

Disposition Summary

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

- a. Jasel Beltre is found to have violated Sections D.1.d, D.1.f, and D.2.a.ii of TACP 2022, D.1.d, D.1.n, D.1.o, D.2.a.i, and D.2.a.ii of TACP 2023, and D.1.o and D.2.a.ii of TACP 2024.
- b. Beltre is declared ineligible from Participation in any Sanctioned Event for a period of 20 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 2045.
- c. A fine of \$55,000 is imposed upon Beltre. 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

Jasel Beltre,

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. Jasel Beltre (“Beltre” or “Covered Person”) is a 24-year-old tennis player from the Dominican Republic. At all times relevant to this case, Beltre was a “Covered Person” bound by the TACP.

II. The Notice of Major Offenses

3. On 15 October 2025, ITIA sent Beltre a Notice of Major Offenses alleging that he had committed a total of twenty-one (21) Corruption Offenses over the course of eleven (11) tennis matches occurring between November 2022 and March 2024. Specifically, the ITIA alleged that Beltre:

- a. Contrived aspects of his [REDACTED] November 2022 doubles match with Maikel Villalona against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2022;
- b. Received payments in exchange for fixing aspects of the [REDACTED] November 2022 match in breach of Section D.1.f of the TACP 2022;

- c. Failed to report a corrupt offense in connection with the [REDACTED] November 2022 match in breach of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2022;
- d. Failed to report a corrupt approach in connection with his [REDACTED] February 2023 singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023;
- e. Contrived the outcome of his [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] service games of his [REDACTED] February 2023 singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023;
- f. Contrived the outcome of the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of his [REDACTED] February 2023 doubles match with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023;
- g. Attempted to contrive an aspect of his [REDACTED] February 2023 singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.n of the TACP 2023;
- h. Contrived the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of his [REDACTED] June 2023 doubles match with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023;
- i. Contrived the outcome of his [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] service games of his [REDACTED] August 2023 doubles match with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023;
- j. Failed to report a corrupt approach in connection with his [REDACTED] August 2023 match in breach of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023;
- k. Facilitated Jossting Cruz's Corruption Offense with respect to Cruz's [REDACTED] November 2023 singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.o of the TACP 2023;

- l. Failed to report Cruz's Corruption Offense with respect to Cruz's [REDACTED] November 2023 singles match in breach of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2023;
 - m. Contrived the [REDACTED] set of his [REDACTED] November 2023 singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023;
 - n. Facilitated Cruz's Corruption Offense with respect to Cruz's [REDACTED] November 2023 doubles match with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.o of the TACP 2023;
 - o. Failed to report Cruz's Corruption Offense with respect to Cruz's [REDACTED] November 2023 doubles match in breach of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2023;
 - p. Facilitated Cruz's attempted Corruption Offense with respect to Cruz's [REDACTED] March 2024 doubles match with Janio [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.o of the TACP 2024; and
 - q. Failed to report Cruz's Corruption Offense with respect to Cruz's [REDACTED] March 2024 match in breach of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2024.
4. The ITIA proposed a sanction for the asserted breaches of the TACP of 20 years ineligibility, backdated to commence on the date of his Provisional Suspension, *i.e.*, 30 May 2025, and a fine of \$75,000, with a reduction of 25% available for early admission.
 5. On 22 October 2025, Beltre provided the following response to the Notice of Major Offenses:

“Dear Tennis Representatives, Contraception Cases and Any Tennis Representatives Involved; those sanctions that I have read and that are restrained here that they may be possible seem very overwhelming to me, from which someone like me could get 250,000 dollars; I was willing all the time to listen and answer their questions, I was attentive to the meetings and so on, I wanted to appeal when the news of the suspension came out in May or June, but I realized that the way to do it was through the Dominican Tennis Federation, unfortunately I could not do it because they do not want to see me playing tennis, What I wanted most

