



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

BETWEEN:

DARTS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Regulatory Body for Darts

-and-

Prakash Jiwa

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 21 January 2025 to consider a case involving Prakash Jiwa (Jiwa).
2. The case involves allegations of match fixing, and other rule breaches, by Jiwa during matches played as part of the Modus Super Series, these events being regulated by the DRA. Jiwa is also a Professional Darts Players Association (PDPA) associate member and, as such, subject to DRA regulations.

3. The match fixing allegations relate to four Modus Super Series matches played on 16 and 17 February, and 1 June 2023. These being:
 - Jiwa v Owen Bates on 16 February 2023 which Jiwa lost 4 – 0;
 - Jiwa v Adam Hunt on 17 February 2023 which Jiwa lost 4 – 0;
 - Jiwa v Peter Hudson on 1 June 2023 which Jiwa lost 4 – 1; and
 - Jiwa v Willie Borland on 1 June 2023 which Jiwa lost 4 – 1.
4. On 2 June 2023, the DRA received an alert from the International Betting Integrity Association (IBIA) of suspicious betting on the match between Jiwa and Hudson played on 1 June. On 5 June, the IBIA issued another alert on the match between Jiwa and Willie Borland also played on 1 June. This alert also referred to suspicions concerning the matches against Bates and Hunt played on 16 and 17 February, respectively.
5. The suspicious betting was identified as having been placed by two individuals who have links to Jiwa, Bettor 1 and Bettor 2. Neither Bettor 1 nor Bettor 2 is subject to DRA regulation.
6. On 3 June 2023, the DRA received an email from George Noble, an experienced darts referee and official, that stated:

“Re: Prakash Jiwa

. . . I monitor the Betfair exchange from time to time while the MODUS SUPER SERIES is being played, this is more for my peace of mind and to check for any irregularities in the markets.

During monitoring the exchange on Thursday 1st June, I noticed out of the ordinary sums of liquidity matched and available to match on Prakash Jiwa’s games. With this in mind I played back the footage of his matches out of curiosity to check there was nothing untoward taking place.

With my experience in the darts world and knowing the large sums on Betfair, I unfortunately took the view that all was not what it seemed and in my opinion his performance did not look quite right.

To be on the safe side I made the decision to suspend Prakash, with the thoughts that if something untoward had taken place we would hear from

yourself if not then it was just a coincidence. Unfortunately it now looks it was not purely a coincidence.

When I spoke to Prakash to informing him he was being suspended he said he did not understand gambling and had no idea as to what has happened and it was nothing to do with him, my observation from his tone led me to question this, I would have expected a far stronger response from someone who is completely innocent, I know I would have certainly taken that stance anyway. He accepted the suspension and asked what would happen next, I said I would let him know in due course. I am obviously not party to any betting patterns from bookmakers so can not say for sure if there is a case to answer. . .”

7. The UK Gambling Commission took the decision to investigate this matter for potential criminal offences committed under section 42 Gambling Act 2005. In order to avoid any risk of prejudicing a criminal investigation, the DRA stayed any investigation pending the outcome of the Gambling Commission enquiries.
8. On 7 November 2023, Jiwa, Bettor 1, and Bettor 2 were interviewed under caution by the Gambling Commission. They were all then bailed pending further investigation. Both Jiwa and Bettor 2 made “no comment” during their interviews, and Bettor 1 denied any involvement in match fixing. On the same date, the DRA informed Jiwa that he was suspended from competing in all DRA – regulated events.
9. On 28 May 2024, the DRA informed Jiwa that he was now the subject of a DRA investigation in relation to the allegations against him that led to the Gambling Commission enquiry.
10. On 19 June 2024, Jiwa was formally told by the Gambling Commission that he was no longer the subject of their investigation and that no further action would be taken in his case.
11. The DRA investigation was provided with material gathered by the Gambling Commission during its enquiries. It was established that the majority of the suspicious betting was placed by Bettor 1, who is connected to Jiwa because they both work for the same employer, Bettor 1 being Jiwa’s line manager. A small number of bets were also placed by Bettor 2, a friend of Bettor 1 who lives at the same address.

