

## TENNIS ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAM

**Angel Josue Maleno Rosario,**

Covered Person,

**Jesus Maleno Rosario,**

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. Angel Josue Maleno Rosario (“AMR”) is a 22-year-old tennis player from the Dominican Republic. At all times relevant to this case, AMR was a “Covered Person” bound by the TACP.
3. Jesus Maleno Rosario (“JMR”) is a 26-year-old tennis player from the Dominican Republic. At all times relevant to this case, JMR was a “Covered Person” bound by the TACP.

#### **II. The Notice of Major Offenses to AMR**

4. On 15 October 2025, ITIA sent AMR a Notice of Major Offenses alleging that he had committed a total of four (4) Corruption Offenses over the course of two (2) tennis matches occurring in June and August 2022. Specifically, the ITIA alleged that AMR had:

- a. Contrived aspects of his [REDACTED] June 2022 doubles match with JMR against [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d;

- b. Received \$300 to lose a service game in the [REDACTED] June 2022 doubles match in breach of Section D.1.f;
  - c. Failed to report a corrupt approach in connection with the [REDACTED] June 2022 doubles match in breach of Section D.2.a.i; and
  - d. Failed to report a corrupt approach in connection with his [REDACTED] August 2022 singles match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.2.a.i.
5. The ITIA proposed a sanction for the asserted breaches of the TACP of 4 years ineligibility and a fine of \$7,500.
6. On 15 October 2025, AMR provided the following response to the Notice of Major Offenses: “I already told you what happened to my career, I have not fixed games, and if you want to see me personally let me know when you are in Parque del Este and I go and talk personally.”<sup>1</sup>
7. The same day, AMR sent another response stating as follows:
- They have seen my performance and how my career is. I only work and save money to travel and play professional tennis and still doubt me?, I just spent all my savings to attend two future in El Salvador and although I could not enter main draw I continue to train hard and work as a teacher to continue traveling until I become a professional, and still they doubt me, please realize that I am just a boy from the Dominican Republic wanting to be ATP AND REPRESENT ALL THOSE WHO COME FROM 0. I don't want to stop playing tennis until I achieve my goals of being a professional, please let me continue with my career.
8. On 28 October 2025, AMR provided the additional following response:
- 1- I deny the crime of corruption before [REDACTED] [REDACTED] party.
  - 2- When they interviewed me I told them that at that time I did not remember exactly what was the match in which the stranger had appeared to offer me money, and I did not confirm with certainty that that match was against the players that you mentioned in the email you sent me.

---

<sup>1</sup> The players submitted their responses in Spanish. ITIA provided free translations of the responses, which are quoted here.

Now I remember better, and I can confirm that the stranger did not appear in the match against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Taking that into account I want to make it clear that: I deny the crime of corruption against the players [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

- 3- The match in which the stranger appeared was against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] the stranger gave me 200 dollars before entering the court so that I would lose game number [REDACTED] and he told me that he was going to give me 200 more but when I left the court he only gave me 100 more and told me that I did not comply with what he asked me and that I am a bad player who he gets nervous.

My brother didn't know anything about this, until the game was over and he asked me why I was playing more nervously than usual and I explained what happened with the stranger, which made my brother angry and we argued for a while. It is worth noting that my brother and I thought the stranger was just a coach or some random person; we never thought about the possibility of fixing that match, and we never intended to do so.

### **III. The Notice of Offense to JMR**

9. On 15 October 2025, ITIA sent JMR a Notice of Offense asserting that he had committed a total of two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to one tennis match occurring in June 2022.

Specifically, the ITIA alleged that AMR had:

- a. Contrived aspects of his [REDACTED] June 2022 doubles match with AMR against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d; and
- b. Failed to report AMR's Corruption Offense in violation of Section D.2.a.ii.

10. The ITIA proposed a sanction for the asserted breaches of the TACP of 1 year and 10 months ineligibility, incorporating a 25% discount for early acceptance on the basis that he would not appeal, and a fine of \$3,750.

