

TENNIS ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAM

INTERNATIONAL TENNIS)
INTEGRITY AGENCY,)
and)
LUIS RODRIGUEZ,)
Covered Person.)

DECISION OF THE ANTI-CORRUPTION HEARING OFFICER

I. THE PARTIES

1. *The ITIA:* The International Tennis Integrity Agency is the operationally independent entity responsible for enforcing the Tennis Anti-Corruption Program. The ITIA was represented in the matter by John Thomas and Maggie McQuiddy of Smith Hulsey & Busey and Katy Stirling, ITIA counsel.
2. *Luis Rodriguez:* Mr. Rodriguez is a resident of the Dominican Republic. He is a certified National Chair Umpire for tennis matches covered by the Tennis Anti-Corruption Program. At all times relevant to this case, Mr. Rodriguez was a “Covered Person” bound by that Program. At numerous points in this case, Mr. Rodriguez was asked if he had legal representation and he made it clear that he could not afford a lawyer.

II. THE NOTICE OF MAJOR OFFENSES

On 31 July 2024, ITIA sent Mr. Rodriguez a Notice of Major Offenses in which it alleged that he had engaged in corrupt activity in games in each of six separate matches for which he had served as the chair umpire. Specially:

Match 1: *Baptiste Crepatte v. [REDACTED]* at the [REDACTED] Dominican Republic [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic ([REDACTED] November 2018)

1. On [REDACTED] November 2018, you were the chair umpire at the match between Baptiste Crepatte and [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] Dominican Republic [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic.
2. On [REDACTED] November 2018, the International Betting Integrity Agency (“IBIA”) sent a match alert to the ITIA that eight suspicious bets were placed on Mr. Crepatte to win the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match.

3. The data that you entered into your hand-held scoring device does not match the calls you made as evidenced by the recorded audio of the match:
 - a. The scorecard shows that you entered into your hand-held scoring device the Mr. Crepatte won the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set.
 - b. On the audio recording, you announced that Mr. [REDACTED] – not Mr. Crepatte – won the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set.
4. The false data that you entered into your hand-held scoring device enabled the suspicious bets to be successful.
5. You breached the TACP (2018) by:
 - a. Contriving an aspect of the match between Mr. Crepatte and Mr. [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 1); and
 - b. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 2).

Match 2: *Franco Feitt v. [REDACTED]* at the [REDACTED] Dominican Republic [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic ([REDACTED] December 2018)

6. On [REDACTED] December 2018, you were the chair umpire for the match between Franco Feitt and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] Dominican Republic [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic.
7. On 12 December 2018, IBIA sent a match alert to the ITIA reporting ten suspicious bets on this match:
 - a. Five suspicious bets that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set would [REDACTED]; and
 - b. Five suspicious bets on Mr. Feitt to win the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set.
8. The data that you entered into your hand-held scoring device does not match the calls you made as evidenced by the recorded audio of the match:
 - a. The scorecard shows that you entered into your hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. Feitt [REDACTED] the game following the [REDACTED] point.
 - b. On the audio recording, only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set. The recording further shows that you did not announce any scores between your announcement of: (i) [REDACTED] following the [REDACTED] point and (ii)

your calling “ [REDACTED] for Mr. Feitt following the [REDACTED] point – meaning that the score [REDACTED].

- c. The scorecard also shows that you entered into your hand-held scoring device that Mr. Feitt won the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set.
 - d. Contrary to the scorecard, the audio recording shows that Mr. Feitt was unable to return Mr. [REDACTED] serve on the [REDACTED] point of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set.
9. You entered false data into your hand-held scoring device that enabled the suspicious bets to be successful.
10. You breached the TACP (2018) by:
- a. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of the match between Mr. Feitt and Mr. [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 3);
 - b. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 4);
 - c. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 5); and
 - d. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 6).

