

*In the matter of alleged Corruption Offenses under the Tennis Anti-Corruption Program (TACP)*

The International Tennis Integrity Agency (ITIA)

-and-

Murod Abdurakhimov

**SUMMARY**

- On 11 March 2024, the ITIA issues a *Notice of Major Offense under the 2024 Tennis Anti-Corruption Program and referral to Anti-Corruption Hearing Officer* ('Notice of Major Offense') to Mr. Abdurakhimov (hereinafter Mr. Abdurakhimov or the 'Covered Person').
- The Notice of Major Offense contains details of seven Charges against Mr. Abdurakhimov (totaling eighteen possible Major TACP Offenses) related to seven separate professional tennis matches which took place in 2019 and 2021 that Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated
- Further to both Parties being given an opportunity to make Submissions, which the Covered Person elected not to do, the AHO issues this Decision on Sanction and orders the imposition of a 20-year period of ineligibility and a \$30,000 fine upon Murod Abdurakhimov who has been found liable for committing 18 Major Offenses under the TACP.

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This dispute involves the ITIA and Murod Abdurakhimov (or the 'Covered Person'), an Uzbek Tennis Official.
2. Further to the ITIA charging Mr. Abdurakhimov with Major offenses under the TACP, issuing the Notice by email, and issuing Submissions to the AHO in support of the ITIA Charges in accordance with Procedural Directions, Mr. Abdurakhimov has stopped engaging in this proceeding.
3. The Major Offenses the Covered Person has been charged with contained seven charges (totalling 18 possible Major TACP Offenses) against Mr. Abdurakhimov arising from seven matches the Covered Person was officiating and which took place in 2019 and 2021.
4. Mr. Abdurakhimov's alleged anti-corruption violations relate to seven separate professional tennis matches he officiated and comprise six alleged breaches of the 2019 TACP contained within three charges, and 12 alleged breaches of the 2021 TACP contained within four charges.

These TACP breaches are summarised and broken down as follows in the Notice of Major Offense. Notably:

1. Three alleged breaches of Section D.1.b of the 2019 TACP by, directly or indirectly, soliciting, facilitating, or conspiring to solicit or facilitate any other person to wager on the outcome or any other aspect of any Event or any other tennis competition.
  2. Three alleged breaches of Section D.1.d of the 2019 TACP by directly or indirectly contriving, attempting to contrive, agreeing to contrive, or conspiring to contrive the outcome or any other aspect of any Event.
  3. Four alleged breaches of Section D.1.b of the 2021 TACP by directly or indirectly facilitating any other person to wager on the outcome or any other aspect of any Event or any other tennis competition.
  4. Four alleged breaches of Section D.1.m of the 2021 TACP by purposely delaying or manipulating entry of scoring data from any Event for any reason.
  5. Four alleged breaches of Section D.1.n of the 2021 TACP by directly or indirectly attempting, agreeing or conspiring to commit any Corruption Offense.
5. Although having been given the opportunity to do both, Mr. Abdurakhimov has neither exercised his right to hearing before this AHO nor made Submissions on Sanction within the deadline provided, as expressly requested by the AHO. As a result, applying by analogy, Section G.1.e. ii of the TACP, the Covered Person has effectively accepted liability for the eighteen (18) Charges and deferred the decision on sanction to an Anti-Corruption Hearing Officer ('AHO').
  6. AHO Olga Hamama was initially appointed to this matter. Due to procedural inefficiencies and personal issues, as provided in TACP Section G.1.f., Janie Soublière was later appointed to take over and decide the matter. Ms. Soublière holds an appointment as an AHO per section F.1 of the TACP. The AHO was appointed as a replacement to AHO Hamama without objection by any party to these proceedings as the independent and impartial adjudicator to decide this matter as set out in the TACP 2024, which applies to all procedural aspects of this dispute.
  7. Pursuant to TACP Section G.1.e.iv., the following is the AHO's Decision on Sanction.

## THE PARTIES

8. The ITIA is appointed by the Governing Bodies who participate in the TACP, namely the ATP Tour Inc., the Grand Slam Board, the International Tennis Federation (ITF) and the Women's Tennis Association (WTA) Tour Inc., to administer the TACP and the actions of all Covered Persons bound thereto. The ITIA is empowered to investigate potential breaches of the TACP

and to bring charges against Covered Persons where they conclude that there are sufficient grounds to do so.

9. Mr. Abdurakhimov is a Chair Umpire and defined as a Covered Person under the TACP.
10. The Covered Person is considered an “Official” under the ITF Code of Conduct and as “Tournament Support Personnel” under the TACP. He has completed the Tennis Integrity Protection Programme (‘TIPP’), an ITF requirement, every two years from 2019 until 2023. The TIPP is a mandatory online educational tool to assist Covered Persons, including Officials, understand their responsibilities under the TACP and how to identify when other individuals breach the TACP (including match-fixing and corrupt approaches).

## PROCEDURE

11. Following receipt of the Notice of Major Offense, Mr Abdurakhimov confirmed to the ITIA via e-mail dated 19 July 2024 that he wished to defend the Charges at a Hearing.
12. On request from AHO Hamama, the ITIA attended a Pre-Hearing Directions call on 6 September 2024, which Mr Abdurakhimov did not attend. Following that call, a final version of the Procedural Order was shared with the parties on 11 September 2024.
13. On 27 September 2024, the ITIA disclosed the documents on which it relies in these proceedings.
14. On 15 November 2024, the ITIA filed witness evidence from: (i) the ITIA investigator, Denys Gee; and (ii) the ITIA betting liaison officer, Mark Swarbrick.
15. On 16 December 2024, the ITIA filed an expert report of [REDACTED] a certified [REDACTED] Chair Umpire.
16. On 19 December 2024, the ITIA filed its written Submissions on Sanction.
17. Further to the Covered Person’s failure to file written submissions and his lack of response to the AHO’s message regarding the same, the hearing initially scheduled for January 2025 does not take place. The Covered Person then completely stopped engaging in the process and the matter was left unattended with no determination being made.
18. AHO Soublière was then appointed to this matter in July 2025 to bring finality to the same, with no objection from either party.
19. Upon being apprised of the case file, to ensure that all parties’ due process rights were respected and that they were fully informed of the process going forwards, AHO Soublière invited the Parties to a meeting where she could explain the rest of the process and make

determinations on the procedural calendar going forward. The ITIA responded to the invitation to accept to meet with the AHO and the Covered Person. The Covered Person did not respond.

20. The AHO then informed the Parties that she was convening a mandatory call with the Parties and the AHO noted if the Covered Person was absent, the call would still take place and a final procedural calendar would be set in absentia. The Parties were invited to provide reasoned justification as to why they would be unable to attend this mandatory call and neither party informed the AHO of their anticipated non-attendance.
21. A Directions call was held on 29 July 2025 at 3pm CET. The Covered Person did not attend. During the meeting, the ITIA provided the AHO with a clarification of the procedure so far. Given the Covered Person's complete lack of engagement in the process since December 2024, the AHO sought confirmation that the email the Case Secretariat was using to send the Covered Person communications was accurate. The ITIA confirmed it was the same address they had used in the past to communicate with the Covered Person, to which he had responded. The AHO then informed all those present on the call what she would be issuing Procedural Directions to all parties and requested that the ITIA utilize all available means to ensure that the Covered Person received the same. The ITIA confirmed that it would message the Covered Person to inform him that Directions had been issued to his email and that these required action.
22. On 30 July 2025, a written communication was sent to the Parties which read as follows:

*A Directions Call was held on 29 July 2025 at 2pm UK time further to neither party indicating that they could not attend, as invited to do so on 23 July 2025.*

*Counsel for the ITIA and Katy Stirling from the ITIA were present.*

*The Covered Person, Mr. Abdurakhimov, did not attend.*

*Although it is apparent from the case file that Mr. Abdurakhimov has ceased to engage in this process, the newly appointed AHO to this file would like to give Mr. Abdurakhimov one last opportunity to file written submissions in Response to the ITIA Submissions on Sanction and is invited to indicate by Friday 01 August 2025 if he intends to do so.*

