

**IN THE MATTER OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE WPBSA DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

**David Casement QC (Chairman)**

**Yasin Patel**

**Tarik Shamel**

**WORLD PROFESSIONAL BILLIARDS AND SNOOKER ASSOCIATION LIMITED**

**-and-**

**YU DELU**

**DECISION ON SANCTION**

1. By charge letter dated 25 May 2018 Yu Delu was charged with 15 breaches of the WPBSA Members Rules and Regulations Betting Rules. The charges related to five snooker matches in five competitions between February 2015 and November 2017.
2. Notification of the appointment of the Disciplinary Committee was given to Mr Delu on 31 August 2018. The Disciplinary Committee was composed of David Casement QC (Chairman), Tarik Shamel and Yasin Patel.
3. Mr Delu had been interviewed on 11 December 2017, 27 February 2017 and 25 May 2018 by Nigel Mawer, Vice President of the WPBSA (“the Association”). Mr Delu maintained his innocence throughout the interviews. In order to assist Mr Mawer in his investigation and his assistance was a formidable set of reports provided by Sportradar providing data analysis in respect of the matches involving Mr Delu and which were under suspicion.

4. Part of the analysis provided was an analysis of Mr Delu's text messages which showed discussions clearly referring to match-fixing and also his own betting on snooker matches. One of the texts showed Mr Delu taking the initiative in offering match-fixing services to a person he was in communication with.
5. At the directions hearing on 17 September 2018 Mr Delu through his solicitor Mr Rode asked for the opportunity to have the documentation served upon him translated into Chinese so that he could consider his position further. That request was facilitated with a series of directions. The hearing listed for the trial of the matter, namely 21 September 2018 was treated as a further directions hearing. The substantive trial of the charges was listed for 2 November 2018. By email sent late on 31 October 2018 Mr Rode on behalf of Mr Delu notified his admission to eight of the charges namely charges 1,2,3,4,5,6,8 and 9. A copy of the charges set out in the charge letter are annexed hereto.
6. By reason of his late admissions of guilt Mr Delu was admitting to:
  - (a) agreeing to fix the outcome of five snooker matches;
  - (b) in fact fixing the outcome of four matches;
  - (c) communicating his decision to fix those matches to persons that he knew would seek to benefit from the decision by betting on the outcome of fixed Matches;
  - (d) conducting himself as aforesaid for financial reward;
  - (e) lying to the investigator in the course of his interview;
  - (f) failing to co-operate with the WPBSA investigation;
  - (g) betting on snooker when prohibited from doing so.
7. It was submitted by Mr Weston on behalf of the Association that:

- (a) Mr Delu engaged in deliberate and premeditated corruption to secure for his friends/associates and himself substantial financial gain. On one match (Match 3) the stakes placed on the result were £65,000 and would have generated a profit of £86,000;
- (b) Mr Delu was involved in match-fixing on five occasions in five tournaments and his activity covers a period of 2 ½ years;
- (c) Mr Delu did this for substantial reward and without protest.

8. The misconduct of Mr Delu represents a scourge to the game of snooker. The problem of match-fixing strikes at the heart of the integrity of the game as it does on many other sports. This has been noted by other tribunals in many different sports:

In *O v UEFA* [CAS 2010/A/2172] it was stated:

“45. However, the Panel has to remind itself that match-fixing, money-laundering, kickbacks, extortion, bribery and the like are a growing concern, indeed a cancer, in many sports, football included, and must be eradicated. The very essence of sport is that competition is fair; its attraction to spectators is the unpredictability of its outcome.

46. There are several pronouncements of CAS panels to that effect.”

In *PTIOs v Nick Lindahl* [CAS 2017/A/4956] it was stated:

“66. The PTIOs argue that most severe penalties are required in order to combat match-fixing. The Panel agrees that fair competition is the very essence of sport and its attraction to spectators and sponsors. Match-fixing and other types of corruption pose a major risk to the existence and success of all sports and possibly more so in an individual sport in which one player competes against another (unlike a group of runners, as an example) and one corrupt participant is required to obtain an improper result.

67. Match-fixing is one of the most serious types of corruption offences in sport and tennis regulators are right in demonstrating zero tolerance to match-fixing and imposing severe sanctions which punish a corrupt player and also serve as an effective deterrent for other players.

68.... A severe sanction is required to punish and deter match-fixing and that permanent ineligibility may be a proportionate sanction for players who are involved in such corruption offences.”

