

# BROKEN LAW

## How the Hunting Act has Failed

### A REPORT BY ACTION AGAINST FOXHUNTING

‘Possibly one of the most farcical eras in criminal justice history’, says Chief Superintendent on fox hunting crime

The same quality of evidence in a murder trial, would have led to an easy conviction."

CPS barrister, illegal hunting trial May 2023

Fox hunting isn't illegal, you can shoot them snare them trap them flush them with dogs to guns and enter a terrier below ground to bolt to net or gun . It's not illegal to hunt and control fox's and it will always be that way . As for cubbing ? Cubs are born early spring it's now Autumn 🤔 Any wild animal fur or feather that harms livestock or crops will always be controlled, stop wasting your time get a job .

57 shares

October 2024

Most relevant ▾



What a joke-even if they ban it hunting will continue-----for the foxes sake-----these people havent a clue-----i hunt with hounds and like many people will continue to do so

12m Like Reply Message Hide



Fox's are vermin. Hunting keeps down they damage they cause. Don't get so soppy. Better than poison, the alternative

in accordance with the law and by kind invitation of the farmers and landowners in our country, The Churlow Hunt aims to simulate an alternative to proper hunting through trail hunting until such time as the present Act is either repealed or amended. We also make use of other exempt ways of hunting. For example, we employ a bird of prey. Our hounds are used to flush a fox to the bird of prey. Terriers are also used to flush a fox to a gun for the protection of game birds. Both of these are legal.

view all 3 replies



Agony of the fox cubs... you sad f

1d Like

Frank Guffogg I agree I've had many days hunting ruined by these unwashed hippies

2d Like

2 🍷 🤔



# **Broken Law – How the Hunting Act has Failed**

## **A Report by Action Against Foxhunting**

**Authors**

**Pip Donovan**

**Sarah Little**

**Published October 2024**

**This is an evidenced-based report connecting documented cases of pursuits and kills of wild mammals with their treatment under the Hunting Act 2004. It highlights the significant issues with the Act and its inability to prevent the hunting of wild mammals.**



### **About Action Against Foxhunting**

Action Against Foxhunting (AAF) is a national campaign organisation dedicated to ending foxhunting forever. Our sister group is Action Against Stag hunting. We have local groups in most counties of England and Wales, run by volunteers.

[www.actionagainstfoxhunting.org](http://www.actionagainstfoxhunting.org) / [www.actionagainststaghunting.org](http://www.actionagainststaghunting.org)

[info@actionagainstfoxhunting.org](mailto:info@actionagainstfoxhunting.org)

# Contents

|                                                                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....                                                           | 5  |
| Overview.....                                                                     | 5  |
| Improving the Hunting Act: recommendations .....                                  | 8  |
| List of case studies.....                                                         | 11 |
| Count of case studies illustrating the need for each of our recommendations ..... | 12 |
| CASE STUDIES.....                                                                 | 17 |
| 29/04/2005, Exmoor.....                                                           | 17 |
| 21/01/2012, Holderness .....                                                      | 19 |
| 19/02/2014, Middleton .....                                                       | 22 |
| 08/03/2017, Portman .....                                                         | 24 |
| 01/01/2016, Fitzwilliam (falconry case).....                                      | 27 |
| 23/09/2017, Grafton Hunt (falconry case) .....                                    | 30 |
| 14/12/2019, Lamerton.....                                                         | 32 |
| 17/10/2020, Beaufort .....                                                        | 34 |
| 13/09/2021, Beaufort .....                                                        | 36 |
| 13/11/2021, South Dorset .....                                                    | 39 |
| 27/12/2021, Puckeridge.....                                                       | 44 |
| 15/01/2022, Belvoir.....                                                          | 47 |
| 18/01/2022, Dunston Harriers .....                                                | 49 |
| 08/01/2023, Fernie .....                                                          | 53 |
| 14/01/2023, East Kent with West Street (now Kent Hounds) .....                    | 54 |
| 28/01/2023, Weston and Banwell.....                                               | 56 |
| 08/02/2023, 20/02/2023, West Norfolk .....                                        | 58 |

