

Disciplinary Committee

Date: 18 January 2022

FIFA[®]

Sent to:

Chilean Football Association
ffch@anfpchile.cl

Cc.

CONMEBOL

Notification of the grounds of the Decision

Ref FDD-9660

Dear Sirs,

Please find attached the grounds of the decision passed in the aforementioned case by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee on 02 December 2021.

We would appreciate your taking due note of this decision and ensuring its implementation.

Yours faithfully,

FIFA



Carlos Schneider
Director of the FIFA Judicial Bodies

Fédération Internationale de Football Association

FIFA-Strasse 20 P.O. Box 8044 Zurich Switzerland

Tel: +41 43/222 7777 - Email: Disciplinary@fifa.org

Decision of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

passed on 02 December 2021

DECISION BY:

Mr Anin YEBOAH, Ghana (Deputy Chairman)
Mr Thomas HOLLERER, Austria (Member)
Mr Yasser AL-MISEHAL, Saudi Arabia (Member)

ON THE CASE OF:

Chilean Football Association

(Decision FDD-9660)

REGARDING:

Art. 13 - FDC – Discrimination

Art. 16 - FDC - Order and security at matches

I. FACTS

1. The following summary of the facts does not purport to include every single contention put forth by the actors at these proceedings. However, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (**the Committee**) has thoroughly considered in its discussion and deliberations any and all evidence and arguments submitted, even if no specific or detailed reference has been made to those arguments in the following outline of its position and in the ensuing discussion on the merits.
2. On 16 November 2021, a match was played between the representative teams of Chile and Ecuador in Santiago (Chile – Attendance 8,505 spectators – Final score 0-2) in the context of the Preliminary Competition of the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™, South American Zone (**the Match**).
3. In this context, the referee of the Match mentioned the following incidents in his report (**the Referee Report**):
 - *“A los 15min ingresó al campo de juego un espectador que fue retirado por seguridad sin causar mayores incidentes.”*
 - *“A los 70min el público local situado en tribunas norte ha lanzado una lata de Coca Cola no logrando impactar al arquero visitante.”¹*
4. In addition, the match commissioner mentioned in its report (**the MC Report**) several incidents in the following terms:
 - *“A los 15 minutos ingreso un espectador al campo de juego, el mismo fue retirado con apoyo de seguridad sin causar incidentes.”*
 - *“A los 22 min el público local ubicado en tribuna sur ha detonado una bomba de estruendo sin causar danos a personas.”*
 - *“A los 70 min el público ubicado en tribuna norte arroja una lata de coca cola que no impacto en el arquero visitante.”*
 - *“Al final del partido el público local ubicado en tribuna oficial profirió insultos racistas a los jugadores visitantes: Negros de mierda y Negros Culeados.”²*
5. In view of the foregoing, disciplinary proceedings were opened against the Chilean Football Association (**the Respondent**) on 18 November 2021 with respect to a potential breach of arts. 13 and 16 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code (**FDC**). In particular, the latter was provided with the

¹ Free translation:

- In the 15th minute a spectator entered the field of play and was removed by security without causing any major incident.
- In the 70th minute the home crowd in the north stands threw a Coca Cola can, but it did not hit the visiting goalkeeper.

² Free translation:

- After 15 minutes a spectator entered the field of play and was removed with the help of security without causing any incidents.
- In the 22nd minute the home crowd located in the south stand detonated a bomb without causing any damage.
- In the 70th minute the public located in the north stand threw a can of Coca Cola which did not hit the visiting goalkeeper.
- At the end of the match the home crowd in the official stand hurled racist insults at the visiting players: Fucking niggers and shit niggers.

above-mentioned reports and was granted a six-day deadline to provide the Secretariat to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (**the Secretariat**) with its position.

II. RESPONDENT'S POSITION

6. On 24 November 2021, the Respondent provided its position, which can be summarised as follows:

Regarding the alleged lack of order and security:

"After 15 minutes a spectator entered the field of play and was removed with the help of security without causing any incidents."