12. Analysis of material supplied to the DRA by the Gambling Commission showed that Bettor 1 and Bettor 2 placed 103 bets on Jiwa matches, Bettor 1 placed the vast majority. They staked £2,751.75 with an average stake of £26.71. This gave a return of £8,377.69 and a profit of £5,834.36 if all the bets were paid out.
13. By contrast Bettor 1 also placed 17 bets on non-Jiwa darts matches, staking £82.80 with an average stake of £4.87, therefore displaying 5.5 times more confidence in Jiwa matches in terms of the money staked.
14. An independent assessment of Jiwa's performance was conducted by Ritchie Gardner (Gardner), a respected former professional player. In the relevant matches Gardner highlighted consistently poor finishing below the standard that would be expected of Jiwa and described this as "*extremely worrying.*"
15. Gardner also commented that because the matches were not played on the same date they cannot be explained as a "*bad day at the office.*" Gardner noted that at times Jiwa's darts were an inch or more from the intended target. In his interview Jiwa accepted that, at his standard, this was "*quite a margin.*"
16. Shortly after Jiwa's last match on 1 June 2023 he was informed by Noble that he was being withdrawn from the tournament because of the suspicious betting patterns. This triggered a WhatsApp conversation between Bettor 1 and Bettor 2 that was recovered by the Gambling Commission from Bettor 1's device:

Bettor 1: "*Boom*" (12.57, shortly after his final match);

Bettor 1: "*He's just been told they are pulling him out tomorrow*" (18.47);

Bettor 2: "*Wise that;*"

Bettor 1: "*Corals not telling me anything. He's been told someone close to him has been betting;*"

Bettor 2: "*So they get info about us betting then;*"

Bettor 1: "*Clearly. I suppose dodgy patterns;*"

Bettor 2: "*Listen we will have to cool it now then dean;*"

Bettor 1: "*Absolutely can't do it again like that;*"

Bettor 2: "*Mate he will be kicked out;*"

Bettor 1: "*They would have to prove it. I will just say I was betting against him because I think he's crap. I told him this.*"

17. The DRA's case is that this conversation is an acknowledgment of wrongdoing by all three men, including an apparent reason on how the "dodgy" betting would be explained.
18. On 13 August 2024, Jiwa was interviewed by the DRA. He denied any involvement in match fixing. He claimed that his poor play was a product of his unfamiliarity with new darts that he had started to use the week before, as well as drinking alcohol at the matches. He also stated that he wasn't aware of Bettor 1's betting.
19. Bettor 1 was also interviewed on 13 August 2024 and claimed that his success was due to a system that he devised and implemented in May 2023. It is the DRA's case that there is no credible evidence of such a system exists, despite Bettor 1's attempts to explain it. Bettor 1 agreed his betting was unusual because of the increased volume and staking. He also said he was aware it could be construed as "dodgy patterns."
20. During Jiwa's interview he was asked about his phone records that indicated he had received a call from Bettor 1 on 6 August, a few days after he was asked to attend the DRA interview meeting, Jiwa said that he had to speak to him about work matters. It was noted that messages with Bettor 1 on Jiwa's phone only went back to 13 June 2024 and that previous messages were missing.
21. Jiwa stated that he regularly deletes messages to free up space on his phone. It was put to him that he had messages on his phone from another work colleague going back to 2021, suggesting that only messages with Bettor 1 had been deleted. Jiwa accepted he had deleted Bettor 1's messages because they showed that he had been betting and he didn't want his wife to know.
22. He accepted that he had bet on Premier League darts and this involved Bettor 1. He stated that he had deleted all messages with Bettor 1, including between ten and fifteen about betting.
23. The evidence on which the DRA based its case is set out in the documents that were made available to all parties and considered in detail by the Committee and detailed at paragraph 27 below.
24. On 29 October 2024, the DRA informed Jiwa that he was charged with the following offences:

Charge 1

On or before 16 February 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and Owen Bates on 16 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

And/or

2.

