



IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT UNDER THE ENGLAND AND WALES CRICKET BOARD DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE REGULATIONS

Before:

Gareth Graham

BETWEEN:

CRICKET REGULATOR

and

LANCASHIRE COUNTY CRICKET CLUB

SUMMARY PROCEDURE DECISION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Lancashire County Cricket Club (the “**Respondent**”) was charged by the Cricket Regulator with two breaches of Regulation 5.1.1 of the England and Wales Cricket Board Competitive County Cricket Registration Regulations 2025 (the “**CCCR Regulations**”).
2. Two players had participated for the Respondent in its Second XI Championship match against Essex CCC 2nd XI at Billericay commencing on 28 July 2025 without having first completed the ECB’s three ‘education modules’ (namely the Anti-Corruption, Recreational Drugs / Anti-Doping and Player Behaviour modules).
3. The Respondent accepted the charge.
4. The Respondent is fined £500, to be paid within four weeks of the date of this written decision.

INTRODUCTION

5. The Cricket Regulator confirmed in its Charge Letter dated 1 August 2025 that it considered it appropriate for this case to proceed under the Summary Procedure.
6. On 5 August 2025, the Respondent admitted the charge. On 18 August 2025, the Respondent also agreed to the range of sanctions referred to in the Charge Letter.
7. The case was referred to the Chair of the Cricket Discipline Panel to determine whether it was appropriate to initiate the Summary Procedure in this case. The Chair of the Cricket Discipline Panel determined that it was appropriate to initiate the Summary Procedure in this case and appointed me as the Sole Arbitrator to determine the applicable sanction under the Summary Procedure within the range specified by Regulation 7.4 of the England and Wales Cricket Board Disciplinary Procedure Regulations 2025 (the “**DP Regulations**”).
8. This is my reasoned decision, reached after consideration of the documentation placed before me. It is a summary. The fact that specific reference is not made herein to any part or aspect thereof does not mean it was not considered and given the appropriate weight.

THE CHARGE

9. The Respondent was charged with two breaches of Regulation 5.1.1 of the CCCR Regulations.
10. The particulars of the charge were that two players [REDACTED] participated for the Respondent in its Second XI Championship match against Essex CCC 2nd XI at Billericay commencing on 28 July 2025 without having first completed the ECB’s three ‘education modules’ (namely the Anti-Corruption, Recreational Drugs / Anti-Doping and Player Behaviour modules).
11. In the Charge Letter, the Cricket Regulator notified the Respondent pursuant to Regulation 5.1.4 of the DP Regulations that it considered the range of applicable sanctions to be:
 - i. A reprimand;

- ii. A fine not exceeding £500.

MATERIAL CONSIDERED

12. I was provided with a bundle of documents that included the Charge Letter, the CCCR Regulations and the DP Regulations, as well as email correspondence between the Cricket Regulator and the Respondent. I am grateful to the parties for the manner in which they had cooperated. I am also grateful for the administrative assistance provided by Anna Thomas, Sport Resolutions.

RELEVANT FACTS

13. The relevant facts were set out concisely in the Charge Letter. As set out above, two players participated for the Respondent in its Second XI Championship match against Essex CCC 2nd XI at Billericay commencing on 28 July 2025 without having first completed the three ECB 'education modules'.
14. Regulation 5.1 of the CCCR Regulations states as follows:

"5.1 Subject to the overriding discretion of the ECB:

5.1.1 in order to register with a Professional County Club, a Cricketer must:

- (a) complete (i) the Anti-Corruption Module, (ii) the Recreational Drugs/Anti-Doping Module, (iii) the Player Behaviour Module and (iv) the ECB Cardiac Screening Pre-Registration Requirements; and*
- (b) hold a signed Approved Playing Contract;*

5.1.2 a Cricketer must not play for a Professional County Club in any Competitive County Cricket match unless:

- (a) they are registered for that Professional County Club or loaned to that County in accordance with these Regulations; and*
- (b) the Professional County Club with which they are registered has submitted to the ECB a signed undertaking in the form prescribed by the ECB."*

15. The Respondent's failure to ensure that the players had completed the education modules represented breaches of Regulation 5.1.1 of the CCCR Regulations.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

