

**IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION
INDEPENDENT REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF AN ALLEGED BREACH OF RULE E8 OF THE FA
RULES**

Before:

Ms. Grace Cheng (Chair)

Mr. Francis Benali

Mr. Francis Duku

B E T W E E N:

THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION

- and -

JAMIE JELLIS

DECISION OF THE REGULATORY COMMISSION

Secretariat to the Regulatory Commission:

Mr. Michael O'Connor (FA Judicial Services Assistant Manager)

A. Introduction

1. This matter relates to alleged breaches by Mr. Jamie Jellis (“**Player**”) of Rule E8 of The Football Association’s (“**FA**”) Rules, as set out in The FA Handbook (2018-2019, 2019-2020, 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-2023 versions) (“**Rules**”, with each of them being a “**Rule**”) in respect of 2,248 bets (“**Bets**”, with each being a “**Bet**”) placed on football matches between 30 April 2019 to 4 July 2023.
2. These proceedings are conducted in accordance with the Rules.

3. Whilst the Commission has considered all facts, evidence, and arguments submitted, the Commission refers in this Decision only to the submissions and evidence it considers necessary to explain its reasoning. Any omission to refer to a piece of evidence or point raised should not be taken as a suggestion that the Commission has not given due consideration to such evidence or submission.

B. Procedural background

4. On 29 August 2025, the Regulatory Commission (“**Commission**”) was constituted, comprising of Ms. Grace Cheng (Chair), Mr. Francis Benali and Mr. Francis Duku, all of whom are independent panel members of The FA. Mr. Michael O’Connor (FA Judicial Services Assistant Manager) acted as the Secretariat to the Commission.
5. On 3 September 2025, a personal hearing (“**Hearing**”) via video conference was held to determine the matter. Ms. Rebecca Turner (Head of Regulatory Advocates) appeared on behalf of The FA. The Player was in attendance, represented by Mr. Nick Cusack (PFA Advocate).
6. In advance of the hearing, the Commission was provided with a hearing bundle containing evidence, as well as a report from Sporting Chance. Neither The FA nor the Player submitted any written submissions in advance of the hearing.

C. Facts

7. The FA is the governing body of English football and is responsible for the governance of all affiliated football in England.
8. The Player is aged 24 (d.o.b. – 12 January 2001) and is currently playing under contract as a professional midfield footballer for Walsall Football Club (EFL League Two). His total gross income from football is per week. He was at all material times registered to play with various clubs, as follows: (i) Stevenage FC (“**SFC**”) (League Two) in the 2018/19 season; (ii) SFC (League Two), Aylesbury United FC (“**AUFC**”) (Southern League Division One Central – loan), Hitchin

Town FC (“**HTFC**”) (Southern League Premier Division Central – loan) and Wingate & Finchley FC (Isthmian League Premier Division – loan) in the 2019/20 season; (iii) AUFC (Southern League Division One Central) in the 2020/21 season; (iv) AUFC (Southern League Division One Central), King’s Langley FC (“**KLFC**”) (Southern League Premier Division South) and Hemel Hempstead Town FC (“**HHFC**”) (National League South) in the 2021/22 season; (v) KLFC (Southern League Premier Division Central) and Tamworth FC (“**TFC**”) (Southern League Premier Division Central – loan) in the 2022/23 season.

9. On 2 June 2025, the Player was interviewed (“**Interview**”) by (“**Investigator**”) who is employed by The FA as a Betting Integrity Investigator. The Interview was conducted via Microsoft Teams. (PFA Player Services Executive) was also in attendance.

10. During the Interview, the Player admitted to the Charges. The Player attributes the Bets being placed due to him being a “*young, naïve person*” at the time when he “*never had a full understanding of what I could and couldn’t bet on*” and “*didn’t think of any consequences back then*”. He stated that “*being that young, it was obviously like, ‘I’ll just follow what other people do, and it’s never going to have consequences on me because these other people are doing it as well.’*”. However, he stopped betting “*when I gained that knowledge and that understanding of, ‘Well, you can’t actually do this.’ And when I wanted my career to actually go somewhere...*”. He stated that he found out what the betting rules were “*through other people*” around the time when he joined KLFC.

11. The Player explained that whilst most of the Bets were placed by himself, some of them were made by , to whom he had granted access to his betting account. He stated that he had opened a betting account and started placing bets on football in April 2019 “*through maybe boredom, or when I was at digs, and being away from home... It was maybe a comfort thing for me, at that time of my life. I obviously struggled being away from home, being that young, and it was my first experience away*”. He stated that he may have also placed bets on horse racing “*and stuff like that*” during that time.