On or before 16 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 contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and Owen Bates on 16 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)

3.

On or before 17 February 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and Adam Hunt on 17 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

And/or

4.

On or before 17 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 contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and Adam Hunt on 17 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)

5.

On or before 1 June 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and Peter Hudson on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

And/or

6.

On or before 1 June 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the 10 fact that you would contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and Peter Hudson on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)

7.

On or before 1 June 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and William Borland on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

And/or

8.

On or before 1 June 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 William Borland on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)

9.

On or before 13 August 2024 you failed to cooperate with a DRA investigation by deliberately deleting messages with Bettor 1 from your phone thereby preventing investigators from examining them.

Contrary to DRA Rule, Rule 4.5

10.

On or before 13 August 2024, you placed bets on Darts Premier league matches.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.1 (i)

And/or

11.

On or before 13 August 2024, you solicited, induced, enticed, instructed, persuaded, encouraged, facilitated, authorised, or permitted another person

namely Bettor 1 to place bets for your benefit on the outcome of Premier League darts matches.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.1 (ii)

25. On 14 December 2024, Jiwa responded by email to the DRA:

"In reply to your letter confirming the charges against me.

Please take the following as my reply to those allegations set out in the letter:

I admit to a breach of the DRA Rules in relation to item 10 of the charges against me, where I placed a £10 bet on the Premier League (Which Lost) which is against DRA rules Appendix A 2.1.1 I wasn't aware as a Non-Tour Card Holder, I wasn't able to gamble on Darts, I thought it was just for Tour Card Holders.

I deny all other charges i.e. 1-9 and 11 The Gambling Commission started this investigation over a year ago, they took my phone and kept it for around 7 months. The Gambling Commission then dropped the case as there wasn't a case to answer.

The DRA have now taken up this case and I have read all the charges, and the investigation notes which also include an interview. I have co-operated in this investigation from the start, I gave my phone in and have since given in my bank statements and had an interview.

All the investigation notes are completely circumstantial and have no evidential basis. I have had a career of good standing with no issues in all the years I have played. And due to this issue, I missed the World Championship last year where I was guaranteed £7,500 which doubled if I won and my sponsors bonuses, so I had everything to lose and nothing to gain.

- *The suspects that placed all the bets, admission from the start that denies any involvement by me.*

- *No significant evidence of tempting me to risk for such a small return, when what I could lose is far more.*

- *I had been drinking in the early morning time before matches which is not normal practice so had adverse effect on performance.*

- *13-month suspension already served which has cost me thousands of potential incomes.*

- *No evidence has been found that I had any involvement in this as all is "circumstantial " with no other proof to suggest otherwise.*

- *I have been more than corporate (sic) with the DRA by providing any banking statements they had required to deny any involvement in this.*

- *No evidence by the Gaming Commission after their investigation who have closed their case with no further action."*

HEARING

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

- Louis Weston (Counsel for the DRA);
- Nigel Mawer (DRA);
- Steve Richardson (DRA investigator); and
- Alan Warriner-Little (AWL) (PDPA), representing Jiwa.

27. 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 (47 pages), including:
 - A DRA case summary document;
 - Statement of Richard Gardner dated 15 November 2024;
 - Statement of Steve Richardson (DRA investigator) dated 19 October 2024;
 - Statement of Nigel Mawer dated 29 October 2024;
 - Statement of Greg Fletcher (SBIU) dated 4 September 2024;
- An Opening Note prepared by Mr Weston;
- A Bundle of correspondence between the DRA and the Jiwa (34 pages):
 - Prakash Jiwa notification and immediate suspension letter 07/10/23;
 - Gambling Commission letter to Prakash Jiwa 19/06/24;
 - Prakash Jiwa notification of continuing investigation letter 28/05/24;