|                                                                                      |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>16/11/2023, Blackmore and Sparkford Vale .....</b>                                | <b>64</b> |
| <b>25/11/2023, North Shropshire .....</b>                                            | <b>66</b> |
| <b>06/01/2024, Lamerton .....</b>                                                    | <b>68</b> |
| <b>13/03/2023, Quantock Stag Hounds.....</b>                                         | <b>70</b> |
| <b>17/02/2024, Radnor and West Herefordshire.....</b>                                | <b>71</b> |
| <b>20/04/2024, Devon and Somerset Stag Hounds.....</b>                               | <b>72</b> |
| <b>Other stag kills by stag hunts from August 2024 onwards .....</b>                 | <b>75</b> |
| <b>02/03/2024, East Cornwall and Taunton Vale.....</b>                               | <b>76</b> |
| <b>KILLING OF DOMESTIC ANIMALS AND DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTIAL AREAS BY HUNTS.....</b> | <b>79</b> |
| <b>HAZARDOUS INCIDENTS ON ROADS.....</b>                                             | <b>81</b> |
| <b>CONCLUSION .....</b>                                                              | <b>82</b> |
| <b>GLOSSARY .....</b>                                                                | <b>83</b> |
| <b>IMAGES .....</b>                                                                  | <b>86</b> |
| <b>Images / cont. ....</b>                                                           | <b>87</b> |
| <b>Images / cont. ....</b>                                                           | <b>88</b> |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>                                                        | <b>89</b> |



# Executive Summary

## Broken Law – How the Hunting Act has Failed

### Overview

1. The [Hunting Act 2004](#) is on the brink of being replaced or amended. Lawmakers now realise it has not achieved its primary objective of preventing the hunting of wild mammals with dogs. There are several possible reasons for this, including the fact that the legislation is largely deemed to be confusing, misinterpreted and riddled with loopholes.
2. The Hunting with Dogs Act (2004) covers England and Wales. Scotland has separate legislation, [Hunting with Dogs \(Scotland\) Act 2023](#). In Northern Ireland, it is still legal to hunt live quarry. All of the case studies in the report are from England. Action Against Foxhunting is based in England, hence the use of English cases.
3. *Broken Law - How the Hunting Act has Failed* is an evidenced-based report that explores the connection between shortcomings in the Hunting Act and documented cases where wild animals were claimed to be pursued and killed by hunts. We consider twenty-five cases altogether, twenty-one in detail. Eleven cases resulted in a not guilty verdict, and eleven were dropped by police or the CPS (Crown Prosecution Service), including one dropped after the initial prosecution. In two cases, some defendants were found guilty, but other defendants were not.
4. This report is aimed at anyone tasked with amending the existing Hunting Act or creating a new act to replace it. Any new legislation must be clear, specific, rigorous, enforceable and practical in its application.
5. Given the existence of drag hunts and clean boot hunts (see glossary), this report assumes that hunts will continue to take hounds in packs to follow a trail of some kind. However, our recommendations are intended to protect wild mammals from harm, whether intentional or unintentional. One way of doing this would be to limit activities that are considered smokescreens for illegal activities, such as trail hunts.
6. This report lists twenty-four recommendations to improve the Hunting Act, all directly related to the case studies. This list is not exhaustive, and we recognise that other equally valid improvements are possible.
7. This report considers twenty-five documented cases from fox, stag and hare hunts spanning the twenty years of the Hunting Act. These represent only a

small number of investigations and cases involving the potential pursuit and killing of a wild mammal by a hunt. This report focuses on typical cases, and cases where there is enough information to be certain that a wild mammal was pursued by hunt dogs and/or killed. In lesser detail, the report also considers documented cases of disruption to residential areas, killings of domestic animals, and hazardous incidents on the roads.