*Should Mr. Abdurakhimov intend to make submissions in Response to the ITIA's submissions of 29 December 2024, considering he has had the ITIA's submissions for over 8 months, his written submissions must be filed no later than 7 August 2025.*

*Should no response be received from the Covered Person by Friday 01 August 2025, the AHO will consider that Mr. Abdurakhimov has implicitly waived his right to a hearing, close*

*the written submissions, and issue a final and binding reasoned decision in this matter in short order’.*

23. The Covered Person did not respond by 01 August 2025 as advised and directed.
24. The AHO notes for the sake of good order that Section F.8 of the 2024 TACP notes ‘*each Covered Person shall be determined to be immediately contactable at their current (i) postal address, (ii) personal mobile telephone or (iii) personal email address*’. In accordance with the further reasons provided on this point below, given the additional effort that was made to communicate with him via text messages, the AHO is satisfied that Mr. Abdurakhimov received the numerous correspondence sent to him and elected not to respond and/or elected to no longer participate in the process.
25. Therefore, as advised in her 30 July 2025 Directions, the AHO considers that Mr. Abdurakhimov has both waived his right to a hearing and to file a Response to the ITIA’s Submissions on Sanction.
26. The written procedure is now closed and given the inordinate amount of time it has taken to decide this matter, the AHO has proceeded expeditiously to draft this written and reasoned decision not to cause greater prejudice to either party. The AHO thus issues this Decision on Sanction in accordance with the TACP, and its related and applicable Guidelines, on the basis of the documents in the case file to date.

#### **APPLICABLE LAW AND JURISDICTION**

27. It is uncontested that the applicable rules are substantively the 2019 and 2021 TACP with regards to the Charges and the 2024 TACP with regards to the procedure.
28. No party has objected to the appointment of the undersigned AHO to hear this matter. She has been properly appointed and seized of the matters in dispute.
29. No other matters relating to jurisdiction or the arbitrability of these matters have been raised by any party.

#### **PARTIES’ SUBMISSIONS**

30. The AHO has carefully considered the totality of the Parties’ written submissions. They are summarised below. Additional facts and allegations found in the Parties’ submissions and evidence may be set out, where relevant, in connection with the legal discussion that follows.

The AHO refers in her award only to the submissions and evidence she considers necessary to explain her reasoning.

## ITIA

31. The ITIA submits that the appropriate sanction for Mr. Abdurakhimov's established TACP Offenses is a 20-year ban from tennis together with a fine of \$40,000.
32. The Corruption Offenses that Mr. Abdurakhimov has been charged with are set out in the ITIA's Notice of Major Offense. Specifically, the charges brought against Mr. Abdurakhimov by the ITIA and the ITIA's position in relation to each is as follows:

### Charge 1

33. Mr. Abdurakhimov is charged with breaches of the following sections of the 2019 TACP:
  - (i) Section D.1.b, which reads: *"No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, facilitate, or conspire to solicit or facilitate any other person to wager on the outcome or any other aspect of any Event or any other tennis competition..."*
  - (ii) Section D.1.d, which reads: *"No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, contrive, attempt to contrive, agree to contrive, or conspire to contrive the outcome, or any other aspect, of any Event."*
34. On 11 June 2019, the ITIA received a match alert from the International Betting Integrity Association (the 'IBIA') (then known as Sports Betting Integrity, or 'ESSA') in which it reported that the betting operator, [REDACTED] had identified suspicious betting activities in relation to a professional tennis match which Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated. That match took place at the ITF [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] June 2019 between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (the 'First Match').
35. After investigation, the ITIA concluded that Mr. Abdurakhimov was intentionally delaying and/or manipulating the scores of the First Match that were entered into Mr. Abdurakhimov's handheld electronic scoring device (the 'Scoring Device') to ensure that a

specific and targeted betting outcome occurred. The Scoring Device is used to record scores in a professional tennis match and is directly linked to the international online betting markets.

36. The ITIA reviewed the audio from the First Match and observed that after approximately four minutes and 48 seconds a loud rustling noise could be heard. At approximately five minutes and eight seconds into the recording, the audio for the match is suppressed such that only very limited sound is audible despite the Scoring Device working and continuing to record sounds from the court. The audio is not fully regained until approximately one hour, six minutes and 35 seconds into the recording during Set ■ Game ■
37. Each Scoring Device used to score ITF matches has a unique number assigned to it. The Scoring Device number that Mr. Abdurakhimov used for the First Match was ■■■■■. Following the discovery of the audio issue that occurred during the First Match, the ITIA investigator, Denys Gee, requested that the ITF provide him with a copy of the audio recording produced by the same Scoring Device but used by a different Chair Umpire for a different match at the same ITF ■■■■■ tournament in ■■■■■ to check if the same audio issue occurred. The Scoring Device was used during the singles match between ■■■■■ ■■■■■ and ■■■■■ ■■■■■ which took place on the ■ June 2019. There were no audio issues found with the audio for this match recorded by the Scoring Device.
38. In addition, the ITIA has considered the point-by-point data for the First Match, which is a record of every entry made into the Scoring Device. The ITIA is also concerned by the timings between some of the points in Set ■ Game ■ which appear to have been played far quicker than would usually be expected.
39. In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov denied manipulating the score entry of the First Match and blamed technical issues for the problems with the audio.

#### *Betting data*

40. On 14 June 2019, ██████ reported suspicious betting from three new accounts registered in Republic of Ireland, each of which had verified their identities with ██████ by providing ██████ passports, in respect of the First Match.
41. There were 13 bets placed by the three bettors on Set █ Game █ to go ██████. The 13 bets were all placed in the period between ██████ and ██████ UK time (being ██████ to ██████ time), meaning that five bets were placed during the previous game (i.e., Set █ Game █) and the other eight bets were placed in Game █ itself.
42. The total amount staked by the 13 bets was £1,090.90 and nine of the bets involved identical stakes of £88.69, with each of the three ██████ accounts placing at least one bet with that stake. All of the 13 bets were successful, resulting in a total combined profit of £2,573.18.

#### *ITIA Position*

43. The ITIA alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov deliberately suppressed the audio to avoid any discrepancy between the score the Covered Person was calling out loud and the score he entered into the Scoring Device being detectable. The ITIA asserts that Mr. Abdurakhimov entered, or was prepared to enter, an incorrect score into the Scoring Device to ensure that a pre-agreed outcome, being Set █ Game █ ██████ transpired.
44. The ITIA also alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov took those steps as Mr. Abdurakhimov was part of a scheme with one or more unknown individuals to manipulate the online betting markets for financial profit.
45. Therefore, the ITIA submits:
1. Mr. Abdurakhimov facilitated those third parties to bet on the First Match, an Event, in breach of section D.1.b of the 2019 TACP.
  2. Mr. Abdurakhimov contrived or attempted to contrive an aspect of the First Match in



breach of section D.1.d of the 2019 TACP.

## Charge 2

46. Mr. Abdurakhimov is charged with a further breach of Section D.1.b of the 2019 TACP and a further breach of Section D.1.d of the 2019 TACP.
47. In the same 11 June 2019 IBIA match alert, two betting operators, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] reported that they had identified suspicious betting activities in relation to another match which Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated at the same [REDACTED] ITF tournament. This match took place on [REDACTED] June 2019 and was between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (the 'Second Match'). The ITIA's investigation revealed the same type of concerns identified with the First Match.
48. The ITIA reviewed the audio from the Second Match and heard that after approximately seven minutes and eight seconds a loud rustling sound could be heard. After seven minutes and 17 seconds into the recording, the audio for the match is suppressed such that only very limited sound is audible at all despite the Scoring Device working and continuing to record sounds from the court.
49. The audio is not fully regained until approximately 30 minutes and 39 seconds into the recording which can be identified as being during Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] shortly after Mr. Abdurakhimov is believed to have called "[REDACTED]" in that set. The audio is then suppressed in the same way again at approximately one hour, five minutes and fifty-two seconds into the recording. The audio is regained at approximately one hour, 20 minutes and ten seconds into the recording and no further issues are detected.
50. The Scoring Device number that Mr. Abdurakhimov used for the Second Match was [REDACTED]. The ITIA again compared the audio for the Second Match with the audio from the same Scoring Device but where a different Chair Umpire was using it. This was a match between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which took place on [REDACTED] June 2019. There were no

issues found with the audio for this match recorded by the Scoring Device.

