

Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

passed on 7 July 2023

regarding an employment-related dispute concerning
the player Tristan Koskor

BY:

Frans de Weger (the Netherlands), Chairperson
Khadija Timera (Senegal), member
André dos Santos Megale (Brazil), member

CLAIMANT:

Tristan Koskor, Estonia
Represented by K&S Legal

RESPONDENT:

Pegeia 2014, Cyprus
Represented by Mr Marios Apostolidis

I. Facts of the case

1. On 31 July 2022, the Estonian player, Tristan Koskor (hereinafter: *the Claimant* or *player*), and the Cypriot club, Pegeia 2014 (hereinafter: *the Respondent* or *club*) signed an employment contract (hereinafter: *the Contract*) valid as from 1 August 2022 until 30 June 2023.
2. According to the Claimant, art. 1.3 of the Contract foresaw a net monthly remuneration of EUR 5,000 between 31 August 2022 and 30 April 2023, as well as a promotion bonus of EUR 2,000 net and various additional advantages such as accommodation, a car and a return flight ticket.
3. On the other hand, the Respondent alleged that the Contract only foresaw a monthly net remuneration of EUR 150 to which the Claimant would be entitled.
4. At an unspecified date in December 2022, the Claimant allegedly requested a private meeting with the president of the Respondent, complaining about his minimum participation in matches and expressing the wish to play more frequently.
5. On 20 December 2022, the parties allegedly signed a mutual termination Agreement (hereinafter: *the Termination Agreement*).
6. In accordance with such Agreement, it was purportedly stipulated as follows:

"After a mutual agreement between the [Respondent] and the [Claimant], the [Respondent] accepts to give a free transfer to the [Claimant], by mutually terminating earlier the professional Contract Agreement that both parties have signed on 31 July 2022 for the football season 2022/2023.

[The Respondent] paid in full to the [Claimant] all amounts of salaries / bonuses and has no further financial obligations or obligations of any other type towards the player, including and arising from any oral & written agreements and from the professional Contract Agreement that both parties have signed on 31 July 2022 for the football season 2022-2023.

The [Claimant] declares that he has no further financial requisitions and demands or requisitions/demands of any other type from [the Respondent] and that he has been paid in full all amounts of salaries / bonuses included and arising from any oral & written agreements and from the professional Contract Agreement that both parties signed on 31 July 2022 for the season 2022-2023."

7. According to the Respondent, the Claimant specifically requested not to forward said Agreement to the Cypriot Football Association until he would find a new club, and that, in the meantime, the Claimant would continue to train with the rest of the team. The Respondent purportedly agreed to such alleged request.

8. On the same day, the Respondent provided the Claimant with a handwritten cash receipt of EUR 20,000 for the salaries between August 2022 and November 2022.
9. On 26, 27 and 28 December 2022 the Respondent communicated "fitness session plans" to the Claimant.
10. On 6 January 2023, according to the Respondent, the Claimant allegedly requested to be included in the match on 7 January 2023, in spite of the Termination Agreement being in place.
11. On 7 January 2023, the Claimant participated in an official match for the Respondent.
12. On 10 January 2023, according to the Respondent, the Claimant allegedly threatened the president of the former, stating that he changed his mind about leaving the Club and that if he did not receive EUR 15,000 in cash by the end of the week, he would tell the squad that his signature on the Termination Agreement was forged and that he would submit a claim for the residual value of the Contract.
13. On 11 January 2023, a representative of the Respondent informed the Claimant that he has been removed from the team, that he should no longer participate in training sessions and should only use the gym for personal workouts, because the Respondent wishes not to be held responsible for any potential injury.
14. On the same day, the Claimant replied to said message, informing the Respondent that he has a valid Contract which he intends to honour and that he expects the Respondent to do the same. He further stated that, in case of any injuries, he expects to be treated the same way as any other player, and in accordance with the rules of the CFA. The Claimant lastly outlined that, if he found a different club willing to provide him with "normal conditions", he would mutually terminate the Contract.
15. On 14 January 2023, the Cypriot agent who facilitated the transfer of the Claimant to the Respondent sent a "signed" copy of the Termination Agreement to the Claimant's Estonian agent, stating that the Claimant "already signed his mutual release".
16. On the same day, the Claimant replied, informing that he never signed the Termination Agreement, has never seen the document, and that consequently it had been forged. The Claimant also stressed that he had no intention to terminate the Contract.
17. Following such correspondence, the Respondent allegedly threatened the Claimant that it would call the police to evict him from his apartment if he did not accept the terms of the Termination Agreement and vacated the accommodation immediately.