- One spectator from the crowd entered a prohibited area.
- However, this pitch invasion in no case disturbed the development of the Match.
- The spectator, upon seeing how Mr. Arturo Vidal - player of the Chilean national team - was expelled from the Match, entered Zone 1 to accompany him peacefully, while he walked off the pitch.
- The spectator was subsequently arrested by the Police.

"In the 22nd minute the home crowd located in the south stand detonated a bomb without causing any damage".

- The Respondent categorically rejects any conduct that undermines order and security. Nevertheless, it is worth noting the lack of evidence presented in the present case, where at no time there is a video or part of the broadcast of the match showing a detonation in the stadium.
- As per art. 40 FDC., facts recorded in the reports of the match officials are presumed to be accurate. However, according to art. 36 FDC, the burden of proof in respect of disciplinary offences lies with the FIFA judicial bodies.
- The Respondent confirmed that there was indeed a loud noise during the match but that, in no case, occurred inside or close to the stadium.
- Furthermore, as body checks were conducted on each spectator before entering the stadium, it was not possible to bring such an item into the stadium.

"In the 70th minute the public located in the north stand threw a can of Coca Cola, but it did not hit the visiting goalkeeper."

- The Respondent categorically condemns this incident.
- Without justifying the reprehensible act of the supporter, the Respondent pointed out that this throw occurred when the Ecuadorian goalkeeper was delaying the restart of the game, in a total unsportsmanlike manner.
- However, as a mitigating circumstance, the Respondent indicated that the bottle did not hit the goalkeeper.
- In view of the foregoing, the Respondent emphasized that it takes its security-related obligation seriously and hired a company specialized in security to provide a safer atmosphere during the match in question.

Regarding the alleged incident of discrimination

"At the end of the match the home crowd in the official stand hurled racist insults at the visiting players: Shit niggers and fucking niggers."

- The Respondent categorically rejects any racist or discriminatory conduct.
- In this respect, the Respondent has carried out countless activities and projects, aimed at educating and raising awareness about this type of behavior.
- Nevertheless, the Respondent pointed out the lack of evidence submitted in the present proceedings. In particular, the Respondent referred again to art. 36 and 40 FDC and emphasized that it was not aware of the occurrence of this racist incident.
- Moreover, the Respondent installed anti-discriminatory banners in the stadium and the speaker repeated around 15 times messages to promote respect for the visiting team.

Regarding the implementation of a prevention plan

- In the unlikely event that the aforementioned position is not sufficient, the Respondent wished to recall that it has spent a significant amount of time drawing up a roadmap to implement a culture where diversity is lived on a daily basis:
 - During the Copa America in 2015, the supporters were invited to show a green card during the anthem of the rival team, without booing or whistling, showing a sign of respect.
 - In 2019, FIFA chose the Respondent with the aim of implementing a regional model of collaboration in the fight against discrimination in football.
 - In the same year, the Respondent implemented a diversity and non-discrimination project, including among other, workshops for clubs related to non-discrimination and violence-free spaces. In this way, 18 national clubs have been trained.
 - A protocol for the prevention and punishment of sexual harassment, discrimination and mistreatment in football was set up and several campaigns in that respect were conducted.

Request

- In view of the foregoing, the Respondent requested the Disciplinary Committee to refrain from imposing sanctions, or in the alternative, to impose the lowest possible sanction.

7. The Committee, once again, reiterated that it has considered all the facts, allegations, legal arguments and evidence provided by the Respondent, and in the present decision had only referred to those observations and evidence regarded as necessary to explain its reasoning.

III. CONSIDERATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

8. In view of the circumstances of the present case, the Committee decided to first address the procedural aspects of the case, *i.e.* its jurisdiction and the applicable regulatory framework, before proceeding to the merits of the case and determining the possible infringements as well as the possible resulting sanctions.

A. Jurisdiction of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

9. First of all, the Committee noted that at no point during the present proceedings did the Respondent challenge its jurisdiction or the applicability of the FDC.
10. Notwithstanding the above and for the sake of good order, the Committee found it worthwhile to emphasise that, on the basis of art. 2 (1) FDC read together with art. 53 FDC, it was competent to evaluate the present case and to impose sanctions in case of corresponding violations.

