UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
FTC DOCKET NO. 9435

ADMINSTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: JAY L. HIMES

IN THE MATTER OF:

DR. SCOTT SHELL, DVM **APPELLANT**

APPELLANT'S PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND PROPOSED ORDER

Andrew J. Mollica, Esq.
1205 Franklin Ave Suite 16LL
Garden City, New York 11530
516 528-1311 Cell
516 280-3182 Office
jdmol@aol.com
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

Dr. Scott Shell, DVM ("**Dr. Shell**" and/or "**Appellant**"), submits the following Proposed Findings of Fact ("**PFF**"), Proposed Conclusions of law, and Proposed Order.

I. Proposed Findings of Fact ("PFF")

1. Dr. Shell is a veterinarian, licensed in Ohio and West Virginia. AB1 1043, ¶ 1.

2. On October 4, 2023, Horseracing Integrity and Welfare Unit ("**HIWU**") investigators confiscated a "bottle labeled 'Hemo 15" ("**Bottle**") from Appellant's veterinarian vehicle at JACK Thistledown Racino. AB1 271(III).

3. The Bottle identified pharmacy, Horse Necessities, Inc., the veterinarian, Dr. Shell, and patient, Covered Horse, "*Mo Don't No Horse*." AB1 271(III), 276.

4. HIWU sent the Bottle to the Pennsylvania Equine Toxicology & Research Laboratory ("**PETRL**") for testing. On December 12, 2023, PETRL reported the composition of the Bottle's contents. ("**PETRL Report**"). AB1 272, 279-80.

5. The PETRL Report did not identify any Banned Substances but HIWU's Chief of Science, Dr. Mary Scollay testified that reported Cobalt was "problematic." AB2 116:8-13 (Scollay); AB1 279-80.

6. Dr. Scollay testified Cobalt is a trace mineral, found in vitamin B-12 and could have been derived from other Bottle contents. AB2 139:9-13, 140:14-19, 141:20-142:2 (Scollay).

7. The Horseracing Integrity and Safety Authority ("**HISA**") has a threshold for Cobalt in horse's blood [or urine] and there is no evidence any horse treated by Appellant met that threshold. AB1 1074; AB2 140:21-141:2, 167:2-168:4 (Scollay).

8. The PETRL Report did not show evidence of "Cobalt Salt," which is a Banned Substance. AB1 279-80, 1074; AB2 143:1-144:3 (Scollay).

9. The PETRL Report identified nicotinamide, which Dr. Scollay stated is a potential metabolite of a B Vitamin and it is "under investigation" as to whether it is an actual metabolite or contaminant of formulating vitamin or drug products. Dr. Scollay stated it is a banned substance, but "as of yet because of the potential for it being a metabolite of B vitamins, it remains on a monitoring list." AB2 121:1-12 (Scollay).

10. Nicotinamide is not on HISA' Banned Substance list. AB1 1055-1132.

11. The PETRL Report did not show nicotinamide to be a Banned Substance violation, only of "significant interest." AB2 121:1-12 (Scollay).

12. The Bottle's label states: "[t]his is a compounded drug. Not an FDA approved or indexed drug," AB1 1309, which Dr. Bertone testified is the pharmacy's standard statement and incorrect as to Appellant's Hemo 15. AB2 451:11-14 (Bertone).

13. "Hemo 15" is not on HISA's Banned Substance List. AB 1055-1132.

14. "Hemo 15" is shorthand for a combination of vitamins, minerals, and amino acids. AB2 222:13-15 (Shell), AB2 303:14-19 (Maxwell); AB2 379:12-14 (Bertone).

15. Appellant's Hemo 15 and Bottle made no label claims to treat or diagnose any condition. AB2 389:22-390:5 (Bertone); AB2 148:2-21, 155:23-156:16 (Scollay).

16. Appellant obtained all his Hemo 15 from Horse Necessities, Inc. and ingredients were the same for 37 years. AB2 265:2-15, 270:6-14 (Shell).

17. HIWU searched the HISA Portal and found Appellant self-reported 228 "Hemo 15" administrations from May 29 to October 19, 2023, for 37 Covered Horses. AB1 267 ¶ 10.

18. On January 8, 2024, HIWU alleged Appellant committed 228 violations of ADMC Program Rule ("**Rule**") 3214(c),[1] Administration of a Banned Substance to a Covered Horse, based

[1] Hereinafter, "**Rule(s)**."

on the self-reported Hemo 15 entries, alleging it is banned under Rule 4111. AB1 270-74.