18. On 15 January 2023, the Claimant sent a further email to the Respondent, outlining that he signature was forged, that he had been banned from participating in training, and that he was forced to leave his accommodation, and that on the basis of such alleged abusive behaviour, he terminated the Contract unilaterally with alleged just cause.
19. On 18 January 2023, the Respondent contacted the Claimant, informing the latter that the Termination Agreement is valid and binding, and at the same time that the Contract registered with the CFA allegedly only foresaw a salary of EUR 150 net.
20. On 23 January 2023, the Claimant responded, asserting to the Club that the registered Contract with CFA is falsified, and that the salary for December 2022 remained unpaid. The Claimant further emphasized that the Respondent is acting in utmost bad faith.
21. Following the departure of the Claimant from Cyprus, the parties exchanged correspondence, with the Respondent offering the Claimant EUR 5,000 plus legal fees "to drop the issue", whereas the Claimant insisted on receiving a compensation of EUR 15,000. The Respondent also emphasized in this exchange of correspondence that the Claimant *"came to the club as a main striker (...) but kept his form below bar in every single game, scoring 0 goals and having a generally speaking below average performance."*
22. On 20 February 2023, the Claimant signed an employment contract with Estonian club JK Narva Trans (hereinafter: *the New Club*) valid as from the date of signature until 3 December 2023 (hereinafter: *the New Contract*).
23. The New Contract foresaw the following net remuneration :
 - As from the date of commencement of the New Contract until 30 June 2023: EUR 510;
 - As from 1 July 2023 until 3 December 2023: EUR 810 net;
 - An unspecified "scholarship fee".

II. Proceedings before FIFA

24. On 16 February 2023, the Claimant lodged a claim against the Respondent in front of FIFA. A brief summary of the parties' submissions is outlined below.

a. Position of the Claimant

25. In his claim, the player argued that the Respondent had forged the Termination Agreement, excluded him from training, and forced to leave his accommodation under threat of calling the police to do so.
26. The Claimant also argued not having been paid the salary for December 2022. In this regard, he emphasised that the Respondent submitted a forged copy of the Contract in which his salary was stated as EUR 150 net, whereas the payment slip for his salaries from August 2022 – November 2022 clearly indicate that he received remuneration of EUR 20,000 net – i.e. EUR 5,000 net monthly.
27. The Claimant further emphasised that he had communicated with the Respondent's fitness staff following the alleged signature of the Termination Agreement, as well as participating in an official match, which all support the line of argument that he had not signed such Agreement and continued to be part of the team until the Respondent informed him of his exclusion.
28. The Claimant thus requested EUR 25,000 net as compensation, corresponding to the alleged residual value of the Contract as from December 2022 until April 2023.
29. Lastly, the Claimant requested annual interest of 5% as from 23 December 2022 until the date of effective payment.

b. Reply of the Respondent

30. In its reply, the Respondent argued that the Claimant allegedly signed a valid and binding Termination Agreement, acknowledging all outstanding amounts having been paid and waiving the right to any future amounts.
31. The Respondent emphasised that the signature on the Termination Agreement matched the one on the Contract (which was also uploaded on TMS), and that, as a consequence, the allegation of forgery must be dismissed.
32. The Respondent alleged that the Claimant had insisted on leaving the club due to a lack of playing time, signing the Termination Agreement, and thereafter plotting a scheme of "blackmailing" the club's president in order to unlawfully obtain compensation he is not entitled to.