8. For each case, we consider the events, the evidence, the investigation, the judgement and, where relevant, possible reasons why cases were dropped or why there were no convictions. We also refer to relevant social media reports and reports in online newspapers. Additional insights into the documented cases beyond that contained in the judgement come directly from those who were present at the time and involved in the police investigations.
9. The cases involve: twenty-three pursuits by hounds of wild mammals with or without a kill; and thirteen kills of wild mammals. Twenty-one cases involve foxes, two involve deer (with fifteen stag kills) and one involves two hares.
10. Fourteen cases failed because the prosecution could not prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the person in control of the hounds intended to hunt a wild mammal. Out of control hounds are often blamed for the pursuit and death of the wild mammal. Given that this creates a real risk of a legal loophole, one of our recommendations is that all pursuits and killings of wild mammals by hunt dogs must be illegal, no matter how they happened.
11. In many cases, the hunts claimed they were trail hunting. This is where a hunt claims they are following a pre-laid (animal-based) scent and not a wild mammal. While some have argued that trail hunting is being used as a smokescreen, our research shows that the failure to convict was not solely due to this line of defence.
12. The new Labour Government has committed to banning trail hunting. While this is welcome, it will not prevent the pursuit and killing of wild mammals by hunts. The hunts have openly circumvented the Hunting Act in many ways beyond claiming, through a series of smokescreens and loopholes, that they were trail hunting. For example, banning trail hunting will have no effect on stag hunting, where hunts tend to rely on the broad interpretations of the exemptions under the Act. This means that any new legislation must be watertight, closing all existing loopholes, without opening any new ones. This report shows the extent to which the existing Hunting Act has been abused.
13. Four of the cases failed to result in conviction because the hunts claimed they were acting under a lawful exemption. These do not include stag pursuits and kills because their use of the 'research and observation' exemption has not been challenged by police or in court. The only time police challenge them is if they use more than two dogs at a time or hunt on land without permission. Arguably, however, the most significant and damaging

use of an exemption is for stag hunting, where hunts typically cite 'research and observation' in the case of most pursuits and killings. Between August and September 2024, fifteen stags are known to have been pursued and eight killed by two Stag Hunts.

14. Evidence is also crucial for securing convictions. In eight cases, insufficient evidence contributed to the failure to convict. If hunt saboteurs or monitors are not present at a pursuit and kill, there might be no evidence that it took place. The victim is the dead wild mammal. Even when saboteurs and monitors are present, it goes without saying that it can be a challenge for them to follow and film mounted huntsmen and the hounds. Also, the police do not have the resources nor the expertise to monitor every hunt.

As a result of these difficulties, this report recommends that hunts should be banned as organisations and packs of hunting hounds banned from being used. If such bans do not come about, however, the law should be rigorous enough and enforced to the fullest to ensure that hunting is no longer viable.

15. The Road Traffic Act 1988, the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991, the Deer Act 1991, and the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 are also relevant, as the hunts may fall foul of these laws too. We therefore suggest that the new legislation includes a provision that where illegal hunting results in a violation of other legislation, then the possible penalty for the other offence becomes higher.
16. Thirteen cases in brief involve the disruption and damage hunts have caused in residential areas.
17. Action Against Foxhunting Midlands' incident log reveals that the Warwickshire Hunt alone caused over fifty dangerous incidents on roads.
18. Hunting where the genuine intention is not to kill an animal and the activity itself does not create any real risk of doing so (as in, for example, clean boot hunting or drag hunting), should not be affected by changes to the Hunting Act. However, if hounds from any hunt pursue and/or kill a wild mammal, no matter what they call themselves, the new Hunting Act should apply.
19. In addition to the recommendations for improving the Hunting Act, we would like all provisions in other legislation exempting hounds to be repealed to ensure hunts are held to the same standards as most other keepers of dogs. For example, the Dogs (Protection of Livestock) Act 1953 exempts a 'pack of hounds' from its offence of worrying (e.g. attacking) livestock and the Control of Dogs Order 1992, which requires that every dog in a public place wears a collar with the name and address of the owner inscribed, does not apply to a 'pack of hounds'. In addition, the Road Traffic Act 1988 makes it an offence to cause or permit a dog to be on a designated road without the dog being held on a lead; however, this does not apply to those "under proper control for sporting purposes".