B. Applicable law

11. In order to duly assess the matter, the Committee firstly began by recalling the content and the scope of the relevant provisions of the 2019 edition of the FDC, which was, in its view, the edition applicable to the present issue. In particular, the Committee considered that both the merits and the procedural aspects of the present case should be covered by the 2019 edition of the FDC.
12. In continuation, the Committee referred to arts. 13 and 16 FDC in the following terms:

Art. 13 of the FDC – Discrimination

1. *Any person who offends the dignity or integrity of a country, a person or group of people through contemptuous, discriminatory or derogatory words or actions (by any means whatsoever) on account of race, skin colour, ethnic, national or social origin, gender, disability, sexual orientation, language, religion, political opinion, wealth, birth or any other status or any other reason, shall be sanctioned with a suspension lasting at least ten matches or a specific period, or any other appropriate disciplinary measure.*
 2. *If one or more of an association's or club's supporters engage in the behaviour described in paragraph 1, the association or club responsible will be subject to the following disciplinary measures:*
 - (a) For a first offence, playing a match with a limited number of spectators and a fine of at least CHF 20,000 shall be imposed on the association or club concerned;*
 - (b) For reoffenders or if the circumstances of the case require it, disciplinary measures such as the implementation of a prevention plan, a fine, a points deduction, playing one or more matches without spectators, a ban on playing in a particular stadium, the forfeiting of a match, expulsion from a competition or relegation to a lower division may be imposed on the association or club concerned.*
- (...)

13. The abovementioned provision represents the continuation of art. 4 of the FIFA Statutes, which strictly prohibits discrimination of any kind and on any grounds. In particular, this provision of the Disciplinary Code aims to punish the perpetrator(s) of the discriminatory act, but also holds the clubs and association to which the perpetrator(s) belongs responsible for this behaviour in accordance with art. 13 (2) FDC.

14. Through this strict liability rule, the club or association concerned is responsible for the misconduct of its supporters even if it is not at fault. As such, the Committee is empowered to sanction not only the perpetrator of the discriminatory act, but also the club/association to which the latter belongs, in order to implement FIFA's zero-tolerance policy on discrimination.
15. In particular, the Committee wished to emphasise that the abovementioned principle of strict liability is a fundamental element of the football regulatory system, as well as one of the few legal tools to prevent misconduct by supporters from occurring and going unpunished.
16. In relation to the above, the Committee recalled that according to CAS jurisprudence, the term "supporter" is an open concept, which must be assessed from the perspective of a reasonable and objective observer³. This means that the behaviour of the person may lead a reasonable and objective observer to conclude that the latter is a supporter of that particular club/association. Moreover, CAS specified that the behaviour of individuals and their location in and around the stadium are important criteria in determining the team they support⁴.
17. Finally, it should be kept in mind that discrimination and insulting behaviour can be intentional but also unintentional in the sense that even if the use of the terms was not intentionally addressed to a specific person or group of persons for insulting or discriminatory purposes, these terms and expressions may still be insulting in the eyes of third parties⁵.

Art. 16 of the FDC – Order and security at matches

1. *Host clubs and associations are responsible for order and security both in and around the stadium before, during and after matches. They are liable for incidents of any kind and may be subject to disciplinary measures and directives unless they can prove that they have not been negligent in any way in the organisation of the match. In particular, associations, clubs and licensed match agents who organise matches shall:*
 - a) *assess the degree of risk posed by the match and notify the FIFA bodies of those that are especially high-risk;*
 - b) *comply with and implement existing safety rules (FIFA regulations, national laws, international agreements) and take every safety precaution demanded by the circumstances in and around the stadium before, during and after the match and if incidents occur;*
 - c) *ensure the safety of the match officials and the players and officials of the visiting team during their stay;*
 - d) *keep local authorities informed and collaborate with them actively and effectively;*
 - e) *ensure that law and order are maintained in and around the stadiums and that matches are organised properly.*
2. *All associations and clubs are liable for inappropriate behaviour on the part of one or more of their supporters as stated below and may be subject to disciplinary measures*

³ CAS 2015/A/3874.

