

**HORSERACING INTEGRITY AND SAFETY AUTHORITY, Respondent.**

**APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF FINAL CIVIL SANCTION**

Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 3058 and 16 CFR § 1.146, Appellant Zvi Kriple hereby files this Application for Review of the Final Decision issued by the HISA Board of Directors on December 9, 2025 (Case No. 2025-21505). Appellant requests that the Commission set aside the 2-year suspension and dismiss the charges following a de novo review.

**I. SPECIFICATION OF ERRORS**

Appellant asserts that the HISA Board committed the following errors of law and fact:

1. **Failure to Apply the Correct Legal Standard for "Deprivation":** The Board interpreted HISA Rule 2215(a)(4) as a strict liability rule. Under a proper legal analysis, "deprivation of care" requires an intentional or negligent act of withholding care. The record proves that Appellant did not withhold care but was actively seeking it during a logistical crisis.
2. **Disregard of Undisputed Mitigating Evidence:** The Board's decision acted as a "rubber stamp," failing to assign any weight to the undisputed fact that Appellant remained with the horse until 1:30 AM and made exhaustive attempts to contact regulatory veterinarians.
3. **Abuse of Discretion in Sentencing:** The imposition of a 2-year suspension—the maximum penalty—is grossly disproportionate to the facts of the case, where the "violation" was caused by the unavailability of track-side emergency services rather than trainer misconduct.

**II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

On the night of the incident involving the horse "Royal Honey," a medical emergency (colic) occurred during hours when Belterra Park lacked available attending veterinarians. Appellant's conduct was the opposite of neglect:

- Appellant made repeated attempts to contact **Dr. Renn** and other emergency contacts.
- Appellant remained at the barn to provide manual care and monitoring for several hours.
- The inability to transport the horse or secure a veterinarian was a result of systemic failures within the racing facility's infrastructure, for which the Appellant cannot be held legally liable.

**III. REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

The Board's decision is arbitrary, capricious, and not supported by substantial evidence. Appellant respectfully requests that the Commission:

1. Grant a de novo evidentiary hearing before an Administrative Law Judge;
2. Vacate the 2-year suspension; and
3. Find that Appellant fulfilled his "Duty of Care" to the maximum extent possible under the circumstances.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Zvi Kriple, Appellant**

[Date] 12/19/2025

[Your Address]

[Your Phone Number] 859-806 5439

## **STATEMENT OF CONTESTED FACTS: THE EFFORT TO SAVE ROYAL HONEY**

### **In Re: Zvi Kriple (Case No. 2025-21505)**

Appellant Zvi Kriple provides the following Statement of Facts to correct the record and demonstrate that no "deprivation of care" occurred under Rule 2215(a)(4).

#### **1. The Onset of the Emergency**

On the night in question, the horse "Royal Honey" began showing acute signs of colic. Appellant, as the Responsible Person, was physically present at the barn immediately upon discovery of the horse's distress.

#### **2. Exhaustive Efforts to Secure Professional Care**

Contrary to the Authority's findings, Appellant engaged in a multi-hour, desperate search for veterinary intervention. The timeline of these efforts is as follows:

- **Direct Outreach to Regulatory Personnel:** Appellant made repeated attempts to contact **Dr. Renn**, the regulatory veterinarian on duty/call for the facility. These attempts were met with no immediate physical response or intervention.
- **Search for Attending Veterinarians:** Appellant reached out to multiple private attending veterinarians typically associated with the racetrack. Due to the hour and the lack of a centralized emergency protocol at the facility, no veterinarian was able to attend to the horse.
- **The 1:30 AM Vigil:** Witness testimony and barn records show Appellant remained in the stall with Royal Honey until approximately 1:30 AM, providing manual care, walking the horse, and monitoring vitals while waiting for a response that never came.

#### **3. The Logistical "Trap" (Unavailable Infrastructure)**

The "deprivation" of care was a result of external factors beyond Appellant's control:

- **Lack of Emergency Transport:** Appellant investigated the possibility of transporting the horse to a surgical clinic. However, specialized equine transport capable of handling a horse in acute distress was not available at that hour.
- **Clinic Closures:** Local veterinary clinics were either at capacity or did not have emergency staff available to receive a "walk-in" colic case without a referring veterinarian—who, as noted, was unreachable.

#### **4. Conclusion of Fact**

Appellant did not "permit" the horse to suffer. He was the only individual present fighting for the horse's life. To label a trainer's inability to manifest a veterinarian out of thin air as "deprivation" is a factual error. The horse received every ounce of care that was humanly and logistically possible within the confines of the racetrack's available resources.

