

Decision of the
Table Tennis England Disciplinary Committee
Hearing on 6 March 2025

COMPLAINANT: Table Tennis England

RESPONDENTS :

1. Luke Savill
2. Darius Knight
3. Kazeem Adeleke
4. Joseph Ferriera

Committee:

Mr Michael Bishop (Chair)
Mr Ian Bloom
Mr Tim Ollerenshaw

Hearing Date: 6 March 2025

Decision Date: 6 March 2025

Regarding alleged violations of the:

1. Table Tennis England's Anti-Corruption Regulations (ACR), and
2. Table Tennis England's

Disciplinary Regulations 12.2.19 (DR 2019)

Disciplinary Regulations 1.8.20 (DR 2020)

Disciplinary Regulations 10.7.23 (DR 2023)

The Disciplinary was held under the rules of: Regulations Part D: Disciplinary Regulations 12 February 2025

References herein are to the main bundle by page [n]

and to the Correspondence Bundle by page [CBn]

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1. It was established that at the relevant times of the allegations, all the Respondents were subject to ETTA/TTE Disciplinary Regulations as each of them was an affiliated person to ETTA/TTE [46].
2. On 4th March 2025, Mr Adeleke informed TTE by email that he would not be able to attend the Hearing on the 6 March 2025 due to an unspecified illness: *Dear Sue, I am writing to inform you that i will not be able to attend the hearing due to health reason. I am also appealing for a fair decision as my statement remain the same. I was never a part of match fixing though i placed some bets on table tennis due to my oversight to the law that govern the game.* He qualified in a further email that ‘fear’ should have read ‘fair.’
3. In a further email also dated the 4 March 2025 Mr Adeleke confirmed that he was happy for the hearing to proceed in his absence: *Dear Joana, thank you for your email. I have no objection nor reason for the hearing not to go ahead in my absence. I will accept whatever decision that comes my way.*
4. Mr Ferriera sent an email on 5 March 2025 questioning why the Case Summary Opening note did not accept the evidence of Mr Whitehead: *‘In the summary bundle that you sent me on Monday, the reply in my section says that they will not accept the evidence from Conor Whitehead. In a serious case such as this I don’t see how letting me know 3 days before a hearing that my evidence will not be accepted is good enough really. This is crucial evidence to show my innocence. Surely, I should have been given more notice on this. Now I am not sure wether my witness will be able to attend the hearing tomorrow at such late notice and this is very unfair.’*
5. An email was sent from the disciplinary panel Secretary to Mr Ferreira on 5 March 2025. It read as follows: *Thank you for your email which I will pass on to the Panel and all Parties, by this email. I would like to point out that the summary bundle, with timetable, was sent to all Parties and Panel on Friday 28 February and I re-sent it on Monday this week.*
6. An email sent from the disciplinary panel Secretary to Mr Ferreira on 5 March 2025 confirmed that *The Committee are happy to proceed with the Joseph Langham’s case with or without Conor Whitehead’s attendance.*

POST HEARING MATTERS

7. An email was sent by Mr Savill to TTE on 11 March 2025 and forwarded promptly by TTE to the Panel as they were considering their decision. See paragraph 55. for how the Panel considered this email noting that it only comments on his own circumstances.
8. An email was received by TTE on 11 March 2025 from Mr Ferreira and was forwarded promptly by TTE to the Panel. See paragraph 58. for how the Panel considered this email.

THE CHARGES

9. On the 6 December 2024 letters were sent by TTE to each of the Respondents outlining the charges that, being subject to the jurisdiction of TTE, each of them was charged under:
 - (1) Table Tennis England’s Anti-Corruption Regulations (ACR), and
 - (2) Table Tennis England’s
 - a. Disciplinary Regulations 12.2.19 (DR 2019)
 - b. Disciplinary Regulations 1.8.20 (DR 2020)
 - c. Disciplinary Regulations 10.7.23 (DR 2023).

The charges were that:

10. (Charge 1) Luke Savill between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing with Adam Green in breach of:
 - a. §3.1.10 of the DR2019,
 - b. §3.1.10 of the DR2020, and/or
 - c. §3.2.1 of the ACR.
11. (Charge 2) Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, took part in betting on table tennis in breach of:
 - a. §3.1.9 of the DR2019,
 - b. §3.1.9 of the DR2020, and/or
 - c. §3.1.1 of the ACR.
12. (Charge 3) Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, used inside information for betting on table tennis in breach of §3.4.1 of the ACR.
13. (Charge 4) Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, disclosed inside information for betting on table tennis in breach of §3.4.2 of the ACR.
14. (Charge 5) Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, failed to disclose the betting of Adam Green, and/or his involvement in match fixing in relation to table tennis in breach of §3.5.5 of the ACR.
15. (Charge 6) Luke Savill, between 1 March 2024 and 2 December 2024, failed to provide reasonable assistance to an investigation carried out by TTE in breach of §8.3 of the DR2023 by:
 - a) Failing to give any response to an email of 13 March 2024, and/or
 - b) Failing to give any response to an email of 18 March 2024.
16. (Charge 7) Darius Knight, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches in breach of:
 - a) §3.1.10 of the DR2020, and/or
 - b) §3.2.1 of the ACR.
17. (Charge 8) Darius Knight, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, disclosed inside information for betting on table tennis in breach of §3.4.2 of the ACR.
18. (Charge 9) Darius Knight, between 11 November 2018 and 18 December 2020 took part in betting on table tennis in breach of:
 - a) §3.1.9 of the DR2019,
 - b) §3.1.9 of the DR2020, and/or
 - c) §3.1.1 of the ACR.
19. (Charge 10) Darius Knight, between 1 March 2024 and 2 December 2024, failed to provide reasonable assistance to an investigation carried out by TTE in breach of §8.3 of the DR2023 by failing to provide documentation requested by the TTE's investigator in an email of 12 March 2024.
20. (Charge 11) Kazeem Adeleke, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches in breach of:
 - a) §3.1.10 of the DR2020, and/or

b) §3.2.1 of the ACR.

21. (Charge 12) Kazeem Adeleke, between 19 October 2018 and 28 April 2019 took part in betting on table tennis in breach of:

- a) §3.1.9 of the DR2019,
- b) §3.1.9 of the DR2020, and/or
- c) §3.1.1 of the ACR.

22. (Charge 13) Joseph Langham Ferreira, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches in breach of:

- a) §3.1.10 of the DR2020, and/or
- b) §3.2.1 of the ACR.

