

# **Decision**

taken by the

**adjudicatory chamber**

of the

**FIFA Ethics Committee**

Mr Vassilios Skouris [GRE], Chairman  
Ms Ayotunde Phillips [NGA], Member  
Mr Melchior Wathelet [BEL], Member

taken on 8 October 2019

in the case of:

**Mr Sayed Aghazada [AFG]**

**Adj. ref. no. 23/2019**

## I. Inferred from the file

1. Mr Sayed Aghazada (hereinafter: "*Mr Aghazada*" or "*the official*"), Afghan national, was, from 2012 until 2019, the General Secretary of the Afghanistan Football Federation (hereinafter: "*AFF*"). He was also a member of the AFC Executive Committee, as well as of the Organising Committee for the FIFA U-20 World Cup from 2014 until 2017.
2. On 30 November 2018, a number of serious allegations of "*severe mental, physical, sexual and equal rights-abuse of the female players by male Afghan Football Federation-officials*", in particular Mr Keramuudin Karim (president of the AFF between 2005 and 2018 and former FIFA standing committee member), became public in several media publications.
3. Pursuant to art. 59 of the FIFA Code of Ethics, 2018 edition ("*2018 FCE*") and based on the abovementioned information, on the same day, Ms Maria Claudia Rojas, Chairperson of the investigatory chamber of the FIFA Ethics Committee (hereinafter: the "*investigatory chamber*"), instructed the secretariat of the investigatory chamber to carry out an initial evaluation of this matter. In this regard, the AFF was required to provide by 7 December 2018 all relevant information in its possession in relation to the above allegations.
4. On 10 December 2018, the Attorney General of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (hereinafter: "*Attorney General*") informed FIFA that he had assigned a committee to investigate the allegations on sexual and physical abuse of the Afghanistan women's national team by the AFF officials. FIFA was made aware that the Attorney General suspended a number of five AFF officials, including Mr Karim and Mr Aghazada.
5. On 17 January 2019, the AFF, provided the investigatory chamber with its position in connection with the sexual allegations. In substance, the AFF denied all the accusations about sexual abuse, threats and violence against any of its female players.
6. On 14 February 2019, the Asian Football Confederation ("*AFC*") requested that the AFC and the AFC Disciplinary and Ethics Committee be permitted to assume jurisdiction over the matters connected with AFF in accordance with article 30 of the FCE in order to ensure a thorough investigation of important allegations affecting one of the AFC's member associations.
7. On 1 April 2019, the investigatory chamber permitted the AFC and the AFC Disciplinary and Ethics Committee to assume jurisdiction over said matters in accordance with art. 30 of the 2018 FCE.
8. However, on 18 April 2019, the investigatory chamber informed AFC that at the current stage of the FIFA investigations there was sufficient evidence to prosecute this case in a proper manner, and that FIFA may be better positioned to investigate and adjudicate the case immediately.

9. On 22 April 2019, the AFC informed that they shared the view of the investigatory chamber that the latter should conclude its investigations and submit the final report to the adjudicatory chamber of the FIFA Ethics Committee (hereinafter: the "*adjudicatory chamber*").
10. On 8 June 2019, the adjudicatory chamber found Mr Karim guilty of having abused his position and sexually abused various female players, in violation of the FCE, and sanctioned him with a life ban on taking part in any football-related activity (at national and international level (administrative, sports or any other), as well as a fine of CHF 1,000,000.
11. Taking into account the relevant information and documentation obtained throughout the preliminary stage of the investigation, the chairperson of the investigatory chamber, Ms Maria Claudia Rojas, concluded that there was a prima facie case that Mr Aghazada committed violations of the 2018 FCE.
12. As such, on 4 July 2019, Mr Aghazada was informed of the initiation of the investigation proceedings under reference E19-00011, against him for possible breaches of articles 13, 15, 17, 23 and 25 of the 2018 FCE.
13. Reference is made, in respect to any further factual and procedural aspects, to the final report submitted, together with the investigation files, by the investigatory chamber to the chairperson of the adjudicatory chamber on 22 August 2019, upon completion of the respective investigation proceedings, in accordance with art. 62 par. 3 and art. 68 of the FCE, 2019 edition ("*2019 FCE*").
14. On 23 August 2019, a letter was sent to Mr Aghazada (through his legal representative), informing him that adjudicatory proceedings had been opened, providing him with a copy of the final report and the relevant enclosures and requesting him to submit his position (cf. art. 68 and art. 71 of the 2019 FCE) by 6 September 2019. Mr Aghazada was further informed that, in case he would request for a hearing to be held, such hearing would take place on 24 September 2019, and was consequently asked to confirm any such potential request by 28 August 2019.
15. On 28 August 2019, Mr Aghazada requested a hearing, as well as the rescheduling of such, due to his difficulty to travel (in view of a travel ban imposed on him by Afghan authorities) and the unavailability of his legal representative on the relevant date (24 September 2019). Mr Aghazada also proposed a series of alternative dates for the hearing and asked for support with respect to obtaining a visa and an exception to his travel ban.
16. On 3 September 2019, Mr Aghazada was informed that his request for a hearing was granted, and that such hearing would take on 8 October 2019. Mr Aghazada was further asked to provide valid passport copy/copies in relation to the respective visa invitation letter(s), and was informed that the adjudicatory chamber (or FIFA) would not intervene before any state authorities (in Afghanistan or elsewhere) in relation to his apparent travel ban (reminding him of the content of art. 75 par. 2 of the 2019 FCE). Finally, Mr Aghazada was referred to art. 38 and art. 69 par. 4 of

the 2019 FCE, and advised that his legal counsel would be allowed to duly represent him at the hearing, in case Mr Aghazada was prevented from attending such.

