

FA NATIONAL SERIOUS CASE PANEL  
CONSOLIDATED DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN SITTING ALONE

*on behalf of Amateur Football Alliance*

NON-PERSONAL HEARING

*of*

**Aura Tovide**

Hackney Spartans FC

[Case IDs: 11280962M & 11280971M]

Consolidated with

**Ashley McHugh**

Hackney Spartans FC

[Case ID: 11261025M]

&

**Hackney Spartans FC**

[Case ID: 11261024M]

---

THE DECISION AND REASONS OF THE COMMISSION

---

<b><u>Content</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>	<b><u>Paragraphs</u></b>
1. Introduction .....	3.....	1 - 3
2. The Charges .....	3.....	4 - 9
3. The Reply .....	7.....	10 - 11
4. The Commission .....	7.....	12
5. The Hearing and Evidence .....	7.....	13 - 23
6. Standard of Proof .....	15.....	24
7. The Findings & Decision .....	15.....	25 - 33
8. Previous Disciplinary Record .....	17.....	34 - 36
9. Mitigation .....	17.....	37
10. The Sanction.....	17.....	38 - 46

## Introduction

1. On 30 April 2023, Hackney Spartans FC (“Hackney”, the “Home Club”), played a Hackney & Leyton Sunday Football League Division 1 fixture against Azteca FC (“Azteca”, the “away club”) – collectively the “match”.
2. Following the fixture, a report was made regarding alleged misconduct that took place during and after the abandonment of the fixture.
3. Amateur Football Alliance (“AFA”) investigated the reported incidents.

## The Charges

4. On 30 May 2023, AFA charged Adura Tovide:
  - 4.1. with misconduct for a breach of FA Rule E3 – Improper Conduct against a Match Official (including physical contact or attempted physical contact and threatening and/or abusive language/behaviour);
  - 4.2. It is alleged that Adura Tovide used violent conduct and/or threatening and/or abusive and/or indecent and/or insulting language/behaviour contrary to FA Rule E3.1 and it is further alleged that this constitutes Physical Contact or attempted Physical Contact against a Match Official as defined in FA Regulations. This refers to the allegation that Mr Tovide pulled the referee by their arm after the match had been abandoned or similar.
  - 4.3. AFA advised in the charge letter the offence carried a sanction range of a suspension between 112 days and 2 years (entry point 182 days) a fine of up to £150 (£75 mandatory minimum) and mandatory education.
  - 4.4. The notification letter also informed Hackney Spartans FC, due to the serious nature of the offence, the participant is immediately suspended from all football and football activities until the case has been dealt with by the Association.

4.5. The relevant section of FA Rule E3 states<sup>1</sup>:

*“E3.1 A Participant shall at all times act in the best interest of the game and shall not act in any manner which is improper or brings the game into disrepute or use any one, or a combination of, violent conduct, serious foul play, threatening, abusive, indecent or insulting words or behaviour.*

*[...]”*

5. On 30 May 2023, AFA also charged Adura Tovide:

5.1. with misconduct for a breach of FA Rule E3 – Improper Conduct (not including threatening and/or abusive language/behaviour);

5.2. Adura Tovide of Hackney Spartans FC Spartans is hereby charged with a breach of FA Rule E3.1 Improper Conduct in respect of the above fixture. It is alleged that during the fixture Mr Tovide gave a false name when receiving a yellow card in the subject match, which is improper pursuant to FA Rule E3.1.

5.3. AFA advised in the charge letter the offence carried a sanction range of a suspension between 0-3 matches a fine of up to £40.

5.4. The notification letter also informed Hackney Spartans FC, due to the serious nature of the offence, the participant is immediately suspended from all football and football activities until the case has been dealt with by the Association.

5.5. The relevant section of FA Rule E3 states<sup>2</sup>:

*“E3.1 A Participant shall at all times act in the best interest of the game and shall not act in any manner which is improper or brings the game into disrepute or use any one, or a combination of, violent conduct, serious foul play, threatening, abusive, indecent or insulting words or behaviour.*

