



**IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT UNDER THE RULES
OF THE DARTS REGULATION AUTHORITY**

BETWEEN:

DARTS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Regulatory Body for Darts

-and-

Andy Jenkins

Respondent

**DECISION
OF
THE DRA DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

INTRODUCTION

1. The Disciplinary Committee ("the Committee") of the Darts Regulation Authority ("DRA") convened for a hearing ("the Hearing") on 17 March 2025 to consider a case involving Andy Jenkins ("Jenkins").
2. The case involves allegations of match fixing and one charge of betting on darts matches. The match fixing allegations relate to twelve matches ("the relevant matches") played as part of the Modus Super Series ("MSS") between 22 August 2022 and 5 July 2023, these events being regulated by the DRA. At time of competing, Jenkins was therefore the subject of DRA Rules.

3. On 2 June 2023, the International Betting Integrity Association (“IBIA”) alerted the DRA that Betting operator A, had identified suspicious betting patterns in respect of five matches involving Jenkins. Four of these are subject of these charges.
4. Additional betting platforms ([REDACTED]) subsequently reported suspicious betting on eight additional matches involving Jenkins.
5. The relevant matches identified by Betting operator A all involved Jenkins and included the following opponents:
 - John Desreumaux (Jenkins lost: 2:4) – 19 May 2023. Suspicious betting for Andy Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match;
 - Johnny Haines (0:4) – 26 May 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match, the match to end 0:4 and five legs or fewer to be played;
 - Robin Beger (4:3) – 4 July 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match; and
 - Johan van Velzen (4:3) – 5 July 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match.
6. Betting Operator B also reported suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in his match with van Velzen on 5 July 2023, stating that the *“stakes wagered by this customer on this match accounted for approximately 15% of the overall turnover on the match.”*
7. Betting Operator C reported a single UK-based account expressing suspicious betting across four matches involving Jenkins, commenting that *“notably, the stakes wagered by this customer on the aforementioned matches were significantly increased*

compared with their historical betting averages.” On each occasion the market targeted was for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the relevant match.

- Paul Hogan (0:4) – 25 February 2023;
- Johnny Haines (0:4) – 26 May 2023;
- Robin Beger (4:3) – 4 July 2023; and
- Johan van Velzen (4:3) – 5 July 2023.

8. Betting Operator D reported two customers exhibiting suspicious staking behaviour across eight matches involving Jenkins;

- Robert Thornton (4:2) – 22 August 2022. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match;
- Johnny Haines (0:4) – 26 May 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to lose the match 0:4;
- Darren Johnson (3:4) – 4 January 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match and to lose the match;
- Adam Mould (1:4) – 3 January 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match;
- Peter Manley (4:0) – 4 January 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match;
- Andreas Toft Jorgensen (4:0) – 24 August 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match;

- Johan van Velzen (4:3) – 5 July 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match; and
- Robin Beger (4:3) – 4 July 2023. Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match.

9. Subsequent investigation with Betting Operator D identified two further matches that involved suspicious betting by the same bettors placing money on Jenkins:

- Scott Walter – 19 May 2023 (3:4). Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match.
- Dom Taylor – 19 May 2023 (2:4). Suspicious betting for Jenkins to not score a 180 in the match.

10. Investigation by the DRA established that the suspicious bets on the relevant matches were placed by individuals (“the bettors”) who are all linked to Jenkins and who, like him, reside in the Portsmouth area:

- Bettor B who is closely connected to Jenkins through the local darts community;
- Bettor A who is an employee of Bettor B's company;
- Bettor C, the partner of Bettor B;
- Bettor D, Bettor C's son; and
- Bettor E, the partner of Bettor A.

11. The DRA presented the Hearing with two statements from Richard Gardner (“Gardner”), a former professional darts player, with experience of playing in world championships and at international level. He was a founding member of the World Darts Council, now the Professional Darts Corporation and has been a member of the DRA for over ten years.

12. Gardner was asked to analyse the performance of Jenkins in the relevant matches, based on viewing video footage. Gardner’s evidence is set out in pages 27 – 43 of the case statements bundle. In summary, he concludes, in respect of each match:

- Robert Thornton. Jenkins makes two attempts at 180 in six legs, *“his 1st attempt was a good attempt but his second one was a strange switch to the 19s with his last dart.”*
- Andreas Toft-Jorgensen. Jenkins makes one attempt at a 180 - *“a well thrown dart only narrowly missing”* - in four legs, all of which he won.
- Adam Mould. Jenkins had two attempts at 180 in five legs, *“his 1st attempt was a strange switch to the 19s with his last dart. His second was a decent attempt only narrowly missing”*
- Darren Johnson. Jenkins made no attempt at 180 in six legs, with Gardner concluding that *“this match for me was a poor one from both players. But Jenkins darts were noticeably different after going 2-1 ahead, his darts were a lot further away from the target sometimes up to 3 - 4 inches away. It seemed to me that he was throwing with less power than in the 1st three legs which may be the cause for this.”*
- Peter Manley. Jenkins made three attempts at 180 in four legs, *“twice he threw at the 20 although both darts were high (especially the 1st attempt), his last attempt saw him switch to the 19s with the last dart. For me I see no reason why he should switch when there was plenty of room left in the treble 20 and*

would still leave a finish even if he'd only hit a single 20. Lastly with his 1st attempt at a 180 with two trebles in and sitting perfectly he deliberated for quite some time where to throw his last dart which ended up very high. A person of Jenkins experience should know what is left after 2 darts and should not need to take this amount of time over one dart."

