

**In the Matter of the Appeal Board of  
The Football Association (the FA)**

**BETWEEN**

GEMMA WOODFORD (1<sup>ST</sup> APPELLANT)

And

SHANKLIN LFC (2<sup>ND</sup> APPELLANT)

V

HAMPSHIRE FA (RESPONDENT)

---

**WRITTEN REASONS OF THE APPEAL BOARD**

---

1. These are the written reasons for the decision made by an FA Appeal Board that heard the above mentioned case by "Teams" video conference on Thursday 11 January 2024.
2. The Appeal Board members were Mr Christopher Reeves (Chair), Mr Dennis Strudwick and Mr Bob Purkiss.
3. Mr Shane Comb Wiltshire FA, FA National Secretary acted as Secretary to the hearing.
4. At the request of both Appellants the Appeal was dealt with as a paper hearing in the absence of the parties.
5. On 21 November 2023 the Respondent charged the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellant with a breach of FA Rule E10 (participant) Failed to comply with a decision of the Association namely that the Appellant played in a game between Shanklin LFC and Gosport LFC on 22 October 2023 while serving a one match ban.
6. On 21 November 2023 the Respondent charged the 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellant with a breach of FA Rule E12 (Club) Failed to comply with a decision of the Association namely that the First Appellant had played in a game between Shanklin LFC and Gosport LFC on 22 October 2023 whilst she was serving a one match ban.
7. At a hearing held on 13 December 2023 by Teams video link an FA Regional Disciplinary Commission on behalf of the Hampshire FA by a unanimous decision found the charges

against both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellants proven and imposed sanctions of a 2 match suspension, a £20 fine and 5 club penalty points on the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellant and a £25 fine on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellant.

8. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellants have appealed the Respondent's decision on the ground that it came to a decision to which no reasonable body could have come.
9. The Appeal Board took due note of the Appellant's submission that by virtue of an email exchange between the 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellant and the Respondent that the Appellants formed the view that the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellant was not suspended from the game scheduled for the 22 October and was therefore free to play in that fixture.
10. The Appeal Board further noted that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellant accepts that the Whole Game System showed that two sin bin offences had been recorded against the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellant in the fixture played on the 15 October 2023 which triggered a one match suspension effective from 22 October.
11. The Appeal Board noted that the confusion in the mind of the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellant and the email exchange which contributed to that confusion had been fully considered by the first instance Commission in arriving at their decision in respect of the charges raised against the Appellants.
12. The Appeal Board took due note of the fact that the charges are both strict liability offences and whilst noting how the confusion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellant arose took the view that the Whole Game System was clear as to the sin bin offences committed by the 1<sup>st</sup> Appellant in the game on the 15 October 2023 and equally clear as to the suspension imposed as a consequence of those offences.
13. The Appeal Board noted that the first instance Commission considered the respective disciplinary records of both Appellants in deciding an appropriate sanction and determining that both offences should be placed in the low category as a result of the clean record of both Appellants.
14. The Appeal Board having taken into account all the submissions of the parties and having given the Appeal Bundles careful consideration unanimously dismissed the Appeal.
15. There is no order as to costs and the appeal fee is to be forfeited.

16. The Appeal Boards's decision is final and binding on all parties.

Christopher Reeves – Chair of Appeal Board

Dennis Strudwick

Bob Purkiss

16 January 2024