

THE FIVB DISCIPLINARY PANEL

composed by

Ms. Sabinah Clement (IVB)	Chairperson
Mr. Tomohiro Tohyama (JPN)	Member
Mr. Mounir Ben Slimane (TUN)	Member

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. The [event]¹ match between [team from a European Country, hereafter “Team 1”,] and [team from another European Country, hereafter “Team 2”] [results of the match] took place on [date of the match], at 19:00, in [place, where Team 1 is located, hereafter “Team 1 Place”], [country, where Team 1 is located, hereafter “Country 1”] (hereinafter “the Match”).
2. On [date of the Match], the International Olympic Committee (IOC) Integrity Betting Intelligence System (IBIS) received an alert with regards to an alleged breach of sports integrity in the sport of Volleyball and, accordingly, informed the IBIS Single Point of Contact for FIVB, [name]. The alleged breach of the FIVB regulatory framework arose from a bet which has been placed on the Match.
3. On [date of the Match], the FIVB and [the continental federation that organized the event, hereafter “Continental Federation”] requested the [Continental Federation]Supervisor on site to read a declaration concerning betting and manipulation of matches before the start of the Match and to have it signed by the captain and the team manager of each team. The captain and the team manager of each team signed the declaration.
4. On [date], the IOC Ethics and Compliance Office provided the FIVB with a Report (hereinafter “the First Report”) confirming that two (2) players from the team [Team 2] had placed bets against their own team.
5. On [date], the IOC Ethics and Compliance Office provided the FIVB with another Report (hereinafter “the Second Report”) informing the FIVB that [the Respondent] had opened an

¹ In the interest of the protection of privacy, this is a redacted version of the decision. Any reductions are marked with bold brackets.

account to bet specifically on the Match and that her bets were placed around the same time as one (1) of the players referred to in the First Report using the same betting operator.

6. On 5 May 2017, the FIVB Board of Administration approved the FIVB Disciplinary Regulations 2017, which entered into force on 8 June 2017. Relevant changes to the FIVB Disciplinary Regulations 2017 with regards to the present case were as follows:
 - The FIVB Board of Administration confirmed FIVB's exclusive jurisdiction to adjudicate disciplinary cases with regards to betting and match manipulation; and
 - The FIVB Board of Administration adopted new procedural provisions with regards to disciplinary cases.
7. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat notified [the Respondent] of the opening of disciplinary proceedings. The deadline to provide the FIVB Disciplinary Panel with a response was [date].
8. On [date], [the Respondent] filed her statement of defense (including supporting documentation) with the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat.
9. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat informed [the Respondent] of the next steps of the procedure (i.e. whether she would be heard in person or in writing).
10. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat informed [the Respondent] of the following:
 - a) Date of the hearing: [date]; and
 - b) Presence of an expert during the hearing: Mr. Friedrich Martens, Head of Integrity Betting Intelligence System at the IOC
 - c) Composition of the FIVB Disciplinary Panel in the present case, namely:
 - Ms. Sabinah Clement (IBV), Chairperson;
 - Mr. Mounir Ben Slimane (TUN) and Ms. Margaret Ann Fleming (SCO), Members.
11. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat informed [the Respondent] of the time of the hearing.

12. On [date], [the Respondent] requested a change in the time of the hearing. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat agreed to the request on the same day.
13. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat informed [the Respondent] that Mr. Tomohiro Tohyama (JPN) would replace Ms. Margaret Ann Fleming (SCO) in the present disciplinary case.
14. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel heard [the Respondent]. During the hearing, [the Respondent] admitted having placed different bets on the Match and confirmed that her betting account had been suspended since. [The Respondent] denied any connection with the sport of Volleyball in general, and with the players listed in the First Report in particular.
15. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat sought the assistance of the Volleyball Federation of [country, where Team 2 is located, hereafter Country 2] to establish whether [the Respondent] holds any position in the sport of Volleyball at club, regional or national level within the territory under the jurisdiction of the [Country 2] Volleyball Federation.
16. On [date], the Volleyball Federation of [Country 2] confirmed to the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat that [the Respondent] does not hold any official position in the sport of Volleyball at club, regional or national level within the territory under its jurisdiction (hereinafter “the Third Report”).

