

**IN THE MATTER OF A FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION
INDEPENDENT REGULATORY COMMISSION**

BETWEEN

THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION

v

LIVERPOOL FC, EVERTON FC, ARNE SLOT & SIPKE HULSHOFF

**WRITTEN REASONS AND DECISION OF THE INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
COMMISSION FOLLOWING A CONSOLIDATED PAPER HEARING ON 25 FEBRUARY
2025**

- 1) These are the written reasons for a decision made by an Independent Regulatory Commission (the “Commission”) which sat via videoconference on 25 February 2025.
- 2) The Commission members were Ms Laura McCallum (acting as Chair and Independent Legal Panel Member), Mr Dennis Strudwick (Independent Football Panel Member) and Mr Mick Kearns (Independent Football Panel Member).
- 3) Mr Paddy McCormack of the FA Judicial Services Department acted as Secretary to the Commission.
- 4) The following is a summary of the principal issues and matters considered by the Commission. It does not purport to contain reference to all the issues or matters considered, and the absence in these reasons of reference to any particular point or submission made by any party should not be read as implying that it was not taken into consideration. For the avoidance of doubt, all the evidence and materials provided to the Commission was taken into consideration during our deliberations.

Background

- 5) On 12 February 2025, Everton FC (“EFC”) hosted Liverpool FC (“LFC”) in the Premier League at Goodison Park (the “Match”). The Match was described as historical in nature as it was set to be the last meeting of the two Liverpool based clubs (dubbed the Merseyside Derby) at EFC’s Goodison Park, before EFC moves to its new stadium. As well as the historical importance of the Match, the Match also attracted significant global media attention given LFC’s position in the table and EFC’s current form. The Match was described by the Match Delegate as having an “*emotional atmosphere both on and off the pitch.*”
- 6) The Match resulted in a 2-2 draw with EFC scoring an equaliser late in stoppage time in the 98th minute. The full-time whistle prompted celebrations from EFC’s players and spectators, sparking EFC’s Abdoulaye Doucoure (“AD”) to run some 20-25 yards towards the stand where the LFC supporters were housed. This prompted a reaction from LFC’s Curtis Jones (“CJ”) causing both players to act in an aggressive confrontation. Following the arrival of two EFC players who, whilst in support of AD, aggressively grabbed CJ, a mass confrontation ensued with players from both Clubs becoming embroiled in the conflict and attracting the involvement of stewards, police and the assistance of technical

staff. The Referee subsequently issued second yellow cards to both AD and CJ for their part in the incident that instigated the mass confrontation.

- 7) It was reported by the Referee that following the full-time whistle, he was approached by LFC's Arne Slot ("AS") who had entered the field of play to confront the Referee and the Match Officials team. Tensions were running high. It was alleged that AS' manner was confrontational and aggressive. It was alleged that he initially used abusive words whilst shaking the Referee's hand including that the Referee had "*fucking give them everything*" and that AS hoped that the Referee "*was proud of that performance.*" The Referee thereafter confirms (having reviewed the video footage to clarify) that he was approached again by AS around one minute later. In this exchange, AS once again shook the Referee's hand and said "*if we don't win the league, I'll fucking blame you.*" It is then further alleged that AS turned to the Assistant Referee and shouted twice that it was "*a fucking disgrace.*" As a result of AS' conduct, he was shown a red card by the Referee.
- 8) Additionally, Sipke Hulshoff ("SH") is alleged to have entered the field of play following the full-time whistle to confront the Referee in an "*extremely aggressive manner.*" It is alleged that SH said the Referee was "*fucking shit*" and "*gave them everything*" and he was a "*fucking disgrace.*" We are advised that the Referee attempts to remove himself from the situation to deal with the dismissals of CJ and AD, but SH continues to follow him and is eventually restrained by colleagues, but continues to shout "*fucking shit.*" SH was also shown a red card by the Referee and dismissed.

The Charges

The Clubs: EFC and LFC in respect of Mass Confrontation

- 9) Following the confrontation described at paragraph 6 above, both Clubs were charged with a breach of FA Rule E20.1 in the following terms:

"It is alleged that following the completion of the fixture, [EFC/LFC] failed to ensure that its players and/or technical area occupants did not behave in a way which was improper and/or provocative."