12. *“I could have stopped at any point, if someone told me that it was going to jeopardise me or my future, and where I wanted to go”.* He also denies placing any of the Bets using specific knowledge that he had due to his position in football. He showed remorse and stated repeatedly words to the effect that *“I am ashamed of myself, the person that I was back then. It’s a completely different person to who I am now”.*
13. On 18 July 2025, the Player was charged (“**Charges**”) with misconduct under E1(b) of the Rules in respect of the Bets placed on football matches between 30 April 2019 to 4 July 2023. The particulars of the Charges were as follows:
- (1) 2018/19 season – it was alleged that the Player placed 119 bets (“**2018/19 Bets**”) on football matches between 30 April 2019 and 31 July 2019 whilst he was a participant at SFC in breach of Rule E8(1)(a)(i) –
- a. 109 of the 2018/19 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition.
 - b. 10 of the 2018/19 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition in which the Player’s club and/or the Player was participating.
- (2) 2019/20 season – it was alleged that the Player placed 302 bets (“**2019/20 Bets**”) on football matches between 2 August 2019 and 26 July 2020 whilst he was a participant at SFC, AUFC and HTFC in breach of Rule E8(1)(a)(i) –
- a. 249 of the 2019/20 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition.
 - b. 53 of the 2019/20 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition in which the Player’s club and/or the Player was participating.

(3) 2020/21 season – it was alleged that the Player placed 428 bets (“**2020/21 Bets**”) on football matches between 1 August 2020 and 13 July 2021 whilst he was a participant at AUFC in breach of Rule E8.1 –

- a. 405 of the 2020/21 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition.
- b. 23 of the 2020/21 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition in which the Player’s club and/or the Player was participating.

(4) 2021/22 season – it was alleged that the Player placed 622 bets (“**2021/22 Bets**”) on football matches between 13 August 2021 and 31 July 2022 whilst he was a participant at AUFC, KLFC and HHFC in breach of Rule E8.1 –

- a. 570 of the 2021/22 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition.
- b. 52 of the 2021/22 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition in which the Player’s club and/or the Player was participating.

(5) 2022/23 season – it was alleged that the Player placed 777 bets (“**2022/23 Bets**”) on football matches between 1 August 2022 and 4 July 2023 whilst he was a participant at KLFC and TFC in breach of Rule E8.1 –

- a. 717 of the 2022/23 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition.
- b. 60 of the 2022/23 Bets were placed on the result and/or progress and/or conduct and/or any other aspect of a football match or competition in which the Player’s club and/or the Player was participating.

14. On 7 August 2025, the Player admitted to the Charges and requested an opportunity to attend a Commission for a personal hearing. He stated that he wished to be represented by Mr. Nick Cusack of the PFA. On 6 August 2025, a Mitigation and Defence Case Summary was submitted on behalf of the Player. On 7 August 2025, the Player also submitted a written statement.

D. Submissions of the parties

The FA

15. The FA's position is that under its Betting Rules, a Participant at Step 4 or above is prohibited from betting on the result, progress, conduct or any other aspect of, or occurrence in, a football match or competition, or any other matter concerning or related to football anywhere in the world, including the transfer of players, employment of managers, team selection or disciplinary matters.
16. The FA did not provide written submissions on the Charges but relied on the following evidence: (i) witness statement of (FA Betting Integrity Investigator) dated 3 June 2025; and (ii) transcript of the Interview.
17. The Investigator stated that the Player was identified as having potentially breached The FA's Betting Rules. The FA then contacted all UK-licensed betting operators and asked them to share any accounts in the Player's name that showed breaches of The FA's Betting Rules. This resulted in four accounts ("Accounts") being shared with The FA by four different betting operators.
18. The Accounts showed a total of 2,248 football related bets made by the Player across 5 separate seasons, with the Player making a total net loss of £2,856.34 (staking £15,420.78 and with a return of £12,564.44), as follows –
- (1) In the 2018/19 season, the Player placed 119 bets with a net profit of £272.79 (staking £641.63 and with a return of £914.42).

(2) In the 2019/20 season, the Player placed 302 bets with a net loss of £627.92 (staking £1,608.88 and with a return of £980.96).

