



**IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUG UNDER THE RULES
OF THE DARTS REGULATION AUTHORITY**

BETWEEN:

DARTS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Regulatory Body for Darts

-and-

PRAKASH JIWA

Respondent

**DECISION
OF
THE DRA DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

INTRODUCTION

1. The Disciplinary Committee (the Committee) of the Darts Regulation Authority (DRA) convened for a hearing (the Hearing) on 28 February 2025 to consider a case involving Prakash Jiwa (Jiwa). The Hearing was convened remotely, with only the Committee present.
2. In a written ruling dated 18 February 2025 and following a Hearing on 21 January 2025, the Committee found that Jiwa had fixed the outcome of four matches between 16 February and 1 June 2023 and passed information relating to this to a bettor. He was found to be in breach of eight charges in relation to DRA Rules, as set out at Appendix A.

3. Additionally, at the 21 January Hearing, Jiwa accepted a breach of Appendix A, Rule 2.1.1 (i) of DRA Rules in that on or before 13 August 2024 he placed bets on Premier League darts matches.
4. Having made this ruling, the parties were invited to provide submissions on sanction to the Committee by 25 February 2025.
5. A written submission dated 18 February was received from the DRA inviting the Committee to suspend Jiwa for ten years and order him to pay the DRA's costs for the case of £17,741.46.
6. The DRA stated that *"match fixing and match manipulation are rightly seen as a cancer to sport and sports such as darts, which depends on individual skill, and competitions such as the Modus Super Series (where relatively low ranked players are invited to play) are particularly vulnerable to match manipulation and match fixing."*
7. The DRA cited two examples of what it stated were *"equivalent"* cases;
 - 7.1 DRA v Kyle McKinstry (25 November 2020) whereby McKinstry was suspended for 6.5 years for fixing two matches, one of which was admitted and the other contested by the Player. A consecutive suspension of one and a half years was also imposed for failing to provide his phone billing which he contested.
 - 7.2 DRA v Billy Warriner and Leighton Bennett (29 November 2024) whereby the Committee imposed a total suspension of eight years on Bennett who fixed four matches in which he played, failed to assist the investigation, and signed a contract with an unregistered agent. Bennett admitted the charges against him.
8. The DRA submitted that Jiwa's case was more serious than that of McKinstry as it involved more matches. It was also more serious than the Bennett case as whilst it involved the same number of charges, Jiwa was deserving of a longer sanction for following reasons:
 - 8.1 Jiwa contested the allegations and required a full hearing.
 - 8.2 Jiwa has no mitigation. He cannot claim to have been pressured or seduced into the corrupt activity (in contrast to Bennett who was persuaded to engage in fixing by Warriner).

8.3 Unlike Bennett, Jiwa is a mature and experienced player.

8.4 The clear inference in Jiwa's case is that he saw a chance to make money for himself and his friend and then set out to do so.

9. The DRA invited the Committee to exercise its power under section 20.1 of the DRA Rules to order Jiwa to pay the DRA's costs in full, a total of £17,741.46. An amended DRA schedule detailing these costs was received by the Committee on 27 February 2025.

10. On 23 February 2025, a written submission was received from the Professional Darts Players Association (PDPA) on behalf of Jiwa which stated that any sanction should not exceed five years and that no costs should be awarded.

11. In summary, Jiwa made a number of submissions in respect of sanctions:

11.1 The McKinstry and Warriner/ Bennett cases were not relevant to Jiwa's case as they were not the subject of initial investigation by the Gambling Commission and therefore not as serious as the Jiwa case.

11.2 Unlike McKinstry and Bennett, Jiwa provided his full phone and bank statements for examination, and attended all interviews when requested to do so by the DRA. Jiwa also co-operated with the Gambling Commission investigation.

11.3 Whilst Jiwa admitted deleting some text messages from his phone, he had explained that this was done to keep information from his wife and before he was notified of any DRA investigation.

11.4 The The Warrener/ Bennett case was more serious because of the amounts bet and amounts given to Bennett in cash.

11.5 Jiwa did not receive any notice before or during the hearing that he would be liable for costs and had not been provided with sufficient information to judge whether the costs claimed by the DRA were justified.

11.6 Jiwa had suffered significant financial loss during his period of suspension as a result of not being able to compete in Darts events.

DECISION

12. Having considered the evidence presented to the Hearing and taken note of the written submissions provided by the parties, it falls to the Committee to consider an appropriate sanction in respect of Jiwa.
13. In determining this sanction, the Committee is cognisant of the need to protect the integrity, image, and reputation of the sport of Darts. To achieve this, a sanction is required that:
 - provides an appropriate level of punishment;
 - deters others from engaging in such conduct;
 - demonstrates an intolerance of such behaviour by its investigation, discovery, and sanction; and
 - is proportionate to the seriousness of the breach and its circumstances.
14. At the outset, it is the Committee's clear position that offences involving match fixing can have no place in the sport of Darts. It is a corrosive practice that undermines the integrity of the sport. It is unfair on players, spectators, and sponsors. Where it is identified, the Committee has a duty to impose sanctions that reflect the seriousness of the offence, as well as punishing offenders and deterring future offences. Put simply, there can be no place in the sport for such behaviour.
15. Jiwa's submission refers to the Gambling Commission investigation of him and the fact that this was discontinued. It also makes a number of inferences drawn from the fact that the McKinstry and Warriner/ Bennett cases were not subject to such investigation.
16. It is the Committee's view that any investigation by the Gambling Commission is not directly relevant to the case presented by the DRA, whilst accepting that some of the evidence presented by the DRA was initially obtained by the Commission as a result of its investigation. The Gambling Commission investigation and any reason for its discontinuation is not therefore of direct relevance to this Hearing.
17. Likewise, the fact that other match fixing cases pursued by the DRA were not subject to investigation by the Gambling Commission has no bearing on this case.

