

TRIBUNAL & APPEALS BOARD DETERMINATIONS

Case Ref: TA26051

Date of hearing: 20/ 08 / 2026

Hearing Type: Tribunal Hearing

Parties to the hearing

Party 1	Kaushaul Kant (FFA ID: 91052335) – Pakenham United FC
---------	---

Date of alleged offence/fixture (if applicable)

26/06/2026

PARTY 1

Determinations of Charge(s), Claim(s), Matter(s), or Misconduct(s) – as applicable:	Charge No. 1	Plea	Finding	Determination (be specific)
	Party 1 Kaushaul Kant (FFA ID: 91052335) – Pakenham United FC is charged with MP7E (serious offence) - Violent offence(s) as described in R8_5 , resulting in a penalty of 17 Matches . Party 1 wishes to contest this charge.	Not Guilty	Guilty	See Below
Other notes:				
Chair:	Name: Gayann Walker	Signature: <i>Gayann Walker</i>		
Member:	Name: William Song Loong	Signature: William Song Loong		
Member:	Name: Steve Black	Signature: Steve Black		

TRIBUNAL DETERMINATION:

1. Party 1 attended the hearing along with his legal representative, Ethan Pearce, who acted on behalf of Party 1 throughout the hearing. The Match Official also attended with an umpire support person.
2. Party 1 was charged with MP7E as described in R8_5. That section describes an offence where there is "threatening or intimidating language and/or conduct towards a Match Official."
3. On this basis, the Tribunal was of the view that it was not required to determine whether the exact words, "I'll kill you" (or words to this effect) were said by the player. It was enough for the Tribunal to determine there was threatening or intimidating language and/or conduct perceived by the Match Official.
4. The Tribunal notes the age of the Match Official, 16 years old, and that party 1 is an adult with many years of experience in football, both in Victoria and New South Wales and is a father.
5. The Tribunal determined that the Match Official:

TRIBUNAL & APPEALS BOARD DETERMINATIONS

- a. Called the FV “offline” hotline available for referees to report incidents immediately on his way home from the match;
 - b. Took contemporaneous notes of the incident (it would have been beneficial for the Tribunal to have those notes);
 - c. Completed his Dribl report approximately 30 minutes after the completion of the game; and
 - d. Took steps to report the conduct to Victoria Police.
6. The fact that the matter was reported to VicPol was significant to the Tribunal because it showed the level of threats and intimidation experienced by the Match Official. A complaint to the police is not a decision made lightly.
 7. The Tribunal relied upon the statement received from Pakenham United FC. In that statement, Pakenham admitted that it required several players to try and calm Party 1 down and to move him on. No representative from Pakenham attended the Tribunal hearing.
 8. The Tribunal further relied upon the materials from Manningham which reported that Play 1’s behaviour was aggressive, confrontational and intimidating. It also reported that Party 1 was observed repeatedly arguing with the referee which the Tribunal found was consistent with Party 1’s account of confronting the Match Official not only at the 85 minute mark but after the game as well.
 9. Party 1 accepted that he was aware of the formal process for reporting referee conduct and that this process is only available to be undertaken via a club and not an individual. Indeed, Party 1’s evidence was that he was an experienced referee. As such, the Tribunal determined that Party 1’s approach to learn the name of the Match Official was not appropriate.
 10. In all the circumstances, the Tribunal determined that the comments and demeanour of Party 1 (who admitted to losing his composure) aimed at a 16 year old child would have been and was likely a traumatic experience (in the vernacular). No Match Official should be subjected to that behaviour and it was the expectation of the Tribunal that a player, senior referee and father of a 12 year old would not conduct themselves in the manner that Party 1 did.
 11. On this basis, the Tribunal determined the charge to be made out. The Tribunal notes that Player 1 offered the Tribunal an alternative charge of MP7A or alternatively classification of the offence as R8_1, unsporting conduct.
 12. After making its decision on the charge, the Tribunal offered Party 1 an opportunity to make submissions on sanction. The majority of these submissions centred around what a suspension would mean for Party 1’s ability to watch his daughter play football. The Tribunal considered these submissions and the principles of sanctioning in sports disciplinary matters, in particular specific and general deterrence.
 13. The Tribunal was also aware that Party 1 had not been before the Tribunal or otherwise disciplined previously.
 14. On this basis, the Tribunal ascertained that discount of two matches off the recommended sanction of 17 matches was appropriate in the circumstances with the resulting sanction being a 15 match suspension.
 15. The Tribunal understands that Party 1 has already served 2 matches of this sanction. As a result, Party 1 is required to serve the remaining 13 match suspension from the date of this determination.