23. (Charge 14) Joseph Langham Ferreira, between 29 May 2020 and 1 June 2020 took part in betting on table tennis in breach of:

- a) §3.1.9 of the DR2019,
- b) §3.1.9 of the DR2020, and/or
- c) §3.1.1 of the ACR.

A. APPLICABLE RULES

24. Jurisdiction and Power

- a. Section 4.1 of the TTE Regulations Part D: Disciplinary Regulations 12 February 2025 establishes its disciplinary jurisdiction over Affiliated Members.
- b. Section 11 of the TTE Regulations Part D: Disciplinary Regulations 12 February 2025 establishes the Disciplinary Committees powers to make decisions and impose appropriate sanctions in accordance with the disciplinary regulations.

25. Standard of proof

Section 5 of the TTE Regulations Part D: Disciplinary Regulations 12 February 2025 establishes that the Disciplinary Committees decisions on any matter should do so on the balance of probabilities.

B. EVIDENCE AND POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

26. Below is a summary of the relevant facts and allegations based on the Parties' written submissions, pleadings and evidence. Additional facts and allegations found in the written submissions, pleadings and evidence may be set out, where relevant, in connection with the findings at Part D.

27. The evidence against each of the Respondents is contained in the 'Correspondence Bundle [54]' and the 'TTE and Savill et al bundle of material revised 2025'.

28. A further submission had been made 'TTE Knight Et al CASSUM Final' which set out the information from the detailed bundles it relied on in its case to the Panel and is replicated below:

Introduction

1. *This case arises from the investigation into betting on table tennis matches and the use of betting accounts to allow betting on table tennis matches following the conviction in Australia of Andrew [sic – a typo for Adam] Green in 2023 for match fixing in table tennis.*
2. *Table Tennis England's (TTE) case is that the four Respondents were or are subject to Table Tennis England's Disciplinary Regulations (DR), and Anti-Corruption Regulations (ACR) and that they breached those regulations.*
3. *The essential allegations are that:*
 - a) *Adam Green was involved in match fixing in Ukraine in 2020.*
 - b) *Adam Green provided betting services to Luke Savill, and the two of them shared information on betting, including the likely outcomes of fixed matches from 2017 onwards.*
 - c) *Luke Savill used that information to bet himself, but also shared the information with Darius Knight, who with betting accounts operated by Joseph Ferreira and Kazeem Adeleke and a group of other betting accounts operated by Nikola Haxhillazi bet on those outcomes.*
 - d) *Messrs Savill and Knight failed to cooperate with the investigation.*
4. *This Case Summary is set out under these headings:*
 - a) *Adam Green*
 - b) *The Respondents and other relevant persons.*
 - c) *The Investigation and Evidence.*
 - d) *TTE's case and the Charges*

Adam Green

5. *Adam Green is a former professional table tennis player, resident in Australia, but who had in the course of his career travelled and played extensively in Europe. In December 2020 he was arrested by the New South Wales Police who had discovered that he was betting on table tennis matches in Ukraine. Those bets were made by Green as a result of his receiving inside information as to the likely winners of the matches, or that the matches were fixed. Green's betting was linked and informed by his correspondence with Oleksander 'Sasha' Didukh and Serhi Buchatsky, who would send messages to Green telling him which matches and outcomes to bet upon, and Green would then bet upon those outcomes using betting accounts in Australia which he opened or had access to in false or friends/relatives' names. Green then split the profits with Sasha and Serhi.*
6. *Green did not however keep the information that he received about corrupt and fixed matches for his own use, but he shared that information with, relevantly, Luke Savill who he had known since about 2010. Adam Green also placed bets for Savill.*
7. *In December 2023, Green pleaded guilty to offences under the Australian criminal law. One of the three criminal offences alleged he had communicated .. corrupt conduct information to .. Luke Savill. [SR-30]*
8. *He was sentenced to community sentence.*
9. *As a part of his plea and sentence arrangements Adam Green made a statement signed on 14 July 2023, in which he set out the involvement he and others had in match fixing in table tennis [51] and appended to that statement are messages that Green exchanged with Luke Savill [84 and 93] and Didukh [1964]*

The Respondents and other relevant persons

10. Luke Savill was a professional table tennis player affiliated to TTE. He was suspended following allegations of betting on table tennis in August 2021. He is a longstanding friend of Green.

11. Darius Knight:

- a) Is a person affiliated to TTE from 2013 to 1 August 2020, and then from 1 August 2021 was a former player but now runs a coaching company [2018].

At the time relevant to this case, he had betting accounts with the companies Unibet (between 2 November 2018 and 10 May 2020) [SR-1 1973], and Paddy PowerBetfair (PPB) (between 27 May 2020 and 30 May 2020) [SR-2 1977].

12. Joseph Ferreira

- a) Is a semi-professional table tennis player and also a coach. He is affiliated to TTE and was apart from the year 1 August 2020 to 31 July 2021.
- b) At the time relevant to this case, he had betting accounts with the company PPB (between 29 May 2020 and 1 June 2020) [SR-6 1983].

13. Kazeem Adeleke

- a) Was a person affiliated to TTE from 2013 to 31 July 2021.
- b) At the time relevant to this case, he had betting accounts with the companies Coral (between 31 January 2020 and 14 June 2020) [SR-4 1981], Ladbrokes (on 14 June

2020) [SR-4 1982] and Bet 365 (between 19 October 2018 and 28 April 2019) [SR-5 1983].