33. The Respondent made reference to several purported oral agreements with the Claimant, according to which the latter allegedly requested to be included in the match squad despite the Termination Agreement in place.
34. The Respondent equally submitted several affidavits from club staff members corroborating that the Claimant had allegedly signed the Termination Agreement and that he had requested to be included in the matchday squad, and only excluded from training after his threats to the president.
35. In conclusion, the Respondent insisted on the validity of the Termination Agreement and thus requested the claim to be rejected.

c. Replica of the Claimant

36. In his brief replica, the Claimant pointed to the lack of evidence submitted by the Respondent, as well as the contradictory submissions – namely that a player would request to be included in a matchday squad to end up playing only one minute in said match.
37. The Claimant also emphasised again that the alleged copy of the Contract describing a salary of EUR 150 net is entirely contradictory with the payment slip, which the Respondent did not contest.
38. The Claimant also briefly informed the Administration of his new Contract, stating that his salary combined with the “scholarship fee” amounted to EUR 1,200 net.
39. In short, the Claimant reiterated all previous arguments.

d. Duplica of the Respondent

40. In its duplica, the Respondent reiterated all previous arguments, presenting no further supporting evidence.

III. Considerations of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

a. Competence and applicable legal framework

41. First of all, the Dispute Resolution Chamber (hereinafter also referred to as *Chamber* or *DRC*) analysed whether it was competent to deal with the case at hand. In this respect, it took note that the present matter was presented to FIFA on 16 February 2023 and submitted for decision on 7 July 2023. Taking into account the wording of art. 34 of the May 2023 edition of the Procedural Rules Governing the Football Tribunal (hereinafter: *the Procedural Rules*), the aforementioned edition of the Procedural Rules is applicable to the matter at hand.
42. Subsequently, the members of the Chamber referred to art. 2 par. 1 of the Procedural Rules and observed that in accordance with art. 23 par. 1 in combination with art. 22 lit. b) of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (May 2023 edition), the Dispute Resolution Chamber is competent to deal with the matter at stake, which concerns an employment-related dispute with an international dimension between a player from Estonia and a club from Cyprus.
43. Subsequently, the Chamber analysed which regulations should be applicable as to the substance of the matter. In this respect, it confirmed that, in accordance with art. 26 par. 1 and 2 of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (May 2023 edition), and considering that the present claim was lodged on 16 February 2023, the October 2022 edition of said regulations (hereinafter: *the Regulations*) is applicable to the matter at hand as to the substance.

b. Burden of proof

44. The Chamber recalled the basic principle of burden of proof, as stipulated in art. 13 par. 5 of the Procedural Rules, according to which a party claiming a right on the basis of an alleged fact shall carry the respective burden of proof. Likewise, the Chamber stressed the wording of art. 13 par. 4 of the Procedural Rules, pursuant to which it may consider evidence not filed by the parties, including without limitation the evidence generated by or within the Transfer Matching System (TMS).

c. Merits of the dispute

45. Its competence and the applicable regulations having been established, the Chamber entered into the merits of the dispute. In this respect, the Chamber started by acknowledging all the above-mentioned facts as well as the arguments and the documentation on file. However, the Chamber emphasised that in the following considerations it will refer only to the facts, arguments and documentary evidence, which it considered pertinent for the assessment of the matter at hand.

i. Main legal discussion and considerations

46. The foregoing having been established, the Chamber moved to the substance of the matter, and took note of the fact that the parties strongly dispute which version of the Contract is authentic, or “true”, whether or not the Termination Agreement can be considered valid and binding, and lastly whether or not, based thereon, there are any potential damages to be claimed on the basis of the potentially unlawful breach of the Contract by the Respondent.
47. In this context, the Chamber acknowledged that its task was to determine firstly what the contractual basis of the claim at hand was, followed by establishing the circumstances of the parties’ departure from the Contract, and lastly whether or not the Claimant had just cause to terminate the Contract, provided it had not been mutually terminated beforehand.
48. The Chamber firstly recalled the parties’ submissions, beginning with the Claimant, who argued that he terminated the contract with just cause due to abusive behaviour and outstanding remuneration. The Claimant asserted that his signature on the Termination Agreement was forged, that he was excluded from training without any justification, that he was evicted from his accommodation and threatened with police intervention. In the absence of a valid and binding Termination Agreement, therefore, the Claimant outlined that the Contract was terminated with just cause due to abusive behaviour by the Respondent.
49. On the other hand, the Chamber took note of the line of argument of the Respondent, who submitted that the Termination Agreement is valid and binding, on account of the fact that the signature thereon matches with the signature on the Contract, and that it is signed with live ink. It was further noted that the Respondent further justified the inconsistent behaviour following the Termination Agreement with alleged “oral agreements” with the Claimant and corroborated its allegations with witness statements from its current staff members.
50. Before entering the analysis of the parties’ respective submissions, the Chamber recalled the wording of art. 13 par. 5, according to which a party asserting a certain fact bears the burden of proving its veracity.
51. Having outlined the above, the Chamber firstly turned to consider which version of the Contract could be deemed as authentic.
52. In this respect, the Chamber took note of the fact that the Claimant provided as evidence a payment slip in the amount of EUR 20,000, which was dedicated to covering salary payments for the months of August, September, October and November 2022. The Chamber considered this evidence essential in support of the Claimant’s line of argument