16. In the Charge Letter, the Cricket Regulator set out the basis upon which it considered the range of applicable sanctions to be a reprimand and a fine not exceeding £500. That rationale was as follows:
- i. The Cricket Regulator noted that it had adopted a policy in 2025 of offering a formal caution as a sanction to a club where a breach of the education modules had occurred for the first time in the 2025 season in men's cricket. The Cricket Regulator had already issued such a caution to the Respondent on 4 July 2025 in relation to the non-completion of education modules by a player.
 - ii. The Cricket Regulator stated that it had taken into consideration the specific factual background of this case and the relatively recent introduction of the relevant regulations into second XI cricket (this being only the second year in which the regulations had been operational).
 - iii. The Cricket Regulator stated that the breaches in this case appeared to be a result of administrative error as opposed to a deliberate attempt to play ineligible players.
 - iv. The Cricket Regulator also noted that in 2024, the Cricket Discipline Commission, the predecessor to the new Cricket Discipline Panel, had issued cautions as a sanction to 16 professional clubs when charged for the first time with an 'education module' breach. In 2024, two counties had breached the same regulation for a second time and had each been fined £500. No further information was provided as to the nature or extent of these breaches.
17. The Cricket Regulator had notified the Respondent of the two purported breaches of Regulation 5.1.1 by email on 28 July 2025. The Respondent had accepted the

breaches in emails from Mark Chilton, the Respondent's Director of Cricket Performance, dated 29 and 30 July 2025.

18. In his initial response, Mr Chilton indicated that [REDACTED] had played for the Respondent's 2nd XI last season and that the Respondent thought the education modules lasted for two years. However, in admirably candid fashion, Mr Chilton later accepted that neither player had completed the education modules with the Respondent. Whilst Mr Chilton noted that the Respondent had undergone a restructure in its staff since the departure of the Head Coach at the end of May, he made it clear that he was not putting that forward as an excuse.

DECISION

19. The Respondent had accepted the two breaches of Regulation 5.1.1 of the CCCR Regulations. I was appointed solely to determine the appropriate sanction under the Summary Procedure within the range specified in the Charge Letter and in accordance with Regulation 7.4 of the DP Regulations.
20. Regulation 7.4 of the DP Regulations specifies:

"7.4 A Sole Arbitrator may impose any one or more of the following sanctions under the Summary Procedure:

7.4.1 reprimand;

7.4.2 completion of any education/training programme/course (at the cost of the Respondent);

7.4.3 fine not to exceed £2,000;

7.4.4 suspension for a maximum of four scheduled playing days, which may include a specific Match(es) or England Match(es); and/or

7.4.5 alteration of the points awarded in respect of that Respondent's Match(es) up to a maximum points deduction of 1.5 times the maximum points available for one Match in a specified competition."

21. As noted above, the Charge Letter provided for a range of applicable sanctions to be a reprimand and a fine not exceeding £500. This range of sanctions was accepted by the Respondent.
22. In reaching my conclusion as to the appropriate sanction, I took into account the following factors:
- i. The Respondent had selected two players to participate in a Second XI Championship match who had not completed the requisite education modules.
 - ii. The onus is on the Professional County Clubs to ensure its cricketers have completed the relevant requirements in order to play in any Competitive County Cricket match. This includes the education modules, which exist not just to educate players but also to help protect the integrity of the game.
 - iii. The Respondent had already accepted a caution from the Cricket Regulator in July 2025 in relation to the non-completion of education modules by a player.
 - iv. The Charge included two breaches of Regulation 5.1.1 of the CCCR Regulations, in that the Respondent had selected two players to play for the Respondent who had not completed the education modules, albeit that the breaches related to a single match.
 - v. The breaches appeared to be an issue of administrative oversight rather than a deliberate attempt to select players who the Respondent knew were ineligible.
 - vi. The Respondent had accepted the breaches at the earliest opportunity, including before the Cricket Regulator had formally issued the Charge Letter.
23. In all the circumstances of the case, and taking into consideration the various factors set out above, I concluded that a total fine of £500 is an appropriate, fair and



proportionate sanction for the two breaches of Regulation 5.1.1 of the CCCR Regulations here.

SANCTION

24. **The following sanction is imposed:**

- i. **The Respondent is fined £500, to be paid within four weeks of the date of this written decision.**

APPEAL

25. The Respondent admitted the charge 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.

Gareth Graham
Sole Arbitrator
London, UK
28 August 2025