

**IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT
UNDER THE RULES
OF THE WORLD PROFESSIONAL BILLIARDS AND SNOOKER ASSOCIATION**



**Tim Ollerenshaw, Chair
Gordon McKay
Tarik Shamel**

BETWEEN:

WORLD PROFESSIONAL BILLIARDS AND SNOOKER ASSOCIATION ("WPBSA")

World governing body for Snooker and Billiards

-and-

**DAVID JOHN
&
JAMIE JONES**

Respondents

**DECISION
OF
THE WPBSA DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

BACKGROUND AND INVESTIGATION

1. This is the Decision of the Disciplinary Committee of the WPBSA convened to hear charges brought by the WPBSA against David John and Jamie Jones, professional snooker players in connection with betting and match-fixing in contravention of Rules of the WPBSA to which they were and are subject.
2. As a result of information from betting operators supplied to Nigel Mawer QPM, Vice-Chair of the WPBSA, he commenced a thorough investigation into whether charges of misconduct should be brought against David John. Following an analysis of the betting material obtained from the various bookmakers, several interviews with David John took place namely on 18 November 2017, 26 February 2018, 16 September 2018 and 6 October 2018. As a result of

the interviews the Player admitted responsibility which informed the framing of and formal admission to the the subsequent charges.

3. During interviews David John also alleged that another Player, Jamie Jones had been involved in the match-fixing. Following his allegation, Nigel Mawer QPM, Vice-Chair of the WPBSA commenced an investigation as a result of which the WPBSA brought ultimately six charges against Jamie Jones. Following two interviews with Jamie Jones, the Player admitted responsibility for one charge (namely Charge no. 5) and denied all other five charges.

DAVID JOHN

The Charges

4. David John was charged as follows, that:

1. ***He agreed to fix the outcome of his match with Graeme Dott on 29 September 2016 at the International Championship Qualifiers in the UK (in breach of Rule 2.1.2.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules – Betting Rules);***

or

- 1a. ***Passed information about the outcome of the match, which information he had by virtue of his being involved in professional snooker as a player competing in the match. That information related to his performance in the Match (in breach of Rule 2.1.3.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules – Betting Rules).***

2. ***He agreed to fix the outcome of his match with Joe Perry on 24 January 2017 at the China Open Qualifiers (in breach of Rule 2.1.2.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules – Betting Rules);***

or

- 2a. ***Passed information about the outcome of the match, which information he had by virtue of his being involved in professional snooker as a player competing in the match. That information related to his performance in the Match (in breach of Rule 2.1.3.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules – Betting Rules).***

3. *He failed to cooperate with the investigation by failing to provide mobile phone itemised billing that was requested of him during the investigation (in breach of Rule 4.4 of the WPBSA Members Rules.*

The Rules

5. The Rules of the WPBSA relevant to the disposal of this case are as follows:

Extracts from WPBSA MEMBER RULES AND REGULATIONS

SECTION 2 – BETTING RULES

2. Betting Misconduct

2.1 It shall be a breach of these Rules for a Member to do any of the following:

2.1.2.1 to fix or contrive, or to be a party to any effort to fix or contrive, the result, score, progress, conduct or any other aspect of the Tour and/or any Tournament or Match;

2.1.3.1 to use for betting purposes, or to provide to any other person for such purposes, any information relating to the Tour and/or any Tournament or Match that the Member possesses by virtue of his position within the sport and that is not in the public domain or readily accessible by the public;

SECTION 1 – GENERAL

4. Reporting Breaches

.....

4.4 Each Member shall co-operate with the WPBSA in any investigation carried out by the WPBSA under the provisions of these Rules including (but not limited to):

4.4.1 Providing a written statement setting out in detail all of the facts and circumstances with respect to any alleged breach;

4.4.2 Attending to answer questions and provide such information at a time and place determined by the WPBSA

4.4.3 Providing to the WPBSA upon its request any documents, information or any other material of any nature whatsoever held by the Member; and

4.4.4 Procuring and providing to the WPBSA upon its request any documents, information or any other material of any nature whatsoever not held by the Member which the Member has the power to obtain.

