

Date: 20 May 2022

Sent to:
Colombian Football Association
info@fcf.com.co;
atamayo@fcf.com.co;
osramos@fcf.com.co

Cc:
CONMEBOL

Notification of the terms of the Decision

Ref FDD-10720

Dear Madam, Dear Sir,

Please find attached the grounds of the decision passed in the aforementioned case by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee on 27 April 2022.

We would appreciate your taking due note of this decision and ensuring its implementation.

Yours faithfully,

FIFA



Carlos Schneider
Director of the FIFA Judicial Bodies

Decision of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

passed on 27 April 2022

DECISION BY:

Thomas HOLLERER, Austria (Acting Chairperson)

Mark Anthony WADE, Bermuda (Member)

Yasser AL-MISEHAL, Saudi Arabia (Member)

ON THE CASE OF:

Colombian Football Association

(Decision FDD-10720)

REGARDING:

FIFA Disciplinary Code, Article 13 - Discrimination (FDC 2019)

I. FACTS

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 (**the 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. On 24 March 2022, a match was played between the representative teams of Colombia and Bolivia in Barranquilla (Colombia – Attendance 25,352 spectators – Final score 3-0) in the context of the Preliminary Competition of the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™, South American Zone (**the Match**).
3. Following the Match, the referee provided FIFA with a report mentioning the following incident (**the Referee Report**):

*"Una vez finalizado el partido, los delegados de Conmebol nos informaron acerca de los cánticos racistas de la parcialidad local hacia el equipo visitante. Esta situación no fue advertida por el cuerpo arbitral durante el partido"*¹

4. In addition, the match commissioner of the Match mentioned the following in his report (**the MC Report**):

*"Una vez finalizado el partido, los delegados de Conmebol nos informaron acerca de los cánticos racistas de la parcialidad local hacia el equipo visitante. Esta situación no fue advertida por el cuerpo arbitral durante el partido"*²

*"En el minuto 41', 45+1 y 90+2 se registraron canticos racistas de parte de la hinchada local con el mensaje "Poromponpon poromponpon, el que no salta es boliviano maricon". Asociacion local reprodujo en el entretiempo y a traves de la voz del estadio, mensajes tendentes a evitar esta conducta (...)"*³

5. On 28 March 2022, in view of the foregoing, disciplinary proceedings were opened against the Colombian Football Association (**the Respondent**) with respect to the potential breach of art. 13 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code (**FDC**). In particular, the latter was provided with the aforementioned reports and was granted a six (6) day deadline within which to provide the Secretariat to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (**the Secretariat**) with its position.
6. On 29 March 2022, the Respondent provided its position.
7. On 21 April 2022, the Secretariat informed the Respondent about the date on which the matter would be heard by the Committee, as well as about the composition of the latter.

¹ Free translation: "After the match, the Conmebol delegates informed us about the racist chants of the home supporters towards the away team. This situation was not noticed by the refereeing body during the match".

² See *supra* for free translation

³ Free translation: "In the 41st minute, 45+1 and 90+2 minutes, racist chants were recorded from the home fans with the message "Poromponpon poromponpon, whoever doesn't jump is a Bolivian faggot". The local association played at half time and through the stadium's voice, messages aimed at avoiding this behaviour (...)"