- Paul Hogan. Jenkins made one attempt at 180 in four legs, *"and his attempt with the third dart was horrendous and 3 inches off target. Although he lost this match 4-0 all his other darts were a lot closer and this one dart in particular definitely stood out."*
- John Desreumaux. Jenkins made no attempts at 180 in six legs, *"this match did not see Jenkins actually have a dart for a 180 but twice saw him switch after his first dart was perfectly in the treble 20. On both occasions I see no valid reason for him to switch to the 19 segment either for numerical purposes or the way the dart is lying."*
- Scott Walters. *"This was a really good match in general with Andy racing to a 3-1 lead averaging in excess of 100. A few sloppy visits towards the end of the match see his average come down to 88.73 at the end. Although he had a few attempts at 180s his attempts were decent and the few times he switched after dart 1 there was reasoning behind the switch both times. Overall, a good performance by both players."*
- Dom Taylor. In the first leg: *"a good start to the leg from Jenkins 140 third dart was high but well thrown."* In leg 2: *"Jenkins very unlucky not to land a 180 with his third dart bouncing out off the flight of darts one and two."* In leg 6: *"Jenkins 1st visit here sees a perfect 1st dart in the treble 20 and again he switches to the 19 segment. In this instance I see no reason for the switch."*
- Johnny Haines. Jenkins scored one 180 in four legs, *"this match saw Jenkins hit a 180. Haines played a very good game here averaging just shy of 90. The first*

two legs saw Jenkins throw some poor scores but in general his darts were not that far away. Only the odd darts were very poor. The last two legs the darts were very close and at times very unlucky to not be scoring more.”

- Robin Beger. Jenkins made one attempt at 180 in seven legs, *“third visit of leg one sees Jenkins third dart nearly hit double 20 with 2 perfect darts already in the treble 20. With 2 darts sitting like this a player with Jenkins ability and experience shouldn’t be that far away with his third dart.”*
- Johan van Velzen. Jenkins made five attempts at 180 in seven legs, *with “4 of these 5 attempts see him miss his last darts by a considerable distance. I would expect a player of Jenkins standard firstly to be a lot closer with these attempts with dart 3 and secondly, he should be converting at least one of these attempts.”*

13. In overall conclusion, Gardner states that Jenkins *“has been accused of not hitting 180s. Nearly all of these matches saw him have very poor attempt after the 1st two darts were in the treble 20*

14. . *Several times the third dart was extremely high or extremely low and as I said previously a player of Jenkins quality should not be far away after this. Also, on a few occasion his third dart saw him switch targets even though there was no reason to do so. Andy is very much a rhythm player as I was and usually after the 1st two are in the third dart very quickly follows, a few times this was not the case and he took his time before throwing the last dart which I found very strange.”*

15. The matter was initially taken up by the UK Gambling Commission to investigate potential criminal offences. On 15 November 2023, both Jenkins and Bettor A were arrested by the Gambling Commission on suspicion of committing an offence of Cheating contrary to Section 42 of the Gambling Act 2005.

16. On the same day, the DRA informed Jenkins that he was also the subject of a formal DRA investigation and suspended from all DRA regulated events. He was also

informed that the DRA investigation would be “*stayed*” pending the outcome of the criminal investigation by the Gambling Commission.

17. Following his arrest, Jenkins was interviewed under caution. He denied any knowledge of any suspicious betting on his matches and also denied ever deliberately seeking to influence or manipulate the result of a darts match.
18. He admitted that he had known Bettor B as a friend and darts associate for over ten years. He stated that he did not know Bettor A, Bettor C, Bettor D, or Bettor E.
19. The evidence of Gardner was put to him and in particular, the allegations that at times his performance in the relevant matches appeared to be deliberately poor, particularly when missing opportunities to score when 180 by hitting 60 with his final dart. Jenkins denied that this was the case and explained that, in his view, it was not possible for someone watching a match to judge with any certainty the actions of a player.
20. He disagreed with Gardner’s evidence regarding his performance. At the conclusion of the interview Jenkins added that “*I do feel Richard Gardner has got a bit of a grudge towards me over the years if that is relevant,*” explaining that this was related to a previous, unrelated disciplinary matter.
21. Bettor A was also interviewed under caution and answered “*no comment*” to all questions asked of him.
22. On 19 June 2024, the Gambling Commission informed Jenkins and Bettor A that it did “*not consider there is sufficient evidence for a successful criminal prosecution under section 42 of the Gambling Act 2005 and therefore we are closing our investigation with no further action.*”
23. The DRA presented a statement to the Hearing from an independent investigator, Steven Richardson, who had been engaged by the DRA to investigate the case. This

statement is contained at pages 44 – 57 of the case statements bundle. He is a former senior police detective, with considerable experience in the field of sports integrity and the analysis of betting accounts. This includes seven years as the head of investigations for the International Cricket Council Anti-Corruption Unit.

24. During the course of his investigation, Richardson identified betting activity that indicated the potential for Jenkins to be involved in match manipulation, with the majority of the bets being on Jenkins to score no 180s in the relevant matches.
25. The majority of the betting was placed by Bettor B and Bettor A, both of whom live within a few miles of Jenkins. The links between the bettors are set out at paragraph 10 above.
26. In an email to Richardson dated 24 July 2024, Bettor B stated that *“You have sent the same email to my partner Bettor C and my stepson Bettor D. I use there [sic] accounts to place bets. They have no idea what I bet on. So any questions can be directed at me and not them.”*
27. The DRA identified twelve suspicious accounts linked to the bettors and used to bet on Jenkins in the relevant matches. Three of these were in Bettor B's name, five in Bettor A's. Bettor E had two accounts and Bettor D and Bettor C one each. In total there were 124 bets on the relevant matches with £9876.51 staked at an average of 79.64. There was a return of £20,188.58 resulting in a profit of £10,312.07; 109 bets won and fifteen lost, a success rate of 87.9%.
28. Nine of the fifteen losses came in the Haines match when Jenkins in fact scored one 180, which appears to be an anomaly. However, the bettors still won money by betting on the correct score (0:4).
29. In Richardson's opinion, *“the win rate is 88% which is very high, experienced gamblers expect a 40% win lose ratio depending on the odds so that is an exceptional and some would say unbelievable success rate.”*