- Prakash Jiwa notification of charges and hearing letter 29/10/24;
 - Letter to Alastair Campbell re Prakash Jiwa 09.08.24;
 - Prakash Jiwa appeal letter to DRA Disciplinary Committee;
 - Email correspondence – various;
 - Level Letter to the DRA dated 07/08/24;
 - Level Letter to the DRA dated 16/08/24;
 - Prakash Jiwa 1st appeal against suspension finding;
 - Prakash Jiwa 2nd appeal against suspension finding;
- An Exhibits Bundle (141 pages), including:
 - SBIU Master Betting Data Spreadsheet
 - Extract from Bettor 1 phone messages 01.06.23
 - IBIA Alert 3908
 - IBIA Alert 3913
 - 365 account spreadsheet in the name of Bettor 1
 - Prakash Jiwa GC Interview audio (1);
 - Prakash Jiwa GC Interview transcript;
 - Prakash Jiwa GC Interview audio (2);
 - Prakash Jiwa GC Interview transcript;
 - Bettor 1 interview GC;
 - Bettor 1 GC interview transcript;
 - Bettor 2 interview GC;
 - Bettor 2 GC Interview transcript;
 - Interview Audio Prakash Jiwa 13.08.24;
 - Prakash Jiwa Interview Transcript 13.08.24;
 - Photograph of darts shown by Jiwa in interview 13/08/24;
 - Interview Audio Bettor 1 13.08.24;
 - Bettor 1 Interview Transcript 13.08.24;
 - Bettor 1 email re Suspicious betting on Modus Darts matches;
 - Bettor 1 'Odds' spreadsheet;
 - Interview audio Bettor 2 23.08.24;
 - Bettor 2 interview transcript 23.08.24;
 - Two emails from George Noble;
 - Screenshot of calls by Jiwa to Bettor 1;
 - Screenshot of call to Bettor 1 on Jiwa's phone dated 06/08/24;
 - Missed calls on 31.05.24;
 - WhattsApp Jiwa to Bettor 1.
- An additional Bundle (8 pages), including:
 - Statement of Steve Richardson 07/01/25;
 - Exhibit SR-16 Video timings;

- Exhibit SR-17 Game History;
- Exhibit SR-17A Modus 3 Dart Average and check out %; and
- Prakash Jiwa Letter to the DRA 14/12/24.

28. The Hearing commenced with Jiwa confirming that he admitted Charge 10 and denied the remaining charges.
29. Mr Weston opened the 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.
30. The DRA's position was that in the four matches in question Jiwa agreed with Bettor 1 that he would lose these matches by scores of either 4 – 0 or 4 – 1; which he then did. Bettor 1 bet in large sums across multiple markets on multiple betting platforms on these outcomes well in advance of the matches.
31. These bets were not consistent with Bettor 1's betting history. The outcomes of the matches were in line with the bets placed by Bettor 1 and the DRA's position was that they were achieved by Jiwa playing deliberately poorly. Bettor 1 was not a random member of the public but a work colleague of Jiwa and therefore well known to him.
32. Mr Weston used a spreadsheet of Jiwa's matches to show that in the relevant four matches Jiwa's three-dart average was significantly lower than in other matches. Additionally, the matches were so far apart in dates that it was not possible for a bettor to take a view of Jiwa's form going into the matches.
33. The DRA stated that in interview, Jiwa had stated that his poor performance was related to his use of new darts with which he was unfamiliar and the fact that he had been drinking. Mr Weston pointed out that this defence was not supported by an examination of the data on the spreadsheet that showed the poor performance occurred during the four relevant matches and not his performance in other matches at the tournament.
34. The DRA also alleged that if Bettor 1's position was that he was betting against Jiwa on the basis of the player's form, why were his bets focused on the relevant matches and not others played on the same day? There was no evidence to indicate that the bets were placed following an analysis of Jiwa's form on the day of the matches.