4.4.5 Providing the WPBSA with access to all records relating to the alleged breach. This includes, but is not limited to; betting accounts, bank records, telephone records, internet service records, social media accounts, email and other records stored on phones, tablets, electronic devices, computer hard drives or otherwise. To facilitate this, the Member will surrender any such devices for examination by the WPBSA or its representative.

Evidence and Hearing

6. The evidence available to the Disciplinary Committee and considered by it was all that contained in the items identified in the Hearing Bundle as set out in the list annexed to this Decision.
7. In his statement dated 5 November 2018, David John admitted the breaches of the three primary charges put to him.
8. At the Hearing on 18 December 2018 the Player repeated his acceptance of breaches, namely that:-
 1. He had fixed the outcome of his match with Graeme Dott on 29 September 2016; and
 2. He had fixed the outcome of his match with Joe Perry on 24 January 2017; and
 3. He had failed to cooperate with the investigation by failing to provide mobile phone itemised billing
9. At the Hearing the Player repeated his allegation against Jamie Jones, namely that the 'fixes' had come about because David John was introduced by another professional player Jamie Jones to 'A' who among other interests ran a snooker club in Neath.
10. David John alleged that 'A' required John to lose his match with Dott 6-0 or 6-1 for which he was paid £5,000.
11. At the Hearing David John expressed his regret. The Committee records, however, the extremely serious nature of these proven charges and the impact which they have on the sport where the public and other participants in the sport ought to be able to rely on the absolute integrity of the professional players within it.

Findings

12. Based upon the admissions of the Player and other credible evidence available the Committee found that there were contraventions of the Rules as specifically set out in the primary Charges identified above. The alternative charges originally put to David John fall away.
13. Sanctions to be decided following written submissions invited from all parties on a date to be fixed (See Note 1 below).

Note 1: It is anticipated that convened attendance will be by way of a telephone conference for a further Decision on Sanctions to be made, details of which will be communicated in due course following receipt of submissions of the parties and consideration of them by the Committee.

JAMIE JONES

The Charges

14. Jamie Jones was charged (see Note 2 below) as follows:

1. Charge 1

On 29 September 2016, in breach of Betting Rule 2.1.2.4, he solicited, enticed, facilitated or encouraged David John to fix the result or score of a Match between John and Graeme Dott by:

(i) Informing him that 'A' was looking for players to fix matches, and/or

(ii) Informing John that he would be paid £5,000 for doing so and/or

(iii) Then making a call on speaker phone to 'A' for that matter to be discussed.

AND/OR

2. Charge 2

On 29 September 2016, in breach of Betting Rule 2.1.2.1, he contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive to fix the outcome of a Match between John and Graeme Dott by telephoning 'A' and engaging in a telephone conversation with him and David John in respect of the fixing of that match.

AND/OR

3. Charge 3

On or around 29 September 2016, in breach of Betting Rule 2.1.2.2, he accepted a bribe or other reward from 'A' or 'B' for influencing improperly the result or score of a Match between David John and Graeme Dott played on 29 September 2016.

AND/OR

Note 2: Originally only three charges were put to Jamie Jones but these were revised as at 8 November 2018 and put to him via his representative and formed the substance of the case against him heard on 18 December 2018.

4. Charge 4

On 29 September 2016, in breach of Betting Rule 2.1.2.4, he solicited, enticed, facilitated or encouraged David John to fix the result or score of a Match by informing him following the Match between David John and Graeme Dott that he would assist in the fixing of a future Match.

AND/OR

5. Charge 5

On and after 29 September 2016, in breach of Rule 4.2, he failed to report the approach of 'A' to David John to influence the outcome of David John's match with Graeme Dott as soon as was reasonably practicable.

