

# Decision of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

passed on 12 December 2025

## DECISION BY:

**Jorge PALACIO (Colombia), Deputy Chairperson**  
**Lord VEEHALA (Tonga and New Zealand), Member**  
**Thomas HOLLERER (Austria), Member**

## ON THE CASE OF:

**Football Association of Malaysia**  
**(Decision FDD-26166)**

## REGARDING:

**Article 19 - Fielding ineligible player (FDC\_25)**

## I. FACTS OF THE CASE

1. The following summary of the facts does not purport to include every single contention put forth by the parties at these proceedings. However, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (the **Committee**) has thoroughly considered in the 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. This case concerns the fielding of ineligible players by the Football Association of Malaysia (**FAM** or the **Respondent**) in three tier-1 international friendly matches, as detailed in continuation.
3. The case originates from the decision rendered by the FIFA Appeal Committee (**AC**) as part of a forgery charge brought against the FAM and the following players (the **Players**):

Player	Name	Birthplace	Date of birth
Player 1	Gabriel Felipe Arrocha <sup>1</sup>	Santa Cruz de la Palma, Spain	15-Jan-2002
Player 2	Facundo Tomás Garcés Rattaro	Santa Fe, Argentina	5-Sep-1999
Player 3	Rodrigo Julián Holgado	Buenos Aires, Argentina	28-Jun-1994
Player 4	Imanol Javier Machuca	Rosario, Argentina	15-Jan-2000
Player 5	João Vítor Brandão Figueiredo	São Paulo, Brazil	27-May-1996
Player 6	Jon Irazabal Iraurgi	Bilbao, Spain	28-Nov-1996
Player 7	Héctor Alejandro Hevel Serrano	Leidschendam, the Netherlands	15-May-1996

4. The matches under scrutiny in these proceedings are the following (hereinafter jointly referred to as "**Matches**"):
 

Match	Date	Match	Final score	Ineligible Player concerned
Match 1	29-May-25	Malaysia v. Cape Verde	1:1	Player 1
Match 2	4-Sep-25	Malaysia v. Singapore	2:1	Player 1, Player 2, Player 3, Player 5, Player 6
Match 3	8-Sep-25	Malaysia v. Palestine	1:0	Player 1, Player 3, Player 5

### a. Naturalization process

5. The Players underwent a naturalization process and were ultimately granted Malaysian nationality. While the exact steps taken by Malaysian authorities cannot be fully reconstructed, it can be established that the process generally involved two applications for each Player, which culminated in the Players appearing before Malaysian authorities and submitting complete paperwork, including signed and thumb-printed forms. These forms contained declarations affirming good conduct, at least ten years of residence in Malaysia, and acknowledgment of penalties for false statements. Each application file included photographs, registration fees, identity cards, entry permits, and passports or travel documents, but no ancestry-related documents such as parental or grandparental birth certificates.
6. The application forms bear the following dates in respect of each of the Players:

<sup>1</sup> Also known as "Gabriel Palmero".

Player	Name	Application date
Player 1	Gabriel Felipe Arrocha	17 March 2025
Player 2	Facundo Tomás Garcés Rattaro	1 June 2025
Player 3	Rodrigo Julián Holgado	3 June 2025
Player 4	Imanol Javier Machuca	3 June 2025
Player 5	João Vítor Brandão Figueiredo	3 June 2025
Player 6	Jon Irazabal Iraurgi	3 June 2025
Player 7	Héctor Alejandro Hevel Serrano	18 March 2025

7. Each of the Players was issued a Malaysian passport with the following issuance dates:

Player	Passport issuance date
Player 1	18 March 2025
Player 2	3 June 2025
Player 3	3 June 2025
Player 4	3 June 2025
Player 5	3 June 2025
Player 6	3 June 2025
Player 7	18 March 2025

**b. Eligibility enquiries submitted to FIFA**

8. On 19 March 2025, the FAM submitted to FIFA an *"INQUIRY REGARDING ELIGITIBLIY OF PLAYER, HECTOR ALEJANDRO HEVEL TO PLAY FOR MALASYA NATIONAL FOOTBALL TEAM"*. In particular, the FAM enclosed the mentioned player's grandfather's birth certificate dated 06 January 2025 which indicated that the latter, Mr. Hendrik Jan Hevel, was born on 03 February 1933 in "Malacca Straights Settlements", now Malaysia. Said proceedings received the reference FPSD-18682.
9. On 20 March 2025, the FAM submitted to FIFA an *"INQUIRY REGARDING ELIGITIBLIY OF PLAYER, GABRIEL FELIPE AROCHA TO PLAY FOR MALASYA NATIONAL FOOTBALL TEAM"*. In particular, the FAM enclosed the mentioned player's grandmother's birth certificate dated 03 January 2025 which indicated that the latter, Ms. María Belen Concepción Martin, was born on 17 May 1956 in Malacca, Federation of Malaya, now Malaysia. Said proceedings received the reference FPSD-18683.
10. On the same date, FIFA requested additional documentation from the FAM in respect of the case FPSD-18683.
11. Further to a request for additional documentation, on 24 March 2025, FIFA sent a letter to the FAM explaining, *inter alia*, that on the basis of the information provided, Player 7 appeared to comply with all the pertinent requirements and would be eligible to play for the FAM's representative team(s).
12. On 06 June 2025, the FAM submitted to FIFA an *"INQUIRY REGARDING ELIGITIBLIY OF PLAYER, FACUNDO TOMAS GARCES TO PLAY FOR MALASYA NATIONAL FOOTBALL TEAM"*. Specifically, the FAM enclosed the mentioned player's grandfather's birth certificate dated 20 January 2025 which indicated that the former, Mr. Carlos Rogelio Garces Fernandez, was born on 29 May 1930 in "George Town straits settlements (British Malaya)". Said proceedings received the reference FPSD-19517.
13. On 06 June 2025, the FAM submitted to FIFA an *"INQUIRY REGARDING ELIGITIBLIY OF PLAYER, RODRIGO JULIAN HOLGADO TO PLAY FOR MALASYA NATIONAL FOOTBALL TEAM"*. Specifically,

the FAM enclosed the mentioned player's grandfather's birth certificate dated 27 June 1975 which indicated that the former, Mr. Omar Eli Holgado Gardon, was born on 27 July 1932 in George Town Straits Settlements, now Malaysia. Said proceedings received the reference FPSD-19518.