17. On 4 September 2019, Mr Aghazada provided a passport copy and requested an extension of the deadline to submit his position, as well as a full copy of the interviews of all witnesses mentioned in the Final Report (players A, B, C, D and E) and information on who will attend the hearing (in particular, whether any of the witnesses would attend).
18. On 6 September 2019, the chairperson of the adjudicatory chamber requested the chairperson of the investigatory chamber to provide the full transcripts of the interviews with players C and D (or any of the other players mentioning Mr Aghazada in their respective testimonies) and to inform whether the investigatory chamber intended to call any witnesses to the hearing of 8 October 2019.
19. On 10 September 2019, the chairperson of the investigatory chamber provided the redacted transcripts of the interviews with players C and D (granting anonymity to the victims in line with art. 44 of the 2019 FCE) and informed that Ms Janet Katisya would attend the hearing as chief of investigation, on behalf of the investigatory chamber.
20. On the same day, Mr Aghazada was provided with the documents received from the investigatory chamber, and informed of the composition of the panel, as well as of the structure and organisation of the hearing. In particular, Mr Aghazada was notified that no witnesses would be called at the hearing by the investigatory and adjudicatory chambers, and informed that his request to be allowed to question the relevant witnesses in writing has been granted (as well as of the respective procedure to follow). Finally, a final deadline was granted to Mr Aghazada until 16 September 2019 to provide his position as well as a list of questions for the witnesses.
21. On 16 September 2019, Mr Aghazada submitted his position, as well as a statement, and informed that he was willing and ready to provide his position to the panel via video-conference, in the instance his travel to Zurich was not permitted.
22. On 18 September 2019, the chairperson of the adjudicatory chamber acknowledged receipt of Mr Aghazada's submission, and took note of the fact that he did not submit a list of questions to the relevant witnesses (players C and D). With respect to his participation in the hearing by video-conference, Mr Aghazada was referred to art. 74 par. 1 of the 2019 FCE, which provides that hearings shall be conducted in the presence in situ of the requesting party.
23. On 2 October 2019, Mr Aghazada informed that, despite attempts to obtain a temporary exception to his travel ban, the Afghan authorities had failed to comply, and that he was thus unable to travel to Zurich. He consequently requested to be permitted to appear before the panel on the hearing date via video link / Skype / or suchlike method, in order to be present during such hearing and provide his final statement.

24. On 3 October 2019, Mr Aghazada was reminded of the content of art. 38, art. 69 par. 4 and art. 74 par. 1 of the 2019 FCE, and informed that in view of the fact that his inability to attend the hearing appeared to be due to external causes (travel ban), he would be exceptionally allowed to follow the respective hearing by telephone/video link, without the permission to intervene. With respect to his final opportunity to speak, Mr Aghazada was advised that, before the conclusion of the hearing, the Panel will allow for a short recess of maximum 30 minutes, during which he would be able to consult with his legal representatives and, if deemed necessary, provide the adjudicatory chamber with a short written submission, in English, containing his final/personal statement on the ethics proceedings (including the hearing). On the same day, Mr Aghazada acknowledged receipt of the correspondence.
25. On 8 October 2019, the hearing took place at the Home of FIFA in Zurich. Ms Janet Katysia represented the investigatory chamber and Mr Aghazada was represented by Mr Dev Kumar Parmar and Mr Luis de Oleza, and he was able to follow the hearing by telephone link (without intervening). After the parties made their respective oral submissions, and before the conclusion of the hearing, a short recess was allowed for Mr Aghazada to consult with his legal representatives, following which a short written personal statement of Mr Aghazada was read by his legal representative.

## **II. and considered**

### **A. Applicability of the FCE *ratione materiae* (art. 1 of the FCE)**

1. The adjudicatory chamber notes that, according to the final report of the investigatory chamber on the present matter, there are several indications of potential improper conduct in terms of the FCE by the official. In particular, during the investigations, possible violations of the relevant provisions of the 2019 FCE related to duty to report (art. 17) and protection of physical and mental integrity (art. 23), as well as its analogous provisions in the 2012 and 2018 editions of the FCE have been identified. The factual circumstances raise, without any doubt, questions of potential misconduct in terms of the FCE.
2. Consequently, the FCE is applicable to the case according to art. 1 of the 2019 FCE (*ratione materiae*).

### **B. Applicability of the FCE *ratione personae* (art. 2 of the FCE)**

3. According to art. 2 of the 2019 FCE, the Code shall apply, *inter alia*, to “officials”, as per the definitions section in the FCE and FIFA Statutes.
4. By virtue of his positions within AFF, AFC and FIFA mentioned previously (cf. par. I.1 above), Mr Aghazada was an official within the meaning of the definition given in the FCE and the FIFA Statutes during the period presently relevant (2013 – 2018).

5. As a consequence, at the time the relevant actions and events occurred, and in view of Mr Aghazada's position in football at the time, the FCE applies to the official according to art. 2 of the 2019 FCE (*ratione personae*).

### **C. Applicability of the FCE *ratione temporis* (art. 3 of the FCE)**

6. The relevant events took place from 2013 onwards, at a time prior to the current edition of the FCE coming into force. With regard to the applicability of the FCE in time, art. 3 of the 2019 FCE stipulates that the Code shall apply to conduct whenever it occurred. Accordingly, the material rules of the FCE shall apply, provided that the relevant conduct was sanctionable at the time (with a maximum sanction that was equal or more) and unless the previous editions of the FCE would be more beneficial to the party (*lex mitior*).
7. In this context, following the relevant case law and jurisprudence, the adjudicatory chamber notes that the spirit and intent of the 2012 and 2018 editions of the FCE (which were applicable between 2013 and 2018) is duly reflected in the below articles of the FCE, which contain equivalent provisions:
  - Art. 23 of the 2019 FCE has a corresponding provision in the 2012 FCE (art. 24) and in the 2018 FCE (art. 23);
  - Art. 17 of the 2019 FCE has a corresponding provision in the 2012 FCE (art. 18 par. 1) and in the 2018 FCE (art. 17).
8. In consideration of all the above, the adjudicatory chamber concludes that the different FCE editions cover the same offence.

#### *Lex mitior*

9. In his submission, Mr Aghazada claims that, based on the principle of *lex mitior* and of his comparative analysis of the 2012 and 2018 editions of the FCE with respect of the aforementioned provisions presently relevant, the 2012 FCE "constitutes undoubtedly the *lex mitior* in this case".
10. In this respect, the adjudicatory chamber disagrees with the argumentation of Mr Aghazada, and would like to make the following considerations.
11. The principle of *lex mitior* foresees that the accused should benefit from the most favourable law, imposing the lesser penalty.
12. In the present case, as mentioned previously, three editions of the FCE (2012, 2018 and 2019) have been applicable from the start of the infringement (2013) until present.
13. In this respect, the adjudicatory chamber takes note that the 2012 FCE did not foresee any minimum or maximum sanctions for the provisions presently relevant (arts. 18 par. 1 and 24 of the 2012 FCE). The 2018 FCE stipulates a minimum fine of CHF 10,000 for the relevant infringements (arts. 17 and 23) as well as a general maximum ban for a duration of two years, and a special maximum of five years in serious

cases or in cases of repetition, for art. 23. The FCE 2019 keeps the minimum fine for both infringements and the maximum ban for art. 17, however it introduces a general minimum ban of two years, as well as a special minimum ban of ten years, for sexual exploitation or abuse, serious cases or repetition, for art. 23.