from [REDACTED] was to enjoy and develop more in this sport, they did a lot of bad things to me within the sport, including those in charge of tennis here in my country, where they have told me and done things that don't even make sense to me, everyone likes me and even those who hate me know that I didn't get involved with anyone, where at all times after participating in a tournament I am by my side, in my corner to avoid problems, and look, it has still caused me a lot of damage, it is incredible and impressive where I thought that the ITIA could trust you, and even talking to you they told others of those who interviewed me, where supposedly what I told them stayed between us, but; The truth is that these things have gone very far, I clearly showed them that I have not been involved in those things, I mentioned what I had to say and answered the questions they asked me, these things are not acceptable, and there were no agreements that can be carried out so that these sanctions are not like that, because the truth is not seen Fair, I hope and you can read this message, but above all understand that at all times I was clear with you, once I did think about fixing a match, but I couldn't, not because it was difficult or something, but because I am not that type of person, and I said it clearly: my principles and what I have been taught is not for me to do that kind of thing. Have a nice day, and God loves you.”¹

6. The same date, Beltre provided the following additional response:

“Hello again, in the second review of the letter, you tell me that the penalty would be: 15 years out of the circuit and a fine of 56,250 U.S; This is unbelievable, apart from the fact that I allegedly did 21 infractions and these things; With that amount of money I could practically retire here in my country, it is a fairly high amount and that is almost impossible to get, I do not know why things should be like this, because I agree with what others may tell you and there are no answers I have given, to the things I have mentioned and how I have always behaved.”

7. On 28 October 2025, Beltre provided the following further response:

“Unfortunately I cannot allege and confirm crimes that I have not committed, it is not possible that I limit something that has not happened on my part, I gave him information and told them the things that have been happening to me after that first interrogation, it has affected me so much that [REDACTED]; I have already told you that I, Jasel Beltre, have not committed those crimes that you tell me and what perhaps others have told you, I hope to know what measure will be taken, such actions I have not even done.”

III. Procedural Background

8. On 30 May 2025, ITIA served Beltre with a Notice of Provisional Suspension stating that

¹ Beltre submitted his responses in Spanish. ITIA provided free translations of the responses, which are quoted here.

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.d (‘No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, contrive the outcome, or any other aspect, of any Event’), D.1.f (‘No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, receive any money, benefit or Consideration on the basis of not giving their best efforts in any Event and/or negatively influencing another Player’s best efforts in any Event’), D.1.n (‘No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, attempt, agree, or conspire to commit any Corruption Offense’), D.1.o (‘No Covered Person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, facilitate, or incite any other person to commit, 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 [Beltre], in order to protect the integrity of tennis.”

9. On 15 October 2025, as discussed above, the ITIA served Beltre with a Notice of Major Offenses.

10. On 22 and 28 October 2025, as set forth above, Beltre provided responses to the Notice of Major Offenses.

11. On 7 November 2025, I was appointed to serve as the Anti-Corruption Hearing Officer (“AHO”) to adjudicate this matter.

12. 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.”

13. On 1 December 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 Beltre, counsel for ITIA, and a Spanish/English interpreter. At the procedural conference, Beltre

objected to the procedural consolidation of his matter with Cruz's matter. I determined that, to avoid any appearance of prejudice to Mr. Beltre, the matters would be heard separately.

14. As memorialized in Procedural Order #1 dated 3 December 2025, 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.

15. As set forth in Procedural Order # 1, the hearing was set for 25 March 2026, to be conducted virtually and in English.

16. On 22 January 2026, ITIA informed the AHO that while it intended to file its written submission, exhibit list and exhibits the following day, it requested an extension to file the witness statement of its forensic analyst, Zoran Preradovic, to 11 February 2026 when Mr. Preradovic would return from leave.

17. On 23 January 2026, ITIA's requested extension for the filing of Mr. Preradovic's witness statement was granted.

18. On 23 January 2026, ITIA timely provided its written submission, including its exhibits and the witness statements of its investigator, George Child, and its Betting Liaison Officer, Mark Swarbrick.