14. Other persons who are relevant to this case are:

- a) Nicolla Haxhillazi who had a betting account with PPB (between 21 May 2020 and 28 May 2020) [SR-8 1008], Haxhillazi was employed or worked within Darius Knight's coaching business and knew each of the following people:
- b) Andrei Botezatu who had a betting account with PPB (on 9 June 2020) [SR-9 2001]
- c) Mike Hyso who had a betting account with PPB (between 27 May 2020 and 27 June 2020) [SR-10 2004]
- d) Kostian Mitrolari who had a betting account with PPB (between 21 May 2020 and 28 May 2020) [SR-11 2007]
- e) Elena Ionni who had a betting account with PPB (between 21 May 2020 and 28 May 2020) [SR-12 2010]

The Investigation and Evidence

15. As a result of the information obtained by the New South Wales Police, TTE carried out an investigation into betting by persons subject to its regulations. In the course of that investigation, Steven Richardson received evidence from the New South Wales Police and contacted each of the Respondents. The product of his investigations is summarised as follows:

16. Adam Green was interviewed on 20 February 2024 [SR-22 2108] in which he said:

- a) He had shared 2 or 3 bets with Luke Savill [2111 & 2122].
- b) He described his relationship with Luke Savill [2115- 2117] making clear that he was betting on table tennis with him, and explaining how Luke Savill was overkeen/arrogant on his betting in Ukraine and the Eastern block [2119] including betting and losing on a match which was not successful after there had been a betting alert communicated to the players thus making the expected fix fail [2121].
- c) He had discussed how to avoid being detected as betting with Luke Savill to avoid being cut off by the book makers [2123-4]

17. In his witness statement Adam Green [51] had also made clear that

- i) He and Luke Savill were regularly engaged from 2017 in betting on table tennis (¶62 et seq [62])
- ii) He was placing bets for Savill on table tennis acting as a commission agent (see his statement in particular at ¶¶70-71, 67-69 and 76-79 in relation to the periods 2018-2020)
- iii) He was receiving corrupt information to Savill for him to use for betting on table tennis, see his statement in particular at ¶¶85-91 in March and April 2020, after Savill says he has a tipper in Ukraine (¶87).
- iv) Green shared his information from Didukh and Buchatsky with Savill allowing him to bet on the fixed outcome of matches (see ¶¶133-135).

18. Luke Savill:

- a) Was the subject of an investigation in 2018 by Nigel Mawer who produced a report dated 28.8.18 [2272]. That report concluded that Savill had been involved in betting on table tennis on accounts with BetVictor, Betway, 138Bet, Boyle Sports, Royal Panda, Bet365, and Betstars and that other accounts could be linked to Mr Savill, such that it was likely they were being used by him. At ¶32 of that report, Savill is recorded as admitting in an email of 27 February 2018 that he had bet on table tennis. For that conduct he was issued with a warning on 4 September 2020 [2282].
- b) Has not engaged or cooperated at all with the TTE investigation. Mr Richardson has sent to him the emails in March 2024 at [SR-28 2260]. Mr Savill had previously been the subject of an investigation in 2018 [2272].
- c) TTE has however received the very many messages between him and Green on WhatsApp [93] and Viber [84 & 93]. Those messages:

- i) Show Savill to be bemoaning his lack of a betting account in June 2020 [93] and wanting to have new accounts, which he was going to make [94]
- ii) On 3 July 2020 Green explaining to Savill how he was going to impose terms on his giving corrupt information to others for betting [139]
- iii) Regularly discussing betting opportunities in relation to table tennis e.g.

(a) 3.7.20 [201]

(b) 4.7.20 [478]

(c) 6.7.20 [609-610]

19. TTE has not evidence of Savill using betting accounts in his own name following the 2018 investigation. It does however rely on the fact of his using 'proxy' accounts then, in this case.

20. Darius Knight

a) Was interviewed on 8 March 2024 [SR-14 2017]. In that interview:

- i) He denied having any betting accounts then qualified that answer to say no active betting accounts [2020], then accepted he had a Bet 365 account 7 or 8 years previously [2021], but could not say if he had a PPB account [2021].
- ii) He said he may have given someone access to his accounts 5-3 years ago [2022] but said 'no comment' when asked who [2022].
- iii) When shown his PPB's accounts betting on table tennis in May 2020 he could not remember who was betting on the account [2025] even when told of the sum of money bet [2026].
- iv) It was explained that his account had links to 6 other accounts but that did not help him remember the bets [2027].
- v) He said he knew of but did not know Adam Green [2029].
- vi) He said he did know Luke Savill and said he spoke to him every other week [2031]. He denied giving his account to Luke Savill but said I'm sure he's capable of getting loads of accounts if he wants to [2031].
- vii) He knew Nico Haxhillazi (and had done for many years [2036]) who had an email address nicholas@dariusknight.com [2031] (which is Mr Knight's business' domain name [2019]). He made no comment to the question of whether he had let Haxhillazi have access to his betting account.
- viii) When asked about his Unibet account he could not remember if he had used it to bet or let another, then denied doing so [2034].

b) Following his interview, Mr Knight was asked to provide bank statements from 20 May to 30 June 2020 and for the bank card linked to the PPB betting account [2043]. He declined to do so [2041-2042].

21. Joseph Ferreira:

- a) Was interviewed first on 12 March 2024 [SR -16 2054]. In that interview:
 - i) He said he currently played and coached [2055].
 - ii) He accepted having had Betfair accounts some 5-7 years previously [2056].
 - iii) He said most players bet on table tennis in England [2057].
 - iv) He said he had let someone else use his betting account [2058] but would not at first say who, then said it was Darius Knight who had used the account on and off when Mr Ferreira was working for Darius Knight [2059] and had used the Betfair account to place large bets 9 or 10 years ago [2061-2062] and he had transferred money to Darius Knight in relation to the bets [2063].
 - v) He denied placing any bets on his Bet365 account and thought the 2020 bets were by Darius Knight [2063].
 - vi) He said he did not know Adam Green [2064].
 - vii) He did know Luke Savill but was not friends with him [2067].
- b) Provided a bank transfer record which showed that he had received £1000 from nikola@dariusknight.com on 30 May 2020 and paid out £1150 and £10 to ahaxhillazi@outlook.com on 1 June 2020, the £1,000 having been paid to Betfair and then returned £1,215 [SR-17 2074].
- c) Was interviewed for a second time on 27 March 2024 [SR -18 2076].
 - i) He explained Nikoli worked for Darius Knight and Mr Ferreira allowed him access to his own betting account but did not know if it was Nikoli or Mr Knight who was using it, because he gave both of them access to it [2079-2080].
- d) By email of 16 April 2024 [SR-23 2134] he then provided bank statements for his Metro account which showed a payment on 21 June 2020 of £500 to Nikola [2133] which he said in an email of 16 April 2024 was not to do with betting on table tennis [2137]
- e) The bank statements and Neteller information were provided in response to a request of 12 March 2024 [2201].

22. Kazeem Adeleke:

- i) Was interviewed on 22 March 2024 [SR-29 2261] in which he said:
- ii) He neither played table tennis any more, nor was he affiliated to any club [2262].
- iii) He had had a number of betting accounts which had been closed but were not used or blocked for table tennis [2262].
- iv) He had bet on table tennis in his own name [2263]. He was shown the betting on the Bet365 account in his name from 2018 and said that betting was his and that was why his betting was stopped [2264-2265]. He claimed not to know he was prohibited from betting on table tennis [2265]. He said he bet because he was getting too addicted to all this [2266].

