

**IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT UNDER THE ENGLAND AND WALES  
CRICKET BOARD DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE REGULATIONS FOR BREACH OF  
THE PLAYER AND MATCH OFFICIAL REGULATIONS**

Before:  
Richard Whittam KC

**BETWEEN:**

**CRICKET REGULATOR**

**and**

**YORKSHIRE COUNTY CRICKET CLUB**

---

**SUMMARY PROCEDURE DECISION**

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. The Respondent is reprimanded for its admitted breaches of the Players and Match Officials Area Regulations (“**PMOA Regulations**”).
2. The Respondent is fined £1,000.
3. The Respondent shall be deducted 4 points in the Metro Bank 50 competition (or its equivalent). That points deduction is to be suspended for a period of 24 months.
4. The sanction will only be enacted where there is/ are further breach(es) of the PMOA Regulations, and the sanction will apply in the competition in which the breach of the PMOA occurred (or its equivalent). This will be subject to the discretion of a future Cricket Discipline Panel considering whether any exceptional circumstances exist such that the points deduction should not be applied.
5. In the case of a competition reaching the knockout stage, the points deduction should apply to the following season.

6. Save for the exceptional circumstances referred to in paragraph 4 above, the Respondent should expect that the points deduction will be imposed in addition to any sanction imposed for the further breach(es).

## **INTRODUCTION**

7. The Cricket Regulator confirmed in its charge letter dated 19 August 2025 that it considered it appropriate for the case to proceed under the Summary Procedure.
8. On 20 August 2025, by email, the Respondent admitted the charge and agreed to the range of sanctions referred to in the charge letter.
9. On 21 August 2025 the case was referred to me as the Chair of the Cricket Discipline Panel to determine whether it was appropriate to initiate the Summary Procedure in this case.
10. On 22 August 2025 I requested further information from the Cricket Regulator. On 23 August, having been provided with that information, I determined that it was appropriate to initiate the Summary Procedure in this case and appointed myself as the Sole Arbitrator to determine the applicable sanction under the Summary Procedure within the range specified by the England and Wales Cricket Board Disciplinary Procedure Regulations, Regulation 7.4.

## **THE CHARGE**

11. The Respondent was charged with breach of paragraph 7.4.4 of the PMOA Regulations:

*“Each breach committed by a Participant when appearing for a Professional County Club or Hundred Team will count towards an accumulated total for the respective Team. This will include a breach in respect of which a Warning Letter is issued, unless the Warning Letter is rescinded following an appeal. In the case of a third, or any subsequent, breach by one or more Participants of the same Professional County Club or Hundred Team (irrespective of whether the third, or any subsequent, breach is of the same Article as those previously breached and irrespective of the sanctions imposed for*

*the previous breaches) within a rolling period of 12 (twelve) months (which could include several breaches occurring in one match), the Professional County Club or Hundred Team may be referred by the Anti-Corruption Manager to the Cricket Discipline Panel for adjudication and, where applicable, sanction pursuant to the Disciplinary Procedure Regulations.”*

12. On Friday 8 August 2025, letters were issued to 15 participants from Yorkshire CCC (“YCCC”) who were found to be in breach of the Regulations by failing to surrender their mobile communication devices as required by the Regulations. These breaches occurred during the period of PMOA restrictions, which commenced two hours prior to the start of the match between Northants CCC and the Respondent on 8 August 2025.
13. The 15 Participants found to be in breach are as follows:
  1. Adam Lyth
  2. Finlay Bean
  3. James Wharton
  4. Dominic Bess
  5. Ben Coad
  6. Ben Cliff
  7. Dan Moriarty
  8. Jack White
  9. Mathew Milnes
  10. Harry Duke
  11. Imam ul Haq
  12. John Sadler
  13. Alex Donnelly
  14. Curtis Watson
  15. Mathew Wood

14. In addition, Imam ul Haq is not in possession of any PMOA accreditation, meaning his presence in the PMOA constituted an additional breach of the Regulation in accordance with paragraph 3.1.3. of the PMOA Regulations.
15. The charged brought be the Cricket Regulator against the Respondent reads as follows:

*“It is alleged that during the Metro Bank 50 Over fixture between Northants CCC and YCCC on 8 August 2025, YCCC breached paragraph 7.4.4 of the PMOA Regulations as a result of sixteen (16) separate individual breaches. Fifteen breaches related to a breach of paragraph 4.1.1 of the PMOA Regulations by its ‘Participants’ and one breach related to paragraph 3.1.3 of the PMOA Regulations.”*