19. On 11 February 2026, ITIA timely provided the witness statement of Zoran Preradovic.

20. Beltre did not file an answering submission by the 20 February 2026 deadline or at any time thereafter.

21. On 18 March 2026, ITIA submitted its Hearing Bundle for this matter.
22. On 19 March 2026, ITIA Case Management sent an email to ITIA’s counsel and Beltre with the subject “ITIA v Beltre – Zoom Hearing Details.” The email provided Beltre with the Hearing details, Zoom meeting link, and details for a test Zoom call scheduled for 20 March 2026. A delivery receipt was received in relation to this email, confirming delivery of the email to Beltre.
23. On 20 March 2026, ITIA submitted its proposed hearing schedule for this matter.
24. The same day, ITIA Case Management sent a follow-up email to Beltre requesting that he confirm if he would be attending the test Zoom call scheduled that day, and also providing a copy of the proposed hearing schedule that ITIA had submitted to the AHO. No response was received, and Beltre did not attend the test Zoom call on 20 March 2026.
25. On 24 March 2026, ITIA Case Management emailed Beltre to remind him that the Hearing was scheduled for “tomorrow 25 March 2026,” with an 11:00 a.m. Dominican Republic start time, and reattaching the hearing schedule. In addition, Investigator George Child sent Beltre a WhatsApp message reminding Beltre that his “hearing with the ITIA is tomorrow at 11 am Dominican Republic time,” and asking Beltre to “check your emails and confirm you will be joining.” The WhatsApp message reflects that it was read by Beltre on 24 March 2026.
26. Beltre subsequently responded to ITIA Case Management’s email: “Okay, we’ll meet tomorrow.”
27. On 25 March 2026, ITIA Case Management thanked Beltre “for confirming,” and requested that he join the Zoom link 20 minutes before the start time to “enable us to set up the Zoom call and avoid any delays to the hearing schedule.”

28. Shortly before the start of the hearing, ITIA Case Management sent Beltre a reminder that his TACP hearing was commencing shortly, and included the Zoom link for the hearing.

29. When Beltre had not appeared more than 5 minutes after the start of the hearing, Investigator Child sent Beltre a WhatsApp message reminding him that his “hearing has now started,” and asking “[w]ill you be joining? Or are you having technical difficulties joining the Zoom meeting?” The message reflects that it was sent, but does not indicate that it was delivered to or read by Beltre.

30. When Beltre had not appeared more than 10 minutes after the start of the scheduled hearing time, ITIA Case Management emailed Beltre “a final reminder of the TACP Hearing scheduled to commence today at 11am Dominican Republic time,” and again included the Zoom link for the hearing. A delivery receipt was received in relation to this final email, confirming delivery of the email to Beltre.

31. After Beltre failed to appear despite repeated attempts to contact him, the AHO proceeded with the Hearing as scheduled by Zoom on 25 March 2026. The ITIA and its counsel, two Spanish/English interpreters, an observer from ITF, and the AHO participated in the Hearing.

32. The transcript from the Hearing was provided to the AHO on 14 April 2026.

IV. Contentions of the Parties

33. The ITIA contends that its “investigation of Mr. Beltre arises from notifications from the International Betting Integrity Association (the ‘IBIA’) to the ITIA of suspicious betting on several of his matches.” (ITIA Br. ¶ 5.1.) The ITIA “contends that there is more than a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Beltre contrived aspects of his matches, received money to contrive aspects of his matches, attempted to contrive aspects of his matches, and failed to

report corrupt approaches and Corruption Offenses, all as charged in the Notice.” (*Id.* ¶ 6.4.) The key evidence on which ITIA relies includes: bets placed by “known suspicious bettor, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] messages between Beltre and his doubles partner Villalona, messages between Beltre and Cruz, and messages between Beltre and “known corruptors”; match scorecards; statements made by Beltre during his interviews with ITIA; statements made by Cruz during his interview with ITIA; video footage showing examples of Beltre’s “intentional double faults”; the witness statement of ITIA Investigator George Child; the witness statement of ITIA Betting Liaison Mark Swarbrick; and the witness statement of ITIA Analyst Zoran Preradovic. (*Id.* ¶ 6.5.) “The ITIA submits that in all circumstances it is more likely than not that Mr. Beltre has committed the Corruption Offenses as alleged in the Notice.” (*Id.* ¶ 6.6.)

34. With respect to the sanction, the ITIA contends:
 - a. Under the TACP Sanctioning Guidelines (the “Guidelines”), the starting sanction under offender categorization A1 is permanent ineligibility and a fine of up to \$75,000 given the number of offenses alleged, in addition to repayment of corrupt payments;
 - b. The appropriate level of sanction for Beltre is:
 - i. A period of 20 years ineligibility; and
 - ii. A fine of \$75,000.