14. On 06 June 2025, the FAM submitted to FIFA an "INQUIRY REGARDING ELIGITIBLIY OF PLAYER, IMANOL JAVIER MACHUCA TO PLAY FOR MALASYA NATIONAL FOOTBALL TEAM". Particularly, the FAM enclosed the mentioned player's grandmother's birth certificate dated 29 January 2025 which indicated that the latter, Ms. Concepción Agueda Alaniz, was born on 16 August 1954 in "George Town Penang Federation of Malaya", now Malaysia. Said proceedings received the reference FPSD-19519.
15. On 06 June 2025, the FAM submitted to FIFA an "INQUIRY REGARDING ELIGITIBLIY OF PLAYER, JOAO VITOR BRANDAO FIGUEIREDO TO PLAY FOR MALASYA NATIONAL FOOTBALL TEAM". Specially, the FAM enclosed the mentioned player's grandmother's birth certificate dated 27 March 2017 which indicated that the former, Ms. Nair de Oliveira, was born on 26 September 1931 in Johore, British Malaya, now Malaysia. Said proceedings received the reference FPSD-19520.
16. On 06 June 2025, the FAM submitted to FIFA an "INQUIRY REGARDING ELIGITIBLIY OF PLAYER, JON IRAZABAL IRAURGUI TO PLAY FOR MALASYA NATIONAL FOOTBALL TEAM". In particular, the FAM enclosed the mentioned player's grandfather's birth certificate dated 08 January 2025 which indicated that the latter, Mr. Gregorio Irazabal y Lamiquiz was born on 24 February 1928 in Kuching<sup>2</sup>, Sarawak, now Malaysia. Said proceedings received the reference FPSD-19521.
17. On 06 June 2025, FIFA sent a letter to the FAM explaining, *inter alia*, that on the basis of the information provided, Player 3 appeared to comply with all the pertinent requirements and would be eligible to play for the FAM's representative team(s).
18. On 06 June 2025, FIFA sent a letter to the FAM explaining, *inter alia*, that on the basis of the information provided, Player 5 appeared to comply with all the pertinent requirements and would be eligible to play for the FAM's representative team(s).
19. On 06 June 2025, FIFA sent a letter to the FAM explaining, *inter alia*, that on the basis of the information provided, Player 6 appeared to comply with all the pertinent requirements and would be eligible to play for the FAM's representative team(s).
20. On 09 June 2025, after receiving the documentation requested on 20 March 2025, FIFA sent a letter to the FAM explaining, *inter alia*, that on the basis of the information provided, Player 1 appeared to comply with all the pertinent requirements and would be eligible to play for the FAM's representative team(s).
21. On 09 June 2025, FIFA sent a letter to the FAM explaining, *inter alia*, that on the basis of the information provided, Player 2 appeared to comply with all the pertinent requirements and would be eligible to play for the FAM's representative team(s).
22. On 09 June 2025, FIFA sent a letter to the FAM explaining, *inter alia*, that on the basis of the information provided, Player 4 appeared to comply with all the pertinent requirements and would be eligible to play for the FAM's representative team(s).

---

<sup>2</sup> "Kuching" in accordance with the certified translation provided by the FAM.

23. The table below summarizes the proceedings in respect of the Players. It is to be noted that in each of the relevant proceedings, a copy of each of the respective Players' Malaysian passport was presented, with the following issuing dates:

Player	Case Ref.	Player Name	Passport issuance date	FIFA Letter Sent
Player 1	FPSD-18683	Gabriel Felipe Arrocha	18 March 2025	09 June 2025
Player 2	FPSD-19517	Facundo Tomás Garcés	3 June 2025	09 June 2025
Player 3	FPSD-19518	Rodrigo Julián Holgado	3 June 2025	09 June 2025
Player 4	FPSD-19519	Imanol Javier Machuca	3 June 2025	06 June 2025
Player 5	FPSD-19520	João Vítor Brandão Figueiredo	3 June 2025	09 June 2025
Player 6	FPSD-19521	Jon Irazabal Iraurgi	3 June 2025	06 June 2025
Player 7	FPSD-18682	Héctor Alejandro Hevel Serrano	18 March 2025	24 March 2025

24. It is to be noted that such letters issued by FIFA are a requirement for player registration for competitions organized by the Asian Football Confederation (**AFC**), to which the FAM is affiliated<sup>3</sup>.

#### **c. Matches played by the Players**

25. The Players participated in the following matches for the representative team of the FAM:

- a. On 25 March 2025, Player 7 participated in the match *Malaysia v. Nepal* in the context of the AFC Asian Cup Saudi Arabia 2027™ Qualifiers Third Round Group F (final score 2:0). Player 7 scored at the 29<sup>th</sup> minute of that encounter.
- b. On 29 May 2025, Player 1 participated in Match 1.
- c. On 10 June 2025, the Players participated in the match *Malaysia v. Vietnam* in the context of the AFC Asian Cup Saudi Arabia 2027™ Qualifiers Third Round Group F (final score 4:0). Both Player 5 and Player 3 scored, respectively at the 49<sup>th</sup> and 59<sup>th</sup> minute of that encounter.
- d. On 4 September 2025, the Players 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 participated in the Match 2. Player 5 scored at the 55<sup>th</sup> minute of that encounter.
- e. On 8 September 2025, the Players 1, 3, and 5 participated in Match 3. Player 5 scored at the 3<sup>rd</sup> minute of that encounter.

#### **d. Disciplinary proceedings in connection with forgery**

26. On 11 June 2025, FIFA received a complaint regarding the eligibility of the Players 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7. Specifically, the complainant submitted "*a formal complaint regarding reason to believe that certain foreign-born players are ineligible to represent the Malaysian National Football Team [...] their arrival in Malaysia and their commencement of playing for local clubs occurred relatively recently [...] Their naturalization process and international debut took place within a questionable timeframe, raising significant questions about the validity of this process*".

<sup>3</sup> See [AFC Competitions Operations Manual \(ed. 2023\)](#), Article 23 and Appendix 13, as well as Article 25, [Competition Regulations for the AFC Asian Cup Saudi Arabia 2027™](#).