#### **MATERIAL CONSIDERED**

16. I was provided with a hearing bundle which comprised of 108 pages, including the previous decision of the Cricket Discipline Commission against the Respondent for a breach of the PMOA Standards (as they were then) on 20 June 2023, the ECB Disciplinary Procedure Regulations and the PMOA Regulations.
17. At my request, I was also provided with the charge letter.
18. Given the importance of the PMOA Regulations and the need to enforce the regulations that relate to mobile phones and the potential dissemination of information that may be relevant to corruption in the game of cricket, before I determined that it was appropriate to initiate the Summary Procedure in this case, I made further requests of the Cricket Regulator, which included:
  - 18.1. Does the Cricket Regulator have any internal guidance as to when a Professional County Club will be charged with a like offence, or just receive a warning letter?
  - 18.2. Is the decision by the Cricket Regulator in this case in line with that guidance?
  - 18.3. Are there any other like offences currently under investigation?

- 18.4. Given the concerns about corruption in the professional game, including women's cricket, are there any recent decisions, whether reached by the Cricket Discipline Commission or the Anti-Corruption Tribunal or any other body, in relation to a breach of cricket regulations that relate to mobile phones that I should be aware of?
- 18.5. Is there any other material that I should be made aware of that would support, or undermine, the decision to refer this case to me under the Summary Procedure?
19. In reply to those requests, the Cricket Regulator stated:
- 19.1. The Cricket Regulator does not maintain a prescriptive written policy setting out when a Professional County Club will be charged as opposed to individual Participants receiving Warning Letters. However, the general approach is well established in practice, such:
- 19.1.1. Isolated/single breaches by individual Participants are ordinarily dealt with by Warning Letters to those Participants.
- 19.1.2. Multiple breaches involving a significant number of Participants from the same Club in a single fixture or over a series of fixtures, or evidence of systemic or collective failure, will ordinarily be escalated to a Club charge.
- 19.1.3. This approach is expressly supported by Regulation 7.4.4 of the PMOA Regulations.
- 19.2. In relation to this case in particular, the Cricket Regulator stated:
- 19.2.1. The decision to charge YCCC in this case is consistent with the above practice. The relevant factors include:
- 19.2.1.1. Fifteen breaches occurred in a single Tier 1 fixture.
- 19.2.1.2. YCCC had a prior PMOA breach in 2023 which resulted in formal sanction.

- 19.2.1.3. The Club's mitigation mirrors previous cases including comments minimising responsibility (e.g., the visibility of the drop-off box).
    - 19.2.1.4. The majority of the Participants involved had received recent anti-corruption education.
  - 19.2.2. These factors elevate the matter beyond the scope of individual Warning Letters and bring it within the intended ambit of Regulation 7.4.4.
- 19.3. At present, the Cricket Regulator is not investigating any other PMOA breaches of this scale involving a Professional County Club. In the 2025 season there have been isolated breaches by individual Participants across the professional game, each addressed by Warning Letters, but no other systemic breaches of this nature are under active investigation.
- 19.4. There are three recent decisions of the Cricket Discipline Commission (publicly available via <https://www.ecb.co.uk/about/policies/discipline>) and of particular relevance:
  - 19.4.1. Lancashire CCC (2023) – A case concerning multiple PMOA Standards breaches. The Adjudicator imposed a caution, reprimand, and fine of £1,000. The decision emphasised that PMOA compliance is essential, that senior management must take responsibility, and that tolerance for breaches would be limited in future.
  - 19.4.2. Gloucestershire CCC (September 2023) – Seventeen participants failed to surrender mobile phones during a Tier 1 Metro Bank One Day Cup match against Derbyshire CCC. The Club admitted the breach under PMOA Standards 7.4.4, citing logistical challenges at an out ground venue but accepting responsibility. Sanctions imposed under the Summary Procedure: caution, reprimand, and a £1,000 fine.