⁴ CAS 2007/A/1217.

⁵ CAS 2016/A/4788.

and directives even if they can prove the absence of any negligence in relation to the organisation of the match:

- a) the invasion or attempted invasion of the field of play;*
- b) the throwing of objects;*
- c) the lighting of fireworks or any other objects;*
- (...)*

18. It is clear from the wording of this provision that its main purpose is to ensure that matches are properly organised so that no incident can occur and disrupt any football match. In particular, the home association/club shall be held responsible for any incidents in and around the stadium, but may be released from any disciplinary measures if it can prove that all necessary measures have been taken, *i.e.* that it was not negligent in the organisation of the match (art. 16 (1) FDC).
19. In contrast to the first paragraph, the second paragraph contains a strict liability rule according to which an association, whether home or visiting, is responsible for the behaviour of its own supporters⁶.
20. In light of the above, the Committee concluded that while an association/club may be held responsible for the behaviour of its supporters as per art. 16 (2) FDC, it is incumbent on the adjudicating body to consider whether the Respondent should be subject to the imposition of a sanction is justified.

C. Standard of proof

21. Firstly, the Committee recalled that the burden of proof lies with FIFA, which is required to prove the infringement under art. 36 (1) FDC.
22. Secondly, the Committee pointed out that, according to art. 35 (3) FDC, the standard of "*comfortable satisfaction*" is applicable in disciplinary proceedings. According to this standard of proof, the onus is on the sanctioning authority to establish the disciplinary violation to the comfortable satisfaction of the judging body, taking into account the seriousness of the allegation.
23. Finally, the Committee referred to art. 40 FDC, according to which the facts contained in the match officials' reports, as well as in the supplementary reports or correspondence submitted by the match officials, are presumed to be accurate, bearing in mind that proof of their inaccuracy may be provided.
24. Having clarified the foregoing, the Committee proceeded to consider the merits of the case.

⁶ Cf. explanation outlined in art. 13 FDC regarding the notion of supporters.

D. Merits of the case

1. Issue of review

25. The Committee started to analyse the evidence at its disposal, in particular the documentation and information provided in the scope of the present disciplinary proceeding to determine the potential violations of the FDC.
26. As a preliminary remark, the Commission wished to recall that, according to art. 40 FDC, the facts stated in the reports or records of the match officials are presumed to be correct, although it is possible to prove the contrary.
27. In this context, the Committee acknowledged the following elements:
- from the Referee Report:
 - a. In the 15th minute, a spectator entered the field of play and was removed by the security without causing a major incident (**incident 1**);
 - b. In the 70th minute, a can of Coca Cola was thrown at the visiting goalkeeper by the home crowd (**incident 2**).
 - from the MC Report:
 - a. In the 22nd minute, the home crowd detonated a bomb without causing any damage (**incident 3**).
 - b. In the 70th minute, the public located in the north stand threw a can of Coca Cola at the visiting goalkeeper but did not hit him (**incident 2**).
 - c. At the end of the match, the home crowd hurled the following insult at players of the visiting team: "*Negros de mierda y Negros Culeados*"⁷ (**incident 4**).
28. Having established the above, the Committee then acknowledged that the Respondent did not deny the occurrence of incidents 1 and 2, but rather asserted that (i) the invasion of the field of play did not disturb the course of the Match and ii) that the can did not hit the goalkeeper of the visiting team. With respect to incidents 3 and 4, the Respondent emphasised that it totally rejects discriminatory behaviours as well as behaviours that jeopardise order and safety in the stadium but argued that the two incidents at hand were only reported by the match commissioner, without any further evidence on these incidents. In particular, the Respondent stated that it was not aware of incidents 3 and 4 and that the burden of proving the disciplinary infringement was on FIFA.
29. Against this background, the Committee noted that the match officials clearly identified the perpetrators of incidents 2, 3 and 4, specifically:
- Incident 2: a can of Coca Cola was thrown to the visiting goalkeeper by a home (Chilean) supporter;

⁷Free translation: fucking niggers and shit niggers.