11. On 28 October 2025, JMR responded to the Notice of Offense, stating:

Me and my brother Angel Maleno were playing against two players named [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] when the match ended I asked my brother why he was playing more nervous than usual, my brother explained to me that before the match a stranger offered him 200 dollars to lose game number [REDACTED] and after the match he gave him 100 more, When I found out I got very upset and argued with my brother.

I never thought it was match-fixing or anything like that, that's why I didn't inform anyone. I figured he was just an ordinary stranger.

12. The same day, JMR provided the following additional response: "Taking into account what I have just told you in the previous email, I want to make it clear that: I deny the crime of corruption."

#### **IV. Procedural Background**

13. On 7 November 2025, I was appointed to serve as the Anti-Corruption Hearing Officer ("AHO") to adjudicate these matters.

14. On 19 November 2025, ITIA submitted that "[d]ue to the overlapping factual background, the ITIA requests, under Section G.1.i of the TACP, that the proceedings against Angel and Jesus Maleno Rosario be procedurally consolidated."

15. On 19 November 2025, the AHO held a procedural conference to determine the procedure leading up to and including the Hearing of these matters. The procedural conference was attended by AMR, JMR, counsel for ITIA, and a Spanish/English interpreter.

16. During the procedural conference, and as memorialized in Procedural Order #1 dated 21 November 2025, I directed that "[d]ue to the overlapping factual background, these proceedings will be procedurally consolidated."

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

- a. ITIA's opening submission was due on or before 15 January 2026;
- b. The Covered Persons' answering submission(s) was due on or before 12 February 2026;
- c. ITIA's reply submission was due on or before 19 February 2026; and

- d. The Covered Persons' reply submission(s) was due on or before 26 February 2026.
18. As set forth in Procedural Order # 1, the hearing was set for 4 March 2026, to be conducted virtually and in English.
19. On 15 January 2026, ITIA timely provided its written submission, including its exhibits and the witness statement of George Child.
20. The Covered Persons failed to provide any written submission by the 12 February 2026 deadline, or at any time thereafter.
21. On 19 February 2026, ITIA made the following submission to the AHO:  
As outlined in the Procedural Order in this matter, 12 February 2026 was the Players' deadline to file a witness list, witness statements, and Answer brief. The Players filed no correspondence by this deadline. Accordingly, the ITIA has no response to file in accordance with today's deadline, nor can the ITIA identify the Players' witnesses it may wish to cross-examine.  
Section G.1.g of the Program requires written statements for any witness. This requirement would include the Players themselves. As matters stand, the Players should be precluded from testifying on their own behalf. In the event the Players misunderstood this requirement, we suggest giving the Players until Monday (23 February) to file their personal witness statement(s). In the event the Players avail themselves of that opportunity, the ITIA requests that its deadline to file a reply and supporting evidence be extended until 27 February.
22. On 20 February 2026, I issued the following directive: "In the absence of a request from the Covered Persons themselves to extend any of their deadlines set forth in the Procedural Order, those dates will not be extended. However, as parties to the proceedings, the Covered Persons have the right to be heard and they will be permitted to speak at the hearing."
23. On 22 February 2026, AMR submitted an email stating:  
The hearing had already been scheduled for another date, not for March 4, we agree that the process should be followed with the main date, the date is: March 15.  
2- Taking into account the country of us players, and the predominant language in our country: Dominican Republic, it is requested that the trial be in Spanish.

24. On 23 February 2026, I informed the parties that “[i]n response to the communication received yesterday, 22 February 2026, from Angel Maleno Rosario, the Hearing date specified in paragraph 16 of Procedural Order No. 1 is – and remains – 4 March 2026. In accordance with paragraph 17 of the Procedural Order: ‘The Hearing will be conducted in English’ and that remains the direction of the AHO. As specified in paragraph 17: ‘An interpreter fluent in both Spanish and English will be present throughout the Hearing via a simultaneous translation platform. The ITIA is responsible for the cost of the interpreter.’ If either of the Covered Persons wishes to request an extension of the Hearing date specified in the Procedural Order, such request must first be raised with counsel for ITIA and then with the AHO.”

25. On 27 February 2026, ITIA submitted the Hearing Bundles, including its proposed hearing schedule.

26. The Hearing for these matters was held virtually on 4 March 2026. The Covered Persons, ITIA and its counsel, two Spanish/English interpreters, an observer from ITF, and the AHO participated in the Hearing.