II. RESPONDENT'S POSITION

8. The position submitted by the Respondent can be summarised as follows (*free translation from Spanish*):

- On the absence of any infringement:
 - During the Match, neither the Respondent nor its fans violated article 13 of the FDC;
 - There is not a single piece of evidence, nor is there any audio or video material, that shows that any discriminatory or "racist" chant was actually uttered against the Bolivian nationals present at the Match.
 - The referee himself reported that such chant was not noticed by his team, but rather reported by the CONMEBOL delegates;
 - Only the Referee report is presumed to be accurate. In the case at stake, said match official reported that at no time did the four members of the refereeing body notice any situation of a discriminatory nature during the Match;
 - It is important to emphasise that the reports of the officials appointed by CONMEBOL – who for this match were the media officer, the coordinator and the venue manager (as the others were officials appointed by FIFA) – do not enjoy the presumption of veracity and coercive force that the Referee report has. As such, there is no doubt that the existence of racist chants during the Match has definitely not been proven, even summarily;
 - The Respondent emphasized the following elements:
 - As mentioned, the referee was unable to ascertain such a situation, but still recorded it in his report;
 - There is no evidence in the file to prove that such a situation occurred;
 - It would make no sense for the Colombian fans to have made such chants, considering that there were no away fans in the stadium, and chants of this nature are usually made to sabotage and offend the opposing fans, not the players;
 - The match commissioner contradicts himself in his report, as he first ratifies that the referees did not notice the aforementioned racist chants by the home supporters, but later alleges that they did occur. Thus, a report containing irregularities and contradictions must be discarded, and the report of the referee, who claimed not to have noticed situations in violation of art. 13 of the FDC, must prevail;
- On its awareness-raising and sensitisation campaigns for supporters:
 - While it is true that the Respondent requested the stadium's voice to reproduce at half-time messages alluding to respect for opponents and inviting them to avoid any type of discriminatory or disrespectful act towards them, such situation was not due to the alleged chants erroneously reported by the delegate. On the contrary, such announcements were due to the Accommodation and Prevention Plan adopted by the Respondent for the Match and approved by FIFA in previous days, with the purpose of complying with the sanction imposed by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (Decision FDD-10158 of 10 February 2022);
 - As a matter of fact, in compliance with a sanction imposed by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee, the Respondent implemented a campaign called *#AnimaNoInsultes*, through which it sought to promote healthy coexistence in the stadium, encouraging people to cheer for the Colombian national team and to respect their opponents and their fans;

- Among other actions, the campaign planned that, through the stadium's audio and voice system, messages would be broadcasted to raise awareness of the promotion of values such as respect, equality and tolerance. This, before the matches, during half-time and at the end of the matches;
 - On the possible misperception of the word "faggot".
 - There is a high possibility that an error of perception on the part of CONMEBOL officials may have occurred;
 - In addition to the fact that the referee and other people in the stadium did not hear any kind of discriminatory chant, it is to be noted that in Colombia chants are usually made to the same "melody", but without using the word "maricón".
 - Given the above, the Respondent considered that it is not appropriate to be sanctioned for the infringement of art. 13 of the CDF
9. In support of its position, the Respondent provided a copy of the seating plan implemented for the Match in accordance with a previous decision passed by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee⁴, along with an explanation of its antidiscrimination campaign (*#AnimaNoInsultes*).
10. The Committee, once again, reiterated that it has considered all the facts, allegations, legal arguments and evidence provided by the Respondent, and in the present decision had only referred to those observations and evidence regarded as necessary to explain its reasoning.

III. CONSIDERATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

11. In view of the circumstances of the present case, the Committee decided to first address the procedural aspects of the case, *i.e.* its jurisdiction and the applicable regulatory framework, before proceeding to the merits of the case and determining the possible infringements as well as the possible resulting sanctions.

A. Jurisdiction of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

12. First of all, the Committee noted that at no point during the present proceedings did the Respondent challenge its jurisdiction or the applicability of the FDC.
13. Notwithstanding the above and for the sake of good order, the Committee found it worthwhile to emphasise that, on the basis of art. 2 (1) FDC read together with art. 53 FDC, it was competent to evaluate the present case and to impose sanctions in case of corresponding violations.

⁴ Point 2 of such decision (under ref. FDD-10158) read as follows: *"The Colombian Football Association is ordered to play its next home match of the Preliminary Competition for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™ (i.e. Colombia vs. Bolivia to be played on 24 March 2022) with a limited number of spectators. In this regard, the Colombian Football Association is ordered to close the stands behind the goals during the match subject to the above sanction. The Colombian Football Association shall submit to FIFA the proposed seating plan at the latest 10 days prior to said match"*.