- Incident 3: a home (Chilean) supporter lit a “bomb”;
- Incident 4: home (Chilean) supporters hurled insults at the players of the visiting team.

30. Insofar incident 1 is concerned, the Committee observed that the referee of the Match did not specify whether the person who entered onto the field of play was a home (Chilean) supporter, but upon reading the position of the Respondent, the Committee had no doubt that the aforementioned spectator – who upon seeing how Mr. Arturo Vidal was sent off, entered Zone 1 to accompany him peacefully while the said player walked off the pitch – should be considered a supporter of the home (Chilean) team. Indeed, any (reasonable and objective) observer could only conclude that the perpetrator of this incident was a supporter of the Chilean team.
31. As such, the Committee was comfortably satisfied that the abovementioned incidents (1-4) were all committed by home supporters, *i.e.* supporters of the Chilean team.
32. Having clarified the above, the Committee decided to analyse the abovementioned incidents in order to assess whether any provisions of the FDC had been breached.

2. Infringements committed by the supporters of the Chilean Football Association

i. The discriminatory behaviour of the Chilean supporters (incident 4)

33. As already mentioned, the Committee took note of the fact that the match commissioner reported that at the end of the match the home supporters insulted the players of the visiting team with the words "*Negros de mierda y Negros Culeados*". Nevertheless, the Respondent stated that it was not aware of this incident, which was not supported by other evidence.
34. Against this background, the Committee referred to art. 40 FDC, which provides that the reports or records of the match officials are presumed to be correct, although it is possible to prove the contrary. In this respect, the Committee pointed out that the Respondent had not submitted any elements or evidence to rebut the presumption of accuracy of the MC Report and the information contained therein.
35. As such, the Committee was comfortably satisfied that the aforementioned incident – caused by home supporters (cf. above developments) – occurred and had no doubt that the words uttered by the said supporters were racist and discriminatory towards the players of the Ecuadorian team because of their skin colour. In this respect, the Committee strongly condemned such insults.
36. The use of racist and discriminatory words/insults by supporters is in clear violation of art. 13 FDC in so far that it "*offends the dignity or integrity of (...) a person or group of people through contemptuous, discriminatory or derogatory words (...) on account of race, skin colour, ethnic, national or social origin, (...)*".
37. On account of the above, the Committee recalled that such behaviour is strictly prohibited and is to be sanctioned accordingly.

38. As a result, the Committee considered that the home supporters uttered racist and discriminatory insults in violation of art. 13 (1) FDC, thus incurring the liability of the Respondent under the principle of strict liability contained in art. 13 (2) FDC. The Committee therefore held that the Respondent had to be sanctioned accordingly.

ii. The improper behaviour of the Chilean supporters (incidents 1, 2 and 3)

39. To begin with, the Committee noted that the Respondent did not contest the occurrence of incidents 1 and 3, namely the invasion of the field of play and the throwing of a Coca Cola can at the goalkeeper of the visiting team, but rather downplayed these incidents, in particular the throwing of the can as it did not hit the goalkeeper.

40. With regard to the detonation of the "bomb" in the 22nd minute of the Match, the Respondent submitted a similar statement to that filed with regard to the racist and discriminatory insults, i.e. i) that it was not aware of this incident, (ii) which had not been corroborated by other evidence. In addition, the Respondent argued that a detonation had taken place, but outside the stadium and that security/body checks had been carried out on supporters before they entered the stadium, so that such a "device" could not have entered the stadium.

41. In the light of the above, the Committee again pointed out that the abovementioned incidents were mentioned in the Referee Report and the MC Report and are therefore presumed to have been correctly reflected in the said reports. Moreover, given that the Respondent did not contest the occurrence of incidents 1 and 3 or convincingly demonstrate that the facts reported in relation to incident 2 were inaccurate, for example by submitting evidence proving the contrary, the Committee had no doubt that these three incidents took place and had been perpetrated by home (Chilean) supporters.