## **Improving the Hunting Act: recommendations**

**The Hunting Act must be so robust and clear-cut that any police officer knows that searching for, pursuing, and killing a wild mammal on any land no matter who owns it, is illegal. Our recommendations below go some way in addressing that.**

**Please note that some of these recommendations are contradictory. For example, one asks for no packs of hounds to be permitted, while in others we start from the assumption that they will be. It is for the lawmaker to decide which suggestions are needed to create the clear and robust legal framework to stop hunting once and for all.**

1. Hunting any kind of a scent, including artificial, cannot be used as a defence for accidental, negligent or reckless chases or kills. While trail hunting must be banned, it cannot be used as a defence to argue that there was no intention. In addition, hunts should not be able to argue other legal activities as a defence – that they were simply walking their hounds, for instance.
2. Hunts must be able to produce proof that they have trained all their hounds not to pursue wild mammals. Guidance accompanying the amended Hunting Act or any new legislation must give details of the methods that the hunts should use.
3. If a hunt dog, in the control of a person, whether that person is present or not, kills a wild mammal, this should be an offence. There should be no need to prove an intention to hunt.
4. In the event that hunting any kind of a scent trail is allowed to continue, hunts should keep full records of trail laying, for example: who laid the trail, what the trail was, when it took place and, where. This must be produced when requested by officials. In addition, the planned route of the hunt and the hounds being taken out must be provided in advance and a copy carried during hunt outings and made available on request by officials. All hunt meets must be publicised.
5. Hunt staff must know the route of the trails. To stop the hounds, the huntsman and whipper-in (see glossary) need to know the route of the hunt – if they don't know the route, they cannot possibly know if the hounds have deviated from it. The hunt must carry a copy of the map during the hunt and have it available for anyone to see. They should be required to log the map in advance of the hunt. In some cases, defendants have produced a trail map in court long after the incident happened, and this has been accepted as a defence without any proof of when it was created.
6. It should be mandatory that hounds are called off any chase immediately. New guidance must include a section describing the methods the huntsman must use to call off their hounds if they encounter a wild mammal. For example, to stop the hounds effectively, they need to be able to get in front of



them. Allowing a distance to build up between them and the hounds means they are unlikely to be able to prevent an accident. The guidance could explain that hounds must be kept as close as possible to the hunt members with a permitted distance.

7. There needs to be clear instruction as to what constitutes proper control of hounds. New guidance should outline the strategies the huntsman and the whipper-in must use during a hunt to prevent them from pursuing and killing wildlife.
8. Hunts must not be allowed to take their hounds into places where wildlife lives and rests – woods, for instance. There must be a buffer zone around any land where wild mammals are likely to live and rest. Hunts must not take their hounds inside this zone. The type of land used by resting wildlife must be specified in the law or guidance.
9. The new law must make it an offence to disturb a fox in its resting place. To hunt foxes, the hunt has to find the fox first and they do this usually by rousing a fox from its rest in a covert.
10. The new law must give a very clear and inclusive definition of what hunting is. This should include (but not be limited to) employing dogs to:
  - a. Search for a mammal or
  - b. Pursue a mammal or
  - c. Kill a mammal

This means that conducting any one of the above activities counts as 'hunting'.

11. Allowing hounds to enter any private property without permission of the landowner should be illegal. It should not simply be a trespass matter.
12. All pursuits should be illegal, no matter how long they are. The Hunting Act does not specify how long a chase needs to be for it to be considered illegal. For example, in the Schedule 1, (1) (7) exemption of flushing out an animal to be shot, the law only specifies that the wild mammal must be shot dead "as soon as possible after being found". This leaves the exemption open to interpretation. The new law must specify that no chase of any length by any number of dogs should be allowed. This will also provide much needed clarity in the evidence-gathering process, as even a few seconds of chasing would demonstrate an unlawful act.
13. The new law should not facilitate any kind of hunting through exemptions. There is growing evidence that the hunts abuse the current exemptions. For example, the exemption that permits 'flushing to guns' has allowed hunts to create a smokescreen by having terrier-men accompanying hunts in order to dig out foxes that have taken refuge underground. The intention is not to

shoot them immediately, but release them to be chased. A complete explanation of how this exemption is abused can be found on [AAF's website](#) (*Use of dogs below ground to protect birds for shooting*).

The exemption for falconry is also abused by hunts who simply take a bird of prey with them in order to disingenuously claim this exemption.