35. Mr Weston pointed out that an analysis of Jiwa's three dart average over a series of matches revealed that the four lowest averages were in the relevant matches that Bettor 1 was betting most heavily on. It was the DRA's position that these facts could not be explained by Jiwa having new darts or drinking. Rather, they were the result of an arrangement with Bettor 1.
36. The DRA then called Gardner, an experienced former professional darts player, as a witness and examined his statement of 15 November 2024.
37. In the presence of Gardner, the Hearing was then shown videos of the check outs at the four relevant matches. Having done this, Mr Weston pointed out occasions where he claimed that Jiwa had missed double by a significant amount in order to avoid the risk of winning a leg that would have lost the bets.
38. AWL, on behalf of Jiwa, then cross examined Gardner. AWL is himself an experienced former professional player of note. AWL made the point that, in his view, the three-dart average was not a reliable guide of performance.
39. Gardner agreed that averages could be interpreted in different ways and reflect a number of different reasons, including the number of doubles missed in a game. His opinion was that the distance by which Jiwa missed some doubles during the four relevant matches was suspicious. As an example, he stated that in the first game, Jiwa had fifteen attempts at a double and only one of them could be described as "quite close." This explains Jiwa's low average but also highlighted his poor performance.
40. AWL made the point that in the leg in which fifteen doubles were missed by Jiwa, his opponent was also missing. Gardner again stated that it was the amount by which Jiwa was missing that was suspicious, including one dart that missed the board completely, one that barely hit the board, and one that landed out of camera shot. In his view, this was not consistent with Jiwa's ability as a professional darts player: *"when I see a very good dart player missing by that amount, it does send bad signals to me."*
41. Jiwa asked whether drink or the grip on the darts might affect performance. Gardner agreed that they could but that he did not consider this to be a factor in these matches.
42. AWL then presented the case for Jiwa by stating that the Gambling Commission dropped its case against the player. Jiwa had consistently denied any

involvement in irregular betting or match fixing. He has also taken the PDPA betting integrity model and so understood the issues involved.

43. Whilst accepting that some of the darts in question were some distance from the target, there were instances where the darts were close.
44. Jiwa denied any collaboration with Bettor 1 in betting on the four relevant matches and Bettor 1 would be called to speak to his betting system.
45. Jiwa then gave evidence in person to the Hearing. He stated that he had co-operated fully with all investigations, consistently denied any wrongdoing, and that no doubts had ever been raised in relation to his integrity during a 37-year darts career.
46. He also stated that he was using new darts during his matches and he found problems gripping the dart, sometimes causing him to overcompensate and miss by large margins. He stated that if he had wanted to “*throw*” a match he would not score so heavily so as to avoid putting himself in the position of having to deliberately miss a double.
47. In cross examination, Jiwa stated that he had known Bettor 1 for “*two or three years*” as a work colleague but they were not close personal friends. He knew him to be a gambling man. On one occasion he asked Bettor 1 to place a darts bet for him.
48. He had also had “*a sportsman’s bet*” with him at work by which he won £65 on a football match. He didn’t take the money but asked Bettor 1 to place other bets on football matches for him.

Q: “*These were conversations you had at work, yeah.*”

A: “*Yes.*”

Q: “*So there was no need for you ever to send him messages about betting was there?*”

A: “*No.*”

49. He was then asked why he had told the DRA that he had deleted messages on his phone to Bettor 1 as he didn’t want his wife to see that he had been involved in betting. He stated that this was in relation to the “*sportsman’s bet*” only.
50. It was pointed out to him that he had just told the Hearing that these conversations were done orally at work. He stated that there about ten such messages.