51. In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov denied manipulating the score entry of the Second Match and again blamed technical issues for the problems with the audio.

*Betting data*

52. ██████ reported suspicious betting from 17 new and existing accounts registered in Greece (9), Bangladesh (4), Bulgaria (1), Armenia (1), Belarus (1) and Russia (1) on the day of the Second Match.
53. There were 44 bets placed by these accounts backing Set ██████ Game ██████ to go ██████ of which:
- (i) 33 were single bets solely backing the game to go ██████
  - (ii) Two were doubles bets backing the game to go ██████ together with a bet placed on a women's football match.
  - (iii) Nine were treble bets involving the game to go ██████ together with bets on a couple of beach soccer matches.
54. Of the 44 bets, 17 bets were placed during the previous game (i.e., Set ██████ Game ██████ and the other 27 bets were placed during Set ██████ Game ██████
55. The 44 bets were all placed in the period between ██████ and ██████ UK time (being ██████ to ██████ time), with the total amount staked being £3,226.92. A number of the bets placed by different accounts involved identical stakes.
56. Notwithstanding the fact that some of the treble bets lost because of the outcome of one of the beach soccer matches, all bets backing Set ██████ Game ██████ to go ██████ were successful resulting in a total combined profit of £5,053.86.
57. There were also concerns about suspicious betting on Set ██████ Game ██████ raised by ██████

### *ITIA Position*

58. The ITIA makes the same allegations as it did with the Charge 1 match but this time in relation to the manipulation or attempted manipulation of the score entry into the Scoring Device for Set ■ Game ■ for the benefit of third-party bettors.
59. Therefore, the ITIA submits:
1. Mr. Abdurakhimov facilitated third parties to bet on the Second Match, an Event, in breach of Section D.1.b of the 2019 TACP.
  2. Mr. Abdurakhimov contrived or attempted to contrive an aspect of the Second Match in breach of Section D.1.d of the 2019 TACP.

### **Charge 3**

60. Mr. Abdurakhimov is charged with a further breach of Section D.1.b of the 2019 TACP and a further breach of Section D.1.d of the 2019 TACP.
61. In the same 11 June 2019 IBIA match alert, four betting operators, ■■■■■ and ■■■■■ reported that they had identified suspicious betting activities in relation to another match which Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated at the same ■■■■■ ITF tournament. This match took place on ■ June 2019 and was between ■■■■■ and ■■■■■ (the 'Third Match'). The ITIA's investigation revealed the same type of concerns identified with the First Match and the Second Match.
62. The ITIA reviewed the audio from the Third Match and observed that after approximately six minutes and 35 seconds a loud rustling sound can be heard and then after approximately seven minutes, just before the start of Set ■ Game ■ the audio is then suppressed such that only very limited sound is audible at all despite the Scoring Device working and continuing to record sounds from the court ■ The audio is not fully regained until approximately 36 minutes into the recording during Set ■ Game ■ There were then further issues with the audio recording for the remainder of the Third Match.

63. The Scoring Device number that Mr. Abdurakhimov used for the Third Match was [REDACTED] The ITIA again compared the audio for the Second Match with the audio from the same Scoring Device but where a different Chair Umpire was using it. This was the match between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which took place on [REDACTED] June 2019. There were no issues found with the audio for this match recorded by the Scoring Device.

64. In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov denied manipulating the score entry of the Third Match and again blamed technical issues for the problems with the audio.

*Betting data*

(i) [REDACTED]

65. [REDACTED] reported suspicious betting from three new accounts registered in Republic of Ireland, each of which had also verified their identities with [REDACTED] by providing [REDACTED] passports, on the day of the Third Match.

66. There were five bets placed by the three [REDACTED] accounts backing [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] point in Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED]. The five bets were all placed in the period between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] UK time (being [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] time), all with identical stakes of £132.70 resulting in the total amount staked being £663.50. All the bets were successful, but [REDACTED] did not pay out, having already observed that the betting was suspicious.

(ii) [REDACTED]

67. [REDACTED] reported suspicious betting from three accounts, two of which were new, all registered in Italy. There were six bets placed by the three [REDACTED] accounts backing Ms [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] point in Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED]. The six bets were all placed in the period between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (being [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] time), with a combined total stake of £1,050. All of the six bets were successful, resulting in a total combined profit of £1,995.

68. There were also concerns about suspicious betting on Set ■ Game ■ raised by ■

*ITIA Position*

69. The ITIA makes the same allegations as it did with the Charge 1 and Charge 2 matches but this time in relation to the manipulation or attempted manipulation of the score entry into the Scoring Device for Set ■ Game ■ for the benefit of third-party bettors.

70. Therefore, the ITIA submits:

1. Mr. Abdurakhimov facilitated third parties to bet on the Third Match, an Event, in breach of section D.1.b of the 2019 TACP.

2. Mr. Abdurakhimov contrived or attempted to contrive an aspect of the Third Match in breach of section D.1.d of the 2019 TACP.

**Charge 4**

71. Mr. Abdurakhimov is charged with a breach of each of the following sections of the 2021 Program:

(i) Section D.1.b, which reads: *"No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, facilitate any other person to wager on the outcome or any other aspect of any Event or any other tennis competition..."*

(ii) Section D.1.m, which reads: *"No Covered Person shall purposely delay or manipulate entry of scoring data from any Event for any reason."*

(iii) Section D.1.n, which reads: *"No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, attempt, agree, or conspire to commit any Corruption Offense."*

72. On 15 April 2021, the ITIA received a match alert from the IBIA in which it reported that the betting operators, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had identified suspicious betting activities in relation to a match which Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated. That match took place at the ITF [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] April 2021 between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (the 'Fourth Match'). A comparison of the point-by-point data and score card against the audio of Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] shows two discrepancies as follows:

Point Number	Score Card	Audio Score
1	00:15	15:00
2	15:15	30:00
3	30:15	30:15
4	40:15	40:15
5	Game [REDACTED]	Game [REDACTED]

73. In particular, the ITIA observed that on the [REDACTED] point of Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] Mr. Abdurakhimov entered 0-15 into the Scoring Device meaning the point was awarded to [REDACTED]. However, on the audio Mr. Abdurakhimov can be heard calling out "15-0" meaning Mr. Abdurakhimov awarded the point to [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

74. In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov denied manipulating the score entry of this match and instead claimed that he incorrectly entered certain points into the Scoring Device by mistake because of nerves.

#### *Betting Data*

75. On 14 April 2021, [REDACTED] reported suspicious betting from several accounts, mainly registered in Italy, in respect of the Fourth Match.

76. Of those, there was one bet placed at [REDACTED] UK time (being [REDACTED] [REDACTED] time) on the day of the Fourth Match by one account backing [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] point of Set [REDACTED].

Game [REDACTED] with a stake of £120.85. The bet was successful, resulting in a profit of £211.48.

77. A new account with [REDACTED] understood to be run by [REDACTED] and registered in Russia on 25 March 2021 also placed a single bet backing [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] point of Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED]. This account placed a stake of £84.94 also at [REDACTED] GMT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] time) resulting in a profit of £148.65.

#### *ITIA Position*

78. The ITIA alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov manipulated the entry of the scores into the Scoring Device on Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] to ensure that a pre-agreed outcome, being [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] point of Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] transpired.
79. The ITIA also alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov took those steps as he was part of a scheme with one or more unknown individuals to manipulate the online betting markets for financial profit.
80. Therefore, the ITIA submits that:

1. Mr. Abdurakhimov facilitated third parties to bet on the Fourth Match, an Event, in breach of Section D.1.b of the 2021 TACP.