- 19.4.3. Derbyshire CCC (October 2023) – Sixteen participants failed to surrender mobile phones during a Tier 1 Metro Bank One Day Cup match against Gloucestershire CCC. The Club admitted the breach, explaining staff turnover and oversight, but accepted responsibility. Sanctions imposed under the Summary Procedure: caution, reprimand, and a £1,000 fine.
- 19.5. All three decisions demonstrate a consistent approach - systemic PMOA breaches by County Clubs are charged under Regulation (Standard) 7.4.4 which were determined under the Summary Procedure, with sanctions including a caution, reprimand, and financial penalty.
- 19.6. In most cases of suspected corrupt conduct investigated by National Cricket Federations (“**NCFs**”) and the International Cricket Council (“**ICC**”), the use of mobile communication devices is a key factor. Due to this the Anti-Corruption Code specifically provides NCFs and the ICC to undertake digital forensic examination of Participants mobile devices. The use of mobile communication devices is key in almost all corrupt/ criminal conspiracies heard before sporting and criminal courts. In cricket terms, having the ability to communicate with a Participant would provide significant advantage to any conspiracy to contrive a period of play or gain access to inside information for betting purposes. The start of PMOA Regulations two hours before the commencement of play is deliberate to deter and disrupt this activity. The Participants, in this case, had access to their devices after play had commenced – this meant that it was possible to communicate team selection, bowling plans and other key information – had any malign actors been present.
- 19.7. A significant number of prosecutions by the ICC relate to the refusal of Participants to comply with demands to download digital material from devices such as JAYASURIA and AHAMED ( [\(<https://images.icc->](https://images.icc-cricket.com/image/upload/prd/qkqhe0gcxoa93vpo2gms.pdf?_gl=1*1j9b2uy*_gcl_au*NzQxMzQwMDY0LjE3NTU4Njl1Njc.)

- 19.8. There also numerous cases, prosecuted by the ICC on behalf of associate member NCFs – where communications between corrupt Participants was key evidence – one such example being ICC vs Rizwan JAVED (
- 19.9. There is no material which undermines the decision to deal with this matter under the Summary Procedure. The Summary Procedure is felt to be the most proportionate manner to deal with this. There is no factual dispute over the incidents in question. Whilst Anti-Corruption measures are critical to protect the sport and breaches of those measures need to be dealt with robustly, there is no suggestion any of the YCCC Participants were involved in anything which created integrity concerns around the match. This point was investigated prior to referral to the CDP.
- 19.10. Comparable multiple PMOA breaches by County Clubs (Gloucestershire CCC, Derbyshire CCC, and the Lancashire CCC, referred to above) were all determined under the Summary Procedure by a single Judicial Officer. In each instance, sanctions imposed included a caution, reprimand, and a fine of £1,000.

## **RELEVANT FACTS**

20. To a great extent the charge and the contents of paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 above set out the facts.
21. The Anti-Corruption Manager for the Cricket Regulator confirmed that the Cricket Regulator (and previously the ECB) had provided to the Respondent's Men's and Academy teams the appropriate face-to-face education regarding anti-corruption matters, including the PMOA Regulations (previously, the PMOA Minimum Standards).



22. An Anti-Corruption Officer for the Cricket Regulator confirmed that in the match on 8 August, shortly after play had begun, a number of the Respondent's players had mobile phones in their hands. He recovered 15 of them. Also, Iman UI-Haq was present in the PMOA and he was not listed in the PMOA accreditation system.
23. The Cricket Regulator had investigated whether there were any integrity concerns prior to the matter being referred to the Cricket Discipline Panel.
24. The Cricket Regulator contacted the Respondent on 12 August 2025 with regard to these matters.
25. The Respondent replied on 14 August 2025. The Respondent accepted the seriousness of the charge. Whilst setting out some mitigation (for example suggesting that the designated phone drop-off box was not clearly signposted or positioned in an obvious place and that the presence of Iman UI Haq was an oversight), the Respondent had implemented new measures to improve its internal messaging system, provide specific support staff to oversee PMOA compliance on match days and to re-enforce pre-match operational checklists that include accreditation and mobile device protocols.

### **SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES**

26. The Cricket Regulator submitted that the appropriate sanction in this case included, a reprimand, a fine of £2,000 and the deduction of the maximum points for one match, suspended for 24 months.
27. The Respondent admitted the charge and accepted the range of sanctions proposed by the Cricket Regulator.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

28. Breaches of the PMOA Regulations are serious. It is for that reason that I made the requests that I did of the Cricket Regulator, and I wanted to ensure consistency of approach.
29. I determined that this case only just fell within the category of case that was appropriate to be dealt with by the Summary Procedure.

30. It is important that the investigation did not reveal any malign intent by any participant and that, despite an initial suggestion that the signage for the appropriate box was not clear, the Respondent accepted the charge and had put in place remedial steps.
31. The sanction is as set out in paragraphs 1-6 above.

### **APPEAL**

32. The Respondent admitted the charge(s) and agreed to the range of sanctions referred to in the charge letter. Any sanction imposed by a Sole Arbitrator in accordance with Regulation 7.4 is final and binding and there is no right of appeal from this decision.

**Richard Whittam KC**  
**Sole Arbitrator**  
**London, UK**  
**27 August 2025**