27. In view of the above, the Secretariat to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (the **Secretariat**) carried out investigations in accordance with art 30 (1) and 35 (5) of the FDC. In the scope of the investigations, the Secretariat was able to gather a copy of the original birth certificates in question which indicated the following:

Player	Grandparent	Birthplace	Birth certificate issuance date
1	María Belen Concepción Martín	Santa Cruz de la Palma, Spain	20 June 2025
2	Carlos Rogelio Fernandez	Villa María Selva, Santa Fé de la Cruz, Argentina	13 June 2025
3	Omar Eli Holgado Gardon	Caseros, Buenos Aires, Argentina	16 July 2025
4	Concepción Agueda Alaniz	Roldán, Argentina	13 June 2025
5	Nair de Oliveira	Abre Campo, Brazil	12 June 2025
6	Gregorio Irazabal y Lamiquiz	Villa de Guernica y Luno, Viscaya, Spain	17 June 2025
7	Hendrik Jan Hevel	The Hague, Netherlands	25 August 2025

28. The results of the above investigations were set out in two reports (the **Investigatory Reports**). In particular, the Investigatory Reports list the following evidence, which contrasted to the one filed by the FAM respectively in the proceedings FPSD-18683, FPSD-19517, FPSD-19518, FPSD-19519, FPSD-19520, FPSD-19521 and FPSD-18682:

Player	Grandparent	Birthplace (doctored documents)	Birth certificate issuance date (doctored documents)	Birthplace (original documents)	Birth certificate issuance date (original documents)
1	María Belen Concepción Martín	Malacca, Malaysia	3 January 2025	Santa Cruz de la Palma, Spain	20 June 2025
2	Carlos Rogelio Fernandez	Penang, Malaysia	20 January 2025	Villa María Selva, Santa Fé de la Cruz, Argentina	13 June 2025
3	Omar Eli Holgado Gardon	George Town, Malaysia	24 June 1974 (no current date)	Caseros, Buenos Aires, Argentina	16 July 2025
4	Concepción Agueda Alaniz	Penang, Malaysia	29 January 2025	Roldán, Argentina	13 June 2025
5	Nair de Oliveira	Johore, Malaysia	27 March 2017 (no current date)	Abre Campo, Brazil	12 June 2025
6	Gregorio Irazabal y Lamiquiz	Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia	8 January 2025	Villa de Guernica y Luno, Viscaya, Spain	17 June 2025
7	Hendrik Jan Hevel	Mallaca Straits Settlements, Malaysia	6 January 2025	The Hague, Netherlands	25 August 2025

29. In this context, the Investigatory Reports outlined the following conclusion:

*“Based on the evidence on file, the Secretariat is comfortably satisfied to establish that the documents [submitted by the FAM in the proceedings FPSD-18682, FPSD-18683, FPSD-19517, FPSD-19518, FPSD-19519, FPSD-19520, and FPSD-19521] are forged and that the Players have made use of these documents to evade and circumvent the pertinent FIFA Regulations in order to be eligible to represent the team of the FAM.”*

30. On 22 August 2025, disciplinary proceedings were opened against the FAM and Players 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 for the potential breach of Article 22 FDC. On 28 August 2025, disciplinary proceedings were opened against Player 7 for the same potential breach.

31. On 22 September 2025, the FAM presented its statement of defense and bundle of evidence. The Players, for their part, presented via the FAM on the same date a signed statement reading as follows:

*“We, the undersigned players, hereby declare that we endorse with the arguments and position filed by the Football Association of Malaysia (“FAM”) in connection with the proceedings FDD-24394.”*

32. On 22 September 2025, following the receipt of the FAM and the Players’ respective submissions, the Secretariat informed them that the matter had been referred for adjudication on 25 September 2025 by the Deputy Chairperson of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee sitting as a single judge.

33. The terms of the decision of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee were notified to the FAM and the Players on 26 September 2025. The FIFA Disciplinary Committee found that they had violated article 22 of the FDC for having used forged and/or falsified documents in FIFA proceedings and sanctioned them (the **Decision**).

34. The Decision can be summarized as follows:

- a. The Decision reaffirms the principle of strict liability enshrined in Article 22 FDC, which sanctions not only the act of forgery but also the use of forged documents, irrespective of intent or knowledge. It explains that the provision is deliberately broad, designed to preclude defenses based on ignorance or procedural compliance, and to uphold the integrity of football governance.
- b. Turning to the evidentiary record, the Decision relies extensively on the Investigatory Reports, which juxtapose the doctored birth certificates submitted by FAM against original civil records obtained from Spain, Argentina, Brazil, and the Netherlands. The discrepancies are stark: the forged documents systematically altered the grandparents’ birthplaces to Malaysian localities, thereby fabricating a genealogical nexus essential for eligibility under the Regulations Governing the Application of the Statutes (**RGAS**). The Decision underscores that these falsifications were not incidental but constituted a deliberate mechanism to circumvent eligibility rules.
- c. Further, the Decision rejected the argument that the violation was merely formal and devoid of substantive effect. The Decision reasons that the forged documents were *sine qua non* for the Players’ eligibility, enabling their participation in an official AFC Asian Cup qualifier match, where two of them scored decisive goals. This demonstrates that forgery produced tangible

sporting consequences, thereby aggravating the gravity of the offense. The Decision further dismisses the contention that FIFA's prior correspondence confirming apparent eligibility exonerates the Players and the FAM, clarifying that such confirmation was conditional upon the veracity of the documents submitted at the time.

- d. In assessing culpability, the Decision finds that FAM's reliance on Malaysian authorities and its failure to independently verify original records falls short of the diligence required in FIFA proceedings. The fact that FIFA could procure the original documents without impediment underscores the Respondents' lack of scrutiny. The Decision characterizes this conduct as a breach of the fundamental principles of fair play and transparency, noting that forgery in eligibility matters constitutes a form of cheating, which erodes trust in the fairness of competitions and jeopardizes the very essence of football as an activity founded on honesty and transparency.
- e. By invoking precedents such as the FEGUIFUT case and Chabab Mrirt, the Decision situates its reasoning within a consistent jurisprudential framework that treats document falsification as an egregious violation warranting severe sanctions.
- f. The Decision concludes that both FAM and the Players infringed Article 22 FDC by using forged documents in FIFA proceedings. As to the sanctions under Articles 6 and 25 FDC, the Decision weighs mitigating factors—such as a previously clean disciplinary record—against aggravating circumstances, notably the deliberate and successful circumvention of eligibility rules and the consequential impact on an official match. The resulting sanctions—a CHF 350,000 fine on FAM (calculated on the basis of CHF 50,000 per player involved in the fraudulent use of documentation) and, for each Player, a CHF 2,000 fine and a twelve-month suspension from all football-related activities—are deemed proportionate, necessary, and aligned with FIFA's zero-tolerance policy toward fraudulent conduct.

