

FA NATIONAL SERIOUS CASE PANEL
CONSOLIDATED DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN SITTING ALONE

on behalf of Oxfordshire FA

NON-PERSONAL HEARING

Of

Cassington Rangers FC

[Case ID: 11053582M]

&

Leafield FC

[Case ID: 11048787M]

THE DECISION AND REASONS OF THE COMMISSION

<u>Content</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
1. Introduction	3.....	1 – 3
2. The Charges	3.....	4 – 7
3. The Reply	7.....	8 – 9
4. The Commission	8.....	10
5. The Hearing and Evidence	8.....	11 – 25
6. Standard of Proof	17.....	26
7. The Findings & Decision	17.....	27 – 35
8. Previous Disciplinary Record	19.....	36 – 37
9. Mitigation.....	19.....	38 – 39
10. The Sanctions.....	19.....	40 – 49

Introduction

1. On 26 November 2022, Leaffield FC First ("Leaffield", the "Home Club"), played a Witney & District FA League fixture against Cassington Rangers FC First ("Cassington", the "Away Club") – collectively the "match".
2. Following the fixture, the appointed Match Official submitted a Report via email following an incident leading to the abandonment of the fixture.
3. Oxfordshire Football Association ("Oxfordshire FA") then investigated the reported incidents.

The Charges

4. On 21 December 2022, Oxfordshire FA charged Cassington Rangers FC under case **11048770M**, due to an issue the charge was re-issued on 03 January 2023 under case **11053582M**:
 - 4.1. 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 (**Charge 1**);
 - 4.2. with misconduct for a breach of FA Rule E21 - Failed to ensure spectators and/or its supporters (and anyone purporting to be its supporters or followers) conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match (**Charge 2**);
 - 4.3. It is alleged that Cassington Rangers failed to ensure that directors, players, officials, employees, servants, representatives conducted themselves in an orderly fashion and refrained from improper, offensive, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting or provocative words and/or behaviour contrary to FA Rule E20.1. It is further alleged that the words and/or behaviour made reference to race contrary to FA Rule E20.2.

4.4. This refers to the comment(s) *'Gobbiest cunt', 'Fat', 'he's shit probably because he's foreign', 'kill the cunt', 'let me kill him he's been a cunt all game', 'break his legs', 'make them pay', 'it cant be fun playing with a load of foreign cunts can it', 'fuck off you Brazilian twat' and 'go back to your own country' or similar.* Players from both sides were involved in the altercation and aggression towards each other and in doing so Cassington Rangers in part caused the Abandonment of the game.

4.5. Oxfordshire FA advised in the charge letter each offence carried a sanction range of £0-300 fine.

4.6. The relevant section of FA Rule E20 states¹:

"E20 Each Affiliated Association, Competition and Club shall be responsible for ensuring that its Directors, players, officials, employees, servants, representatives, conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match and do not:

E20. 1 "use words or otherwise behave in a way which is improper, offensive, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting or provocative;"

E20. 2 "conduct themselves in a manner prohibited by E20.1 in circumstances where that conduct is discriminatory in that it includes a reference, whether express or implied, to any one or more of ethnic origin, colour, race, nationality, religion or belief, gender, gender reassignment, sexual orientation or disability."

4.7. The relevant section of FA Rule E21 states²:

"E21 A Club must ensure that spectators and/or its supporters (and anyone purporting to be its supporters or followers) conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match and do not:

E21.1 "use words or otherwise behave in a way which is improper, offensive, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting or provocative;

E21.2 throw missiles or other potentially harmful or dangerous objects at or on to the

¹ p. 146 of FA Handbook

² p. 146 of FA Handbook

pitch; E21.3 encroach on to the pitch or commit any form of pitch incursion;

E21.4 conduct themselves in a manner prohibited by paragraph E21.1 in circumstances where that conduct is discriminatory in that it includes a reference, whether express or implied, to one or more of ethnic origin, colour, race, nationality, religion or belief, gender, gender reassignment, sexual orientation or disability” [...].”