B. Applicable law

14. In order to duly assess the matter, the Committee firstly began by recalling the content and the scope of the relevant provisions of the 2019 edition of the FDC, which was, in its view, the edition applicable to the present issue. In particular, the Committee considered that both the merits and the procedural aspects of the present case should be covered by the 2019 edition of the FDC.
15. In continuation, the Committee referred to art. 13 FDC which reads as follows:

Art. 13 of the FDC – Discrimination

1. *Any person who offends the dignity or integrity of a country, a person or group of people through contemptuous, discriminatory or derogatory words or actions (by any means whatsoever) on account of race, skin colour, ethnic, national or social origin, gender, disability, sexual orientation, language, religion, political opinion, wealth, birth or any other status or any other reason, shall be sanctioned with a suspension lasting at least ten matches or a specific period, or any other appropriate disciplinary measure.*
2. *If one or more of an association's or club's supporters engage in the behaviour described in paragraph 1, the association or club responsible will be subject to the following disciplinary measures:*
 - (a) For a first offence, playing a match with a limited number of spectators and a fine of at least CHF 20,000 shall be imposed on the association or club concerned;*
 - (b) For reoffenders or if the circumstances of the case require it, disciplinary measures such as the implementation of a prevention plan, a fine, a points deduction, playing one or more matches without spectators, a ban on playing in a particular stadium, the forfeiting of a match, expulsion from a competition or relegation to a lower division may be imposed on the association or club concerned.*

(...)

16. The abovementioned provision represents the continuation of art. 4 of the FIFA Statutes, which strictly prohibits discrimination of any kind and on any grounds. In particular, this provision of the Disciplinary Code aims to punish the perpetrator(s) of the discriminatory act, but also holds the clubs and association to which the perpetrator(s) belong responsible for this behaviour in accordance with art. 13 (2) FDC.
17. Through this strict liability rule, the club or association concerned is responsible for the misconduct of its supporters even if it is not at fault. As such, the Committee is empowered to sanction not only the perpetrator of the discriminatory act, but also the club/association to which the latter belongs, in order to implement FIFA's zero-tolerance policy on discrimination.
18. In particular, the Committee wished to emphasise that the abovementioned principle of strict liability is a fundamental element of the football regulatory system, as well as one of the few legal tools to prevent misconduct by supporters from occurring and going unpunished.
19. In relation to the above, the Committee recalled that according to the jurisprudence of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), the term "supporter" is an open concept, which must be assessed from the

perspective of a reasonable and objective observer⁵. This means that the behaviour of the person may lead a reasonable and objective observer to conclude that the latter is a supporter of that particular club/association. Moreover, CAS specified that the behaviour of individuals and their location in and around the stadium are important criteria in determining the team they support⁶.

20. Furthermore, the Committee highlighted that it should be kept in mind that discriminatory behaviour can be intentional but also unintentional in the sense that even if the use of the terms was not intentionally addressed to a specific person or group of persons for discriminatory purposes, these terms and expressions may still be insulting in the eyes of third parties⁷.

C. Standard of proof

21. Firstly, the Committee recalled that the burden of proof lies with FIFA, which is required to prove the infringement under art. 36 (1) FDC.
22. Secondly, the Committee pointed out that, according to art. 35 (3) FDC, the standard of "*comfortable satisfaction*" is applicable in disciplinary proceedings. According to this standard of proof, the onus is on the sanctioning authority to establish the disciplinary violation to the comfortable satisfaction of the judging body, taking into account the seriousness of the allegation.
23. Finally, the Committee referred to art. 40 FDC, according to which the facts contained in the match officials' reports, as well as in the supplementary reports or correspondence submitted by the match officials, are presumed to be accurate, bearing in mind that proof of their inaccuracy may be provided.
24. Having clarified the foregoing, the Committee proceeded to consider the merits of the case.

D. Merits of the case

1. Issues of review

25. The above having been established, the Committee proceeded to analyse the evidence at its disposal, in particular the documentation and information provided in the scope of the present disciplinary proceedings, in order to determine the potential violations of the FDC.
26. In this context, the Committee acknowledged that the following incidents were reported by both the referee and the match commissioner: on three occasions during the Match (*i.e.* at minutes 41, 45+1 and 90+2), home supporters sang chants described as "*racist*". More specifically, the match commissioner mentioned that the chant consisted in the following message: "*Poromponpon poromponpon, el que no salta es boliviano maricon*"⁸.
27. Having established the above, the Committee began by taking into account that the Respondent contested that such incidents took place, emphasising that they were not directly witnessed by the match