that the Contract foresaw a monthly remuneration of EUR 5,000 net. Equally, the Chamber took note of the fact that said evidence remained uncontested by the Respondent, who only relied on the fact that the copy of the Contract submitted by itself had been also uploaded to TMS, which it ultimately deemed insufficient to outweigh the picture painted by the Claimant.

53. In light of the above, the Chamber firstly established that the Claimant's version of the Contract, foreseeing a monthly remuneration of EUR 5,000 net, should be considered as the basis of the present proceedings.
54. Subsequently, the Chamber moved to the question of the validity of the Termination Agreement.
55. In this respect, the Chamber wished to highlight that various – uncontested – exchanges of correspondence between the parties had been submitted as evidence to the file, in which the Respondent was seen to provide the Claimant with training instructions, the latter participating in a match for the Respondent, and lastly him being excluded from participating in training sessions with the rest of the team, all following the purported signature of the Termination Agreement.
56. Compared thereto, the Chamber observed that the Respondent largely relied on uncorroborated allegations of "oral agreements" made between the Claimant and itself to explain the participation in the match and the training instructions.
57. Furthermore, the Chamber took note of the witness statements provided by the Respondent as part of its submission. In this respect, it wished to remark that all of these witness statements came from its current staff, therefore presenting a conflict of interests which rendered them, in the Chamber's estimation, of limited probative value to the current proceedings.
58. Lastly, the Chamber investigated the contested signature on the "original version" of the Termination Agreement, which had been sent to the FIFA Administration by the Respondent, particularly in comparison to other documents signed by the Claimant, the authenticity of which remained uncontested.
59. In this respect, the Chamber deemed appropriate to remind the parties that, as a general rule, FIFA's deciding bodies are not competent to decide upon matters of criminal law, such as the one of alleged falsified signatures of documents, and that such affairs fall into the jurisdiction of the competent national criminal authority.
60. Having analysed the respective signatures on the Termination Agreement and other documents closely, the Chamber was able to establish minor inconsistencies with the contested signature, which further substantiated the suspicion of the Chamber on the

basis of the Respondent's contradictory behaviour following the alleged signature of the Termination Agreement.

61. Therefore, in conclusion, the Chamber deemed that the Respondent failed to meet its burden of proving that the Termination Agreement was valid and binding, and that the doctrine of *venire contra factum proprium* was applicable in the case at hand. Consequently, the Termination Agreement was considered invalid, and the Chamber moved on to consider the lawfulness of the unilateral termination of the Contract by the Claimant.
62. In doing so, the Chamber recalled its long-standing jurisprudence, according to which only a breach or misconduct which is of a certain severity justifies the termination of a contract without prior warning. In other words, only when there are objective criteria which do not reasonably permit to expect the continuation of the employment relationship between the parties, a contract may be terminated prematurely. Hence, if there are more lenient measures which can be taken in order for an employer to assure the employee's fulfilment of his contractual duties, such measures must be taken before terminating an employment contract. A premature termination of an employment contract can only be an *ultima ratio* measure.
63. In this respect, the Chamber noted that the Claimant's allegation of him being excluded from training and being evicted from his accommodation went unchallenged by the Respondent, as well as no contradictory evidence being on file.
64. Furthermore, it was remarked that the Respondent argued against the alleged outstanding salary of December 2022, and the compensation by saying that the Claimant has waived his entitlement thereto in the Termination Agreement, but since the Termination Agreement was established as being invalid, the Chamber dismissed this line of argument.
65. Lastly, the Chamber deemed it noteworthy that the Respondent alluded to the Claimant's poor performance in correspondence exchanged following the termination notice sent by the Claimant in January 2023, which it considered to shed light on the reasons for the overall conduct exhibited by the Respondent.
66. Therefore, in the totality of circumstances, with one outstanding monthly salary, and with the Claimant having been excluded from training and evicted from his accommodation, the Chamber concluded that the termination of the Contract by the Claimant constituted an *ultima ratio* measure. Therefore, the Chamber held that the Contract was terminated by the Claimant with just cause, in line with art. 14 par. 2 RSTP.

ii. Consequences

67. Having stated the above, the members of the Chamber turned their attention to the question of the consequences of such unjustified breach of contract committed by the Respondent.