(3) In the 2020/21 season, the Player placed 428 bets with a net loss of £680.38 (staking £2,635.03 and with a return of £1,954.65).

(4) In the 2021/22 season, the Player placed 622 bets with a net loss of £109.21 (staking £4,466.28 and with a return of £4,357.07).

(5) In the 2022/23 season, the Player placed 777 bets with a net loss of £1,711.62 (staking £6,068.96 and with a return of £4,357.34).

19. The Investigator confirmed that 198 of the Bets included games in competitions that the Player's clubs participated in during the relevant seasons (comprising 265 FA Cup selections, 66 League Two selections, 51 Southern League Premier Division South selections, 24 Southern League Premier Division Central selections, 19 EFL Trophy selections, 17 FA Trophy selections and 10 National League South selections) –

(1) In respect of the 198 Bets, the Player made a net loss of £280.65 (staking £1,345.69 and with a return of £1,065.04).

(2) Of the 198 Bets, 16 had been placed by the Player on his own club (with 13 being against his own club) in which he made a net loss of £81.62 (staking £106.33 and with a return of £24.71). All of the 16 Bets were accumulators and shows that the Player had bet on the following outcomes –

- a. SFC to lose 9 times;
- b. KLFC to lose 4 times;
- c. SFC to win 1 time;
- d. SFC to draw 1 time;
- e. KLFC to win 1 time.

(3) In relation to the 11 Bets placed on SFC covering 10 separate matches when the Player was a scholar at the club, since he did not make any appearances for SFC, he was not involved in any of these matches.

- a. On 24 August 2019, the Player placed a £6 accumulator which included Mansfield to beat SFC. The match finished 0-0 and therefore, the Bet was unsuccessful.
- b. On 30 August 2019, the Player placed a £6.11 accumulator which included Macclesfield to beat SFC. The match finished 2-2 and therefore, the Bet was unsuccessful.
- c. On 7 September 2019, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included Cheltenham to beat SFC. Cheltenham beat SFC 4-2 and the Bet was successful, with the Player making a profit of £19.62.
- d. On 14 September 2019, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included SFC to beat Carlisle United. SFC lost 3-2 and therefore, the Bet was unsuccessful.
- e. On 21 September 2019, the Player placed two £5 accumulators which both included Forest Green Rovers to beat SFC. The match finished 0-0 and therefore, both of the Player's Bets were unsuccessful.
- f. On 5 October 2019, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included Colchester United to beat SFC. Whilst SFC ended up losing the match 3-2, other selections in the Bet lost and the Bet overall was unsuccessful.
- g. For the remaining 4 Bets that the Player placed on SFC, he was on loan at either AUFC or HTFC.
 - i. On 9 November 2019, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included Peterborough United to beat SFC. The match finished 1-1 and therefore, the Bet was unsuccessful.

- ii. On 19 November 2019, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included Peterborough United to beat SFC. Whilst SFC ended up losing the match 2-0, other selections in the Bet lost and the Bet overall was unsuccessful.
- iii. On 7 December 2019, the Player placed a £3 accumulator which included SFC to draw with Crawley. Whilst SFC ended up drawing this match 0-0, other selections in the Bet lost and the Bet overall was unsuccessful.
- iv. On 29 December 2019, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included Plymouth Argyle to beat SFC. Whilst SFC ended up losing the match 2-1, other selections in the Bet lost and the Bet overall was unsuccessful.

(4) In relation to the 5 Bets placed on KLFC covering 4 separate matches –

- a. On 23 October 2021, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included KLFC to beat Merthyr Town. The Player came on as a 46th minute substitute in this match which finished 1-1. The Bet was unsuccessful.
- b. On 29 October 2022, the Player placed a £5 accumulator which included Carshalton Athletic to beat KLFC. The Player was not in the squad for this match which KLFC won 1-0 and the Bet was unsuccessful.
- c. On 14 November 2022, the Player placed one £20.22 accumulator and one £10 accumulator which both included Rushall Olympic to beat KLFC. The Player was on loan at TFC when this Bet was placed. Whilst KLFC ended up losing 1-0, other selections in the Bet lost and the Bet was unsuccessful.
- d. On 28 November 2022, the Player placed an £11 accumulator which included Nuneaton Borough to beat KLFC. The Player was on loan at TFC when this Bet was placed. Whilst KLFC ended up losing 2-1, other selections in the Bet lost and the Bet was unsuccessful.

