



IN THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE GHANA FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION

Protest Case: No. P 7 – 2021

CORAM

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Osei Kwadwo Adow, Esq. | - | Chairman |
| 2. Mr. Emmanuel Nikoi | - | Member |
| 3. Mr. Nathaniel Laryea | - | Member |
-

TAMALE CITY FC vrs TECHIMAN CITY FC

**PROTEST IN RESPECT OF THEIR DIVISION ONE LEAGUE MATCH
PLAYED AT OHENE AMEYAW PARK, TECHIMAN**

PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Article 56 of the GFA Statutes (2019) and Articles 35(9) of the GFA Division One League Regulations, this Disciplinary Committee (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) considered the depositions from Tamale City FC (hereinafter referred to as “the Petitioner”) and the Statement of Defence from Techiman City FC (hereinafter referred to as “the Respondent”) with their supporting attachments, the reports of the match officials and the video of the match.

SUMMARY OF FACTS

CASE OF TAMALE CITY FC

Tamale City FC (the Petitioner) protested against Techiman City FC (the Respondent) for acts of supporters of the home team which caused the abrupt end of their Division One League Matchday 15 match played at the Ohene Ameyaw park, Techiman in contravention of Article 33(1)(a) and (b) and Article 34.4 of the Division One League Regulations.

The Petitioner consequently prayed the Committee to declare Techiman City FC as losers of the said match in accordance with Article 33(12) of the GFA Division One League Regulations and that Techiman City should forfeit the match in accordance with Article 33(1)(b) of the Division One League Regulations and Article 14(1) of the GFA Disciplinary Code accordingly.

The Petitioner further prayed to be awarded three points and three goals in respect of the said match in accordance with Article 33(2) and 33(10) of the Division One League Regulations and Article 22(2) of the Disciplinary Code.

Additionally, the Petitioner prayed the Committee for Techiman City to be deducted three points and three goals from the Clubs accumulated points pursuant to Article 33(5)(b)

and also apply Article 33(5)(c) of the Division One League Regulations against the Respondent.

DEFENCE OF TECHIMAN CITY FC

In its Statement of Defence, Techiman City described the protest filed by Tamale City Football Club as frivolous and without merit.

Techiman City Football Club stated that it did not cause the abrupt end of the game as stated by the Petitioner. According to the Respondents, the appointed Referee Mr. Moro Iddrisu went for recess and refused to continue with the game after complaining of an unidentified fan used unprintable words against his mother.

On claims that a hoodlum threatened the lives of the match officials at the Pre-match Technical meeting, the Respondents stated that, Assistant One Alice Farizua Chakule, Assistant Two Emmanuel Opoku and the 4th Referee Ali Asante arrived at 10:42 am on the said date for Pre-technical meeting and the Centre Referee Moro Iddrisu arrived when we were having our closing prayer.

The Respondent stated that it will not have been possible for a hoodlum to storm Pre-Match technical meeting when the referees were not part.

The Respondent also stated that the claim by the Petitioner that before recess, the home fans invaded the inner perimeter to attack the match officials was untrue.

Techiman City further indicated that adequate security was provided for the game and that the security was reinforced following the request from Mr. Iddrisu Moro, the Centre referee.

The Respondents therefore concluded that it did not position themselves for the match not to continue and the lives of the match officials were not endangered at any time.

FINDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE DECISION

The Petitioner stated that the Respondent should suffer forfeiture for violating Article 33(1)(a) and (b) and Article 34(4) of the Division One League Regulations.

The Petitioner had alleged that Techiman City FC caused the abrupt end of the match played between the two clubs at the Ohene Ameyaw Park, Techiman.

The Committee considered all the evidence of the match (match officials reports and the video of the match) and finds that the game was halted on 37th minute after supporters of the home team entered the into the inner perimeter.

The Referee Report and the video of the match clearly indicated that the referee halted the game after the fans who entered the inner perimeter threatened him.

The game however, progressed till the end of the first half. Both the Referee and the Match Commissioner stressed that contrary to the GFA Directives and the GFA's Covid-19 Matchday Protocols that the match was to be played behind closed doors, the home team allowed fans into the stands at the stadium.