35. The Players and the FAM appealed the Decision to the FIFA AC, which ultimately dismissed the appeal. The main findings on the merits of the AC were as follows:

- a. The AC conducted a comprehensive documentary review encompassing: (i) the ancestry certificates submitted by FAM in FIFA eligibility inquiries, which recited Malaysian birthplaces; (ii) original civil-status records obtained directly from competent registries in Spain, Argentina, Brazil, and the Netherlands, all indicating non-Malaysian birthplaces; (iii) "Malaysian" birth certificates subsequently issued, which exhibited material omissions, orthographic errors, and internal inconsistencies—such as English place names embedded in Spanish or Portuguese instruments, a grandmother incorrectly marked as "male," and informants identified by nicknames; and (iv) the Players' own WhatsApp transmissions of family records, none of which reflected Malaysian birthplaces.
- b. Applying the comfortable satisfaction standard to this evidentiary matrix, the AC concluded that none of the seven grandparents had been born in Malaysia. This finding invalidated the claimed *jus sanguinis* link and foreclosed reliance on RGAS Article 8(1)(iii) (grandparent born on the territory) as a lawful basis for eligibility. The later issued Malaysian birth certificates were accorded negligible probative weight due to their deficiencies, whereas the foreign civil records bore verifiable seals and QR codes, coherent chronology, and jurisdiction-consistent language. The AC therefore determined that the allegation of Malaysian ancestry was unfounded. Absent genuine lineage or qualifying residence, the players' eligibility to represent Malaysia was unattainable under RGAS but for the falsified documentation.

- c. With respect to the application of Article 22 FDC, the AC determined that the provision encompassed three distinct modalities: forging a document, falsifying an authentic document, and using a forged or falsified document in football-related activities. It further held that sanctions under this provision were dual and mandatory, consisting of a fine and either a suspension of at least six matches or a ban of no less than twelve months. The AC also clarified that Article 8(1) FDC establishes that negligence suffices unless a provision explicitly requires intent; accordingly, Article 22 does not impose intent as an element, meaning that mere use of a falsified document triggers liability. Applying these principles to the case, the AC found that FAM's own admission that its staff "handled, formatted, and altered" ancestry certificates constituted direct falsification and use, thereby engaging liability under Article 22(2) FDC. As for the players, the AC concluded that by signing untrue declarations, submitting ancestry records without basic verification, failing to exercise any degree of care, and subsequently benefiting from FIFA eligibility confirmations and national-team selection, they had used falsified documents with at least gross negligence. Even assuming that intent were required—which it is not—the AC held that the facts demonstrated *dolus eventualis*, as the Players foresaw the risk that the documents were irregular given their lack of genuine ties and accepted that risk in pursuit of selection.
- d. The AC rejected the Players' narrative of victimhood, finding that they were the ultimate beneficiaries of the naturalization and eligibility process. They had initiated applications, provided family documents, sworn to factual content, appeared before Malaysian authorities, accepted passports, and subsequently represented Malaysia in official matches. The AC held that this sequence of actions imposed a heightened professional duty of diligence. The players' repeated posture—claiming they did not read or verify documents, never questioned their agents, and failed to inquire even after sanctions were imposed—was characterized as willful blindness, incompatible with the standard of care expected of international professionals. Their continued assertions during the hearing that their grandparents were Malaysian, despite the existence of authentic records proving otherwise, further undermined their credibility.
- e. The AC rejected FAM's attempt to portray deliberate falsification as mere "administrative adjustments," dismissing this characterization as a forensic euphemism and affirming the existence of the *actus reus*. It further determined that FAM's failure to identify the individuals responsible, impose proportionate internal sanctions, or establish credible independent oversight demonstrated systemic compliance deficiencies. The purported suspension of the Secretary General lacked clarity and effective enforcement, appearing to be a public-relations maneuver rather than a genuine remedial measure. Consequently, the AC concluded that these governance failures and the absence of corrective accountability aggravated the association's organizational culpability, thereby justifying the imposition of a substantial institutional fine and the initiation of additional disciplinary scrutiny.
- f. Having established both falsification and use, the AC proceeded to trace causation to the sporting consequences. It found that the Players had participated in five international fixtures, including official qualifiers and friendlies, and had scored decisive goals. This conduct conferred an advantage *contra legem*, materially influencing match results and impacting FIFA/Coca-Cola Rankings. The AC emphasized that the eligibility letters issued by FIFA could not sanitize the irregularities, as those communications were conditional and predicated on truthful documentation, which was subsequently vitiated by fraud once the doctored content emerged. Accordingly, the AC concluded that the infringement was not merely formal; it

altered the competitive reality and thereby intensified the gravity of the sanction under FIFA's integrity mandate as enshrined in Article 2(g) of the FIFA Statutes.

- g. In addressing the proportionality of the sanctions, the AC determined that the twelve-month ban from all football-related activities, coupled with a CHF 2,000 fine, represented the minimum sanction compatible with the dual-penalty structure mandated by Article 22 FDC. The AC reasoned that a match-limited suspension confined to international duty would have been illusory, as the players were never eligible *ab initio*; restricting the sanction to national-team appearances would have deprived it of practical effect and undermined its deterrent purpose. The AC expressly noted that, but for the principle of *non reformatio in pejus* under Article 63(4) FDC, a more severe sanction would have been warranted in light of the aggravating factors revealed on appeal, including gross negligence, post-sanction passivity, and the persistence of a false narrative.
  - h. As to FAM's sanction, the AC reasoned that the CHF 350,000 fine—calculated as CHF 50,000 per file across seven falsified eligibility cases—was consistent with established comparators and remained well below the CHF 1,000,000 ceiling under Article 6(4) FDC. FAM's attempt to argue proportionality at CHF 50,000 disregarded the multiplicity of infractions, as seven distinct eligibility files had been compromised. The Committee referenced precedents such as the FEF/Byron Castillo matter, where a points deduction and fine were imposed for a single player's document irregularities, to underscore FIFA's historical approach of treating document fraud as a grave institutional violation. In this context, a fine calibrated per count was deemed proportionate, predictable, and sufficiently deterrent. The AC concluded that the sanctions reflected the mandatory duality and minimum thresholds prescribed by Article 22 FDC, tailored to the scale of falsification, the tangible sporting impact, and the imperative to uphold zero tolerance for identity and eligibility fraud.
36. Lastly, exercising its prerogatives under Articles 30, 35, and 55 of the FDC, the AC ordered a targeted investigation into FAM's internal compliance framework and the identification of individuals responsible for the falsification; a detailed review of the involvement of the two licensed football agents named in the record; a separate examination of the three friendly matches in which ineligible players were fielded; and formal notifications to the competent criminal authorities in Brazil, Argentina, Spain, the Netherlands, and Malaysia, given that the factual matrix engaged national offenses of document forgery warranting extrinsic penal proceedings parallel to FIFA's disciplinary sanctions

## II. CASE AT HAND AND THE RESPONDENT'S POSITION

### a. Disciplinary proceedings at hand

37. Based on the above, disciplinary proceedings were opened against the Respondent on 25 November 2025 for a potential breach of Article 19 FDC concerning the fielding of ineligible players in respect of the Matches.
38. On 27 November 2025, the FAM requested a stay of the proceedings or alternatively a deadline extension of three months to file its position.