Match 3: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic ([REDACTED] December 2019)

- [REDACTED] On [REDACTED] December 2019, you were the chair umpire for the match between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic.
12. On 15 December 2019, IBIA reported to the ITIA 58 suspicious bets on this match:
- a. Six suspicious bets that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match would go to deuce; and
 - b. 52 suspicious bets that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match would go to deuce.
13. The data that you entered into your hand-held scoring device does not match the calls you made as evidenced by the recorded audio of the match:

- a. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED] point.
 - b. On the audio recording, only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set. You announce “Game” for Mr. [REDACTED] following the [REDACTED] point, meaning that this game never [REDACTED]
 - c. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED] point.
 - d. On the audio recording, (a) only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set, (b) you do not announce the scores following the [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] points, and (c) you announce “Game” for Mr. [REDACTED] following the [REDACTED] point, meaning that this game was [REDACTED] and never [REDACTED]
14. You entered false data into your hand-held scoring device that enabled the suspicious bets to be successful.
15. You breached the TACP (2019) by:
- a. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of the match between Mr. [REDACTED] and Mr. [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 7);
 - b. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 8);
 - c. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 9); and
 - d. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 10).

Match 4: [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic ([REDACTED] December 2019)

16. On [REDACTED] December 2019, you were the chair umpire for the match between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic.
17. On 17 December 2019, [REDACTED] notified the ITIA about thirteen suspicious bets on this match:
 - a. Four bets that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set would go to deuce;

- b. Seven bets that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set would go to deuce; and
 - c. Two suspicious bets that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set would go to deuce.
18. The data that you entered into your hand-held scoring device does not match the calls you made as evidenced by the recorded audio of the match:
- a. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED] point.
 - b. On the audio recording, only six points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, and you announce “Game” for Mr. [REDACTED] following the [REDACTED] point, proving that the game [REDACTED]
 - c. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED]
 - d. On the audio recording, (a) only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, and (b) you do not announce any scores after announcing [REDACTED]” following the [REDACTED] point, proving that the game was [REDACTED] and never [REDACTED]
 - e. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED] point.
 - f. On the audio recording, (a) only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, (b) you do not announce a score following the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] points, and (c) you announce “Game” for Mr. [REDACTED] following the [REDACTED] point, proving that the game [REDACTED]
19. You entered false data into your hand-held scoring device that enabled the suspicious bets to be successful.
20. You breached the TACP (2019) by:
- a. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of the match between Mr. [REDACTED] and Mr. [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 11);
 - b. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in violation of Section D.1.b (Charge 12);
 - c. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 13);

- d. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 14);
- e. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set this match, in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 15); and
- f. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 16).

Match 5: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Dominican Republic ([REDACTED] December 2019)

- 21. On [REDACTED] December 2019, you were the chair umpire for the match between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic.
- 22. On 15 December 2019, IBIA informed the ITIA of 280 suspicious bets on this match, which several betting operators had reported to IBIA:
 - a. 178 total suspicious bets that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match would go to deuce; and
 - b. 102 suspicious bets placed with [REDACTED] that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match would go to deuce.
- 23. The data that you entered into your hand-held scoring device does not match the calls you made as evidenced by the recorded audio of the match:
 - a. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED] point.
 - b. On the audio recording, only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set, meaning the game never [REDACTED]
 - c. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED] point.
 - d. On the audio recording, (a) only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set, (b) you do not announce the scores following the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] points of the game, and (c) you call "Game" for Mr. [REDACTED] following the [REDACTED] point – all proving the game was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
- 24. You entered false data into your hand-held scoring device that enabled the suspicious bets to be successful.

25. You breached the TACP (2019) by:
- a. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of the match between Mr. [REDACTED] and Mr. [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 17);
 - b. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 18);
 - c. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 19); and
 - d. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 20).

Match 6: [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic ([REDACTED] December 2020)

26. On [REDACTED] December 2020, you were the chair umpire for the match between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] tournament in [REDACTED] Dominican Republic.
27. On 11 December 2020, IBIA reported to the ITIA two suspicious bets that either the [REDACTED] game or the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match would go to deuce.
28. The data that you entered into your hand-held scoring device does not match the calls you made evidenced by the recorded audio of the match:
- a. The scorecard shows that you entered into the hand-held scoring device that the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set [REDACTED] with Mr. [REDACTED] winning the game after the [REDACTED] point.
 - b. On the audio recording, (a) only [REDACTED] points were played in the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, (b) you do not announce the score following the [REDACTED] point, and (c) you announce "Game" for Mr. [REDACTED] following the [REDACTED] point, proving that the game [REDACTED]
29. The false data that you entered into the hand-held scoring device enabled the suspicious bets to be successful.
30. You breached the TACP (2020) by:
- a. Contriving an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of the match between Mr. [REDACTED] and Mr. [REDACTED] in breach of Section D.1.d (Charge 22).
 - b. Facilitating another person to wager on an aspect of the [REDACTED] game of the [REDACTED] set of this match, in breach of Section D.1.b (Charge 22).

