

Disciplinary Committee

FIFA[®]

Date: 19 November 2020

Sent to

Respondent: Czech Football Association
hendrich@fotbal.cz;
facr@fotbal.cz

Notification of the grounds of the decision

Ref FDD-6118

Dear Sirs,

Please find attached the grounds of the decision passed in the aforementioned case by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee on 22 October 2020.

We would appreciate your taking due note of this decision.

Yours faithfully,

FIFA



Carlos Schneider
Head of the FIFA Disciplinary Department

Fédération Internationale de Football Association

FIFA-Strasse 20 P.O. Box 8044 Zurich Switzerland
Tel: +41 43/222 7777 - Email: disciplinary@fifa.org

Decision of the Disciplinary Committee

passed in Zurich, Switzerland, on 22 October 2020

COMPOSITION:

Mr. Alejandro Piera, Paraguay (Deputy Chairman)
Mr. Yasser Al-Misehal, Saudi Arabia (member)
Mr. Charlie Cuzzetto, Canada (member)

RESPONDENT:

Czech Football Association (FACR)

Regarding the registration of minor players without the prior approval of the Sub-Committee appointed by the Players' Status Committee and the failure to respect decisions

Art. 19 par. 1 of the FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players [2018 and 2019 ed.] (hereinafter, the "Regulations" or "RSTP");

Art. 19 par. 3 of the Regulations;

Art. 19 par. 4 of the Regulations;

Art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2 of the Regulations;

Art. 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3 of the Regulations;

Art. 15 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code [2019 ed.] / Art. 64 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code [2017 ed.] (hereinafter, the "FDC")

I. FACTS OF THE CASE

1. The following summary of the facts does not purport to include every single contention put forth by the actors at these proceedings. However, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee has thoroughly considered in its discussion and deliberations any and all evidence and arguments submitted, even if no specific or detailed reference has been made to those arguments in the following outline of its position and in the ensuing discussion on the merits.
2. The case relates to the registration of the following 28 minor players by the Czech Football Association (hereinafter: *the FACR*):
 - i. CICHOS Grzegorz Jakub (nationality: Poland, date of birth: 29.07.2007), hereinafter: *Player 1*;
 - ii. SALGADO SARNICOLA Octavio Bautista (nationality: Uruguay, date of birth: 17.02.2002), hereinafter: *Player 2*;
 - iii. ZERAJIC Peta (nationality: Serbia, date of birth: 19.06.2006), hereinafter: *Player 3*;
 - iv. MAHARRAMOV Anar (nationality: Azerbaijan, date of birth: 28.07.2003), hereinafter: *Player 4*;
 - v. MA Bowen (nationality: China, date of birth: 29.07.2005), hereinafter: *Player 5*;
 - vi. YAN Xinglei (nationality: China, date of birth: 21.03.2005), hereinafter: *Player 6*;
 - vii. YAN Shenhjie (nationality: China, date of birth: 26.05.2005), hereinafter: *Player 7*;
 - viii. XING Jiavan (nationality: China, date of birth: 08.04.2006), hereinafter: *Player 8*;
 - ix. HUANJI Jinensibieke (nationality: China, date of birth: 05.09.2005), hereinafter: *Player 9*;
 - x. BAI Haoyu (nationality: China, date of birth: 30.06.2005), hereinafter: *Player 10*;
 - xi. YANG Gouhui (nationality: China, date of birth: 18.02.2005), hereinafter: *Player 11*;
 - xii. YANG Kailin (nationality: China, date of birth: 25.01.2006), hereinafter: *Player 12*;
 - xiii. LI Zhengda (nationality: China, date of birth: 01.08.2005), hereinafter: *Player 13*;
 - xiv. LI Yiding (nationality: China, date of birth: 07.06.2005), hereinafter: *Player 14*;
 - xv. CAO Sujie (nationality: China, date of birth: 31.03.2006), hereinafter: *Player 15*;
 - xvi. CAO Shansong (nationality: China, date of birth: 11.11.2006), hereinafter: *Player 16*;
 - xvii. HUAFENG Zhang (nationality: China, date of birth: 10.08.2005), hereinafter: *Player 17*;
 - xviii. JU Zaisgang (nationality: China, date of birth: 18.05.2005), hereinafter: *Player 18*;
 - xix. LIAOC Yunlong (nationality: China, date of birth: 21.11.2005), hereinafter: *Player 19*;
 - xx. SHANG Shang Zhengyu (nationality: China, date of birth: 06.05.2005), hereinafter: *Player 20*;
 - xxi. SONG Hadyang (nationality: China, date of birth: 28.01.2005), hereinafter: *Player 21*;
 - xxii. JI Yifan (nationality: China, date of birth: 17.08.2005), hereinafter: *Player 22*;
 - xxiii. WU Guanze (nationality: China, date of birth: 14.11.2005), hereinafter: *Player 23*;
 - xxiv. LIU Xiang (nationality: China, date of birth: 21.02.2005), hereinafter: *Player 24*;
 - xxv. REN Peiyuan (nationality: China, date of birth: 18.10.2005), hereinafter: *Player 25*;
 - xxvi. MO Jiase (nationality: China, date of birth: 27.05.2005), hereinafter: *Player 26*;
 - xxvii. DAI Shenyi (nationality: China, date of birth: 16.09.2005), hereinafter: *Player 27*;
 - xxviii. ZHU Litao (nationality: China, date of birth: 13.12.2005), hereinafter: *Player 28*.
3. In particular, the factual circumstances relating to the present case can be summarized as follows, including the information which the FIFA Disciplinary Committee has taken into account:

- i. The abovementioned 28 players were all registered by the FACR between November 2018 and February 2020;
 - ii. At the time of registration they were all minors;
 - iii. Players 2 and 5-28 were registered as exchange students while Player 4 was registered as a refugee, based on the limited minor exemption dated 29 October 2018 (hereinafter, *the LME*);
 - iv. Player 1 was registered at a professional club based on the exception provided for in art. 19 par. 2 lit. c) of the RSTP;
 - v. Player 3 was registered based on the exception of art. 19 par. 2 lit. a) of the RSTP;
 - vi. All players were registered for Czech clubs without the prior approval of the sub-committee appointed by the FIFA Player's Status Committee (hereinafter: *the Sub-Committee*);
4. On 17 September 2020, following investigations conducted by FIFA's TMS Global Transfer & Compliance Department (hereinafter: *FIFA TMS*), disciplinary proceedings were opened against the FACR with respect to potential violations of arts. 19 pars. 1, 3 and 4 of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players, 2018 and 2019 editions (hereinafter: *the Regulations* or *the RSTP*), art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2 of the RSTP and art. 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3 of the RSTP as well as art. 15 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code (hereinafter: *FDC*), 2019 edition, respectively art. 64 of the FDC, 2017 edition.

II. RESPONDENT'S POSITION

1. On 23 September 2020, the FACR provided its position which can be summarized as follows:
 - In 2017, FIFA issued the "minor application guide" with all types of exceptions, not only those from art. 19 par. 2 – 4 of the RSTP but also including exchange students and refugees. Based on that document, FACR assumed the LME was applicable for all types of exceptions, including refugees and exchange students;
 - In the period of the LME 2016-2018, there was only one transfer of an exchange student and one transfer of a refugee. Both cases were reported in accordance with the LME. Considering that the Sub-Committee decided to grant FACR a renewal of the LME on 29 October 2018, it was more than reasonable to assume that all the previous transfers were processed correctly. Due to the successful renewal of the LME in 2018, FACR assumed there was no need to change its procedure and continued in the same way as before. FIFA did not inform FACR about its wrong procedure;
 - In the June 2019 edition of the RSTP the exceptions for refugees and exchange students have been added to art. 19 of the RSTP, and by that addition, they are applicable to the LME;
 - With regards to Player 3, the club where he was registered, Slavia Ceske Budejovice, is a purely amateur club. Slavia Ceske Budejovice is not linked to the licensed club Dynamo Ceske Budejovice nor to Slavia Praha. Consequently, FACR thought it could process the transfer based on the LME;
 - Regarding the other players, reference is made to the statement provided to FIFA TMS on 17 August 2020;

- In case there was a violation committed by FACR, it would like to apologize, however, its potential wrong procedure was strengthened by the renewal of the LME in 2018.
2. The more detailed arguments made by the Respondent in support of its written submission are set out below as far as they are relevant.

III. CONSIDERATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

A. Jurisdiction of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

1. First of all, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (hereinafter also referred to as the Committee) notes that at no point during the present proceedings did the FACR challenge its jurisdiction or the applicability of the FIFA Disciplinary Code (FDC).
2. Notwithstanding the above and for the sake of good order, the Committee finds it worthwhile to emphasise that, on the basis of art. 53 of the FDC as read together with arts. 25 par. 3 and art. 9 par. 2 of Annexe 3 of the RSTP, it is competent to evaluate the present case and to impose sanctions in case of corresponding violations.

B. Applicable law

3. With respect to the applicable regulations, the Committee first emphasizes that, in accordance with art. 19 par. 1 of the Regulations “*[i]nternational transfers of players are only permitted if the player is over the age of 18*”.
4. In accordance with art. 19 par. 3 of the Regulations “*[t]he conditions of this article shall also apply to any player who has never previously been registered with a club, is not a national of the country in which he wishes to be registered for the first time and has not lived continuously for at least the last five years in said country*”.
5. In this respect, the Committee recalls that art. 19 par. 4 of the Regulations establishes that “*[e]very international transfer according to paragraph 2 (...) is subject to the approval of the sub-committee appointed by the Players’ Status Committee for that purpose. The application for approval shall be submitted by the association that wishes to register the player (...)*”.
6. In continuation, the Committee refers to art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2 of the Regulations which establishes that “*[a]ll applications for a first registration of a minor according to article 19 paragraph 3, or an international transfer involving a minor according to article 19 paragraph 2, must be submitted and managed through TMS*”, as well as to art. 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3 of the Regulations in accordance with which “*TMS helps safeguard the protection of minors. If a minor is being registered as a non-national*

for the first time or is involved in an international transfer, approval must be given by a sub-committee appointed by the Players' Status Committee for that purpose (cf. article 19 paragraph 4). The request for approval by the association that wishes to register the minor on the basis of article 19 paragraphs 2 and 3 and the subsequent decision-making workflow must be conducted through TMS (cf. Annexe 2)".

7. Notwithstanding the above, the Committee equally emphasizes the content of art. 15 of the 2019 FDC and art. 64 of the 2017 FDC respectively, which state that anyone who fails to comply with a (non-financial) decision passed by a body, a committee or an instance of FIFA, or by CAS will be fined for failing to comply with a decision.

C. Standard and burden of proof

8. The Committee recalls the basic principle of burden of proof, as stipulated in art. 36 par. 2 of the FDC, according to which a party claiming a right on the basis of an alleged fact shall carry the respective burden of proof.

D. Merits of the dispute

I. Analysis of the potential violations of the RSTP by the FACR

9. The relevant provisions having recalled, as a preliminary remark, the Committee finds it worthwhile to emphasize that the protection of minors constitutes one of the principles included in the agreement that was concluded between FIFA, UEFA and the European Commission in March 2001 and is one of the essential pillars of the Regulations since then. All of the aforementioned authorities and members of the football community agreed that the measures to ensure the protection of minors and to combat abuses require robust rules which must be implemented in a consistent and strict manner. Such principles were recognized by the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) which by a decision of 6 March 2009 (CAS 2008/A/1485 FC Midtjylland A/S v. FIFA), confirmed the legality of the relevant FIFA regulations, further emphasizing that these provisions do not contravene any rule of public policy or European law.
10. In this respect, the Committee points out that FIFA's efforts to protect minors have since then been recognized by CAS on several occasions (CAS 2005/A/955 Cádiz C.F., SAD v. FIFA and Asociación Paraguaya de Fútbol & 956 Carlos Javier Acuña Caballero v. FIFA and Asociación Paraguaya de Fútbol, CAS 2008/A/1485 FC Midtjylland A/S v. FIFA, CAS 2011/A/2354 Elmir Muhic v. FIFA, CAS 2011/A/2494 FC Girondins de Bordeaux v. FIFA, CAS 2012/A/2787 Villareal CF. FIFA, CAS 2014/A/3611 Real Madrid FC v. FIFA, CAS 2014/A/3793 Fútbol Club Barcelona, CAS 2014/A/3813 Real Federación Española de Fútbol v. FIFA, CAS 2015/A/4312 John Kenneth Hilton v. FIFA, CAS 2016/A/4785 Real Madrid Club de Fútbol v. FIFA, CAS 2016/A/4805 Club Atlético de Madrid SAD v. FIFA and CAS 2017/A/5244 Oscar Bobb & Associação Juvenil Escola de Futebol Hernâni Gonçalves v. FIFA).
11. That having been established, the Committee subsequently analyses the evidence at its disposal (*i.e.* the documentation and information provided in the scope of the proceedings before FIFA TMS as

well as the information provided during the present proceedings) to determine the potential violations of the RSTP committed by the FACR.