19. On January 22, 2024, Appellant provided an explanation to HIWU, stating Hemo 15 is a vitamin supplement, there was no notice Hemo 15 is banned, it is not on the Banned Substance list, and vitamin supplements do not require government approval. AB1 256-58.

20. On February 9, 2024, HIWU charged Appellant under Rules 3214(c) and 4111 for 228 "Hemo 15" administrations. AB1 284-90.

21. Dr. Scollay gave HISA educational presentations, including on March 24, 2023 at Will Rogers Downs, wherein she stated the FDA does not approve or give vitamins ability to have approval, and HISA can't require approval, but if the label on a dietary supplement, vitamins, or mineral says it cures, treats, prevents, mitigates a specific disease condition, or it very specifically affects the structure or function of a system in the body, that is a drug claim, and now it meets the FDA definition of a drug. If they don't need approval a veterinarian can carry vitamin supplements that have no drug claims. AB 1307, ¶ 3, 1311-12, ¶ 13; AB2 137:5-9, 162:22-163:19 (Scollay).

22. Before HISA, Appellant practiced veterinary medicine for 37 years, was never disciplined, and/or charged with malpractice. AB2 199:9-200:18 (Shell).

23. In preparation for HISA, Appellant educated himself, reviewed the Banned Substance list, emails, watched seminars and attended Dr. Scollay's seminar at Mahoning Valley. AB2 208:5-209:4, 241:13-20, 247:6-248:12, 250:14-19, 260:10-261:11 (Shell).

24. Appellant testified Hemo 15 is a vitamin supplement containing amino acids, vitamins, and minerals, and he used it safely for three decades. AB2 222:8-15 (Shell).

25. Appellant did not use Hemo 15 to treat any conditions, and foreign Hemo 15 with claims, has no connection to his Hemo 15. AB2 224:8-13, 226:1-9 (Shell).

26. Appellant testified Hemo 15 did not fall under Rule 4111 as a vitamin supplement that is not regulated (by the government), it is not covered under Rules 4112-4117, AB2 236:8-237:15 (Shell), he made no claim Hemo 15 treats ailments, it is widely accepted in the United States, AB2 237:20-237:12 (Shell), he had no notice that it was a Banned Substance, it is not on the Banned Substance list, AB2 229:13-230:15 (Shell), and as a veterinarian he was compliant with compounding rules. 252:2-254:5 (Shell).

27. HIWU expert Dr. Laura Maxwell testified "Hemo 15" is a Banned Substance under Rule 4111, AB2 315:5-7 (Maxwell), that the FDA has two divisions of animal products, "foods" or "drugs" and Hemo 15 is a new animal drug because it meets FDA's definition of a drug which is "intended to cure, mitigate, treat, or prevent a disease," it is "not taken by mouth," AB2 304:8-23, 307:22-308:17 (Maxwell), and it does not "appear to have valid veterinary use" as there is no known Cobalt deficiency in horses. AB2 314:15-22 (Maxwell).

28. Dr. Maxwell testified the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act ("**AMDUCA**") permits use of approved "drugs in an extra label fashion" and Hemo 15 is not compliant with AMDUCA because it is not an approved drug. AB2 315:20-316:12 (Maxwell). Dr. Maxwell stated GFI # 256 deals with compounding drugs from bulk drug substances, and Hemo-15 does not meet the requirements of GFI # 256 as it does not meet the requirements of compounding for office stock as it is not on a required list of permitted "drugs for compounding" and Appellant did not compound for individual use. AB2 318:4-324:22 (Maxwell).

29. Dr. Maxwell stated the FDA "expressed concerns" about injectable vitamins. AB1 1284-85.

30. Dr. Maxwell and the Arbitrator cited to, "[f]oreign Hemo-15® products," which makes drug claims. AB1 142, ¶ 8.7, 408, ¶ 14. Aside from name, there is no evidence Appellant's

Hemo 15 is the same as the foreign product. AB2 337:18-338:2 (Maxwell).