14. Another provision that is relevant to the present case, in view of the fact that Mr Aghazada has been charged with multiple breaches of the Code, is art. 11 of the FCE (Concurrent breaches), which corresponds to art. 11 in both 2012 FCE and 2018 FCE. While in the 2018 FCE, the provision stipulates that “Where more than one breach has been committed, the sanction other than monetary sanctions shall be based on the most serious breach, and increased up to one third as appropriate, depending on the specific circumstances” (emphasis added), the other two editions (2012 and 2019) do not foresee any such limitation for the increase of the sanction.
15. After examining the various versions of the provisions mentioned above, the adjudicatory chamber concludes that the 2018 FCE appears to be the most limitative in terms of the sanction that can be imposed for the violation of such provisions (between a fine of CHF 10,000 and a ban of two years for a breach of art. 17; between a fine of CHF 10,000 and a ban of five years for a breach of art. 23; and between a fine of CHF 10,000 and a ban of six years and eight months for a breach of art. 17 and 23). Therefore, 2018 FCE would appear to be more beneficial to the official according to the principle of *lex mitior*.
16. Consequently, the material rules of the 2018 FCE are applicable to the case, according to art. 3 of the FCE (*ratione temporis*) and the principle of *lex mitior*. However, based on art. 88 of the 2019 FCE, the current edition of the Code is applicable with respect to the procedural rules enacted within (for example jurisdiction).

#### **D. Jurisdiction of the FIFA Ethics Committee**

17. The scope of jurisdiction of the FIFA Ethics Committee is defined in art. 30 of the 2019 FCE, which is more restrictive compared to the equivalent provisions in the previous editions of the 2019 FCE.
18. Art. 30 of the 2019 FCE defines a primary (par. 1) and subsidiary (par. 2) competence of the FIFA Ethics Committee. According to par. 1, if the relevant conduct has been committed by an individual elected, appointed or assigned by FIFA to exercise a function, the Ethics Committee shall be entitled to investigate and judge the respective matter. Furthermore, par. 2 stipulates that, where the conduct affects a confederation, the Ethics Committee shall be entitled to investigate and judge the respective matter when said conduct has not been investigated and judged, and/or cannot be expected to be investigated and judged by the relevant bodies of the confederation concerned.
19. The adjudicatory chamber notes that the relevant actions and events in relation to which Mr Aghazada’s conduct is presently under scrutiny occurred in the period 2013 – 2018, and that (as mentioned at par. I.1 above), Mr Aghazada was a FIFA standing committee member during the period 2014-2017. Therefore, at least part of the relevant conduct (during three years) was committed by a member of a FIFA committee.

20. Furthermore, the Ethics Committee has not been informed of any proper proceedings having been initiated by the AFF against Mr Aghazada in connection to his conduct (related to the accusations of November 2018). Moreover, the AFC has agreed, by letter dated 23 April 2019 (cf. par. 1.9 above), to allow the FIFA Ethics Committee to assume jurisdiction over the matter, and conduct ethics proceedings.
21. Consequently, the FIFA Ethics Committee is entitled to judge his conduct as per art. 30 of the 2019 FCE.

## **E. Assessment of potential violations of the FCE committed by Mr Aghazada**

### **1. The relevant facts**

22. In the scope of its investigation, the investigatory chamber gathered different types of evidence, including interviews with several female players and an official of the AFF, correspondence from the Afghan public authorities, cooperation with international and local institutions and media releases.

#### Interviews of players/victims

23. From the interviews conducted with the female players, who were granted anonymity (in line with art. 44 of the 2019 FCE) due to existing/potential threats to their persons or that of persons close to them, it emerged that such players had been victims of sexual abuse and harassments taking place between 2013 and 2018.
24. In particular, the transcripts of interviews with five female players describe in detail the sexual attacks perpetrated by Mr Karim that these women fell victim to. During these incidents, Mr Karim was reported to have hugged them, forced them towards him, touched them and/or talked to them in a sexual and inappropriate manner, as well as, in some cases, assaulting and raping them. The following excerpts from the testimonies are particularly relevant in establishing the facts:

#### Player C

*"He came and sat down next to me and he touched my shoulders and he touched me on my body. [...] First of all, on my shoulders on my neck, he kissed me, he tried to hug me. [...] On the chair, he approached me and kissed me and he hugged my kissed me and he was touching me everywhere. He touched me on my hips, he put my arms around him. I was really angry, he tried to kiss me on my lips and he was touching me and he tried to kiss me on my lips."*

*"He came and touched me kissed me, hugged me and things like that. He said don't get nervous and he touched me too much, when it got too much, I packed him at this collar and I pushed him away and I said to him: Boss, don't approach me, don't touch, me I don't need your money, I don't want anything, open the door and let me go. He pushed me with his hand to the bed and then he came and he threw himself on my body, I tried to defend myself, but I couldn't. I tried to get away from him and we had somehow a fight and I tried to defend myself and he gave me a punch into my face, I started bleeding out of my nose. He had given me a punch*



*into my face and I became somehow dizzy. When I got up, I saw that the whole bed was full of blood and that I had black spots and bruises on my neck and on my face. [...] I don't know how much time I was on the bed being weak and unconscious, and when I got conscious again, I got up, I saw everywhere was blood. I didn't have any clothes and I wasn't wearing anything"*

*"The boss was sitting opposite me. He took his pistol and he said to me: I am going to fire the pistol and your brain will explode. If you raise your voice, if anybody gets to know about this, and then he threw the money at my face, about 3 or 4 hundred Dollars, and he said: take the money and disappear from here."*

#### Player D

*"I was sitting on the sofa and he came and sat down next to me and he slowly took my hand and he pressed my hand and he said: whenever anybody is looking into your direction, I will shoot into his eyes because I love you and I don't want anybody to have even a look into your direction. And then he slowly started, I was really afraid I said to him I'm not such a girl. [...] He touched me, he hugged me. He tried to hug me and he wanted to do several things. Different things. I was shouting, I said I am not a bad girl, I am very young. [...] He took my hand, he touched my hands, he hugged me and he kissed me, he wanted to kiss me on my lips."*

