

Disposition Summary

The orders found at the end of this Decision are repeated below for the convenience of the reader.

- a. Jossting Cruz is found to have violated Sections D.1.n and D.2.a.i of TACP 2023, and D.1.n and D.2.a.i of TACP 2024.
- b. Cruz is declared ineligible from Participation in any Sanctioned Event for a period of 2 years backdated to commence on the date of his Provisional Suspension. The suspension therefore shall be deemed to have commenced on 30 May 2025 and will end on 29 May 2027.
- c. A fine of \$2,500 is imposed upon Cruz. Such fine must be paid in full, subject to any payment plan that may be agreed in accordance with Section J.1 of the TACP 2025.
- d. This Decision is the full, final and complete determination of the matter and is binding on all Parties. The Present Decision is, however, subject to a right of appeal to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in accordance with Section I.1 of the TACP 2025. The deadline for filing an appeal with CAS shall be twenty Business Days from the date of receipt of the Decision.
- e. This Decision shall be publicly reported as set forth in Section G of the TACP.

TENNIS ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAM

Jossting Cruz,

Covered Person,

and

International Tennis Integrity Agency

ITIA.

DECISION OF ANTI-CORRUPTION HEARING OFFICER

I. The Parties

1. The International Tennis Integrity Agency (“ITIA”) is the independent entity responsible for enforcing the Tennis Anti-Corruption Program (“TACP”).
2. Jossting Cruz (“Cruz” or “Covered Person”) is a 20-year-old tennis player from the Dominican Republic. At all times relevant to this case, Cruz was a “Covered Person” bound by the TACP.

II. The Notice of Major Offenses

3. On 15 October 2025, ITIA sent Cruz a Notice of Major Offenses alleging that he had committed a total of six (6) Corruption Offenses over the course of three (3) tennis matches occurring in November 2023 and March 2024. Specifically, the ITIA alleged that Cruz:
 - a. Attempted to contrive an aspect of his [REDACTED] November 2023 singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.n of the TACP 2023;
 - b. Failed to report a corrupt approach in connection with the [REDACTED] November 2023 match in breach of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023;

- c. Contrived the service game(s) of his [REDACTED] November 2023 doubles match with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023;
- d. Failed to report a corrupt approach in connection with the [REDACTED] November 2023 match in breach of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023;
- e. Attempted to contrive an aspect of his [REDACTED] March 2024 doubles match with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.n of the TACP 2024; and
- f. Failed to report a corrupt approach in connection with his [REDACTED] March 2024 match in breach of Section D.2.a.i. of the TACP 2024.

4. The ITIA proposed a sanction for the asserted breaches of the TACP of 4 years ineligibility, backdated to commence on the date of his Provisional Suspension, *i.e.*, 30 May 2025, and a fine of \$10,000.

5. On 23 October 2025, Cruz provided the following response to the Notice of Major Offenses:

Kind regards. I hope you're all well. I want to apologize to everyone. I'm so sorry and I feel terrible. I'm sorry for letting Jasel get me involved. I want to ask for your forgiveness and for a second chance. I'm from a lower class and don't have the money to pay such a large amount. I didn't receive anything, in case you think I did, but I didn't. My mother has [REDACTED], and it hurts me to see her like this. I've had a really hard time these past few months. I want to keep playing tennis. I promise this won't happen again. Please give me a chance.

6. On 28 October 2025, Cruz provided the following additional response: "Hello everyone, I hope you are well. I refuse to see a match fixed. I also refuse to see money received. I never received money to do that. Thank you for your time."

III. Procedural Background

7. On 30 May 2025, ITIA served Cruz with a Notice of Provisional Suspension stating that based on the ITIA's investigation, "[t]he evidence set out establishes a likelihood that you have committed Major Offences including breaches of Section D.1.n ('No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, attempt, agree, or conspire to commit any Corruption Offense')." The ITIA thus "deem[ed] that, under Section F.3.b.i.4 of the TACP, it is necessary to impose a Provisional Suspension on [Cruz], in order to protect the integrity of tennis."
8. On 15 October 2025, as discussed above, the ITIA served Cruz with a Notice of Major Offenses.
9. On 23 and 28 October 2025, as set forth above, Cruz provided responses to the Notice of Major Offenses.
10. On 7 November 2025, I was appointed to serve as the Anti-Corruption Hearing Officer ("AHO") to adjudicate this matter.
11. On 19 November 2025, ITIA submitted that "under Section G.1.c of the TACP, the proceedings against Jasel Beltre and Jossting Cruz are procedurally consolidated as both individuals were charged in the same Notice of Major Offense."
12. On 19 November 2025, I held a procedural conference to determine the procedure leading up to and including the Hearing of this matter. The procedural conference was attended by Cruz, counsel for ITIA, and a Spanish/English interpreter.
13. During the procedural conference, and as memorialized in Procedural Order #1 dated 21 November 2025, I directed that "[a] determination as to whether these proceedings and the proceedings involving Jasel Beltre should be procedurally consolidated, given the overlapping factual background, will be made in due course."