III. PRE-HEARING PROCEEDINGS

The general purposes of the Pre-Hearing Proceedings in this case were to: make sure that Mr. Rodriguez understood the charges against him and that he understood how the proceeding would take place; to establish a schedule for Pre-Hearing Briefing, the submission of Exhibits and Witness Statements; to narrow the issues to be presented at the Hearing including by requiring Mr. Rodriguez to raise any objections which he had to the ITIA's evidence; and to establish the date and time for the Hearing itself. A Pre-Hearing Conference took place on 13 September 2024. Both Mr. Rodriguez and representatives of the ITIA were present. Based on the Pre-Hearing Conference, a Pre-Hearing Order (in English and Spanish) was sent to the parties on 20 September 2024. All other instructions from the AHO with respect to the proceedings were communicated by email in English and translated into Spanish by the ITIA case management office. (Copies of the Pre-Hearing Order as well as the AHO's follow-up instructions to the parties in a 10 December 2024 email are attached.)

As provided in the Pre-Hearing Order, ITIA submitted an Opening Brief, written Witness Statements of its three witnesses and Exhibits to serve as its case in chief. Mr. Rodriguez stated at the Pre-Hearing Conference and in subsequent correspondence that he had no witnesses or exhibits. Mr. Rodriguez filed no Brief, Witness Statements, or Exhibits as provided in the Pre-Hearing Order, nor did he submit any summary of his own testimony or any disagreement with the ITIA's position that there was a discrepancy between the match audio and match scorecard as to the winner of particular points or whether a particular game went to deuce, as required in the Pre-Hearing Order and the AHO's 10 December 2024 direction to the parties.

Prior to the commencement of the Hearing, the AHO carefully reviewed and considered the ITIA's initial Brief, Witness Statements and Exhibits (including interviews of Mr. Rodriguez conducted in February 2022 and February 2023), as well as any comments made by Mr. Rodriguez in the Pre-Hearing Conference and correspondence in connection with the case.

IV. THE HEARING

After being rescheduled at the request of Mr. Rodriguez, the Hearing took place by Zoom on 18 December 2024. The Hearing lasted from approximately 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time until 11:30 a.m. Mountain Time.

1. The ITIA was represented at the Hearing by John Thomas and Maggie McQuiddy of Smith Hulsey & Busey as well as Katy Stirling, ITIA Counsel. The ITIA's three witnesses Helen Calton, [REDACTED] and Mark Swarbrick were available for the entire Hearing. Mr. Rodriguez appeared pro se. English/Spanish consecutive translation was provided by two very capable translators.
2. Because Mr. Rodriguez was not familiar with the adjudication process and was appearing pro se, the AHO bent over backwards to make sure that the process was fair to him. For example: he was permitted to make an opening statement, provide testimony, and provide a closing statement, all of which were a mixture of testimony and argument; he was permitted to cross-examine each of the ITIA's witnesses as the initial questioner and

every time the ITIA or the AHO asked a question of a witness, Mr. Rodriguez was reinvited to ask questions.

3. Before going into the merits of the case, it is useful to understand how betting on tennis works. A bet can be placed on virtually anything that happens in a tennis match. In this case, the bets were that a specific game in a specific match would go to deuce (that means that the score in the game would reach 40-40) or that one player would win a specific point in a specific game. Bets are won or lost based on the data entered into the chair umpire's hand-held scoring device and reflected on the electronic match scorecard, which data is then automatically transferred to the betting agencies for pay out. The hand-held scoring device also contains a microphone which not only records the scores called out by the chair umpire, but also picks up the sounds of points being played, including, for example, the thud of the ball being hit during a rally and line calls of "out" by a linesman.