*[...]”*

---

<sup>1</sup> p. 141 of FA Handbook

<sup>2</sup> p. 141 of FA Handbook

6. In consolidation on 24 May 2023, AFA charged Ashley McHugh:
- 6.1. with misconduct for a breach of FA Rule E3 – Improper Conduct against a Match Official including abusive language/behaviour;
  - 6.2. Ashley McHugh of Hackney Spartans FC Spartans is hereby charged with a breach of FA Rule E3.1 Improper Conduct against a Match Official including abusive language in respect of the above fixture. It is alleged that during the fixture Mr McHugh used abusive and/or insulting words towards the Match Official by saying “*I don't care you are a fucking dickhead*” or similar, “*You shouldn't be a referee you are crap*” or similar and “*Your rubbish ref*” or similar. And/or it is further alleged that Mr McHugh had been shown a red card by the referee and asked to move away from the field of play multiple times, as Mr McHugh refused to leave, this left the referee with no option but to abandon the fixture which is improper pursuant to FA Rule E3.1.
  - 6.3. AFA advised in the charge letter the offence carried a sanction range of a suspension between 0-6 matches and a fine of up to £70.
  - 6.4. The relevant section of FA Rule E3 states<sup>3</sup>:  
  
“*E3.1 A Participant shall at all times act in the best interest of the game and shall not act in any manner which is improper or brings the game into disrepute or use any one, or a combination of, violent conduct, serious foul play, threatening, abusive, indecent or insulting words or behaviour.*  
  
[...]
7. In consolidation on 24 May 2023 AFA charged Hackney Spartans FC:
- 7.1. with misconduct for a breach of FA Rule E20 – Failed to ensure directors, players, officials, employees, servants, representatives, conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match

---

<sup>3</sup> p. 141 of FA Handbook

- 7.2. Hackney Spartans FC Spartans are hereby charged with misconduct for a breach of FA Rule E20 in respect of the behaviour of players, officials, employees, servants, representatives in the above fixture. It is alleged that after the fixture had been abandoned Hackney Spartans FC Spartans players failed to conduct themselves in an orderly fashion by surrounding and/or harassing the referee or similar.
- 7.3. AFA advised in the charge letter the offence carried a sanction of a fine up to £300.
- 7.4. The relevant section of FA Rule E20 states<sup>4</sup>:
- “E20 Each affiliated Association Competition and Club shall be responsible for ensuring:*
- E20. 1 “that its directors, players, officials, employees, servants, representatives, spectators, and all persons purporting to be its supporters or followers, conduct themselves in an orderly fashion and refrain from any one or combination of the following: improper, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting or provocative words or behaviour”*
- [...]”*
8. AFA included within each charge letter the evidence that they intended to rely on in each case.
9. The response dates were as follows;
- 9.1. For both charges against Adura Tovide, a response was required by 06 June 2023;
- 9.2. For the cases against Ashley McHugh and Hackney Spartans FC a response was required by 31 May 2023.

---

<sup>4</sup> p. 146 of FA Handbook

## The Reply

10. The responses are as follows;
  - 10.1. For case **11280962M** the charge of Improper Conduct for Physical Contact on a Match Official against Adura Tovide a response was received on 30 May 2023 denying the charge and requesting his be dealt with by correspondence.
  - 10.2. For case **11280971M** the charge of Improper Conduct not including threatening and/or abusive language/behaviour against Adura Tovide a response was received on 31 May 2023 accepting the charge and requesting his be dealt with by correspondence.
  - 10.3. On 24 May 2023 a response was submitted via WGS to cases **11261025M** and **11261024M** with each individual charge being denied and requesting they be dealt with by correspondence;
11. During the investigation, evidence was submitted from:
  - 11.1. Referee Extraordinary Incident Report and further information via e-mail;
  - 11.2. Complaint to league from Hackney Spartans FC;
  - 11.3. E-mails between the AFA Hackney Spartans FC;
  - 11.4. E-mail responses from Hackney Spartans after original charges raised.

## The Commission

12. The Football Association ("The FA") appointed me, Steve Francis, as a Chair member of the National Serious Case Panel, to this Discipline Commission as the Chairman Sitting Alone to adjudicate in these cases.