39. On the same day, the Secretariat informed the FAM on behalf of the Chairperson of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee that a deadline extension until 3 December 2025 was granted and that the request for a stay was accordingly rejected.

**b. The Respondent's position**

40. On 3 December 2025, the FAM filed its position, as follows:

- The FAM reiterated its request for a stay of the proceedings, pending the outcome of its CAS appeal against the FIFA AC decision of 3 November 2025 in the related forgery case. FAM argued that the ineligibility assessment under Article 19 FDC hinges on factual and legal issues currently under CAS review, such as the birthplace of the players' grandparents and the legal effect of sovereign civil-status documents issued by Malaysian authorities. Proceeding in parallel, FAM contended, would risk inconsistent determinations and undermine procedural fairness.
- On the factual posture, FAM acknowledged its earlier admission that members of its secretariat altered copies of foreign civil-status documents during voluntary eligibility inquiries. It emphasized that this conduct was unauthorized by senior leadership and did not involve the Players. To demonstrate corrective action, FAM highlighted the establishment of an independent commission chaired by former Chief Justice Tun Md Raus Sharif, joined by other prominent figures, tasked with investigating the origins of the irregularities and recommending governance reforms. The commission operates with external administrative support and aims to issue its report by year-end, signaling FAM's commitment to transparency and structural remediation.
- FAM also filed evidence to support its position, notably Malaysian birth certificates issued by the National Registration Department (JPN) for the relevant grandparents, which indicate Malaysian birthplaces. The FAM argues that these documents<sup>4</sup>, presented as Exhibits 1.1 to 1.7, amount to confirmations from competent authorities regarding the players' nationality status under Malaysian law. FAM argued that these sovereign acts carry a presumption of validity and should not be disregarded. It further asserted that the weight to be given to these documents, and whether the FIFA AC exceeded its scope by making *de novo* findings on birthplace, are matters squarely before CAS. Consequently, FAM maintained that it would be inappropriate for the Disciplinary Committee to rely on contested appellate findings as dispositive evidence of ineligibility while CAS review is pending.
- On the merits, FAM argued that no breach of Article 19 FDC was established to the "comfortable satisfaction" standard. It stressed that the alleged ineligibility depends on disputed facts and legal questions under CAS review. Additionally, FAM underscored that the matches in question were Tier-1 friendlies, which carry no impact on qualification or standings, and therefore any violation would lack competitive significance. FAM also pointed to its proactive remedial measures—admission of wrongdoing, suspension of personnel, and governance reforms—as compelling mitigating factors recognized under the FDC.
- Regarding sanctions, FAM urged proportionality and avoidance of double-counting, noting that severe penalties had already been imposed in the separate forgery case. It argued that any sanction in this matter should reflect the non-competitive nature of the matches and the ongoing CAS proceedings. FAM proposed that, if a violation were found, the sanction should be limited to a reprimand or warning and, at most, a modest fine, with no sporting consequences such as

---

<sup>4</sup> The documents are identical to the ones presented before the FIFA Appeal Committee in the connected matter.

forfeitures or points deductions. It emphasized that sporting sanctions would be unwarranted given the absence of competitive advantage and the pendency of higher review.

- In its requested relief, FAM asked the Disciplinary Committee to stay the proceedings pending CAS, dismiss the charges under Article 19 FDC, or, in the alternative, impose only a minimal sanction without sporting repercussions. This position was supported by documentary evidence from Malaysian authorities and details of governance reforms, which FAM presented as proof of its commitment to compliance and integrity.

### III. CONSIDERATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

41. In view of the circumstances of the present matter, the Committee decided to first address the procedural aspects, namely, its jurisdiction and the applicable law, before entering into the substance of the matter.

#### a. Jurisdiction of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee

42. 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.

43. Notwithstanding the above and for the sake of good order, the Committee found it worthwhile to emphasise that, in view of arts. 2 (1), 19 and 55 FDC, ed. 2025– edition applicable to the present matter as outlined below –it was competent to evaluate the present case and to impose sanctions in case of corresponding violations.

#### b. Applicable law

44. In order to duly assess the present matter, the Committee deemed that it had to determine which edition of the FDC applied to the substance of the case.

45. In these circumstances, the Committee noted that the potential disciplinary offense at stake, i.e., the fielding of ineligible players by the Respondent, was committed on 29 May 2025 (i.e. the date of Match 1), 4 September 2025 (i.e. the date of Match 2) and 8 September 2025 (i.e. the date of Match 3).

46. Bearing in mind that the current and applicable 2025 edition of the FDC entered into force on 5 September 2025, it is determined that any potential offense committed on 29 May 2025 and 4 September 2025 shall be assessed under the current edition of the Code.

47. This is because Article 4 (2) of the FDC, which states that “[the 2025 ed.] also applies to all disciplinary offences committed prior to the date on which it comes into force, subject to any milder sanction that would apply under previous rules”. Effectively, this provision allows for a retroactive application of the current code to the extent that the sanctions under the new code are more favourable to the accused than those under the previous edition.

48. In this regard, the Committee noticed that Article 19 of the May 2025 ed. has identical wording to the current edition of the FDC, which means that there is no distinction to be made in the sense of penalties to be applied.

49. Finally, the Committee observed that the Respondents did not contest the applicability of a specific version of the FDC to the present proceedings.

