

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL  
BEFORE THE APPEALS PANEL OF TABLE TENNIS ENGLAND  
UNDER THE REGULATIONS OF TABLE TENNIS ENGLAND**

**B E T W E E N :**

**(1) KAZEEM ADELEKE**

**(2) JOSEPH FERREIRA-LANGHAM**

**(3) DARIUS KNIGHT**

**(4) LUKE SAVILL**

**(the Appellants)**

**– v –**

**TABLE TENNIS ENGLAND**

**(the Respondent)**

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECISION ON APPEAL**

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1. Following the decision of the Appeals Panel (the **Panel**) of Table Tennis England (**TTE**) dated 16 October 2025 (the **Appeal Decision**) in the joined appeals of Mr Adeleke (**KA**), Mr Ferreira-Langham (**JF**), Mr Knight (**DK**) and Mr Savill (**LS**) (together, the **Appellants**), two of the Appellants, DK and JF sought clarification of certain (separate and distinct) aspects of the Appeal Decision. The Panel has determined that it is appropriate for these issues to be dealt with by way of supplemental decision.

## 2. DK'S REQUEST

2. On 17 October 2025, following receipt of the Appeal Decision, DK's solicitors wrote seeking clarification of paragraph 46 of the Appeal Decision in relation to Charge 8, in which the Panel found as follows:

“The Panel considered that DK's argument that others were connected to LS in the same way as him, meaning the DC's finding that he was the one with the connection to the source of the information regarding fixed bets had no consistent basis, would have been a good one were it not for the bets placed by DK on 6 May 2020. In the Panel's view, those bets demonstrated that DK was the first Appellant (other than LS) to bet on a fixed match. It was, therefore, open to the DC to infer that DK disclosed that inside information to others. Although there was no direct communication evidence, there was evidence in the timing of the betting records and it is not the Appeal Panel's function to go behind a finding reasonably based on those records.”

3. In summary, DK's solicitors stated that the submission made by TTE on which the Panel had relied, namely that the bets placed on 6 May 2020 were bets on a fixed match, was erroneous and had not been raised before the Disciplinary Committee (the **DC**). Although DK was provided with an opportunity to respond to the argument during the hearing, his solicitors argued that this was a new submission and it was impossible to conduct the necessary analysis (which the Panel notes was, in DK's solicitors' email of 17 October 2025, thorough and extensive) during the hearing.
4. Given the importance of the point to the Panel's finding on Charge 8, TTE was offered the opportunity to respond. On 24 October 2025, TTE responded to DK's submissions, fairly accepting that the submission was indeed erroneous and offering an explanation for that error. The Panel has no hesitation in accepting TTE's explanation and that the error was entirely inadvertent. The Panel makes no criticism of TTE in this regard, noting that the error is of the kind that can and does occur in hearings with substantial evidence running into the thousands of pages.
5. We must, however, address the issues to which this gives rise.

6. At paragraph 46 of the Appeal Decision, we noted that DK’s argument regarding LS’s connection to him, as well as other Appellants, “*would have been a good one were it not for the bets placed by DK on 6 March 2020*”, before going on to conclude that this was evidence that DK was the first Appellant (other than LS) to bet on a fixed match. In other words, the Panel considered that these bets constituted a complete answer to the question posed by DK’s submission. As set out at paragraph 17 of the Decision, we did not reproduce points which went beyond what we (at the time) considered to be sufficient to determine the appeals.
7. Given that TTE has now accepted that its submission in this regard was erroneous, we must consider afresh whether DK’s argument establishes that the DC’s decision was unreasonable. We reminded ourselves of DK’s submissions in this regard, which highlighted that Mr Haxhillazi had placed relevant bets prior to DK, which DK contended undermined TTE’s submission that inside information flowed from DK to other bettors, including Mr Haxhillazi.
8. Set against this submission, we considered the evidence in support of TTE’s case on Charge 8 which was before the DC, namely:
  - a. DK’s statement at interview that he spoke with LS every other week;
  - b. DK’s association with Mr Haxhillazi via his coaching business, and with the other Appellants (Transcript, p. 20, line 13: “*I know, Luke. I know, Kazeem. I know, Niko. I know, Joseph.*”);
  - c. Exhibit SR-13 to Mr Richardson’s statement, which showed the betting activity of a number of relevant bettors chronologically;
  - d. DK’s refusal to produce his bank statements in response to TTE’s request for the same; and
  - e. the cross-examination of DK by TTE (the Panel notes that the advantages enjoyed by a tribunal of first-instance over an appellate body which was not “in the room” are well-established).
9. We have also noted TTE’s submission that, irrespective of the bets placed on 6 May 2020, there was evidence before the DC that DK’s betting activity was aligned with that of Mr Green / LS prior to Mr Haxhillazi placing any bets. In fairness to DK, we also note that this evidence did not feature prominently (if at all) in TTE’s submissions before the DC, nor does it feature in the DC’s decision itself (the sparsity of which we have already commented on in the Decision).
10. None of the evidence set out above is direct evidence in support of the charge: there was certainly no “smoking gun” evidence available to the DC. However:

- a. DK's relatively frequent contact with LS is circumstantial evidence in that it establishes the possibility of them discussing Inside Information in relation to fixed matches;
  - b. DK's association with the other Appellants and Mr Haxhillazi could be considered to make him a common acquaintance or associate among them;
  - c. Exhibit SR-13 establishes that bets were placed by each of the Appellants on matches on which Mr Green / LS had also bet;
  - d. Exhibit SR-13 also shows that large bets were placed using DK's account, on the same matches that Mr Green / LS had also bet, in close proximity to other relevant bettors (for example on 27 May 2020); and
  - e. in circumstances where DK had failed to provide his banking records in response to TTE's request for the same, adverse inferences could be drawn.
11. Bearing all of that in mind, and even excluding the additional submission made by TTE on DK's betting, the Panel concludes that it was not unreasonable for the DC to decide, as it did, that DK *"shared Inside Information, including details of matches that would be fixed, with his network of bettors including Mr Haxhillazi"*.
12. In particular, the DC's finding does not state that DK was the first to bet, and although DK's submission that Mr Haxhillazi placed relevant bets prior to DK counted against TTE's case, it is not the function of the Panel as an appeals body to weigh this evidence in the balance (particularly in light of the advantage enjoyed by the DC in relation to evidence). The DC conducted that exercise and its finding was not outside the range of responses properly available to the DC. The Panel's finding on Charge 8 is therefore unchanged.

### 3. JF'S REQUEST

13. JF stated that he *"fully accept[ed] that the Appeals Panel decision is final"* but nevertheless sought what he described as *"clarification"* on a number of points, summarised as follows:
- a. First, JF asked the Panel to *"clarify whether it considered that mere use of my account (irrespective of who operated it), was sufficient to establish personal responsibility, or whether it was found that the Disciplinary Committee was entitled to reach that conclusion despite contrary evidence"*.
  - b. Second, JF sought clarification of the threshold for what constitutes *"manifestly excessive"* in relation to sanction. This was relevant, so JF said, to (a) the Panel's decision on sanction and its comments that the sanction imposed by the DC in relation to Charge 14 *"may be harsh for betting offences"* and (b) the Panel's decision on costs.

- c. Third, JF sought clarification of the scope of his suspension, including whether it continued to apply to coaching or assisting others in the delivery of table tennis activities.
  - d. Fourth, JF sought confirmation regarding the publication of the Panel's decision.
  - e. Fifth, JF contended that "All the players sanctioned in these proceedings for betting alone (no fixing) are Black" and asked that "TTE reflects on the optics here and review how it identifies and pursues betting offences".
14. The Panel deals first with JF's final three requests, (c), (d) and (e). These are matters to be discussed between JF and TTE and are beyond the Panel's jurisdiction.
  15. As regards JF's first request for clarification, the Panel reiterates what was said in paragraph 17 of the Decision, namely that we did not attempt to reproduce in the Decision every point made by the parties, although we considered them all. We considered JF's arguments closely but, as set out in the decision, found that the decision made by the DC was not beyond the range of rational responses to the evidence and was not, therefore, unreasonable.
  16. As regards JF's second request, as set out at paragraph 56 of the Decision, the bar that an appellant must clear when arguing that a sanction was "manifestly" excessive is a high one. The sanction must not only be excessive: it must "manifestly" be so (for example because it was based on an erroneous finding). Put differently, it must unarguably and obviously be excessive. It is not the Panel's function to consider what sanction we might have imposed in the circumstances and whether that might have been more lenient than that imposed by the DC. Rather, the Panel must consider whether the sanction is so obviously extreme as to clear that high bar set by the words "manifestly excessive".
  17. In this case, we have determined that the sanction imposed by the DC in relation to Charge 14 did not cross that threshold.
  18. As regards costs, the DC's decision was founded upon an error and was therefore manifestly excessive. The Panel's discretion in relation to costs is broad and the exercise of an award of costs is never a precise mathematical exercise. As set out at paragraph 69 in relation to DK:
 

"although the DC's findings on the most serious charge have been overturned and that warrants a deduction in the amount of costs to be paid, DK's actions were nevertheless a serious breach of the rules. In the absence of a costs order against DK, the costs of the investigation and hearing would fall entirely on TTE and, by extension, its membership. In the circumstances, the Panel considered that such a result would not be reasonable either."
  19. Those findings apply equally to JF and, for the same reasons, we imposed the same costs order. There is no appeal from this decision and no need for further clarification.

For and on behalf of the TTE Appeals Panel:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Campbell'.

Alastair Campbell

Chair

13 November 2025