IV. THE MERITS OF THE ITIA'S CASE AGAINST MR. RODRIGUEZ

At the beginning of the Hearing, the ITIA's Witness Statements and Exhibits were admitted without objection. The AHO has considered all of the evidence presented by the parties before and during the Hearing. The AHO also considered a post-hearing email received from Mr. Rodriguez. For the sake of economy, this Decision will only discuss those points which the AHO found to be most important.

The ITIA put forth several arguments in support of its position that Mr. Rodriguez entered false scores into the hand-held scoring device reflecting that the games in question went to deuce (9 separate games in 5 matches) or that one player would win a specific point (one specific point in one specific game in two separate matches) in order to benefit bettors who wagered on those results.

1. The bets placed on the games and points in question were highly suspicious. The ITIA's expert witness on betting in tennis was Mr. Mark Swarbrick. Mr. Swarbrick has extensive experience in the sport betting industry. Before joining ITIA as its betting liaison officer in August 2021, he worked for sports betting operator ██████████ for more than 30 years, much of that time focused on betting in tennis. Mr. Swarbrick's evidence was supplemented by the evidence of Ms. Helen Calton. Ms. Calton has been an investigator with the ITIA and its predecessor agency since 2019. The investigation into Mr. Rodriguez began when ITIA received notification from the International Betting Integrity Association of multiple suspicious bets on multiple matches where Mr. Rodriguez was the chair umpire.

In his witness statement and testimony at the Hearing, Mr. Swarbrick detailed why each of the bets placed on these specific points or games was highly suspicious. In summary, Mr. Swarbrick's reasons included:

- The sheer number of bets placed on these specific markets. (In betting parlance the term "market" is a specific outcome in a match – *e.g.*, particular game going to deuce.) For example, Mr. Swarbrick observed in his witness statement that in

Match 5, [REDACTED] reports forty-one accounts from Greece, Cyprus, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Bulgaria involved in betting on either or both games in question. “To my knowledge, throughout my career in the betting industry, which has spanned over thirty years, I have never come across activity to this level in terms of number of accounts involved in such specific market activity.”

- The unusually high amounts wagered on some of these bets. (Some bettor’s skirted the maximum betting limits for a particular market by also betting on a combination which included one of the markets at issue in this matter.)
 - The fact that several accounts had been opened the day before the match in question started.
 - The fact that many of the same bets were placed with multiple betting operators.
 - The fact that some of the bets were made from accounts which had never bet on a tennis match before.
 - The fact that multiple bets on the same unique market came from accounts registered in many different countries. (e.g., Italy, Greece, United Kingdom and Bangladesh.)
 - The fact that some of the accounts which placed suspicious bets on one match where Mr. Rodriguez was the chair umpire also placed suspicious bets on other matches chaired by Mr. Rodriguez as identified in the Notice of Major Offenses.
 - The profits on these suspicious bets, either paid or held back by the betting companies because of suspected corruption, totalled tens of thousands of euros.
 - Mr. Swarbrick’s conclusion was that these highly suspicious and successful bets could not have occurred without collusion between a corrupt middleman working in agreement with Mr. Rodriguez.
 - The number of suspicious bets made on matches where Mr. Rodriguez was the chair umpire was so significant that in 2019 the betting companies no longer agreed to accept any bets on matches where Mr. Rodriguez as the chair umpire. Mr. Rodriguez acknowledged this at the Hearing.
2. Beyond the highly suspicious betting patterns in these points and games, and important part of the ITIA’s corruption case was its assertion that the audio recordings of the games in question either showed fewer points were actually played than the points entered by Mr. Rodriguez into the hand-held scoring device which showed that the games went to deuce or that when bets were made on the winner a specific point Mr. Rodriguez called out that the correct player had won the point but entered the point in the hand-held scoring device for the losing player so that bets would be successful. Both Ms. Calton and the ITIA’s witness [REDACTED] gave evidence on this issue.