5. In consolidation on 21 December 2022, Oxfordshire FA charged Leaffield FC;
 - 5.1. 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 **(Charge 1)**;
 - 5.2. with misconduct for a breach of FA Rule E21 - Failed to ensure spectators and/or its supporters (and anyone purporting to be its supporters or followers) conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match **(Charge 2)**;
 - 5.3. It is alleged that Leaffield FC failed to ensure that player(s), official(s), spectator(s), and/or all person(s) purporting to be its supporter(s) or follower(s) conducted themselves in an orderly fashion and refrained from improper, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting and/or provocative words and/or behaviour contrary to FA Rule E20, and it is further alleged that Leaffield FC FA Rule E21 - Failed to ensure spectators and/or its supporters (and anyone purporting to be its supporters or followers) conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match. in doing so Leaffield FC in part caused the Abandonment of the game.
 - 5.4. This refers to an incident in the 87th minute of the game, following on field matter, a female supporter of Leaffield FC entered the field of play without the permission of the match official and attacked a Cassington player kicking out at him. Numerous players from Leaffield then started 'Squaring up' to the Cassington players in a mass brawl. The Referee

attempted to gain order and was told several times by the Leaffield players to 'Fuck Off. One Leaffield player was observed taking his shirt off and attacking a Cassington player. The Referee tried to regain control of the game but was unable to do so owing to the actions of most of the players on the pitch. The Referee Abandoned the match with 3 minutes remaining.

5.5. Oxfordshire advised in the charge letter each offence carried a sanction range of £0-300 fine.

5.6. The relevant section of FA Rule E20 states³:

"E20 Each Affiliated Association, Competition and Club shall be responsible for ensuring that its Directors, players, officials, employees, servants, representatives, conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match and do not:

E20. 1 "use words or otherwise behave in a way which is improper, offensive, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting or provocative;"

E20. 2 "conduct themselves in a manner prohibited by E20.1 in circumstances where that conduct is discriminatory in that it includes a reference, whether express or implied, to any one or more of ethnic origin, colour, race, nationality, religion or belief, gender, gender reassignment, sexual orientation or disability."

The relevant section of FA Rule E21 states⁴:

"E21 A Club must ensure that spectators and/or its supporters (and anyone purporting to be its supporters or followers) conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending any Match and do not:

E21.1 "use words or otherwise behave in a way which is improper, offensive, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting or provocative;

E21.2 throw missiles or other potentially harmful or dangerous objects at or on to the pitch; E21.3 encroach on to the pitch or commit any form of pitch incursion;

³ p. 146 of FA Handbook

⁴ p. 146 of FA Handbook

E21.4 conduct themselves in a manner prohibited by paragraph E21.1 in circumstances where that conduct is discriminatory in that it includes a reference, whether express or implied, to one or more of ethnic origin, colour, race, nationality, religion or belief, gender, gender reassignment, sexual orientation or disability” [...]”

6. Oxfordshire FA cited the evidence that they intended to rely on in this case which was included with the charge letters.
7. On the initial charges both participants charged were required to respond to their respective charges by 28 December 2022. With the re-issued charge Cassington Rangers were required to respond by 10 January 2023.

The Reply

8. The responses received were as follows;
 - 8.1. For case **11053582M** the charges against Cassington Rangers, a response was received via WGS to the original charge of **11048770M** on 21 December 2022 denying each charge and requesting they be dealt with by correspondence. With the re-issue the same response was received from Cassington Rangers via WGS on 03 January 2023;
 - 8.2. For cases **11048787M** the charges against Leafield, a response was received to both via email on 21 December 2022 accepting both charges and requesting they be dealt with by correspondence.
9. During the investigation, the evidence was submitted from:
 - 9.1. Match Referee Report and additional information via e-mail;
 - 9.2. Screenshots from FA Management systems;
 - 9.3. Statements provided by Cassington Rangers FC;
 - 9.4. Statements provided by Leafield FC;
 - 9.5. Response to the charges from Leafield FC;