27. The transcript from the Hearing was provided to the AHO on 24 March 2026.

## **V. Contentions of the Parties**

28. The ITIA contends that its “investigation of Messrs. Maleno Rosario arises from notifications from the International Betting Integrity Association (the ‘IBIA’) to the ITIA of suspicious betting on several matches relating to professional tennis player Jasel Beltre.” (ITIA Br. at ¶ 5.1.) The ITIA “contends that there is more than a preponderance of the evidence that Messrs. Maleno Rosario contrived aspects of their matches and failed to report corrupt approach and Corruption Offenses, and that AMR received money for contriving the brothers’ doubles match, all as charged in the AMR Notice and JMR Notice.” (*Id.* ¶ 6.4.) The key evidence on

which ITIA relies includes: statements made by AMR during his 16 March 2025 interview; JMR's 9 April 2025 interview; the match scorecard for the ■ June 2022 doubles match against ■ ■ and ■ ■ "bets placed by known suspicious bettor ■ ■ and the witness statement of ITIA Investigator George Child. (*Id.* ¶ 6.5.) "The ITIA submits that in all circumstances it is more likely than not that AMR and JMR have committed the Corruption Offenses as alleged in their respective Notices." (*Id.* ¶ 6.6.)

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

- a. Under the TACP Sanctioning Guidelines (the "Guidelines"), the starting sanction under offender categorization B1 is a 10-year period of ineligibility and a fine of up to \$10,000 as well as repayment of the corrupt payments.
- b. The appropriate level of sanction for AMR is:
  - i. A period of 4 years ineligibility; and
  - ii. A fine of \$7,500.

30. With respect to the sanction for JMR, the ITIA contends:

- a. The starting sanction under offender categorization B2 is a 3-year period of ineligibility and a potential fine of up to \$25,000.
- b. Under the Guidelines, the appropriate level of sanction for JMR is:
  - i. A period of 2-years-and-6-months ineligibility; and
  - ii. A fine of \$3,750.

31. The Covered Persons deny all charges and allegations against them.

## **VI. Findings**

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

adjudicator to render a determination in these cases.

33. It is undisputed that the applicable rules are the TACP 2022 with regard to the Corruption Offenses and the TACP 2025 with regard to the procedure.

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

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

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

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

#### **A) Angel Josue Maleno Rosario**

##### Alleged Corruption Offenses

37. The ITIA alleges that AMR has committed three (3) Corruption Offenses with respect to his doubles match with JMR against ██████████ and ██████████ on █████ June 2022 (“Match # 1”), and one (1) Corruption Offense with respect to his singles match against ██████████ on █████ August 2022 (“Match # 2”).

38. With respect to Match #1, the ITIA asserts that AMR contrived aspects of Match #1 in violation of Section D.1.d, received money on the basis of not giving his best efforts in violation of Section D.1.f, and failed to report the corrupt approach in violation of Section D.2.a.i.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> In its pre-hearing brief, the ITIA describes its third charge against AMR with respect to Match # 1 as “AMR had knowledge of JMR’s Corruption Offenses related to this match but did not report

39. The ITIA relies primarily on the following evidence to establish the alleged offenses with respect to Match #1: purported “suspicious bets placed by a suspicious better known to the ITIA, ██████████ ██████████ on AMR and JMR to lose the ██████████ set of this match ██████████ the match scorecard showing AMR and JMR lost the ██████████ set ██████████ AMR’s admission during his 16 March 2025 interview with ITIA that he was approached and agreed to lose one of his service games; and the testimony of Investigator George Child.

40. During his 16 March 2025 interview, AMR admitted to receiving a corrupt approach, to being offered \$400 to lose one game in his match, with \$200 to be provided up front and \$200 to be given after the match, and to accepting the money to lose the game. (Ex. 44 at p. 19-20; *see also id.* at 24 (confirming he “did agree to lose one of [his] services games in that match”; *id.* at 26 (“He promised 400 at the start but then he ended up giving me 300.”).)