2. Mr. Abdurakhimov purposely entered scores into the Scoring Device during Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] that did not match the scores Mr. Abdurakhimov called audibly. This amounts to manipulation of the score entry in breach of Section D.1.m of the 2021 Program.

3. Mr. Abdurakhimov attempted, agreed or conspired to commit a Corruption Offense in breach of Section D.1.n of the 2021 TACP.

## Charge 5

81. Mr. Abdurakhimov is charged with a further breach of Section D.1.b of the 2021 TACP, a further breach of Section D.1.m of the 2021 TACP and a further breach of Section D.1.n of the 2021 TACP.
82. In the same 15 April 2021 IBIA match alert referred to in Charge 4, [REDACTED] reported that it had identified suspicious betting activities in relation to another match which Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated at the same [REDACTED] ITF tournament. This match took place on [REDACTED] April 2021 and was between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (the 'Fifth Match').
83. A comparison of the point-by-point data and score card against the audio of Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] shows one discrepancy as follow

Point Number	Score Card	Audio
1	15:00	15:00
2	15:15	30:00
3	30:15	30:15
4	40:15	40:15
5	40:30	40:30
6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
7	Advantage [REDACTED]	Advantage [REDACTED]
8	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
9	Advantage [REDACTED]	Advantage [REDACTED]
10	Game [REDACTED]	Game [REDACTED]

84. The ITIA observed that on the [REDACTED] point of Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] Mr. Abdurakhimov entered 15-15 into the Scoring Device meaning the point was awarded to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. However, on the audio Mr. Abdurakhimov can be heard calling out 30-0, meaning that Mr. Abdurakhimov awarded the point to [REDACTED] [REDACTED].
85. In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov denied manipulating the score entry of this match and instead again claimed that Mr. Abdurakhimov incorrectly entered a point into the Scoring



Device by mistake as a result of being nervous.

#### *Betting Data*

86. On 14 April 2021, ██████ reported suspicious betting from three existing accounts registered in Italy to the ITIA in respect of the Fifth Match.
87. The three accounts collectively placed five bets on ██████ to ██████ the ██████ point in Set ██████ Game ██████. The five bets were all placed in the period between ██████ and ██████ UK time (being ██████ to ██████ time), with a combined stake of £693.06. All of the five bets were successful, resulting in a combined total profit of £949.50.
88. ██████ also reported suspicious betting to the ITIA in respect of the Fifth Match from two accounts registered in Russia. There were five bets placed by these two bettors on ██████ to ██████ the ██████ point in Set ██████ Game ██████. The five bets were all placed in the same time period as the ██████ bets described above with a combined stake of £110.47. All of the bets were successful, resulting in a combined total profit of £151.90.

#### *ITIA Position*

89. The ITIA alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov manipulated the entry of the scores into the Scoring Device on Set ██████ Game ██████ to ensure that a pre-agreed outcome, being ██████ to ██████ the ██████ point of Set, Game ██████ transpired.
90. The ITIA also alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov took those steps as he was part of a scheme with one or more unknown individuals to manipulate the online betting markets for financial profit.
91. Therefore, the ITIA submits that:
1. Mr. Abdurakhimov facilitated third parties to bet on the Fifth Match, an Event, in breach of Section D.1.b of the 2021 TACP.

2. Mr. Abdurakhimov purposely entered scores into the Scoring Device during Set ■ Game ■ that did not match the score Mr. Abdurakhimov called audibly. This amounts to manipulation of the score entry in breach of Section D.1.m of the 2021 TACP.

### Charge 6

92. Mr. Abdurakhimov is charged with a further breach of Section D.1.b of the 2021 TACP, a further breach of Section D.1.m of the 2021 TACP and a further breach of Section D.1.n of the 2021 TACP.
93. On 22 October 2021, the ITIA received a match alert from IBIA in which it reported that the betting operators, ■■■■■ and ■■■■■ had identified suspicious betting activities in relation to another match which Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated. That match took place at the ITF ■■■ tournament in ■■■■■ on ■ October 2021, between ■■■■■ and ■■■■■ (the 'Sixth Match').
94. A comparison of the point-by-point data and score card against the audio of Set ■ Game ■ shows several discrepancies as follows:

Point Number	Score Card	Audio Score
1	00:15	00:15
2	00:30	15:15
3	15:30	30:15
4	30:30	40:15
5	40:30	Game ■■■■■
6		Game ■■■■■

95. In particular, the ITIA observed that on the ■■■ point of Set ■ Game ■ Mr. Abdurakhimov entered 0-30 into the Scoring Device meaning the point was awarded to ■■■. However, on the audio Mr. Abdurakhimov does not clearly call the score for this point, although it sounds like "15-15". In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov asserted that he called the

████ point in █████ favour making the score 15-15. In either scenario, there is a discrepancy between the score card entry and the audio.

96. The remaining points were then awarded to █████ on the Scoring Device. Mr. Abdurakhimov's position in interview was that he also audibly called the █████ and █████ points as having been won by █████ with the █████ point clearly being called as "Game █████ There was no █████ point called. As a result, the remainder of the game shows discrepancies between the score called out audibly and the score entered on to the Scoring Device.

97. In addition, the ITIA has considered the point-by-point data for the Sixth Match. The ITIA is also concerned by the timings between some of the points in Set █████ Game █████ which appear to have been played far quicker than would usually be expected.

98. In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov denied manipulating the score entry of this match and instead again claimed that he incorrectly entered certain points into the Scoring Device by mistake as a result of nerves. Mr. Abdurakhimov also claimed in interview that he sometimes calls scores on court very quietly not to disturb the players and that he does not always call the score in English if the players themselves do not speak English.

#### *Betting Data*

99. On █████ October 2021, █████ reported suspicious betting from three existing accounts registered in Spain. The ITIA notes that █████'s report to the IBIA stated that the bets were placed in "a highly irregular and targeted manner".

100. There were eight bets placed by the three bettors on █████ to █████ the █████ point in Set █████ Game █████ of the Sixth Match. The eight bets were all placed in the period between █████ and █████ UK time (being █████ to █████ time), this being between Game █████ and Game █████ with a combined stake of £1,935.14. All the bets were successful, but █████ did not pay out, having already observed that the betting was suspicious. On the same day,

betting operator, ██████ reported to the IBIA that a new account, registered in Austria, placed clearly targeted bets on ██████ to ██████ the same point of the Sixth Match.

#### *ITIA Position*

101. The ITIA alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov manipulated the entry of the scores into the Scoring Device on Set ██████ Game ██████ to ensure that a pre-agreed outcome, being ██████ to ██████ the ██████ point of Set ██████ Game ██████ transpired.
102. The ITIA also alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov took those steps as he was part of a scheme with one or more unknown individuals to manipulate the online betting markets for financial profit.
103. Therefore, the ITIA submits that:
  1. Mr. Abdurakhimov facilitated third parties to bet on the Sixth Match, an Event, in breach of Section D.1.b of the 2021 TACP.
  2. Mr. Abdurakhimov purposely entered scores into the Scoring Device during Set ██████ Game ██████ that did not match the scores Mr. Abdurakhimov called audibly. This amounts to manipulation of the score entry in breach of Section D.1.m of the 2021 TACP.
  3. Mr. Abdurakhimov attempted, agreed or conspired to commit a Corruption Offense in breach of Section D.1.n of the 2021 TACP.

#### **Charge 7**

104. Mr. Abdurakhimov is charged with further breaches of Section D.1.b, D.1.d and D.1.m of the 2021 Program.
105. On ██████ October 2021, the ITIA received a match alert from the IBIA in which it reported that

██████ had identified suspicious betting activities in relation to another match which Mr. Abdurakhimov officiated. That match took place at the ITF ██████ tournament in ██████ on ██████ October 2021 between ██████ ██████ and ██████ ██████ (the 'Seventh Match').