Stag hunts in particular use exemptions to pursue and kill stags several times a week in season. 'Research and Observation' and 'Rescue of a Wild Mammal' are frequently abused. For example, stag hunters have verbally claimed that they are pursuing a sick deer, despite chasing them for some hours at speed over difficult terrain. Stag hunts have also claimed that they are hunting stags with bTB. The Badgworthy Land Company have produced a [study](#) of this subject<sup>1</sup>. Note: this company is owned by the Devon and Somerset Staghounds.

14. The new law should prohibit all use of dogs for hunting, as opposed to the current law of allowing up to two.
15. The Hunting Act should make it illegal for a person to pursue or frighten wild mammals while accompanying a hunt. A large number of followers on foot and in vehicles accompany stag hunts. Stag hunts usually use only two hounds, and the followers often step in to stop the hunted stag from escaping. They shout, wave their arms and use any means to frighten the animal. This also happens during cub hunting, when hunters on horseback surround a wood, and shout and slap their saddles to stop cubs from escaping. The banned activities involved in this kind of hunting should be specified.
16. The new law should include an offence of 'Going Equipped' to hunt. Guidance could explain that this would include objects used to dig out foxes. A similar offence exists in the Theft Act 1968 for going equipped for stealing.
17. Out of control hounds are the responsibility of the Master and any hunt staff, whether they are nearby or not.
18. Complete guidance should accompany the law to ensure that all enforcement agents understand the signs of hunting. This should include a full explanation of horn calls, voice calls, field positions, details about hound training and hound behaviour, and tactics for traditional hunting (for example, how to find a fox to hunt).
19. Penalties need to be more impactful. Currently the fines are insignificant and unlikely to deter anyone from illegal hunting.
20. Hunting Act cases must no longer be summary only. In summary offences, there is a six-month time limit to bring a charge. In some cases, police have

---

<sup>1</sup> Collard, K.J. A study of the incidence of bovine tuberculosis in the wild red deer herd of Exmoor. *Eur J Wildl Res* **69**, 14 (2023).

had difficulty in contacting the perpetrators. The time limit also puts police under too much pressure to complete a complex case.

21. Hunt Masters, and the Hunt as an organisation, should be held responsible for illegal actions of any hunt staff. Hunts should also be held corporately responsible.
22. Hunts should be banned from taking hounds into residential areas and onto A & B roads.
23. There should be penalties for withholding information. In many cases, identifying the perpetrator has been a problem, even though it seems highly unlikely that hunt members cannot identify other members of their own hunt.
24. If a person, or a hunt as a corporate body, has a conviction for illegal hunting, that person, or body, must be banned from hunting for life.

## **List of case studies**

- 29/04/2005, Exmoor Foxhounds, pursuit of foxes
- 21/01/2012, Holderness, pursuing a fox through private garden
- 19/02/2014, Middleton, two pursuits of a fox
- 08/03/2017, Portman, pursuing a fox
- 01/01/2016, Fitzwilliam (falconry case), pursuit and kill of a fox
- 23/09/2017, Grafton (falconry case), pursuit of fox
- 14/12/2019, Lamerton, prolonged pursuit of fox
- 17/10/2020, Beaufort, pursuit and kill of a fox + 13/09/2021, pursuit of a fox
- 13/11/2021, South Dorset, pursuit and killing of two foxes by hounds
- 27/12/2021, Puckeridge, pursuit and kill of a fox by hounds
- 15/01/2022, Belvoir, pursuit and kill of a fox by hounds
- 18/01/2022, Dunston Harriers, pursuit and probable kill of two hares
- 08/01/2023, Fernie, pursuit of fox through residential area
- 14/01/2023, East Kent with West Street, pursuit and kill of a fox
- 28/01/2023, Weston and Banwell, pursuit and kill of a fox
- 08/02/2023 & 20/02/2023, West Norfolk, pursuit of a fox / kill of a fox in a private garden
- 16/11/2023, Blackmore and Sparkford Vale (BSV), pursuit of a fox + 30/11/2023 pursuit of a fox
- 25/11/2023, North Shropshire, fox pursued across busy road by hounds
- 06/01/2024, Lamerton, prolonged pursuit of a fox
- 13/03/2023, Quantock Stag Hounds, deer pursued by three hounds
- 17/02/2024, Radnor and West Hereford, fox kill (no evidence of the chase)
- 20/04/2024, Devon and Somerset Stag Hounds, prolonged pursuit of stag by hounds and people, stag killed

- 02/03/2024, East Cornwall and Taunton Vale Foxhounds, interfering with badger sett on SSSI land to dig out a fox.