50. The above having been clarified, the Committee decided to begin by recalling the content and the scope of the relevant provisions of the 2025 ed. FDC applicable to the present case, the aforementioned being without prejudice to other rules that may also be at stake:

*"19. FIELDING AN INELIGIBLE PLAYER*

*1. If a player fielded in a match and/or competition is declared ineligible, the FIFA judicial bodies, taking into consideration the integrity of the competition concerned, may impose any appropriate disciplinary measures.*

*2. If a player fielded in a match is declared ineligible following a protest, the team to which the player belongs will be sanctioned by forfeiting the match and paying a minimum fine of CHF 6,000. The player may also be sanctioned.*

*3. The Disciplinary Committee may act ex officio."*

51. In particular, the Committee deemed it appropriate to preliminarily clarify that the question of the Players' eligibility to represent the FAM is governed by the RGAS. On this note, the Committee underlined that it is a well-established principle in football that associations and clubs are responsible for fielding eligible players only.

52. The relevant provisions having been outlined; the Committee subsequently turned its attention to the merits of the case.

**c. Merits of the dispute**

**(a) Player eligibility criteria under the RGAS**

53. As a departure point, the Committee wished to outline the applicable provisions of the RGAS regarding a player's eligibility to play for a national team.

54. The 2024 edition of the RGAS states under its Article 6 (1) that any person holding a permanent nationality that is not dependent on residence in a certain country is eligible to play for the representative teams of the association of that country. In this regard, Article 6 (2) RGAS specifies that there is a distinction between holding a nationality and being eligible to obtain a nationality. The provision reads as follows:

*"IV. ELIGIBILITY TO PLAY FOR REPRESENTATIVE TEAMS*

*6. Principles*

*1. Any person holding a permanent nationality that is not dependent on residence in a certain country is eligible to play for the representative teams of the association of that country.*

*2. There is a distinction between holding a nationality and being eligible to obtain a nationality. A player holds a nationality if, through the operation of a national law, they have:*

- (a) automatically received a nationality (e.g. from birth) without being required to undertake any further administrative requirements (e.g. abandoning a separate nationality); or  
(b) acquired a nationality by undertaking a naturalisation process.

3. With the exception of the conditions specified in article 10 below, any player who has already participated in a match (either in full or in part) in an official competition of any category or any type of football for one association may not play an international match for a representative team of another association. (...)"

55. It stems from the provision that a player holds a nationality if they have either: (a) automatically received said nationality without being required to undertake any further administrative requirements (e.g., nationality by birth); or (b) acquired said nationality by undertaking a naturalization process (e.g., nationality by acquisition or naturalization). Further clarification on this distinction being contained in edition 2021 of the FIFA's Commentary on the Rules Governing Eligibility to Play for Representative Teams (the **Commentary**)<sup>5</sup>.
56. The case at hand concerns exactly the provision under Article 6 (2)(b) RGAS, as the Players acquired a nationality by undertaking a naturalization process. On this, article 8 RGAS establishes as follows:

*"8. Acquisition of a new nationality*

*1. Any player who refers to article 6 paragraph 1 to assume a new nationality and who has not played international football in accordance with article 6 paragraph 3 shall be eligible to play for the representative teams of the new association only if they fulfil one of the following conditions:*

*(a) they were born on the territory of the relevant association;*

*(b) their biological mother or biological father was born on the territory of the relevant association;*

*(c) their grandmother or grandfather was born on the territory of the relevant association; and/or*

*(d) they have lived on the territory of the relevant association:*

*(i) for players that began living on the territory before the age of 10: at least three years;*

*(ii) for players that began living on the territory between the age of 10 and 18: at least five years;*

*(iii) for players that began living on the territory from the age of 18: at least five years. (...)"*

57. The scenario applicable to the Players in the matter at hand is that of Article 8 (1) (c) RGAS, since it stands undisputed that they, and their parents, were not born in Malaysia (lit. "a" and "b" respectively); equally, none of the Players to date have lived in Malaysia to meet the criteria under lit. "d". To this effect, the FAM submitted to FIFA the eligibility enquiries relying exactly on Article 8 (1) (c) RGAS.
58. Summarising the above, any player would be considered ineligible to play for the representative team of an association in circumstances where:
- they do not hold the "permanent nationality [of the relevant country] that is not dependent on residence in [said] country"; and/or

<sup>5</sup> Available at [ro8mje8vw98yp3rvfbmi-pdf.pdf](https://ro8mje8vw98yp3rvfbmi-pdf.pdf)

- they already participated in a match in an official competition for the representative team of another association and has not been granted a change of association under Article 10 RGAS; and/or
- they acquired the nationality of that association's country by undertaking a naturalization process but does not fulfil one of the conditions listed under Article 8 (1) RGAS.

59. It stems from the above that under FIFA's eligibility rules, holding nationality alone is insufficient where nationality was obtained through naturalization or acquisition. In such cases, the player must also meet one of the conditions in Article 8 RGAS: being born in the territory, having a parent or grandparent born there, or having resided there for a defined period. Additionally, players who have already played for another association cannot switch without an approved change under Article 10 RGAS.

60. Considering that eligibility criteria, the Committee then proceeded to evaluate the Players' eligibility to play for the FAM representative team.

**(b) Are the Players eligible to play for the FAM representative team? If not, was article 19 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code breached?**

61. As explained in the previous section, there are two requisites necessary for the Players to be considered eligible to play for the FAM: possessing the Malaysian nationality independently of residence, and their grandmother or grandfather having been born on the territory of Malaysia.

62. In this respect, the Committee finds that the FAM's submissions are self-contradictory at their core. On the one hand, FAM again admitted that its staff "handled, formatted, and altered" foreign civil-status documents within the eligibility enquiries, i.e., the very grandparents' birth certificates used to predicate the Players' purported *jus sanguinis* link to Malaysia. This confession is enough to determine that there is no valid link between the Players and their grandparents to Malaysia, undermining their eligibility to play for the FAM national team.

63. At the same time, the Committee noted that, FAM seeks to cure those same doctored documents by pointing to later-issued "Malaysian" birth certificates, asking the Disciplinary Committee to treat these "sovereign documents" as dispositive of eligibility for the three friendly matches now at issue.

64. This attempt to bridge falsified eligibility-stage documentation with post hoc domestic certificates fails on multiple grounds, as already addressed in the FIFA AC's decision of 3 November 2025, to which the Committee adheres. For the sake of efficiency, the Committee will refrain from repeating the arguments already outlined in the said decision and will rely on the below assertions:

- The AC conducted a detailed, comparative review of the exact certificates now before the Disciplinary Committee. Applying the "comfortable satisfaction" standard, the AC concluded that none of the seven grandparents were born in Malaysia; consequently, the claimed *jus sanguinis* link is bound to fail.
- Crucially, the AC found the Malaysian "certificates" unreliable and accorded them negligible probative value due to material omissions, orthographic anomalies, internal incongruities (including misgendering and nicknames as informants), and the absence of verification features that were present on the authentic foreign records (e.g., QR validation, digital seals).

