



FIDE ARBITERS DISCIPLINARY SUB-COMMITTEE

The Arbiters Disciplinary Sub-Committee (hereafter called "the DSC"), sitting in the following composition: Chairperson: Mrs. Carolina Munoz. Members: Mrs. Genden Oyunchimeg and Mr. Pablyto Robert Baioco Ribeiro.

During an exchange of correspondence and online meetings during the period 4th June – 12 July 2025, made the following

DECISION

Case No 3/2025 "Getting outside help during the exam at the __ IA Seminar"

1. The DSC notes its establishment by the DSC Chairman on 12 June 2025.
2. The DSC notes that in May 27th 2025, the Arbiter Commission (ARB) received from the Lecturers of the __ IA Seminar, IA. __ and IA. __, of a matter concerning alleged violation of the FIDE Regulations by FA. __ (FIDE ID __) ("the Respondent"), relating to actions during the __ Online IA Seminar from __, 2025: "*Communicated via WhatsApp and copied answers from there (screenshots 1-2), handed in a homework solution (TRF file) from someone else (__), see attached pdf and original TRF.*" See IA. Seminar Report.
3. The DSC notes that the Respondent has been allowed to respond to the allegations in the report and has submitted an explanation regarding the case.
4. The DSC notes the contents of the following documents and emails received as part of the case file: Complaint by Lecturers and proof, Emails answer and explanation of the Respondent between 16-24 June 2025; Meetings with Lecturers July 8th 2025.
5. The DSC notes the subject matter of the complaint and defense:
 - 5.1. The Respondent is an FA and he was attendance in the participated in the __ Online IA Seminar.
 - 5.2. The allegations against the Respondent in the present case relate to the use of external help/assistant during the exam.
6. The Respondent in his reply to the DSC did an explanation about the complaint and the proof: "*...I am writing to sincerely clarify the situation concerning the files I uploaded during the __ IA Seminar examination. Prior to the exam, I had shared the homework questions and answers (as part of the seminar assignments) with a few fellow participants for academic discussion. However, during the examination, I strictly adhered to the rules and did not seek or receive any external help or refer to any unauthorized material. Regrettably, while submitting the required documents, I mistakenly uploaded screenshots of the homework content that I had previously shared. This was an unintentional oversight that occurred during a very emotional and stressful time for me—my wife was in the hospital delivering our baby on the same day as the examination. In that moment of personal urgency, I failed to double-check the uploaded files, for which I take full responsibility. I deeply regret this inadvertent error and wish to emphasize that there was absolutely no intention to violate any examination norms. I fully respect the integrity and decorum of the FIDE Arbiter Seminar process and have always upheld these values throughout my chess journey. I was continuously present on the video call as required and followed all instructions sincerely. If any of my actions caused confusion or appeared doubtful, I assure you it was purely unintentional.*" (See 19 June, 2025 email). "*I am writing to offer a sincere explanation regarding the issues surrounding the homework submission and an incident that occurred during the examination. At the time the homework was due final dead line date, my wife, __, was hospitalized due to a pregnancy-related emergency. This personal crisis created an extremely stressful environment, which unfortunately made it difficult for me to verify the*



accuracy of the file I intended to send. I had attempted to submit the homework via email, but my mobile phone switched off during the process. As a result, I was unaware whether the email had been successfully sent or not. Given the urgency of the situation, and dead line of HW, I asked one of my students to forward the file from my "Sent Items" folder. Unfortunately, I did not cross-check what file he downloaded and submitted on my behalf. It was only later that I realized an incorrect or unintended file may have been sent. By that time, several days had passed, and it was no longer possible to rectify the error. On the day of the examination, I would also like to clarify that a WhatsApp notification appeared unexpectedly on my laptop screen. I attempted to dismiss it immediately, but this action may have been misinterpreted. I assure you that the notification was unsolicited and beyond my control. Even I thought to skip seminar due medical reasons of my wife but exam fee was high which I can't afford again and again so forcefully I attended seminar and exam sir. I would like to emphasize that I have over 25 years of experience in this field. I am ___ fide rated player, I am fide instructor, I have been a FIDE Arbiter since ___ and a State Arbiter since ___, serving the chess community with commitment and professionalism." (See 24 June, 2025 email).

7. Upon due consideration, the DSC, by unanimity of its members, finds regarding the admissibility of the complaint that:

- 7.1. The Respondent is registered in the FIDE database as a FA and as such part of the FIDE Family, over which the DSC exercises jurisdiction.
- 7.2. The statements prima facie have the potential to constitute a violation of the conduct prohibited in Article 3.2(a) of the Disciplinary Regulations for Arbiters.
- 7.3. The potential transgression occurred in the international sphere, as the event involved multinational participation. See article 2.7.a of B.065;
- 7.4. The DSC finds, therefore, that it has jurisdiction to investigate the case.