42. In light of the foregoing, in particular the fact that those incidents were caused by home supporters (cf. above developments), the Committee was satisfied to hold the Respondent responsible for the inappropriate behaviour of its supporter in accordance with art. 16 (2) FDC. Indeed, this provision clearly provides that the association is liable for the misconduct of its supporter, especially with regard to *the invasion or attempted invasion of the field of play* (lit. a), *the throwing of objects* (lit. b) and *the lighting of fireworks or any other objects* (lit. c). In particular, the Committee had no doubt that the aforementioned incidents (i.e. incidents 1, 2 and 3) fell within the scope of one of the abovementioned sub-paragraphs.

3. Determination of the sanction

43. The Committee observed in the first place that the Respondent was a legal person, and as such was subject to the sanctions described under art. 6 (1) and (3) FDC.

44. For the sake of good order, the Committee underlined that it is responsible to determine the type and extent of the disciplinary measures to be imposed in accordance with the objective and subjective elements of the offence, taking into account both aggravating and mitigating circumstances (art. 24 (1) FDC).

45. As established above, the Respondent was found liable for the discriminatory and improper behaviour of its supporters in accordance with arts. 13 and 16 FDC.
46. In this context, taking into account the racist and discriminatory behaviour of the Chilean supporters (incident 4), the Committee wished to emphasise FIFA's policy of zero tolerance towards discrimination and any incidents in that regard should be condemned in the strongest possible terms as well as with sanctions that reflect the seriousness of the offence.
47. In continuation, the Committee recalled that, in so far that discriminatory incidents are concerned, it is bound by the minimum sanctions foreseen under art. 13 (2) (a) FDC.
48. In this context, while welcoming the various campaigns and measures undertaken by the Respondent against discrimination and the implementation of a prevention plan in this respect, the Committee held that it could not ignore the fact that the Respondent had been sanctioned by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee during the course of 2021 on two occasions for very similar (if not identical) incidents that occurred during two matches of the Preliminary Competition of the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™, namely during the matches *Chile v. Brazil* and *Chile v. Paraguay* played on 2 September and 10 October 2021 respectively⁸.
49. In particular, the Respondent was sanctioned on both occasions with a match to be played with a limited number of spectators and a fine. In addition, Decision FDD-8988 ordered the Respondent to play the Match that is the subject of the present disciplinary proceedings (*Chile v. Ecuador*) with a limited number of spectators. In other words, while the Respondent was serving a disciplinary sanction, i.e. a match with a limited number of spectators, its supporters committed another discrimination-related offence by insulting the players of the Ecuadorian team in a racist and discriminatory manner.
50. Finally, the Committee noted that the two aforementioned decisions had been notified to the Respondent on 8 November 2021, meaning before the Match subject of the present procedure which was played on 16 November 2021. Consequently, the Committee considered that in light of those precedents, the Respondent could undoubtedly be considered a reoffender within the meaning of art. 13 (2) (b) FDC.
51. In other words, the Committee was satisfied that it was entitled to impose additional and/or harsher sanctions than those foreseen under art. 13 (2) (a) FDC, i.e. those provided by art. 13 (2) (b) FDC, such possibility being limited to "*reoffenders*" or situation in which "*the circumstances of the case require it*", the first criteria being met in the case at stake.
52. In this respect, the Committee considered that, among the range of sanctions available under art. 13 (2) (b) FDC, a fine and "*playing of one or more matches without spectators*" were appropriate measures to sanction the Respondent for the discriminatory behaviour of its spectators. With respect to the match(es) to be played without spectators, the Committee was of the view that, given the present circumstances, it was the most appropriate measure to be deterrent on the Respondent, but also on the perpetrators of those discriminatory incidents as it would be directly impacting them.

⁸ Decisions FDD-8988 and FDD-9247.