9.6. Response to the charges from Cassington Rangers.

The Commission

10. 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

11. The case bundle was sent via e-mail to the appointed Chair 28 December 2022 to be completed within 3 working days. The appointment notification informed of an error on the initial charge notification letters where the incorrect FA Rule had been used to be dealt with as a preliminary hearing. Having considered the error, the case bundles were returned to Oxfordshire FA to be recharged with a 7-day response timeline. Upon completion of this they were to be returned to the Commission chair. These were received on 05 January 2023.
12. I adjudicated this case on 05 January 2023 as a consolidated correspondence hearing.
13. 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 appropriate names have been redacted.
14. Below is a summary of the main points:
15. The appointed Match Official for the fixture submitted a Report which contained the following details;
- 15.1. The report notes in the 87th minute *"a female spectator from Leaffield FC entered the Field of Play and attacked [redacted] by kicking him. A number of Leaffield players then approached and started "squaring up" to each other"*. The

Official then saw a player remove their shirt and *"push an unknown Cassington player in the chest in a motion by which I would describe as a double palm heel"*. Of the female who had entered *"I asked the female her name however she shouted at me in Portuguese. I was then approached by the Leafield number 6 (name unknown) and asked why I needed her name. I explained that a spectator could not enter the Field of Play and attack a player and I was then told to "FUCK OFF" "*.

- 15.2. The referee states he explained the match could not continue unless the spectator left the area *"I was again asked "WHY" and told to "FUCK OFF" so after 87 minutes of play I abandoned the fixture. Whilst I never obtained the details of the Spectator I know that she was affiliated with Leafield F.C. as I had seen her being passed jackets and coats worn by substitutes coming on and off for Leafield. I had also seen her hugging one of the Leafield players"*.
16. On 01 December 2022 Oxfordshire contacted the Referee to obtain clarification on a number of points:
- 16.1. The questions from Oxfordshire FA were *"in your report that you were told to 'Fuck Off' by a player. Can you confirm who this was and from what team they came? You were told to 'Fuck Off' a second time, can you confirm if this was the same person or someone different? Did you take any action against these players? Is there anything else you can add to your report?"*.
- 16.2. On 02 December 2022, the referee responds to the first questions *"I can't confirm precisely who said it. It was the Leafield No. 6 but the numbers didn't correlate with the team sheet so I can't confirm the players name. However I was told several times by Leafield players to "Fuck off" several times during the course of the incident"*.
- 16.3. The referee does make a further observation regarding Leafield FC however this was referencing a previous fixture where they had approached him speaking Portuguese, having used a translator application he had discovered they were using foul and abusive language towards him.

17. The next entry in the case bundle is the screen shots from WGS and the FA Fulltime system. These show the following;
 - 17.1. The Fulltime screen captures show the match outcome and the team details, the league table is also shown.
 - 17.2. The evidence from WGS shows the disciplinary action taken by the referee with a caution for Cassington and a caution and two dismissals for Leaffield. There are also captures providing further detail to the dismissals as one S2 (violent conduct) and the second for S3 (spitting).
18. The next entry is from Cassington, having been approached by Oxfordshire FA on 01 December 2022 for observations on the abandonment including from a specific individual mentioned in the report and the identity of a player who had been pushed, they submit the following in response;
 - 18.1. The reply, dated 01 December 2022 notes of the abandonment *"unfortunately our fixture versus Leaffield was abandoned in the 86th minute, it all started when a Leaffield player (the one who took his shirt off I believe) was shown a second yellow for a foul on [redacted], which led to the female spectator kicking out at [redacted]"*. They continue *"Then that said player pushed one of our players [redacted] in the chest and then unfortunately some players got out of hand which is why [referee] called the game there and then. Another one of their players also got sent off for spitting or aiming to spit at [referee]."*
 - 18.2. The response also notes a potential issue as *"because Leaffield only started the game with 9 men their team sheet wasn't filled in completely, and the two players that were shown a red card weren't on the team sheet as they arrived mid-way through the first half"*. Of the female spectator mentioned in the report, the referee had requested the name and told to leave *"but was refusing to do so"*.
19. The next statement in the case bundle is that requested of the specific player by Oxfordshire FA, this adds the following details;