8. Upon due consideration, the DSC, by unanimity of its members, observes and finds regarding the issue of the Respondents' guilt as follows:

- 8.1. About the statement: *"Communicated via WhatsApp and copied answers from there (screenshots 1-2)"* the Respondent indicated: *"On the day of the examination, I would also like to clarify that a WhatsApp notification appeared unexpectedly on my laptop screen. I attempted to dismiss it immediately, but this action may have been misinterpreted. I assure you that the notification was unsolicited and beyond my control."* According to the evidence provided, mainly the video corresponding to the exam test, DSC was able to determine: The Respondent shared via whatsapp exam's question to a person named ___, who sent to him the answers back. Mr. ___ copied those answer for the exam. It is clear that it wasn't and "unexpectedly" notification that he "attempted to dismiss it immediately". He had received help from an external source, but the Respondent submitted false information in his defense when he sent his answer.
- 8.2. About the statement: *"___:... handed in a homework solution (TRF file) from someone else (___), see attached pdf and original TRF";* the Respondent indicated: *"Prior to the exam, I had shared the homework questions and answers (as part of the seminar assignments) with a few fellow participants for academic discussion. However, during the examination, I strictly adhered to the rules and did not seek or receive any external help or refer to any unauthorized material. Regrettably, while submitting the required documents, I mistakenly uploaded screenshots of the homework content that I had previously shared. This was an unintentional oversight that occurred during a very emotional and stressful time for me—my wife was in the hospital delivering our baby on the same day as the examination. In that moment of personal urgency, I failed to double-check the uploaded files, for which I take full responsibility...At the time the homework was due final dead line date, my wife, ___, was*



hospitalized due to a pregnancy-related emergency. This personal crisis created an extremely stressful environment, which unfortunately made it difficult for me to verify the accuracy of the file I intended to send. I had attempted to submit the homework via email, but my mobile phone switched off during the process. As a result, I was unaware whether the email had been successfully sent or not. Given the urgency of the situation, and dead line of HW, I asked one of my students to forward the file from my "Sent Items" folder. Unfortunately, I did not cross-check what file he downloaded and submitted on my behalf. It was only later that I realized an incorrect or unintended file may have been sent. By that time, several days had passed, and it was no longer possible to rectify the error." According to the evidence provided, DSC was able to determine: a) The task was to make pairings for rounds 1 to 4 using the ratings and results of 10 players, and to send the TRF file. In the homework, the ___ and ___ participants' answers were exactly the same; one (from Respondent) was just a PDF version of the other's TRF file (from Mr. ___). The TRF file was included all players from ___. b) The homework submitted by Mr. ___ it is the same homework submitted by Mr. ___. Even both have the abbreviation for ___pt (___). It's common for a participant to submit their assignment using the initials of their own country (in this case, ___) rather than another country, such as ___. c) The defense given in the emails of June 16 and 24 is not clear and contradictory: In the first email, the Respondent indicates that he sent the assignment with an incorrect file, but in the second email, he indicates that a student did it, since his phone turned off while he was sending it. d) Mr. ___ admits that he sent an incorrect file, that he realized his mistake after it was sent, but he didn't report it to the IA Seminar Lecturers. On the contrary, he maintained that the file sent was his. e) The Respondent failed to inform the Lecturers about his wife's alleged health condition. He first mentioned this when he submitted his defense regarding this disciplinary proceeding. If this had been reported before the exam started, the lecturer would have found a solution to resolve the situation.

Appropriate sanction

1. Upon due consideration, the DSC, by unanimity of its members, finds regarding the matter of an appropriate sanction that:
 - 1.1. When determining the sanction, the DSC must consider all relevant aspects of the case.
 - 1.2. The Respondent is considered a first offender.
 - 1.3. The Respondent did not cooperate in the investigation because the explanations he gave were inconsistent with the evidence provided in the case.
 - 1.4. The Respondent has committed the offence in his capacity as an attendance in the ___ International Arbiter Seminar.
 - 1.5. The Respondent, as a FIDE Arbiter.
 - 1.6. All DSC members agree that Mr. ___ used external help during the IA Seminar exam, from another person.
 - 1.7. All DSC members agree that Mr. ___ copied the homework of another attendance in the IA Seminar, and sent it to the Lecturers as yours.
 - 1.8. Taking the above into consideration, the DSC finds by unanimity of its members that a disqualification for three months is an appropriate sanction in this case.
 - 1.9. The sanction will take effect immediately upon notification.
2. Accordingly, and taking into account all of the above, the DSC by unanimity decides as follows:
 - 2.1. The Respondent is found guilty of breach of Articles 3.2.a and 3.3.c. of the FIDE Arbiter Disciplinary Regulations: "a. Unworthy of confidence or trust: Arbiters who through their behaviour no longer inspire the necessary confidence or have in other ways become unworthy of trust." "c. Failure to cooperate: The failure of an arbiter, without compelling



- justification, to cooperate with any investigation carried out in relation to a possible breach of FIDE rules or with other arbiters and anti-cheating officials.”
- 2.2. The Respondent is sanctioned with a disqualification for three months.
 - 2.3. The Respondent is warned that the sanction was taken considering that it was his first offence. Future transgressions of the regulations, whether due to negligence or fraud, may be viewed as a repeat offence.
3. The Respondent is referred to Article 6 of the B.06.5 FIDE ARBITER DISCIPLINARY REGULATIONS and advised that he has the right to appeal this decision to the FIDE Council by giving written notice of such appeal to the DSC Chairperson (wimcmunoz@gmail.com) within 15 calendar days from the date upon which he receives this decision. The notice of appeal must clearly state all the grounds for the appeal. An appeal lodgement fee of 300 euros must be paid simultaneously to the FIDE Financial Department. Failing the due exercise of this right of appeal, the DSC's decision will become final.
 4. The DSC will communicate the decision to the Respondent, the FIDE Management Board and the FIDE Arbiters Commission.

DATED ON THIS 23 July 2025

IA. Carolina Munoz Solis
CHAIRPERSON DISCIPLINARY ARBITERS SUB-COMMITTEE