30. Richardson also states that in his experience there are a number of “*suspicious characteristics*” that are accepted by the betting industry and the Gambling Commission as being evidence that match manipulation may have taken place. Following an analysis of the bettors’ betting accounts and the relevant matches, it is the DRA’s case that several of these suspicious characteristics are present in this investigation. These include:

- Geographic location of the person placing the bets and proximity to the player. Bettor B is closely connected to Jenkins and has known him through darts for over ten years. Bettor A is employed by Bettor B. There is evidence that Bettor A's partner (Bettor E) placed bets at the direction of Bettor A and that Bettor B controls the accounts of Bettor C and Bettor D. All the bettors live near Jenkins.
- The opening of an account to bet on a specific event or match and does not bet on any other event or match. In such cases, the account is likely to be opened close to the event date and can be used to spread the betting across providers to avoid limits imposed by the operator or to conceal the volume of the betting. An analysis of the bettors’ accounts in this case identified multiple examples of accounts being opened close to the match or event and only betting on Jenkins matches:
 - Bettor A opened a betting account on 17 August 2022, with the first bet placed on 22 August 2022 on the Thornton match;
 - Bettor A registered a two separate accounts on 27 April 2023, the first bet on the first account was on 27 May 2023, and the first bet on the second account was on 19 May 2023;
 - All bets on the three Bettor A accounts listed above were only on the relevant matches;

- Bettor A registered an account on 4 July 2023. The account only placed one bet which was £120 on 5 July 2023 on Jenkins to score no 180s in his match against van Velzen that day. The bet won and returned a profit of £96.41.
 - Bettor E registered an account on 22 August 2022, with the first bet placed from it two days later on one of the relevant matches;
 - Bettor E registered another account on 19 May 2023, with the first bet placed an hour later on one of the relevant matches;
 - Bettor D betting account was opened on 9 April 2022, with the first bet placed on one of the relevant matches on 22 August 2022;
 - Bettor C's account was opened on 25 February 2023, with the first bet placed on one of the relevant matches on 19 May 2023.
- Bets placed which are out of character to the accounts usual betting behaviour. This can be an indicator that the bet is for someone else rather than the registered account holder or that the account holder has received some significant inside information about the event. In this investigation, the bettors' stakes on the relevant matches were significantly higher than their betting on matches that did not involve Jenkins and their other sports betting.

31. Bettor B has three betting accounts in his name that have made forty-five bets on the relevant matches. In total £3,711.01 is staked at an average of £82.46 with a profit of £3,564.04. Only three bets lost, all on the Haines match for no 180s by Jenkins. The betting success ratio was 93.33%.

32. Paragraphs 20 – 48 of Richardson's statement provides a detailed analysis of the betting accounts of the bettors and provides a comparison of the betting on the relevant matches in comparison with other darts matches and other non darts

betting. It is the DRA's case that this demonstrates clearly that the betting for the relevant matches is significantly different to the bettors' other betting. In particular, the betting on the relevant matches shows a high degree of confidence in the outcome by the bettors.

33. In respect of the Haines match on 26 May 2023 the DRA's case, as stated at paragraphs 49 – 53 of Richardson's statement, is that while the majority of bets placed on the relevant matches by the bettors were for Jenkins to not score 180s, there were also twenty bets for the match winner.
34. The only bets placed on the correct score were in the Haines match for Haines to win the match 4-0. These bets all won. There was one additional bet for £20 for Haines to win 4:1.
35. There were twenty-three bets placed across nine accounts by Bettor B, Bettor A, and Bettor E on the Haines match. There were eleven bets on Jenkins to score no 180s with £572.44 staked at an average of £52.04, Jenkins scored a solitary 180 in the match, so all the bets lost.
36. There were twelve bets on the match result and correct scoreline backing Haines with £630 staked at an average of £52.50 generating a profit of £1,951.53.
37. In total this match generated a profit of £1,651.06 for the bettors despite the solitary 180. The DRA is unable to state definitely why the betting pattern in the Haines match differs from the other matches but argues that the bettors still won money and that there are suspicious characteristics in this match involving the same bettors.
38. Richardson analysed 207 matches played by Jenkins in the MSS from 22 February 2022 to 5 July 2023. This shows that his three-dart average in all matches was 83.86. On the day of the Haines match he played a total of four matches. His three-dart average was 84.45. For the Haines match itself, it was 74.66 – the 183rd lowest of the 207 matches.

39. An enquiry by the DRA revealed that between 22 August 2022 and 5 July 2023 on the [REDACTED] platform there were 178 bets by other accounts on Jenkins not to score one 180, staking £2,802.09 at an average of £15.74.

40. In comparison, the Bettor A and Bettor E accounts placed twenty-one bets on the no 180s market, staking £2,083.00 at an average stake of £99.19. Therefore Bettor A and Bettor E were responsible for 43% of the betting on the no 180s by Jenkins betting in all matches that he featured in. The average stake by the Bettor A and Bettor E accounts represented a 530% increase on the average stake by other accounts betting on the same market. Bettor A and Bettor E were the only two of the bettors to have accounts with Betting Operator D.

41. Richardson also analysed the relevant matches to establish any correlation between the amount of 180s scored by Jenkins and the betting:

- On 22 August 2022, Jenkins played five matches and scored no 180s in two of them, including against Thornton. The bettors only bet on Jenkins not scoring a 180 in the Thornton match which was his last match of the day.
- On 24 August 2022, Jenkins played five matches and scored no 180s in two of them, including against Jorgensen. The bettors only bet on Jenkins scoring no 180s in the Jorgensen match which was his third match of the day.
- On 3 January 2023 Jenkins played five matches and scored no 180s in three of them, including against Mould. The bettors only bet on Jenkins scoring no 180s in the Mould match, which was his last match of the day.
- On 4 January 2023 Jenkins played five matches and scored no 180s in two of them, against Manley and Johnson. The bettors only bet on Jenkins scoring

no 180s in the Manley and Johnson matches which were the first and fourth matches for Jenkins.

