Record of operational decision

protect it from pain and suffering, failing to provide a suitable environment for livestock and failing to remove dead stock. Date of decision: 13 February 2023 Decision maker: Head of Public Protection Economy and Environment Scheme of delegation Paragraph 70 (03/08/2022) delegated decision: Ward: Three Crosses Consultation: Legal Services: In accordance with S222 of the Local Government Act 1972 we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)(England) regulations 2013. Reasons for decision: In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed.		
Date of decision: 13 February 2023	Decision title:	protect it from pain and suffering, failing to provide a suitable environment for
Decision maker: Head of Public Protection Authority for delegated decision: Ward: Three Crosses Consultation: Legal Services: In accordance with \$222 of the Local Government Act 1972 we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)(England) regulations 2013. Reasons for In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder relations between persons sharing such a characteristic. Highlight any associated risks finance/legal/equalit y considered and rejected: Details of any declarations		
Authority for delegated decision: Ward: Three Crosses Consultation: Legal Services: In accordance with \$222 of the Local Government Act 1972 we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)[England) regulations 2013. Reasons for In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence the repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder relations between persons sharing such a characteristic. Highlight any associated risks finance/legal/equalit y considered and rejected: Details of any declarations	Date of decision:	13 February 2023
delegated decision: Ward: Three Crosses Legal Services: In accordance with \$222 of the Local Government Act 1972 we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)[England) regulations 2013. Reasons for In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality Considerations The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder relations between persons sharing such a characteristic. Highlight any associated risks finance/legal/equalit y considerations: Details of any declarations	Decision maker:	Head of Public Protection
Consultation: Legal Services: In accordance with \$222 of the Local Government Act 1972 we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)(England) regulations 2013. Reasons for In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1	delegated	Economy and Environment Scheme of delegation Paragraph 70 (03/08/2022)
prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire Which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Youncil's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)(England) regulations 2013. Reasons for decision: In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality Considerations The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder relations between persons sharing such a characteristic. Highlight any associated risks finance/legal/equalit y considered and repetced: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations		Three Crosses
Decision made: To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)(England) regulations 2013. To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, and the Animal By-Products (Enforcement)(England) regulations 2013. In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality Considerations The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder relations between persons sharing such a characteristic. Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations:	Consultation:	prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire which is also in
Reasons decision: In June 2022 officers attended a field where the defendant had numerous animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality	Decision made:	To prosecute for offences under Section 4 and 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006,
animals, including llamas, sheep and a horse. Officers found dead carcasses and evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality Considerations The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder relations between persons sharing such a characteristic. Highlight any associated risks finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations	Reasons for	, , , , , , ,
evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence Equality Considerations The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder relations between persons sharing such a characteristic. Highlight any associated risks finance/legal/equalit y considerations: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations		
Highlight any associated risks finance/legal/equalit y considerations: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations	Equality	evidence of fly strike on one of the llamas. A veterinary surgeon determined that, due to the fly strike, one llama was suffering, whilst others had matted fleeces and the stockmanship was inadequate. The defendant has not responded to requests to be interviewed. The evidential test is met through witness statements and photographic evidence. It is in the public interest to prosecute because: 1) a conviction is likely to result in a banning order; 2) harm was caused to animal health and the environment; 3) the defendant's previous convictions are relevant to the present offence 4) there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to be repeated; 5) a prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence The decision to prosecute does not discriminate, harass or victimize nor encourage conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010. It also does not unfairly impact upon anyone with a relevant protected characteristic nor hinder
associated risks finance/legal/equalit y considerations: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations		relations between persons snaring such a characteristic.
finance/legal/equalit y considerations: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations		
y considerations: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations		
Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations		
alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations	•	
considered and rejected: Details of any declarations	_	
rejected: Details of any declarations	· ·	
Details of any declarations		
declarations		
	-	
of interest made:		
	of interest made:	

Signed Date: 13 February 2023