*"I entered the room, I saw everything was quiet. I went inside and I saw that Keramuddin Karim is sitting in his underpants on the bed. When I saw him in that condition, I was shocked. I hadn't imagined something like that, I hadn't thought about it. When I saw him in that condition, I wanted to flee and to escape. Only himself, he could open the door, nobody else could open the door. [...] He stood up from the bed. He took off my veil, my headscarf. He started tearing off my clothes, whatever I was wearing. I was shouting all the time. Screaming. And over there, everything is silent, it's very quiet. I thought for myself you are lost, completely lost, I was crying, shouting, screaming, he tore off my clothes and wanted to pull off my complete clothes, and then I continued screaming and shouting and knocking at the door and screaming: help, help. I knew exactly that nobody could hear me"*

25. With respect to Mr Aghazada's conduct and involvement in the relevant behavior/abuse perpetrated by Mr Karim, the following statements were made by players C and D:

#### Player C

*"The boss was sitting opposite me. He took his pistol and he said to me: I am going to fire the pistol and your brain will explode. If you raise your voice, if anybody gets to know about this, and then he threw the money at my face, about 3 or 4 hundred Dollars, and he said: take the money and disappear from here. There was another door to the backside and I saw that there was a car from him standing there which he arrives at the federation with. This was at the back of the federation, this was completely separate from the federation, I felt I was in a very bad situation, I tried to get out of this situation as soon as possible. Then I saw his secretary, Mr Ali Aghazadah, he is his General Secretary. I met him and I wanted to start crying and to tell him what had happened. I wanted to tell him in what situation I was. [...] I*

wanted to get out of the federation and to find a way to get home. It was there, where I met his secretary and at that time I wanted to tell him I wanted to escape towards him and to tell him to help me. He pulled his card out of his pocket and said to me you can make money out of that, you can money and you can go wherever you want, but I don't want to see you ever again in the federation. I didn't have any other way, I could only follow my own plans and go to my friend's place.

Question: What card?

Player C: A business card, Mr. Ali Aghazadah, he had a business card. He threw it at my face and he said, whenever you want to leave this country, you can call me, but you should never ever come back to the federation again."

Player D

"Player D: (...) is the responsible person. She was [...] at that time. She wanted to make a complaint. She made a complaint, but Ali Aghazada prevented from forwarding her complaint. He is the General Secretary of the Football Federation he had not forwarded her complaint. He hampered it."

Other evidence

26. According to the relevant transcript, the AFF official interviewed in the scope of the investigation confirmed that several girls were raped. As per the official, Mr Karim would take the girls to his office, where he had a bedroom with a bed. The same person testified that *"we went inside [office] and in that back of the room there is a wardrobe and there is a secret wall. Behind that wardrobe, there is a secret room."*
27. Furthermore, the FIFA Ethics Committee was informed by the AFF that, in the scope of the accusations made publicly by the players, the Attorney General's office assigned a committee to investigate the allegations, which led to the arrest and suspension of various AFF officials, including Mr Aghazada. As confirmed by the AFF (and himself), a travel ban was imposed on Mr Aghazada.
28. Moreover, in the scope of the investigation proceedings, Mr Aghazada provided a certified translation of the accusation letter issued by the Attorney General to the AFC Disciplinary and Ethics Committee. Such accusation letter mentions that a witness rendered testimony before the Attorney General, stating, among others:
 

*"[...] It was too late at night, I was crying, I also had no money. The way was strange to me. I reached to the gate of the federation. The smaller door was open. I entered and I saw Ali Aghazada was there. I was crying I wanted to tell him what happened, he took his business card threw it at my face. He said whenever you needed money call this number otherwise get lost from here..."*
29. This testimony appears to be almost identical to the statements of "Player C" in her respective interview conducted in the scope of the ethics proceedings.
30. FIFA was also in constant contact with international institutions, such as United Nations Agencies, local organizations in Afghanistan and other public bodies, with the aim to clarify the situation of the female players and to support the current investigation, as well as to ensure the security and safety of the players who have accused

the AFF officials (principally Mr Karim). When the threats levelled against the group of players who spoke out escalated and forced them to flee their country, FIFPro and other actors supported the efforts of the players to find refuge in a secure country. This included engaging with public authorities on the issuing of humanitarian visas for the players, which allowed them to travel to foreign countries and apply for asylum. It must be underlined that humanitarian visas are only granted in specific circumstances such as the "*applicant's life or physical integrity are directly, seriously and tangibly endangered*".

31. Finally, a number of media releases have been published containing statements of players including specific situations, details and information with regard to the sexual harassment, rape and threatening accusations.

## **2. Mr Aghazada's position**

32. In his submission dated 16 September 2019, Mr Aghazada's legal representative provided the following summarized statement of defence (the main lines of which were repeated in the statements made orally at the hearing on 8 October 2019):

- Only tenuous and partial evidence was provided by the investigatory chamber against Mr Aghazada. Despite not bearing the burden of proving his innocence, he has provided all support possible to demonstrate that he was not aware of the actions of Mr Karim towards the women football players within the AFF;
- These players have admitted on numerous occasions they have not shared their experiences before with anybody at AFF until speaking with Khalida Popal. It is therefore extremely unlikely that any other person different to the victims could have shared this sort of conducts with anyone. Whilst it is agreed that the actions described are reprehensible, and the challenges victims could face in raising their voices in such instances are well respected, it is abundantly clear in this instance that any reference to Mr Aghazada is flaccid, and has little or no substance;
- It is clear in the evidence provided by Players C and D and mentioned in the Final report that it was Mr Mohammad Hanif Sediqi Rustam, the personal secretary of Mr Karim, who was aware of the hideous actions of the latter, and who assisted Mr Karim in perpetrating his crimes, not Mr Aghazada;
- The reputation of Mr Aghazada has already been tarnished for life only because he was an AFF official under the rule of Mr Karim. Therefore he should not be punished further, as an employee cannot and should not be sanctioned for the crimes of his/her boss;
- Mr Aghazada was not charged, let alone has been found guilty of any crime against women or any connivance thereof by the Afghan authorities;
- The adjudicatory chamber is requested to assess all facts, applicable law and evidence duly provided in this case, and to fully dismiss all charges against Mr Aghazada;

- In the event the panel would wish to sanction Mr Aghazada, it should take into consideration the following aspects: Mr Aghazada has been suspended nationally since December 2018 (meaning he has been out of work for ten months), period which should be counted in any suspension sanction imposed; he has continued to comply with anything that FIFA and the AFC has asked of him, in particular he has cooperated with the ethics proceedings; the lowest possible sanction should be applied on account of the principle of *lex mitior*.
33. The adjudicatory chamber has analyzed and reviewed the case file in its entirety. The summary of Mr Aghazada's position does not purport to include every contention put forth. However, the adjudicatory chamber has thoroughly considered in its discussion and deliberations any and all evidence and arguments submitted (in writing and orally), even if no specific or detailed reference has been made to those arguments in the outline of Mr Aghazada's position and in the ensuing discussion on the merits.