41. Investigator Child testified that “[t]o [his] knowledge, neither Mr. Angel Josue Maleno Rosario nor Mr. Jesus Maleno Rosario ever made a report to the ITIA of any corrupt approach or corruption offense.” (Child WS ¶ 20.) During his interview with Investigator Child, AMR admitted that he never reported the corrupt approach to the ITIA. (Ex. 44 at 28.) And likewise at the Hearing, AMR confirmed that the first time he reported this corrupt approach to the ITIA was in his interview with Investigator Child. (Hearing Tr. at 13.)

42. In responding to the Notice of Major Offenses, AMR disputes that the match in which he was approached and received money to lose a game involved ██████████ and ██████████ and instead states that the relevant match was against ██████████ and ██████████ But under Section E.5, the

---

those offenses.” (ITIA Br. ¶ 5.2(a).) And in its presentation at the hearing, the ITIA submitted a presentation identifying only 2 charges against AMR with respect to Match #1. Given that the ITIA made no suggestion that it was modifying or withdrawing the corruption offenses alleged in the Notice of Major Offenses, the AHO addresses the alleged offenses as set forth in the Notice of Major Offenses.

“[e]stablishment of a Corruption Offense under this Program shall not require . . . identification of the Event to which a Corruption Offense pertains.” Thus, it is of no legal moment which particular match AMR agreed to lose one game in for purposes of determining whether he has committed the alleged offenses.

43. Furthermore, at the hearing AMR stated: “I didn’t know why [the stranger] gave me 200 and then after that he gave me 100 and I didn’t know why he gave me 200.” (Hearing Tr. at 13.) I do not find credible AMR’s testimony that he did not know why the stranger provided him money, given his clear statements during his interview with Investigator Child and in his response to the Notice of Major Offenses that he was offered the money to lose one game in his match.

44. AMR also suggests that he did not follow through with contriving the match, stating in his response to the Notice of Major Offenses that “the stranger gave me 200 dollars before entering the court so that I would lose game number ■ and he told me that he was going to give me 200 more but when I left the court he only gave me 100 more and told me that I did not comply with what he asked me and that I am a bad player who . . . gets nervous.” Whether or not AMR successfully carried out the 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.

45. Based on the foregoing, I find that the ITIA has met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that AMR has committed breaches of Sections D.1.d (contriving), D.1.f (receipt of money), and D.2.a.i (failure to report a corrupt approach) of the TACP 2022.

46. With respect to Match # 2, the ITIA alleges that AMR failed to report a corrupt approach, relying principally on AMR’s 16 March 2025 interview with Investigator Child.

47. During his interview, AMR stated that the same individual approached him a second time “when I was playing challenger” in 2023 in [REDACTED] against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Ex. 44 at 26-27.) AMR further stated that the individual offered him \$3000, with \$500 to be paid in advance, but that he “said no.” (*Id.* at 26.) And, as discussed above, Investigator Child testified that to his knowledge AMR has not reported any corrupt approach. Based on the foregoing, I find that ITIA has met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that AMR has breached Section D.2.a.1 (failure to report a corrupt approach).

48. Accordingly, the alleged breaches of Sections D.1.d, D.1.f, and D.2.a.i of TACP 2022 by AMR have been established.

#### Sanction

49. 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.

50. 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.

51. 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).

52. 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.

53. 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).

54. ITIA contends that AMR "meets the qualifications of a level B culpability because his alleged offenses involve (i) some planning or premeditation and (ii) acting in concert with others (Mr. Beltre and JMR)." (ITIA Br. ¶ 7.9.1.)

55. I find that AMR's culpability falls within Category B as the offenses involved "some planning or premeditation" and he has committed "several offenses." As discussed below, I do not find AMR was acting in concert with JMR, nor did ITIA present evidence establishing AMR was acting in concert with Mr. Beltre. Nonetheless, because the offenses involved some planning or premeditation and several offenses have been proven, I find AMR bears "medium" or

Category B culpability.

56. As to impact, ITIA submits that “AMR 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.)

57. While two of the four proven offenses do not fall under D.1.a., D.1.b., D.1.q., or D.2., I find that the offenses are more properly viewed as having a “material impact on the reputation and/or integrity of the sport” rather than a “significant, material impact on the reputation and/or integrity of the sport.” In addition, AMR obtained little material gain from his offenses. I thus find, having considered all of the evidence, that AMR’s conduct falls within impact Category 2.