51. He then confirmed that he had deleted all messages between him and Bettor 1 but claimed that this was done before he was aware of any investigation of his conduct.
52. In respect of the four relevant matches, it was put to him that they had some of the lowest check out percentages over his playing year. Jiwa described this as a *"coincidence."*
53. Jiwa was asked which matches had been affected by his drinking. He stated that he couldn't identify specific matches.
54. He was then asked about his new darts that he said were received in May 2023. It was pointed out that these could not have been a factor in the two February 2023 matches. Jiwa agreed with this point.
55. It was pointed out that, having lost to Hudson, his average then improved for the next three games, before falling again in the Borland match. He stated that drink may *"probably"* also have been a factor.
56. He accepted that he was embarrassed by some of the distances by which he missed double but stated that this was not intentional.
57. Jiwa was then asked about a conversation between Bettor 1 and Bettor 2 (page four of the Exhibits Bundle and paragraph 16). Just after Jiwa had lost his match against Hudson, Bettor 1 messaged Bettor 2 with *"Boom."*
58. Jiwa denied being in conversation with Bettor 1 that day or knowing that he had bet on him. He stated that he spoke with Bettor 1 the day before the game and not again until after he had finished playing on 1 June where he may have mentioned to him that he had been pulled out of the tournament but couldn't recall doing so.
59. He accepted that the messaging between Bettor 1 and Bettor 2 indicated that he had informed Bettor 1 that he had ben pulled out of the tournament. It was pointed out that this contradicted his interview evidence of 13 August 2024 that he did not discuss darts or betting with Bettor 1 during this conversation.
60. He stated that it was only when he was interviewed by the Gambling Commission on 7 November 2023 that he realised that Bettor 1 was the bettor placing the suspicious bets on him. When he spoke to Bettor 1 about this, he said: *"sorry, I shouldn't have done what I did."* Again, it was pointed out that in his

interview with the DRA in August 2024 he initially stated that he had not spoken to Bettor 1 about the matter.

61. Bettor 1 then gave evidence in person to the Hearing. He stated that he had been trying to devise a betting system by analysing the Modus series. He had made a mistake by betting on Jiwa's matches by not realising the problems that might arise because he knew him.

62. AWL asked him to explain his system. Bettor 1 stated that:

"I label it a system but it literally was just to observe and analyse Modus system results, performances and to identify people who were in poor form and then I worked out a betting grid of different prices where I could track if I put a bet on that won how much the winnings would be. It was really as simple as that."

63. Bettor 1 stated that Jiwa was not involved in or aware of the bets he placed.

64. Mr Weston confirmed that Bettor 1 had provided the DRA with a copy of his betting grid. Bettor 1 agreed that in effect the grid demonstrated the potential outcomes of particular bets at specific odds, as opposed to being a "system" in itself.

65. He stated that part of his system was *"to identify people who were performing poorly"* and agreed that his system was dependent on him making a judgment on what would happen in a match. He stated that he used Darts Connect to identify such players.

66. Bettor 1 stated that he joined several different betting platforms because they each offered different incentives. He said there was *"no particular reason why"* he continued to use different platforms.

67. Mr Weston asked in relation to his betting on the Bates match on 19 February 2023, on what basis did he form the opinion that Jiwa would lose 4 – 0 in view of the fact that Jiwa hadn't played in the Modus series for over two months. Bettor 1 stated that two years had passed and he couldn't recall his thinking at the time.

Q: "Why would it be that you only thought he was going to be out of form when he was playing Mr Bates and not when he was playing Mr Hunt or Mr Osborn on the 16th of February?"

A: *“Again, you’re talking two years ago, my thought process of how I came to that decision I couldn’t honestly say right now.”*

68. Bettor 1 stated that his system also involved considering whether opponents were in good form, as well as poor form.

69. Mr Weston pointed out that Bettor 1 bet on Jiwa losing to Adam Hunt on 17 February, in a match where Jiwa’s three dart average was subsequently 65.35. Yet on the previous day Bettor 1 had not bet on the match between the two players where Jiwa averaged 92. It was put to Bettor 1 that he appeared to bet on the matches where Jiwa subsequently played poorly, but not on games where he performed better. Bettor 1 acknowledged that this was a *“coincidence.”*