14. Beltre subsequently objected to the procedural consolidation of his matter with this matter. I determined that, given the circumstances, the matters would be heard separately.

15. As further memorialized in Procedural Order #1, the following schedule was issued for written submissions:

- a. ITIA's opening submission was due on or before 23 January 2026;
- b. The Covered Person's answering submission was due on or before 20 February 2026;
- c. ITIA's reply submission was due on or before 27 February 2026; and
- d. The Covered Person's reply submission was due on or before 6 March 2026.

16. As set forth in Procedural Order # 1, the hearing was set for 24 March 2026, to be conducted virtually and in English.

17. On 23 January 2026, ITIA timely provided its written submission, including its exhibits and the witness statement of George Child.

18. On 5 February 2026, Cruz submitted an email with the subject "evidence that I did not take any money." In the body of the message, Cruz included his mother's bank account statements dated 7 November 2023 and 6 March 2024, stating "I used my mother's account because I was a minor and didn't have my own account."

19. On 18 February 2026, Cruz submitted an email with the subject "evidence where I didn't lose the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] In the body of the message, Cruz included an image of the result of his singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and stated: "Here's the result, I didn't rig any scores."

20. On 21 February 2026, Cruz submitted an email stating as follows:

I respectfully and firmly deny any involvement in match manipulation. I have never fixed, manipulated, or intentionally influenced the outcome of any match. I have always competed honestly and in accordance with the rules and integrity standards of the sport.

I also confirm that I have never received any money, gifts, or any other benefit in connection with any alleged manipulation or improper conduct.

21. Neither ITIA nor the Covered Person provided any reply submissions.
22. On 17 March 2026, ITIA submitted its Hearing Bundle for this matter.
23. On 19 March 2026, ITIA submitted its proposed hearing schedule for this matter.
24. The Hearing was held virtually on 24 March 2026. The Covered Person, ITIA and its counsel, two Spanish/English interpreters, an observer from ITF, and the AHO participated in the Hearing.
25. At the conclusion of the hearing, I declared the hearing provisionally closed, subject to the ITIA providing, at my request, any authority regarding the meaning of “attempt” as charged.
26. On 1 April 2026, the ITIA submitted one CAS award and two AHO Decisions “to provide clarity on ‘attempt’ under TACP D.1.n.”
27. A transcript of the Hearing was provided to the AHO on 14 April 2026.

IV. Contentions of the Parties

28. The ITIA contends that its “investigation of Mr. Cruz arises from notifications from the International Betting Integrity Association (the ‘IBIA’) to the ITIA of suspicious betting on several matches relating to professional tennis player Jasel Beltre.” (ITIA Br. ¶ 5.1.) The ITIA “contends that there is more than a preponderance of the evidence Mr. Cruz contrived aspects of his matches, attempted to contrive aspects of his matches, and failed to report corrupt approaches, all as charged in the Notice.” (*Id.* ¶ 6.4.) The key evidence on which ITIA relies includes: messages between Cruz and Beltre and between Beltre and “known corruptors”; match scorecards; statements made by Cruz during his 17 March 2025 interview with ITIA; and the witness statement of ITIA Investigator George Child. (*Id.* ¶ 6.5.) “The ITIA submits that in all

circumstances it is more likely than not that Mr. Cruz has committed the Corruption Offenses as alleged in the Notice.” (*Id.* ¶ 6.6.)

29. With respect to the sanction, the ITIA contends:

- a. Under the TACP Sanctioning Guidelines (the “Guidelines”), the starting sanction under offender categorization A2 is a 10-year period of ineligibility and a fine of up to \$15,000 given the number of offenses alleged.
- b. The appropriate level of sanction for Cruz is:
 - i. A period of 4 years ineligibility; and
 - ii. A fine of \$10,000.

