

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL BOARD OF THE FOOTBALL
ASSOCIATION

BETWEEN

LONDON TIGERS 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 Microsoft Teams (video-conferencing).
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.
5. The Appellant was represented by the attendance of Mr Mesba Ahmed.
6. The Respondent was represented by Mr Mark Ives and Mr Mark Frost and Mr James Earl attended as observers.

The Hearing

7. The Respondent, on 12 May 2022, refused the Appellant's application to request a lateral movement from the Spartan South Midlands League Division One to the Combined Counties League Division One for the 2022/23 season.
8. The Appeal Board, having taken into account the submissions of the parties and having given the Appeal Bundle careful consideration, noted the following.

9. The Appeal Board thanks both parties for the manner in which they made their submissions.

10. 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.

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

12. 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 Appellant put forward strong arguments concerning their 'home-base' being in Westminster and the issues pertaining to the damage imposed upon their original stadium, which has led to them to having to ground share with Amersham Town FC. The parties were in agreement that the Appellant was on the borderline of the lines drawn between the leagues being considered.
 - c. The Respondent, however, had not made an unreasonable decision in concluding that the ground at which the Appellant plays was necessarily a central point as to dividing the relevant leagues and allocating the Appellant. The ground is reasonably located within the catchment of the League within which they have been placed. The Appeal Board were unanimous in finding that the Respondent was not unreasonable to make the decision they did.
 - d. The Appellant put forward proposals as to what an ideal outcome could be should their appeal be allowed, however, it was found that the solutions posed would not be proportionate, reasonable nor feasibly open to the Appeal Board to order.

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

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

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

Paul Tompkins
Glenn Moulton
Robert Purkiss MBE

10 June 2022