



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 between the period 19th January – 7 March 2026, made the following

DECISION

Case No 1/2026 " **Conduct of Chief Arbiter IA S.L. regarding the game G. vs. H. (Round 9).**"

1. The DSC notes its establishment by the DSC Chairman on 19 January 2026.
2. The DSC notes that in January 5th 2026, the Arbiter Commission (ARB) received from Mr. D.P., of a matter concerning alleged violation of the FIDE Regulations by IA. S.L. (FIDE ID __) ("the Respondent"), relating to actions during the ___ Tournament. During the 9th round of the U-10 category, the Chief Arbiter (CA) observed an illegal move (King left in check) on the board of G. vs. H.. Due to the high number of ongoing games and insufficient arbiter-to-player ratio, the CA could only reach the board after several subsequent moves had been played. The CA then intervened, reconstructed the position prior to the illegal move, and allowed the game to continue. The complainant (a parent of a third-party player) alleges that this intervention was unauthorized under Rapid Chess regulations.
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 and proof, Email answer and explanation of the Respondent on January 27th and proof.
5. The DSC notes the subject matter of the complaint and defense:
 - 5.1. The Respondent is an IA and he was Chief Arbiter in the ___ Tournament.
 - 5.2. The allegations against the Respondent in the present case relate to an intervention in a rapid game against the Laws of Chess, Appedix A.
 - 5.3. The Respondent in his reply to the DSC did an explanation about the complaint and the proof: *"...In the game of round 9, G.- H., M, referred to by the Complainant (it should be noted that this was a game in which the Complainant's son was not directly involved; the Complainant's son lost his game in the final round), the following situation occurred. At a certain moment, the electronic board was used as a source of additional verification. While*



standing between the rows of players (one row away from the board of the game G., A – H., M), I clearly saw that G., A, playing with the white pieces, made the move 54. ab (Annex 5) and pressed the clock — this was an impossible move (the white king remained in check). Naturally, it was unacceptable to shout to the players across a row, so I started moving toward their board. However, this took some time, as at that moment I was supervising approximately 15 other games, and the players were making moves quite quickly and managed to make several moves in the meantime. Since I had observed a completed illegal move and, in addition, confirmed my assessment using the electronic game record, I decided to act in accordance with Articles 7.1, 7.5.1, 7.5.5 and A3 of the FIDE Laws of Chess. After the appropriate corrections, the game was continued from 53... cb, and after several moves it ended in a draw by mutual agreement of the players (Annex 6).” (See 27 January, 2027 email).

6. Upon due consideration, the DSC, by unanimity of its members, finds regarding the admissibility of the complaint that:
 - 6.1. The Respondent is registered in the FIDE database as an IA and as such part of the FIDE Family, over which the DSC exercises jurisdiction.
 - 6.2. The statements prima facie has the potential to constitute a violation of the conduct prohibited in Article 3.6(e) of the Disciplinary Regulations for Arbiters.
 - 6.3. The potential transgression occurred in the international sphere, as the event involved multinational participation. See article 2.7.a of B.065;
 - 6.4. The DSC finds, therefore, that it has jurisdiction to investigate the case.
7. Upon due consideration, the DSC, observes and finds regarding the issue of the Respondents' guilt as follows:
 - 7.1. About the statement: *“There was no Appeals Committee at the tournament. No technical meeting regarding the Tournament Regulations prepared by the Organizer was held. The Appeals Commission was not established at the tournament from the outset, and no information about it was included in the Regulations__”*
Chief Arbiter’s Responsibility: While the Organizer failed to provide the infrastructure, a FIDE International Arbiter has the professional obligation to ensure that basic FIDE standards (Articles 11.1 and 12.1) are met before the tournament begins. Accepting to lead a high-level international youth event without a legal recourse for players (Appeals Committee) is a breach of professional standards. According to C05 articles 3.3. and 10.2; even the Organizer did not include any part regarding a technical meeting or an Appeals Committee when preparing the tournament regulations; the Chief Arbiter had the opportunity to resolve this issue before the start of the first round. This is a unanimous



consideration of all DSC members.