35. Beltre failed to provide any answering submission or evidence, and failed to appear for the Hearing. The only submissions from Beltre are his 22 October 2025 and 28 October 2025 emails responding to the Notice of Major Offenses, denying all charged Corruption Offenses.

V. **Findings**

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

adjudicator to render a determination in this case.

37. It is undisputed that the applicable rules are the TACP 2022, TACP 2023 and TACP 2024 with regard to the Corruption Offenses and the TACP 2025 with regard to the procedure.

38. Section G.2.b of the TACP provides:

“The Covered Person shall have the right (i) to be present and to be heard at the Hearing and (ii) to be represented at the Hearing, at their expense, by legal counsel. The Covered Person may choose not to appear at the Hearing, but rather to provide a written submission for consideration by the AHO, in which case the AHO shall take such submission into account in making their Decision. However, the non-attendance of the Covered Person or their representative at the Hearing, after proper notice of the Hearing has been provided, shall not prevent the AHO from proceeding with the Hearing in their absence, whether or not any written submissions are made on their behalf.”

39. Beltre was repeatedly provided proper notice of the Hearing. Thus, pursuant to Section G.2.b, the Hearing proceeded in Beltre’s absence.

40. 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.

41. 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.”

42. 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

43. The ITIA alleges that Beltre has committed four (4) Corruption Offenses with respect to

his doubles match with Maikel Villalona against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] November 2022 (“Match # 1”); one (1) Corruption Offense with respect to his singles match against [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] February 2023 (“Match # 2”); two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to his singles match against [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] February 2023 (“Match #3”); one (1) Corruption Offense with respect to his doubles match with [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] February 2023 (“Match #4”); one (1) Corruption Offense with respect to his singles match against [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] February 2023 (“Match #5”); two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to his doubles match with [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] June 2023 (“Match # 6”); three (3) Corruption Offenses with respect to his doubles match with [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] August 2023 (“Match #7”); two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to Cruz’s singles match against [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] November 2023 (“Match #8”); one (1) Corruption Offense with respect to his singles match against [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] November 2023 (“Match #9”); two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to Cruz’s doubles match with [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] November 2023 (“Match #10”); and two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to Cruz’s doubles match with [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] March 2024 (“Match # 11”).²

Match #1

44. The ITIA asserts that Beltre contrived two aspects of Match #1 each in violation of

² At the hearing, the ITIA presented a “summary of Beltre Charges” purporting to identify 22 charges against Beltre across 11 matches. The reference to 22 charges appears to have been a computational error. I am not aware of any modification of the Corruption Offenses alleged in the Notice of Major Offenses, and thus I address the 21 alleged offenses as set forth in the Notice of Major Offenses.

Section D.1.d (Charges 1-2), received money on the basis of not giving his best efforts in violation of Section D.1.f (Charge 3), and failed to report a Corruption Offense committed by Villalona in violation of Section D.2.a.ii (Charge 4) of the TACP 2022.

45. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #1:

- a. A suspicious betting alert from IBIA identifying bets placed by a suspicious bettor known to the ITIA, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on Beltre and Villalona to lose the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set and the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match;
- b. Betting data for [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- c. Mark Swarbrick's testimony regarding the nature of the bets placed by [REDACTED] on Match #1;
- d. The match scorecard showing, consistent with the suspicious bets, that Beltre and Villalona lost the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set and the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set;
- e. Messages between Beltre and Villalona following the match discussing their compensation for fixing the match, specifically a \$908 payment sent to Beltre via Western Union and split evenly between Beltre and Villalona; and
- f. Investigator Child's testimony that to his "knowledge, Mr. Beltre never made a report to the ITIA of any corrupt approach or corruption offense."

46. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre violated the TACP 2022 by contriving two aspects of Match #1 each in violation of Section D.1.d (Charges 1-2), receiving money on the basis of not giving his best efforts in violation of Section D.1.f (Charge 3), and failing to report Villalona's Corruption Offense in violation of Section D.2.a.ii (Charge 4).

Match # 2

47. The ITIA asserts that Beltre failed to report a corrupt approach with respect to Match # 2 in violation of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023 (Charge 5).

48. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offense with respect to Match #2:

- a. Beltre's 4 April 2025 interview with Investigator Child, in which Beltre admitted that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] approached him to fix the first match he played in during the first ITF Future tournament he participated in during 2023; and
- b. Investigator Child's testimony that Beltre has never made a report to the ITIA of any corrupt approach.

49. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre failed to report a corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023 (Charge 5).

Match # 3

50. The ITIA asserts that Beltre contrived two aspects of this match each in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charges 6-7).

51. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #3:

- a. A suspicious betting alert from IBIA identifying bets placed by [REDACTED] on Beltre to lose the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match;
- b. Betting data for [REDACTED]
- c. Mark Swarbrick's testimony regarding the nature of the bets placed by [REDACTED] on Match #3;

- d. Messages between Beltre and “ [REDACTED] from before Match # 3 in which Beltre agrees to contrive his [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] service games of the match;
- e. The match scorecard evidencing that Beltre lost his [REDACTED] service game of the [REDACTED] set of this match but won the [REDACTED] service game of the [REDACTED] set;
- f. Messages between [REDACTED] and “ [REDACTED] another corruptor known to ITIA, discussing Beltre’s agreement to fix aspects of the match; and
- g. Messages between Beltre and [REDACTED] following Match # 3, in which Beltre states he did not complete the fix because money had not been transferred;

52. Whether or not Beltre 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.

53. Having considered all of the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre contrived two aspects of Match # 3 in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charges 6-7).

Match # 4

54. The ITIA asserts that Beltre contrived the outcome of the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charge 8).

55. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offense with respect to Match #4:

- a. A suspicious betting alert from IBIA identifying bets placed by [REDACTED] on Beltre to lose the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match;
- b. Betting data for [REDACTED]

- c. The testimony of Mark Swarbrick, including that “[t]he [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match was Mr. Beltre’s service game. Mr. Beltre served a double fault on the [REDACTED] point of this game. In my experience, the likelihood of a male tennis player of Mr. Beltre’s experience serving a double fault on any given serve is about 5%.” Swarbrick further testified that in his “opinion, it is extremely unlikely that Mr. [REDACTED] would place two wagers on a single point within this match—Mr. [REDACTED] only wagers on any match that day—without knowing the outcome of the point in advance. Mr. Beltre’s double fault corroborates my opinion.”; and
- d. The match scorecard evidencing that, consistent with the suspicious bets, Beltre lost the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match by double faulting.

56. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre contrived an aspect of Match # 5 in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charge 8).

Match #5

57. The ITIA asserts that Beltre attempted to contrive an aspect of this match, in violation of Section D.1.n of the TACP 2023 (Charge 9).

58. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offense with respect to Match #4:

- a. Messages between Beltre and [REDACTED] from 18 February 2023 in which [REDACTED] tells Beltre he will pay Beltre in advance for an agreed-upon fix, and Beltre responds that he would fix the match but would not lose the match at a score of [REDACTED] provided payment was made in advance. After the match, Beltre wrote to [REDACTED] stating “you didn’t tell me anything.”

59. 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.

60. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre attempted to contrive an aspect of Match # 5 in violation of Section D.1.n of the TACP 2023 (Charge 9).

Match #6

61. The ITIA asserts that Beltre contrived the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set and the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charges 10-11).

62. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #6:

- a. A suspicious betting alert from IBIA identifying bets placed on Beltre and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to lose the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set and the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set;
- b. The match scorecard confirming, consistent with the suspicious bets, Beltre and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] lost the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set and the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set;
- c. Video footage showing that Beltre used less than his best efforts; and
- d. Mark Swarbrick’s testimony regarding the nature of the bets placed on Match #6.

63. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre contrived the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set and the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, both in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charges 10-11).

Match # 7

64. The ITIA asserts that Beltre contrived two aspects of Match #7—the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] services games of this match—each in violation of Section D.1.d (Charges 12-13), and failed to report a corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i (Charge 14) of the TACP 2023.

65. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #7:

- a. Messages between Beltre and a corruptor known to the ITIA as “[REDACTED]” for Beltre to lose his [REDACTED] two service games of this match to “0 or 15” in exchange for \$1,200 and a tennis racket;
- b. Beltre’s 30 July 2024 interview with Investigator Child, admitting that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] approached him to fix the match; and
- c. Investigator Child’s testimony that Beltre has never made a report to the ITIA of any corrupt approach.

66. Although shortly before the match, Beltre stated that he didn’t intend to go through with the fix (“[n]othing’s going, you didn’t send nor tell me),” as previously discussed, “the mere fact that [the athlete] reached an agreement violates on its own” the rules prohibiting contrivance.

CAS 2014/A/3467, Guillermo Olaso de la Rica v. TIU, ¶ 109.

67. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre contrived the outcome of his [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] services games of this match, resulting in two violations of Section D.1.d (Charges 12-13), and failed to report a corrupt approach, in violation of Section D.2.a.i of the TACP 2023 (Charge 14).

Match #8

68. The ITIA asserts that Beltre facilitated Cruz’s attempt to contrive Match #8 in violation of

Section D.1.o (Charge 15), and failed to report Cruz’s attempted contrivance of this match in violation of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2023 (Charge 16).

69. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #8:

- a. Messages between Beltre and “██████” in which Beltre informed ██████ “I’ve got something for you, a trusty friend is playing tomorrow, we can do something with him,” and “1 thousand for the █████ set █████ let me know.” In response to a request for the player’s name, Beltre stated “he got the █████ and sent a photograph of the draw reflecting Cruz’s match against ██████
- b. Messages between Cruz and Beltre, in which 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.” 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.” Cruz followed up with Beltre asking: “But what about the result?” “Is it not possible?” Beltre responded: “Not like this.” (*Id.*)
- c. Investigator Child’s testimony that Beltre never made a report to the ITIA of any corruption offense.

70. Although the result reflects that Cruz didn’t actually fix Match #8, as discussed above, 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.

71. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre facilitated Cruz’s attempt to contrive Match #8 in violation of Section D.1.o (Charge 15), and failed to report Cruz’s attempt to contrive, in violation of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2023 (Charge 16).

Match # 9

72. The ITIA asserts that Beltre contrived the [REDACTED] set of Match #9, in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charge 17).

73. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #9:

- a. Messages between Beltre and [REDACTED] in which Beltre and [REDACTED] agreed that Beltre would be paid to lose the [REDACTED] set of this match at a score of [REDACTED] and
- b. The match scorecard confirming that Beltre lost the [REDACTED] set of this match at a score of [REDACTED]

74. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre contrived the [REDACTED] set of this match, in violation of Section D.1.d of the TACP 2023 (Charge 17).

Match # 10

75. The ITIA asserts that Beltre facilitated Cruz’s contrivance of Match #10 in violation of Section D.1.o (Charge 18), and failed to report Cruz’s contrivance of this match in violation of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2023 (Charge 19).

76. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #9:

- a. Messages between Cruz and Beltre;
- b. Cruz's 17 March 2025 interview with Investigator Child, in which Cruz stated that Beltre approached him to fix this match;
- c. The match scorecard; and
- d. Investigator Child's testimony that to his knowledge Beltre has never made a report to the ITIA of any corruption offense.

77. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre solicited, facilitated, or incited Cruz to commit, attempt, agree or conspire to commit a Corruption Offense, in violation of Section D.1.o of the TACP 2023 (Charge 18).

78. I find, however, that the ITIA has failed to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre failed to report Cruz's contrivance of his service games during this match because the ITIA has not met its burden of proving that Cruz contrived an aspect of this match.

79. As previously discussed, whether or not Cruz successfully carried out an agreed-upon contrivance is not dispositive of whether he has committed a Corruption Offense because "the mere fact that [the athlete] reached an agreement violates on its own" the rules prohibiting contrivance. CAS 2014/A/3467, *Guillermo Olaso de la Rica v. TIU*, ¶ 109.

80. Here, however, the messages between Cruz and Beltre fail to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that an agreement was ever reached. 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. While these messages evidence that Beltre solicited or incited Cruz to commit a Corruption Offense, I am not persuaded that the messages demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cruz ever agreed to contrive any aspect of the match.

81. 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 of proving that Cruz ever agreed to Beltre’s proposed fix. 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.