106. A comparison of the point-by-point data and score card against the audio of Set ██████ Game ██████ of the Seventh Match shows several discrepancies as follows:

Point Number	Score Card	Audio Score
1	00:15	Only "love" called
2	15:15	30:00
3	30:15	No score called
4	40:15	40:15
5	40:30	40:30
6	Game ██████	Game ██████

107. In particular, the ITIA observed that on the ██████ point of Set ██████ Game ██████ Mr. Abdurakhimov entered 0-15 into the Scoring Device meaning the point was awarded to ██████. However, on the audio Mr. Abdurakhimov can only be heard calling out "love". In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov asserted that he called "15-0" for this point when the audio for this match was replayed to him. In either scenario, there is a discrepancy between the score card entry and the audio. There are then subsequent discrepancies for, at least, the ██████ point.
108. In addition, the ITIA has considered the point-by-point data for the Seventh Match. The ITIA is also concerned by the way in which points were entered into the Scoring Device during Set ██████ Game ██████ as well as the timings between those points.
109. In interview, Mr. Abdurakhimov denied manipulating the score entry of this match and instead again claimed that he incorrectly entered certain points into the Scoring Device by mistake because of nerves. Mr. Abdurakhimov also explained that he did not call the ██████ point in Set ██████ Game ██████ because he claimed to have seen another player sitting on a bench near the scoreboard making hand gestures to ██████ whilst using his phone.

#### *Betting Data*

110. On [REDACTED] October 2021, [REDACTED] reported suspicious betting from one new account and one existing account registered in Spain.
111. There were five bets placed by the two accounts backing [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] point in Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] of the Seventh Match. The five bets were all placed in the period between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] UK time (being [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] time), with a combined stake of £763.81. All of the five bets were successful, but [REDACTED] did not pay out, having already observed that the betting was suspicious.

#### *ITIA Position*

112. The ITIA alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov manipulated the entry of the scores into the Scoring Device on Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] to ensure that a pre-agreed outcome, being [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] point of Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] transpired.
113. The ITIA also alleges that Mr. Abdurakhimov took those steps as he was part of a scheme with one or more unknown individuals to manipulate the online betting markets for financial profit.
114. Therefore, the ITIA submits that:
1. Mr. Abdurakhimov facilitated third parties to bet on the Seventh Match, an Event, in breach of Section D.1.b of the 2021 TACP.
  2. Mr. Abdurakhimov purposely entered scores into the Scoring Device during Set [REDACTED] Game [REDACTED] that did not match the score Mr. Abdurakhimov called audibly. This amounts to manipulation of the score entry in breach of Section D.1.m of the 2021 TACP.
  3. Mr. Abdurakhimov attempted, agreed or conspired to commit a Corruption Offense in breach of Section D.1.n of the 2021 TACP.

### **The ITIA's Proposed Sanctions**

115. The Notice of Major Offense also made reference to and enclosed a link to the Sanctioning Guidelines (the “Guidelines”), issued by the Tennis Integrity Supervisory Board, and which are drawn on historical precedent. These provide a framework for the issuing of sanctions under the TACP to support fairness and consistency. They are not binding on AHOs but set out various principles and factors which AHOs may consider appropriate to their decision making. As rightly clarified by the ITIA its submissions, AHOs retain full discretion in relation to the sanctions to be imposed.
116. The categories in the Guidelines contain a number of indicative starting points and ranges as guidelines in terms of sanctioning for ineligibility and fines and set out a five-step process to determine the appropriate sanction in a particular case. The Guidelines provide that an AHO may then consider any adjustment from that starting point by considering any aggravating or mitigating factors.
117. The ITIA recalls that Guidelines’ five steps are as follows:
- i. Determining the offense category;
  - ii. Starting point and category range (which includes a non-exhaustive list of aggravating and mitigating factors);
  - iii. Consideration of any reduction for early admissions;
  - iv. Consideration of any other factors which may merit a reduction, such as substantial assistance to the ITIA;
  - v. Setting the amount of the fine (if any).

### *The Period of Ineligibility*

118. As to culpability, the ITIA submits that Mr Abdurakhimov sits between Categories A and B, albeit closer to Category A given that two of the three Category A factors are relevant to him:
- a. A high degree of planning and premeditation (category A)*

119. As described in the evidence and in the ITIA's submissions, the alleged match-fixing charges were necessarily pre-meditated given the betting arrangements that were put in place. The degree of planning was plainly high given the need for Mr Abdurakhimov to agree with one or more third party bettors as to which points of which games the relevant bets were placed on and what Mr Abdurakhimov had to do on court to ensure the bets were successful (which they all were). The specificity, timing and quantum of the betting are also indicative of considerable thought having been given. The element of planning is particularly acute for Mr Abdurakhimov given that he had to simultaneously audibly call the correct score on court or consciously choose not to call the score at all.

*b. Acting in concert with others (category B).*

120. The ITIA infers that from its analysis of the betting data, and discrepancies and irregularities in the audio recording, Mr Abdurakhimov must have been involved in facilitating bets and contriving an aspect of the Event. The ITIA does not have evidence that Mr Abdurakhimov initiated or led others to commit offenses which would have been required for Category A. However, the clear inference must be, if the ITIA's case is deemed to be made out, that Mr Abdurakhimov did act in concert with others since he is not in a position to place the various bets whilst preparing in advance of officiating and during the course of officiating the match.

*c. Multiple offenses over a protracted period of time (category A).*

121. The Charges – which equate to a total of 18 separate alleged breaches of the TACP – relate to seven Matches that took place between 2019 and 2021. This is plainly multiple offenses over a protracted period of time.

122. As to impact, the ITIA submits that Mr Abdurakhimov sits comfortably in Category 1 as the factors listed in that category in the Guidelines are most relevant to his actions. They are as follows:



*a. Major TACP offenses (category 1).*

123. The manipulation of the score on the PDA (Section D.1.m), conspiracy to commit a Corruption Offense (Section D.1.n), contriving the outcome or an aspect of an Event (Section D.1.d) and facilitation of betting (Section D.1.b), are all Major Offenses as defined under the TACP. The concept of Major TACP Offenses covers many of the offenses under the TACP with the exception of offenses where a six-month ban, and \$10,000 fine is the maximum sanction. That is not the case in these proceedings, so all the Charges are “major TACP offenses”.

*b. Significant material impact on the reputation and/or integrity of the sport*

124. The role of officials in tennis, and especially Chair Umpires, is a vital one. Aside from ensuring the events on court proceed smoothly and fairly, Chair Umpires are expected to be a model of integrity and set an example throughout the sport. A Chair Umpire is there to uphold the rules but instead Mr Abdurakhimov deliberately sought to breach them and undermine the integrity of his position. It is rare for match officials to be manipulating scores in the way alleged in these proceedings so the impact on the reputation and/or integrity of the sport would, therefore, be very significant.

*c. Holding a position of trust/responsibility*

125. For the reasons set out above, the role of a Chair Umpire is one of utmost importance. Chair Umpires are the final authority for all decisions on court and therefore, necessarily, are expected to uphold the highest standards and their level of integrity should not need to be questioned at any point. Chair Umpires are trusted to uphold the integrity of each match, for the good of the players, the betting markets and the sport as a whole. Mr Abdurakhimov’s alleged conduct is clear evidence of his disregard for his position of trust/responsibility.

*d. Material gain.*

126. The ITIA is confident that Mr Abdurakhimov has been paid for entering incorrect scores into the PDA. However, any remuneration, and the scale of that remuneration, is unknown. As a result, the ITIA does not feel it can argue that the category 1 standard of “relatively high

value of illicit gain” is established. Instead, the ITIA believes it is justifiable to proceed based on the existence of “material gain” in the category 2 standard. That inference can fairly be drawn given the nature of the scheme described and the unlikelihood that Mr Abdurakhimov would consent to being involved with such a scheme without payment.

127. In light of the factors set out above, the ITIA submits that the range of sanction should be between 10 years to a lifetime ban and that based on the Guidelines, a starting point of 20 years is appropriate in the circumstances as there are no considerable aggravating circumstances that exist, other than wasting the AHO and the ITIA’s time and resources, and no mitigating circumstances that could be applied.