- 10) FA Rule E20 states:

“Each Affiliated Association, Competition and Club shall be responsible for ensuring that its Directors, players, officials, employees, servants and representatives, attending any match do not:

E20.1 behave in a way which is improper, offensive, violent, threatening, abusive, indecent, insulting or provocative.”

- 11) The FA's 'Essential Information for Clubs 24/25' sets out when incidents of 'mass confrontation' are to be reported to the FA by Match Officials. Specifically, Match Officials are required to report any incident *“where two or more players or club officials are involved in a confrontation with opposing players or club officials.”*
- 12) The Charge was designated as Non-Standard because the FA considered that the case bore particular facts of Misconduct that were of a serious and/or unusual nature. In this instance, the involvement of technical area occupants and the proximity of the incident to the crowd, in the FA's opinion, served to aggravate the Misconduct and enhance its seriousness such that the case was designated Non-Standard. The Commission has absolute discretion to determine sanction in Non-Standard cases.
- 13) Both Clubs submitted comprehensive and helpful submissions in mitigation. Their mitigation cases can be summarised as follows:

LFC

- a) LFC promptly admitted the Charge at the earliest opportunity. It apologised and expressed its regret. The Club confirmed that it had spoken to its players and reminded them of their responsibilities as professional footballers and representatives of the Club, stressing that confrontations with opposition players have no place in professional football.
- b) Background was provided around the significant historical occasion that marked the last ever derby match between LFC and EFC at Goodison Park, the home of EFC, and the fact that it was a very important fixture given both teams' performances as of late, and LFC being top of the Premier League table. It was effectively a *“highly charged emotional atmosphere both on and off the pitch”* as supported by the Match Delegate Report.

- c) LFC submitted that the incident arose due to AD's initial behaviour whereby he taunted the LFC supporters. This was an act of provocation.
- d) There were no acts of 'violent conduct' as part of the mass confrontation.
- e) The mass confrontation lasted approximately one minute and commenced after the final whistle had been blown. There was no delay in the running of the match itself.
- f) The mass confrontation was at the lower end of the scale of seriousness.
- g) LFC submitted that the sanction should reflect a breach at the lower end of the scale of offending and should be no more than Standard Penalty 1 (£20,000).

EFC

- a) EFC promptly admitted the Charge at the earliest opportunity, apologised, and expressed its regret.
- b) A post-match debrief was held highlighting the errors in behaviour of Club personnel. All players have been reminded in the strongest terms of their obligations and responsibilities in respect of their conduct. Players involved in the confrontation have apologised internally. The Club will endeavour to ensure that there is no repeat incident.
- c) The Club acknowledged that AD approached the LFC support in an ill-advised manner, but the Player was approximately 20 yards away from the LFC support so was not proximal to the crowd.
- d) Internal HR disciplinary procedure is underway where AD's conduct is concerned.
- e) CJ's reaction to AD's celebrations was excessive. CJ "*chased after, shoved and grabbed AD from behind in retaliation.*" CJ should have allowed the match officials to address AD's behaviour.
- f) EFC players rushed towards AD in a misguided attempt to protect him. Any actions were to calm the situation.

- g) No EFC technical occupants became involved in the mass confrontation.
 - h) Incident was not proximal to the crowd.
 - i) Given the mitigating circumstances and the specific facts of the case (including the significance of the Match as previously outlined), EFC requested that the Commission issue a warning only. However, if the Commission is not so minded in that regard, the sanction should be no more than the penalty imposed in Standard Penalty case where the charge is admitted, given *“the Incident occurred on the pitch and a fair distance away from the crowd and that the involvement of the Club’s technical area occupants was to defuse the incident in the main.”*
- 14) The Commission reviewed the multiple clips of video footage submitted that showed the Mass Confrontation from different angles and length. We formed the view that the confrontation was more of a serious nature than both EFC and LFC were admitting to. Firstly, AD instead of celebrating with his teammates or indeed his own supporters, chooses to run 20-25 yards and goad the LFC support. We consider that that was inflammatory in itself and but for that action, the Mass Confrontation may have been avoided. Equally, CJ’s actions in response were aggressive and disproportionate. Had he not reacted in the manner he did and/or let the Referee deal with any AD related misconduct, again the mass confrontation may not have occurred. Thereafter, having viewed the footage, once AD and CJ come together, AD is supported by two other EFC players but those EFC players instead of pulling AD away, appear to back him up (aggressively) so it becomes 3 against 1. It is this action that causes the confrontation to spiral with more and more players running into the melee, with involvement then from police officers and stewards. In one frame, we see a female police officer attempting to push (with force) one player away from the melee (with another female police officer coming in to assist her). We don’t consider that the mass confrontation quickly dissipates either. Indeed, the aftereffects appear to continue towards and down the tunnel with numerous angry words being exchanged. Likewise, we are of the view that whilst AD’s initial goading of the LFC support is not dangerously close to the support, once the Mass Confrontation spirals, it does spill into the track of the pitch and may have had the impact of enflaming the LFC support given the throwing of objects from the stand housing the LFC support (one player appears to be hit by a plastic bottle during the confrontation itself).