### **3. Legal assessment**

#### **a) Possible violation of art. 23 of the 2018 FCE (Protection of physical and mental integrity)**

##### *A. Wording of the relevant provision*

34. Art. 23 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE stipulates that persons bound by the FCE shall respect the integrity of others involved.
- a. Persons involved
35. The first element set out in art. 23 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE is that the person acting must be bound by the FCE. As has already been shown [cf. par. II.4 above], Mr Aghazada was at the relevant time a football official, and thus bound by the FCE.
- b. Protection, respect and safeguard
36. Mr Aghazada, as the general secretary of AFF was one of the most senior and main officials of said member association. As such, he had the duty to protect, respect and safeguard the integrity and personal dignity of all their constituents, whether they be players or officials. In particular, the AFF, that Mr Aghazada was in charge of running from an operational aspect as its general secretary, should be /have been regarded as a safe environment for all players, male or female.
37. Based on the clear and specific testimony of players C and D, the Panel finds extremely implausible that Mr Aghazada could have not been aware of Mr Karim's conduct or of what was happening in the AFF, in his capacity as general secretary of the association.

38. One of the victim players (player C) testified to have met Mr Aghazada while crying and begging for help, after having been sexually abused and threatened by Mr Karim a few minutes before. Mr Aghazada's attitude in dealing with a completely vulnerable, weak and defenceless victim of abuse was clearly depicted as follows: *"he pulled his card out of his pocket and said to me you can make money out of that, you can money and you can go wherever you want, but I don't want to see you ever again in the federation"*. This conduct and attitude are unacceptable. While the victim player reached out and share with Mr Aghazada the vile conduct she has just suffered (trusting that, in his capacity as a very senior official of the AFF, he would actually be in a position to act and help) the latter simply brushed her aside, offering her the possibility to "make money out of that" (in a blunt disregard of her pain, humiliation and emotional and physical damage suffered as part of the abuse). This despicable attitude fails to respect any standards of protection and/or of safeguard to any player, any woman or even human being. Moreover, the testimony of the player clearly demonstrates that Mr Aghazada was fully aware of the conduct of Mr Karim, as well as of the very serious nature of the impact it had on the players and the association itself. However, and despite his responsibilities and role as general secretary of AFF, Mr Aghazada failed to take any action to remedy or stop the shameful and vicious conduct perpetrated by Mr Karim (or at the very least attempt to do so).
39. Another victim (player D) clearly stated that a complaint was presented to Mr Aghazada (by another player) with respect Mr Karim's conduct and that the former *"prevented from forwarding her complaint"* and/or *"hampered it"*. In other words, instead of protecting and safeguarding the player, by his conduct, Mr Aghazada protected Mr Karim and allowed his conduct to continue (in secrecy).
40. The Panel would like to refer next to one of the arguments made by Mr Aghazada, who claimed that the investigatory chamber, in its investigation and final report, confused his actions with those of Mr Karim.
41. In this respect, it is admitted that the initial investigations prompted by the investigatory chamber were focused on the allegations concerning Mr Karim's conduct (sexual abuse of various female players). It is also undisputed that Mr Karim was consequently charged, convicted and sanctioned by the Ethics Committee for his conduct (cf. par. I.10 above).
42. However, as has been mentioned previously, the investigation's scope was extended, since it had been clear from the beginning that Mr Karim, while the main protagonist/perpetrator, was not the only person or official involved in the scandal. In fact, the initial media allegations, dating from as early as November 2018 (cf. par. I.2 above) mentioned *"severe mental, physical, sexual and equal rights-abuse of the female players by male Afghan Football Federation-**officials**"* (emphasis added), and the Attorney General had informed that several (five) AFF officials, including Mr Aghazada, had been suspended in December 2018 (cf. par. I.4 above), a fact confirmed by the respective official.
43. It is therefore normal and justified that the present proceedings refer also to Mr Karim's conduct, as this is strictly linked and related to that of Mr Aghazada (and

vice-versa). Notwithstanding the above, it must be made clear that the charges in the two separate cases are completely distinct: while Mr Karim was charged with having sexually abused several female players (corresponding to a breach of art. 23 of the 2018 FCE) as well as his function as president of the AFF (corresponding to a violation of art. 25 of the 2018 FCE), the charges against Mr Aghazada concern his involvement in the conduct of Mr Karim, in particular his awareness of such, and his failure to prevent and report it (in violation of arts. 17 and 23 of the 2018 FCE).