- v) *He accepted the bets on the Coral account were his [2265].*
- vi) *He said he did not know Adam Green [2267] and said that the betting he made was to do with his watching of matches, and nothing to do with Green, even though he was betting in higher stakes than before [2268].*
- vii) *He was asked about the bets on his Ladbrokes account and said he bet on a lot of matches [2269 and 2270/1].*
- viii) *He denied knowing Nicola Haxhillazi [2270].*

23. *Mr Richardson also interviewed*

- a) *Mike Hyso on 13 March 2024 [SR-19 2084] in which, Mr Hyso said Mr Haxhillazi had been given access to his betting account when he lived with him and others at 111 Tennyson in London [2084-2085].*
- b) *Kostian Mitrollari on 15 March 2024 [SR-20 2090] in which he said his cousin Mr Haxhillazi placed bets on his betting account whilst he lived at 111 Tennyson in London [2094.]*
- c) *Elena Ioanni on 24 March 2024 [SR-21 2100] in which she said when she was living at 111 Tennyson, Mr Haxhillazi had access to and used her betting account [2102].*

24. *In his statements Mr Richardson analyses the evidence received by his investigation from the Respondents and from the betting companies.*

- a) *In his statement [26], he highlights:*
 - i) *At 13 – 25 the contents of the messages between Savill and Green and the fact of their discussing betting on table tennis and the means to do so including how to avoid banks' investigations into money transfers between them. It includes at ¶19*
 - ii) *the explanation of [SR-26 2223] which is a bet placed by Green and which following a message between them on 23 July 2020, Savill confirms he is betting on too. That match is one which Didukh communicated with Green about, and one Green bet on.*
 - iii) *At ¶¶28-32, that in some instances the PPB accounts that have been produced for this investigation can be shown to have been operated computer/phone even though the accounts were in different names and have been betting on the same opportunities within short time frames. That information is summarised in SR-13 [2013]. If SR-13 is sorted by Device then it is clear that the Knight account is used from the same Device as all of the other accounts (Mitrollari, Hyso, Haxhillazi, Ferreira, and Ioanni).*
 - iv) *At that the accounts of Adeleke show similar betting to the Green Betting on both the Coral and Ladbrokes account and that Adeleke increases his stakes on the Green bets (¶101). In relation to Adeleke's betting where his accounts have bet on the same outcome in SR-4 [1981] those outcomes are highlighted in green.*
 - v) *In respect of the accounts of Knight (¶33), Ferreira (¶34) and Adeleke (¶¶35-39) the statement highlights the extreme success those accounts had with their betting on table tennis.*

- b) *In his statement:*

- i) *Mr Richardson focusses on the 69 bets that appear on SR-13 and the additional 22 bets on Adeleke's betting which also feature on Green's betting (see ¶¶40-44). In respect of those bets the report highlights that there is a correlation between messages Savill/Green and the bets placed by Adeleke and on SR-13 (¶¶43-49).*
- ii) *Mr Richardson then identifies (¶¶50-62) those messages between Green and Savill which demonstrate that they were involved and aware that matches were being fixed, and involved in betting on those matches.*

TTE's Case and the Charges

25. TTE's case is that

- b) *a) Green and Didukh were involved in fixing the outcome of table tennis and betting upon them.*
- c) *Green shared this information with Savill directly.*
- d) *Savill also used Green as a means of betting on table tennis.*
- e) *There was then a second group of bettors on table tennis matches which included Messrs Knight, Ferreira, Adeleke and Haxhillazi. It is likely that Darius Knight was the recipient of information from Savill and that he used accounts let to him, and accounts which were let and operated by Haxhillazi and him to bet on the outcomes.*
- f) *In each of the cases of Messrs Knight, Ferreira and Adeleke not only were they betting or allowing their betting accounts to be used to bet on table tennis, they were also betting or allowing their betting accounts to be used to bet on table tennis matches which Green and Didukh were betting on and achieving an extremely high success rate. The inference is that they knew they had either information that the outcome was fixed or very high quality inside information as to the likely results.*
- g) *TTE's case is that in addition to betting on table tennis, the information shared between Didukh, Green and Savill was being disseminated to Knight, Ferreira and Adeleke with the involvement of Haxhillazi to put money on the information that Green had obtained.*
- h) *Additionally in the case of Messrs Savill and Knight they have not cooperated with TTE's investigation.*

26. The charges TTE brings are set out in Charges sent herewith. In short summary the Charges are on the following evidence:

- a) *Luke Savill*
 - i) *Charge 1 covers the misconduct of betting on fixed matches with Adam Green.*
 - ii) *Charge 2 covers the betting on table tennis with Adam Green and others. TTE's case is that Darius Knight and the Respondents he knew were betting with and for Savill as well as for themselves.*

- iii) *Charge 3 relates to Savill's use of Inside Information to bet on table tennis. TTE's primary case is that many of the matches he bet upon were in fact fixed, but it is likely some were based on his or other Inside Information.*
- v) *Charge 4 relates to Savill's dissemination of Inside Information, including that matches would be fixed, to others to use for betting. The others include Adam Green but also Darius Knight. Charge 5 relates to Savill's failure to disclose Adam Green's activities.*
- vi) *Charge 6 relates to Savill's failure to cooperate with the TTE investigation at all.*

b) Darius Knight

- i) *Charge 7 relates to his betting on matches which were known to be fixed and bet upon by Adam Green. TTE's case is that Darius Knight with Haxhillazi, used other proxy accounts to place bets on these outcomes, the overlap between Green and these persons bets being shown on SR-13.*
- ii) *Charge 8 relates to Darius Knight sharing Inside Information, including that matches would be fixed, with his network of bettors including Haxhillazi.*
- iii) *Charge 9 relates to Darius Knight's personal betting and the betting on his account that he permitted.*
- iv) *Charge 10 relates to Darius Knight's failure to cooperate with the investigation.*

c) Josphe Ferreira

- i) *Charge 11 relates to the betting on a fixed matches in his named account. TTE makes clear that Ferreira lent himself to this enterprise, and was not the principal mover, he appears to have been working with Haxhillazi as shown by the money transfers between them.*
- ii) *Charge 12 relates to Ferreira's personal betting on table tennis, and his being a party to the bets placed using his account.*

d) Kazeem Adeleke (note these charges should be 13 and 14)

- i) *Charge 11 relates to the betting on a fixed matches in his named account. TTE makes clear that Adeleke lent himself to this enterprise and was not the principal mover.*
- ii) *Charge 12 relates to Adeleke's personal betting on table tennis, and his being a party to the bets placed using his account.*

C. HEARING

29. The Hearing

Attendance

- a. The meeting was held via Zoom and attendees dialled in through a link provided.
- b. Two of the parties, Mr Knight and Mr Ferreira attended and were not represented, Mr Adeleke informed the panel that he was ill and did not attend but had confirmed that he was content

for the proceedings to continue in his absence, and Mr Saville failed to respond to the invitation.