The Committee finds that that after the blast of the whistle for the end of the first half, fans of the home team approached the referees and attempted to physically attack them.

The Committee also found that attempts by the Police on duty to prevent physical assaults on the referees resulted in a fight between the supporters and the police. As a result of the fight, the Committee found that two policemen, Constables Pius Ennin and Dominic Frimpong sustained various degrees of injuries.

The Committee further found that the police managed to send the match officials to the dressing room unharmed and waited for reinforcement team arrived.

The Match Commissioner however added that the Police Divisional Commander informed the match officials that he was withdrawing all policemen from the match venue due to the attack on two of his men.

It is the finding of the Committee that the match did not continue after the threat by the supporters, the injuries to the policemen and the statement by the Police Divisional Commander to withdraw the police personnel present at the venue due to the attack on his men.

The relevant regulation on this matter is very clear. Article 33(1)(a) and (b) of the Division One League Regulations read as follows:

A team commits an offence punishable by forfeiture of a match where:

- a. that team walks off the field of play or refuses to continue play.*
- b. that team positions itself in such a way as to render the progress of the game impossible or the player(s) or **supporter(s) of the team initiate(s) an act responsible for the abrupt end of the match.***

It is the finding of this Committee that the acts of the supporters of the home team on the 37th minute and at the end of the first half seen in the video led to the abrupt end of the match. Techiman City FC were, thus, caught in the web of Article 33.1(a)(b) of the Division One League Regulations.

The second part of the regulation is very instructive on the subject matter. It simply punishes the club to which, the official(s) or the player(s) or the supporter(s) who **initiates the act responsible** for the end of the match belongs to.

It is the finding of the Committee that the supporters of Techiman City FC (who should not be in the stadium due to COVID-19 protocols in the first place) were the initiators of the acts which led to the abrupt end of the match.

The supporters of Techiman City FC initiated acts against the match officials that led to the abrupt end of the match.

This conduct of the officials and supporters of the home team is a subject of a misconduct charge and therefore this Committee shall reserve specific comments about it.

It is the holding of this this Committee that the Protest of Tamale City FC shall succeed.

DECISIONS

The Committee therefore makes the following decisions:

1. That for Techiman City FC initiating the acts responsible for causing the abrupt end of the match, Techiman FC shall forfeit the match in accordance with Article 33(1)(b) of the Division One League Regulations.
2. That having been found to have forfeited the match, Techiman City FC shall be considered as having lost the match in accordance with Articles 33(2) and 34(12) and accordingly, three points and three (3) goals are hereby awarded in favour of Tamale City FC.
3. That in addition, being the defaulting club, Techiman City FC shall lose three (3) points from the club's accumulated points from their previous matches pursuant to Article 33(5)(a) of the Division One League Regulations.
4. That in addition, being the defaulting club, Techiman City FC is hereby fined Two Thousand and Five Hundred Ghana Cedis (GH¢2,500.00) payable to the GFA, 50% of which shall be paid to Tamale City FC pursuant to Article 33(5)(b) of the Division One League Regulations.
5. That in addition, being the defaulting club and being the Home Team, Techiman City FC is hereby ordered to pay an amount of Five Hundred Ghana Cedis (GH¢500.00) payable to the GFA, which shall be paid to Tamale City FC as their Transportation Cost as the Away Team pursuant to Article 33(5)(c) of the Division One League Regulations.
6. That the fines mentioned in Decisions 4 and 5 above, shall be paid to the GFA within fourteen (14) days upon receipt of this Ruling, failing which Techiman City FC shall forfeit their subsequent matches after the said deadline.
7. That should any party be dissatisfied with or aggrieved by this Decision, the party has within one (1) day of being notified of this Ruling to appeal to the Appeals Committee of the Ghana Football Association {See Article 35(10) of the Division One League Regulations}.



Osei Kwadwo Addo, Esq.
Chairman, Disciplinary Committee
Wednesday, May 5, 2021