31. Appellant's expert, Dr. Joseph Bertone, testified Appellant's Hemo 15 is a vitamin supplement, makes no label drug treatment claims, therefore it is not a drug, it does not need FDA approval as a drug, AB2 379:8-380:9, 382:20-386:1, 399:1-15 (Bertone), it is acceptable in the United States veterinary community, AB2 380:11-17, 382:6-18 (Bertone), and foreign, trademarked Hemo 15, that makes drug claims, is inapplicable to Hemo 15 in the United States. AB2 381:1-20, 457:16-458:1 (Bertone). Dr. Bertone testified "you cannot impugn intent," as a claim to treat a condition must be on the label, otherwise it is not a drug. AB2 388:12-389:1 (Bertone). Dr. Bertone testified Hemo 15 is not on the Banned Substance list and nothing else would lead him to conclude it is banned. AB2 393:9-18 (Bertone).

32. GFI #256 is guidance, not law. AB2 387:15-388:2 (Bertone).

33. Hemo 15 is not addressed under Rules 4112 to 4117. Rule 4111(i)). AB2 398:8-16 (Bertone).

34. Dr. Bertone testified Hemo 15 is not a drug and therefore does not require government approval, rendering Rule 4111(ii) inapplicable. AB2 398:18-399:23 (Bertone).

35. Dr. Bertone testified AMDUCA is a drug use compliance act, and it does not apply as Appellant's Hemo 15 is not being administered as a drug to mitigate disease, and Appellant's Hemo 15 is "compliant" with GFI # 256, AB2 417:5-18 (Bertone), as Appellant's medical records identified individual horses, AB2 419:22-420:19, 471:14-17 (Bertone) and the FDA website now permits compounding from "products from a pharmacist" and/or therefore GFI # 256 does not even apply. AB2 385:3-386:1, 417:14-18 (Bertone). Dr. Bertone testified route of administration does not make Hemo 15, dietary, or injectable vitamins drugs, without drug claims. AB2 383:8-384:4 (Bertone). Dr. Bertone testified, aside from FDA experts, the public and veterinarians have

relatively no understanding of the issues addressed in Rule 4111. AB2 508:10-510:7 (Bertone).

36. HIWU expert Dr. Joshua Sharlin opined everything in the animal world is either food, food ingredients, or a drug. AB2 494:16-24 (Sharlin). Dr. Sharlin states in analysis of GFI # 256, the "first question to consider under [the FDA] flowchart is whether the compounded drug in issue was created to fulfill a prescription for a specific animal." AB1 1297, and "[t]here are two possible sources for the active ingredient in a compounded drug: an FDA-approved drug, or a bulk drug substance." AB1 1856. Dr. Sharlin opined Hemo 15 is a drug, not compliant with GFI # 256 but agreed with Dr. Bertone that when it comes to the FDA approval process every starts with the drug claim, and then opined about making an "end-run" around FDA regulations because a "claim" is not a requirement of a compounded drug label. AB2 497:4-503:5 (Sharlin). A "bulk drug substance" is defined as "any substance intended to furnish pharmacological activity or other direct effect in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease, or to affect the structure or any function of the body." AB1 1136.

37. Arbitrator Hon. Hugh Fraser's ("**Arbitrator**") June 11, 2024, Amended Decision, in JAMS Case No. 1501000708, found Appellant committed 228 violations under Rule 3214(c) based on 228 self-reported administrations of "Hemo 15" to 37 Covered horses, under Rule 4111. AB1 113, 143, ¶ 8.11. ("**Decision**") and Rule 4111 can be "understood by Covered Persons of ordinary intelligence and is [not] arbitrary and capricious," as only Appellant reported Hemo 15. AB1 146, ¶ 8.22. Dr. Scollay did not know anyone using Hemo 15 so she could not speculate on how it would be reported. AB2 170:21-171:6 (Scollay).

38. The Arbitrator imposed penalties ("**Civil Sanction**") consisting of (a) two years ineligibility, with credit for any Provisional Suspension; (b) a fine of $25,000; (c) payment of $10,000 costs, and (d) he found no fault for 227 of the 228 counts, expunging the penalties for

those counts. AB1 149-50(IX).

39. The Arbitrator found Appellant at fault for not further researching, asking questions about Hemo 15, and its label, but held it was understandable that he continued administration of the substance after his initial reporting (for five months) without warning or consequence". AB1 149, ¶ 8.34.

II. Proposed Conclusions of Law

1. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 3058(b)(2)(A)(i), HISA/HIWU did not meet its burden to establish Appellant administered Banned Substances to Covered Horses 228 times, based on records of self-reported administrations of "Hemo 15."