3. Mr. Rodriguez did not contest the ITIA's description of the discrepancies between the match audios and the entries made into the hand-held scoring device as reflected in the match scorecards. Specifically:
 - In its interview with Mr. Rodriguez in February 2023 the ITIA took Mr. Rodriguez through these discrepancies, including having him listen to the match audios. At that time, he offered various explanations for what might have happened, but he did not contest that there were discrepancies between the audio of the matches and the match scorecards.
 - The Pre-Hearing Order instructed Mr. Rodriguez to provide any disagreement which he has with the description of the relevant match scorecard and audio set forth in the Notice of Major Offense: No disagreement was submitted by Mr. Rodriguez.
 - The AHO's 10 December 2024 instructions to the parties stated:

“Mr. Rodriguez has received the ITIA Brief, Exhibits and Witness Statements. Mr. Rodriguez has filed no specific response to any of these documents. In particular, he does not contest the discrepancy between the match audio and the hand-held scoring device for the points identified in the Notice of Charge.” Mr. Rodriguez never raised any issue with that statement by the AHO.

During the Hearing, Mr. Rodriguez acknowledged that he had listened to the match audios forwarded to him by the ITIA along with its other Exhibits and confirmed in response to a question for Mr. Thomas, that he had no challenge to the discrepancies raised by the ITIA.

V. MR. RODRIGUEZ'S EVIDENCE

Mr. Rodriguez's evidence consisted entirely on his own testimony and argument. He called no witnesses, provided no exhibits and his cross examination of the ITIA's witnesses was brief. In his defense, Mr. Rodriguez argued that:

1. He had a recollection of the matches in question taking place, but not of specific games or points.
2. He has never bet on tennis himself or manipulated a score for the benefit of others.
3. No one ever approached him to engage in corruption in connection with any of these or other matches.
4. Serving as a chair umpire was his main occupation to support himself and his family so he would never risk that by engaging in any corrupt activity.
5. There was no way that he could have communicated with corrupt bettors during a match.

6. That perhaps the players were responsible for any corruption that resulted in the suspicious betting.
7. There could have been other people outside of the match who caused changes in the scorecard.
8. Perhaps what was heard on the match audio came from adjoining courts.
9. The players would have challenged him if he had called the wrong score.
10. Sometimes the hand-held scoring device would freeze or go on and off and sometimes the hand-held scoring device would lose internet connectivity.
11. Perhaps extra points were added to the scorecard by the hand-held scoring device malfunctioning.
12. Back in 2018, he had not had much experience using the hand-held scoring device, so perhaps he made mistakes by pushing the wrong button.
13. He has always cooperated with the ITIA's investigation.

VI. CLOSING OF THE HEARING

Before the closing of the Hearing, the AHO again asked both parties whether they had any objection to the AHO deciding the case. The answer from both parties was negative. The AHO also asked whether either party had any objection to how the case had been handled or to the conduct of the Hearing. Again, the answer was negative.

VII. THE AHO'S FINDING OF CORRUPTION

The AHO must determine whether the ITIA has proved its corruption case by a balance of probability.

1. The AHO is not persuaded by the arguments put forward by Mr. Rodriguez. The AHO finds that:
 - There is no evidence that someone other than Mr. Rodriguez had access to the hand-held scoring device during the matches. The argument that the players or some third party may have somehow caused the fraudulent entries into the device makes no sense.
 - Based on the evidence of [REDACTED] who is very familiar with the operation of the hand-held scoring device used by Mr. Rodriguez, there is no way that a malfunction of the device or loss of internet connectivity could have caused

extra points (allowing bets to be won on games going to deuce) to be added to the match scorecard.

- It doesn't matter whether Mr. Rodriguez was unable to communicate with corrupt bettors during a match. As pointed out by Mr. Swarbrick, the specific bets where Mr. Rodriguez's corrupt assistance might be needed would have been communicated to Mr. Rodriguez before the match started.
- The fact that there were eleven separate instances where bets that were already suspicious based on betting patterns coincided with discrepancies in the match audios (which made those bets successful) was not, coincidentally, the result of mistakes by Mr. Rodriguez arising from his lack of experience with the hand-held scoring device.
- Based on the overwhelming evidence put forward by the ITIA, the AHO is not persuaded by Mr. Rodriguez's protestations of innocence.