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

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

60. 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.

61. Here, I do not find any aggravating or mitigating circumstances warrant an upward or downward adjustment from the starting point.

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

63. Having considered the submissions and evidence, I conclude that a period of ineligibility of three (3) years is proportionate and appropriate in this case.

64. As to the level of the fine, the ITIA submits that I should impose a fine of \$7,500.

65. 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,” AMR is viewed as having committed two offenses, one for Match #1 and one for Match # 2, and the fine scale is \$0 to \$25,000.

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

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

68. When asked during his interview how much money he has made playing tennis, AMR stated “maybe two times in main draw, like \$40/50 dollar,” “I have like \$150 \$100 I don’t know,” while acknowledging that in tournaments in the Dominican Republic he wins money but “not ITF level.” (Ex. 44 at 14-15.) And at the hearing, AMR testified that to play in tournaments, he “has to be a ball boy and [he] has to teach classes.” (Hearing Tr. at 9.) ITIA does not dispute any of AMR’s assertions of modest means and insignificant revenues from playing tennis.

69. In light of AMR's financial circumstances, I find that a fine of \$2,000 is appropriate. The imposed fine may be paid in installments as determined by the ITIA.

**B) Jesus Maleno Rosario**

Alleged Corruption Offenses

70. The ITIA alleges that JMR has committed two (2) Corruption Offenses with respect to Match # 1, his doubles match with AMR against [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] June 2022.

71. ITIA contends that JMR contrived aspects of Match #1 in violation of TACP Section D.1.d, and failed to report a Corruption Offense in violation of Section D.2.a.ii. The ITIA relies on the following evidence to establish AMR contrived aspects of Match #1: purported "suspicious bets placed by a suspicious better known to the ITIA, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on AMR and JMR to lose the [REDACTED] set of this match [REDACTED] the match scorecard showing AMR and JMR lost the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] and double faulted four times; AMR's admission during his 16 March 2025 interview with ITIA that he was approached and agreed to lose one of his service games in exchange for compensation and that JMR was aware that he had agreed to fix his service game in this match.

72. I find that the ITIA has failed to meet its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that JMR contrived the [REDACTED] set of Match #1. With respect to this alleged offense, the ITIA relies solely on the betting data of what it describes as "a suspicious bettor known to the ITIA" that AMR and JMR would lose the [REDACTED] set of the match [REDACTED] the outcome of the set being [REDACTED] and evidence that AMR and JMR collectively double-faulted four times. But ITIA submitted no evidence that the level of double faulting was unusual or not within the typical range of players at this level nor any evidence that the [REDACTED] score of the [REDACTED] set was particularly unusual or unexpected. Nor is the fact that JMR was aware that AMR had agreed to lose one service game

(as discussed below) particularly probative of whether JMR participated in contriving the outcome of the [REDACTED] set of Match #1. In sum, under the facts and circumstances of this case, evidence that a “suspicious bettor known to the ITIA” made a bet on the outcome of the set that was ultimately true, and that JMR was at some point aware that AMR had agreed to fix a single game in that set, is insufficient to meet ITIA’s burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that JMR contrived the outcome of the set.

73. The ITIA has, however, met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that JMR failed to report a Corruption Offense in violation of Section D.2.a.ii. During his 16 March 2025 interview, AMR provided conflicting accounts of when he told JMR that he had agreed to lose one of his service games. At one point, AMR suggested he told JMR before the match, while later stating he told JMR after the match. Consistent with the latter account, in response to the Notice of Offense, JMR stated: “Me and my brother Angel Maleno were playing against two players named [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] when the match ended I asked my brother why he was playing more nervous than usual, my brother explained to me that before the match a stranger offered him 200 dollars to lose game number [REDACTED] and after the match he gave him 100 more. When I found out I got very upset and argued with my brother.”

74. But whether AMR told JMR about his agreement to lose game number [REDACTED] before or after the match is of no consequence for JMR’s failure to report. JMR acknowledged in his response to the Notice of Offense that he was aware that his brother had accepted money in exchange for losing a game of their doubles match.