- FAM's current reliance on those same documents cannot be reconciled with its admission that the underlying foreign certificates were tampered with in FIFA eligibility enquiries.

65. The Committee emphasized that FIFA's eligibility determinations under RGAS operate independently from domestic nationality acts. Naturalization or domestic civil-status certifications do not substitute for RGAS connecting-factor requirements (Article 6 and Article 8 RGAS), nor can they retroactively validate eligibility that was predicated on falsified ancestry submissions. As the AC put it: holding nationality (even lawfully acquired) is distinct from satisfying the eligibility conditions that must be met at the time of selection and fielding (birth on territory, parent/grandparent born on territory, or defined residency periods). Those safeguards protect the authenticity of national-team representation and prevent manipulation through artificial or expedited processes.
66. The FAM concedes that the "Malaysian" certificates on which it now relies were later issued, and further admits they were not presented to FIFA during the original eligibility checks. The AC noted the Malaysian authorities themselves did not receive the original foreign birth certificates for the grandparents; instead, the Malaysian authority issued its own copies based on secondary information, stating it could not retrieve original handwritten records and therefore created an "official copy" based on adduced evidence. This lacuna was highlighted by the AC as undermining the thoroughness and conclusiveness of those Malaysian certificates.
67. In the present case, FAM's bid to substitute the reliability of contemporaneously falsified documents with subsequent domestic one cannot meet the evidentiary threshold for eligibility under RGAS nor for exculpation under Article 19 FDC. With the exception of the certificate regarding Mr. Irazabal's grandfather<sup>6</sup>, none of the Malaysian-issued birth certificates existed at the time of the Matches, or at least no evidence has been produced to this effect. In fact, 6 out of the 7 "Malaysian" birth certificates do not even contain a date of issuance.
68. In this regard, the FAM asks for deference to "sovereign acts" while CAS reviews the AC decision. But the issue before this Committee is whether FAM fielded ineligible players in three friendlies; that question turns on whether RGAS conditions were satisfied at the time of fielding, and on the reliability of the documents actually submitted to FIFA then. The AC decision—grounded on the same file—states they were not reliable and that the grandparents were not born in Malaysia. Those findings, based on authenticated foreign registries and on the defects in the "Malaysian" birth certificates, are squarely aligned with the record before this Committee. FAM's appeal to CAS does not transform unreliable documentation into compliant RGAS proofs, nor does it bar this Committee from adjudicating Article 19 violations independently of Article 22 sanctions.
69. In light of the AC's comprehensive evaluation, FAM cannot rely on the later "Malaysian" certificates to justify the players' eligibility for the friendlies under review. The probative benchmark is set by authentic foreign civil-status records which depict the birthplace of all grandparents outside Malaysia. Those materials disprove Malaysian grandparental birthplaces and thus collapse the only connecting factor FAM invoked (RGAS Article 8(1)(iii)). The contradiction between FAM's tampering admission and its reliance on discredited post hoc documents underscores not mitigation but aggravation: it confirms that the fielding decisions rested on an ineligible status that cannot be retroactively regularized.
70. Accordingly, the Committee finds FAM's position irreconcilable and determines that there is no ancestral link between the Players' grandparents and Malaysia. It follows that the criteria under Article

---

<sup>6</sup> Issued on 26 August 2025.

8(1)(iii) RGAS is not met, and the Players are not eligible to play for the FAM representative team and Article 19 FDC has been breached by FAM.

**(c) Determination of the sanction**

71. Having found that the Players are not eligible to play for the Malaysian national team, the Committee observed in the that the FAM is a legal person, as such subject to the sanctions described under arts. 6.1 and 6.3 FDC.
72. As established above, the Respondent was found responsible for having infringed Article 19 FDC. In accordance with the said provision, when such a breach occurs, the Committee, taking into consideration the integrity of the competition concerned, may impose any appropriate disciplinary measures.
73. Against such background, the Committee is equally responsible to determine the type and extent of disciplinary measures to be imposed in accordance with the objective and subjective elements of the offence, taking into account both aggravating and mitigating circumstances (Article 25(1) FDC).
74. This being said, the Committee acknowledged the Respondent's statements that the following mitigating circumstances should be taken into account:
  - FAM acknowledged that members of its secretariat altered copies of foreign civil-status documents during voluntary eligibility inquiries. It emphasized that this admission demonstrates transparency and acceptance of responsibility, which should be treated as a mitigating factor under the FIFA Disciplinary Code.
  - FAM highlighted the creation of an independent commission chaired by former Chief Justice Tun Md Raus Sharif, joined by other prominent figures, to investigate the origins of the irregularities and recommend governance and compliance reforms. The commission operates with external administrative support and aims to issue its report by year-end, signaling proactive remediation.
  - FAM stated that it had suspended relevant personnel and replaced internal processes to prevent recurrence, presenting these steps as evidence of corrective action.
  - FAM argued that the matches in question were Tier-1 friendlies, not competitive fixtures affecting qualification or standings. It claimed that this context significantly reduces the gravity of the alleged violation and should influence sanctioning.
  - FAM asserted that the underlying facts remain sub judice before CAS and that Malaysian authorities have issued authentic birth certificates and nationality confirmations for the Players' grandparents. While this argument primarily challenges liability, FAM also framed it as a reason for leniency, suggesting that uncertainty over the facts warrants restraint in sanctioning.
  - FAM stressed that it is already subject to severe sanctions in the separate forgery case and argued that imposing harsh penalties here would amount to double punishment (*ne bis in idem*). It urged the Committee to calibrate any sanction to avoid cumulative severity.
75. Nonetheless, the Committee did not concur with the arguments advanced by FAM as mitigating factors. Firstly, the admission by FAM that its staff members had altered foreign civil status documents during eligibility inquiries could not be considered as mitigation. Conversely, this

admission served to highlight the deliberate nature of the irregularities, thereby emphasizing the association's failure to uphold its fundamental compliance obligations. The attempt to portray this conduct as "transparency" or "cooperation" did not mitigate the liability under Article 19 FDC, which imposes a stringent obligation on member associations to ensure that only eligible players are fielded.