- On 25 February 2023 Jenkins played four matches. He scored no 180s in three of them, including the match against Hogan which was his first match of the day. The bettors only bet on Jenkins scoring no 180s in the Hogan match.
- On 19 May 2023 Jenkins played five matches with no 180s scored by him in three of them, these being the matches against Desreumaux, Walters and Taylor. These were the first, fourth and fifth matches of the day for Jenkins. The bettors only bet on Jenkins scoring no 180s in the matches against Desreumaux, Walters and Taylor.

On 19 May 2023, Jenkins was a late substitute into the event. It is also the day of suspicious messaging between Bettor A and Bettor E set out in paragraph 46 - 49 below.

- On 27 May 2023 Jenkins played four matches; he scored no 180s in two of them. He scored a 180 in the Haines match. The bettors bet on no 180s in the Haines match, but they also bet on the correct 0:4 scoreline as discussed at paragraph 32 – 36.
- On 4 July 2024 Jenkins played five matches with no 180s scored by him in four of them, including against Beger, his last match of the day. The bettors only bet on Jenkins not scoring a 180 in the Beger match.
- On 5 July 2024 Jenkins played five matches and scored no 180s in 3 of them; including against van Velzen. This was his second match of the day. The bettors only bet on Jenkins scoring no 180s in the van Velsen match.

42. On 31 July 2024, Jenkins was interviewed by the DRA. The transcript of this interview is at pages 71 – 124 of the exhibits case bundle. In summary, Jenkins restates his

position from the interview with the Gambling Commission on 15 November 2023. He has known Bettor B through the local Portsmouth darts scene for ten to fifteen years. He denied ever being involved in any form of match fixing. He also disputed the evidence given by Gardner in respect of his performance. He stated that he had no financial pressure that might influence him to throw matches.

43. Jenkins concluded the interview by saying:

"I did a bit of homework. Obviously, I wasn't privileged to these matches or any of this betting because obviously they showed me betting but I have looked at footage of me other nights. The following night I have played and there was no.... I never hit one 180 in the Finals nights and other nights I have played all night and not hit any 180's and there was no betting brought up by you today of these things. So if you want to look into that. . . Would I jeopardise what I am trying, would I jeopardise £9000 between I think it is five, what I read five or six? I wouldn't. . . I don't need the money. I have a Mum that is quite well off that looks after her baby boy. I am her only son. So I don't need money. I never needed money."

44. Alan Warriner Little ("AWL") of the Professional darts Players Association "PDPA") who was representing Jenkins during the interview, commented that:

"Just again, reiterating that point Andy has just said there. I have written it down specifically was that, obviously we have been talking a lot about 180's that have won, bets won. There has been no suggestion apart from on one occasion when 180 bets have lost. Which Andy mentioned there in terms of games that he's watched and there has been other nights where he has not hit 180's but they have not been mentioned in this interview. Ritchie Gardner is obviously an opinion but interesting from Ritchie as well that as you suggested that some of his opinions are measured in terms of he agreed with the 180 was close, and not a long way off, which would have made a bit of a difference as well. Switching; Any player will tell you every player is different. Looking at the

angles, we can only assume you quite rightly said when you look at the angle that we have, any player can tell you differently, and they do strange things. The timings on one of the replacements where Andy was a replacement. Was quite long in the day when I think that was a 180 bet I think. Top of my head. That was a long way into the day and as we note make this note that everybody has to hand their phone in when they arrive at Modus and they don't get it until they leave. The financial situation, obviously that is personal to Andy but as he said there he's got no bills, he works hard on a regular basis. So it's not, for some other people it might be an issue. For Andy he just goes month to month and has no worries with it. That's all I've got to say in terms of what we have gone through today."

45. The DRA made efforts to interview Bettor B, Bettor A, Bettor E, Bettor C, and Bettor D as part of its investigation. Bettor B and Bettor A declined this request, and the others did not respond.
46. Some of the information from the mobile phones of Jenkins and Bettor A obtained during the Gambling Commission was provided to the DRA. Material from Jenkins' phone identified a WhatsApp group named 'Pajenksio,' of which Bettor B is also a member. In a part of the conversation that discusses Jenkins performance at MSS a message is sent by "██████████" on 2 January 2023 that says: "Get on Jenks 4=0 7/4 v Manley". At 13:21 Bettor B messages: "Under 0.5 on 180s in all games". Seconds later Bettor B sends another message saying "Manley."
47. Jenkins did play Manley on 2 January and won 4-1 without scoring any 180s. Neither Bettor B nor the other bettors bet on this match. They did however, bet on Jenkins scoring no 180s on both 3 and 4 January, including on no 180s against Manley on the 4th.
48. Material from Bettor A's mobile phone was obtained that related to betting on Jenkins. In respect of the Desreumaux match, a series of messages between Bettor A and Bettor E on 19 May 2023 were identified. The match began at around 13.40.

- 12:14 – Bettor A: *“I don't know how this will turn out as I'm talking to you from my car, but I hope you get the right message. X”*
- 12:15 – Bettor E: *Okay love you got your car then x.*
- 12:17:23 – Bettor A: *“Yeah, I love Driving and Bettor B's cousin [REDACTED] myself so that just means they're obviously ever if Bettor B calls me telling me I'll see what's gonna happen. I can call you shy away so you can put on. Oh my babes don't go mad Darcy, anything cause a big Mac as fuck, but just like 50 quid or 100 quid or something. Don't go too mad or [REDACTED] babes well feels of a man and a conversation with you rather than sending you a text messages might be really long winded but I'm just talking to you through my car so yeah love X”*

49. The DRA allege that this dictated message makes sense when seen in context and indicates that Bettor A appears to be waiting for a call from Bettor B to see what is going to happen, and he will then call Bettor E straight away so that she can make a bet. Bettor A is telling her to exercise some caution and bet £50 or £100.