- 19.1. They begin by mentioning a foul with a *“Little bit of afters I was nearest so went to get our player (a 16yr old lad) away from the situation when a lot of there players came over shouting in which I couldn’t understand”*. At this point *“the ref asked for there number so I was saying to him that he needs to go to the ref as I’m walking away I feel my hand get hit look round and a female spectator of the opposite team had kicked out at me”*.
- 19.2. The author notes all 22 players had gathered and they were *“trying to get our players away from the situation, spoke to there captain to get his players away he agreed to do so. Looked around and the ref had called the game off”*.
20. The case bundle then moves onto the statements from Leafield, as with their opponents, Oxfordshire FA contacted them on 01 December 2022 and asked for their observations and reasons for the abandonment, the first response on the same date from a team official state;
- 20.1. They have spoken to many of their players and allege there were issues with opposition supporters during the first half *“leafields players suffered quite a lot of abuse from cassingtons crowd on side line being drunk and out of control running on the pitch shouting at our players racism comments fuck off home ,get on your boat and fuck off home you Brazilian assle ,you fat cunt ,and loads threatening behaviour, 3 to 4 cassington players were very racist and threatening our players ,as the game went on the problem got worse the leafield striker got abused that much he didn't want to take part in the game anymore and took himself off”*. He adds the player was sent off which caused the player to become *“stressed and went home”*.
- 20.2. Of the final incident around the 85th minute *“the cassington player abused a lady on the sideline and told her she was a fucking bitch out loud; she came onto the pitch to shout at him and he grabbed her so she kicked him and one of our players parted it the lady and her partner left the playing field she was crying and upset”*. The statement then mentions the dismissal for spitting *“that just did not happen one of the cassington players shouted he's spat but he did not the ref decided to send him off but the ref did not see anything”*.

- 20.3. There are further allegations of abuse throughout the fixture *“there were threatening and racist behaviour coming from cassington players and drunken crowd on sideline and kept coming on the field of play abusing our players. At the end of the day there's only so much you can take its human nature”*. There is also an allegation towards the Match Official *“the referee that day was very poor, I've had 2 reports that the referee joined in with the bad comments and laughed at some the racist comments and also said at one point to a player you deserve everything you get I've never seen a ref do this he was terrible and did nothing for the abuse”*. They believe both their red cards should be rescinded as the referee failed to address the abuse and stamp it out early on which would have prevented them.
- 20.4. They consider themselves a nice and hardworking club and *“we should not be subject to abuse and racism it's not the first time it's happened all we want to do is play football it should be open to everybody and any race and colour ,we have some Brazil guys in our club that just want to play football and show off there skills we love them in our club they are really lovely guys it's a shame there are people in the game that want to be idiots and spoil it for others”*.
- 20.5. They conclude with *“The racism needs to be stamped out, there are some lads in our club that think very strongly about this and want to speak. We would come in to your offices to speak. These comments and things went on in game are coming from players that feel very strongly about sat as I was not there but I got the picture of events”*.
21. In response to this, Oxfordshire FA, noting the author was not present at the fixture reply on 02 December requesting of there are any persons who were present that would submit a statement within 7 days. On 07 December 2022, they received the following in response;
- 21.1. The statement is from a player and begins noting the issue with Leafield only having 9 players and there was little incident in the first half from a football perspective as he believes *“was mostly due to natural complacency from Cassington due to Leafield's inferior numbers”*. As right back he was

nearest the touchline with the Cassington spectators who *"were clearly very drunk and did appear to be behaving in a very disorderly manner in front of children. Whilst I personally received no abuse, many of our players did. One of our players was called the gobbiest cunt on the pitch after simply shouting "come on boys, we're playing well." He was also constantly being called fat during the half almost every time he touched the ball after this and the abuse was completely unnecessary"*. Believing the player to be targeted as he was one of their better players to put him off. He also notes abuse to the Leafield goal keeper from the spectators when one said *"he's shit, probably because he's foreign."* With the score 1-1 at half time, I noticed the spectators get more and more aggressive as the half went on".