30. Cruz “den[ies] any involvement in match manipulation,” insisting that he has “never fixed, manipulated, or intentionally influenced the outcome of any match.” He states that he has “always competed honestly and in accordance with the rules and integrity standards of the sport,” and has “never received any money, gifts, or any other benefit in connection with any alleged manipulation or improper conduct.”

31. At the hearing, Cruz explained that he did not want to engage in any of the conduct, but that he “was a minor and [he] was just led by Jasel [Beltre]” and “really was used.” (Hearing Tr. at 8.) Cruz further contended that he “felt, like, scared because Jasel, he’s a very strong character and sometimes he gets a bit aggressive and I was scared that, like, maybe if I reported it, maybe I would have problems with him if I met him in the street, and then he would assault me, or something like that. So then, I had this fear and I just allowed myself to be led by him, but really, I didn’t want to do it, and I apologize 1000 times.” (*Id.* at 8-9.)

V. **Findings**

32. No party has objected to my jurisdiction or to my being an independent, impartial, neutral

adjudicator to render a determination in this case.

33. It is undisputed that the applicable rules are the TACP 2023 and TACP 2024 with regard to the Corruption Offenses and the TACP 2025 with regard to the procedure.

34. Section G.3.a of the TACP provides that the ITIA must prove the commission of a Corruption Offense by a preponderance of the evidence:

The ITIA (which may be represented by legal counsel at the Hearing) shall have the burden of establishing that a Corruption Offense has been committed. The standard of proof shall be whether the ITIA has established the commission of the alleged Corruption Offense by a preponderance of the evidence.

35. Section G.3.d provides that “[t]he AHO shall not be bound by any jurisdiction’s judicial rules governing the admissibility of evidence. Instead, facts relating to a Corruption Offense may be established by any reliable means, as determined in the sole discretion of the AHO.”

36. Bearing the above in mind, the issue to be determined is whether the ITIA has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the Covered Person committed each of the Corruption Offenses alleged in the Notice of Major Offenses. I thus address each of the alleged Corruption Offenses in turn.

A) Corruption Offenses

37. The ITIA alleges that Cruz has committed two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to his singles match against █████ █████ on █ November 2023 (“Match # 1”), two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to his doubles match with █████ █████ against █████ █████ and █████ █████ on █ November 2023 (“Match # 2”), and two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to his doubles match with █████ █████ █████ █████ against █████ █████ and █████ █████ on █ March 2024 (“Match #3”).

Match #1

38. The ITIA asserts that Cruz attempted to contrive aspects of Match #1 in violation of Section D.1.n, and failed to report a corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i.

39. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #1: messages between Beltre and “a corruptor known to the ITIA as [REDACTED]” messages between Cruz and Beltre, and the testimony of Investigator Child.

40. On [REDACTED] November 2023, Beltre informed [REDACTED] “I’ve got something for you, a trusty friend is playing tomorrow, we can do something with him,” and “1 thousand for the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] let me know.” In response to a request for the player’s name, Beltre stated “he got the [REDACTED] and sent a photograph of the draw reflecting Cruz’s match against [REDACTED] (ITIA Ex. 33.)

41. The same day, Cruz asked Beltre: “What did the guy say to you?” Beltre responded: “I contacted him now, I’m waiting for him to contact me.” Beltre later told Cruz: “I’m waiting for an answer, if they don’t tell me anything between now and the morning, forget about it and go for it.” (*Id.*)

42. The next morning, Beltre messaged Cruz: “Good morning, bro, go for it, because the page is causing problems and if they don’t bring up the live score with the draw they can’t do anything.”

43. Cruz followed up with Beltre asking: “But what about the result?” “Is it not possible?” Beltre responded: “Not like this.” (*Id.*)

44. Cruz lost Match #1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (ITIA Ex. 34.)

45. While, as Cruz insists, the result reflects that he didn’t actually fix Match #1, an attempt “does not require that there be a final and binding agreement to fix the match in order to qualify the conduct as an attempt. . . . It is clear that the provision seeks to cover all preliminary stages and all acts of the person concerned which—without leading to completion of the offense of contriving the outcome of an Event—seek or attempt to achieve that result.” CAS 2020/A/7129, *PTIO v. Youssef Hossam*, ¶ 424.

46. I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cruz has committed the Corruption Offense of attempt. Cruz’s messages to Beltre—and in particular his messages asking Beltre, “But what about the result?” “Is it not possible?”—evidence that Cruz sought an opportunity to contrive an aspect of Match #1.