- 12:18 – Bettor E: *“I don't get one bit of what just said x”*
- 12:25 – Bettor A: *“Hahahaha what the fuck does that say”*
- 12:25 – Bettor A *“I'm working by myself so I can call you when I get told something x”*
- 12:25 – Bettor E: *“Okay love just ring ring and let me know Xx”*
- 12:26 – Bettor A: *“Will do x”*
- 12:27 – Bettor E: *“Good darling x”*
- 13:44 – Bettor E: *“Done love x”*
- 13:44 – Bettor A *“Cheers love x”*
- 14:11 – Bettor A: *“Money money money x”*
- 14:17 – Bettor E: *“What do you won't me to do with yours x”*
- 14:28 – Bettor A: *Put it in my bank as soon as it's in your please x*
- 14:29 – Bettor E: *I'm withdrawing it then x*

- 15:17 – Bettor A
Yeah x

50. It is the DRA's case that an analysis of the betting for the Desreumaux match together with this chain of messages, shows that the betting was coordinated. All bets were for Jenkins not to score 180 and all won, resulting in a profit of £401.19:

- 12.57: Bettor B bet £50;
- 13.02 - 13.04: Bettor A made three bets totalling £100;
- 13.11: Bettor C bet £50;
- 13.15: Bettor E bet £60; and
- 13.43: Bettor E bet £20.

51. Further messages between Bettor A and Bettor E in respect of the Jorgenson match on 24 August 2022 also indicated Bettor A informing Bettor E on what and how to bet:

- 11:11 – Bettor A: "Andy Jenkins no 180 next game click on the game and read through them put under 5',
- 11:14 – Bettor E: "I think I've done it right."

52. The betting in respect of this match by the bettors was all for Jenkins not to score a 180. All the bets won, resulting in a profit of £326.40:

- 10:15: Bettor B bet £50;
- 11:13 Bettor E bet £20;
- 11.13: Bettor B bet £41.67;
- 11:17: Bettor A bet £150;
- 11:57: Bettor D bet £100.

53. On 12 December 2024, the DRA informed Jenkins that he was charged with the breaches of DRA Rules as set out at Appendix A.

HEARING

54. The Hearing was convened remotely to consider the matter. The following persons were present in addition to the Committee and Jenkins:

- Louis Weston (Counsel for the DRA);
- Nigel Mawer QPM (DRA Chairman);
- Steve Richardson (DRA investigator); and
- AWL (PDPA), representing Jenkins.

55. The parties had been provided with several documents that have been reviewed and considered by the Committee in addition to the evidence provided during the Hearing:

- A Bundle of DRA reports and statements (66 pages), including:
 - A DRA case summary document;
 - Statement of Richard Gardner;
 - 2nd Statement of Richard Gardner;
 - Statement of Steve Richardson;
 - Statement of Nigel Mawer.
- An Opening Note prepared by DRA Counsel, accompanied by a Table of Matches.
- An Exhibits Bundle (200 pages), including;
 - IBIA Alert 3962
 - SBIU 5184 Master Betting Data Spreadsheet
 - Betting Operator A Jenkins account;
 - Jenkins Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) interview recording 15.11.23;
 - Jenkins PACE interview recording transcript 15.11.23;
 - Bettor A PACE interview audio recording 15.11.23 Part 1;
 - Bettor A PACE Interview Transcript 15.11.23. Part 1;
 - Bettor A PACE interview audio recording 2 of 2;
 - Bettor A PACE Interview Transcript 2 of 2;
 - Interview DRA audio Jenkins 31.07.24 Pt 1;
 - Jenkins DRA Interview transcript 31.7.24 Pt 1;
 - Interview audio Jenkins 31.07.24 Pt 2;
 - Jenkins DRA interview transcript 31.07.2024 pt 2;
 - Andy Jenkins Interview Package;

- Emails between Bettor A and Richardson;
- Bettor A Gambling Commission letter;
- Emails between Bettor B and Richardson;
- Extracts from UFDR - RS-AJ-01_2024-07-23_Report – Jenkins v Mould, Johnson, Manly phone extracts
- Extracts from UFDR - KT-CE-01_2024-07-23_Report – Jenkins v Desreumaux (Bettor A phone);
- Extract from UFDR - KT-CE-01_2024-07-23_Report – Jenkins v Jorgenson (Bettor A phone);
- Email re Amended Group C Fixtures - Friday 19th May;
- Modus AJ. Matches (Separate spreadsheet not in bundle);
- Open-source research on bettors;
- Email to Bettor C from DRA requesting interview;
- Email to Bettor D from DRA requesting interview;
- Email to Bettor E from DRA requesting interview;
- Betting Operator A Jenkins match bets and financial information;
- Betting Operator D Email report 06.07.23;
- Betting Operator A Email re Modus Jenkins matches 12.07.23;
- Betting Operator A Email further comments re Jenkins 19.07.23;
- SBIU Master Betting Data Spreadsheet

56. The Hearing commenced with Jenkins confirming that he admitted Charge 25 and denied the remaining charges.

57. Mr Weston opened the DRA case by referring to the opening note previously supplied to all parties and invited the Committee to consider this as it contained the key elements of the DRA's case. In summary, the note (and accompanying table) set out the DRA's case as being:

- *“Prior to playing in each of the Matches, Mr Jenkins agreed with bettors connected to him (the Bettors) that he would secure specific outcomes in the Matches (even numbered Charges 2 to 24);*
- *Jenkins secured those outcomes, but performing below his expected performance to secure the agreed betting outcomes (odd numbered Charges 1 to 23);*
- *That Table tells the obvious story that the Bettors in every Match anticipated that Mr Jenkins would not score a single 180 and bet that he would not. In each of the Matches, apart from Match 10 [the Haines match], the Bettors were successful. In that Match 10 the Bettors placed other bets that Mr*

Jenkins would lose 4-0 and those bets were successful, and Mr Jenkins lost 4-0 and so profited from the outcome of the Match."