20. During the Hearing, Ms. Turner took the Commission through the history of the matter in detail, in particular details of the 16 Bets that were placed by the Player on his own club which were considered to be aggravating. The FA concluded that although there was a high impact on the overall perception, this was mitigated by the fact that the Player had been a scholar at the time when the 16 Bets were placed or was on loan to another club. Of the 16 Bets that were placed by the Player on his own club, only one involved the Player playing and the Bet placed was for KLFC to win. The FA accepted that the majority of the Bets placed were accumulators and the size of the average Bet placed was fairly modest. It was accepted that there was a wealth of mitigation in this case, including the Player's young age when he started betting, and the fact that he has a clean record. The Commission was invited to impose a financial penalty as well as a suspension of no more than 6 months.

The Player

21. The Player has admitted to the Charges and stated that most of the Bets were general football bets placed as part of low stake multi-game accumulators which was done to alleviate boredom or as part of social activity with friends. The only Bet that was placed when the Player played for KLFC was part of an accumulator for KLFC to win which was said to be "*the primary aim of any Footballer*". The only Bet placed for KLFC to lose was said to be "*in the context of someone at the Football Club in an attempt to prevent [the Player] from moving on. The bet was motivated by anger, and [the Player] had no prospect of playing*".

22. The mitigation put forward emphasised the Player being a young man who was unaware of the specifics of the FA Betting Rules and who used betting to cope with boredom and setbacks to his hopes of having a career as a professional football player. It was stated that he has no previous record of misconduct and has fully co-operated with the FA investigation. Any immediate suspension was said to put his first-team place in jeopardy as well as to have the predictable effect of resulting in negative and perhaps harmful consequences.

23. The Player further provided a written statement dated 7 August 2025 in which he stated that he does not believe that he has received education on the FA's betting rules whilst playing for SFC. He stated that "[m]ates who played local football were all putting ACCAs on as part of their Saturday routine and when I turned 18, I started doing the same". The Player stated that at the time when the Bets were placed, "it was not in my mind that I could be getting involved in the Professional game again". He confirmed "[t]here was nothing at any of the Clubs I played at on loan from Stevenage to indicate that I was not permitted to bet on Football" and the Bets were not placed on the basis of inside knowledge.

24. He stated that the Bet placed on KLFC to lose was made in response to the of the club appearing to resent his attempt to improve his career by pursuing an opportunity to join TFC which had annoyed him. The Player stated that he has not placed a bet on football since 4 July 2023 and confirmed that "I take full responsibility for my actions". He showed remorse and stated that "[i]t was obviously naïve" and further stated that "I can guarantee that I will not be betting on Football in the future".

25.

26.

27. At the Hearing, Mr. Cusack accepted on behalf of the Player that the number of Bets placed was substantial although not prolific. It was stressed that the Player was young and inexperienced, with a lack of awareness and comprehensive understanding of The FA Betting Rules at the time that the Bets were placed. It was submitted that he had been honest, candid and transparent throughout the proceedings. The Commission was referred to a recent case in October 202 involving Gary Powell who was said to have received a £250 fine for betting activities with mitigation including his lack of awareness of The FA Betting Rules. Mr. Cusack stressed that any immediate suspension would have an adverse effect on the Player's football career which may in turn affect his health condition. The Commission was invited to suspend any sporting sanction that may be imposed. The Player also took the opportunity to address the Commission and apologised.

E. Discussion

28. The Commission reminded itself of Rule E8.1 (as per the 2024/25 Handbook and which appears in similar form in earlier versions of the Handbook) which provides as follows –

“E8.1 *A Participant shall not bet, either directly or indirectly, or instruct, permit, cause or enable any person to bet on –*

E8.1.1 the result, progress, conduct or any other aspect of, or occurrence in or in connection with, a football match or competition; or

E8.1.2 any other matter concerning or related to football anywhere in the world, including, for example and without limitation, the transfer of players, employment of managers, team selection or disciplinary matters.”

29. The FA's sanctions guidelines ("**Guidelines**") for betting cases charged under Rule E8(b) provide as follows –

- (1) A bet placed on any aspect of any football match anywhere in the world but not involving the Participant's Club competitions attracts a warning or a fine which may be suspended.
- (2) A bet placed on the Participant's competition but not involving his Club (including spot bets) attracts a fine which may be suspended but not where the Participant has no connection with the Club bet on.
- (3) A bet placed on the Participant's own team to win attracts a fine with a range of between 0-6 months.
- (4) A bet placed on the Participant's own team to lose attracts a fine with a range of between 6 months to life.
- (5) A bet placed on a particular occurrence(s) not involving the player who bet (spot bet) attracts a fine with a range of between 0-12 months.
- (6) A bet placed on a particular occurrence(s) involving the player who bet (spot bet) attracts a fine with a range of 6 months to life.