44. Another argument of Mr Aghazada is that he could not have been aware of the activities and actions of Mr Karim against female football players since the interviewed players C and D stated to have never shared this information before.
45. In this respect, the Panel would also like to clarify and make an important distinction in the testimony of the relevant players. When these witnesses declared to have never exposed these conducts before, they were referring to reporting them outside the AFF. Moreover, it is clear from the content of the interviews they at least attempted to bring the infringements to the attention of officials within the federation, in particular Mr Aghazada (cf. par. II.25 and II.28 above), and they were ignored.
46. Moreover, even if the players had not tried to report Mr Karim's conduct before they did so outside the AFF, this would be perfectly justifiable, in the opinion of the Panel. Taking into account the social context in which the victims lived, their cultural background and religion, it cannot be expected of them to be openly willing to make allegations of sexual abuse public, in particular while/after being harassed by Mr Karim and even receiving death threats. It was not until they fled their country and felt safe, that they decided to speak up outside (and against) the federation. In the opinion of the Panel, this took a lot of courage and does not suggest any element of bad faith, hidden motive or agenda in coming forward to testify.
47. Moreover, both players C and D mention Mr Aghazada specifically and explicitly by name, indicating that he was aware of Mr Karim's conduct, statements which are further supported by the testimony given by a victim before the Attorney General as stated in the accusation letter provided by Mr Aghazada himself.
48. Another important argument in his submissions was Mr Aghazada's vehement denial to have ever met player C as stated in her testimony, and his claim that both players C and D have mistook him for Mr Rustam.
49. In this respect, the Panel has thoroughly examined the testimonies of the two players and would like to make the following considerations.
50. While it is undisputed that references to a "secretary" of Mr Karim, which evidently corresponds to Mr Rustam, were made in the testimony of player D, such mentions cannot be mixed or confused with the specific extracts of the testimonies (presented at par. II.25 and II.28 above) where Mr Aghazada is explicitly identified by name and title. Furthermore, Mr Aghazada has not brought any arguments or evidence in support of any such potential case of mistaken identity. It is also not plausible that Mr Rustam, a mere secretary with no specific prerogatives in the AFF, would give player C his card, or that he could offer her money or the possibility to flee the country; it

is also improbable that he could hamper or obstruct a player from lodging a complaint or reporting the conduct of Mr Karim within the AFF. Finally, the Panel has no reason to doubt player C's testimony, which has been corroborated by the accusation letter of the Attorney General, and since Mr Aghazada himself has never claimed any dishonesty or untruthfulness in relation to the witness testimonies.

51. Another aspect the Panel would like to address is the attitude of Mr Aghazada when the first allegations of Mr Karim's conduct surfaced and the investigation of the Ethics Committee was launched.
52. Following an official letter from the AFF (through the same legal counsel who is representing Mr Aghazada in the scope of the present proceedings) which vehemently rejected the false accusations made with regard to the Afghan Football Federation's women national team" and reiterated that "these allegations are completely groundless", no evidence exists of Mr Aghazada taking any action, in his capacity as general secretary of the association, to investigate or probe the relevant conduct. This further demonstrated by the fact that the Attorney General had to step in and initiate an investigation, proceedings which are still ongoing according to Mr Aghazada.
53. As a general secretary of the AFF since 2012, Mr Aghazada had the responsibility to oversee its daily operations. It is therefore not plausible that Mr Aghazada did not realise or at least suspect all this time there was a problem among the female players, even more so when these players started leaving. Even assuming, *quod non*, that he was not aware of the conduct committed by others (in this case Mr Karim, his direct superior), it was his responsibility to know what was going on at the federation, what potential threats it could face so that he could avoid or prevent any damage to its reputation and image. In order to do so, he could have conducted an internal investigation, which would have surely revealed the systemic prevalence of these violations (from 2012 to 2018) that affected several players. Therefore, his failure to take any action in order to find out the truth about this horrendous scandal and activities of Mr Karim (be it negligent or otherwise) has affected not only the victim players, but also Afghan women players in general, the AFF and (the image and reputation of) Afghan football as a whole.
54. Another argument of Mr Aghazada was that, due to his function as general secretary of the AFF, which entailed running the operations of the association, he had little engagement with the women's team or department, which was overseen or headed by other officials.
55. In this respect, the Panel would like to refer to a document provided by Mr Aghazada himself - a correspondence dated 22 May 2016 through which he requested the Hong Kong Football Association to support in the organisation of a training camp for the Afghanistan Women's National Football Team (Enclosure 17 to the final report) – which clearly shows that Mr Aghazada was involved in the female football players' affairs. Furthermore, reference is made once more to the testimonies of players C and D, which attest that Mr Aghazada was fully aware of what was happening and did worse than nothing, in one case trying to offer money to the victim and suggest she leaves the country, and in the other directly hampering or blocking

the player from complaining (thus attempting to conceal or protect Mr Karim's conduct).

*B. Conclusion*

56. The Panel considers the evidence at hand sufficient to establish Mr Aghazada's conduct and his participation in the infringement committed by Mr Karim. There are three separate witness statements clearly identifying Mr Aghazada as the official to whom the victims went looking for help.
57. In his position as general secretary of AFF and one of the most senior officials of the association, he had the duty to protect, respect and safeguard the integrity and personal dignity of all their constituents, both players and officials.
58. FIFA takes a zero-tolerance approach to any violation of the physical or mental integrity of any human being. This is particularly important when it comes to youth and women football. Sexual abuse toward female players only discourages women's involvement in the game.
59. In the present case, Mr Aghazada's conduct of advising female players victims of sexual abuse to leave the association and their country or to "make money" of their pain and suffering, and refraining them from reporting these serious violations, displays a complete lack of empathy and it is contrary to any principles of protection and safeguard.
60. In view of the above, the Panel finds that, by his aforementioned conduct, Mr Aghazada has breached art. 23 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE.

*C. Potential breach of art. 24 par. 1 of the 2012 FCE*

61. In his submission, Mr Aghazada argues that art. 24 of the 2012 FCE constitutes *lex mitior*, by comparison to art. 23 of the 2018 FCE, not only in view of the lack of a minimum sanction (in the former), but also since the content of its first paragraph is different, requiring "a more specific or closer contact between offender and offender(s)".
62. Art. 24 par. 1 of the 2012 FCE contains the following additional sentence to the content of art. 23 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE: "They shall ensure that the personal rights of every individual **whom they contact and who is affected by their actions** is protected, respected and safeguarded" (emphasis added). Therefore, the provision of the 2012 FCE appears to contain two additional conditions or restrictions with respect to the persons whose personal rights and integrity need to be protected, respected and safeguarded: they must be in contact with the offender (person committing the infringement) and they must be affected by his/her actions.
63. In the present case, it has already been established, in particular through the testimony of players C and D, that Mr Aghazada entered into contact with (at least) two of the victim players: player C testified to have met and talked to him after being abused by Mr Karim, while player D recounted how another abused player was hampered by Mr Aghazada from lodging/raising a complaint in that respect.