## The Hearing and Evidence

13. The case bundle was sent via e-mail to the appointed Chair 08 June 2023 to be completed within 3 working days.

14. I adjudicated this case on 08-09 June 2023 as a consolidated correspondence hearing.
15. The following is a summary of the principal submissions provided. It does not purport to contain reference to all the points made, however the absence in these reasons of any particular point, or submission, should not imply that we did not take such point, or submission, into consideration when we determined the matter. For the avoidance of doubt, we have carefully considered all the evidence and materials furnished with regard to this case. Where possible names have been removed from the evidence presented in the case bundle.
16. The case bundle begins with the Match Referee's Extraordinary Incident Report, dated 01 May 2023, this provides a detailed account of the allegations of Improper Conduct during the fixture;
  - 16.1. The statement contains details of issues prior to the fixture regarding the nets and a suitable match ball leading to a slight delay. There was also a lack of corner flags which caused an issue with an early decision made by the Referee. Having awarded a penalty, he states *"raised their coaches anger levels to making sarcastic comments about me and my ability to referee the game. I also had to ask him twice to come off the field of play after using the first off two yellow cards for dangerous play and also what I perceived to be intent without impact as the player hurt one of his own players while trying to foul an Azteca player"*.
  - 16.2. In a short spell the Referee had to issue final warnings to three Hackney players *"the Hackney Spartens coach and entarauge were making condensing and foul mother comments at me, unfortunately this was done when my back was turned so I couldn't directly see who was saying this but they were being said by numerous people from that side of the pitch"*. He then awarded a second penalty against Hackney and the Hackney manager *"started shouting at me again from the sidelines and this was encouraging quite a few of his players to do the same on the pitch. After another foul by a Hackney player the coach started screaming at me from the sideline. I approached him and advised him that if he*

*continued I would yellow card him, to this his reply was I don't care you are a fucking dick head".*

- 16.3. The Referee feels the behaviour would only get worse from this point onwards *"because of the level of anger and abuse directed at me I gave him a straight red and instructed him to leave the pitch. He vehemently refused to leave. I then advised him that if he did not leave I would abandon the game. His response was "do it I don't give a fuck but I'm not going" ". It was clear to the Referee the situation was on the brink of becoming out of control "I asked him again to leave the pitch and once again he refused, which left me no option but to abandon the game. At this stage we were twenty five minutes into the second half and the score was 0-6 to Azteca".*
- 16.4. As the Referee left the field of play *"I was being acausted harassed and physically man handled by some of the Hackney Spartens players to the point where I had to stop walking and look at two players at this point and tell them do not touch me and not to put there hands on me anymore". He was approached by the Aztec coach to see if they could continue but the Referee was not prepared to do so as he "believed that doing so would have most definitely put someone in direct harm's way. I explained to him that if I came back and allowed the game to continue and one of his players ended up with a broken leg or a very serious injury that he would put the blame squarely on my shoulders and I was not carrying that. With this statement he realised that his request could be extremely detrimental to the safety of his players and said ok".*
- 16.5. The report ends noting *"The behaviour of the Hackney Spartens coach we reprehensible disgraceful and should not be allowed from any coach or manager of any team. He should be reported to the FA as this is not acceptable on any level of grass roots football. His mannerisms and behaviours towards me fell well below the standards expected from a person in his position from the moment I spoke to him before kick off".*
17. The further contact between the Referee and the AFA adds the following;

- 17.1. The e-mail trail begins 02 May 2023 and asks a series of questions for clarification on the allegations within the report. The first question is a request for a description of the Hackney coach who is described by the Referee as *"a white man approx. 5ft 5-6in tall and portly and he was wearing a track suit"*. The second notes the distance of the encroachment which he notes as 5-7 yards.
- 17.2. For question 3 regarding what he had been called and by whom he states *"I was called a dickhead, stupid, blind as I was wearing my sports goggles. He won't give us anything, as he said he will give what he sees and he can't see. Your rubbish ref. You shouldn't be a referee you are crap. This attitude encouraged his team of players to repeat some of those comments, on the pitch during the first half. At one point I called a Hackney Spartens player over to me and advised him that if he made one more derogatory comment I would book him and depending on the severity of his comment I maybe and would give him a straight ref card, fortunately that seemed to be enough and this player refrained from any further comments for what turned out to be the rest of the game"*.
- 17.3. Question 4 questions the term entourage and what he means by this, he describes one of the leading antagonists who was *"shouting and screaming at me directly rather than only just appealing my decisions. This person was making a point of trying to be as disruptive as possible. He didn't seem to be a player as he did not have any kit on but he was there from the start"*. He notes the others as players waiting to come on and some that had been taken off but he was still receiving *"I was still receiving a barrage of comments which now came from players who had been substituted. At the same time some of the players on the pitch were repeating and mimicking what their coach was saying from the side lines on the pitch"*.
- 17.4. Question 5 focusses on the allegation of *"harassed and physically manhandled"* by members of Hackney following the abandonment and if they can provide descriptions. He replies *"one particular player that as he ran up behind me and pulled me back by my right arm it actually broke my*

*stride to the extent that I was almost stopped in my tracks. At this point I felt that I had no other option but to square myself off to him and the other players that were around me put my hands out in a defensive manner, look this young man directly in his eyes and tell him firstly don't put your hands on me and them to the rest of them don't touch me keep your hands of me."*. The Referee was also concerned that he was extremely close *"to having to fight my way out of this huddle which was a very daunting thought as I was now surrounded by five to six players"*. He does however note the player that manhandled him was cautioned in the fixture.