70. Using the DRA spreadsheet, Mr Weston then pointed out that he placed higher stakes on Jiwa’s matches.

Q: *“Why was it you could tell the form of Mr Jiwa so that you’d bet twenty quid on it, but when you’re looking at Mr Kist it’s only a quid. Why the twenty times more confidence?”*

A: *“. . . This is where I was actually properly testing my thought process of my system.*

Q: *“Mr Jiwa, twenty quid to lose 4 – 0, 4 – 1, Mr Kist a couple of quid to lose 4 – 0, 4 – 1. Why the difference in confidence?”*

A: *“Again, you’re talking two years ago, I don’t know, it’s difficult to pinpoint, to remember a thought process from two years again is very difficult.”*

71. Bettor 1 was then asked about the message exchange with Bettor 2 detailed in paragraph 16. He stated that Bettor 2 was his landlord and they lived at the same address.

72. In relation to the messages, Bettor 1 was asked what he meant by *“dodgy patterns?”* Bettor 1 stated that at this point he realised that his betting may have looked suspicious. He stated that *“dodgy means strange to me.”*

73. He was then asked what he meant by *“they will have to prove it?”* Bettor 1 replied:

“I don’t know. I can’t remember the context of what I was trying to say to him. I think that’s the realisation where I’ve realised that betting on Prakash’s matches was the wrong thing to do and again yes, the dodgy patterns thing would come into play. But at the end of the day if he thought that other people would think we were doing anything dodgy, you’d have to prove it. But I wasn’t doing anything dodgy. So that’s where I’m coming from with that.”

Q: “I will just say I was betting against him because I think he’s crap. That is you making up an excuse isn’t it?”

A: “A reason, I wouldn’t say an excuse.”

74. Bettor 1 stated that he has also lost more bets than he had won. Mr Weston stated that this was demonstrably not the case in respect of his bets on Jiwa.

DECISION

75. 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.

76. In respect of charges 1 to 8 relating to the fixing of the four matches referenced at paragraphs 3 and 24, the Committee first considers the question of whether the betting on the relevant matches is suspicious and therefore indicative of match fixing. In considering this, the Committee considers the evidence provided by the IBIA and the DRA in these respects.

77. The Committee also considers the evidence provided by Bettor 1 that his bets were the product of a system developed by him. On this, the Committee takes the view that Bettor 1 has not provided a credible explanation for any system that would explain the bets he placed on the four matches in question.

78. The Committee is persuaded that compelling evidence exists that the nature of the bets placed by Bettor 1 on the four relevant matches detailed at paragraph 3 is suspicious and indicative of match fixing. This is based on 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 bettor in comparison with his other betting activity.

79. Having determined that the betting activity is consistent with match fixing, the Committee then considers the evidence put forward by the DRA to support its case that Jiwa participated in such activity.
80. The principal evidence in this respect is provided by Gardner and also in the evidence of Noble, both of whom are experienced in the sport of darts and both of whom, independently, highlighted concerns about level of performance by Jiwa in the four suspicious matches.
81. The Committee accepts the point made by AWL and Jiwa that three dart averages are not necessarily a reliable indicator of performance. Gardner also accepted this point.
82. The Committee concludes that, in this case, the averages are nevertheless of evidential value. The point was made during the Hearing that averages can be negatively affected by a player's failure to hit doubles. In the four relevant matches, it is the Committee's view that Jiwa's averages are a product of his failure to hit numerous doubles to check out. It is also noted that Jiwa's averages are higher in the non-suspicious matches.
83. Having heard the evidence and viewed video footage of the relevant matches, the Committee is not persuaded by Jiwa's argument that his performance in the four matches was a result of either his unfamiliarity with his new set of darts or his intake of alcohol. Simply put, these factors did not seem to affect him to the same extent in other, non-suspicious, matches on 1 June 2023.
84. Additionally, it is noted that the "new darts" could not have been a factor in his performance in February 2023, as Jiwa stated he took possession of them in May 2023.
85. The Committee finds that Jiwa deliberately under performed in the four relevant matches.
86. The Committee notes that Jiwa and Bettor 1 are work colleagues and have known each other for some time. They are therefore in regular contact and it is agreed by both that they both discuss betting on darts and other sports. Jiwa accepts that he has asked Bettor 1 to place bets for him.
87. The Committee also notes that the evidence of Noble (paragraph 6) is clear that at the time he was withdrawn from the Modus Series on 1 June 2023, Jiwa told him that he "*did not understand gambling.*" Having heard the