## **Sanction**

9. Attending the hearing on sanction on behalf of Mr Delu was Lisa Wilding QC. We are grateful for the assistance provided by Ms Wilding whose submissions were clear and succinct. We have taken into account all matters of mitigation raised including Mr Delu’s previous good disciplinary record and his late guilty pleas.
10. Mr Weston addressed the Disciplinary Committee on a number of previous cases although he made it clear that none of them provide a binding precedent. It was submitted that this case comes close to that of Stephen Lee where, following a fully contested hearing, a period of Suspension was handed down for 12 years.
11. In our judgment the appropriate starting point in the present case is the same as that in the Stephen Lee case namely 12 years. It is appropriate that a message is sent out that this conduct is both dishonest and dishonourable and will be met with severe sanctions.
12. Mr Delu pleaded guilty to charges which were regarded as satisfactory such that there was no need for a hearing in respect of the other charges. Mr Delu is therefore entitled to credit for those guilty pleas. However last minute pleas do not attract as much credit as early pleas because most of the cost of preparation has already been incurred. The credit Mr Delu

receives is 10% as opposed to a one third reduction which might have been available for a plea at the earliest opportunity.

13. The period of Suspension which is passed upon Mr Delu is therefore 10 years 9 months commencing from the date of interim Suspension, namely 25 May 2018, and will last until 5pm 24 February 2029.
14. It is also appropriate that Mr Delu pay the costs of these proceedings. There was no objection to that in principle or to the quantum of costs save that it was said that the Suspension is likely to have a negative impact upon his earning capacity and therefore his ability to make payment. The enforcement of the costs order is a different matter. Mr Delu shall pay the sum of £20,823.80.
15. Finally, the Committee wishes to record that it has been greatly impressed with the skill and courtesy displayed by Nigel Mawer, Vice Chairman of the Association, throughout his investigation in respect of this matter. The professionalism with which the evidence has been collated and presented has been of great assistance to the Committee.

**DAVID CASEMENT QC (CHAIRMAN)**  
**TARIK SHAMEL**  
**YASIN PATEL**  
**26 November 2018**

## ANNEX

1. That you agreed to fix the outcome of your match with Martin McCrudden at the Indian Open Qualifiers on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2015 in breach of Rule 2.1.2.1 , or
  - 1a. Passed Information about the outcome of the match, which Information you had by virtue of your being involved in professional snooker as a player competing in the match. That Information related to your performance in the Match in breach of Rule 2.1.3.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules Betting Rules.
2. That you agreed to fix the outcome of your match with Dominic Dale at the Paul Hunter Classic in Germany on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2015 in breach of Rule 2.1.2.1 , or
  - 2a. Passed Information about the outcome of the match, which Information you had by virtue of your being involved in professional snooker as a player competing in the match. That Information related to your performance in the Match in breach of Rule 2.1.3.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules Betting Rules.
3. That you agreed to fix the outcome of your match with Ian Glover at the Welsh Open in Wales on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2016 in breach of Rule 2.1.2.1 , or
  - 3a. Passed Information about the outcome of the match, which Information you had by virtue of your being involved in professional snooker as a player competing in the match. That Information related to your performance in the Match in breach of Rule 2.1.3.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules Betting Rules.
4. That you agreed to fix the outcome of your match with Michael Georgiou at the European Masters Qualifiers on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2017 in breach of Rule 2.1.2.1 , or
  - 4a. Passed Information about the outcome of the match, which Information you had by virtue of your being involved in professional snooker as a player competing in the match. That Information related to your performance in the Match in breach of Rule 2.1.3.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules Betting Rules.
5. That you agreed to fix the outcome of your match with Kurt Maflin at the Shanghai Masters on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017 in breach of Rule 2.1.2.1 , or
  - 5a Passed Information about the outcome of the match, which Information you had by virtue of your being involved in professional snooker as a player competing in the match. That Information related to your performance in the Match in breach of Rule 2.1.3.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules Betting Rules.
6. Between June and October 2017 you were approached to fix a matches that you were to play in and you failed to report the approaches within 24 hours

to the Company Secretary or Tournament Official in breach of Rule 4.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules.

7. On 13<sup>th</sup> November 2017 when you were approached to fix a match that you were to play against Kurt Maflin on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017 you failed to report the approach within 24 hours to the Company Secretary or Tournament Official in breach of Rule 4.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules.
8. That you failed to cooperate with the investigation by failing to provide material that was requested of you during the investigation in breach of Rule 4.4 of the WPBSA Members Rules.
9. That you have been betting on snooker in breach of Rule 2.1.1.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules, or
10. That you have *solicited, induced, enticed, instructed, persuaded, encouraged, facilitated, authorised or permitted any other person to enter into a Bet for the Member's direct or in direct benefit on snooker* in breach of Rule 2.1.1.1 of the WPBSA Members Rules.