#### **The Fine**

128. The ITIA submits that the amount of any fine should, by reference to the Fines Table in the Guidelines, ordinarily reflect the categorisation of the offenses. That means that offenses categorised as A1 may attract a fine at the higher end of the scale of the Fines Table.
129. Whilst Section H.1.b(i) of the TACP provides that fines are separate from a requirement on Covered Persons to pay an amount equal to amounts received by a Covered Person in connection with corrupt activity, the ITIA does not have evidence of the sums received by Mr Abdurakhimov for his offenses.
130. As Mr Abdurakhimov has been found liable for all the Charges, the Fines Table in the Guidelines suggests that a fine in the range of \$25,000 and \$50,000 would be appropriate for him. Given there are seven Matches which are the subject of the Charges, an appropriate fine would be in the region of \$30,000 to \$40,000.

#### **The ITIA’s Overall Proposal**

131. The ITIA submits that the starting point set out above should be the final sanction as regards a ban. Mr Abdurakhimov should, therefore, serve a ban of 20 years and a fine in the region of \$30,000 to \$40,000 imposed.

**I. Mr. Abdurakhimov**

132. Mr. Abdurakhimov has not engaged with the process and although he had ample opportunity to make submissions on his behalf, he has elected not to do so.

**DECISION**

**Preliminary issue**

133. To dispel any doubts regarding potential breaches of the Covered Person's procedural rights, the AHO would like to begin by outlining the numerous efforts that were made to contact and involve him in this process.
134. The Covered Person did, initially, inform AHO Hamama that he was exercising his right to a hearing. He then failed to engage whatsoever with the process notwithstanding being sent numerous communications, at the same email address at which the ITIA and its investigators had previously been able to reach him. This is also the same email address from which he informed AHO Hamama that he wanted a hearing. Further to that communication, the Covered Person ceased communicating with the ITIA and the Cases Secretariat.
135. The specific efforts and step by step procedural steps taken in this matter prior to AHO Soublière being appointed to it are set out as [REDACTED] attached to this decision.
136. When AHO Soublière was appointed to take over this file, notwithstanding the apparent lack of engagement from Mr. Abdurakhimov since at least November 2024, and to proceed on the side of caution and procedural fairness, the AHO requested that similar efforts be undertaken to reach the Covered Person.
137. In addition to trying to contact the Covered Person by email, the AHO requested that the ITIA use every possible means at its disposal to try to contact the Covered Person further to the 29 July 2025 Directions Call. The ITIA confirms that it attempted to contact him via WhatsApp but

that his WhatsApp handle, which had been used previously by ITIA Investigator, has since been deactivated. The ITIA therefore sent Mr. Abdurakhimov two texts messages, one on 29 July 2025 and one on 30 July 2025, informing him that Procedural Directions had been sent to him and that he should respond to the same. The phone number to which these text messages were sent is the same number that the ITF has on file for Mr. Abdurakhimov.

138. As outlined above, as soon as AHO Soublière was appointed to this matter, The Covered Persons was contacted on behalf of the AHO on at least five additional occasions,

- On 17 July 2025: by email to inform him of her appointment and give him the opportunity to meet with her to discuss the next procedural steps in the process and timeline for response thereof
- On 23 July 2025: by email to invite him to a mandatory Procedural Meeting
- On 29 July 2025: by email advising him of the Procedural Directions the AHO had issued and timelines for response thereof failing which his right to a hearing and to file Submissions would be deemed waived,
- On 29 July 2025: by text message – advising him of the newly issued Procedural Directions and timelines for response therein
- On 30 July 2025: by text messages advising him one final time of the Procedural Directions.

139. It is therefore abundantly clear that significant and consistent efforts were made to contact the Covered Person to have him (i) file a Response the ITIA Submissions on Sanction, and (2) exercise his right to a hearing before AHO Soublière and engage in the process.

140. CAS case law has consistently confirmed (see for example TAS 2022/A/8907 paras 74 et Seq and CAS 2020/A/7590 & 7591 para 63), that parties shall act within a time limit provided by an adjudicator from the moment when he or she could in good faith have taken cognizance of the communication/ decision.

141. Similarly, CAS case law provides (See for example CAS 2022/A/8598 para 121 et seq; CAS 2022/A/7494 paras 61 et seq, CAS 2-19/A/6294 paras 77-78, CAS 2017/A/5334 para 64 et seq), that a recipient's email mailbox is in their sphere of control and that "the moment a communication (like a Decision or Procedural Directions) enters the control of the recipient where it can be retrieved from the latter's server and/or once a message leaves the sender's sphere of control, it is in principle received by the recipient". Finally, the same case law confirms that proof of sending the email is in principle deemed sufficient to prove that the message is complete.
142. The AHO also notes that Section F.8 of the TACP provides that "*each Covered Person shall be determined to be immediately contactable at their current (i) postal address, (ii) personal mobile telephone or (iii) personal email address.*"
143. Considering the above, and that none of the email correspondences sent to the Covered Person were returned as undeliverable. The AHO finds that Mr. Abdurakhimov received all emails and text messages sent to him and chose not to engage in the process, thereby implicitly waiving his right to a hearing before AHO Soublière and to file written submissions in Response to the ITIA's.
144. The AHO is thus satisfied that she and the ITIA Cases Secretariat have gone over above what is necessary to ensure that Mr. Abdurakhimov's procedural rights have been respected and is comfortable issuing this Decision *in absentia*.

## Deliberations

### *Liability*

123. Due to his total lack of engagement in the process since AHO Soublière has taken over the file and considering he has now been deemed to have waived his right a hearing and chosen not to make any submissions in Response to the ITIAs Submission on Sanction, the AHO applies

Section G 1. D iii of the TACP which reads: *If no hearing is requested, the AHO shall promptly issue a Decision confirming the commission of the Corruption Offense(s) specified in the Notice of Major Offense and ordering the imposition of sanctions, after giving due consideration to the Covered Person's written submission (if any) and any response submitted by the ITIA.*

124. Accordingly, the AHO now deems that Mr. Abdurakhimov has accepted liability for each of the above Charges and the determination left to the AHO pertains to the sanctions that are applicable to the same.

#### *Sanctions*

125. The sanctions which may be imposed by the AHO in relation to the Charges are set out in section H.1.a of the 2024 TACP. That section reads as follows:

*"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".*

126. The potential sanction for Mr. Abdurakhimov under section H.1.b is a lifetime/permanent ineligibility from Sanctioned Events, a \$250,000 fine and repayment of any corrupt payments Mr. Abdurakhimov may have received.
127. In assessing the sanctions to be imposed, the AHO notes as a preliminary fact that match fixing is a serious threat to tennis. Once admitted and proven, match fixing committed by Officials is even more abhorrent as it is a deliberate, intentional offense committed by the very

individuals entrusted with the task of ensuring that tennis matches are played within the parameters of well-established rules. Chair Umpires are the de facto custodians of honest on-court tennis rules. The flouting actions of officials and Chair Umpires, like Mr. Abdurakhimov, who repeatedly violate these rules and work in concert with others in tarnishing and corrupting the sport must neither be left unpunished, nor disciplined lightly. As the TACP attempts to eradicate corruption in tennis, the imposition of lenient sanctions would defeat the purpose not only the TACP's efforts to circumvent recidivism but also the TACP's efforts to deter others from being swayed by the possible windfalls of match fixing, which the AHO fully appreciates are often considerably greater than a Covered Person's usual earnings.

128. Conversely, as case law has established in all spheres, any sanction imposed must be proportional to the offense committed.
129. As stated above, for the reasons outlined, the ITIA has filed detailed submissions which recommend a fine in the amount of \$40 000 and a 20-year period of ineligibility.
130. The Covered Person has not filed any Response to rebut or challenge the same.
131. The AHO is not bound by the sanction recommended by the ITIA and may impose appropriate, just and proportional sanctions pursuant to the TACP bearing in mind the circumstances of the Charges against Mr. Abdurakhimov *"after giving due consideration to the parties written submissions"*.
132. The AHO is satisfied here that the sanctions she imposes are reasonable, proportional and consistent with those imposed in similar circumstances, notably in the many recent match fixing cases involving umpires prosecuted by the ITIA.