58. The DRA case set out what it claimed to be key elements of the case: the connection of the bettors to Jenkins, the "extraordinary" nature of the betting, and the playing performance of Jenkins.
59. The connection of the bettors to each other and to Jenkins facilitated the passage of information between them all. In this case, from Jenkins to Bettor B, and then to the other bettors.
60. The DRA case is that the betting evidence demonstrates that the bettors "*had extraordinary confidence that the outcomes that they bet on were likely to succeed,*" based on:

"a. The Bettors used multiple accounts, to bet on the same outcomes, and each followed each other's betting. The obvious point is that the Bettors were trying to place as much money on the outcomes as they perceived they safely could, without either being caught or disturbing odds.

b. The bets were all placed before the Match and not in play. Regularly bets were placed about 30 minutes before the Matches, but sometimes the day before. The 30-minute time is consistent with the last opportunity for Mr Jenkins to use his phone whilst playing in an MSS event.

c. The sums staked were far higher on these events and outcomes than the bettors' usual stakes. For Bettor B about double his normal stake, for Bettor A about seven times his normal stake, and for Bettor E about forty times her normal stake which was on horseracing;

d. The bets were remarkably successful winning 87.9% of the time and making a profit of £10,312.07;

e. Accounts were opened to apparently bet on Mr Jenkins' matches;

f. The Bettors did not normally bet on no 180s . . . That position is not without exception, the full betting accounts show that Bettor B and Bettor A did occasionally bet on 'no 180s' but when they did they did as a part of a multiple bet. The only occasions outside of the Matches where they bet on the single outcome of no 180s are in these matches, where in stark contrast to the Matches a single bet on a single betting platform was placed.

- i. 31.5.21 Andy Jenkins v Fallon Sherrock in the Online Live League stake £100 Bettor B (NM7) – the bet won.
- ii. 22.7.22 Andy Jenkins v Dan Read £50 stake Bettor B (NM8) – the bet won.
- iii. 23.8.22 Andy Jenkins v Lee Evans £10 stake Bettor A – the bet lost.
- iv. 23.1.23 John Henderson v Reece Colley £20 stake Bettor A – the bet lost.
- v. 19.5.23 Mal Cuming v Andy Jenkins £10 stake Bettor B – the bet lost.

g. The Bettors were successful on their no 180s bets eleven out of twelve times, on the one occasion they failed [the Haines match] they remained in profit as the score bets 4-0 were very profitable.

61. It is also the DRA's case that Jenkins played in 209 MSS matches between 3 February 2022 and 7 July 2023 and yet the bettors only bet on twelve of those Matches (approximately 5.7%). There being no obvious basis on which to choose these twelve matches, the DRA point to the evidence relating to the Desreumaux match on 19 May 2023 as an explanation.

62. This refers to the evidence of the messaging between Bettor A and Bettor E and makes clear that the decision to bet was dependent on information from Bettor B. When Bettor A receives information from Bettor B, within a few minutes Bettor A, Bettor E, and Bettor B all place bets on Jenkins to not score a 180. This is set out at paragraphs 47 – 51.

63. The DRA states that *"the betting when looked at objectively cannot be explained by some sudden gift of analysis of the sport of darts by the Bettors. If that gift existed it would have been put to more frequent use, even if the analysis was only into the performance of Mr Jenkins."*

64. In respect of the evidence relating to Jenkins' performance, the DRA's position is that this has two elements. Firstly, data on the 209 MSS matches played by Jenkins between 3 February 2022 and 5 July 2023 indicates that he failed to score 180 in 108 of those matches, amounting to 51.6%. The DRA claim that Jenkins *"failing to score in 11 or 12 specific matches chosen at random is vanishingly small - it is 0.00069% (ie*

0.51611) or 0.00036% (ie 0.51612). Mr Jenkins' performance in the Matches as anticipated by the Bettors was, at the least, extremely unlikely."

65. Mr Weston put to the Hearing that the odds of the bettors making successful selections of no 180s in these 11 out of 209 matches at random was *"six ten thousandths of it happening by chance, so these people knew something and that's particularly obvious in this case in that Mr Jenkins didn't just play in these eleven matches, he played in [209] matches and they only bet on the twelve on the 180s so they picked these matches for a purpose."*

66. The DRA states that secondly, this statistical evidence is supported by the analysis of Gardner that indicates that, in the relevant matches, Jenkins had the opportunities to score 180 but didn't, summarised as follows: *"Match 1 – twice, Match 2 – once, Match 3 – twice, Match 4 – none, Match 5 – thrice, Match 6 – once; Match 7 – nil (but hit treble 20 and switched), Match 8 – two but explicable decisions to try other shots, Match 9 – two (one striking other darts); Match 10 – one chance and taken; Match 11 – once, and Match 12 – five. In Matches 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 12 Gardner considers Jenkins move from attempting as treble 20 was either very poor or inexplicable."*

67. The DRA's submission is that Gardner's evidence is very strong support for the case that Jenkins was missing or taking the chance to try to score 180s in the Matches. It is accepted sometimes he missed by small margins, but the outcome was that he missed and so secured the betting.

68. In respect of the Haines match, the DRA accepts that *"the pattern of match manipulation and/or fixing is atypical, in that the Bettors bet 'as usual' on Mr Jenkins not scoring 180s. However, in this Match Jenkins did score a 180, and he did so in circumstances where obviously he could have missed. The betting on Match 10 therefore is anomalous as the Bettors bet on him to score no 180s. However as is set out in the betting evidence, the bettors showed a substantial net profit on the match overall because, for the only time in the 12 Matches, the bettors also bet on the outcome of the Match being 4-0 or 4-1 against Jenkins."*

69. Mr Weston, on behalf of the DRA, then stated that the evidence provided by the DRA to Jenkins had not been challenged and that Jenkins had not served any evidence on his behalf. Nor did he believe that Jenkins was going call any witnesses.