15) The Commission recognises that the Match was historical and significant in nature but that in itself causes the incident to become all the more unfortunate given the widespread media interest and global broadcast. The incident goes to overshadow the historical nature of the Match and becomes a negative talking point that risks the game being brought into disrepute.

16) In determining LFC sanction, the Commission noted that LFC had a previous disciplinary record for Rule E20.1 with four offences committed within the range of this season and the last five full seasons which is as follows:

- Versus Manchester City FC on 01/04/23 in the Premier League – Surrounding Match Official – admitted – Fined £37,500.
- Versus EFC on 13/02/23 in the Premier League – Mass Confrontation – admitted – Fined £25,000.
- Versus Middlesbrough FC on 28/01/23 in U18 Premier League North (Non-First Team) – Mass Confrontation – admitted – Fined £5,000 & issued a warning.
- Versus Fulham FC on 06/11/22 in the Premier League 2 Division 1 (Non-First Team) – Mass Confrontation – admitted – Fined £5,000.

It should be noted that the Commission disregarded two out of four of those previous offences as they did not involve LFC's First Team.

17) In determining EFC sanction, the Commission noted that EFC had a previous disciplinary record for Rule E20.1 with five offences committed within the range of this season the last five full seasons which is as follows:

- Versus Manchester City FC on 01/09/24 in U18 Premier League North (Non-First Team) – Mass Confrontation – admitted – Fined £5,000.
- Versus Leeds United FC on 18/02/23 in the Premier League – Mass Confrontation – admitted – Fined £55,000.
- Versus LFC on 13/02/23 in the Premier League – Mass Confrontation – admitted – Fined £40,000.
- Versus Crystal Palace FC on 22/10/22 in the Premier League – Mass Confrontation – Accepted Standard Penalty 1 – Fined £20,000.
- Versus Manchester United FC on 24/09/21 in the Premier League 2 Division 1 (Non-First Team) – Mass Confrontation – admitted – Fined £6,500.

It should be noted that the Commission disregarded two out of five of those previous offences as they did not involve EFC's First Team.

18) Both Clubs sought sanctions no greater than Standard Penalty 1 (which was £20,000). The Standard Penalty criteria is relevant for matters that can be dealt with quickly and with no requirement for a hearing where the penalty offered is accepted. Where Non-Standard cases are concerned, a Commission has the right to disregard the Standard Penalty and may impose a maximum sanction of £250,000.

19) We weighed up the aggravating and mitigating factors for both Clubs and determined where in the range of £20,000 and £250,000 the Misconduct rests.

20) We considered the following to be aggravating factors for LFC:

- a) The aggressive behaviour of CJ having a pivotal role to play in the cause of the Mass Confrontation;
- b) The proximity to the crowd once the confrontation developed;
- c) The nature and extent of the police and steward involvement;
- d) The length of the incident (we do not agree it dissipated quickly);
- e) The public perception given it was a global televised match; and
- f) The fact there is a previous disciplinary record of similar offending for First Team (taking into account previous sanctions).

21) We considered the following to be mitigating factors for LFC:

- a) LFC apologised and admitted the Charge at earliest opportunity;
- b) LFC has expressed regret over the occurrence;
- c) There was no Violent Conduct involved in the confrontation; and
- d) LFC has spoken to players concerned.

22) To avoid credit for the admitted plea being applied twice, the Commission considered Standard Penalty 2 as the appropriate starting point (£30k) rather than Standard Penalty 1. Had it not been for the mitigating factors listed at paragraph 21, the Commission would have imposed a monetary sanction of £65,000 given the aggravating factors outlined above (including consideration of previous sanctions within the historical disciplinary record) but reduced this to £50,000 in light of the mitigating factors.