⁵ CAS 2015/A/3874 Football Association of Albania v. UEFA & Football Association of Serbia

⁶ CAS 2007/A/1217 Feyenoord Rotterdam v. UEFA

⁷ CAS 2016/A/4788 Federación Mexicana de Fútbol Asociación v. FIFA

⁸ Free translation: "*Poromponpon poromponpon, whoever doesn't jump is a Bolivian faggot*"

officials, but rather reported to them. By way of consequence, the Respondent deemed that the presumption of accuracy or veracity afforded to the reports of match officials pursuant to art. 40 FDC shall not apply *in casu*. Notwithstanding those arguments, the Respondent further considered that the CONMEBOL officials – *who allegedly witnessed those incidents and reported them to the match officials* – may have misinterpreted the actual chant performed by the Colombian supporters, given that most of their chants are based on the same melody.

28. In those circumstances, the Committee carefully analysed the reports of the referee and the match commissioner and noted that both of them clearly specified that the incident(s) at stake had been reported to them by CONMEBOL officials, but not directly witnessed by the refereeing team⁹.
29. In light of this, the Committee referred to CAS jurisprudence¹⁰ which, within the scope of the UEFA Disciplinary Regulations, analysed the “‘regulatory assumption’ that the statements contained in official UEFA reports are correct”. In this regard, CAS confirmed that “[t]his regulatory assumption shifts the burden of proof to the Appellant in this case. The function of the burden of proof is to allocate who bears the risk that the proof of a specific fact is not possible. The regulatory assumption that the report of the UEFA inspector is correct results in a shift of the burden proof to the Appellant”.
30. More importantly, the Panel in the aforementioned case highlighted the following:

“To assume a “regulatory assumption” in this case makes sense, because only the Appellant has the domestic authority (Hausrecht) and only the Appellant has the possibility to secure the evidence in this respect, for example to take pictures or video-recordings of the behaviour of the spectators (...). UEFA has not this possibility to secure evidence and for this reason UEFA depends on a regulatory assumption that the inspector’s report describes the event correctly. Without this assumption UEFA would not be able to proof violations of UEFA-regulations since it has no access to the respective evidence (...).”

31. Applying such reasoning to the case at stake, the Committee determined that the facts and incidents reported in their reports by both the referee and the match commissioner shall still bear the “regulatory assumption” of their veracity, even if such incidents were not directly witnessed by the latter.
32. This being said, the Committee concurred with CAS in so far that, *in casu*, the Respondent would have been in a position to “take (...) video-recordings of the behaviour of the spectators” during the Match and thus to provide evidence contradicting the incidents reported by the match officials at minutes 41, 45+1 and 90+2 of the Match.
33. Nevertheless, upon analysing the submission of the Respondent, the Committee noticed that, although it challenges the occurrence of the chants described in the match officials reports, it failed to provide any substantial documentary evidence in this respect.
34. As such, and in the absence of any proof of the inaccuracy of the match officials’ reports, the Committee deemed that it had no other alternative but to rely on the clear and unequivocal description of the facts reported therein.

⁹ The incident being reported in identical terms by the referee and the match commissioner: “Una vez finalizado el partido, los delegados de Conmebol nos informaron acerca de los cánticos racistas de la parcialidad local hacia el equipo visitante. Esta situación no fue advertida por el cuerpo arbitral durante el partido” (for free translation – see footnote 1 *supra*).

¹⁰ CAS 2015/A/3926 FC Gelsenkirchen-Schalke 04 v. UEFA

35. Summarising the above considerations, and despite the allegations of the Respondent, the Committee was comfortably satisfied that the reported chants occurred during the Match.
36. Having clarified the above, the Committee once more observed from the match officials' reports that the chants at stake were performed by Colombian supporters¹¹, such element not being contested by the Respondent (the latter rather confirming that there were no supporters of the away team in the Stadium, while emphasising on the usual "melody" used by the Colombian supporters for their chants).
37. By way of consequence, the Committee was comfortably satisfied that the abovementioned chants were all committed by home supporters, *i.e.* supporters of the Colombian team.
38. Having clarified the above, the Committee decided to analyse the abovementioned incidents in order to assess whether any provisions of the FDC had been breached.

