

IN THE MATTER OF

ENGLAND BOXING

-and-

MR. PAUL ROSENDALE

DISCIPLINARY PANEL DECISION

A. Introduction

- 1. This is the written decision of the Disciplinary Panel comprising Kathryn Hovington (Chair), [REDACTED] and Mark Harper KC in the matter of Mr. Paul Rosendale pursuant to the England Boxing Disciplinary Procedure (“**the Procedure**”).
- 2. The hearing was held remotely using Zoom on Thursday 22 May 2025.
- 3. England Boxing were represented by Anthony Sheppard (“**Mr. Sheppard**”). Mr. Rosendale attended and represented himself. He was accompanied by [REDACTED]

B. The Charges

- 5. The Charges presented by EB were as follows:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b.

- i. On 04 September 2022 following the course and via digital media, and following the verbal request, Mr. Rosendale made the request again for the female official to join a threesome with him.
- ii. At the beginning of the hearing the Panel raised with EB whether it was intended that this charge be conditional on Charge 1. Mr. Sheppard confirmed

that was not the intention. In these circumstances and with the consent of Mr. Rosendale, the charge was amended to read:

On 04 September 2022 following the course and via digital media, Mr. Rosendale made a request for the female official to join a threesome with him (**“Charge 2”**);

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- e. The above behaviours have taken place during Mr. Rosendale’s appointment in roles as an England Boxing Official and England Boxing Officials Educator.
6. EB contended that the Charges amounted to breaches of the following policies operated by EB (**“the EB Policies”**):
- i. Equity & Inclusion Policy - Section 4 paragraphs 3 and 4;
  - ii. Social Media Policy – Page 3 at (3), page 6 and pages 7 and 8 (points 3 and 8);
  - iii. Code of Conduct – Page 19;
  - iv. Individual Membership Policy – Pages 2 and 3 Section 5.

7. The response of Mr. Rosendale to the Charges was as follows:

[REDACTED]

- b. Charge 2 – the sending of the request via digital media was admitted but he wished to put the same in context. It was implicit in this position that Mr. Rosendale was denying that his conduct contravened the EB Policies.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

8. Mr. Rosendale also made the point that the Equity & Inclusion Policy and the Code of Conduct relied upon were not in force at the date of Charges 1 and Charges 2. Whilst this did not turn

out to be material for the reasons set out below, the Panel was of the view that it would assist in future if each disciplinary charge could be referenced to the relevant parts of each policy relied upon and that consideration is given to the relevant policies that were in force at the relevant time.

**C. Preliminary Matters**

9. At the outset of the hearing the Panel considered a request by Mr. Rosendale to rely upon, notwithstanding that the same had not been provided within the time laid down in the Procedure, (a) further documents and (b) evidence from four witnesses. The Panel asked Mr. Rosendale to explain the issues relating to the Charges that the evidence from the witnesses was intended to address. He informed the Panel that one witness [REDACTED] was a character witness and that the other three witnesses would address the behaviour of the complainants at England Boxing events, not including the Officials Course referred to in Charges 1 and 2.
10. England Boxing did not oppose the introduction of and reliance on the further documents nor the evidence of [REDACTED]. It did oppose the introduction of and reliance on the evidence of the further witnesses on the ground that the evidence was not relevant to the conduct of Mr. Rosendale which was the subject of the Charges and which the Panel was being asked to consider.
11. The Panel took time for consideration. The Panel informed the parties that it would allow the introduction of and reliance upon the further documents (these were referred to as Appendix 9) and the evidence of [REDACTED] but that it would not permit the introduction of and reliance on the evidence of the further witnesses. The Panel stated that it would provide its reasons when it set out its written reasons on the determination of the Charges.
12. The reason why the Panel refused to allow Mr. Rosendale to introduce and rely upon the evidence of the further witnesses was that it agreed with the submission made by England Boxing. How the complainants may or may not have acted on other occasions was of no relevance to the determination of the issues underlying the Charges which were solely concerned with the actions of Mr. Rosendale.

**D. The Hearing**

13.
  - a. The Panel heard opening statements from both parties, evidence from [REDACTED] and closing statements from both parties. EB did not call evidence from the two complainants, adducing instead the statements that they had made to EB.
  - b. Having heard the same (the Panel having previously read all the materials provided to them) and considering the decision in private, the Panel informed the parties of the unanimous decision set out below and stated that it would provide written reasons. Both

parties confirmed at the end of the hearing that they considered that they had had a fair hearing.