2. "[T]he Agency has the burden of establishing that a violation of the Protocol has occurred to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel, bearing in mind the seriousness of the allegation that is made. This standard of proof in all cases is greater than a mere balance of probability [i.e., a preponderance of the evidence] but less than clear and convincing evidence or proof beyond a reasonable doubt." Rule 3121.

3. "Administration…to a Covered Horse of any Banned Substance…" is an Anti-Doping Rule Violation. Rule 3214(c). "The Prohibited List identifies Prohibited Substances…" Rule 3111(a)-(b). Banned Substances" includes Rule 4111 "S0 Non-Approved Substances," defined as:

> "[a]ny pharmacological substance that (i) is not addressed by Rules 4112 through 4117, (ii) has no current approval by any governmental regulatory health authority for veterinary or human use, and (iii) is not universally recognized by veterinary regulatory authorities as a valid veterinary use, is prohibited at all times. For the avoidance of doubt, compounded products compliant with the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act (AMDUCA) and the FDA Guidance for Industry (GFI) #256 (also known as Compounding Animal Drugs from Bulk Drug Substances) are not prohibited under this section S0.

4. "Hemo 15" is shorthand for a combination of vitamins, minerals, and amino acids and the only evidence of ingredients in Appellant's Hemo 15 was a PETRL Report, which did not report Banned Substances, and did not show constituent elements Cobalt or Nicotinamide were a Rule violation. **PFF 4-6, 8-11, 14.**

5. HIWU produced no evidence showing Cobalt met HISA's blood (or urine) threshold. **PFF 7.**

6. Hemo 15 is not on the Banned Substance list and HIWU produced no evidence that Appellant's Hemo 15 is the same as European Hemo 15. **PFF 13, 30.**

7. The Arbitrator erroneously relied on attributes of European Hemo 15®, which unlike Appellant's Hemo 15, makes claims. **PFF 25, 30.**

8. The Arbitrator's Decision and Civil Sanction are arbitrary and capricious because it is impossible to reasonably explain why Appellant's Hemo 15 is banned, without evidence of what is in that Hemo 15, and the Decision is not based on "substantial evidence." *see Killian v. Healthsource Provident Adm'rs*, 152 F.3d 514, 520 (6th Cir. 1998), which is less than a preponderance but more than a scintilla; [and] refers to relevant evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Gentry v. Commr. of Social Sec*., 741 F.3d 708, 722 (6th Cir. 2014).

9. The Arbitrator's reliance solely on the name "Hemo 15" is unreasonable and cannot support a violation. Absent proof that Appellant's Hemo 15 contained Banned Substances, HISA/HIWU did not meet its burden to establish a violation of Rules 3214(c) or 4111 with evidence, a preponderance of the evidence, or even substantial evidence.

10. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 3058(b)(2)(A)(ii), the Arbitrator erroneously found that Appellant's Hemo 15, is a Banned Substance and a violation of Rule 4111, **PFF 37**, because

Appellant's Hemo 15 is either compliant with Rule 4111, or the rule is inapplicable. In this context, compliant means non-offensive to the rule.

11. Unlike European Hemo 15, Appellant and his Hemo 15 did not make any claims to cure, treat, or prevent any condition and therefore it cannot be considered a drug. **PFF 31.**

12. Hemo 15 is not addressed by Rules 4112 through 4117. Rule 4111(i); **PFF 33.**

13. Under Rule 4111(ii), Hemo 15 has no "current approval by any governmental regulatory health authority for veterinary or human use," but unlike European Hemo 15®, Appellant's Hemo 15 makes no claims to treat any condition, therefore it cannot, and does not need governmental regulatory approval for veterinary use. **PFF 34-35**. This renders Appellant's Hemo 15 compliant (non-offensive) and/or Rule 4111 inapplicable, and there is no need to review Rule 4111's "avoidance of doubt" provisions under AMDUCA or GFI # 256.

14. The Arbitrator acted arbitrarily and capriciously by seriously failing to apprehend the significance of the fact that Appellant's Hemo 15 made no label drug claims, and therefore it is not a drug. *See Erickson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.,* 39 F.Supp.2d 864, 870 (E.D. Mich.1999).

15. The Arbitrator erroneously credited HIWU experts who presupposed that Hemo 15 is a drug. Dr. Maxwell and Dr. Sharlin erroneously analyzed Appellant's Hemo 15 under AMDUCA and GFI # 256. PFF 27, 35.

