

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL BOARD OF THE FOOTBALL
ASSOCIATION

BETWEEN

CHASETOWN FC

Appellant

and

THE FA ALLIANCE COMMITTEE

Respondent

DECISION AND WRITTEN REASONS OF THE APPEAL BOARD

1. The Appeal Board conducted a hearing on Wednesday, 7 June 2023, to determine an appeal by the Appellant against a decision of the Respondent, dated 15 May 2023.
2. This hearing was conducted by Microsoft Teams (video-conferencing).
3. The Appeal Board consisted of Mr Roger Burden (Chairperson), Mr Robert Purkiss MBE, and Mr Glenn Moulton. Mr Conrad Gibbons, the Judicial Services Officer, acted as Secretary to the Appeal Board.
4. The Appellant was represented by the attendance of Mr Steve Jones, Club Chair, and Mr Richard Lamb, CEO and Carbon & Environmental Expert. The Respondent was represented by Mr Mark Ives and, attending as observers, Mr James Earl and Mr Matt Edkins.

The Hearing

5. The Respondent, on 15 May 2023, notified the Appellant of their decision that the Appellant was to be laterally moved from the Northern Premier League Division One Midlands to the Northern Premier League Division One West for the 2023/24 season.
6. The Appeal Board, having taken into account the submissions of the parties and having given the Appeal Bundle careful consideration, noted the following.

7. The Appeal Board thank both parties for the manner in which they made their submissions.
8. The Appeal Board noted that the Appellant was appealing on the following ground(s):
 - a. Came to a decision to which no reasonable such body could have come.
9. The Appeal Board unanimously dismissed the appeal on this ground.
10. The Appeal Board reached this decision considering the following:
 - a. The following is a summary of the primary considerations of the Appeal Board, however the absence in these reasons of any particular point, or submission, should not imply that the Appeal Board did not take such point, or submission, into consideration when it considered the matter and reached its findings.
 - b. The comparison of the number of supporters that might possibly travel to away fixtures, and the carbon impact of that travel, are not factors that the Appeal Board would expect the Respondent to investigate when making its decision.
 - c. The Respondent had properly considered Sporting Khalsa as an alternative and calculated that Sporting Khalsa would be involved in approximately 30 less travelling miles than the Appellant. The Respondent had also considered a range of other factors in a reasonable manner.
 - d. The fact that the Respondent selected the Appellant, based on this small mileage difference, may have been a marginal one but was entirely reasonable.
11. The Appeal Board considered the matter of costs and decided that there would be no order as to costs.
12. The Appeal Board order that the appeal fee be forfeited.
13. The Appeal Board's decision is final and binding.

Roger Burden (Chair)

Glenn Moulton
Robert Purkiss MBE

8 June 2023