76. In this regard, the Committee wishes to underline that the FAM asserts that it has suspended relevant personnel, yet it has not provided any evidence to substantiate this claim. The only suspension referenced in prior proceedings – that of the purported suspension of its Secretary General – was deemed by the FIFA AC to be superficial and lacking credibility, appearing as a public relations maneuver rather than a genuine governance measure. This "bogus" suspension serves to emphasize systemic deficiencies rather than to demonstrate meaningful remediation. It is imperative to note that assertions of internal disciplinary action, in the absence of substantiating evidence, cannot be regarded as mitigating factors.
77. Secondly, the Committee determined that the assertion made by FAM, that the matches were tier-1 friendlies and therefore of lesser significance, was immaterial. Article 19 FDC is applicable to all matches, irrespective of competitive stakes. Tier-1 friendlies affect the FIFA/Coca-Cola World Rankings, which in turn influence competitive balance, seeding, and future tournament pathways, particularly regarding the FIFA World Cup™. The integrity of international football is compromised whenever ineligible players are fielded, whether in official matches or friendlies; FIFA's disciplinary jurisprudence is consistent on this point as detailed further below.
78. Thirdly, the reference by FAM to governance reforms and the establishment of an "independent commission" did not mitigate the violation. It is important to note that these measures were implemented only after the misconduct was exposed and proceedings initiated. Post-violation remediation proved incapable of either eradicating the breach or neutralizing its severity.
79. Fourthly, the legal foundation for FAM's invocation of *ne bis in idem* is not present in this case. The forgery case under Article 22 FDC and the present proceedings under Article 19 FDC address distinct violations. The former concerns the fabrication and utilization of forged documentation in football-related processes; the latter concerns the act of fielding ineligible players in official matches. These constitute distinct infringements under different provisions of the FDC, each of which engages independent regulatory interests. Sanctioning under Article 19 FDC does not constitute double punishment; rather, it enforces FIFA's strict obligation to ensure that only eligible players participate in matches and their integrity.
80. In light of these considerations, the Committee concluded that none of the arguments advanced by FAM warranted mitigation. The breach of Article 19 FDC was established, and sanctions had to reflect the seriousness of the violation and the association's aggravated responsibility.
81. At this junction, and taking into consideration the necessary requirements under Article 19 FDC, the Committee referred to the case law of the FIFA Judicial Bodies and noted the following decisions:
  - FDD-17441 Emilio Nsue Lopez & FDD-17978 Equatorial Guinea FA – ineligible player (Emilio Nsue) fielded in 43 international matches, including 2 matches of the Competition. Accordingly, the matches *Equatorial Guinea v. Namibia* and *Liberia v. Equatorial Guinea* of the Competition (played on 15 November 2023 and 20 November 2023 respectively) were declared lost by forfeit by Equatorial Guinea by a score of 3-0. The FEGUIFUT was also fined and the player in question suspended. The forfeiture and suspension were confirmed on appeal by the FIFA Appeal

Committee (ref. FDD-18560 and FDD-18561, respectively) and the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS 2024/A/11090 Emilio Nsue Lópezv. FIFA and CAS 2024/A/11091 FEGUIFUT v. FIFA).

- FDD-11926 Mexican Football Association - ineligible player (Alejandro Zendejas) fielded in 5 international friendly matches. Accordingly, matches declared lost by forfeit by Mexico (by a score of 3-0). The Mexican Football Association was also fined CHF 10,000.
- FDD-11149 Moldova Football Association - ineligible player (Mihail Platica) fielded in one international friendly match. Accordingly, such match was declared lost by forfeit by Moldova (by a score of 3-0). The Moldova Football Association was also fined CHF 6,000.
- FDD-9346 Moroccan Football Association - ineligible player (Rosella Anne Ayane) fielded in one international friendly match. Accordingly, such match was declared lost by forfeit by Morocco (by a score of 3-0). The Moroccan Football Association was also fined CHF 6,000.
- FDD-25365 South African Football Association - ineligible player (Teboho Mokoena) fielded in one match in the frame of the FIFA World Cup 2026™ preliminary competition. Accordingly, such match was declared lost by forfeit by South Africa (by a score of 3-0). The South African Football Association was also fined CHF 10,000.

82. Considering the consistent jurisprudence of the Committee in similar situations, in order to ensure competitive balance and fairness as well as the integrity of football, the Committee decided to impose the following sanctions:

- a. A forfeiture of the Matches by score of 3-0 each; and
- b. a fine of CHF 10,000, the latter falling under the parameters of Article 6.4 FDC and being reasonable considering the number of matches at stake and their status (i.e. approximately CHF 3,333 per match).

83. The Committee accepted that these measures were severe but considered them necessary to protect the integrity of football and proportionate to the seriousness of the offences committed.

## Decision

1. The Respondent, **Football Association of Malaysia**, is found responsible for breaching article 19 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code (ed. 2025) for having fielded ineligible players in the following Tier-1 international friendly matches: **Malaysia v. Cape Verde played on 29 May 2025; Malaysia v. Singapore played on 4 September 2025; and Malaysia v. Palestine played on 8 September 2025.**
2. The match *Malaysia v. Cape Verde* played on 29 May 2025 is declared lost by forfeit by the representative team of Malaysia by a score of 3-0.
3. The match *Malaysia v. Singapore* played on 4 September 2025 is declared lost by forfeit by the representative team of Malaysia by a score of 3-0.
4. The match *Malaysia v. Palestine* played on 8 September 2025 is declared lost by forfeit by the representative team of Malaysia by a score of 3-0.
5. The Respondent is ordered to pay a fine to FIFA for CHF 10,000. The Respondent is granted a final deadline of thirty (30) days in which to both (a) pay the amounts indicated above and (b) file relevant the proof of payment with FIFA. Upon expiry of the final deadline and in the event of persistent default or failure to comply in full within the period stipulated, the present matter will be *ex officio* submitted to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee to impose harsher sanction(s) upon the Respondent.

FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE  
DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION



**Jorge PALACIO (Colombia)**

**Deputy Chairperson of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee**

---

### **NOTE RELATED TO THE LEGAL ACTION**

This decision can be contested before the FIFA Appeal Committee (art 61 FDC). Any party intending to appeal to the FIFA Appeal Committee must announce its intention to do so in writing within three (3) days of notification of the grounds of the decision. The appeal brief must then be filed in writing within a further time limit of five (5) days, commencing upon expiry of the first-time limit of three (3) days (art 60 (4) FDC). The appeal fee of CHF 1,000 shall be transferred to the bank account below on submission of the appeal brief at the latest (art 60 (6) FDC).

### **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 the abovementioned case number.