16. While Dr. Maxwell testified Hemo 15 is a "new animal drug" because it "intended to cure, mitigate, treat, or prevent a disease," Dr. Maxwell cannot "impugn" intent without a drug claim on a label. **PFF 31.**

17. AMDUCA is a drug use compliance act that allows veterinarians to use approved "drugs in an extra-label fashion". Therefore, AMDUCA does not apply to Appellant's Hemo-15 which makes no claims and is not a drug. **PFF 28, 35.**

18. GFI # 256 addresses compounding drugs from bulk "drug" substances. **PFF 28.** There was no evidence Appellant's Hemo 15 is a "drug" or compounded from a "bulk drug substance" as defined by the FDA, as neither Hemo 15 nor its constituents make drug claims to treat or cure, and it is "compliant" with GFI # 256, based on Appellant's individual use, the FDA website allowing compounding from pharmacy products, and/or GFI #256 does not even apply. **PFF 35.**

19. Dr. Sharlin agreed with Dr. Bertone that in FDA approvals, a claim is what makes it a drug, and while he discussed safety and an "end-run" around FDA Regulations, he did not show how Hemo 15 or its constituents were a drug under the FDA rules. **PFF 36.**

20. While the FDA expressed concerns about injectable vitamins, it is only a drug if there is a drug label claim, and route of administration does not transform substances into drugs. **PFF 29, 35.**

21. While the pharmacy label on Appellant's Hemo 15 said it is a "compounded drug," that is irrelevant based on the contents of the Bottle, and Dr. Bertone's testimony that the standard label is incorrect as it concerns Appellant's Hemo 15. **PFF 12.**

22. The arbitrator erred in failing to accord the lack of drug claims its proper weight and credited HIWU experts in error. Thus, the Agency did not properly establish that Dr. Shell's administrations of Hemo-15 were a "violation" of Rule 4111 or Rule 3214(c). 15 U.S.C. § 3058(b)(2)(A)(ii).

23. Rule 4111, the Decision, and the Civil Sanction violate Appellant's due process right to notice of the prohibited behavior to be penalized, on its face and as applied, as Appellant did not have notice of forbidden conduct. *FCC v. Fox TV Stas., Inc.,* 567 U.S. 239, 253 (2012). Rule 4111 forbids "the doing of an act in terms so vague that men of common intelligence must

necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application, [which] violates the first essential of due process of law." *Connally v. Gen. Constr. Co.,* 269 U.S. 385, 391 (1926). Rule 4111 is "so technical or obscure that it threatens to ensnare individuals engaged in apparently innocent conduct." *United States v. Blaszak,* 349 F.3d 881, 886 (6th Cir. 2003). This principle applies to administrative regulations. *Diebold, Inc. v. Marshall*, 585 F.2d 1327, 1335-36 (6th Cir. 1978).

24. Rule 4111 is vague and technical on its face, and as applied to Appellant. Appellant had no notice Hemo 15 was banned via the Banned Substance list and Covered Persons of reasonable intelligence cannot ascertain what substances are banned under Rule 4111, whether substances not subject to FDA approval, that makes no drug claims, satisfy the conditions of the rule, or if and how the rule turns substances with no drug claims into a drug or Banned Substance. **PFF 13, 19, 26.** The rule requires uber-technical analysis, FDA expert opinion, lacks definitions, relies on GFI #256 "guidance" which requires supposition, **PFF 32, 35**, and this leaves it judges to decide what is banned, resulting in arbitrary enforcement. *Beckles v. United States,* 580 U.S. 256, 266 (2017)(vague laws invites arbitrary enforcement).

25. As such, Rule 4111, the Decision and Civil Sanctions violate Dr. Shell's due process rights on their face and as applied.

26. Rule 4111, the charges, the Decision and Civil Sanctions are arbitrary and capricious because the Arbitrator unreasonably concluded that because "no other veterinarian has been charged with the administration of Hemo 15" that Rule 4111 is not arbitrary and capricious and/or void for vagueness**. PFF 37.** This is speculation (not evidence) as to why other veterinarians did not report Hemo-15, ignores that it could have been reported as a vitamin, and FDA experts, disagree what Rule 4111 applies to, if it applies to substances making no drug claims, and that its vagueness encourages arbitrary enforcement and Covered Persons of reasonable intelligence

cannot decipher Rule 4111.