2. Infringements committed by the Colombian supporters

39. To begin with, the Committee recalled that it was comfortably satisfied that the reported chants – *"Poromponpon poromponpon, el que no salta es boliviano maricon"* – occurred on three occasions during the Match and were performed by Colombian supporters.
40. With respect to the chant itself, the Respondent essentially emphasised that the word *"maricón"* may not have been pronounced. As a matter of fact, the Respondent deemed that it may have been misinterpreted by the CONMEBOL officials as most of the chants of the Colombian supporters are based on the same melody.
41. Notwithstanding the above, and in the absence of any documentary evidence demonstrating that another word was used by the Colombian fans, the Committee held that it could only reject the Respondent's argument.
42. In so far that the word *"maricón"* itself is concerned, the Committee decided to refer to some of its previous considerations¹² and recalled that *"the word 'maricón' (which can be translated in English as 'faggot') is a homophobic slur used towards gay men, and, as such, discriminates on the grounds of sexual orientation"*.
43. Against such background, the Committee recalled that any use of homophobic slur by supporters is in clear violation of art. 13 FDC in so far that it *"offends the dignity or integrity of (...) a person or group of people through contemptuous, discriminatory or derogatory words (...) on account of (...) sexual orientation"*. Any such behaviour is strictly prohibited and is to be sanctioned accordingly.
44. As a result, the Committee considered that the home supporters performed discriminatory chants in violation of art. 13 (1) FDC, thus incurring the liability of the Respondent under the principle of strict

¹¹ *"Una vez finalizado el partido, los delegados de Conmebol nos informaron acerca de los cánticos racistas de la parcialidad local hacia el equipo visitante."* (emphasis added; for free translation – see footnote 1 *supra*)

"En el minuto 41', 45+1 y 90+2 se registraron canticos racistas de parte de la hinchada local (...)" (emphasis added; for free translation – see footnote 3 *supra*)

¹² Including in the decision under ref. FDD-10158 rendered against the Respondent on 10 February 2022

liability contained in art. 13 (2) FDC. The Committee therefore held that the Respondent had to be sanctioned accordingly.

3. The determination of the sanction

45. The Committee observed in the first place that the Respondent was a legal person, and as such was subject to the sanctions described under art. 6 (1) and (3) FDC.
46. For the sake of good order, the Committee underlined that it is responsible for determining 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 the aggravating and mitigating circumstances (art. 24 (1) FDC).
47. As established above, the Respondent was found liable for the discriminatory behaviour of its supporters in accordance with art. 13 FDC.
48. In particular, with regard to the discriminatory behaviour of the Argentinian fans, the Committee wished to emphasise FIFA's policy of zero tolerance towards discrimination and that any incidents in that regard should be condemned in the strongest possible terms as well as with sanctions that reflect the seriousness of the offence.
49. In continuation, the Committee recalled that, in so far that discriminatory incidents are concerned, it is in principle bound by the minimum sanctions foreseen under art. 13 (2) (a) and (b) FDC.
50. Against such background, the Committee noted from the case file before it that the same discriminatory behaviour from Argentinian supporters had previously occurred during another match of the Preliminary Competition of the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™, played on 28 January 2022, and for which the Respondent had been ordered by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee to pay a fine of CHF 25,000 and to play one match, *specifically the Match in the present case*, with a limited number of spectators (decision under reference FDD-10158).
51. In particular, the Committee noted that the above decision was notified to the Respondent prior to the Match¹³. As such, given that the incidents at stake are of a similar nature (the exact same word having been used) and gravity and have been committed after notification of said decision and within less than three years of the previous offences, the Committee was satisfied that the present matter constituted a case of recidivism in the sense of art. 25 FDC.
52. By way of consequence, the Committee deemed that it was therefore entitled to apply art. 13 (2) (b) FDC, which provides that *"for reoffenders or if the circumstances of the case require it, [the association responsible will be subject to] disciplinary measures such as the implementation of a prevention plan, a fine, a points deduction, playing one or more matches without spectators, a ban on playing in a particular stadium, the forfeiting of a match, expulsion from a competition or relegation to a lower division may be imposed on the association or club concerned."* (emphasis added). In that context, the Committee recalled that the Respondent undoubtedly qualified as a reoffender in such context.