30. The Guidelines provide that the following factors are to be considered in determining whether there should be any increase or decrease from the entry point: (i) overall perception of impact of bet(s) on fixture/game integrity; (ii) player played or did not play; (iii) number of bets; (iv) size of bets; (v) fact and circumstances surrounding pattern of betting; (vi) actual stake and amount possible to win; (vii) personal circumstances; (viii) previous record – any previous breach of Betting Rules will be considered as a highly aggravating factor; (ix) experience of the participant; and (x) assistance to the process and acceptance of the charge.

31. A key aspect was stated to be whether the offence creates the perception that the result or any other element of the match may have been affected by the bet, e.g. because the Participant has bet against himself or his club or on the contrivance of

a particular occurrence within the match. Such conduct will be a serious aggravating factor in all cases. A further serious aggravating factor will be where the Participant played or was involved in the match on which the bet was made.

32. The Guidelines make clear that they are not intended to override the discretion of Regulatory Commissions to impose such sanctions as they consider appropriate having regard to the particular facts and circumstances of a case. However, in the interests of consistency, it is anticipated that the Guidelines will be applied unless the applicable case has some particular characteristic(s) which justifies a greater or lesser sanction outside the Guidelines.
33. The Commission considers that the Player had placed a large number of bets (2,248 Bets) over an extended period of time (between 30 April 2019 to 4 July 2023) and staking a large amount of £15,420.78 over this period. 198 of the Bets included games in competitions that the Player's clubs participated in during the relevant seasons, with 16 having been placed by the Player on his own club (and 13 of those 16 Bets being against his own club).
34. The Commission did not find that the Player suffers from a gambling addiction. He was able to cease all football gambling related activities in July 2023 upon becoming aware that this may have adverse consequences for his football career once he started taking football more seriously and started playing at a higher level.

He did not profit from the Bets, has fully co-operated with the investigation of The FA and accepted the Charges at the first opportunity. He has shown deep remorse for his actions which appears to have been those of a young man who suffered from boredom and wished to take part in social activities, without realising the consequences of his actions. He also took the opportunity to personally address the Commission at the hearing and offered an apology for his actions which he regrets.

35. Taking into account the various mitigating and aggravating factors in this case, the Commission is satisfied that a financial penalty of £1,200
- would be appropriate in this case, as well
- as a sporting sanction of a 5-month suspension, to be suspended for a 12-month period. The FA does not oppose the suspension of a sporting sanction which the

Commission considers to be appropriate given the specific facts of this case, involving a wealth of mitigating factors. In particular, the Commission considers that the Player has shown deep remorse for his actions, has ceased all football gambling activities since July 2023,

An immediate suspension is likely to result in adverse consequences for the Player's football career

36. The Player is warned as to his future conduct and is strongly encouraged to attend an educational programme with Sporting Chance or similar provider. The Commission considers this to be an important component in ensuring that the Player receives the necessary assistance that he requires to ensure that he does not return to his gambling activities.

F. Costs

37. The FA did not seek costs against the Player.

38. In the circumstances, the Commission was satisfied that each Party shall bear its own costs incurred in bringing or defending the Charges, as the case may be. The costs of convening the Commission shall be borne in their entirety by the FA.

G. Conclusion

39. The Player has admitted the Charges and is warned as to his future conduct.
40. The Player is suspended from all football-related activity for a period of 5 (five) months which is suspended for a period of 12 (twelve) months from the date of this decision. The suspended sanction will only be activated if, during the 12-month suspension period, the Player commits a further breach of the Rules which is of a similar nature or is otherwise deemed by The FA to warrant the activation of the suspended sanction. Should no such breach occur during the 12-month period, then the 5-month suspension will lapse without being enforced.
41. The Player is ordered to pay a financial penalty of £1,200.

42. Each Party shall bear its own costs in this matter. The costs of convening the Commission shall be borne in their entirety by the FA.

43. This decision is subject to the relevant FA Appeal Regulations.

Grace Cheng (Regulatory Commission Chair)

Francis Benali

Francis Duku

3 September 2025

London, UK