123. The ITIA has provided a thorough analysis of the evidence vis a vis the Guidelines. The AHO need not reiterate the same. This analysis has neither been challenged nor been contested by the Covered Person before the AHO.
124. As established above, pursuant to Section G 1. D. iii of the TACP, each Charge can be considered as having been established due to Mr. Abdurakhimov's lack of engagement in the process and failure to Respond to the Submission on Sanctions and failure to exercise a hearing before AHO Soublière. The AHO does for the sake of good order find that the case against Mr. Abdurakhimov, and each of the Charges brought against him and now considered established, are grounded in uncontested evidence, some direct, some indirect and some inferential. This evidence sets out the various fixes, how bets placed which led to material earnings correspond to Mr. Abdurakhimov's alleged "mistakes", how the scores were manipulated by deciding in advance when the manipulation in the handheld device would occur, how the Covered Person's *modus operandi* of suppressing audio not to bring attention to the incorrect scores he was entering in the handheld devices was consistently carried out, how the plan relied on those involved in the fix, and the various suspicious betting alerts that were raised by various betting syndicates in relation to each of these fixes. The evidence against Mr. Abdurakhimov also allegedly involves the forensic analysis of match records and betting patterns.
125. Even if the evidence related to one or two of the Charges is not as convincing as the other Charges and highly based on inferences, given the compelling betting patterns and expert evidence corroborating the Covered Person's apparent usual *modus operandi* in relation to the handheld device and suppression of audio and the betting activity that followed, the AHO is satisfied that the ITIA have established all Charges to the required legal standard.
126. The AHO makes this finding further to considering the extensive expert Report and analysis of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Official, which she accepts and stands uncontested.



127. Indeed, while it can be assumed the Covered Person's explanation for the multiple errors was human error, [REDACTED] explains that while there are instances where a Chair Umpire may incorrectly enter the score into the PDA, it is easy to rectify the mistake. The PDA has an 'Undo' button for use during the match to correct an incorrect score. When a Chair Umpire realises that they have entered the score incorrectly, they should simply click the 'Undo' button as soon as they realize a mistake has been made.

128. On this [REDACTED] opined:

*I would expect a Chair Umpire to notice any mistake quickly. That is because the Chair Umpire should still call out the correct score verbally so any discrepancy between that and the PDA score should be immediately obvious. If the verbal score called was incorrect I would expect the players to notice that and raise that with the Chair Umpire.*

*Of course, mistakes can happen, particularly if a Chair Umpire loses focus or concentration. However, these mistakes should only happen rarely (particularly for an experienced White Badge Chair Umpire) and, if they do happen, they can and should be easily corrected*

129. In the Executive summary of this report, [REDACTED] finds:

*I apply my knowledge and experience of officiating to the facts in this particular case and explain why I consider that Mr Abdurakhimov manipulated the entry of scores into the PDA. I have reached my conclusion on the basis of the following (which I set out in further detail in Section H):*

- a. the failure of Mr Abdurakhimov to call a score on certain points;*
- b. discrepancies between the audio recording and scorecard/point by point data in relation to the number of points played in certain games; and*
- c. suspicious timings between entries into the PDA.*

*For the reasons set out below, I do not believe that Mr Abdurakhimov simply made mistakes when recording the outcome of points into the PDA or failing to call the score audibly. In my view, there is good evidence that Mr Abdurakhimov deliberately manipulated the data which he entered into the PDA*

130. The evidence in the case file sets out three main ways a Chair Umpire can commit corruption violation while officiating. The most relevant to this matter is that
- A Chair Umpire can manipulate the score as it is entered into the PDA, i.e. verbally call one score (likely the correct score in the game being played) or fail to call a score at all and manually enter a different score into the PDA than what happened on court, which is transmitted to betting markets. This allows successful bets to be placed which do not reflect the score on the court. The Chair Umpire can then further manipulate the score, later in the game, to try to ensure the outcome of the game on the PDA reflects the true outcome on the court.
131. The AHO accepts, as opined by [REDACTED] that the audio recording of the matches, the scoring in the PDA and on court and timing of certain points are all highly suspicious.
132. Additional compelling evidence is tendered by Investigator Denys Gee, whose evidence also remains uncontested and who explains that Mr Abdurakhimov was first brought to the ITIA's attention following receipt of an alert from the International Betting Integrity Association and then again on 14 June 2019, by way of an alert from [REDACTED] Mr Abdurakhimov was again brought to the ITIA's attention following receipt of another alert from the IBIA on 15 April 2021 and two further alerts from the IBIA on 22 October 2021 in relation to two other matches. All these matches were analyzed including the betting activities surrounding them as provided by betting operators, the PDA and audio data and recording, match data, including point by point scoring and the match scorecard. Mr. Gee's findings, which are also uncontested and which the AHO accepts are as follows:

*The match-fixing Charges in these proceedings involve suspicious betting evidence being paired with suspicious point- by-point data and related scorecards, which do not match the audio recording of the match taken from Mr Abdurakhimov's PDA. On some occasions, the audio was difficult to hear suggesting the sounds may have been suppressed in some way making that comparison much harder. Taking that evidence into account, I reached the conclusion that manipulation of the scores by Mr Abdurakhimov was the most likely explanation.*

133. The AHO further notes that in making his conclusions, Mr. Gee relied on the evidence of [REDACTED] and Mark Swarbrick, ITIA Betting Liaison Officer, who has particular expertise regarding betting patterns and betting operators. The AHO accepts both expert's uncontested evidence.
134. Mr Swarbrick analysed the available betting data and sets out in his witness statement why he believes the betting evidence to be suspicious for each of the Charges. Analysis of the scores, and betting allowed him to conclude in essence, that there was no logical reason to see betting in relation to any of the matches that Mr. Abdurakhimov fixed (Match 7 -Charge 7). He also opines that the bets in relation to these matches were highly suspicious (Match 1- Charge 1 , Match 5- Charge 5 and Match 7 - Charge 7) , and/or that "it is highly unusual to see this many bettors placing bets on such a minor betting market (Match 2- Charge 2) and /or striking similarities and /or that bettors were placing bets on a pre-determined outcome (Match 3 - Charge 3) and/or highly selective and overlapping entirely (Match 4 – Charge 4)and /or highly irregular and/or clearly targeted (Match 6 – Charge 6).
135. Mr. Swarbrick's evidence which offers a plain yet highly compelling opinion of how each of these matches was considered "highly" irregular, illogical, targeted and/or suspicious, alongside the rest of the evidence in the case file is conclusive. It allows the AHO to find that

the ITIA has established to the required standard that Mr. Abdurakhimov has committed all the Corruption offenses for which he has been charged, in relation to each of these matches.

136. For all the reasons above, given that Mr Abdurakhimov has been found liable for the seven Charges and keeping in mind the ITIA's extensive analysis of its application of the Guidelines to these Charges to determine the applicable sanction and fine applicable to the same, the AHO accepts the ITIA's uncontested categorisation of Mr. Abdurakhimov's Offenses as between an A1 and A2 under the Guidelines.
137. This means that the appropriate sanction to impose under the Guidelines rests between 10 years to a lifetime ban. Given that Mr. Abdurakhimov has not filed any submissions to rebut the proposed sanction, the 20-year ban proposed by the ITIA is proportional and reasonable considering Mr. Abdurkhimov's established 18 Major Corruption Offenses.
138. As to the fine, again applying the Guidelines, the AHO appreciates the ITIA's categorization but lowers the proposed fine because there is no evidence whatsoever in the case file (even indirect) that the Covered Person did make earnings from his corrupt activity and, even on the assumption that he did, that there is no evidence of how much this would be. Additionally, the amounts bet on the matches is not particularly high. Given that he is already being handed a 20-year period of ineligibility, the AHO finds that a more appropriate fine to be imposed upon Mr. Abdurakhimov to be \$25,000.
139. However, the AHO also notes as provided in the Guideline as an aggravating factor, that Mr. Abdurakhimov's failure and refusal to engage in the system must be construed against him as he has wasted the ITIA's time and resources. Therefore, the AHO adds an additional \$5,000 to the \$25,000 above and sets the fine at \$30,000.