70. AWL then addressed the Hearing on behalf of Jenkins by stating that Jenkins did not see a need to call any witnesses or serve any evidence *"because he feels that he will answer any questions that are set to him to give his best version of events to prove his innocence."*

71. He stated that Jenkins has cooperated with both the Gambling Commission and DRA investigations. AWL emphasised that Jenkins is not a high 180 scorer and *“so, if anybody who is a bettor studies the betting market. . . they will certainly see this as an opportunity.”*
72. AWL also emphasised that Gardner has identified both *“good and bad”* attempts at 180s during the relevant matches and stated his belief that a fully “independent review” would have been more helpful to the Committee.
73. In relation to paragraph 17 of the DRA Opening Note, AWL stated that even top professionals often miss several attempts at 180s in matches.
74. AWL pointed out that bets were placed close to matches but phones have to be handed in at MSS prior to matches and so could not have been used by Jenkins to communicate with the bettors.
75. AWL then confirmed that Jenkins would not be providing evidence in person and relied on his position as stated in previous interviews.
76. Mr Weston then closed the DRA’s case by highlighting the messages between Bettor A and Bettor E as demonstrating that Bettor A is waiting to be told something before betting on it. The DRA case being that this was not the result of analysis but because of information originating from Jenkins.
77. He also emphasised that Gardner’s evidence was not challenged. Jenkins had chosen not to give evidence and could not therefore present evidence to counter Gardner’s evidence.
78. In respect of Haines match, the DRA states that Bettor A, Bettor E, and Bettor B bet on Jenkins to lose 0:4 or 1:4 as well as not to score 180, the heavier betting being on the match score. They did not bet on the match score in any of the other relevant matches.

DECISION

79. Having heard evidence and considered relevant documents, it falls to the Committee to determine, on a balance of probabilities, whether the charges brought by the DRA are proven. A balance of probabilities requires the Committee to decide whether it is more likely than not that Jenkins acted to fix either the result or a specific outcome within a match in order that specific bets would win.

80. In considering the evidence, the Committee considers there to be four elements to determine:

- The connection between Jenkins and the bettors, and between the bettors;
- Whether the betting on the relevant matches is suspicious and therefore indicative of match fixing;
- Whether the communication between relevant bettors is indicative of match fixing; and
- Whether Jenkins' performance in the relevant matches is indicative of efforts to fix the result or specific outcome relating to these bets and bettors.

81. The Committee is satisfied that Jenkins is connected to the bettors. He accepts that he has known Bettor B for several years. Bettor C is Bettor B's partner and Bettor D her son. Bettor A is employed by Bettor B. Bettor E is Bettor A's partner. This alone is not evidence of anything other than to establish that the bettors are all directly or indirectly linked to Jenkins. This only becomes relevant when considered along with other evidence in the case.

82. The Hearing was provided with a significant amount of material in relation to the betting on the relevant matches. Having reviewed this, the Committee is persuaded that very compelling evidence exists that the nature of the bets placed by the bettors in the relevant matches is suspicious and indicative of match fixing.

83. The factors leading the Committee to this view are set out at paragraphs 25 – 40. In summary, they include the choice of matches, their subsequent outcome, the use of multiple betting platforms, as well as the amounts placed and apparent confidence shown by the bettors in comparison with their other betting activity.

84. No evidence was presented to the Hearing to explain the betting behaviour and choices of the bettors, such as an explanation of any system used by the bettors that would explain the betting in the relevant matches and why it varied from their normal approach to betting. From its own deliberations, neither has the Committee been able to determine an indication of any such system.

85. Jenkins' position, stated repeatedly, is that he was completely unaware of the betting by the bettors on the relevant matches. In view of the apparent closeness of his relationship with Bettor B and that it is based on darts, the Committee finds it

somewhat surprising that Bettor B does not appear to mention his success when betting on Jenkins to the player himself.

86. The messaging between the bettors is considered at paragraphs 45 - 51. The Committee considers that the messages between Bettor A and Bettor E on 19 May 2023 are particularly significant. The Committee agrees with the DRA argument that these indicate that Bettor A is waiting on information from Jenkins from Bettor B in relation to betting. When this is received, he communicates it to Bettor E by means of a phone call. Several bets are then placed by Bettor B, Bettor A, and Bettor E on Jenkins not to score a 180 in the Desreumaux match.
87. The Committee also notes that the exchange between Bettor A and Bettor E is suggestive of previous knowledge by Bettor E, in that Bettor A does not appear to need to go into any detail to explain what he is referring to.
88. Having considered the communications evidence in tandem with the betting on the relevant matches, it is the Committee's view that this adds a further layer of compelling evidence to conclude that the betting is consistent with match fixing.
89. With this established, the Committee must then establish to the same burden of proof whether Jenkins participated in this match fixing. None of the bettors are within the jurisdiction of the DRA.
90. The Committee accepts the DRA position that the degree of confidence reflected by the bettors on the relevant matches is not the result of any system or performance analysis by them. It also accepts the argument that the odds of these successful bets being selected at random are "vanishingly small." This leaves the question of what inspired such confidence and in particular, whether this is based on knowledge provided by Jenkins.
91. In individual sport like darts a player is able to influence all aspects of a match, from losing to specific outcomes within a game. In this case, the alleged outcome being to score no 180s in a game. Whilst not impossible, this is more difficult in team sports.
92. The Committee considered the issue of the players' phones being confiscated prior to playing in MSS matches thirty minutes prior to play beginning. The DRA's case is that the bets on the relevant matches were placed prior to this timeframe and therefore consistent with information being passed by Jenkins.
93. The Committee takes the view that this scenario is certainly possible. However, it is also possible that devices are not handed in as required and also that agreement can

be made to bet on a particular match by reference to its timing. For example, the second or fourth match of the day. In this scenario, the opponent would become known when the draw was made.