II. COMPETENCE

17. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel is competent to hear this case as per Article 17.5 of the FIVB Disciplinary Regulations 2016 (now Article 26.5 of the FIVB Disciplinary Regulations 2017).
18. In addition to the above, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that the FIVB Board of Administration clarified the exclusive jurisdiction of the FIVB with regards to betting and match manipulation cases in May 2017. Article 26.7 of the FIVB Disciplinary Regulations 2017 reads as follows:

“The Confederations are competent to impose sanctions at the continental level provided that the matter does not fall within the competence of an FIVB body or has been delegated expressly to them by the FIVB in a specific case. For this purpose, they

must adopt the same procedural provisions as provided herein. FIVB has exclusive jurisdiction in:

- [...]
- Cases of betting and manipulation of competitions” (emphasis added).

19. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel further notes that the Respondent did not challenge the competence of the FIVB Disciplinary Panel to hear the present case *per se*. [the Respondent] merely stated that there is no law in [Country 2] prohibiting betting, as long as the bet is fair.

III. APPLICABLE LAW

20. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that the FIVB Constitution and Regulations apply to this case. Since FIVB has its seat in Switzerland, Swiss law may apply subsidiarily.

21. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel further notes that two set of FIVB Disciplinary Regulations may apply to the resolution of the case at hand:

- The FIVB Disciplinary Regulations 2016, which were approved by the FIVB Board of Administration on 7 April 2016 and entered into force on 8 April 2016 (hereinafter “FIVB DR 2016”); and
- The FIVB Disciplinary Regulations 2017, which were approved by the FIVB Board of Administration on 5 May 2017 and entered into force on 8 June 2017 (hereinafter “FIVB DR 2017”).

22. The Match took place on [date of the Match], i.e. when the FIVB DR 2016 were in force. Consequently, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel finds that the conduct of [the Respondent] is to be reviewed under the FIVB DR 2016. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel finds however that the FIVB DR 2017 apply to the present case insofar as they concern the procedure governing these proceedings.

23. In the Charge Letter dated [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel qualified the alleged violation of the FIVB DR 2016 by [the Respondent] as follows:

- Using inside information provided by [a player of Team 2, hereafter “the Player of Team 2”].

Relevant provisions: Article 13 of the FIVB DR 2016 in conjunction with Appendix B, Article B.2.4(a) of the FIVB DR 2016.

The substantives rules which are relevant for the resolution of this dispute are quoted in the following paragraphs.

24. Article 13.1 of the FIVB DR 2016 prohibited the following conduct:

"The conduct described in Appendix B, Articles B.2.3, B.2.4 and B.2.5, shall be sanctioned as a major offence, subject to the specific provisions set out below".

25. Appendix B, Article B.2.4(a) of the FIVB DR 2016 read as follows:

"Using Inside Information for Betting purposes or otherwise in relation to Betting" (emphasis added).

26. Article 13.3 of the FIVB DR 2016 provided the following sanction with regards to corruption and related violations:

"In case of corruption proven to the comfortable satisfaction of the deciding body, the referee or other Participant and all other persons who have participated in the illegal activity shall be sanctioned with a fine of a minimum of CHF 50,000 and a suspension from participation in any official activity within the sphere of the FIVB at national, continental and world-wide level for a period between five (5) years and a life ban" (emphasis added).

27. Appendix B, Article B.1 of the FIVB DR 2016 defined the terms underlined above as follows:

"[...]