- 21.2. The second half bought a change to the mentality of Cassington *"with them looking to hurt us at every possible opportunity. Players who I was having friendly banter with in the first half were suddenly going in for late, two footed tackles at every opportunity, clearly under instruction to do this at half time by their coach"*. Having now moved to the opposite side to the Cassington spectators he adds *"their spectators had risen to this too and shouts of "kill the cunt" could be heard. Whilst being on the end of some fairly rough treatment, mine was nothing compared to many of our Brazilian players and some of the tackles that they received were disgraceful in my opinion"*.
- 21.3. The author accepts challenges are part of the game but he was *"winning almost every time they touched the ball as quite often there were two players looking to hurt them at the same time. Despite the extremely abrasive nature of their play and targeting of some of our players, all of whom who received the worst of the tackles and abuse during the second half being Brazilian"* adding the referee *"let them go"*. They also feel Leafield players were being reprimanded for their reactions and *"the Cassington players were able to carry on clearly playing to deliberately hurt out team"*.
- 21.4. The statement then moves on to the incident towards the end of the fixture where one of the Leafield players reacted badly to a foul *"One of their players, number 3 I believe, tried to confront him and I held him back. He started*

shouting to me "let me kill him, he's been a cunt all game." After the altercation died down, shouts from the Cassington players of "break his legs" and "let's make them pay" became very prominent". He then alleges he got told "by one of their players that "it can't be fun playing with a load of foreign cunts can it." A few minutes later, a similar incident followed. This time I heard shouts of "fuck off you Brazilian twat" and "go back to your own country."".

- 21.5. All 22 players were by this time involved *"After the immediate shock at hearing some of these shouts, those that heard were furious and things got more heated. Our player involved in the original incident was then sent off for his reaction, despite the tackle on him being far worse in my opinion"*.
- 21.6. He then refers to the entry to the field of play by a Leafield supporter *"one of our spectators (a young woman no taller than 5'0 feet) tried to intervene. I believe this to be with good intentions. Once, she got involved, one of the Cassington players moved straight over to her and appeared very aggressive in his manner. She claimed afterwards that he'd grabbed her. By the time I had seen and had got involved I hadn't seen this but a number of players claim to have done so". Having separated them "she appeared distraught and kicked out at him, again further enhancing the likelihood of physical contact of some kind. After the kick, he turned around and shouted "you fucking bitch, dare you do that again. I bet deep down you'd like it if we were alone love."". The author notes due to the language barrier and all else that was going on he was the only one to hear it.*
- 21.7. The spectator's partner, a Leafield player, then became involved at which point the author cannot remember the specifics of the event but does remember *"the Referee intervening at some point but making it out like she was the only problem. The Referee then called the match off and immediately shouted that Leafield will be reported. This despite the clear aggressors throughout the match being Cassington at all times, through very little provocation from Leafield players"*.