23) We considered the following to be aggravating factors for EFC:

- a) AD's provocative conduct and his intent to goad the fans (given the distance travelled towards the LFC supporters following the full-time whistle) had a pivotal role in the cause of Mass Confrontation;
- b) The involvement of the initial two EFC players who came to support AD and the role that played in the growth of the confrontation;
- c) The proximity to the crowd once the confrontation developed;
- d) The nature and extent of the police and steward involvement;
- e) The length of the incident (we do not agree it dissipated quickly);
- f) The public perception given it was a global televised match; and
- g) The fact there is a previous disciplinary record of similar offending for First Team (taking into account previous sanctions).

24) We considered the following to be mitigating factors for EFC:

- a) EFC apologised and admitted the offence at the earliest opportunity;
- b) EFC has expressed regret;
- c) There was no Violent Conduct involved in the confrontation;
- d) EFC has spoken to all players in the strongest of terms; and
- e) EFC has commenced internal HR disciplinary procedure against AD – the Commission took a positive interest in this step by EFC as it is considered that such a step is a greater deterrent than merely reminding players of their responsibilities etc.

25) To avoid credit for the admitted plea being applied twice, the Commission considered Standard Penalty 2 as the appropriate starting point (£30k) rather than Standard Penalty 1. Had it not been for the mitigating factors listed at paragraph 24, the Commission would have imposed a monetary sanction of £90,000 given the aggravating factors (including the initial conduct described at paragraph 23(b) and consideration of the historical disciplinary record and the sanctions within) but reduced this to £65,000 in light of the mitigating factors (as described above, we took considerable interest in the internal disciplinary procedure that was being followed).

Arne Slot ("AS")

26) AS was charged with two breaches of FA Rule E3:

- (1) It is alleged that following the completion of the fixture, you acted in an improper manner and/or used insulting and/or abusive words and/or behaviour towards a Match Official (Match Referee) and/or

- (2) It is alleged that following the completing of the fixture you acted in an improper manner and/or used insulting and/or abusive words and/or behaviour towards a Match Official (Assistant Referee).

27) FA Rule E3 states:

“A Participant shall at all times act in the best interests 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.”

28) AS admitted the Charges and elected for a paper hearing to determine the sanction on the basis of all written submissions and evidence before the Commission.

29) In his submissions AS, whilst admitting the Charges, disputed the language alleged to have been used and suggested there may have been confusion between what AS and SH said to the Referee. It was alleged that AS said whilst shaking the Referee's hand, “*if we don't win the league, I'll fucking blame you.*” Instead, AS asserts that he in fact said, “*if we don't win the league, I will have you to thank for that.*” The FA maintained that AS' language and words were as reported by the Match Officials. However, the FA argued that this discrepancy didn't make a material difference to the sanction, in any event, given the words used still constituted AS acting in an improper manner, and AS accepts the same. It should be noted that AS does not dispute stating “*fucking disgrace*” to the Assistant Referee.

30) AS acknowledged that his actions were unacceptable and let his frustrations get the better of him due to him believing that certain key decisions made by the Match Officials did not go LFC's way. He lodged a written statement as well as submissions on sanction. AS made a sincere apology both privately and in public, during a press conference, commenting that “*I think what happened was that the extra time, that additional five minutes that ended up being eight, a lot happened, and the emotions got the better of me. If I look back at it I would love to do it differently. I am hoping to do it differently next time as well.*”

31) Further, AS states that any language used in his exchange with the Referee and Assistant Referee was not directed as personal abuse. It was accepted that it was emotive language but it was with the aim of expressing general frustration rather than a personal slur against

the two Match Officials. AS accepts that he should have waited until after the match and once they were back in the privacy of the tunnel area (or indeed the Referee's Room) before attempting to speak with any of the Match Officials.

