

# Statement from the Australian Brumby Alliance

The Talbot knackery case and approved brumby rehoming

*For immediate release — 12 June 2026*

---

The illegal knackery operated by Adrian Talbot, now before the Wagga Wagga court, is being shared online as though it is representative of the rehoming of brumbies. It is not. We want the facts on the record.

**The Australian Brumby Alliance had no involvement.** The ABA is a national alliance of independent member organisations. It is not an approved rehomer, it operates no rehoming program of its own, and it has never rehomed a brumby. Adrian Talbot had no association with the ABA of any kind — he was not a member, was not approved through us, and received no horse through any ABA program or process, because no such process exists. Recent media reporting referring to him sourcing horses through an “Australian Brumby Alliance rehoming program” is incorrect, and we have asked for it to be corrected. Mr Talbot was however a registered rehomer under the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) wild horse program from which he sourced brumbies.

**The court has made no finding of a link between Mr Talbot and the ABA.** Mr Talbot pleaded guilty to two licensing offences only, and the presiding judge has reserved judgement until 23 June 2026. There is, as yet, no judgement and no finding of fact linking this case to the ABA. A connection that does not exist should not be reported as though a court had established it.

**The failure here was one of NPWS oversight — and the government’s own review said so.** Mr Talbot was an approved rehomer under the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) program. After the carcasses were found, the NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water investigated and reported in June 2024. It did not find that rehoming had failed. It found that NPWS had not performed proper due diligence on his application, had approved him despite inconsistent applications and missing reporting, and had not adequately verified what happened to horses after they were placed. The fault lay in administration, not in the method.

**The standards were then rightly raised — and approved rehomers welcome it.** In direct response to that review, NPWS strengthened the rehoming guidelines, with independent veterinary review. Approved rehomers support these tighter rules overall although they involve additional costs for rehomers.

**The brumby rehoming sector abhors what this man is accused of.** The people and organisations who do this work accept brumbies from the wild at their own cost, do the veterinary work, geld their colts, and exist precisely to keep these horses out of the saleyard-and-slaughter cycle. An operator who diverted horses to an unlicensed knackery would be a betrayal of everything approved rehoming stands for.

**A properly funded and structured rehoming program is the answer to this — not an example of it.** The ABA and rehomers including Umbango South Brumby Sanctuary have approached the Government with a proposition for a new model of rehoming, built around the safeguards that would have prevented this, and seeking appropriate resources to expand and support rehoming as a humane way of managing the brumby population. This should include:

- mandatory screening of every adopter as a binding condition of funding, with property and welfare checks before any horse is placed;
- compulsory microchipping, branding and DNA sampling, so every horse can be traced for life;
- mandatory reporting to government on the fate of every horse;
- a formal agreement with NPWS to close the communication gaps the review identified; and
- a binding return-to-sanctuary policy that prohibits any onward sale, transfer or surrender to saleyards or slaughter, and requires a horse to be returned to the rehomer if it can no longer be kept.

Under those safeguards, the diversion alleged in this case could not lawfully or practically have occurred. They prevent it at the point of placement — they do not depend on someone catching it after the fact.

**The lesson of this case is not that rehoming cannot be trusted. It is that rehoming must be properly funded, properly governed and properly resourced — which is exactly what approved rehomers are asking government to support, as a non-lethal alternative to shooting.**

— Australian Brumby Alliance

Media contact: Colleen Krestensen • Deputy President, ABA • 0411155835