(1) Art. 19 pars. 1, 3 and 4 of the RSTP in conjunction with art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2 of the RSTP and art. 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3 of the RSTP

12. First and foremost, the Committee reiterates that, in principle, international transfers of players are only permitted if the player is over the age of 18 (art. 19 par. 1 of the RSTP).
13. In continuation, the Committee turns its attention to the birth date of the Players involved and acknowledges that, at the time they were registered with the FACR, they were all minors in accordance with the definitions section of the Regulations.
14. In continuation, the Committee highlights that at no point during the present proceedings did the FACR contest that it registered the Players. To the contrary, the FACR confirmed the registration of the Players in its submissions.
15. Notwithstanding the above, the Committee recognizes that art. 19 par. 2 of the Regulations provides for three exceptions to the general principle of art. 19 par. 1 of the Regulations, under which circumstances an international transfer of a minor player or the first registration of a foreign minor player could be possible.
16. However, the Committee points out that, even in the event that one of the exceptions laid down under art. 19 par. 2 of the Regulations was applicable to the situation of the Player, neither the Club nor the association concerned would be authorized to complete the Player's transfer unless the Sub-Committee had granted its approval. Indeed, in line with art. 19 par. 4 of the Regulations, such an international transfer *"is subject to the approval of the sub-committee appointed by the Players' Status Committee for that purpose"* and said approval shall be obtained prior to the registration of the minor player concerned.
17. In this regard, the Committee observes that no application had been approved by the Sub-Committee (nor even submitted to it) by the FACR with respect to the Players at stake.
18. In this sense, the Committee observes that Player 2 was previously registered in Uruguay, Player 3 in Serbia and Player 4 in Azerbaijan. They were internationally transferred and the FACR received an ITC from the relevant associations.
19. As such, the Committee is convinced that, by moving from a club affiliated to an association other than the FACR to a club affiliated to the FACR, whilst being aged below 18, the Players 2-4 were internationally transferred in contravention of art. 19 par. 1 of the Regulations.
20. For the remaining players, the Committee notes that it appears that the FACR registered these non-national minor players for the first time as per art. 19 par. 3 of the RSTP without the prior approval of the Sub-Committee.

21. In this regard, the Committee highlights that any potential registration of a player in a country other than his country of origin and/or his international move to such country, would be considered as an international transfer in accordance with the Regulations.
22. With respect to the case at hand, the Committee notes that, on 29 October 2018, the bureau of the Sub-Committee of the Players' Status Committee extended the FACR's limited exemption from the obligation to refer applications for approval for minor players to the Sub-Committee of the Players' Status Committee in accordance with art. 19 par. 4 of the Regulations.
23. In this regard, the Committee notes that the FACR claimed that it believed the LME was applicable to all types of exceptions, including refugees and exchange students.
24. In this context, the Committee wishes to highlight that the LME can only be used to register minor players in circumstances that fall, beyond any doubt, under the wording of the exceptions provided for in art. 19 par. 2 of the Regulations and the "five-year-rule", which is explicitly reflected in art. 19 par. 3 and 4 of the Regulations.
25. With this in mind, the Committee would like to emphasize that, at the time of registration of the Players, i.e. between November 2018 and February 2020, the June 2018 edition (for the registration of Players 1-3) and the June 2019 edition (for the registration of Players 4-28) of the Regulations were applicable, which did not provide for the explicit exception for exchange students or refugees. As a result, at the time of registration, the LME did not include exchange students or refugees. Therefore, Player 2 and Players 4-28 would have required the prior approval of the Sub-Committee and the registration should have been processed via TMS.
26. As a consequence, the Committee explains that Player 2 and the Players 4-28 could not have been registered based on the LME.
27. The Committee further observes that Player 1 was registered at the club FC Vitkovice 1919, which at the time of registration, on 2 November 2018, was a professional club. The FACR registered the Player 1 based on the LME and the exception provided for in art. 19 par. 2 lit. c) of the Regulations.
28. In this sense, the Committee highlights that the LME, in accordance with art. 19 par. 4 of the Regulations, only applies to minor amateur players who wish to be registered with exclusively amateur clubs. In this context, the Committee emphasizes that only clubs which are exclusively able to register amateur players in accordance with art. 2 of the Regulations are considered amateur clubs.
29. In view of the foregoing, the Committee concludes that, due to the Player 1 being registered at a professional club, the prior approval of the Sub-Committee would have been required.
30. With respect to Player 3, the Committee takes note that the Player was registered at an amateur club, based on the exception of art. 19 par. 2 lit. a) of the RSTP. In this sense, the Committee considers that this exception is covered by the LME and therefore, the FACR registered Player 3 correctly.