94. There are two elements of performance evidence relied on by the DRA. Firstly, the evidence of Jenkin's playing performance provided by Gardner. Secondly, a statistical analysis of Jenkins' performance in MSS matches between 3 February 2022 and 5 July 2023.
95. In respect of the playing evidence, Gardner provides a reasoned and balanced analysis of Jenkins' performance in the relevant matches. In summary, this identifies evidence of serious attempts to hit 180s in some matches, as well as poor attempts and changes of throw that are consistent with efforts to avoid scoring a 180 in others.
96. Jenkins' own position and that of AWL on his behalf, is that such evidence is subjective and that a view of video footage does not always provide a dependable guide. They also state that players have their own preferences when switching targets during matches.
97. The Committee also notes that Gardner's evidence is based on viewing the relevant matches, all of which were considered suspicious. Whilst this evidence is of some value to the Committee, a review of other matches played on the same day would also have been helpful to provide some comparison on Jenkins' performance in both suspicious and non – suspicious matches. This is also a point alluded to by Jenkins in his DRA interview and one that the Committee feels has merit.
98. For these reasons, the video – based playing performance evidence is considered to be of limited value in this case.
99. As accepted by the DRA, the Haines match constitutes an anomaly in that the bettors bet on Jenkins to score no 180s and, unlike the other eleven matches, he hit one. However, the bettors were in overall profit because, again unlike the other eleven matches, they also bet on the correct match score (Jenkins to lose 0:4).
100. The Committee accepts that there are a number of possible reasons for this but also finds that the betting is suspicious. It also notes that as set out at paragraph 37, Jenkins' three dart average in this match was significantly lower than his three-dart average for other matches that day.

101. The Committee is also persuaded by the statistical analysis outlined in paragraph 40 which shows a pattern of the bettors betting on no 180s in particular matches on days when Jenkins is regularly playing four or five matches. On such days, no betting is placed on matches where a 180 is scored by Jenkins.
102. This analysis is considered to be consistent with the DRA argument that the bets were placed as a result of “inside” knowledge rather than on a routine bet on the no 180 market in Jenkins matches.
103. If bettors have identified that Jenkins scored no 180s in approximately 50% of his matches then the bettors might reasonably have been expected to bet smaller amounts on a larger number of his matches. Rather, they bet higher than their usual stakes using several different accounts to do, on a small number of games.
104. The evidence indicates that the betting was effectively done by Bettor B and Bettor A. Bettor B informed the DRA that he controlled the accounts in the names of Bettor C and Bettor D. The evidence also indicates that Bettor E bet as and when directed by Bettor A and then passed the winnings into his bank account. This provides a further layer of suspicion to the betting.
105. Taking all the evidence available to the Committee into account, it finds a compelling case that the betting on the relevant matches was placed by the bettors as a result of an agreement made with Jenkins to provide information to be used for betting purposes and to fix specific outcomes within a match or the result of a match (Haines).
106. The Committee finds Jenkins to be in breach of Charges 1 – 24 as set out in Appendix A by fixing the results of twelve matches contrary to Rules 2.1.2 (i), 2.2, and 2.1.3(i) of Appendix A of DRA Rules.
107. Charge 25 is admitted by Jenkins and this is accepted by the Committee.

SUMMARY

108. The Committee finds Jenkins in breach of Rules 2.1.2 (i), 2.2, and 2.1.3(i) of Appendix A of DRA Rules in respect of twenty-four breaches related to fixing outcomes within twelve matches.
109. The Committee also accepts Jenkins’ plea in respect of one breach of Rule 2.1.1 (i) of Appendix A of the DRA Rules.

110. The Parties are invited to provide Submissions on Sanction and Costs in writing on or before 11 April 2025 after which the Committee will issue its decision regarding the same.

Tarik Shamel, Chair

Tim Ollerenshaw

Dave Jones

3 April 2025

APPENDIX A

Charge 1

On or before 22 August 2022 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Robert Thornton on 22 August 2022 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.
Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

2

On or before 22 August 2022 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Robert Thornton on 22 August 2022 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.
Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

3

On or before 24 August 2022 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Andreas Toft Jorgensen on 24 August 2022 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.
Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

4.

On or before 24 August 2022 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Andreas Toft Jorgensen on 24 August 2022 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.
Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

5.

On or before 3 January 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Adam Mould on 3 January 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.
Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

6.

On or before 3 January 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Adam Mould on 3 January 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.
Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

7.

On or before 4 January 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Darren Johnson on 4 January 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

8.

On or before 4 January 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Darren Johnson on 4 January 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

9.

On or before 4 January 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Peter Manley on 4th January 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

10.

On or before 4 January 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Peter Manley on 4 January 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

11.

On or before 25 February 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Paul Hogan on 25 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

12.

On or before 25 February 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Paul Hogan on 25 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

13.

On or before 19 May 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and John Desreumaux on 19 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

14.

On or before 19 May 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and John Desreumaux on 19 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

15.

On or before 19 May 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Scott Walters on 19 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

16.

On or before 19 May 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Scott Walters on 19 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

17.

On or before 19 May 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Dom Taylor on 19 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

18.

On or before 19 May 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Dom Taylor on 19 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

19.

On or before 27 May 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Johnny Haines on 27 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

20.

On or before 26 May 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and Johnny Haines on 26 May 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

21.

On or before 4 July 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Robin Beger on 4 July 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

22.

On or before 4 July 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Robin Beger on 4 July 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

23.

On or before 5 July 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score, progress or conduct of a Darts match played between yourself and Johan Van Velzen on 5 July 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.2 (i) and Rule 2.2

And/or

24.

On or before 5 July 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would not throw any 180s in the match played between yourself and Johan Van Velzen on 5 July 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.3 (i)

25.

Between 17/03/22 and 04/05/2023 you had a Coral betting account in your name on which you placed 88 bets on darts staking £2,438.04 and making a profit of £266.46.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A 2.1.1 (i)