82. Because 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 with respect to Cruz has not been established, I find that the ITIA has likewise failed to meet its burden of proving that Beltre failed to report a Corruption Offense by Cruz with respect to this match.

Match # 11

83. The ITIA asserts that Beltre facilitated Cruz’s attempted Corruption Offense with respect to Match #11 in violation of Section D.1.o (Charge 20), and failed to report Cruz’s attempted contrivance of this match in violation of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2024 (Charge 21).

84. The ITIA primarily relies on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #11:

- a. Messages between Cruz and Beltre discussing a possible fix for this match;

- b. Cruz's 17 March 2025 interview with Investigator Child, in which Cruz admitted that Beltre approached him to fix this match; and
- c. Investigator Child's testimony that to his knowledge Beltre has never made a report to the ITIA of any corruption offense.

85. Having considered all the evidence, I find that the ITIA has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Beltre facilitated Cruz's attempted contrivance of Match # 11, in violation of Section D.1.o (Charge 20), and failed to report Cruz's Corruption Offense, in violation of Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2024 (Charge 21).

B) Sanction

86. 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.

87. 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.

88. 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).

89. 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.

90. 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).

91. ITIA contends that Beltre "meets the qualifications of a level A culpability offender because his alleged offenses involve (i) a high degree of planning or premeditation, (ii) initiating or leading others (Mr. Villalona and Mr. Cruz) to commit offenses, and (iii) multiple offenses over a protracted period of time." (ITIA Br. ¶ 7.9.1.)

92. I find that Beltre's culpability falls within Category A. The ITIA has proven that Beltre committed 20 Corruption Offenses from November 2022 to March 2024, which easily qualifies as "multiple offenses over a protracted period." Furthermore, many of the offenses involved a "high degree of planning or premeditation," and Beltre led and initiated others—in particular, Mr. Cruz—to commit offenses. I thus find Beltre bears "high" or Category A culpability.

93. As to impact, ITIA submits that "Beltre meets the qualifications of a level 1 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., (ii) his alleged offenses had a significant, material impact on the integrity of the sport; and (iii) he is alleged to have received material gain from his corrupt activity.” (ITIA Br. ¶ 7.9.2.)

94. I find Beltre’s conduct falls within impact Category 1. He has committed 15 Corruption Offenses that do not fall under D.1.a, D.1.b, D.1.q, or D.2, and the volume and type of offenses committed by Beltre have a significant, material impact on the reputation and/or integrity of the sport.

95. Thus, viewing culpability and impact together, I conclude Beltre’s conduct falls within Category A.1.

96. The starting point for a Category A.1 period of ineligibility under the Guidelines is a life ban, with a category range of 10 years to a life-ban. The ITIA has requested a 20-year ban and a fine of \$75,0000.

97. 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.

98. Here, I do not find any mitigating factors warrant a downward adjustment from the starting point. With respect to aggravating factors, I note that after disputing the charges, requesting an evidentiary hearing and confirming his intention to attend, Beltre failed to submit any evidence or appear for the evidentiary hearing. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in light of ITIA’s request for a 20-year ban, a sanction below the starting point of permanent ineligibility, I decline to impose an upward adjustment from the starting point in this case.

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

100. Having considered the submissions and evidence, and given ITIA's request for a 20-year ban, I conclude that a period of ineligibility of twenty (20) years is proportionate and appropriate in this case.

101. As to the level of the fine, the ITIA submits that I should impose a fine of \$75,000.

102. 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," Beltre is viewed as having committed eleven (11) offenses, and the fine scale is \$50,001 to \$75,000.

103. I find that a fine of \$55,000 is appropriate. The imposed fine may be paid in installments as determined by the ITIA.

VI. Conclusion and Orders

104. Accordingly, my Order is as follows:

- a. Beltre is found to have violated Sections D.1.d, D.1.f, and D.2.a.ii of TACP 2022, D.1.d, D.1.n, D.1.o, D.2.a.i, and D.2.a.ii of TACP 2023, and D.1.o and D.2.a.ii of TACP 2024.
- b. Beltre is declared ineligible from Participation in any Sanctioned Event for a period of 20 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 2045.

- c. A fine of \$55,000 is imposed upon Beltre. 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