## **APPLICATION FOR STAY OF FINAL CIVIL SANCTION**

Pursuant to 16 CFR § 1.148, Appellant moves for an immediate stay of the 2-year suspension pending the outcome of this review.

**1. Likelihood of Success on Merits:** On de novo review, the Commission will find that "deprivation" requires a voluntary act of withholding. The evidence of Appellant's desperate search for a veterinarian contradicts this finding.

**2. Irreparable Harm:** Absent a stay, Appellant will suffer immediate and permanent loss of his livelihood, clients, and professional reputation. A 2-year suspension is a "death penalty" for a horse racing career that cannot be remedied by future legal victory.

**3. Public Interest:** A stay is in the public interest to ensure that trainers are not punished for logistical failures outside their control, which would otherwise discourage transparency in reporting medical emergencies.



**BEFORE THE HORSERACING INTEGRITY AND SAFETY AUTHORITY****IN THE MATTER OF:****ZVI KRIPLE**

)

)

)

**Action No. 2025-21507****RESPONSE TO APPEAL****\* \* \* \* \***

On August 25, 2025, the Covered Horse ROYAL HONEY died in her stall at Belterra Park. ROYAL HONEY began displaying signs of colic on August 23, 2025.<sup>1</sup> ROYAL HONEY's condition worsened over the next day, and she ultimately died at 3:30 a.m. on August 25, 2025 from a colon volvulus – rupture of her digestive tract.<sup>2</sup> At no point from August 23 to August 25 did ROYAL HONEY receive any veterinary treatment for her condition.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Krippe left ROYAL HONEY alone in her stall at 1:30 a.m. on August 25, and ROYAL HONEY died two hours later.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Krippe, the Responsible Person for ROYAL HONEY, failed to provide ROYAL HONEY with proper veterinary care from August 23 to August 25, 2025.

Rule 2215(a)(4) provides:

No Covered Person acting alone or in concert with another person shall compromise the welfare of a Covered Horse for competitive or commercial reasons or subject or permit any Covered Horse under their control, custody, or supervision to be subjected to or incur the following:

...

(4) deprivation of necessary care, sustenance, shelter, or veterinary care.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amended IAP Decision at 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*; HISA Hearing Exhibit 1 – Dr. Bart Sutherland's Welfare Assessment.

<sup>3</sup> Amended IAP Decision at 2-3.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 2.

Mr. Kriple violated HISA Rule 2215(a)(4) with his failure to provide necessary veterinary care to ROYAL HONEY. The Internal Adjudication Panel (“IAP”) Decision (the “IAP Decision”) reaching this conclusion should be affirmed as it is not clearly erroneous and is supported by the evidence and applicable law.<sup>5</sup>

1. The IAP issued specific findings of fact and conclusions of law in the IAP Decision, which are supported by the evidence in the record.

The evidence in the record supports the IAP’s Decision that Mr. Kriple violated Rule 2215(a)(4). The IAP evaluated the evidence presented by both Mr. Kriple and HISA at the hearing. When considering the testimony Mr. Kriple provided, the IAP summarized Mr. Kriple’s testimony to be that “despite his best and repeated efforts over the periods of August 23 and 24, 2025, [Mr. Kriple] was unable to find any veterinarian that would either come to the racetrack to treat the horse or receive the horse at a clinic where it could be seen and treated.”<sup>6</sup> Mr. Kriple testified at the hearing, but he presented no other witnesses or documentary evidence in support of his position. No other evidence in the record supports Mr. Kriple’s testimony.

HISA, conversely, presented three witnesses at the hearing. First, HISA presented Dr. Bart Sutherland, who testified regarding his professional veterinary opinion of ROYAL HONEY’s treatment and conducted a Welfare Assessment based on the Covered Horse’s conditions and events of August 23 to August 25, 2025.<sup>7</sup> He

---

<sup>5</sup> The IAP decision was subsequently amended to reflect that all relevant events in this matter took place from August 23 to August 25, 2025 rather than April 23 to April 25, 2025. Enforcement counsel’s Response to the Request for Stay in this matter referenced the April dates cited in the IAP decision, but enforcement counsel now adopts the correct dates of August 23 to August 25, 2025 in this filing.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>7</sup> HISA Hearing Exhibit 1 – Dr. Bart Sutherland’s Welfare Summary.

opined that large colon volvulus, ROYAL HONEY's condition, is one of the most severe and painful abdominal emergencies a horse could experience, typically requiring surgery, and if left untreated often results in death.<sup>8</sup> Ultimately, Dr. Sutherland concluded in his report:

It is my opinion from the information provided that Mr. Zvi Kriple caused needless suffering by unnecessarily delaying or avoiding pursuing treatment for the uncontrollable pain of the horse "Royal Honey."<sup>9</sup>

Next, HISA presented Dr. Timothy Renn, ROYAL HONEY's attending veterinarian, for testimony. In addition to his testimony, Dr. Renn also provided a sworn statement regarding the Covered Horse's condition and events in question.<sup>10</sup> Dr. Renn testified that Mr. Kriple contacted him on August 24, 2025, around 12:30 p.m. because ROYAL HONEY had colic. Informing Mr. Kriple that he was 100 miles away, Dr. Renn encouraged him to call Park Equine Hospital in Bourbon County, Kentucky or speak to other trainers to find a local veterinarian who could treat the horse.<sup>11</sup> Dr. Renn specifically told Mr. Kriple the horse needed treatment "or it was probably going to die."<sup>12</sup> Later that night, Mr. Kriple again called Dr. Renn and told him that the horse had yet to be seen by a veterinarian. Dr. Renn did not hear from Mr. Kriple again until after ROYAL HONEY's death.

Dr. Renn testified that ROYAL HONEY never received any veterinary care despite trainer Pearl Chain contacting veterinarian Dr. Tony Wolfe who agreed to

---

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> HISA Hearing Exhibit 3 – Dr. Timothy Renn's Veterinary Report.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

treat ROYAL HONEY. According to Dr. Renn, trainers Pearl Chain, Steve Sandy, and Christy Estevanko, all stabled at Belterra Park, volunteered to transport the ROYAL HONEY to Dr. Wolfe's office for treatment free of charge, "yet Zvi declined to have the horse seen."<sup>13</sup> Based on his professional experience, Dr. Renn opined that a ruptured volvulus required surgery for cure, or in the alternative, or euthanasia to prevent a "long drawn-out painful death of Royal Honey."<sup>14</sup>

HISA also presented Belterra Park steward David Pate for testimony. Mr. Pate testified regarding the stewards' actions regarding the events surrounding ROYAL HONEY's death. He testified that the Board of Stewards rescinded Mr. Kriple's Ohio racing license with prejudice and recommended he be placed on a "Stop List" to prevent him from future racing licensure in Ohio because he failed to provide ROYAL HONEY with medical care, even when it was offered to him free of charge.<sup>15</sup> Mr. Pate continued:

It is my opinion, as a Steward and horseman in general, that Mr. Kriple should never be granted a racing license, of any kind, ever again. This is the second (2<sup>nd</sup>) time he has been found to have neglected animals in his care, and I would rather not find out if it will happen a third (3<sup>rd</sup>) time.<sup>16</sup>

Based on the review of the evidence in the record, the IAP determined that HISA had established the following facts by a "preponderance of evidence":<sup>17</sup>

Covered Person Zvi Kriple (P000-021-507) was the responsible person for the Covered Horse Royal Honey (H000-062-142) which was stabled at Belterra Park on August 23, 2025. On the afternoon of August 23,

---

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> HISA Hearing Exhibit 4 – David Pate Statement.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> IAP Amended Decision at 1.



2025, which was a racing day at Belterra Park, the Covered Horse began to show symptoms of colic, a painful intestinal condition in horses. Without having sought veterinary aid on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, at 12:30PM on Sunday August 24, 2025 the Covered Person made contact with Dr. Timothy Renn to seek veterinary aid. Dr Renn informed the Covered Person that he was 100 miles away and was unable to return to the track to attend to the horse. He suggested several alternative veterinarians which might be able to attend to the horse in a timely manner. He further stressed the importance of having the horse seen to and that the condition, left untreated, could lead to a very painful death of the Covered Horse.

Dr. Renn further testified that his next contact with the Covered Person was at 8:30PM on the 24<sup>th</sup> when he was told by the Covered Person that the horse still had not been treated by a veterinarian. In his testimony, Dr. Renn quoted another trainer who was on the call as saying that several trainers had volunteered to ship the horse to a nearby vet clinic free of charge but that the Covered Person refused to take advantage of those offers. The Covered Person testified that he left the horse unattended at 1:30 AM on the 25<sup>th</sup> and that the Covered Horse fell out of its stall at 3:30AM and died what Dr. Renn described would have been a very painful death.