evidence of the bets placed by Bettor 1 for Jiwa at Jiwa's request, the Committee does not believe this statement to be correct. This statement by Jiwa is also inconsistent with his DRA interview in 13 August 2024, at which he stated that he had previously been a heavy bettor, including on sports events, and that he had sought professional help in respect of this.

88. The Committee also notes discrepancies in Jiwa's evidence between his DRA interview on 13 August 2024 and his evidence at the Hearing in relation to his interactions with Bettor 1 in respect of betting.
89. It is apparent from Jiwa's evidence that he deleted messages with Bettor 1 related to betting from his phone. Whilst he states that these messages are not related to the four relevant matches, in view of the discrepancies highlighted above, the Committee is concerned that they appear to have been deleted prior to Jiwa's interview with the Gambling Commission and after concerns about the matches were brought to Jiwa's attention.
90. The Committee also considers the message exchange between Bettor 1 and Bettor 2 (paragraph 16) as being highly suspicious and indicative of a corrupt betting scheme of which the two were fully aware. The Committee is persuaded that such a scheme could only have been instigated with the connivance of Jiwa to fix the result.
91. In particular, Bettor 1's use of the phrase *"I will just say I was betting against him because I think he's crap. I told him this"* indicates to the Committee that Bettor 1 and Jiwa had discussed a response to any allegations should the matter be subject to investigation.
92. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 75 to 91 above, the Committee finds Charges 1 – 8 relating to match fixing by Jiwa to be proven.
93. The Committee then considers Charge 9, in respect of failing to assist a DRA investigation by Jiwa deleting messages between himself and Bettor 1.
94. No evidence was presented to the Hearing as to the date of any such deletion. The deletion itself is accepted by Jiwa on the basis set out at paragraph 51.
95. Evidence presented to the Hearing indicates that Jiwa's phone was seized by the Gambling Commission in November 2023 and returned to him in June 2024. It appears that no evidence of messages between Jiwa and Bettor 1 was found by the Gambling Commission. This suggests that the messages were deleted prior to November 2023.

96. Whilst, as outlined at paragraph 89, the Committee is concerned by the deletion of these messages, the available evidence suggests that this was done prior to Jiwa being informed that he was subject to investigation by the DRA.
97. Whilst the wording of Rule 4.5 does not require that a Player be informed they are under such investigation, the Committee takes the view that this is a necessary prerequisite for the offence to be made out.
98. For this reason, the Committee finds Charge 9 in relation to failing to assist a DRA investigation not proven.
99. As Charge 11 is presented as an alternative to Charge 10, which is accepted by Jiwa, the Committee makes no separate finding in respect of Charge 11.

SUMMARY

100. The Committee finds Jiwa in breach of Rules 2.1.2 (i), 2.2, and 2.1.3(i) of Appendix A of DRA Rules in respect of eight breaches related to the fixing of the results of four matches.
101. The Committee finds one charge against Jiwa of failing to assist a DRA investigation contrary to DRA Rule 4.5 to be not proven.
102. Having accepted Jiwa's plea in respect of one breach of Rule 2.1.1 (i) of Appendix A of the DRA Rules, the Committee makes no separate finding in respect of an alleged breach of Rule 2.1.1 (ii) of Appendix A.
103. The Parties are invited to provide Submissions on Sanction and Costs in writing on or before 25 February 2025 after which the Committee will issue its decision regarding the same.

Tarik Shamel, Chair

Tim Ollerenshaw

Dave Jones

18 February 2025