- 17.5. Continuing with his response to question 5 he feels his actions *"the players took a half step back to which I carried on walking towards the changing rooms. During this time the captain of Hackney Spartens was shouting at me that I made this game about me and not the game, I spilled the game and I'm a bad referee. He even said to me that I should have come to him and he would have spoken to their coach"*. His response to the captain was *"you heard and saw what was going on with your coach and you had more than enough time to come across and talk to him, did you do it no so don't tell me this now, and at this point he stepped back as well"*.
- 17.6. Question 6 asks how much force was used during the alleged physical contact *"Enough force to literally stop me in my tracks and I was walking with intent to get back to the passion, which was quite disturbing."*. Question 7 requests the team sheet for the fixture, the Referee does send this but adds *"After looking at this team sheet I am now convinced that the player that I booked who was wearing number 15 gave me a false name. This is per the two following circumstances. Directly after I booked him he started to walk away and the name he gave me was Tejan. I was calling him to show him the yellow card and I called him the time loudly but he did not respond. Another Hackney Sparens player called him who was right beside him and then he turned around. Unfortunately for him number 15 on the team sheet is Kerlan James"*.
18. The next part of the e-mail trail focusses on the description of the alleged offender wearing number 15 in the fixture as follows;

- 18.1. On 03 May 2023 the Referee describes the player a *“About 6ft tall black man with an afro”*. Following a series of e-mails regarding issues with WGS and inputting the misconduct for the fixture, two photographs are provided to the Match Official on 24 May 2023, labelled 1 and 2 the Referee identifies photograph 1 as being of the alleged offender.
19. The next inclusion is the Referee report form sent to the league which adds the following;
- 19.1. This states *“ref was very abusive from the start he was shouting in players faces. He did not let anyone talk to him. I asked him for the time politely he told me to shut up. He then did not let us make a sub to replace an injury he shouted in my face and said he will abandon the game. He then walked away”*.
20. The case bundle then moves on to the statements from Hackney Spartans FC. These begin with an e-mail dated 02 May 2023 from Ashley McHugh, he adds the following details;
- 20.1. He begins noting *“The referee in question was incredibly unprofessional and rude. The game was noted as being played in good spirit fork both teams and staff. There were no incidents with players. The referee was very rude and dismissive of players and staff. He shouted at numerous players who were not raising voices or being rude. I had asked for the time and was told to “shut up and leave him alone”. This happens twice”*.
- 20.2. At one point they were asked to step back from the line which *“I and staff did so without incident. When a penalty was questioned by players the referee called the myself to him and instantly began shouting. I did not shout back nor use offensive language. The referee said he will abandon the game and the I replied “You can because this is a shambles and I don’t get why you’re shouting in my face””* the Referee then walked away.
- 20.3. Both teams followed him to get him to come back but *“he was not touched, shouted at or abused in any way. There were many witnesses to this”*. He adds he reported the Referee to the league *“I have no qualms with the cards and will address these. We have very little issue with discipline as our record will*

*show. We have been noted as being a respectful team by the league and have had no issue like this before. Which makes this more the saddening me”.*