27. The Decision and Civil Sanctions are also arbitrary, capricious, and otherwise contrary to law, because without due process notice that Hemo-15 was a Banned Substance, accompanied by Appellant's due diligence, he cannot logically and reasonably be held at fault. **PFF 23, 26.**

28. "[I]f a Covered Person establishes in an individual case that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) charged, the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility and other Consequences for such Covered Person shall be eliminated." Rule 3224(a).

29. Where the Covered Person establishes that he or she bears No Significant Fault or Negligence for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation in question, then (unless Rule 3225(b) or 3225(c) applies) the period of Ineligibility shall be fixed between 3 months and 2 years, depending on the Covered Person's degree of Fault." Rule 3225.

30. Although there is no liability, the Arbitrator should have expunged all penalties under Rule 3224, not just for 227 of the 228 counts, because Appellant cannot be faultless for having no notice for 227 counts, but then find fault for the first count, which also lacked the same notice. It was HISA and congress' obligation to promulgate clear rules, not Appellant obligation to ask. *Fox*, supra, at 253. Appellant is faultless and as an alternative holding, all penalties are expunged.

31. Finally, the Fifth Circuit's Decision in *National Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association v. State of Texas,* 107 F.4th 415 (5th Cir. 2024) ("**NHPB**"), is the better reasoned case as compared to the Sixth Circuit case in *Oklahoma v. United States,* 62 F.4th 221 (6th Cir. 2023), cert. denied, 2024 U.S. LEXIS 2724 (June 24, 2024), and the Arbitrator's Decision

is reversed, and Civil Sanction vacated, because HISA/HIWU enforcement of HISA unconstitutionally violates the private nondelegation doctrine on its face, and as applied to Appellant, as private entities did not function subordinately to the FTC. *NHPB,* 107 F.4th at 429. An as-applied challenge was not reviewed in *Oklahoma*, and Appellant was subject to Rule 4111 due process violations in improper proceedings, suffered monetary and reputational damages, without FTC oversight, FTC post-review rulemaking cannot undue those damages.

III. Proposed Order

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, incorporated herein, it is hereby **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that:

The Decision of the Arbitrator **IS REVERSED**, the Civil Sanctions are **VACATED**, and the charges against Appellant are **DISMISSED, with prejudice.**

Entered this ____day of_____, 2024

_____
Jay L. Himes
Administrative Law Judge

Dated: September 11, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/ Andrew Mollica

_____
Andrew J. Mollica, Esq.
1205 Franklin Ave Suite 16LL
Garden City, New York 11530
516 528-1311 Cell
516 280-3182 Office
jdmol@aol.com

WORD COUNT AND SPECIFICATIONS CERTIFICATION

I Andrew Mollica, Esq. certify that the above Proposed Findings of Fact, Proposed Conclusion of Law and Proposed Order were prepared using a computer, Microsoft Word Program, that I used Times New Roman Font, double spaced text, and that I conducted a word count with the Microsoft program, and not including caption, cover page, signatures, service documents, this document is **3,735 words**, including footnotes.

September 11, 2024

/s/ ***Andrew Mollica***
Andrew J. Mollica

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 16 CFR §1.146(a) and 16 CFR §4.4(b), a copy of this Appellant's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Proposed Order, is being served on this September 11, 2024, via Administrative E-File System and by emailing a copy to:

Allison J. Farrell Michelle C. Pujals Horseracing Integrity & Welfare Unit 4801 Main Street, Suite 350 Kansas City, MO 64112-2749 afarrell@hiwu.org mpujals@hiwu.org **COUNSEL FOR HIWU** **A Division of Drug Free Sport, LLC**	James Bunting Alexandria Matic Tyr LLP 488 Wellington Street West, Suite 300-302 Toronto, ON M5V1E3 Canada jbunting@tyrllp.com amatic@tyrllp.com **COUNSEL FOR HIWU**
Hon. Jay L. Himes **ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE** Office of Administrative Law Judges Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20580 Via email to oalj@ftc.gov	April Tabor **Office of the Secretary** **Federal Trade Commission** 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite CC-5610 Washington, DC 20580 Via email: electronicfilings@ftc.gov
BRYAN BEAUMAN REBECCA PRICE 333 W. Vine Street, Suite 1500 Lexington, Kentucky 40507 bbeauman@sturgillturner.com rprice@sturgillturner.com **HISA ENFORCEMENT COUNSEL**	

/s/ Andrew J. Mollica
Andrew J. Mollica, Esq.