- c. TTE was represented by Mr Louis Weston, external counsel, and their witnesses were Mr Richardson, Mr Mawer, and Ms Keay-Blyth.
- d. The Panel consisted of Mr Bishop as Chair, supported by Mr Bloom and Mr Ollerenshaw.
- e. Ms Wressell attended as Disciplinary Secretary for TTE.

30. The Panel Chair asked the respondents for their pleas to the relevant Cases and their responses are shown below:

Charge 1 Luke Savill between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing with Adam Green – No Response.

Charge 2 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, took part in betting on table tennis – No Response.

Charge 3 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, used inside information for betting on table tennis – No Response.

Charge 4 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, disclosed inside information for betting on table tennis – No Response.

Charge 5 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, failed to disclose the betting of Adam Green, and/or his involvement in match fixing in relation to table tennis – No Response.

Charge 6 Luke Savill, between 1 March 2024 and 2 December 2024, failed to provide reasonable assistance to an investigation carried out by TTE – No Response.

Charge 7 Darius Knight, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches – Denied.

Charge 8 Darius Knight, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, disclosed inside information for betting on table tennis – Denied.

Charge 9 Darius Knight, between 11 November 2018 and 18 December 2020 took part in betting on table tennis – Denied.

Charge 10 Darius Knight, between 1 March 2024 and 2 December 2024, failed to provide reasonable assistance to an investigation carried out by TTE in breach of §8.3 of the DR2023 by failing to provide documentation requested by the TTE's investigator in an email of 12 March 2024. – Denied.

Charge 11 Kazeem Adeleke, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches – Denied see point 5.

Charge 12 Kazeem Adeleke, between 19 October 2018 and 28 April 2019 took part in betting on table tennis – Accepted see point 5.

Charge 13 Joseph Langham Ferreira, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches - Denied in correspondence

Charge 14 Joseph Langham Ferreira, between 29 May 2020 and 1 June 2020 took part in betting on table tennis – Accepted in correspondence.

Below is a summary of what the Panel considered as relevant new or contradicting evidence from the hearing relevant to the matters described above in Part B and Part C.

31. Mr Knight stated that he had no knowledge of Mr Green prior to his first interview with Mr Richardson.
32. Mr Knight stated that he has multiple betting accounts and that several people could have his password and logon details including the ability to use money from his bank, or betting accounts, to place further bets.
33. Mr Knight said that he would not provide bank statements to a process that had no rights to this information and TTE couldn't tell him what to do. He confirmed this again when responding to a question from the Panel 'why he wouldn't submit his bank details as this would substantially prove his statements regarding betting.'
34. Mr Knight said that anyone who worked in his businesses would have an email address specific to his Companies and that he would have no knowledge of how they were used by the individual assigned that address.
35. Mr Knight stated that Mr Ferreira's statement that Mr Knight used his account, as he had said that he was not allowed to bet on table tennis as an ITTF player, was not true.
36. Mr Knight stated that he had no relationship with Nikko Hazhillazi.
37. Mr Knight confirmed that he had bet on Table Tennis in the past.
38. Mr Ferreira trusted people to use his bank and betting accounts
39. Mr Ferreira was asked again whether Mr Knight had asked to use his betting account as he said he could not bet under his name as an ITTF player.

D. FINDINGS

While the Panel carefully considered all the facts, evidence, allegations and arguments submitted, the Panel refers in these findings only to the submissions and evidence it considers necessary to explain its decisions.

40. The Panel considers it proven on the balance of probabilities that Mr Savill on the six charges:
 - Charge 1 - he bet on fixed matches with Adam Green.
 - Charge 2 – he bet on table tennis with Adam Green as well as with Darius Knight and the other Respondents.
 - Charge 3 – he used Inside Information to bet on table tennis matches based on the success rate of his bets.
 - Charge 4 – he passed on inside information on matches that would be fixed to others, including Adam Geen and Darius Knight to use for betting.
 - Charge 5 – he failed to disclose Adam Green's activities to parties impacted by the betting.
 - Charge 6 – he failed to engage or cooperate with the TTE investigation or the disciplinary process.
41. The Panel considers it proven on the balance of probabilities that Mr Knight on the four charges:
 - Charge 7 - bet on Table Tennis matches which were known to be fixed and were the same bets as Mr Green. Darius Knight and Mr Haxhillazi used other proxy accounts to place bets on these fixed matches with again similar bets as Mr Green, as demonstrated in the submission SR-13.

Charge 8 – shared Inside Information, including details of matches that would be fixed, with his network of bettors including Mr Haxhillazi.

Charge 9 – bet using his own account which, although he initially pleaded not guilty to the charge, he admitted to betting on the outcomes of table tennis matches during the cross examination by TTE.

Charge 10 - failed to cooperate with the investigation and deliberately concealed information from the TTE (and the Panel) that may not have been favourable to his defence.

42. The Panel concludes that on the balance of probabilities that Mr Ferreira on the two charges:

Charge 11 – bet on fixed matches in his named account and was involved in the enterprise, and although was not the main mover, his money transfers with Mr Haxhillazi demonstrated that he had a connection with him.

Charge 12 -- bet using his own account which, although he initially pleaded not guilty to the charge, he admitted to betting on the outcomes of table tennis matches during the cross examination from TTE.

43. The Panel concludes that on the balance of probabilities that Mr Adeleke on the two charges:

i) Charge 13 – bet on fixed matches in his named account and that he was involved in the enterprise, although he was not the main mover.

ii) Charge 14 - bet on table tennis as admitted in his email of 4th March 2025, and was a party to the bets placed using his account.