47. The ITIA also has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cruz failed to report a corrupt approach with respect to Match #1. The communications between Cruz and Beltre evidence that Beltre approached Cruz to fix the match, and Cruz was aware that Beltre was attempting to organize a corrupt opportunity with respect to Match #1. Specifically, Cruz asked Beltre: “What did the guy say to you?” Further, when Beltre informed Cruz that he had been unable to organize the corrupt opportunity “because the page is causing problems and if they don’t bring up the live score with the draw they can’t do anything,” Cruz asked, “But what about the result?” “Is it not possible?” Furthermore, Investigator George Child testified that “[t]o [his] knowledge, Mr. Cruz never made a report to the ITIA of any corrupt approach or corruption offense” (Child WS ¶ 18), and Cruz did not submit any evidence suggesting otherwise.

48. Accordingly, I find that the ITIA has proven that Cruz attempted to contrive aspects of Match #1 in violation of Section D.1.n and failed to report a corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023.

Match # 2

49. The ITIA asserts that Cruz contrived an aspect of Match #2 in violation of Section D.1.d, and failed to report a corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i.

50. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #2: messages between Cruz and Beltre, Cruz’s 17 March 2025 interview with Investigator Child, and the testimony of Investigator Child.

51. During his 17 March 2025 interview with Investigator Child, Cruz acknowledged that Beltre approached him to fix this match. (ITIA Ex. 35 at 17.) Cruz admitted that Beltre “told me I had to lose my service match my service game for 0-40 . . . [b]ut in this case I didn’t do it, we won my service games.” (*Id.*)

52. ITIA asserts that “Beltre and Cruz agreed that Mr. Cruz would lose one of his service games of this match” and “[a]fter the match, Messrs. Beltre and Cruz discussed that Mr. Cruz failed to complete the agreed-upon fix. Specifically, Mr. Beltre told Cruz that he should have double-faulted in order to lose the game. Mr. Cruz responded that he did not double-fault because ‘it was going to look very suspicious.’” (ITIA Br. ¶¶ 5.13-5.14.)

53. I find that the ITIA has failed to meet its burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cruz contrived an aspect of Match #2.

54. As ITIA correctly noted during the hearing, whether or not Cruz successfully carried out an agreed-upon contrivance is not dispositive of whether he has committed the charged offense. As explained in CAS 2014/A/3467, *Guillermo Olaso de la Rica v. TIU*, “the mere fact that [the athlete] reached an agreement violates on its own” the rules prohibiting contrivance. *Id.* ¶ 109.

55. Here, however, the messages between Cruz and Beltre fail to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that an agreement was ever reached.

56. The messages submitted by ITIA from before the match were sent, with one exception, solely by Beltre, stating “Go on,” “Remember, no room for error,” and “First let [REDACTED] serve, then you.” The only message from Cruz from before the match was a response of “Tt,” which ITIA states is “unclear” as to the translation. I am not persuaded that the messages from before the match establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cruz ever agreed to contrive any aspect of the match. (ITIA Ex. 36.)

57. Nor do the messages from after the match, considered in conjunction with the messages from before the match, persuade me that ITIA has met its burden. The messages after the match reflect that Beltre was unhappy that Cruz did not fix the match and double fault as Beltre had told him (“that’s why I told you to double”), to which Cruz responded: “how many times do you want to double me,” “it was going to look very suspicious.” (*Id.*) I find these messages are, at most, equivocal as to whether Cruz ever agreed to contrive the match. In other words, I find it at least as likely that Cruz never agreed to Beltre’s proposed fix.

58. To be sure, had ITIA submitted evidence establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cruz agreed to the fix proposed by Beltre but failed to carry out the agreed-upon contrivance, the offense of contrivance would be established. But here, ITIA has failed to meet its burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cruz ever agreed to the fix proposed by Beltre, and thus the Corruption Offense of contrivance has not been established.

59. The ITIA has, however, proven that Cruz failed to report a corrupt approach with respect to Match # 2. During his 17 March 2025 interview with Investigator Child, Cruz admitted that Beltre “did mention me about fixing the match but I didn’t want to do it.” (ITIA Ex. 35 at 17.) He further admitted that he didn’t report the approach. When asked why he didn’t report the approach to anyone, Cruz responded: “Because I was afraid of losing my friendship with him. But I think I did the wrong thing because he wanted me to fix the match, and I should have reported.” (*Id.* at 18.) Investigator Child confirmed that Cruz had not, to his knowledge, reported any corrupt approach. (Child WS ¶ 18.)