- 20.4. The AFA respond to this e-mail on 03 May 2023 and ask for further information on alleged abuse by spectators and of a player specified by the Referee, on the same date the club note *“In regards the spectator I am not entirely sure. My team does not have anyone who matches the description and I am based at about the half way line most games with my subs. There were a few pockets of spectators but none who are with myself or the subs. [redacted] is Ines up and fully registered online. So I’m not sure where the ref has got this from. I feel the ref may have been too focussed on being the centre point and not concentrated fully on admin. In my opinion”.*
- 20.5. Also, the same date the AFA ask about the player described by the Referee and allegedly the person that pulled on him, the club note *“The player who wore the 15 was [redacted] who is signed up and registered. There is no false name. He said he gave his name [redacted] which is correct. Again, I’m unsure where confusion is coming from with this. The captain [redacted]. Has said he and other form BOTH teams followed the ref to plead for him to stay as I had followed his instructions. No physical contact was made by either teams players”.*
- 20.6. The club also add they find the Physical contact allegations to be *“rather distressing as this was not the case. I would like to make a counter claim as in this report the referee makes no mention of being verbally abusive and shouting in my face. Coming very close to my face in fact which I found very threatening. I was also told to shut up when politely asking for timings halfway through the second half. To all the above I responded in a polite fashion as not to relate a scene”.*
21. The next inclusion in the case bundle is an undated e-mail from the club to the AFA which notes the following;
- 21.1. They note there may have been an error with the player the Referee has alleged made physical contact, they state *“The players name is Adura*

*Tovide. He was wearing 15 on the day and is not registered. I have attached his photograph. I am very sure the ref will identify him as the player he booked and believes to have touched him. He matches the description. This photo was taken on the day. As a result I would like the charges against [redacted] dropped and any subsequent consequence to the club I accept”.*

- 21.2. There are a number of pictures included for the Referee to look at and the club also note an issue with obtaining a FAN and *“I have attached another image for the ref to look at. I am very certain this is who the ref is referring to. Until today I was unaware that this player was unregistered as I had me the match day taking of the team but not the team sheets or players info”.*
- 21.3. In a following communication the club note they have reason to believe Adura Tovide had provided a different name when booked, adding *“I did not fill out the team sheet my coach did (and does all match days) and I feel I have been mislead in regards player registration. As secretary, I take full responsibility for the infringement and will accept any sanction against me in regards this. I have made contact myself with the player [redacted] and he is very distressed at the allegation and was unaware his name was used by Adura Tovide. I had prior to this, asked my coach [redacted] to make contact with players in regards to this matter. However I have now stepped in”.* They further urge the AFA to provide the photographic evidence to the Referee.
- 21.4. The next communication then asks for statements to be removed as whilst they were initially stated to have been provided by the player originally charged, they had in fact been written by Adura Tovide. A further e-mail covers the alleged mix-up of player details and the author had taken a step back from club activity but has now intervened *“and sent over player details and photos as it is not my aim to willingly mislead yourself or the AFA”.* The last part is in reference to the original player charged and a wish for the charge to be dropped.
- 21.5. The final correspondence contains further evidence the original player charged was not present at the fixture in question. There is mention of a

video being submitted from Adura Tovide regarding the incident but this has not been included within the evidence bundle.

22. Despite being contacted by AFA there has been no response from Azteca to provide their observations on the alleged incidents.
23. That concluded the relevant evidence in the case.

### Standard of Proof

24. The applicable standard of proof required for this case is the civil standard of the balance of probability. This standard means, we would be satisfied that an event occurred if we considered that, on the evidence, it was more likely than not to have happened.

### The Findings & Decision

25. For case **11280971M** the charge of Improper Conduct not including threatening and/or abusive language/behaviour against Adura Tovide as a response was received accepting the charge this has been found **Proven** by admission.
26. For case **11280962M** the charge of Improper Conduct for Physical Contact on a Match Official against Adura Tovide the FA handbook contains a threshold for this charge as follows;
  - 26.1. *“96.2 Physical contact or attempted physical contact: physical actions (or attempted actions) that are unlikely to cause injury to the Match Official but are nevertheless confrontational, examples include but are not limited to: pushing the Match Official or pulling the Match Official (or their clothing or equipment)”*
27. The Match Referee alleges he was pulled back by the arm by the player in such a manner that it caused him to “*stop in his tracks*”. The club have countered this did not take place and no-one had made any contact with the Referee. There has been no statement provided by Adura Tovide to provide their observations on the incident. The evidence from the club regarding the player admits to the player