E. SANCTIONS DISCUSSION

44. The Panel, having decided at the Hearing on liability as set out above, moved to consider Sanctions and invited the parties to put forward Submissions which (after a break in proceedings) they did.

45. In considering the sanctions the Panel referred to the International Table Tennis Federation Statutes 2025 (effective 1st January 2025):

6.9.2.1 Betting

6.9.2.1.1 Participation in, support for, or promotion of, any form of betting related to an event or competition including betting with another person on the result, progress, outcome, conduct or any other aspect of such an event or competition. This rule applies to any form of betting related to an event or competition in which the participant is directly participating or that is otherwise taking place in the participant's sport or that is taking place in another sport at an international competition hosted by a major event organisation in which the participant is participating. Inducing, instructing, facilitating or encouraging a participant to commit a violation of Article 6.9.2.1.

6.9.2.2 Manipulation of Results

6.9.2.2.1 Fixing or contriving in any way or otherwise improperly influencing, or being a party to fix or contrive in any way or otherwise improperly influence, the result, progress, outcome, conduct or any other aspect of an event or competition.

6.9.2.2.2 Ensuring or seeking to ensure the occurrence of a particular incident in an event or competition which occurrence is to the participant's knowledge the subject of a bet and for which he or she or another person expects to receive or has received a benefit.

6.9.2.2.3 Failing in return for a benefit (or the legitimate expectation of a benefit, irrespective of whether such benefit is in fact given or received) to perform to the best of one's abilities in an event or competition.

6.9.2.2.4 Inducing, instructing, facilitating or encouraging a participant to commit a violation of Article 6.9.2.2.

and

6.9.2.4 Misuse of Inside Information

6.8.5.2.4.4.1 Using inside information for betting purposes or otherwise in relation to betting.

6.8.5.2.4.4.2 Disclosing inside information to any person with or without benefit where the participant might reasonably be expected to know that its disclosure in such circumstances could be used in relation to betting.

6.8.5.2.4.4.3 Inducing, instructing, facilitating or encouraging a participant to commit a violation set out in Article 6.9.2.4. obtained in that event with all consequences, including forfeiture of all titles, medals, computer ranking points and prize and appearance money, in addition to possible sanctions under Article

6.9.6.3 Ineligibility and Financial Sanctions

6.9.6.3.1 The Hearing Panel shall have discretion to impose a period of ineligibility on participants in accordance with the bands set out in Article 6.9.7.3.2. In imposing any period of ineligibility, the ITTF Tribunal shall be entitled to consider whether any aggravating and/or mitigating factors under Article 6.9.7.4 or the ITTF Tribunal Regulations should be taken into account.

6.9.6.3.2 The respective period of ineligibility for a violation set out in:

Article 6.9.2.1 (betting), shall be a minimum of two [2] years and a maximum of four [4] years;

Article 6.9.2.2 (manipulation of results), shall be a minimum of two [2] years and a maximum of four [4] years;

Article 6.9.2.3 (corrupt conduct), shall be a minimum of two [2] years and a maximum of four [4] years;

Article 6.9.2.4 (misuse of inside information), shall be a minimum of two [2] years and a maximum of four [4] years;

Article 6.9.2.5 (other violations) shall be a minimum of two [2] years and a maximum of four [4] years.

6.9.6.3.3 The period of ineligibility shall commence on the date the decision of the ITTF Tribunal is published and shall end on date stated in the published decision. The ITTF Tribunal may at its sole discretion reduce the period of ineligibility imposed by any period of provisional suspension already served by the participant prior to the decision being reached.

6.9.6.3.4 No participant shall participate in any capacity in any event or competition during their period of ineligibility as imposed by the ITTF Tribunal.

6.9.6.3.5 If a participant violates any prohibition on participation imposed in accordance with Article 6.9.7.3.2, such participant shall be disqualified immediately from the relevant event or competition and the period of ineligibility originally imposed in accordance with these rules shall recommence from the date of such violation.

6.9.6.3.6 These rules shall continue to apply to any ineligible participant and any violation committed during a period of ineligibility shall be treated as a distinct violation and separate proceedings shall be brought against the participant in accordance with these rules.

6.9.6.3.7 In addition to the imposition of a period of ineligibility as set out above, the ITTF Tribunal shall have discretion to impose a fine of up to maximum amount of the value of any benefit received by the participant out of, or in relation to, the violation(s) of Article 6.9.2 and the fine shall be a minimum of CHF5,000.

6.9.6.4 Aggravating and Mitigating Factors

6.9.6.4.1 In order to determine the appropriate sanction to be imposed in each case the Hearing Panel shall assess the relative seriousness of the violation, including identifying all relevant factors that it deems to aggravate or mitigate the nature of the violation committed.

6.9.6.4.2 Aggravating factors which may be considered by the ITTF Tribunal shall include (without limitation and where applicable):

6.9.6.4.2.1 failure to co-operate by the participant with any investigation or requests for information;

6.9.6.4.2.2 any previous violations by the participant;

6.9.6.4.2.3 the participant receiving or being due to receive a significant Benefit in connection with the violation;

6.9.6.4.2.4 the violation having or having the potential to affect the course or result of an event or competition;

6.9.6.4.2.5 the participant displaying a lack of remorse (including, for example, refusing to take part in anti-corruption educational programs organised by the ITTF); and

6.9.6.4.2.6 any other aggravating factor the ITTF Tribunal deems relevant.

6.9.6.4.3 Mitigating factors which may be considered by the Hearing Panel shall include (without limitation and where applicable):

6.9.6.4.3.1 co-operation by the participant with any investigation or requests for information;

6.9.6.4.3.2 a timely admission of guilt by the participant; 6.9.6.4.3.3 the participant's clean disciplinary record;

6.9.6.4.3.4 the youth or inexperience of the participant;

6.9.6.4.3.5 the violation not having affected or not having the potential to affect the course or result of an event or competition;

6.9.6.4.3.6 the participant displaying remorse (including, for example, agreeing to take part in anti-corruption educational programs organised by the ITTF; and

6.9.6.4.3.7 any other mitigating factor the ITTF Tribunal deems relevant.

46. The Panel also considered the response from TTE 'TTE Knight Et al Response to Chair' copied below:

1. The Committee's Chair has helpfully highlighted to the parties that under the Statutes of the ITTF and in particular §6 Code of Ethics ¶6.9.6.3.2 the ITTF sets out the respective period of ineligibility for specified violations of the Ethics Code. Further, that for each of the identified offences there is a minimum and maximum period of 2 and 4 years respectively.