## Count of case studies illustrating the need for each of our recommendations

| Recommendations for improving the Hunting Act                                                                                            | Count of cases that may have been successful if this provision existed (25 cases in total).                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Hunting any kind of a scent, including artificial, cannot be used as a defence for accidental, negligent or reckless chases or kills. | <b>13 Cases</b><br>Exmoor<br>Holderness<br>Middleton<br>Portman<br>Lamerton<br>Beaufort (two cases)<br>South Dorset<br>Puckeridge<br>Belvoir<br>Dunston<br>Weston & Banwell<br>West Norfolk                                                                   |
| 2. Hunts must be able to produce proof that they have trained their hounds not to pursue wild mammals.                                   | <b>16 Cases</b><br>Exmoor<br>Holderness<br>Middleton<br>Lamerton<br>Beaufort (two cases)<br>South Dorset<br>Belvoir<br>West Norfolk<br>East Kent<br>Dunston<br>Blackmore & Sparkford Vale (BSV) (two cases)<br>Puckeridge<br>North Shrops<br>Weston & Banwell |

| Recommendations for improving the Hunting Act                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Count of cases that may have been successful if this provision existed (25 cases in total).                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <p>3. If a hunt dog, in the control of a person, whether that person is present or not, kills a wild mammal, this should be an offence. There should be no need to prove an intention to hunt.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <p><b>13 Cases</b><br/> Fitzwilliam<br/> Beaufort<br/> South Dorset (two cases)<br/> Puckeridge<br/> Belvoir<br/> Dunston Harriers (two cases)<br/> East Kent with West St.<br/> Weston &amp; Banwell<br/> West Norfolk<br/> Radnor &amp; West Hereford<br/> Devon &amp; Somerset</p> |
| <p>4 &amp; 5. In the event that hunting any kind of a scent trail is allowed to continue, hunts should keep full records of trail laying, for example: who laid the trail, what the trail was, when it took place and, where. This must be produced when requested by officials. In addition, the planned route of the hunt and the hounds being taken out must be provided in advance and a copy carried during hunt outings and made available on request by officials. All hunt meets must be publicised.</p> | <p><b>8 Cases</b><br/> Holderness<br/> Middleton<br/> Portman<br/> Beaufort<br/> South Dorset<br/> Puckeridge<br/> Dunston<br/> West Norfolk</p>                                                                                                                                      |
| <p>6. It should be mandatory that hounds are called off any chase immediately.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <p><b>16 Cases</b><br/> Exmoor<br/> Holderness<br/> Middleton<br/> Portman<br/> Lamerton<br/> North Shrops<br/> Beaufort<br/> South Dorset<br/> Puckeridge<br/> Belvoir<br/> Dunston</p>                                                                                              |

| Recommendations for improving the Hunting Act                                                         | Count of cases that may have been successful if this provision existed (25 cases in total).                                                                                                                             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                       | Lamerton<br>Fernie<br>BSV (two cases)<br>West Norfolk                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 7. There needs to be clear instruction as to what constitutes proper and effective control of hounds. | <b>14 Cases</b><br>Holderness<br>Devon & Somerset<br>Middleton<br>Lamerton<br>South Dorset<br>North Shrops<br>West Norfolk<br>Lamerton<br>Beaufort<br>Fernie<br>East Kent<br>Dunston<br>BSV (two cases)                 |
| 8 & 9. The new law must make it an offence to disturb a fox in its resting place.                     | <b>14 Cases</b><br>Middleton<br>Portman<br>Lamerton<br>South Dorset<br>Puckeridge<br>North Shrops<br>Belvoir<br>Dunston<br>Weston & Banwell<br>East Kent<br>BSV (two cases)<br>East Cornwall & Taunton Vale<br>Lamerton |