- 7.2. About the statement: *“While standing between the rows of players (one row away from the board of the game G., A – H., M), I clearly saw that G., A, playing with the white pieces, made the move 54. ab (Annex 5) and pressed the clock — this was an impossible move (the white king remained in check). Naturally, it was unacceptable to shout to the players across a row, so I started moving toward their board. However, this took some time, as at that moment I was supervising approximately 15 other games, and the players were making moves quite quickly and managed to make several moves in the meantime. Since I had observed a completed illegal move and, in addition, confirmed my assessment using the electronic game record, I decided to act in accordance with Articles 7.1, 7.5.1, 7.5.5 and A3 of the FIDE Laws of Chess. After the appropriate corrections, the game was continued from 53... cb”.*

The majority of DSC members considered that Article A.5.2 of the Laws of Chess had not been complied with. The arbiter observed an illegal move. According to Article A.5.2, the arbiter should act before the opponent has made his/her next move; and according with Arbiter defense, he acted after “several moves” were made. According to the Respondent *“The number of arbiters (5 for all categories, more than 200 participants — children aged 6 to 14) and electronic devices (2 boards per age group, 8 in total) at the tournament was insufficient to comply with Paragraph A.4 of the FIDE Laws of Chess. However, electronic devices were present and were used as an additional source of information.”* The Competitive Rules of Play shall not apply for this case (see A.4.). So, it should apply A.5. and the arbiter should not have intervened in the illegal move 54 by the white player; since, although he observed it, by the time he intervened in the game several moves had already been made by both players.

- 7.3. Mr Baioco Ribeiro considered Article 7.5.5 of the Laws of Chess explicitly state that an arbiter shall intervene if he observes an illegal move. The CA’s testimony and electronic board records confirm he witnessed the violation. The complainant’s argument that an arbiter cannot intervene without a claim is only applicable under specific “Limited Supervision” conditions (Article A.4 Rapid Chess). Since the CA witnessed the move, his duty of office (ex officio) overrides the “silent” status of the arbiter. Mr Baioco Ribeiro considered the CA acted in full accordance with the FIDE Laws of Chess. The technical intervention was correct, and there is no evidence of “misapplication” of the rules of play. While A.5.2 limits the player’s right to claim after a subsequent move is made, it does not strictly prohibit an arbiter from fulfilling their primary duty under Article 7.5.5. If an arbiter clearly observes an illegal move, their obligation is to ensure the integrity of the game. In this case, IA L. witnessed the illegal move (King in check) but was physically



unable to stop the clock instantaneously due to the high player-to-arbiter ratio, so he was a certain distance and couldn't shout to stop. To penalize an arbiter for correcting a witnessed illegality once they reached the board would set a dangerous precedent, suggesting that speed of play can override the Laws of Chess even when an official is present. Sanctioning the arbiter would punish him for being an active arbiter and would promote passive arbiters in rapid and blitz formats.

8. Appropriate sanction

Upon due consideration, the DSC, by unanimity of its members, finds regarding the matter of an appropriate sanction that:

- 8.1. When determining the sanction, the DSC must consider all relevant aspects of the case.
 - 8.2. The Respondent is considered a first offender.
 - 8.3. The Respondent cooperated in the investigation because the explanations he gave were consistent with the evidence provided in the case.
 - 8.4. The Respondent has committed the offence in his capacity as IA of the ___ Tournament.
 - 8.5. All DSC members agree that Mr L. is guilty of not following the competition rules, by not holding a technical meeting and not establishing an appeals committee prior to the tournament.
 - 8.6. The majority of DSC members agree that Mr L. is guilty of breach the article A.5.2. of the Laws of Chess. Mr Baioco Ribeiro has a dissenting vote.
 - 8.7. Taking the above into consideration, the DSC finds by unanimity of its members that a **written warning valid for 12 months** is an appropriate sanction in this case.
 - 8.8. The sanction will take effect immediately upon notification.
9. Accordingly, and taking into account all of the above, the DSC by unanimity decides as follows:
- 9.1. The Respondent is found guilty of breach of Articles **3.6.e**: "3.6 Technical Breaches... e. A significant failure to comply with the provisions of the tournament regulations and with the Laws of Chess, instructions, circulars and decisions of the FIDE organs."
 - 9.2. The Respondent is sanctioned with a written warning valid for 12 months. The expected corrective measures to be taken by the arbiter are: update on at least Laws of Chess (E.01), General Regulations for Competitions (C.05) and Appeals Committee Procedural Rules (C.11).
 - 9.3. 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.



10. 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.
11. The DSC will communicate the decision to the Respondent, the complainant, the FIDE Management Board and the FIDE Arbiters Commission.

DATED ON THIS 10th March 2026

IA. Carolina Munoz Solis
CHAIRPERSON DISCIPLINARY ARBITERS SUB-COMMITTEE