68. The Chamber observed that the outstanding remuneration at the time of termination, coupled with the specific requests for relief of the player, are equivalent to one salary under the contract, amounting to EUR 5,000 net.
69. As a consequence, and in accordance with the general legal principle of *pacta sunt servanda*, the Chamber decided that the Respondent is liable to pay to the Claimant the amounts which were outstanding under the contract at the moment of the termination, i.e. EUR 5,000 net.
70. In addition, taking into consideration the Claimant's request as well as the constant practice of the Chamber in this regard, the latter decided to award the Claimant interest at the rate of 5% *p.a.* on the outstanding amounts as from 1 January 2023 until the date of effective payment.
71. Having stated the above, the Chamber turned to the calculation of the amount of compensation payable to the player by the club in the case at stake. In doing so, the Chamber firstly recapitulated that, in accordance with art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations, the amount of compensation shall be calculated, in particular and unless otherwise provided for in the contract at the basis of the dispute, with due consideration for the law of the country concerned, the specificity of sport and further objective criteria, including in particular, the remuneration and other benefits due to the player under the existing contract and/or the new contract, the time remaining on the existing contract up to a maximum of five years, and depending on whether the contractual breach falls within the protected period.
72. In application of the relevant provision, the Chamber held that it first of all had to clarify as to whether the pertinent employment contract contained a provision by means of which the parties had beforehand agreed upon an amount of compensation payable by the contractual parties in the event of breach of contract. In this regard, the Chamber established that no such compensation clause was included in the employment contract at the basis of the matter at stake.
73. As a consequence, the members of the Chamber determined that the amount of compensation payable by the club to the player had to be assessed in application of the other parameters set out in art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations. The Chamber recalled that said provision provides for a non-exhaustive enumeration of criteria to be taken into consideration when calculating the amount of compensation payable.
74. Bearing in mind the foregoing as well as the claim of the player, the Chamber proceeded with the calculation of the monies payable to the player under the terms of the contract from the date of its unilateral termination until its end date. Consequently, the Chamber concluded that the amount of EUR 20,000 net (i.e. the residual value of the Contract, or

four monthly salaries between January 2023 and April 2023) serves as the basis for the determination of the amount of compensation for breach of contract.

75. In continuation, the Chamber verified as to whether the player had signed an employment contract with another club during the relevant period of time, by means of which he would have been enabled to reduce his loss of income. According to the constant practice of the DRC as well as art. 17 par. 1 lit. ii) of the Regulations, such remuneration under a new employment contract shall be taken into account in the calculation of the amount of compensation for breach of contract in connection with the player's general obligation to mitigate his damages.
76. Indeed, the player found employment with the New Club. In accordance with the New Contract, the player was entitled to a remuneration of EUR 6,000 net in the overlapping period between the two contracts, considering his monthly salary and additional scholarship fee, which collectively amounted to a monthly sum of EUR 1,200 net. Therefore, the Chamber concluded that the player mitigated his damages by EUR 6,000 net.
77. Subsequently, the Chamber referred to art. 17 par. 1 lit. ii) of the Regulations, according to which a player is entitled to an amount corresponding to three monthly salaries as additional compensation should the termination of the employment contract at stake be due to overdue payables. In the case at hand, the Chamber confirmed that the contract termination took place, *inter alia*, due to said reason i.e. overdue payables by the club, and therefore decided that the player shall receive additional compensation.
78. In this respect, the DRC calculated the amount of additional compensation to be EUR 15,000 net, i.e. three times the monthly remuneration of the player, which was, however, limited to EUR 6,000 net, i.e. the mitigated amount, in order not to exceed the residual value of the Contract.
79. Consequently, on account of all of the above-mentioned considerations and the specificities of the case at hand, the Chamber decided that the club must pay the amount of EUR 20,000 net to the player, which was to be considered a reasonable and justified amount of compensation for breach of contract in the present matter.
80. Lastly, taking into consideration the player's request as well as the constant practice of the Chamber in this regard, the latter decided to award the player interest on said compensation at the rate of 5% *p.a.* as of 16 January 2023 until the date of effective payment.

iii. Compliance with monetary decisions

81. Finally, taking into account the applicable Regulations, the Chamber referred to art. 24 par. 1 and 2 of the Regulations, which stipulate that, with its decision, the pertinent FIFA deciding body shall also rule on the consequences deriving from the failure of the

concerned party to pay the relevant amounts of outstanding remuneration and/or compensation in due time.