- providing an incorrect name to the Referee adding credibility to the observations of the Match Official.
28. The Commission believe, on the balance of probability, it is more likely than not Adura Tovide has made physical contact with the Referee by taking hold of heir arm. It is also believed to have been committed in a confrontational manner in response to the abandonment of the match and does meet the threshold within the FA handbook. Therefore, the case has been found **Proven**.
  29. For case **11261025M** the E3 charge for Ashley McHugh, the Commission considered the evidence presented. The Referee alleges use of offensive terms towards him and when dismissed Ashley McHugh has refused to leave the area; by doing so has caused the abandonment of the fixture.
  30. The participant charged has provided a response noting the lack of professionalism displayed by the Referee and, when asked to move back from the line, he did engage with the Referee but did not shout or use offensive language. However, does admit to the Referee informing him he would abandon the match to which he has responded *"You can because this is a shambles and I don't get why you're shouting in my face"*.
  31. The Commission consider it to be more likely than not to have taken place as alleged by the Referee and that abusive and offensive language has been used by Ashley McHugh. It is also believed they are responsible for the abandonment of the fixture and therefore the charge is found **Proven**.
  32. For case **11261024M** the E20 charge for Hackney Spartans, the Referee has alleged he has received abusive comments from the sidelines during the fixture from members of Hackney Spartans playing staff. In addition, it is further alleged, once the game has been abandoned, he has also been surrounded by players from Hackney following the decision.
  33. The club response denies any such comments towards the Referee during the fixture and further notes the Referee walking away after the abandonment who, although followed by players from both sides *"was not touched, shouted at or abused in anyway"*. From the evidence presented the Commission believe it was more

likely than not to have taken place as alleged and the club have failed to control their players, therefore the charge is found as **Proven**.

### Previous Disciplinary Record

34. Adura Tovide's Participant Offence History contains no previous misconduct of this nature.
35. Ashley McHugh's Participant Offence History contains no other misconduct of any nature.
36. Hackney Spartans FC have 1 team, their five-year offence history contains neither on-field discipline or misconduct charges prior to this season. For the current season they have 3 standard charges in total all from the same fixture dated 13 November 2022 which was also against Azteca FC. There are also 7 cautions, 2 of which are also from the previous Azteca FC fixture.

### Mitigation

37. For case **11280962M** as this has been accepted the "*credit for a guilty plea*" can be considered. Nothing further has been received in mitigation.

### The Sanction

38. For case **11280962M** Adura Tovide's E3 charge, the sanction range is as follows;
  - 38.1. Suspension of 112 days to 2 years with an entry point before considering mitigating and aggravating circumstances of 182 days;
  - 38.2. A fine up to £150 with a mandatory minimum of £75;
  - 38.3. Mandated FA Education.
39. The Commission after taking into consideration the previous disciplinary record against the aggravating factor of making physical contact with a Match referee, have awarded the following sanction:
  - 39.1. To serve a suspension of 154 days from all football activity to include ground/venue ban backdated to 30 May 2023;

- 39.2. fined a sum of £75;
  - 39.3. Adura Tovide is to satisfactorily complete a mandatory face-to-face education programme before the suspension is served or Adura Tovide be suspended until such time, he successfully completes the mandatory education programme, the details of which will be provided to Adura Tovide;
  - 39.4. 6 (six) club disciplinary points awarded.
40. For case **11280962M** Adura Tovide's E3 charge, the sanction range is as follows;
- 40.1. Suspension of 0-4 matches;
  - 40.2. A fine up to £40.
41. After taking into consideration the previous offence history, acceptance of the charge against the failure of the player to provide their name to the Match Referee, the sanction will be:
- 41.1. To serve a suspension of 2 match;
  - 41.2. fined a sum of £20;
  - 41.3. 7 (seven) club disciplinary points awarded.
42. For case **11280962M** Ashley McHugh's E3 charge, the sanction range is as follows;
- 42.1. Suspension of 0-6 matches;
  - 42.2. A fine up to £70.
43. The Commission believe the actions of Ashley McHugh to verbally abuse the Match Referee and to then refuse to leave the area of the field of play once dismissed and being the main cause of the abandonment of the match places this at the highest end of the sanction range. However, after taking into consideration Ashley McHugh's previous excellent record in mitigation, the sanction will be:

- 43.1. To serve a suspension of 5 matches from all football activity to include ground/venue ban;
  - 43.2. fined a sum of £50;
  - 43.3. Warned as to future conduct.
44. For case **11261024M** Hackney Spartans FC, the sanction range for this offence is;
- 44.1. Fine up to £300.
45. After taking into consideration their previous disciplinary record, against the actions of playing staff during and after the fixture, the sanction will be:
- 45.1. Fined a sum of £100;
  - 45.2. Warned as to future conduct.
46. The decisions are subject to the right of appeal under the relevant FA Rules and Regulations.

Signed...

**Steve Francis** (Commission Chair)

09 June 2023