¹³ The findings of the decision having been notified on 11 February 2022 and the grounds on 8 March 2022.

53. In addition to the foregoing, the Committee further took into account that the discriminatory behaviours during the Match were not isolated events as they occurred on (at least) three occasions during the Match.
54. Having established the above, the Committee deemed that, as a general rule, amongst the range of sanctions listed under art. 13 (2) (b) FDC, a fine and one match to be played without spectators were usually imposed on reoffenders in response to the discriminatory behaviour of its spectators. This being said, the Committee also wished to emphasise that the list of disciplinary measures provided for under art. 13 (2)(b) is non-exhaustive – as provided for through the use of the open-ended term “(...) *disciplinary measures such as* (...)” therein – and as such, alternative sanctions besides those specifically listed under art. 13 (2) (b) FDC may also be imposed where deemed appropriate, as long as those alternative sanctions are laid down in art. 6 FDC.
55. With such considerations in mind and after having reviewed the entirety of the case file before it, the Committee held that it also needed to take into account the efforts undertaken by the Respondent in fighting discriminations after having been previously sanctioned by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee. In particular, the Committee wished to acknowledge and praise the efforts and commitment of the Respondent (specifically acknowledging its campaign and the measure undertaken by the Respondent in this sense during the Match).
56. In view of those measures implemented by the Respondent, the Committee was therefore settled in its opinion that, whilst it was entitled to apply art. 13 (2) (b) in view of the Respondent’s categorisation as a reoffender, it would be appropriate and justified to deviate from the “standard” sanction in case of recidivism. Such conclusion was further reinforced by the circumstances and particulars of the case at hand, specifically the fact that despite being repeated, the chants appeared to have been limited to a short period of time.
57. This being determined, the Committee therefore held that in the present circumstances a fine together with a match with a limited number of spectators were appropriate measures with which to sanction the Respondent for the discriminatory behaviour of its supporters.
58. With respect to the amount of the fine, the Committee recalled that in accordance with art. 6 (4) FDC, it may however not be greater than CHF 1,000,000.
59. Therefore, taking into account the entirety of the case file before it as well as the mentioned previous sanction(s) which had already been imposed on the Respondent in the present competition (Preliminary Competition for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™), the Committee determined that a fine amounting to CHF 30,000 was to be considered appropriate and proportionate.
60. With regard to the match to be played with a limited number of spectators, the Committee held that such measure had to be implemented on the occasion of the next home match of the Preliminary Competition for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™ to be played by the Respondent. In this respect, the Committee considered that a more significant closure than the one implemented for the match at stake had to be pronounced and concluded at least 25 % of the available seats shall be closed during the match subject to the above sanction.
61. On a final note, the Committee stressed that all above measures were considered justified, specifically taking into account the nature of the incident(s) which occurred during the Match at stake, but also the fact that this type of incident continues to occur despite the sanctions imposed previously by FIFA on the

Respondent. In fact, it was expected by the Committee that such sanctions would (finally) serve to have the necessary deterrent effect, both on the Respondent and its supporters, in order to avoid similar incidents in the future.

IV. DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

- 1. The Colombian Football Association is ordered to pay a fine to the amount of CHF 30,000 for the discriminatory behaviour of its supporters in connection with the match *Colombia vs. Bolivia* played on 24 March 2022 in the scope of the Preliminary Competition for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™, South American Zone.**
- 2. The Colombian Football Association is ordered to play its next (A level) FIFA competition match as host association with a limited number of spectators. In this regard, the Colombian Football Association is ordered to close at least 25 % of the available seats during the match subject to said sanction. The Colombian Football Association shall submit to FIFA the proposed seating plan at the latest 10 days prior to the relevant match.**
- 3. The fine is to be paid within 30 days of notification of the present decision.**

FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE
DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION



Thomas HOLLERER (Austria)

Acting Chairperson 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). 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). The appeal fee of CHF 1,000 shall be transferred to the aforementioned bank account upon submission of the appeal brief (art. 56 par. 6 of the FDC).