75. Furthermore, as discussed above, the ITIA does not bear the burden of proving the particular event to which a Corruption Offense pertains, and thus I need not resolve whether the match at which AMR committed his offenses, and with respect to which JMR failed to report,

was Match # 1 or a different match as asserted by AMR and JMR.

76. Investigator Child testified that he is not aware of JMR making any report to the ITIA of any Corruption Offense, and neither JMR nor AMR presented any evidence otherwise.

77. Based on the foregoing evidence, I find that the ITIA has met its burden of proving that JMR breached Section D.2.a.ii for failure to report a Corruption Offense.

### Sanction

78. ITIA contends that the Corruption Offenses JMR committed may be categorized as B2, with a sanction of 2 years and 6 months (an increase to the proposed sanction in the Notice of Offense on the basis that the 25% discount no longer applies since JMR appealed).

79. ITIA contends that JMR “meets the qualifications of a level B culpability offender because his offenses involve (i) some planning or premeditation and (ii) acting in concert with others (Mr. Beltre and AMR).” (ITIA Br. ¶ 7.13.1.)

80. I find that JMR’s culpability falls within Category C as the ITIA has proven only a single offense of failure to report, which involved little or no planning.

81. As to impact, ITIA submits that “JMR meets the qualifications of a level 2 impact offender because (i) he committed offenses that do not fall under Section D.1.a, D.1.b, D.1.q, or D.2. and (ii) his offenses had a significant, material impact on the integrity of the sport.” (ITIA Br. ¶ 7.13.2.)

82. The ITIA has proven a single Corruption Offense under Section D.2. for failure to report. I find that JMR’s failure to report, while wrongful, had only a minor impact on the integrity and/or reputation of the sport and JMR received no material gain from his offense. I thus find, having considered all the evidence, that JMR’s conduct falls within impact Category 3.

83. Thus, viewing culpability and impact together, I conclude JMR's conduct falls within Category C.3.

84. The starting point for a Category C.3 period of ineligibility under the Guidelines is a 3-month suspension, with a category range of admonishment to a 6-month suspension.

85. I do not find any aggravating or mitigating circumstances warrant an upward or downward adjustment from the starting point.

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

87. Having considered the submissions and evidence, I conclude that a period of ineligibility of three (3) months is proportionate and appropriate in this case.

88. As to the level of the fine, the ITIA submits that I should impose a fine of \$3,750.

89. While the Guidelines state that "[o]rdinarily where there is a period of suspension a fine of at least \$1000 should also be imposed," given the facts and circumstances of this case, including that the only proven offense was a failure to report a corruption offense, I find that a fine of \$500 is appropriate. The imposed fine may be paid in installments as determined by the ITIA.

## **VII. Conclusion and Orders**

90. Accordingly, my Order in respect to AMR is as follows:

- a. AMR is found to have violated Sections D.1.d, D.1.f, and D.2.a.i of TACP 2022.
- b. AMR is declared ineligible from Participation in any Sanctioned Event for a period of 3 years commencing upon the day after the date of this Order. The suspension shall therefore commence on 25 April 2026 and end on 24 April 2029.

- c. A fine of \$2,000 is imposed upon AMR. Such fine must be paid in full by the Player prior to applying for reinstatement.
- 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.

91. Accordingly, my Order in respect to JMR is as follows:

- a. JMR is found to have violated Section D.2.a.ii of the TACP 2022.
- b. JMR is declared ineligible from Participation in any Sanctioned Event for a period of 3 months commencing upon the day after the date of this Order. The suspension shall therefore commence on 25 April 2026 and end on 24 July 2026.
- c. A fine of \$500 is imposed upon JMR. Such fine must be paid in full by the Player prior to applying for reinstatement.
- d. This Decision is the full, final and complete determination of the matter and is binding on all Parties. There are no further appeal rights in accordance with Section I.1 of the TACP 2025.
- e. This Decision shall be publicly reported as set forth in Section G of the TACP.

Ordered, this 24th day of April, 2026



---

Jeffrey A. Mishkin