- 21.8. Of the alleged spitting towards the referee, he *"didn't see this incident however, many players at the time were adamant that it didn't happen and that it was the Cassington players looking to con the Referee. Back in the hall where both teams had to change afterwards, the Referee was saying about how we were to be reported and how he wouldn't include any allegations of racism in his report, despite it being very clearly prominent"*.
- 21.9. He followed the referee as he spoke to the opposition as he had been sorting the match out and felt he was on friendly terms with the referee and opposition management. During this he alleges the referee *"said that there may be a racism complaint made, with a sarcastic tone and a large smirk on his face. The Cassington management then basically responded by laughing about this with the Referee clearly not too fussed about this"*. This concluded their statement on the events.
- 21.10. In addition to describing the events, they finish by stating *"I know that I wasn't a witness to a lot of the racism and that a lot more of it has been reported from what I heard. In conclusion, Cassington had drunken, aggressive spectators clearly looking to cause trouble, a clear intent to hurt the Leaffield players during the second half, multiple racist comments being made throughout the game and a player threatening a Leaffield spectator in a completely inappropriate manner. As well as this, the Referee made no attempt to stop this and clearly was looking to target any wrongdoing from Leaffield"*.
22. The final part of the case bundle are the responses from both clubs to the charges. The first, from Leaffield, dated 21 December 2022 states;
- 22.1. They request Oxfordshire FA *"put leaffield football club down as guilty as the one of 4 spectator's we had that day has entered the field of play (lady spectator) who was retaliating from abuse from cassington player and was handled by player. We had very few coaches that day and was unable to control 50 plus drunk cassington crowd as scared of abuse and getting hurt so no control was applied as being scared"*. They conclude *"We are not looking forward to playing them away as our players are very frightened of another encounter"*.

- 22.2. On the same date Oxfordshire FA request confirmation of the plea being for both charges, also on the same date they respond *“just to clarify we are guilty on both counts and could you enter plea please”*.
23. The responses from Cassington begin with one from a team official, this is undated and contains the following details;
- 23.1. They were at the fixture and feel the game was *“played in good spirit from both sides where Leaffield started the game with only 9 players and had to play on and with for players from their Reserve side to arrive, and which they were the better side in all fairness. Unfortunately, things started to change with around 20 minutes off play remaining when until Leaffield knew the game was lost when we went 3-1 and 4-1 up”*.
- 23.2. At this point in the fixture Leaffield players *“started giving away more fouls than usual and shouting at the referee in a more intense manner. Then an incident happened on the other side of the field from where I was watching around the 86th minute mark where a female spectator entered the pitch and attacked our player [redacted] by kicking out at him after a foul was given by their no. 9 on [redacted] who incidentally was pushed in the chest with both hands and received a second yellow card for the altercation”*.
- 23.3. All this led to *“all players coming in the centre of the pitch with the majority of players trying to pull teammates away from the situation. Another Leaffield individual then questioned the referee over the initial incident and then spat in his direction, so he abandoned the game with two or three minutes remaining”*.
24. The second response is from the same individual requested to provide a statement previously by Oxfordshire FA, also undated they add the following;
- 24.1. They note the foul and trying to get their player away *“from the pushing and shoving going on and a lot of Leaffield players coming over shouting in their language which I couldn't understand. The referee then asked for the Leaffield's player shirt number which he refused to do so”*. He tried to get the player to go to the referee when *“I felt my hand get hit, so I turned around and a female spectator on the Leaffield side had kicked out at me”*.

24.2. With all 22 players now involved he and the Leafield captain *“agreed politely to pull our players away respectively from the situation. As we did, I turned around and the referee had abandoned the game”*.

25. That concluded the relevant evidence in the case.

Standard of Proof

26. 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

27. For case **11048787M** E20 and E21 charges against Leafield, there was response by email accepting the charges, therefore both were found **Proven**.

28. For case **11053582M** the E20 and E21 charges against Cassington Rangers FC both were denied. The Commission considered **Charge 1**, the E20 for failing to control their players. The statements provided by the Match Official only notes the actions of Leafield players as aggressors and does not mention any improper conduct by Cassington.

29. The statements from Cassington note *“some players got out of hand”* and *“all 22 players had gathered”*; the responses also add *“pushing and shoving”* and *“all players coming in the centre of the pitch with the majority of players trying to pull team mates away from the situation”*. Additionally, Leafield statements also comment on *“all 22 players were involved at this point”*. These all counter the referee’s report of the incident and it is more likely than not all 22 players were involved and, on the balance of probability the Commission have found **Charge 1** as **Proven**.