60. Accordingly, I find that the ITIA has proven that Cruz failed to report a corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023.

Match # 3

61. The ITIA asserts that Cruz attempted to contrive aspects of this match in violation of Section D.1.n, and failed to report a corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i.
62. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #3: messages between Cruz and Beltre, Cruz's 17 March 2025 interview with Investigator Child, and the testimony of Investigator Child.
63. I find that the ITIA has proven by a preponderance of the evidence an attempted contrivance. While Cruz asserted in his interview that he "never agreed to do anything" and "never did it" (ITIA Ex. 35 at 20), as discussed above, an attempt does not require a final and binding agreement to fix the match. After asking Beltre, "did you speak with the guy?," Cruz followed up twice with Beltre before the match saying, "let me know" and "we're about to play." (ITIA Ex. 38.) These messages evidence that Cruz was seeking a potential contrivance for Match # 3, which is sufficient for the alleged offense of attempt.
64. The ITIA also has proven that Cruz failed to report a corrupt approach with respect to Match #3. During his 17 March 2025 interview, Cruz admitted that Beltre "had mentioned to [Cruz] about fixing the match." (Ex. 35 at 19.) Investigator Child testified that Cruz has not reported any corrupt approach, and Cruz provided no evidence to the contrary.
65. Accordingly, the alleged breaches of Sections D.1.n and D.2.a.i of the TACP 2024 have been established.

B) Sanction

66. Section H of the TACP addresses sanctions against players who breach a provision of the TACP:
- H.1 . . . the penalty for any Corruption Offense shall be determined by the AHO in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section G, and may include:
- H.1.a With respect to any Player, (i) a fine of up to \$250,000 plus an amount equal

to the value of any winnings or other amounts received by such Covered Person in connection with any Corruption Offense, (ii) ineligibility from Participation in any Sanctioned Events for a period of up to three years unless permitted under Section H.1.c., and (iii) with respect to any violation of Section D.1., clauses (c)-(p), Section D.2 and Section F, ineligibility from Participation in any Sanctioned Events for a maximum period of permanent ineligibility unless permitted under Section H.1.c.

67. The Guidelines provide a framework for the issuing of sanctions under the TACP to promote fairness and consistency. The Guidelines are not binding on AHOs but set out various principles and factors that AHOs may consider appropriate to take into account. An AHO retains full discretion in relation to the application of or departure from the Guidelines.

68. The five steps in the Guidelines are as follows:

- a. Determining the offense category;
- b. Starting point and category range (which includes a non-exhaustive list of aggravating and mitigating factors);
- c. Consideration of any reduction for early admissions;
- d. Consideration of any other factors which may merit a reduction, such as substantial assistance to the ITIA;
- e. Setting the amount of the fine (if any).

69. The Guidelines also address the issue of multiple charges against a Player:

Where there are multiple Corruption Offenses, in the interests of efficiency, they should ordinarily be taken together in one concurrent sanctioning process (albeit taking particular cognizance of the offense(s) which carry(ies) the highest sanction). It is also noted that multiple offenses is a factor for the purposes of categorization of the impact with a greater number of Corruption Offenses ordinarily leading to a higher categorization.

70. An application of the Guidelines involves, in the first instance, ascertaining the category of the offenses which have been committed. This in turn involves assessing both the level of culpability of the Covered Person's actions (subdivided into categories A to C) and the level of impact those actions have had (subdivided into categories 1 to 3).

71. ITIA contends that Cruz “meets the qualifications of a level A culpability offender because his alleged offenses involve (i) a high degree of planning or premeditation and (ii) multiple offenses over a protracted period of time.” (ITIA Br. ¶ 7.9.1.)

72. I find that Cruz’s culpability falls within Category B as the offenses involved “some planning or premeditation,” rather than a “high degree of planning or premeditation”; he “acted in concert” with Beltre rather than “initiating or leading [Beltre] to commit offenses” (indeed, the evidence reflects that it was Beltre who was leading Cruz to commit the offenses); and Cruz has committed “several offenses.” I thus find Cruz bears “medium” or Category B culpability.

73. As to impact, ITIA submits that “Cruz meets the qualifications of a level 2 impact offender because (i) the ITIA alleged he committed several offenses that do not fall under D.1.a, D.1.b, D.1.q, or D.2, and (ii) his alleged offenses had a significant, material impact on the integrity of the sport.” (ITIA Br. ¶ 7.9.2.)