"Betting": shall mean making, accepting, or laying a wager of money or any other form of financial speculation and shall include, without limitation, activities commonly referred to as sports betting such as fixed and running odds, totalizator/toto games, live betting exchange, spread betting and other games offered by sports betting operators;

[...]

"Inside Information" means any information relating to any Competition that a Participant possesses by virtue of his position within the sport. Such information includes, but is not limited to, factual information regarding the competitors, the conditions, tactical considerations or any other aspect of the Competition, but does not include such information that is already published or a matter of public record,

readily acquired by an interested member of the public or disclosed according to the rules and regulations governing the relevant Competition;

“Participant” means any Player, Player Support Personnel, judge referee, delegate, technical official, FIVB representative, Control Committee or Appeal Sub-Committee member, competition official, National Federation team or delegation member and any other accredited person;

[...]”.

IV. PROCEDURE

28. By letter of [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel informed [the Respondent] (hereinafter “the Respondent”) that disciplinary proceedings were opened against her and that the FIVB Disciplinary Panel would adjudicate this case. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel provided the Respondent with the opportunity to submit her position in writing by no later than [date].

29. On [date], the Respondent submitted her position directly to the FIVB Disciplinary Panel Secretariat, whereby she wrote *“I had no inside informations, I have nothing to do with mister [the Player of Team 2], or other volleyball players from [Team 2], there was no need to have internal informations, as long as there were different articles in the media, where it was specified that the most important players were not going to be on the volleyball field during the game between the team [Team 1]and [Team 2], because of some health problems(flu) and it considered that it was almost impossible for [Team 2] to win the game.This is why I made those bets”*. The Respondent further explained the following: *“My bets were legal, there is no law in [Country 2] that can forbid to bet, as long as the bet is fair.I hope you will take the right decision in this case because nothing illegal happened”* .

30. On [date], the FIVB Disciplinary Panel heard the Respondent by telephone. During the hearing, the Respondent admitted having bet on the Match (approximately LEI 800 = EUR 200 in total). The Respondent indicated that she had previously bet on the sport of Volleyball and tennis. The Respondent confirmed that the betting operator had blocked her betting account. In the present case, the Respondent had decided to place the bets because the media reported that the club [Team 2] would be missing certain key players. The Respondent denied knowing personally the players referred to in the First Report. The Respondent further denied any connection with [another Person that allegedly was involved in the betting incident] or

with the sport of Volleyball in general. The Respondent studies architecture at [place, where Team 2 is located] University.

31. On [date], the Volleyball Federation of [Country 2] confirmed that the Respondent does not hold any official position in the sport of Volleyball at club, regional or national level within the territory under its jurisdiction

V. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

(a) Violation: Misuse of Inside Information

32. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that Article 13 in conjunction with Appendix B, Article B.2.4(a) of the FIVB DR 2016 required the rule violation be committed by a referee or a Participant. Other “persons” who have participated in the rule violation may be sanctioned as well (Article 13.3 of the FIVB DR 2016).
33. With regard to the above, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel shall first establish whether [the Respondent] is a referee, a Participant or a “persons” within the meaning of the FIVB DR 2016 in order to discuss a potential rule violation by the Respondent.
34. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that the definition of Participant under Appendix B, Article B.1 of the FIVB DR 2016 included referees (see para 27). The FIVB Disciplinary Panel is satisfied that the Respondent is not a referee nor a Participant under the definition of Appendix B, Article B.1 of the FIVB DR 2016 because the FIVB could not establish that the Respondent performed any of the roles or functions listed in this provision (see para 27) at the time of the alleged rule violation. This is notably evidenced by the Third Report.
35. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that the first letter of the word “persons” in Article 13.3 of the FIVB DR 2016 was not capitalised. In light of the foregoing, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel understands that the word “persons” referred to in this provision was not a defined concept under the then Appendix B, Article B.1 of the FIVB DR 2016 but rather a reference to the word persons in Article 1 of the FIVB DR 2016, namely the list of natural and legal persons subject to the jurisdiction of the FIVB. Consequently, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel is to discuss whether the Respondent falls under this list. In this respect, Article 1 of the FIVB DR 2016 read as follows:

“For the purpose of these Regulations, the following natural and legal persons are subject to the jurisdiction of the FIVB under the terms herein established:

- *The FIVB governing institutions (Congress, Board of Administration, Executive Committee, President);*
- *The FIVB supporting institutions (Confederations, National Federations, Executive Group, Zonal Associations, Councils and Commissions);*
- *Persons elected or appointed to a position in any FIVB governing institution other than the Congress;*
- *Persons elected or appointed to a position in any FIVB supporting institution;*
- *Persons holding an honorary title granted by the FIVB;*
- *Natural and legal persons organising or involved in any way in the organisation of FIVB competitions;*
- *FIVB officials and referees;*
- *National leagues, clubs, teams and their administrators, team managers, players, coaches, technical and support personnel, and referees affiliated to a NF;*
- *The FIVB licensed agents.”*

36. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that the FIVB could not establish that the Respondent performed any of the roles or functions listed in Article 1 of the FIVB DR 2016 above at the time of the alleged rule violation. This is again evidenced by the Third Report.

37. In sum, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel is satisfied that the Respondent is not a referee nor a Participant or a “persons” under the definition of Appendix B, Article B.1 of the FIVB DR 2016 and Article 1 of the FIVB DR 2016 respectively because the FIVB could not establish that the Respondent performed any of the roles and functions listed in these provisions.

38. Based on the above, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel finds that the Respondent cannot be held liable for a violation of Article 13.1 of the FIVB DR 2016 in connection with Appendix B, Article B.2.4(a) of the FIVB DR 2016 because the Respondent was not subject to the jurisdiction of the FIVB at the time of the alleged rule violation. Consequently, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel cannot not discuss whether the constitutive elements of a rule violation are met and, accordingly, shall close the present proceedings.

* * *

Taking all the above into consideration

THE FIVB DISCIPLINARY PANEL

Concludes and Decides

1. [The Respondent] ([Country 2]) was not subject to the jurisdiction of the FIVB at the time of the alleged rule violation.
2. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel Case FIVB DP [year]-06 ([the Respondent]) is closed.
3. This decision may be appealed in accordance with the attached Notice of Appeals.

Lausanne, [date] **For the FIVB DISCIPLINARY PANEL**

Ms. Sabinah Clement
Chairperson

NOTICE OF APPEALS

1. Parties who are affected by a decision of a FIVB body (e.g. the President, the Board of Administration, the Disciplinary Panel etc.) can file an appeal to the FIVB Appeals Panel unless otherwise provided in the FIVB Constitution and Regulations.
2. Appeals must be made in writing and must be received by the FIVB Secretariat within fourteen (14) days from notification of the decision, failing which the appeal will be considered inadmissible.
3. Appeals shall be accompanied by a copy of the decision appealed against and a bank certificate confirming payment of the administrative fee of CHF 2,000 into the following account:

Banque Cantonale Vaudoise (BCV)

Place Saint-François 14

CH-1001 Lausanne / Switzerland

Account: T 5344.53.25

IBAN: CH33 00767 000T 5344 5325

BIC Code (Swift Address): BCVLCH2LXXX

Bank clearing: 767

4. Failure to pay the administrative fee within the deadline fixed by the FIVB Secretariat will result in considering the appeal withdrawn. The FIVB Appeals Panel may decide that the administrative fee be reimbursed in the event that the appeal is successful.
5. The appeal can be filed by a proxy if he/she presents a written power of attorney.
6. For details of the appeals procedure please refer to Section III of the FIVB Disciplinary Regulations (<http://www.fivb.org/EN/FIVB/Legal.asp>).
7. A further appeal against the decision by the FIVB Appeals Panel can only be lodged with the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, within twenty-one (21) days following receipt of the decision.