- 32) It was confirmed that AS had a good disciplinary record with no previous similar offences and this is a 'one-off'.
- 33) In AS' written submissions on sanction, AS requested that the Commission consider the following cases, particularly the sanctions imposed on each of the Participants for what AS asserted was similar or more severe Misconduct:
- a) The FA v Vincent Kompany (2024);
 - b) The FA v Nottingham Forest FC v Mr Steven Reid (2024);
 - c) The FA v Jesse Marsch (2022);
 - d) The FA v Joseph Barton (2020); and
 - e) The FA v Mauricio Pochettino (2019).
- 34) The Commission is not minded to expand upon the facts of each of the aforementioned cases in these reasons but can confirm that all cases were considered in detail and debated, along with the reasons for the level of sanction.
- 35) AS asked the Commission when determining sanction not to impose an extended touchline ban and to also consider staggering any sanction along with SH's sanction to ensure both Participants were not absent from the dug-out at the same time.
- 36) The Commission viewed the footage multiple times. It reminded itself of the Match Officials reports and the fact that this was an emotional, highly charged fixture where AS very honestly concedes that he let the frustrations get the better of him. It was a crucial time of the Season where LFC are top of the Premier League table and were hoping to stretch their lead. The video footage shows AS visibly remonstrating with the Referee. He is clearly unhappy in his demeanour. Whilst the footage of AS is not as clear as that against SH (which we will come to below), on the balance of probabilities, we consider given (1) the Referee's report; (2) what we do see of AS' demeanour in the video footage and (3) the fact that AS concedes he was frustrated and this was an important game that it's more likely than not that AS used the language alleged by the Referee and the FA.

- 37) The Commission reminded itself that it is not bound by the decisions of Commissions previous cases and the overall circumstances of the case before us is paramount. The Commission was referred to the case of Wilfred Zaha v The FA in that regard.
- 38) The Commission also reminded itself of totality of sanction and that it would be inappropriate to effectively stack sanctions as a result of the multiple charges.
- 39) Having considered the rules, and reasons cited behind the request for staggering the sanction, and having debated the subject, we did not consider that the absence of two key individuals in the technical area as a result of multiple offending was compelling reason enough to stagger any match suspension that the Commission may impose. It is the risk that technical area occupants (and indeed, players) take should they choose to react emotionally in the heat of the moment, and other participants follow suit. Albeit, the Commission does recognise that significant pressure comes with these matches and it can be difficult to keep a calm composure when feeling aggrieved. The Commission welcomed the fact that AS recognised that it would have been more appropriate to attempt a conversation with the Referee once everyone was back in the tunnel area. Allowing for that passage of time may have also allowed everyone to calm down and collect themselves, avoiding the confrontation that arose.
- 40) In considering the level of sanction appropriate to all of the circumstances surrounding AS' Charge, the Commission considered the following were aggravating factors:
- a) AS, as the Manager of LFC, is a role model and should be exercising good discipline both on and off the pitch, and setting an example to his players, who had already involved themselves in a serious Mass Confrontation;
 - b) AS approached the Referee not once but twice to reiterate his frustration;
 - c) AS also approached the Assistant Referee, culminating in the second breach; and
 - d) The Match was broadcasted globally, and AS' actions did not provide the positive image of the game that the governing bodies strive for.
- 41) The Commission considered the following could be considered as mitigating factors:

- a) AS apologised but most notably, he also apologised and made reference to his own behaviour during a broadcast of a pre-match conference (it should be noted that the Commission took a positive interest in this given AS showed contrition and went over and above what we usually see from Managers in such circumstances);
- b) AS admitted the Charge at the earliest opportunity; and
- c) AS has no previous misconduct offence on his disciplinary record but also notes that AS only entered the FA's jurisdiction in Summer 2024.

42) Given the above, had it not been for the mitigating factors, the Commission would have imposed a 3-match suspension as well as a fine commensurate with AS' salary. However, given the mitigating factors, the Commission was minded to reduce the sanction to a 2 match suspension and impose a fine of £70,000, having reduced that figure from £100,000 as a result of applying credit for AS' mitigation. The Commission considered that it was not bound by the decisions cited by AS' representatives and that the sanction proportionately reflected the individual circumstances of the case.

43) The Commission considered that an extended touchline ban would not be appropriate in AS' case but that there was no clear and compelling reason to suspend any of the sanctions in part or in their entirety.

Sipke Hulshoff ("SH")

44) SH was also charged with two breaches of FA Rule E3.1:

- (1) It is alleged that following the completion of the fixture, you acted in an improper manner and/or used insulting and/or abusive words and/or behaviour towards a Match Official and/or
- (2) It is alleged that following your dismissal, you acted in an improper manner and/or used insulting and/or abusive words and/or behaviour towards a Match Official.

45) FA Rule E3 states:

"A Participant shall at all times act in the best interests 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.”