74. Two of the five proven offenses do not fall under D.1.a, D.1.b, D.1.,q, or D.2, and Cruz’s Corruption Offenses have a “material impact on the reputation and/or integrity of the sport.” While the evidence does not support that Cruz obtained any material gain from his offenses, I nevertheless find that his conduct falls within impact Category 2.

75. Thus, viewing culpability and impact together, I conclude Cruz’s conduct falls within Category B.2.

76. The starting point for a Category B.2 period of ineligibility under the Guidelines is 3 years, with a category range of 6 months to a 5-year suspension.

77. Under the Guidelines, “[h]aving identified the starting point within the category range, the AHO may then consider any adjustment from the starting point for aggravating or mitigating

factors.” The Guidelines provide a non-exhaustive list of aggravating and mitigating factors that may be considered in providing for an upward or downward adjustment from the starting point.

78. Here, I do not find any aggravating circumstances warrant an upward adjustment from the starting point, and instead find several mitigating factors warrant a downward adjustment from the starting point. Cruz repeatedly expressed genuine remorse for his conduct throughout the proceedings. He was a teenager at the time of the offenses, and his age and lack of maturity allowed him to be persuaded by Beltre to discuss and become involved in potential corrupt opportunities. At the hearing, Cruz credibly testified that he “was used” by Beltre, and that he “did not want” to engage in the Corruption Offenses but was “scared” that if he reported Beltre’s corrupt approaches he “would have problems with [Beltre] if I met him in the street, and then he would assault me, or something like that. So then, I had this fear and I just allowed myself to be led by him, but really, I didn’t want to do it, and I apologize 1000 times.” (Hearing Tr. at 8-9.) Based on the foregoing mitigating factors, I find a 12-month downward adjustment from the starting point is appropriate in this case.

79. Cruz has not made any early admission warranting a reduction in the otherwise-applicable sanction nor has he provided substantial assistance.

80. Having considered the submissions and evidence, I conclude that a period of ineligibility of two (2) years is proportionate and appropriate in this case.

81. As to the level of the fine, the ITIA submits that I should impose a fine of \$10,000.

82. The Guidelines state that “[w]here there is multiple offen[ses] in relation to particular matches, each match will, save for exceptional circumstances, be taken as one Offense for the purposes of the Fines table.” Thus, for purposes of assessing the “fine scale,” Cruz is viewed as having committed three offenses, and the fine scale is \$0 to \$25,000.

83. The Guidelines further state that “[o]rdinarily where there is a period of suspension a fine of at least \$1000 should also be imposed.”

84. The Guidelines note that “the financial means of the Covered Person (including without limitation where the Covered Person is a player, coach, umpire, trainer or physiotherapist and his/her primary source of income is from participation in tennis, being prize money and sponsorship, and his/her average annual income is less than the amount of the otherwise-applicable fine) may be taken into account to reduce the level of the fine (which may accordingly move to the bottom of, or even below, the relevant scale on the Fines Tables).”

85. Throughout the proceeding, Cruz has consistently stated that he has minimal financial resources. ITIA does not dispute any of Cruz’s assertions of modest means.

86. In light of Cruz’s financial circumstances, I find that a fine of \$2,500 is appropriate. The imposed fine may be paid in installments as determined by the ITIA.

VI. Conclusion and Orders

87. Accordingly, my Order is as follows:

- a. Cruz is found to have violated Sections D.1.n and D.2.a.i of TACP 2023, and D.1.n and D.2.a.i of TACP 2024.
- b. Cruz is declared ineligible from Participation in any Sanctioned Event for a period of 2 years backdated to commence on the date of his Provisional Suspension. The suspension therefore shall be deemed to have commenced on 30 May 2025 and will end on 29 May 2027.
- c. A fine of \$2,500 is imposed upon Cruz. Such fine must be paid in full, subject to any payment plan that may be agreed in accordance with Section J.1 of the TACP 2025.

- d. This Decision is the full, final and complete determination of the matter and is binding on all Parties. The Present Decision is, however, subject to a right of appeal to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in accordance with Section I.1 of the TACP 2025. The deadline for filing an appeal with CAS shall be twenty Business Days from the date of receipt of the Decision.
- e. This Decision shall be publicly reported as set forth in Section G of the TACP.

Ordered, this 5th day of May, 2026



Jeffrey A. Mishkin