

IN THE MATTER OF

BETWEEN:

ENGLAND BOXING

- and -

MR MICHAEL MORRIS

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE DECISION

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This is the written decision of the England Boxing Disciplinary Committee (“**DC**”) consisting of Mr John Roderick (Chair), Mr Matthew Ross and Mr Jon Dennis in the matter of Mr Michael Morris (“**MM**”) presented by England Boxing (“**EB**”) in accordance with s.12 of the England Boxing Disciplinary Code (the “**Code**”) version 1.1 (dated 28 February 2023).

2. HEARING

Hearing particulars

2.1 The DC has been formed under s.12.1 of the Code due to EB considering the case not appropriate for the Summary Procedure (as defined in the Code) and a full disciplinary procedure required due to the severity of the offence.

2.2 The DC sat on Tuesday 27 May 2025 at 6:00pm, virtually via Zoom.

2.3 The panel was attended by the DC and Mr Anthony Sheppard (“**AS**”) on behalf of EB. MM did not attend the hearing and requested for the matter to be dealt with by papers in his email to AS dated 22 May 2025.

2.4 Prior to the hearing the DC was provided documentation by AS on behalf of EB consisting of:

- (a) the MM disciplinary panel pack;
- (b) the emailed response from MM to AS;
- (c) a copy of the EB Code of Conduct with alleged offences highlighted;
- (d) a copy of the Code; and
- (e) a copy of the EB Individual Membership Policy with alleged offences highlighted.

Breaches reported by EB

2.5 At the hearing the DC were asked to consider the evidence put forward by AS in support of the allegations made against MM in relation to two key elements:

- (a) breaches of the Code of Conduct, specifically:
 - (i) protect themselves and others involved in the sport from verbal or physical abuse and threatening or intimidating behaviour;
 - (ii) never use inappropriate language or gestures; and

- (b) breaches of the Individual Membership Policy, specifically section 5 '*Responsibilities of Individual Members*'.

Burden and standard of proof

- 2.6 The burden of proving the breaches was on EB.
- 2.7 The applicable standard of proof was the balance of probability meaning that the DC will need to be satisfied that the breaches put forth by EB, based on the evidence provided and mitigating points raised, if any by MM, were more likely than not a breach of the Policy.

Jurisdiction

- 2.8 In accordance with ss2 and 4 of the Code the DC shall have jurisdiction to deal with the matter.
- 2.9 The DC found that the Code can be applied to MM as he was actively involved with EB at the time of the accused breaches.

Facts and Submissions

- 2.10 The DC read evidence and submissions provided by EB and heard the case presented by AS. The below is a summary of that material. The DC took account of all that is heard and read.
- 2.11 EB set out their case in the following manner:
- (a) On 25 March 2025 EB received a complaint from the regional welfare office from the London Region relating to an incident at Cricklewood ABC where a member had allegedly threatened other members with a knife during a training session on 23 March 2025.
 - (b) The member, MM, making the threats with a knife is a registered member at Cricklewood ABC and was registered to complete his Level 1 coaching qualification and had at that stage completed his Safeguarding Certification, however no first aid or DBS certificates had been issued.
 - (c) It is noted that at the point of the complaint, EB and the educator made the decision to suspend the training course MM was enrolled on (and part way through) due to the health and safety concerns of the other members.
 - (d) MM was barred from the club by Mr Buick, the head coach of Cricklewood ABC, and no interim suspension was put in place by EB because MM was not affiliated to any other club and does not hold any coaching qualification.
- 2.12 The alleged offences are based on the following key details:
- (a) Mr Buick, head coach at Cricklewood ABC, requested MM to attend the gym on Sunday 23 March 2025 to check a water pump that was operating to drain a flooded area of the basement.
 - (b) MM attended the gym and is alleged to have sat on the main gym floor reading a book. When one of the members training in the gym that day (with a second member) spoke to and questioned MM about the book he was reading a verbal altercation ensued which led to a physical altercation with the second member, later leading to MM heading to the kitchen of the gym and wielding a bread knife, chasing the second member around the gym and swiping at him with the knife.
 - (c) There is also an allegation that MM had disconnected the CCTV in the gym before this incident occurred, however this is not proven and no further action has been taken on this point, but Mr Buick noted to EB that the cameras had been disconnected and an engineer was required to be called out to fix the cameras after the incident on the 23rd.
 - (d) Of the three witnesses, two were involved in the altercation with MM and one the panel classes as independent. There are three individual witness statements provided by

members of EB who were either training or attending the gym that day that all state the same details of the case:

- (i) MM was in the gym and caused a verbal altercation;
 - (ii) he escalated this to a physical altercation, getting into a fight with one of the training members; and
 - (iii) further escalated the matter by wielding a knife and attempted to cut and swipe at the member.
- (e) Further points to note:
- (i) EB have stated that when presenting the case to MM and attempting to contact him to obtain his version of the events, EB and AS found it difficult to contact MM due to his registration details on the Locker. These appeared to be purposely vague so as to make communication difficult.
 - (ii) EB stated that MM initially denied all offences alleged before accepting the offences in his email correspondence to AS on 22 May 2025, accepting all the charges presented to him.
 - (iii) In MM's email response on 22 May 2025, he takes ownership of the offences alleged but does not provide any mitigating circumstances, additional evidence, or a different version of events. No character witnesses were submitted for consideration. He stated that he let himself down and hopes to continue coaching.

Determination

- 2.13 The DC took account of all the written and live evidence presented by AS and considered the appropriate decision of the panel.
- 2.14 The DC determined that the main points of concern were:
- (a) there was no evidence provided that proved MM disconnected the CCTV so the DC considered this to be a point of concern but not necessarily something that could be relied upon. However, the DC determined that if it was MM who disconnected the CCTV that this would give evidence of a pre-meditated action by MM and therefore be an aggravating factor;
 - (b) the quick escalation by MM to move from a verbal altercation to a physical one before picking up and wielding an offensive weapon and proceeding to chase and try to attack another member with this;
 - (c) the vague details provided by MM on the EB membership system, the Locker, making it difficult to contact and liaise with MM, especially after a serious event as alleged here;
 - (d) the short time that MM has been a member with EB and for an event this serious to occur was a strong point of concern. The DC understood that MM had only been a member of EB since January 2025. For such a serious offence to have occurred only 3 months into MM's membership was a key concern for the DC;
 - (e) a lack of DBS certificate before attending MM's Level 1 coaching course. The DC is aware that a satisfactory DBS result is not required prior to commencing a coaching course however the lack of being able to provide one and the DBS service returning MM's application due to the address provided being problematic was of concern; and
 - (f) the lack of remorse from MM in his email response to AS accepting the offences. MM did not take advantage of the ability to attend the hearing nor did he offer an alternative view of events. MM's email did not provide any mitigating circumstances or an apology.

The panel is not aware of any apology to; the victims, Cricklewood ABC nor the participants in the course which was suspended.

- 2.15 Considering the points at paragraph 2.14 the DC made the following determinations of facts on the balance of probabilities;
- (a) there was evidence provided that supported the offences alleged at paragraphs 2.5(a) and (b) above;
 - (b) there was not enough evidence provided that determined whether or not MM disconnected the CCTV equipment in the gym; and
 - (c) MM accepted the offences alleged.

3. **OUTCOME**

- 3.1 The actions of MM during the incident are considered very serious and are a direct breach of the EB Code of Conduct and Individual Membership Policy.
- 3.2 The DC concluded that as a result of the dangerous actions of MM and the lack of any mitigating circumstance or remorse shown by MM the following sanctions are imposed:
- (a) MM is suspended permanently as a member of EB, as of the date of this decision;
 - (b) the permanent suspension shall be limited to a period of 10 years from the date of this decision; and
 - (c) following the 10-year suspension, MM shall be provided with the opportunity to re-apply as a member of EB, conditional upon the receipt of a satisfactory DBS certificate, approved by EB.

Additional points to note

- 3.3 The DC were made aware that due to MM's actions the Level 1 coaching course had to be temporarily suspended and then completely rescheduled due to the allegations made against MM and the concern for the safety of other members. By having to reschedule the training course, there was a potential for financial loss to the members who had to rearrange their schedule, potentially take additional days off from work, and to EB having to find time to provide the training course with an educator at a later date.
- 3.4 The information above was not provided to the DC until after the decision was determined, however the DC considered it important to note, after being informed of the knock-on effect of MM's actions.
- 3.5 The DC were also informed that MM was disruptive in the training course that he had attended and there had been multiple disagreements with the educator providing the course.
- 3.6 The DC makes no order for costs as none were sought.

4. **RIGHT OF APPEAL**

- 4.1 A right of appeal is available to both EB and MM in accordance with s.13 of the Code.

DocuSigned by:

ZAE9528F31AF47D...

John Roderick, Chair

On behalf of and agreed by the Disciplinary Committee

2 June 2025