64. Furthermore, it has also been found that the actions of Mr Aghazada, concealing and protecting the conduct of Mr Karim, directly affected the victims, Afghan (national) football players who were affiliated to the AFF, the association Mr Aghazada was the general secretary of.
65. In view of the above, both respective conditions for the applicability of art. 24 par. 1 of the 2012 FCE are complied with in the present case, and the Panel concludes that, by his conduct, Mr Aghazada has (also) breached this provision.
66. Notwithstanding the above, and as already explained previously (cf par. II.6-16 above), the adjudicatory chamber considers that the material rules of the 2018 FCE, and not 2012 FCE, apply to the present case, in accordance with art. 3 of the FCE and *lex mitior*.

### **b) Possible violation of art. 17 of the 2018 FCE (Duty to report)**

#### *Wording of the relevant provision*

67. According to art. 17 of the 2018 FCE, persons bound by the Code who become aware of any infringements of this Code shall inform, in writing, the secretariat and/or chairperson of the investigatory chamber of the Ethics Committee directly.

#### *a. Persons involved*

68. The first element set out in art. 17 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE is that the person acting must be bound by the FCE. As has already been shown [cf. par. II.4 above], Mr Aghazada was at the relevant time a football official, and thus bound by the FCE.

#### *b. Awareness of any infringements of the 2018 FCE*

69. The wording used at art. 17 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE entails that that the individual under the obligation to report does not have to have complete knowledge of all the facts of the case or understand all its legal implications. Rather, it is sufficient if the individual concerned has reasonable grounds for a suspicion of, or has witnessed potential misconduct.
70. In the present case, based in particular on the testimonies of the relevant players as described above, the Panel is comfortably satisfied that Mr Aghazada was aware of Mr Karim's conduct, which clearly corresponds to an infringement of the (2018) FCE, for which Mr Karim was actually convicted and sanctioned by the FIFA Ethics Committee (cf. par. I.10 above). Moreover, he not only remained passive and failed to report such conduct to FIFA (or any other authorities, inside or outside football), but he even took action to protect and conceal it, by suggesting to a player to leave the country, or by hampering another from lodging a complaint in this respect.
71. By not reporting the conduct of Mr Karim, which represented a very serious violation of the 2018 FCE, as well as a criminal behaviour/infringement, Mr Aghazada allowed it to continue, and ultimately affect and damage not only the victim players but also Afghan football as a whole.

72. In view of the above, Mr Aghazada is found guilty of having breached art. 17 of the 2018 FCE.

**c) Overall conclusion**

73. Taking the above considerations into account in their entirety, the adjudicatory chamber is comfortable to conclude that Mr Aghazada has violated the following provisions of the 2018 FCE:
- Art. 17 of the 2018 FCE (Duty to report);
  - Art. 23 of the 2018 FCE (Protection of physical and mental integrity).

**F. Sanctions and determination of sanctions**

74. According to art. 6 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE, the Ethics Committee may pronounce the sanctions described in the FCE, the FIFA Disciplinary Code (hereinafter: FDC) and the FIFA Statutes.
75. When imposing a sanction, the adjudicatory chamber shall take into account all relevant factors in the case, including the nature of the offence, the offender's assistance and cooperation, the motive, the circumstances, the degree of the offender's guilt, the extent to which the offender accepts responsibility and whether the person mitigated his guilt by returning the advantage received (art. 9 par. 1 FCE). It shall decide the scope and duration of any sanction (art. 9 par. 3 FCE).
76. When evaluating, first of all, the degree of the offender's guilt, the seriousness of the violation and the endangerment of the legal interest protected by the relevant provisions of the 2018 FCE need to be taken into account. In this respect, it is important to note that as the general secretary of AFF, Mr Aghazada was one of the most senior representatives of a FIFA member association. In addition, he was formerly a member of a committee of FIFA, and of the AFC Executive Committee. As such, Mr Aghazada held several prominent and senior positions in association football at national, regional and international level. In these functions, he had a responsibility to serve the football community as a role model. Yet, his conduct revealed a pattern of not only disrespect for core values of the 2018 FCE, but also for human dignity.
77. With regard to the circumstances of the case, the adjudicatory chamber emphasises that several of its aspects render the case at hand to be of gravity. Firstly, Mr Aghazada is a senior and influential football official at several levels. The dramatic context in which Mr Aghazada committed the above mentioned breaches illustrates the seriousness of said infringements. It is recalled that Mr Karim, the president of the AFF and Mr Aghazada's superior, had sexually abused various female players, going as far as to rape and assault those who refused to accept his advances. The sexual harassment/assault and abusive conduct was repeated and, in fact, part of a systematic treatment to which, unfortunately, female players were subjected to in Afghanistan over a course of several years, between 2013 and 2018. Furthermore, the situation was kept hidden/secret due to extreme pressure and coercions, but also due to the attitude and passivity of other persons, such as Mr Aghazada,

who chose to do nothing, and even worse - conceal and protect the conduct of Mr Karim instead of exposing and preventing it. In fact, it was only because of the bravery of some of the victims, who decided to speak out despite fearing for their lives, that the matter was eventually discovered and could be investigated and prosecuted.

78. As far as the official's motive is concerned, the adjudicatory chamber agrees that no element suggests or indicates the fact that Mr Aghazada had any personal interests involved in his actions presently relevant. It is much more plausible that his conduct was motivated by indifference and lack of empathy towards the victim players. In any case, Mr Aghazada's motive in the present case must be qualified as reprehensible.
79. Another circumstance that is suited to mitigate the culpability of an offender, according to the case law of FIFA's judicial bodies, is remorse or confession. In this sense, the adjudicatory chamber notes that Mr Aghazada has not demonstrated, at any point during these proceedings and in spite of the overwhelming evidence against him, awareness of wrongdoing. In fact, in his submissions, he repeatedly stressed that he was not aware at any point of Mr Karim's conduct, and that he had never met the players in question in the relevant context, despite the clear and substantive evidence pointing to the contrary.
80. Finally, the Panel does take note of the fact that Mr Aghazada appears to have been suspended as from December 2018 by the Afghan authorities.
81. To sum up, the adjudicatory chamber deems that the guilt of Mr Aghazada in the present case is serious, and virtually no aspects are suited to mitigate the degree of his guilt.
82. With regard to the type of sanction to be imposed on Mr Aghazada, the adjudicatory chamber deems – in view of the particularly serious nature of his misconduct (cf. par. II.25 *et seqq.* above) – only a ban on taking part in any football-related activity is appropriate in view of the inherent, preventive character of such sanction in terms of potential subsequent misconduct by the official. In the light of this, the adjudicatory chamber has chosen to sanction Mr Aghazada by banning him from taking part in any football-related activity (art. 7 par. 1(j) of the 2018 FCE; art. 56 par. 2(f) of the FIFA Statutes; art. 11(f) and art. 6 par. 2 lit. c) of the FDC).
83. With regard to the scope and duration of a ban (see art. 9 par. 2 and 3 of the 2018 FCE), the adjudicatory chamber points out that, where art. 17 par. 2 of the 2018 FCE (duty to report) establishes a maximum ban duration of two years for the respective violation, art. 23 par. 6 (protection of physical and mental integrity) of the 2018 FCE foresees a more extensive maximum limit of five years in serious cases and/or in the case of repetition. Moreover, art. 11 of the 2018 FCE stipulates that, where more than one breach has been committed, the sanction other than monetary sanctions shall be based on the most serious breach, and increased up to one third as appropriate, depending on the specific circumstances.
84. In the present case, the Panel considers that, while both breaches are serious, the principal violation committed by Mr Aghazada was that of the protection of physical and mental integrity (art. 23 of the 2018 FCE). In reaching such consideration, the