OR

6. Charge 6

On 29 September 2016, in breach of Betting Rule 2.1.2.4, he solicited, encouraged or facilitated David John to engage in a fix of the result or score of the Match between David John and Graeme Dott by informing him that 'A' was seeking to find out if David John if he was prepared to make it happen that David John would not win 2 frames in that Match.

The Rules

15. The Rules of the WPBSA relevant to the disposal of this case are as follows:

Extracts from WPBSA MEMBERS RULES AND REGULATIONS

SECTION 2 – BETTING RULES

2. Betting Misconduct

2.1 It shall be a breach of these Rules for a Member to do any of the following:

2.1.2 Corruption

2.1.2.1 to fix or contrive, or to be a party to any effort to fix or contrive, the result, score, progress, conduct or any other aspect of the Tour and/or any Tournament or Match;

2.1.2.2 to seek or accept or offer or agree to accept any bribe or other reward to fix or to contrive in any way or otherwise to influence improperly the result, score, progress, conduct or any other aspect of the Tour and/or any Tournament or Match;

.....

2.1.2.4 to solicit, induce, entice, persuade, encourage or facilitate any Member to breach any of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph 2.1.2.

SECTION 1 - GENERAL

4. Reporting Breaches

4.1 In the event that a Member is approached or solicited in any way (whether directly or indirectly) to influence the outcome or conduct of any game of snooker or billiards whether or not in return for payment or any other form of remuneration or benefit (an "Approach2), that Member ("the Reporting member") shall report such an Approach to the WPBSA (via the Company Secretary or a Tournament Official) as soon as reasonably practicable and in any event not later than 24 hours after any such Approach being made. Further, the Reporting Member shall provide the WPBSA (via the Company Secretary or a Tournament Official) with all information in his or her knowledge relating to the Approach and shall co-operate in any subsequent investigation and/or other action(s) arising out of such a report.

4.2 Any Member becoming aware of an Approach (as defined in clause 4.1 above) being made to another individual shall report such Approach to the WPBSA (via either the Company Secretary, a Tournament Official or the Anti-Corruption Hotline) as soon as reasonably practicable and in any event within 24 hours of becoming aware of such Approach.

Evidence and Hearing

16. The evidence available to the Disciplinary Committee and considered was all that contained in the items identified in the Hearing Bundle as set out in the List annexed to this Decision.
17. In his statement dated 2 December 2018, Jamie Jones admitted the breach alleged in respect of Charge 5 and denied all of the other charges.
18. At the Hearing on 18 December 2018 the Player repeated his position, namely he denied Charges 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 and confirmed his acceptance of Charge 5.

19. In cases brought under these Rules the standard of proof is on a balance of probabilities and in respect of Charges 1 – 4 and 6 (Charge 5 having been admitted by Jamie Jones) the burden of discharging the level of proof required fell on the WPBSA.
20. The members of the Committee heard evidence put forward by the WPBSA principally that of David John. His statement and a record of his interviews with Nigel Mawer were in the Hearing Bundle and Mr John was cross-examined at some considerable length by Counsel on behalf of Mr Jones.
21. The members of the Committee found Mr John to be an unreliable witness overall. It was put forward in submissions by Counsel for the WPBSA that the “Lucas” principle (familiar to many criminal practitioners) was suitable for application to this case. In that event if a witness was considered to be unreliable about some events or issues nevertheless in respect of his evidence on one particular element or elements of the events he could be relied upon.
22. David John had initially and strongly protested his innocence in relation to matters levelled at him personally, but then subsequently confessed that he had been untruthful in various respects in other statements made previously during the WPBSA’s investigation. While this is not a criminal case, the Committee did understand the relevance of the principle put forward by the WPBSA and its potential application here but were not convinced that Mr John should be believed any more on the narrower series of events surrounding the Dott match on 29 September 2016 which was a focus of the Committee’s attention in relation to the charges against Mr Jones.
23. It is not in dispute that there was a “fix” of the Dott match (as accepted by Mr John) and the Committee in dealing with the unadmitted charges against Mr Jones had significantly to analyse the course of events that took place on the day of the Dott match when (and prior to the match) both players David John and Jamie Jones shared a room together, a fact which was agreed by both players albeit their agreement did not extend to all other events that happened that day. It has been impossible for the Disciplinary Committee to reconstruct exactly the events of that day and there were conflicting versions of what happened particularly in relation to the communications with ‘A’.
24. It is also common ground that communications did take place with ‘A’ on Jamie Jones’ mobile, but the Committee has been unable to make findings on exactly what did happen both as to the nature of those communications and what impact they ultimately have in