31. At this stage, the Committee is of the opinion that the FACR, for the registration of Players 1-2 and Players 4-28, did not act with the requested diligence expected in circumstances such as the ones at hand. These deficiencies led to the current situation in which 27 minor players were registered without the relevant applicable procedures having been followed.
32. As a result of all the above, and in particular considering that “[t]here should be no doubt that the ban on transferring under-aged players is addressed to both “associations” and clubs” (CAS 2014/A/3793 FC Barcelona v. FIFA, par. 9.2), the Committee is of the opinion that, by proceeding to register the Players 2 and 4, which were internationally transferred, the FACR breached art. 19 par. 1 of the Regulations.
33. Moreover, the Committee considers that, by registering Player 1 as well as Players 5-28, the FACR violated art. 19 par. 3 of the Regulations.
34. The Committee further deems that it has no other alternative but to conclude that the FACR is to be found guilty for the violation of art. 19 par. 4 of the Regulations, read together with art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2 and art. 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3 of the Regulations, as it failed to obtain the approval of the Sub-Committee prior to registering the 27 Players.

(2) Art. 15 of the FDC (2019 ed.) / Art. 64 of the FDC (2017 ed.)

35. After having established the above, the Committee reiterates that, on 19 October 2016, the bureau of the Sub-Committee granted a LME to the FACR. In particular, the Committee emphasizes that, in accordance with said LME, the FACR was exempted from the obligation to refer applications for approval for minor players to the Sub-Committee in accordance with art. 19 par. 4 of the Regulations provided that the minor players concerned were to be registered as amateurs, for purely amateur clubs. By means of a decision dated 29 October 2018 the LME was extended for two years.
36. In these circumstances, the Committee observes from the file in its possession that the FACR reported having registered the Players 1-2 and Players 4-28 on the basis of the LME.
37. Notwithstanding the above, the Committee observes that the FACR registered Player 1, who was registered at a professional club, based on the LME and the exception of art. 19 par. 2 lit. c) of the RSTP.
38. Moreover, the Committee notes that the FACR registered Player 2 and Players 5-28, which were all exchange students, based on the LME. The Committee further notes that Player 4, who was a refugee, was also registered based the LME.
39. In this context, the Committee would like to highlight again that the LME is only applicable to the registration of players who undoubtedly fall under the exceptions of art. 19 par. 2 of the Regulations or the so-called “five-year-rule” in the sense of art. 19 par. 3 and 4 of the Regulations. In this sense, the Committee emphasizes again that, at the time of registration, exchange students and refugees did not fall under the exceptions of art. 19 par. 2 of the Regulations.

40. As such, by proceeding to the registration of Player 1 for a club that was not of purely amateur status, and by registering Player 2 as well as Players 4-28 the FACR failed to comply with the LME and therefore with the decision rendered by the bureau of the Sub-Committee on 29 October 2018.
41. As a consequence, the Committee deems that by registering Players 4-28 the FACR has violated art. 15 of the FDC (2019 ed.) and by registering Players 1-2 the FACR breached art. 64 of the FDC (2017 ed.).

II. Summary

42. In view of the foregoing, the Committee concludes that the FACR, by its conduct as described above, violated the following provisions:
 - Art. 19 par. 1, art. 19 par. 3, art. 19 par. 4, art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2, art. 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3 of the Regulations due to the registration of 27 minor players (Players 1-2 and Players 4-28);
 - Art. 15 of the FDC (2019 ed.) with respect to the registration of Players 4-28 as well as art. 64 of the FDC (2017 ed.) with respect to the registration of Players 1-2 for failing to comply with the decision passed by the bureau of the Sub-Committee of the Players' Status Committee on 29 October 2018.
43. Therefore, the Committee considers that the FACR is to be sanctioned for the aforementioned violations.