140. As expressly provided and foreseen in Section H.1.a. of the TACP, the AHO thus imposes a \$30,000 fine on Mr Abdurakhimov in addition to a 20-year ban, both as discipline and to deter other Covered Persons considering engaging in similar corrupt conduct in the future.

## ORDER

141. The Covered Person Murad Abdurakhimov, a Covered Person as defined in the 2024 TACP, is liable for 18 Corruption Offenses under the 2019 and 2021 TACP.
142. Pursuant to the TACP the sanctions to be imposed for these Corruption Offenses are:
- i. A 20-year ban from Participation, as defined in Section B.17 of the 2024 TACP, in any Sanctioned Event as prescribed in TACP Section H.1.a. (i), effective on the date of this Decision.
  - ii. A \$30,000 fine as prescribed in TACP section H.1.a.(iii).
143. Pursuant to TACP Section G.4.e., this award on sanction is to be publicly reported.
144. Pursuant to TACP Section G.4.d. this Decision on Sanction is a full, final, and complete disposition of this matter and is binding on all parties.
145. Pursuant to TACP Section I, this Decision can be appealed to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland within twenty Business Days from the date of receipt of the decision by the appealing party.

Dated at Beaconsfield, Quebec this 07 day of August 2025



---

Janie Soublière C. Arb. Anti-Corruption Hearing Officer

**PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**CHARGES BROUGHT BY THE INTERNATIONAL TENNIS INTEGRITY AGENCY**

**AGAINST MUROD ABDURAKHIMOV**

**BEFORE ANTI-CORRUPTION HEARING OFFICER JANIE SOUBLIERE**

---

**PROCEDURAL CHRONOLOGY**

---

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date</b>
Notice of Major Offense sent by the ITIA to Mr Abdurakhimov.	11 March 2024
Mr Abdurakhimov e-mails Cases in response to the Notice of Major Offense, denying all wrongdoing and making threats. He does not request a Hearing. Directions awaited from AHO Hamama.	25 March 2024
Given the threats, AHO McLaren (as Chair of the AHOs) asks that Denys Gee, the ITIA investigator, asks Mr Abdurakhimov via e-mail and text message whether he wishes to arrange a time to speak again.	30 April 2024
Mr Gee contacts Mr Abdurakhimov via e-mail asking whether he wishes to arrange a time to speak again.	1 May 2024
AHO Hamama acknowledges Mr Abdurakhimov's response to the Notice of Major Offense and requests that he confirms whether he wishes to have a Hearing by 3 May 2024.	1 May 2024
Mr Gee contacts Mr Abdurakhimov via e-mail and text message again, to follow up on the 1 May 2024 email.	3 May 2024
AHO Hamama summarises recent correspondence between Cases/the ITIA/Mr Gee and Mr Abdurakhimov and requests Mr Abdurakhimov to confirm whether he wishes a hearing by 16 May 2024.	9 May 2024
Mr Abdurakhmanov informs Mr Gee via e-mail that his mother is in hospital, his father is unwell at home and that he will contact Mr Gee again once his mother is discharged from hospital.	16 May 2024

Event	Date
The ITIA confirms, upon request from AHO Hamama, that it is content to pause the proceedings to allow Mr Abdurakhimov more time to respond to the Notice of Major Offense.	21 May 2024
Mr Abdurakhimov informs Mr Gee via e-mail that he is required to constantly care for his mother following her [REDACTED] but that he will be in touch again once she has recovered.	11 June 2024
Mr Gee acknowledges Mr Abdurakhimov's e-mail and expresses sympathy with his situation.	11 June 2024
Following a request by the ITIA, AHO Hamama requires that Mr Abdurakhimov does the following by 1 July 2024: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Confirms in writing whether he wants to defend the charges at a Hearing; and</li> <li>2. Provides evidence of the medical conditions of both of his parents.</li> </ol>	20 June 2024
Mr Abdurakhimov provides Mr Gee with various documentation evidencing his mother's medical condition via e-mail. Mr Abdurakhimov fails to confirm whether he wishes to defend the charges at a Hearing.	1 July 2024
Following the receipt of this evidence, the ITIA requests that AHO Hamama provides Mr Abdurakhimov with a final opportunity to confirm he wishes to defend the charges at a Hearing, failing which he will be deemed to have waived that right.	3 July 2024
AHO Hamama asks Mr Abdurakhimov to confirm by 19 July whether he: (i) contests the charges against him; and (ii) would like a Hearing to be held in this matter.	16 July 2024
Mr Abdurakhimov confirms to the ITIA via e-mail that he requests a Hearing.	19 July 2024
AHO Hamama issues directions to the Parties.	22 August 2024
Cases requests a response from Mr Abdurakhimov in respect of the timing of the Pre-Hearing Directions call proposed in AHO Hamama's directions.	23 August 2024
Mr Abdurakhimov requests that the Pre-Hearing Directions call takes place after 20 September (without providing any reasons).	26 August 2024
AHO Hamama orders that the Pre-Hearing Directions call takes place on 6 September.	4 September 2024
Mr Gee sends a text message and an e-mail to Mr Abdurakhimov reminding him of the Pre-Directions call later that day.	6 September 2024
Pre-Hearing Directions call (Mr Abdurakhimov does not attend).	6 September 2024

Event	Date
AHO Hamama issues directions (in the form of a Procedural Order) to the Parties.	11 September 2024
The ITIA requests an amendment to the Procedural Order such that the deadline for the ITIA to file its witness evidence be 1 November.	25 September 2024
AHO Hamama provides Mr Abdurakhimov with a week to respond to the ITIA's request.	27 September 2024
Cases requests a response from Mr Abdurakhimov in respect of whether he: (i) requests a Hearing in this matter; and (ii) wishes to participate in the proceedings.	2 October 2024
AHO Hamama affords Mr Abdurakhimov a further opportunity to confirm whether he requests a Hearing in this matter by 11 October, confirming that in the absence of such a request, the matter will be dealt with on the papers.	7 October 2024
AHO Hamama issues further directions to the Parties with a Hearing scheduled for 17 January 2025, notwithstanding Mr Abdurakhimov's continued lack of engagement.	22 October 2024
Cases requests confirmation from Mr Abdurakhimov in respect of holding a Hearing in this matter and, if so, provision of his availability.	30 October 2024
Mr Gee sends Mr Abdurakhimov an e-mail and a text message asking whether he has received an e-mail from the ITIA in respect of the Hearing.	30 October 2024
Mr Gee confirms to the ITIA that he has not received a response from Mr Abdurakhimov by way of e-mail or text.	1 November 2024
Cases requests again whether Mr Abdurakhimov is available to attend a Hearing on 16 January 2025.	4 November 2024
The ITIA files and serves the witness statements of: (i) Mark Swarbrick; and (ii) Denys Gee respectively via e-mail.	15 November 2024
AHO Hamama asks Cases whether there has been any further correspondence from Mr Abdurakhimov in respect of the Hearing.	21 November 2024
The ITIA confirms to Cases/AHO Hamama that there has not been any further correspondence from Mr Abdurakhimov in this matter.	25 November 2024
The ITIA files and serves the expert report of James Keothavong and confirms to Cases that there has not been any further correspondence from Mr Abdurakhimov in this matter.	16 December 2024
The ITIA files and serves its written submissions and confirms to Cases that there has not been any further correspondence from Mr Abdurakhimov in this matter.	19 December 2024



Event	Date
<p>AHO Hamama issues the following directions to the Parties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr Abdurakhimov must confirm availability and participation in the Hearing to be held on 16 January 2025 by 10 January 2025, 1 pm CET; and</li> <li>2. In case Mr Abdurakhimov fails to respond (in time), the AHO will proceed without a Hearing, based on the written submissions provided by the Parties in these proceedings, for the sake of procedural efficiency.</li> </ol>	<p>7 January 2025</p>