82. In this regard, the DRC highlighted that, against clubs, the consequence of the failure to pay the relevant amounts in due time shall consist of a ban from registering any new players, either nationally or internationally, up until the due amounts are paid. The overall maximum duration of the registration ban shall be of up to three entire and consecutive registration periods.
83. Therefore, bearing in mind the above, the DRC decided that the Respondent must pay the full amount due (including all applicable interest) to the Claimant within 45 days of notification of the decision, failing which, at the request of the Claimant, a ban from registering any new players, either nationally or internationally, for the maximum duration of three entire and consecutive registration periods shall become immediately effective on the Respondent in accordance with art. 24 par. 2, 4, and 7 of the Regulations.
84. The Respondent shall make full payment (including all applicable interest) to the bank account provided by the Claimant in the Bank Account Registration Form, which is attached to the present decision.
85. The DRC recalled that the above-mentioned ban will be lifted immediately and prior to its complete serving upon payment of the due amounts, in accordance with art. 24 par. 8 of the Regulations.

d. Costs

86. The Chamber referred to art. 25 par. 1 of the Procedural Rules, according to which *"Procedures are free of charge where at least one of the parties is a player, coach, football agent, or match agent"*. Accordingly, the Chamber decided that no procedural costs were to be imposed on the parties.
87. Likewise, and for the sake of completeness, the Chamber recalled the contents of art. 25 par. 8 of the Procedural Rules, and decided that no procedural compensation shall be awarded in these proceedings.
88. Lastly, the DRC concluded its deliberations by rejecting any other requests for relief made by any of the parties.

IV. Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

1. The claim of the Claimant, Tristan Koskor, is partially accepted.
2. The Respondent, Pegeia 2014, must pay to the Claimant the following amount(s):
 - **EUR 5,000 net as outstanding remuneration** plus 5% interest *p.a.* as from 1 January 2023 until the date of effective payment;
 - **EUR 20,000 net as compensation for breach of contract without just cause** plus 5% interest *p.a.* as from 16 January 2023 until the date of effective payment.
3. Any further claims of the Claimant are rejected.
4. Full payment (including all applicable interest) shall be made to the bank account indicated in the **enclosed** Bank Account Registration Form.
5. Pursuant to art. 24 of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players, if full payment (including all applicable interest) is not made **within 45 days** of notification of this decision, the following **consequences** shall apply:
 1. The Respondent shall be banned from registering any new players, either nationally or internationally, up until the due amount is paid. The maximum duration of the ban shall be of up to three entire and consecutive registration periods.
 2. The present matter shall be submitted, upon request, to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee in the event that full payment (including all applicable interest) is still not made by the end of the three entire and consecutive registration periods.
6. The consequences **shall only be enforced at the request of the Claimant** in accordance with art. 24 par. 7 and 8 and art. 25 of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players.
7. This decision is rendered without costs.

For the Football Tribunal:



Emilio García Silvero

Chief Legal & Compliance Officer

NOTE RELATED TO THE APPEAL PROCEDURE:

According to article 57 par. 1 of the FIFA Statutes, this decision may be appealed against before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) within 21 days of receipt of the notification of this decision.

NOTE RELATED TO THE PUBLICATION:

FIFA may publish this decision. For reasons of confidentiality, FIFA may decide, at the request of a party within five days of the notification of the motivated decision, to publish an anonymised or a redacted version (cf. article 17 of the Procedural Rules Governing the Football Tribunal).

CONTACT INFORMATION

Fédération Internationale de Football Association
FIFA-Strasse 20 P.O. Box 8044 Zurich Switzerland
www.fifa.com | legal.fifa.com | psdfifa@fifa.org | T: +41 (0)43 222 7777