53. In those circumstances, the Committee regretted that, despite the previous sanctions imposed on the Respondent and the efforts undertaken by the latter to implement preventive measures, such kind of incidents happened again during the Match at stake, especially when the stands behind the goal were closed following Decision FDD-8988.
54. Nevertheless, the Committee wanted to emphasise its appreciation on the efforts made by the Respondent prior to the Match (*praising the prevention plan and anti-discrimination campaign conducted by the latter*) but also during the Match (*the anti-discriminatory banners installed in the stadium and the messages of the speaker promoting respect for the visiting team*). However, the Committee underlined that those elements could not outweigh the seriousness of the offence committed, such behaviours having no place in football.
55. As such, the Committee was satisfied that harsh sanctions were necessary considering that the previous ones failed to have the expected deterrent effect on those perpetrating the racist and discriminatory insults. The prevention plan and various measures implemented by the Respondent unfortunately failed to be fruitful in eradicating discriminatory behaviours.
56. Given the above and keeping in mind (i) the seriousness of the offence committed, (ii) the fact that the Respondent had already been ordered on two occasions to play one match with a limited number of spectators and (iii) that the previous sanctions appeared to have proven to be insufficient, the Committee was satisfied that imposing one match without spectators was a proportionate and adequate sanction.
57. In so far that the fine is concerned, the Committee recalled that, in accordance with art. 6 (4) FDC, it may not be lower than CHF 100 and greater than CHF 1,000,000.
58. Against this legal background, the Committee decided to impose a fine amounting to CHF 60,000 for the following reasons:
 - The fines imposed on the Respondent in cases FDD-8988 and FDD-9247 were taken into account.
 - The Chilean supporters hurled racist and discriminatory insults to players of the visiting team.
 - In addition to the aforementioned incident, the home supporters committed further infringements, such as i) invading the field of play, ii) detonating a “bomb” and iii) throwing a can of Coca Cola to the goalkeeper of the visiting team.
59. As a result, the Committee held that playing one match without spectators combined with a fine amounting to CHF 60,000 for the four incidents that were perpetrated by the Chilean supporters during the Match were to be considered appropriate and proportionate measures. In particular, the Committee was hopeful that such sanctions would (finally) serve the necessary deterrent effect, both on the Respondent and its supporters, while encouraging the Respondent to continue its efforts to prevent such incidents to happen again.
60. Finally, and with respect to the match to be played without spectators, the Committee took into account the previous decision under reference FDD-9247 and held that such measure had to be implemented on the occasion of the upcoming home match *Chile vs. Uruguay*, to be played on 29 March 2022 in the context of the Preliminary Competition for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™.

IV. DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

- 1. The Chilean Football Association is ordered to pay a fine to the amount of CHF 60,000 for the discriminatory as well as the inappropriate behaviour of its supporters (invasion of the field of play, throwing of objects, lighting of fireworks) in connection with the match *Chile vs. Ecuador* played on 16 November 2021 in the scope of the Preliminary Competition for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™, South American Zone.**
- 2. The Chilean Football Association is ordered to play its home match *Chile v. Uruguay* to be played on 29 March 2022 in the context of the Preliminary Competition for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022™, without spectators.**
- 3. The fine is to be paid within 30 days of notification of the present decision.**

FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE
DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION



Anin Yeboah

Deputy Chairman of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

NOTE RELATING TO THE PAYMENT OF THE FINE:

Payment can be made either in Swiss francs (CHF) to account no. 0230-325519.70J, UBS AG, Bahnhofstrasse 45, 8098 Zurich, SWIFT: UBSWCHZH80A, IBAN: CH85 0023 0230 3255 1970 J or in US dollars (USD) to account no. 0230-325519.71U, UBS AG, Bahnhofstrasse 45, 8098 Zurich, SWIFT: UBSWCHZH80A, IBAN: CH95 0023 0230 3255 1971 U, with reference to case number above mentioned.

NOTE RELATING TO THE LEGAL ACTION:

This decision can be contested before the FIFA Appeal Committee (art. 57 FDC). Any party intending to appeal must announce its intention to do so in writing within three (3) days of notification of the grounds of the decision. Reasons for the appeal must then be given in writing within a further time limit of five (5) days, commencing upon expiry of the first time limit of three (3) days (art. 56 (4) FDC). The appeal fee of CHF 1,000 shall be transferred to the aforementioned bank account upon submission of the appeal brief (art. 56 (6) FDC).