| Recommendations for improving the Hunting Act                                                                                         | Count of cases that may have been successful if this provision existed (25 cases in total).                                                                           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10. The definition of hunting must include employing dogs to: search for a wild mammal, pursue a wild mammal, and kill a wild mammal. | <b>10 Cases</b><br>Holderness<br>Portman<br>South Dorset<br>Puckeridge<br>West Norfolk<br>East Kent<br>Lamerton<br>Quantock<br>Radnor<br>East Cornwall & Taunton Vale |
| 11. Allowing hounds to enter any private property without permission of the landowner should be illegal.                              | <b>4 Cases</b><br>Holderness<br>Beaufort<br>South Dorset<br>West Norfolk                                                                                              |
| 12. All pursuits should be illegal, no matter how long they are.                                                                      | <b>9 Cases</b><br>Exmoor<br>Holderness<br>South Dorset<br>Puckeridge<br>Devon & Somerset<br>Fernie<br>BSV (two cases)<br>North Shrops                                 |
| 13. The new law should not facilitate any kind of hunting through exemptions.                                                         | <b>5 Cases</b><br>Exmoor<br>Grafton<br>Fitzwilliam<br>Devon & Somerset<br>East Cornwall & Taunton Vale                                                                |
| 14. The new law should prohibit all use of dogs for hunting, as opposed to the current law of allowing up to two.                     | <b>5 Cases</b><br>Exmoor<br>Portman                                                                                                                                   |

| Recommendations for improving the Hunting Act                                                                         | Count of cases that may have been successful if this provision existed (25 cases in total).                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                       | Weston & Banwell<br>Devon & Somerset<br>Quantock Staghounds                                                                                                             |
| 15. People must not pursue or frighten wild mammals.                                                                  | <b>16 Cases</b> - this applies to stag hunting in particular. One case is presented in detail, and fifteen others in brief.                                             |
| 16. The new law should include an offence of going equipped to hunt.                                                  | <b>1 Case</b><br>East Cornwall & Taunton Vale                                                                                                                           |
| 17. Out of control hounds are the responsibility of the huntsman and whipper-in, whether he is present or not.        | <b>11 Cases</b><br>Devon & Somerset<br>Belvoir<br>Lamerton (two cases)<br>Holderness<br>Middleton<br>South Dorset<br>Ferne<br>West Norfolk<br>East Kent<br>North Shrops |
| 18. Complete guidance should accompany the law to ensure that all enforcement agents understand the signs of hunting. | <b>10 Cases</b><br>Portman<br>South Dorset<br>Grafton<br>Puckeridge<br>Dunston<br>North Shrops<br>Ferne<br>Weston & Banwell<br>West Norfolk<br>Lamerton                 |
| 19. Penalties need to be more impactful.                                                                              | <b>All 25 Cases</b> (the penalty did not deter any of the perpetrators).                                                                                                |

| <b>Recommendations for improving the Hunting Act</b>                                                                                                                    | <b>Count of cases that may have been successful if this provision existed (25 cases in total).</b>                                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 20. Hunting Act cases must no longer be summary only.                                                                                                                   | <b>All 25 Cases</b>                                                                                                                                 |
| 21. Hunt Masters, and the Hunt as an organisation, should be held responsible for illegal actions of any hunt staff. Hunts should also be held corporately responsible. | <b>9 Cases</b><br>Holderness<br>Middleton<br>Grafton<br>Lamerton<br>Beaufort (two cases)<br>Dunston<br>West Norfolk<br>East Cornwall & Taunton Vale |
| 22. Hunts should be banned from taking hounds into residential areas and onto A & B roads.                                                                              | <b>3 Cases</b><br>Fernie<br>West Norfolk<br>Holderness<br><br>These are also hazardous incidents on roads (see section at the end of this report)   |
| 23. There should be penalties for withholding information.                                                                                                              | <b>1 Case</b><br>West Norfolk                                                                                                                       |
| 24. If a person, or a hunt as a corporate body, has a conviction for illegal hunting, that person, or body, must be banned from hunting for life.                       | <b>All 25 cases</b>                                                                                                                                 |

**Everything in this report is factually true to the best of our knowledge. However, if there are any errors, please inform us at:**

**[info@actionagainstfoxhunting.org](mailto:info@actionagainstfoxhunting.org)**