relation to the charges. In short paraphrase, David John says Jamie Jones was fully aware and helped set up the fix and Jamie Jones says that he accepts there were communications with 'A' as a result of which the fix was arranged but did not in any way help set it up and wanted nothing to do with it.

25. The Committee during the Hearing also considered the oral evidence of Mr John, and the available evidence from other sources including that of Mr Jones himself and other witnesses. The Committee was not convinced by all explanations put forward by Mr Jones himself who was also subjected to lengthy cross-examination by Counsel for the WPBSA.
26. The Disciplinary Committee did not have the advantage of being able to see the telephone records of Jamie Jones' mobile phone he had at the time which would have illuminated the case. The Disciplinary Committee did take the view on balance (and finding) that Jamie Jones did leave his mobile telephone in the room with David John for a period of time while he was not present with it and that it was during this period that the fix was cemented.
27. The Committee was also troubled by the exact detail and the nature of the relationship between Mr Jones and 'A' a full understanding of which may also have had an impact on the outcome of the case, but, despite encouragement from various parties in the Hearing this remained unclear.
28. Other witness statements were adduced including that of 'A' but none of the other witnesses were at the Hearing and the Disciplinary Committee could therefore attribute no particular weight to their statements which would help decide the case.
29. The Disciplinary Committee did not have sufficient evidence that enabled the WPBSA to succeed on the unadmitted Charges against Mr Jones and therefore decided to dismiss charges 1 – 4 and 6.

Charges 5 and the Failure to Report

30. With regard to Charge 5 against Jamie Jones (admitted by him) the Disciplinary Committee's view is that, although he may well have found himself in a difficult position, he failed to report the matter (the substance of the Charge). Although there was some conflict in the witness statements of Mr Mawer and Mr Jones as to who contacted whom initially about this it was clear that there was no reporting of this until some two years after the event.

31. Jamie Jones did nothing to address the matter before or up to a long time after the fix and the match had taken place. He could have indeed taken steps to report the matter before the match took place which could have prevented a corrupt outcome, or he could have taken steps to help prevent any further similar activities taking place. He chose not to and in the Committee's view has contributed to further damage to the sport. The Committee considers this to be an extremely serious matter in itself particularly in the context of the responsibility of a professional player to ensure as far as possible the integrity of the game.

Findings

32. Having taken into account all the various factors outlined above the Disciplinary Committee did not find the case against Jamie Jones proven in relation to Charges 1 -4 and 6 and therefore dismissed these Charges against him.

33. Based upon his admission and other credible evidence available the Committee found Charge 5 proven.

34. Sanction in respect of Charge 5 to be decided following written submissions invited from all parties on a date to be fixed (See Note 1 above).

GENERAL

The Committee would like to place on record their appreciation of:-

- 1) the detailed investigation of Mr Mawer of the WPBSA; and
- 2) the skill and time applied by both Advocates Mr Weston and Mr Harris in both their written and oral contributions to the Hearing process: appropriate to the level of seriousness required in disposing of these sorts of cases.

Tim Ollerenshaw, Chair

Gordon McKay

Tarik Shamel

11 January 2019

IMPORTANT NOTE: THIS DECISION DOCUMENT SHOULD BE REDACTED INsofar AS IT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND DATA RELATING TO THIRD PARTIES, IF IT IS TO BE PUBLISHED TO ANY OTHER THIRD PARTIES.

ANNEX

List of Documents in Hearing Bundle (attached) and copy additional screenshots (pages A-G)