2. TTE makes these submissions in response.

3. First, the ITTF code is not binding on the Disciplinary Committee. It has not been adopted by TTE and is not binding on the Committee or the Respondents.

4. Second, the sanctions specified in the Ethics Code are not applicable to the offences found proven in this case. The ITTF Code applies to ITTF sanctioned events and participants in ITTF Sanctioned Events (see the Preamble to §6).

5. Third the ITTF Code is plainly not intended to address circumstances of multiple breaches of obligations (which is the position in this case). Obviously so because The ITTF Code applies to a single offence. So, for a single bet a minimum of 2 years is in principle applied. In this case Mr Savill was party to 69 bets.

6. Fourth, the ITTF Code is obviously out of step with other sports. Its guidance stands in stark contrast to the ITIA and to the guidance of domestic sports. It must be considered that the ITTF Code is directed to single instances of misfeasance in ITTF events only.

7. Fifth, the sanction of 'ineligibility' is not a sanction under the TTE codes. The TTE Regulations have different sanctions (and also a range of sanctions) which demonstrates the views and opinions of the sport in England.

8. Sixth, the ITTF Statutes are not designed or intended to address domestic offences under TTE's jurisdiction. One might consider that the ITTF Statutes aim to address international athletes in the same way as they might be under WADA codes (i.e. in principle a 4- and 2-year sanction).

9. Seventh, were it to apply to the Respondents each of them would be subject to a minimum period of 2 years 'ineligibility' for each bet. That would lead to manifestly absurd sanctions which TTE does not encourage.

10. Eighth, TTE recognises that it may be of value to the Disciplinary Committee to consider that the ITTF considers any offence under the Code of Ethics demands an immediate sanction of ineligibility. That however is where the help from the ITTF Statutes ends.

11. In the circumstances TTE stands on its submission as to Sanctions.

47. The Panel also considered the sanction information presented by Table Tennis England based on the guidance and codes prepared by the International Tennis Integrity Association (ITIA). The panel did not utilise the guidelines in deciding on the sanctions but relied on the submission of TTE in its interpretation of them.

48. Mr Knight and Mr Ferriera each addressed the panel on the issue of sanctions but raised no material considerations which affected the decisions of the Panel.

F. SANCTION CONSIDERATIONS

49. Having considered the evidence presented to the Panel, it falls to the Panel to consider an appropriate sanction in respect of all Parties

50. The committee has considered the following purpose for which sanctions are imposed.

- Punishment of the Respondent
- Reduction of the offending behaviour(s) in the wider TT community (including its reduction by deterrence).
- Reform of the Respondent.
- Protection of the wider table tennis community.
- Making of reparation to person(s) affected by the offences.

51. In determining these sanctions, the Panel is cognisant of the need to protect the integrity, image, and reputation of the sport of Table Tennis. To achieve this, it is considered that a sanction is required that:

- provides an appropriate level of punishment.
- deters others from engaging in such conduct.
- demonstrates an intolerance of such behaviour by its investigation, discovery, and sanction; and
- is proportionate to the seriousness of the breach and its circumstances.

52. At the outset, it is the Panel's clear position that offences involving betting and match fixing can have no place in the sport of Table Tennis. It is a corrosive practice that undermines the integrity of the sport. It is unfair on players, spectators, and sponsors. Where it is identified, the Panel has a duty to impose sanctions that reflect the seriousness of the offence, as well as punishing offenders and deterring potential future offenders. Put simply, there can be no place in the sport for such behaviour.

G. SANCTION DECISIONS

53. Mr Knight and Mr Ferriera were given the opportunity to address the Panel but failed to supply any further information to assist the Panel in determining the sanctions. The two respondents in attendance failed to show any sign of remorse. Mr Adeleke in his correspondence also failed to show any sign of remorse.

54. In relation to sanctions against Mr Savill the Panel consider that there are no mitigating circumstances but the aggravating factors include failure to respond or engage with the investigation or disciplinary proceedings, the fact that the betting took place over an extended period of time and involved close and detailed coordination with Mr Green and the fact that a previous warning was issued following a betting investigation in 2020 [2282].

55. An email was sent by Mr Savill to TTE on 11 March 2025 and forwarded promptly by TTE to the Panel as they were considering their decision. Without breaching Mr Savill's request for confidentiality, Mr Savill explained in that email, for the first time, deeply distressing personal details which had led or at least contributed to his behaviour as set out in the charges against him, and his lack of response to TTE's efforts to reach him as part of the investigation. The Panel regretted that Mr Savill had not co-operated with the investigation nor supplied such information as he now disclosed, either to the investigator in 2024, or in person or through a representative at the Hearing. In the complete absence of any explanation or information or mitigation from Mr Savill, the Panel considered that his conduct justified the most severe sanction. However, whilst provided after the Hearing had concluded, the Panel also considered that it would be unfair on Mr Savill to disregard Mr Savill's personal circumstances. Accordingly, whilst the Panel does not resile from the conclusions they reached before they were made aware of Mr Savill's position, and whilst they maintain their commitment to upholding the integrity of the sport as set out in paragraphs 50 and 51 of this judgment, they have decided to retain their original decision to impose an indefinite suspension on Mr Savill, but with this important qualification: Regulation 11 (2) of the TTE Regulations entitles the TTE Board to lift this suspension after a minimum of 5 years from the hearing date. The Panel hereby makes the recommendation to the Board as part of this judgment that if it deems it appropriate to lift the ban that it should only do this after 6 years and it should consider evidence provided by Mr Savill or someone on his behalf that (a) he has received appropriate help in dealing with his need to bet on table tennis matches, and (b) no longer does so.

56. In relation to sanctions against Mr Knight the Panel considered his previous good character as a mitigating factor but the aggravating factors include his position in the Sport, failure to co-operate with the investigation and requests for information, receiving a significant benefit from his actions, his actions having the potential to affect the results of the matches in Ukraine and his displaying a lack of remorse during the investigation and hearing.

57. In relation to sanctions against Mr Adeleke the Panel considered his previous good character as a mitigating circumstance but the aggravating circumstances include failure to co-operate with the investigation and requests for information, receiving a significant benefit, his actions having the potential to affect the course or result of the matches in Ukraine and his displaying a lack of remorse during the investigation or provide any written evidence of remorse.