Autopsy results showed that the cause of death was a rupture of the Covered Horses' digestive tract.<sup>18</sup>

From this, the IAP reached the conclusion that:

Based on the applicable Racetrack Safety Rules ... and based upon the established evidence ... the Hearing Panel has determined that the Covered Person has violated the following Racetrack Safety Rule: 2215 (a)(4), which prohibits "the deprivation of necessary care, sustenance, shelter, or veterinary care" to a Covered Horse.<sup>19</sup>

The IAP's Decision, including the findings of fact and conclusion of law, are not clearly erroneous and are supported by the evidence in the record and applicable law.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 3.



2. It is the duty of Responsible Person to provide the minimum necessary care to Covered Horses.

In his appeal, Mr. Kriple asserts a “systemic failure, not personal negligence”<sup>20</sup> caused ROYAL HONEY’s death. This argument is nonsensical. Though Dr. Renn, ROYAL HONEY’s attending veterinarian, was unable to treat the Covered Horse from August 23 to August 25, 2025, he provided Mr. Kriple with the name of another equine hospital to call for treatment services.<sup>21</sup> Additionally, another trainer at Belterra Park contacted Dr. Wolfe, who agreed to treat ROYAL HONEY, and multiple trainers offered to ship the Covered Horse to Dr. Wolfe’s office for treatment free of charge.<sup>22</sup> Mr. Kriple refused each of these offers and suggestions. ROYAL HONEY did not receive veterinary care for her painful condition that ultimately led to her death because Mr. Kriple refused to provide her with the necessary, veterinary care she needed – even when offered to him.

Further, veterinarians are not required by HISA to be at the racetrack overnight. The Responsible Person has the duty to ensure that Covered Horses in his care receive treatments that are “the minimum necessary to address the diagnosed health concerns identified during the veterinary examination and diagnostic process.”<sup>23</sup> Dr. Renn told Mr. Kriple that the horse would “likely die” if she did not receive immediate treatment. Other trainers attempted to assist Mr. Kriple with the care of ROYAL HONEY. Yet, Mr. Kriple, the Responsible Person for ROYAL HONEY,

---

<sup>20</sup> Mr. Kriple Statement on Appeal at 2.

<sup>21</sup> HISA Hearing Exhibit 4 – David Pate Statement.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> Rule 3040(b)(3)(iii).

did not provide her with the minimum level of necessary veterinary care. Mr. Kriple's deprivation of necessary, veterinary care resulted in ROYAL HONEY's death and his violation of Rule 2215(a)(4).

3. Mr. Kriple was not deprived of any due process during the adjudication.

Mr. Kriple received a fair hearing. Mr. Kriple was served with a Notice of Violation on September 10, 2025. Mr. Kriple did not respond to the Notice of Violation. On September 18, 2025, IAP member Abbott provided notice of his appointment to the parties. Mr. Abbott conducted a status conference with Mr. Kriple and counsel for HISA on September 22, 2025. At that conference, the parties agreed that the final hearing would occur on October 20, 2025 and witness and exhibit disclosures would be submitted by September 29, 2025 (HISA) and October 13, 2025 (Mr. Kriple). Mr. Kriple never objected to any part of the agreed upon timeline for adjudication. Mr. Kriple never expressed any concern or inability to prepare for the hearing prior to the hearing or during the hearing. Mr. Kriple did not present any witnesses, besides his own testimony, and he did not produce any documentary evidence at the hearing. Mr. Kriple was not deprived of any due process during the adjudication.

Mr. Kriple now makes broad, unfounded claims that witness intimidation occurred. He has provided no specificity in this allegation. HISA does not engage in witness intimidation.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

**ZVI KRIPLE**, Appellant,

**v.**

**HORSERACING INTEGRITY AND SAFETY AUTHORITY**, Respondent.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this day, **December [Insert Date], 2025**, I caused a true and correct copy of the following documents:

1. **Notice of Appeal and Application for Review**
2. **Application for Stay of Final Civil Sanction**
3. **Statement of Contested Facts**

To be served upon the following parties via electronic mail (email), which is the primary method of service agreed upon by the parties and the Commission:

**To the Federal Trade Commission:**

- Secretary of the Commission: [electronicfilings@ftc.gov](mailto:electronicfilings@ftc.gov)
- Office of Administrative Law Judges: [oalj@ftc.gov](mailto:oalj@ftc.gov)

**To the Respondent (HISA/HIWU):**

- HISA Legal Department: [legal@hisaus.org](mailto:legal@hisaus.org)
- HIWU Adjudications: [adjudications@hiwu.org](mailto:adjudications@hiwu.org)
- [If you have the specific email of the lawyer who was at your hearing, add it here]

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Zvi Kriple, Appellant**

[Your Address]

[Your Phone Number] 859-8065 439

[Your Email Address] ZKRIPLE@YAHOO.COM