### E. Determination

14. The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proving the Charges (including the facts underlying the same and the breaches of the EB Policies) was on England Boxing and that the standard of proof was the balance of probabilities.

Charge 1

[illegible]

[REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

Charge 2

17. The sending of the message was admitted by Mr. Rosendale. It was sent on the following day from the events referred to in paragraph 15 above. It was sent to A. Mr. Rosendale says that it has to be viewed in the context of the events of the previous evening and in particular A being the friend of B who was in a sexual relationship with Mr. Rosendale.
18. The Panel dealt with this charge under the Social-Media Policy. The Panel did not see how the Equity & Inclusion Policy (even if it was operative in some form in September 2023) was engaged as the message was not discriminatory and Mr. Rosendale was not a service user. The Code of Conduct (even if the relevant part was operative in some form in September 2023) and the Individual Membership Policy did not add anything to the Social-Media Policy in the sense that if there was no breach of the Social-Media Policy it was not seen how there could be a breach of the Code of Conduct or the Individual Membership Policy.
19. The sending of the message falls within the Social-Media Policy as that policy covers instant messaging platforms. It was (subject to the point addressed in paragraph 20 below) a breach of that policy as it was, when viewed objectively, offensive, harassing, embarrassing, intimidating

and/or otherwise inappropriate. It is irrelevant if (as Mr. Rosendale contended) he believed that A would not find it so bearing in mind the discussions he had had with her on the previous evening. Equally it is irrelevant whether A was offended or not. The reaction (expected or otherwise) of the recipient does not alter the objective nature of the message.

20. The issue is, whether in sending the message, Mr. Rosendale was acting as a member of/person representing EB such that he was subject to the Social-Media Policy. In this regard we note that the policy states: *“As part of England Boxing’s community you are an extension of the England Boxing brand. As such, the boundaries between when you are representing yourself and when you representing England Boxing an often be blurred. This becomes even more of issue as you increase your profile or position within England Boxing. Therefore, it is important that you represent both yourself and England Boxing appropriately online at all times”.*

21. The message was sent by Mr. Rosendale following a course that he had been delivering for England Boxing. A had been on that course. Her connection with Mr. Rosendale was through England Boxing. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The Panel therefore determines that Mr. Rosendale, when sending the message, was subject to the Social-Media Policy.

22. In these circumstances Charge 2 is established.

Charge 3

[REDACTED]

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

[REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

[illegible]

\_\_\_\_\_

[REDACTED]

Charge 4

[REDACTED]

**F. Sanction**

29. Charge 2 having been proved the Panel considered whether it was appropriate to impose a sanction and if so, the appropriate sanction by reference to the Procedure.
30. Mr. Rosendale has been the subject of an interim suspension as from 14 March 2025. That relates to all England Boxing activity.
31. We have taken account of the evidence given by [REDACTED] and the mitigation proffered by Mr. Rosendale. In this latter regard, we have noted, in particular, the contribution that Mr. Rosendale has made to England Boxing, his expressions of remorse and the steps that he is taking to address the underlying behaviours that gave rise to the Charges.
32. The Panel considers that it is appropriate to impose a sanction. The behaviour the subject of Charge 2 is serious and was fundamentally inconsistent with the work of England Boxing in seeking to encourage more females to become involved in boxing, coaching and officiating and creating a culture where everyone feels welcome to so get involved. The Panel also noted in this regard the position of Mr. Rosendale as an official and educator of officials.
33. The Panel considers that the appropriate sanction is a suspension from all England Boxing activity for a period of 10 weeks commencing on 14 March 2025. The result of this will be that the suspension will come to an end on 23 May 2025.
34. The Panel did consider whether Mr. Rosendale should be required to attend some form of training as it was concerned that Mr. Rosendale was of the view that how a female acts (or is perceived to act) should determine what is/is not appropriate to say/send to her and that the appropriateness or otherwise of communications should be determined by the absence (apparent or otherwise) of offence on the part of the recipient. Having given it due consideration, the Panel was of the view that this would not be necessary as it expected that the experience of dealing with the Charges, his remorse and the steps he was taking to address his underlying behaviours coupled with this decision, should be sufficient.
35. There was no application for costs.

**G. Right of Appeal**

36. A right of appeal is available to both England Boxing and Mr. Rosendale in accordance with the Procedure.

**Kathryn Hovington**



**Mark Harper KC**

**Dated:**