

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL BOARD OF THE FOOTBALL
ASSOCIATION

BETWEEN

INGLES FC

Appellant

and

THE FA LEAGUES COMMITTEE

Respondent

DECISION AND WRITTEN REASONS OF THE APPEAL BOARD

1. The Appeal Board conducted a hearing on Tuesday, 7 June 2022, to determine an appeal by the Appellant against a decision of the Respondent, dated 12 May 2022.
2. This hearing was conducted by Correspondence.
3. The Appeal Board consisted of Mr Paul Tompkins (Chairperson), Mr Robert Purkiss MBE, and Mr Glenn Moulton.
4. Mr Conrad Gibbons, the Judicial Services Officer, acted as Secretary to the Appeal Board.

The Hearing

5. The Respondent, on 12 May 2022, notified the Appellant that they were to be laterally moved from the United Counties Football League Division One to the Midland Football League Division One for the 2022/23 season.
6. The Appeal Board, having taken into account the submissions of the parties and having given the Appeal Bundle careful consideration, noted the following.
7. The Appeal Board noted that the Appellant was appealing on the following ground:
 - a. Came to a decision to which no reasonable such body could have come.

8. The Appeal Board dismissed the appeal on this ground.

9. The Appeal Board reached this decision considering the following:
 - a. The following is a summary of the primary considerations of the Appeal Board, however the absence in these reasons of any particular point, or submission, should not imply that the Appeal Board did not take such point, or submission, into consideration when it considered the matter and reached its findings.
 - b. The Appeal Board noted that the Appellant raised relevant arguments concerning the increased distance of travel for the Appellant in their lateral move and the inherent impact this might have on the playing squad and financial implications. The Appeal Board also took consideration of the submissions concerning the reduced number of local derbies that the Appellant would have the benefit of from the lateral movement, as well as the increased journey times for away fixtures across the season.
 - c. The Appeal Board, however, determined that the decision of the Respondent was not a decision which was so unreasonable no reasonable such other body could have come.
 - d. In considering if the decision could be determined to be unreasonable, the Appeal Board found there was no alternative solution that could have been applied that could be considered as more reasonable in accordance with the Regulations and principles the Respondent appeared correctly to have applied.
 - e. The Appeal Board, although there was sympathy with the arguments raised by the Appellant, were satisfied that the Respondent made their decision with proportionality, considering the geographical placement of Clubs in the relevant leagues. The principles and criteria applied by the Respondent were appropriate for the integrity of the competition.
 - f. The remit of the Appeal Board is to consider whether the decision of the Respondent was so unreasonable that no reasonable such body could have come to it. The Appellant ultimately failed to satisfy this high hurdle.

10. The Appeal Board considered the matter of costs and decided that there would be no order as to costs.

11. The Appeal Board order that the appeal fee be forfeited.

12. The Appeal Board's decision is final and binding.

Paul Tompkins
Glenn Moulton
Robert Purkiss MBE

10 June 2022