18. In the McKinstry case, a suspension of six and a half years was imposed in respect of two fixed matches; one charge being admitted by the Player, the other denied. The Committee takes the view that the Jiwa case is more serious as it involved four matches on three separate dates, all of which were denied by Jiwa.
19. The Committee views the Bennett case as a closer comparator. This also involved four matches played on two separate dates, two days apart. Whilst Bennett accepted the charges against him, this was done following a lengthy investigation that could have been foreshortened had the Player done so at an earlier stage. The credit given to Bennett for his plea was limited for this reason. This resulted in a suspension of seven and a half years for match fixing.
20. The Committee accepts some of the submissions made on behalf of Jiwa in respect of the Bennett case but considers that, in terms of sanction, Jiwa's case is more serious.
21. The Committee also considered the suspension imposed on Warriner in the Warriner/ Bennett case. Although his role related principally to the placing of bets and he was not involved as a player, like Jiwa he is also a PDPA associate member and a regular competitor at events.
22. Warriner accepted his role in the fixing of four matches and provided an explanation of his role. There were also aggravating features relevant to his sanction, not least the fact that he took the lead in involving Bennett in match fixing. Warriner was suspended for eight years for match fixing.
23. In respect of the eight match fixing charges, Jiwa has not accepted any culpability during either the investigation or the Hearing. He is an experienced darts player and a mature man who, in the view of the Committee, freely entered into a scheme to fix matches with a work colleague. There is no evidence that he was either coerced or deceived into pursuing this course of conduct on different dates over a period of time from 16 February until 2 June 2023.
24. For these reasons, the Committee finds no factors to mitigate any sanction in respect of Jiwa.
25. Section 20.1 of the DRA Rules permit the Committee the discretion to award costs incurred as a result of proceedings or investigation undertaken by the DRA in relation to proceedings. In this case, the Committee is satisfied that the schedule of costs submitted by the DRA is both accurate and justified. It also takes the view

that these costs were incurred as a result of the position adopted by Jiwa during both the DRA investigation and the Hearing.

26. Whilst the Committee accepts Jiwa's submission in respect of his potential financial losses during his period of suspension, it does not consider this to be a relevant factor when considering the issue of costs.

SANCTION

27. For the reasons set out above, Jiwa is sanctioned as follows:

27.1 For charges 1 – 8 set out at Appendix A relating to the four fixed matches in which he was involved at the Modus Super Series events, Jiwa is suspended for a period of eight years;

27.2 For the breach of DRA Rules relating to betting on Premier League darts matches prior to 13 August 2024, Jiwa is suspended for a period of six months. This suspension will be concurrent with his other sanction.

28. Additionally, Jiwa is ordered to pay costs of £17,741.46. These costs are payable by 31 December 2026 or such other date as the DRA may agree at its discretion.

29. Jiwa's suspension period is deemed to have started on 7 November 2023, the date on which he was first suspended by the DRA and will end at 23.59 on 6 November 2031 or on receipt of full payment of the costs, whichever is the later date.

SUMMARY

30. For proven breaches of eight DRA rules relating to allegations of match fixing in respect of four separate matches at Modus Super Series events and one breach of DRA Rules relating to betting on Darts matches, Jiwa is suspended from playing in or being involved in any way in any DRA regulated events for a total period of eight years and ordered to pay £17,741.46. costs. The suspension will end on 6 November 2031.

Tarik Shamel, Chair
Tim Ollerenshaw
Dave Jones

5 March 2025

APPENDIX A

Charge 1

On or before 16 February 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and Owen Bates on 16 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

Charge 2

On or before 16 February 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and Owen Bates on 16 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)

Charge 3

On or before 17 February 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and Adam Hunt on 17 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

Charge 4

On or before 17 February 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and Adam Hunt on 17 February 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)

Charge 5

On or before 1 June 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and Peter Hudson on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

Charge 6

On or before 1 June 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and Peter Hudson on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)

Charge 7

On or before 1 June 2023 you fixed or contrived or were a party to an effort to fix or contrive the result or score of a Darts match played between yourself and William Borland on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A Rules 2.1.2 (i) and 2.2.

Charge 8

On or before 1 June 2023 you provided information to be used for betting purposes to another person or persons and that information included the fact that you would contrive the score and/or outcome of the Match played between yourself and William Borland on 1 June 2023 at the Modus Super Series event in Portsmouth.

Contrary to DRA Rules, Appendix A, Rule 2.1.3 (i)