58. In relation to sanctions against Mr Ferreira the Panel considered his previous good character and his age at the time of his actions as a mitigating factor but the aggravating factors include failure to fully co-operate with the investigation, receiving a significant benefit from his actions, his actions

having the potential to affect the results of the matches in Ukraine and his displaying a lack of remorse during the investigation and hearing.

59. In relation to the email received by TTE on 11 March 2025 from Mr Ferreira which attached a voicemail from Mr Hazhillazi in which he claimed that he had placed bets on table tennis matches using Mr Ferreira's account without Mr Ferreira's knowledge or consent. The Panel considered this material both on its merits and in the light of a further submission from TTE in response to it. After due consideration, the Panel concluded that it would be disproportionate to reconvene the Hearing for the purpose of cross-examining both Mr Hazhillazi and Mr Ferreira in connection with this discrete issue since, in the light of Mr Ferreira's (belated) admission that he had bet on table tennis matches, his Sanction would neither be lengthened nor shortened.

60. The sanctions recommended by Table Tennis England were:

Mr Savill TTE invites a sanction of a lifetime suspension; if a determinate sanction is imposed it is submitted it should be for at least 15 years.

Mr Knight An appropriate sanction for his being a party to fixed matches is a suspension of at least 5 years and passing information is at least 5 years concurrently.

An appropriate sanction for his betting is at least 6 months (concurrently).

An appropriate sanction for his failure to cooperate is at least 12 months consecutively (it being a distinct offence).

Mr Ferreira

a) An appropriate sanction for his being a party to fixed matches is a suspension of at least 4 years.

b) An appropriate sanction for his betting is at least 6 months (concurrently).

Mr Adeleke

a) An appropriate sanction for his being a party to fixed matches is a suspension of at least 5 years.

61. The Panel consider the following sanctions are justified and it has considered the relevant aggravating and mitigating circumstances outlined above in reaching its decision:

Charge 1 Luke Savill between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing with Adam Green – indefinite suspension but subject to paragraph 55.

Charge 2 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, took part in betting on table tennis: 2 years suspension concurrent.

Charge 3 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, used inside information for betting on table tennis: 5 years suspension concurrent.

Charge 4 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, disclosed inside information for betting on table tennis: 5 years suspension concurrent.

Charge 5 Luke Savill, between 28 August 2018 and 18 December 2020, failed to disclose the betting of Adam Green, and/or his involvement in match fixing in relation to table tennis: 2 years suspension concurrent.

Charge 6 Luke Savill, between 1 March 2024 and 2 December 2024, failed to provide reasonable assistance to an investigation carried out by TTE : 1 year suspension concurrent

Total Suspension for Luke Saville: Indefinite suspension (but subject to Paragraph 55)

Charge 7 Darius Knight, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches: 5 years suspension.

Charge 8 Darius Knight, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, disclosed inside information for betting on table tennis: 5 years suspension concurrent.

Charge 9 Darius Knight, between 11 November 2018 and 18 December 2020 took part in betting on table tennis: 2 years suspension concurrent.

Charge 10 Darius Knight, between 1 March 2024 and 2 December 2024, failed to provide reasonable assistance to an investigation carried out by TTE in breach of §8.3 of the DR2023 by failing to provide documentation requested by the TTE's investigator in an email of 12 March 2024.: 1 year suspension consecutive.

Total Sanction for Darius Knight: 6 years

Charge 11 Kazeem Adeleke, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches: 5-year suspension.

Charge 12 Kazeem Adeleke, between 19 October 2018 and 28 April 2019 took part in betting on table tennis: 2 years suspension concurrent.

Total Sanction for Kazeem Adeleke: 5 years

Charge 13 Joseph Langham Ferreira, between 1 January 2020 and 18 December 2020, was a party to match fixing on table tennis matches: 3 years suspension.

Charge 14 Joseph Langham Ferreira, between 29 May 2020 and 1 June 2020 took part in betting on table tennis: 2 years suspension concurrent.

Total Sanction for Joseph Ferreira: 3 years

62. Definition of the Sanction

This means that a player who is Sanctioned must not:

- Take part in any table tennis activity (either competition or practice) held under the auspices of the Table Tennis England at any level (club, league, county or national).
- Sit on (or in) any committee at club, league, county, region or national levels nor help with the organisation of any event.
- Coach or assist in coaching at any level.
- Umpire any matches or act as a referee at any level.
- Spectate at any event / club / training session.

H. COSTS

Under the Disciplinary Regulations the Panel has the power to order the Respondents to pay the costs of the hearing of an investigation (see §14.1.6 [22]).

In the absence of submissions or representations from the four respondents either in person at the hearing or via correspondence, the Panel noted that:

63. The costs presented to the panel by TTE were laid out in their submission 'TTE and Savill, Knight, Adeleke and Ferreira Schedule of Costs 06.03.25' and amount to £46,893.31 (Including fees of £1500 for one member of the Panel) ; and
64. In view of the outcome of the proceedings and considering all relevant circumstances, the Panel finds that each Respondent shall bear 25% of these costs amounting to £11,723.48 each.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS TO TTE

The two Respondents who attended the Hearing claimed, on various occasions, that they were not aware that they should not facilitate or take part in any form of Table Tennis related betting under the regulations as an affiliated member. They both also referred to the extensive betting by other members. The Disciplinary Panel firmly recommends that TTE should issue an urgent and specific reminder to all members that any betting on Table Tennis matches whether in the UK or elsewhere is prohibited and that any breach renders the member liable to disciplinary proceedings including possible suspension from playing or being involved in any way in any TTE sanctioned events.

J. SUMMARY

65. Mr Saville is suspended indefinitely from 6 March 2025 (subject to paragraph 55) and ordered to pay costs of £11,723.48 within 28 days from 6 March 2025.
66. Mr Knight is suspended for 6 years from 6 March 2025 and ordered to pay costs of £11,723.48 within 28 days from 6 March 2025.
67. Mr Adeleke is suspended for 5 years from 6 March 2025 and ordered to pay costs of £11,723.48 within 28 days from 6 March 2025.
68. Mr Ferreira is suspended for 3 years from 6 March 2025 and ordered to pay costs of £11,723.48 within 28 days from 6 March 2025.

Panel Members:

Mike Bishop (Chair)

Ian Bloom

Tim Ollerenshaw

17 March 2025