2. The AHO is persuaded by the evidence presented by the ITIA. The AHO found the testimony of the ITIA witnesses to be credible and compelling. Based on a review of all the evidence, the AHO finds:

- The winning bets described in the Notice of Major Offense had to be a result of corruption, not coincidence. It is very likely these suspicious bets would never have been made in the first place without some advanced knowledge that points would be manipulated by the chair umpire as necessary to make the bets successful;
- As pointed out by Ms. Calton and [REDACTED] Mr. Rodriguez's failure to call out the score after each point in the games where corruption is alleged was not a coincidence. Rather Mr. Rodriguez's failure to call out points, assisted in his fraudulent manipulation of the points entered into the hand-held scoring device, and reflected on the match scorecard.
- The match audios of the games in question in fact show fewer points played than were entered by Mr. Rodriguez into the hand-held scoring device. That did not occur because of a malfunction of the device or coincidental "mistakes" by Mr. Rodriguez. The same is true for the two cases where the bet was on which player would win a specific point and the winner of the point as announced by Mr. Rodriguez on the audio was different than what he entered into the hand-held scoring device which made the bets on those points successful. Based on the extensive evidence of suspicious bets which only won because of entries which Mr. Rodriguez made in the hand-held scoring device but were proved to be fictitious by the match audio, the AHO therefore finds to a level of confidence far beyond a balance of probability that Mr. Rodriguez has committed eleven separate and distinct corruption offenses as set forth in the ITIA's Notice of Major Corruption Offenses.

VII. SANCTIONS

Under the Tennis Anti-Corruption Program, sanctions for corruption offenses are largely left to the discretion of the AHO. There are however, published Sanctioning Guidelines which AHOs may follow. Based on those Guidelines, the ITIA recommended a period of ineligibility of ten years and a significant fine to be paid on a payment plan as a condition of reinstatement at the end of the period of ineligibility.

On the issue of sanctions, Mr. Rodriguez's evidence was that the money which he earned as a chair umpire provided more than half of his livelihood. His testimony at the Hearing and statements in his interviews in November 2022 and 2023 was that he made about 10,000 pesos per tournament as a chair umpire. His other source of income was teaching beginner tennis at a university for which he was paid [REDACTED]. His expenses include [REDACTED] in addition, he also pays [REDACTED]. Mr. Rodriguez's request at the Hearing was that if he is to be punished for his mistakes, then that punishment should be a fine which is paid back through part of his earnings as a chair umpire.

The AHO considers Mr. Rodriguez's corruption violations to be very serious. As a chair umpire, he was in an important position of trust charged with upholding the integrity of the sport. This was not a one off occurrence of bad judgment. The ITIA has established that Mr. Rodriguez corruptly manipulated scores allowing bets to win 11 times in six matches over a span of more than two years. Hundreds of bets were affected with potential financial consequences of tens of thousands of euros. For Mr. Rodriguez to know when the result of a point or game needed to be manipulated in order to change a losing bet into a winner, he must have colluded with another person or persons involved with the placement of those bets in advance of the match starting. The AHO finds that this was intentional corruption on the part of Mr. Rodriguez which adversely affected the reputation and integrity of the sport of tennis. This is made clear by the fact that the betting agencies even stopped accepting wagers on matches where Mr. Rodriguez was the chair umpire. Applying the ITIA Sanctioning Guidelines, the AHO finds that Mr. Rodriguez's culpability falls in Category A and the impact of that culpability falls in Category 1. Considering all the facts and circumstances in this case, the AHO has determined that a lifetime ban is the appropriate period of ineligibility to be imposed on Mr. Rodriguez. The AHO believes that Mr. Rodriguez is likely to have important information on the involvement of others in this betting scheme. The AHO would have no problem with a significant reduction in Mr. Rodriguez's period of ineligibility if he decides to fully cooperate with the ITIA and provides Substantial Assistance in disrupting the network behind this corrupt betting scheme. Also, under the Sanctioning Guidelines, a very significant fine would be warranted in this case. However, considering Mr. Rodriguez's limited resources, as evidenced by the fact that he could not afford a lawyer, the AHO considers a fine in the amount of \$15,000 to be proportionate. That fine will not be payable unless and until Mr. Rodriguez may be reinstated for providing Substantial

Assistance. As part of any Substantial Assistance consideration, the amount of this fine may also be reduced.

Dated: January 21, 2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Young", written in a cursive style.

Richard R. Young, AHO