30. The Commission then looked at the aggravated aspect and the use of such comments from players of Cassington. These are not referenced in the evidence provided in any way other than the statements of Leafield. The Match Referee does not comment on this nor do the statements or responses from Cassington;

not even any statement made to refute this aspect. If comments such as these had been made throughout the fixture as alleged there is an expectation, they would have been reported to the referee who would be duty bound to report such claims.

31. The statement from Leafield contains a substantial amount of detail listing the comments they have heard personally; this also alleges the referee was aware but stated they would not include this aspect in their report which would be against FA direction. With the alleged level of comments made towards multiple members of Leafield it is noted there are no further statements from those in attendance. Additionally, there is no further submission from the referee following the allegations raised by Leafield.
32. With only a single statement noting three comments allegedly from players and no further supporting evidence from an individual that was present at the fixture the Commission believe it was unlikely to have taken place and have found the aggravated aspect as **Not Proven**.
33. The Commission then turned to **Charge 2** E21 for the behaviour of their spectators at the fixture. Within the Match Official's report there is no mention of the Cassington spectators nor is there any reference in those provided by Cassington. The only mention of supporters within the statements comes from the Leafield. With the level of detail provided regarding the alleged levels of abuse the Commission believe on the balance of probability it is more likely than not the spectators of Cassington Rovers were abusive and have found the E21 charge as **Proven**.
34. When considering the aggravated aspect of the E21 charge, the Leafield statements contain detail of the alleged comments made by this body of individuals. Again, there is no supporting evidence as to the comments and of any aggravated comments from any other individual present. There is no mention of any such comments from the Match Official, whilst they do not mention the Cassington supporters in any capacity it would be expected the

suggested level of racist abuse would be reported should it have been heard by or reported to the Match Official.

35. On the balance of probability, the Commission believe it was less likely the comments were made; therefore, the aggravated aspect of the charge is found **Not Proven**.

Previous Disciplinary Record

36. Cassington Rangers FC have 1 team, the five-year offence history contains no other similar misconduct charges.
37. Leaffield Town have 3 teams and their five-year offence history contains no other previous misconduct charges relating to this case.

Mitigation

38. As the cases Leaffield has been accepted the "*credit for a guilty plea*" can be given.
39. Nothing further has been received.

The Sanctions

40. For case **11053582M** E20 Cassington Rangers FC the sanction range for this offence is as follows:
- 40.1. A fine up to £300.
41. After taking into consideration Cassington Rangers' previous record, the participation in a mass confrontation and this being partly to blame for the abandonment; the sanction will be:
- 41.1. fined a sum of £90;
- 41.2. A warning as to future conduct.
42. For case **11053582M** E21 Cassington Rangers FC the sanction range for this offence is as follows:
- 42.1. A fine up to £300

43. After taking into consideration Cassington Rangers' previous record, the actions of verbal abuse from the supporters towards the opposing players; the sanction will be:
 - 43.1. fined a sum of £120;
 - 43.2. A warning as to future conduct.
44. For case **11048787M** E20 Leafield FC the sanction range for this offence is as follows:
 - 44.1. A fine of up to £300
45. After taking into consideration Leafield FC's previous record, the participation in a mass confrontation; the sanction will be:
 - 45.1. fined a sum of £90;
 - 45.2. A warning as to future conduct.
46. For case **11048787M** E21 Leafield FC the sanction range for this offence is as follows:
 - 46.1. A fine of up to £300.
47. After taking into consideration Leafield's previous record, the actions of a supporter entering the field of play becoming involved in confrontation and kicking an opponent, refusing to leave the area of the field of play and this being cited by the referee as the reason for the abandonment; the sanction will be:
 - 47.1. fined a sum of £150;
 - 47.2. A warning as to future conduct.
48. The decision is subject to the right of appeal under the relevant FA Rules and Regulations.
49. Signed...

Steve Francis (Commission Chair)

05 January 2023