adjudicatory chamber reasoned that Mr Aghazada's actions as depicted above had direct consequences on the integrity of the victim players, who were subjected to sexual abuse from Mr Karim, which Mr Aghazada failed to prevent or stop.

85. In view of the above, and in accordance with the content of arts. 11 and 23 par. 6 of the 2018 FCE, the adjudicatory chamber concludes that, in the present case, the duration of the ban to be imposed for the most serious breach has a maximum limit of five years and that the maximum applicable sanction (for the two concurrent infringements) can be increased up to one third as appropriate.
86. At this point, the adjudicatory chamber reaffirms that FIFA has a zero-tolerance policy on human rights violations and condemns all forms of gender-based violence.
87. In conclusion and taking into account all of the above considerations and circumstances of the case, the Panel decides that a ban on taking part in any football-related activity (administrative, sports or any other) at national and international level for a period of five years is appropriate and commensurate. In accordance with art. 42 par. 1 of the 2018 FCE, the ban shall come into force as soon as the decision is communicated.
88. In the present case, the adjudicatory chamber is of the opinion that the imposition of a ban on taking part in any football-related activity is not sufficient to sanction the misconduct of Mr Aghazada adequately, in particular given the gravity of the matter, and the damage caused to the victim players, as well as to the image and reputation of the AFF (and Afghan football) due to the official's failure to act appropriately. Hence, the adjudicatory chamber considers that the ban imposed on Mr Aghazada should be completed with a fine, a financial sanction with a strictly punitive purpose in the present case.
89. The amount of the fine shall not be less than CHF 300 and not more than CHF 1,000,000 (art. 6 par. 2 of the 2018 FCE in conjunction with art. 15 par. 1 and 2 of the FDC). In the case at hand, the adjudicatory chamber determines that a fine of CHF 10,000 would be appropriate. Accordingly, Mr Aghazada shall pay a fine of CHF 10,000.

## **G. Procedural costs and procedural compensation**

90. The procedural costs are made up of the costs and expenses of the investigation and adjudicatory proceedings (art. 54 of the 2019 FCE).
91. Mr Aghazada has been found guilty of violations of art. 17 and art. 23 of the 2019 FCE and has been sanctioned accordingly. The adjudicatory chamber deems that no exceptional circumstances apply to the present case that would justify deviating from the general principle regarding the bearing of the costs. Thus, the adjudicatory chamber rules that Mr Aghazada shall bear the procedural costs (art. 56 par. 1 of the 2019 FCE).
92. In the present case, the costs and expenses of the ethics proceedings – including a hearing before the adjudicatory chamber – add up to [...].

93. According to art. 57 of the 2019 FCE, no procedural compensation shall be awarded in proceedings conducted by the Ethics Committee. Consequently, Mr Aghazada shall bear his own legal and other costs incurred in connection with these proceedings.

### **III. has therefore decided**

1. Mr Sayed Aghazada is found guilty of an infringement of art. 17 (Duty to report) and art. 23 (Protection of physical and mental integrity) of the FIFA Code of Ethics, in relation to his awareness of and failure to report and prevent the sexual abuse committed by Mr Keramuudin Karim, former President of the Afghanistan Football Federation (AFF), against several female players in the period 2013 – 2018.
2. Mr Sayed Aghazada is hereby banned from taking part in any kind of football-related activity at national and international level (administrative, sports or any other) for a period of 5 years, as of notification of the present decision, in accordance with article 7 lit. j) of the FIFA Code of Ethics in conjunction with art. 6 par. 2 lit. c) of the FIFA Disciplinary Code.
3. Mr Sayed Aghazada shall pay a fine in the amount of CHF 10,000 within 30 days of notification of the present decision. Payment can be made either in Swiss francs (CHF) to account no. [...] or in US dollars (USD) to account no. [...], with reference to case no. "*Adj. ref. no. 23/2019 (Ethics E19-00011)*" in accordance with art. 7 let. e) of the FIFA Code of Ethics.
4. Mr Sayed Aghazada shall pay costs of these ethics proceedings in the amount of [...] within 30 days of notification of the present decision, which shall be paid according to the modalities stipulated under point 3. above.
5. Mr Sayed Aghazada shall bear his own legal and other costs incurred in connection with the present proceedings.
6. This decision is sent to Mr Sayed Aghazada. A copy of the decision is sent to the AFF, the AFC, the chairperson of the investigatory chamber of the FIFA Ethics Committee, Ms Maria Claudia Rojas, and to the chief of investigation, Ms Janet Katisya.

---

### **LEGAL ACTION:**

In accordance with art. 82 par. 1 of the FCE and art. 58 par. 1 of the FIFA Statutes, this decision can be appealed against to the Court of Arbitration of Sport ("CAS") in Lausanne, Switzerland ([www.tas-cas.org](http://www.tas-cas.org)). The statement of appeal must be sent directly to CAS within 21 days of notification of this decision. Within another ten (10) days following

the expiry of the time limit for filing the statement of appeal, the appellant shall file with CAS a brief stating the facts and legal arguments giving rise to the appeal (see art. R51 of the Code of Sports-related Arbitration).

FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE  
DE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'V. Skouris', is centered below the text of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association.

Vassilios Skouris  
Chairman of the adjudicatory chamber  
of the FIFA Ethics Committee