- 46) SH admitted the Charges and elected for a paper hearing to determine the sanction on the basis of all written submissions and evidence before the Commission.
- 47) SH submitted both a written statement and written submissions as part of his case in mitigation. SH apologised for his behaviour and admitted the Charge at the earliest opportunity. He accepted that his behaviour towards the Referee was not acceptable. He regretted coming across as aggressive in his approach of Mr Oliver, he advised it was not his intention.
- 48) SH accepts that he let his frustrations get the better of him. He provides context that his frustrations were as a result of a highly charged match, particularly the “controversial” closing minutes when EFC equalised.
- 49) SH whilst accepting the Charge wished to clarify the language he used. He advised that *“the foul language used was not directed at Mr Oliver personally, contrary to what is contained in his official report. I would like to clarify what I said to Mr Oliver was that the resulting melee between both sets of players was because of the “shit decisions” during the Match. I wish to make this point clear to Mr Oliver I would not want him to think I insulted him personally.”*
- 50) SH advised that he had a clean disciplinary record.
- 51) SH sought to rely on the same submissions in respect of the level and staggering of sanctions as are set out under AS’ paragraphs at paragraphs 33 and 35 of these written reasons.
- 52) The Commission viewed the video footage multiple times. In our opinion, it clearly shows SH remonstrating in an aggressive manner with the Referee. His body and face is up close to the Referee. He is pointing profusely and appears to be shouting. He’s subsequently taken away by LFC Player, Virgil Van Dyk. A commentator states that he *“is being dragged away.”* Although we can’t hear what SH is saying in the footage, we believe on the balance of probabilities that given the body language in the footage and given the Match Officials’ reports, it’s more likely than not that SH used the language alleged by the Match Officials

and the FA. This is also coupled with the fact that SH admits to letting his frustrations get the better of him.

53) The Commission reminded itself that it is not bound by the decisions of previous Commissions and the overall circumstances of the case before us is paramount, with reference to Wilfred Zaha v The FA.

54) The Commission also reminded itself of totality of sanction and that it would be inappropriate to effectively stack sanctions as a result of the multiple charges.

55) Having considered the rules, and reasons cited behind the request for staggering the sanction, and having debated the subject, we did not consider that the absence of two key individuals in the technical area as a result of offending was compelling reason enough to stagger any match suspension that the Commission may impose. It is the risk that technical area occupants (and indeed, players) take should they choose to react emotionally in the heat of the moment, and other participants follow suit.

56) In considering the level of sanction appropriate to all of the circumstances surrounding SH's related Charge, the Commission considered the following were aggravating factors:

- a) SH, as Assistant Manager of LFC, is a role model like AS and should be exercising good discipline both on and off the pitch, and setting an example to the LFC players, who had already participated in a serious Mass Confrontation (requiring police involvement) at the time that this offence took place;
- b) The continuation of SH's remonstrance following his dismissal; and
- c) The Match was broadcasted globally and as a result, SH's actions did not paint the positive image of the game that the governing bodies strive for.

57) The Commission considered the following could be considered as mitigating factors:

- a) SH admitted the Charge at the earliest opportunity and apologised; and
- b) SH has no previous misconduct offence on his disciplinary record but the Commission notes that SH only entered the FA's jurisdiction in Summer 2024.

58) Given the above, had it not been for the mitigating factors, the Commission would have imposed a 3-match suspension as well as a fine commensurate with SH's salary. However, given the mitigating factors, the Commission was minded to reduce the sanction to a 2 match suspension and impose a fine of £7,000, having reduced the figure from £10,000 as a result of applying credit for SH's mitigation. The Commission considered that it was not bound by the decisions cited by SH's representatives and that the sanction proportionately reflected the individual circumstances of the case.

59) The Commission considered that an extended touchline ban would not be appropriate in SH's case. The Commission found no clear and compelling reasons to justify suspending any sanction either in part or in their entirety.

60) To summarise the sanctions imposed on the parties in this matter were as follows: -

- a) LFC: £50,000 fine
- b) EFC: £65,000 fine
- c) AS: 2 match Standard Touchline suspension to be served immediately and a fine of £70,000.
- d) SH: 2 match Standard Touchline suspension to be served immediately and a fine of £7,000.

61) There was no award of costs made against either of the parties.

62) This decision is subject to appeal.

Regulatory Commission

Ms Laura McCallum (Chair)

Mr Dennis Strudwick

Mr Mick Kearns

26 February 2025