III. The determination of the sanction

44. The violations of the Regulations by the FACR having been established, the Committee subsequently considers the sanction(s) to be imposed.
45. The Committee observes in the first place that the FACR is a legal person, and as such can be subject to the sanctions described under art. 6 par. 1 and 3 of the FDC.
46. For the sake of good order, the Committee underlines that it is responsible to determine the type and extent of the disciplinary measures to be imposed in accordance with the objective and subjective elements of the offence, taking into account both aggravating and mitigating circumstances (art. 24 par. 1 of the FDC).
47. As it was established above, the FACR is guilty of having infringed several provisions of the RSTP (arts. 19 pars. 1, 3 and 4 as well as art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2 and 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3) and the FDC (art. 15 [2019 ed.] / art. 64 [2017 ed.]).

48. In this regard, the Committee would like to highlight again that art. 19 of the RSTP is not merely procedural but substantive and seeks to provide effective protection to the integrity and development of underage players. In this context, the Committee stresses that it is clear that the FACR's behaviour as described throughout this decision breaches the general prohibition of transfers of minor players which is one of the pillars of the RSTP.
49. In this sense, the Committee examines all the circumstances belonging to the case at stake.
50. Moreover, it has to be pointed out that the FACR already has a previous record of an infringement of the RSTP related to the registration of two minor players without prior approval of the Sub-Committee (case ref. 180378).
51. Taking into account the facts described in the present case – and in particular that this matter involves the improper transfer of 27 underage players –, the Committee considers that the appropriate sanction to be imposed on the FACR in relation to the violation of the abovementioned provisions of the RSTP and the FDC would be a fine.
52. With regard to the fine, according to the provisions of art. 6 par. 4 of the FDC, the Committee notes that it may not be lower than CHF 100 or greater than CHF 1,000,000.
53. Taking into account all the circumstances of the case, while keeping in mind the deterrent effect that the sanction must have on the reprehensible behaviour, the Committee considers a fine of CHF 100,000 to be adequate and proportionate to the offence.
54. In addition, a warning is also issued pursuant to art. 6 par. 1 lit. a) of the FDC in relation to the FACR's conduct. In particular, the FACR is ordered to undertake all appropriate measures in order to guarantee that the FIFA regulations (in particular the FDC as well as the RSTP) are strictly complied with. Should such infringements occur again in the future, the Committee would be left with no other option than to impose harsher sanctions on the FACR.

IV. DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

1. The FIFA Disciplinary Committee found the Czech Football Association responsible for the infringement of the relevant provisions of the RSTP related to the protection of minors (art. 19 pars. 1, 3 and 4 together with art. 1 par. 1 of Annexe 2 and art. 1 par. 3 of Annexe 3) as well for the infringement of the relevant provisions of the FDC related to the failure to respect decisions (art. 15 [2019 ed.] as well as art. 64 [2017 ed.]).
2. The FIFA Disciplinary Committee orders the Czech Football Association to pay a fine to the amount of CHF 100,000.
3. In application of art. 6 par. 1 lit. a) of the FIFA Disciplinary Code, the Czech Football Association is warned on its future conduct.

4. The above fine is to be paid within thirty (30) days of notification of the present decision.

FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE
DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION



Alejandro Piera

Deputy Chairman of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

NOTE RELATING TO THE PAYMENT OF THE FINE:

Payment can be made either in Swiss francs (CHF) to account no. 0230-325519.70J, UBS AG, Bahnhofstrasse 45, 8098 Zurich, SWIFT: UBSWCHZH80A, IBAN: CH85 0023 0230 3255 1970 J or in US dollars (USD) to account no. 0230-325519.71U, UBS AG, Bahnhofstrasse 45, 8098 Zurich, SWIFT: UBSWCHZH80A, IBAN: CH95 0023 0230 3255 1971 U, with reference to case number above mentioned.

NOTE RELATING TO THE LEGAL ACTION:

This decision can be contested before the FIFA Appeal Committee (art. 57 of the FDC, 2019 edition). Any party intending to appeal must announce its intention to do so in writing within three (3) days of notification of the grounds of the decision. Reasons for the appeal must then be given in writing within a further time limit of five (5) days, commencing upon expiry of the first time limit of three (3) days (art. 56 par. 4 of the FDC, 2019 edition). The appeal fee of CHF 1,000 shall be transferred to the aforementioned bank account on the date of the expiry of the time limit of five days for submitting the reasons for appeal at the latest (art. 56 par. 6 of the FDC, 2019 edition).