

IN A MATTER BEFORE:

[PUBLICATION COPY]

A DISCIPLINARY PANEL OF ENGLAND BOXING

BETWEEN:

ENGLAND BOXING

The national governing body of amateur boxing in England

-and-

SOHAIB TRIA

THE DISCIPLINARY PANEL'S DECISION AND REASONS

Details highlighted in grey in this document are to be redacted fully from any copy of it that is to be further disseminated or published (beyond its provision to England Boxing by the Disciplinary Panel Chair), for reasons given in the body of the decision, by order of the Chair.

Independent Disciplinary Panel

Mr. Craig Harris (Chair)

Mr. Andrew Street



Representation

Mr. Graham Hurst, EB Compliance and Safeguarding Manager, for England Boxing

Sohaib Tria did not attend the hearing and was unrepresented

Hearing date: 26th March 2026 (by Microsoft Teams)

INTRODUCTION

1. This matter concerned misconduct alleged against Mr. Sohaib Tria (“**ST**”) at a time when he was an England Boxing (“**EB**”) member and member of the ‘All Stars’ boxing gym, with ‘Locker’ (i.e. membership) number 223230.
2. ST had withdrawn from EB membership prior to the Disciplinary Panel (“**Panel**”) hearing and been banned from that gym. The detail, relevance and consequences of his withdrawal from membership are considered further below. He did not attend and was not represented at the hearing, which took place by virtual means on 26th March 2026.

THE CHARGE & REPLY

3. It was alleged that ST had breached the EB Code of Conduct requirement that members, *“Protect themselves and others involved in the sport from verbal or physical abuse and threatening or intimidating behaviour”*, as required under the *“Expected minimum standards of conduct”* set out at page 7 of that Code, by committing a serious violent act within a boxing setting; namely, attending the All Stars gym on 10th November 2025 and attempting to stab another boxer, [REDACTED]
4. There was no reply to charge from, or on behalf of ST.

BACKGROUND

5. On 10th November 2025, [REDACTED] of the All Stars gym, wrote an email addressed to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] In summary, [REDACTED] wrote:

“I have been asked to contact you by the police, to report an incident involving a new boxer, who transferred from another club...to us....

...He came into our club half way through training tonight with the seniors amateurs class, which he has been attending on and off, he then launched an attack with a long knife against a fellow boxer from our club. He did cut him on the top of the shoulder...”

6. The email went on to say that the offending boxer had been disarmed during the incident and managed to run away. Police were called, the matter was being investigated further and the offending boxer – said to be *“Sohaib Tria, locker number 223230”* – was being searched for. There was a suggestion that the incident might have come about as a result of a *“little argument”* between the boxers concerned, about two weeks earlier, over a bottle of water. Amongst other information provided by [REDACTED], it was said that ST was now banned from the All Stars club for life and that the police had advised she

[REDACTED]

7.

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

9. The relevance and implications of those emails will be addressed as part of the Panel's considerations and decision below.

10. EB itself became aware of the complaint about ST on 13th November 2025, according to the Disciplinary Case Overview that was provided to the Panel, albeit how EB was made aware was not clear. As one would expect, EB then initiated the disciplinary process that culminated in the Panel hearing.

11. The EB Disciplinary Case Overview said that EB made several attempts to get witness statements and updates as to the investigation from the police, who informed EB on 30th January 2026 that the criminal investigation had ceased with no further action to be taken against ST, due to a lack of any witness to events being willing to provide a statement; there having been no weapon recovered; and no CCTV provided by the boxing club concerned.

12.

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

13. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

16. ST was informed that he was charged as at §3 above on 11th March 2026 and, as has already been noted above, failed to respond thereto.
17. He had been issued with an interim suspension from all EB boxing activity on 13th November 2025 (the day EB had become aware of the complaint), pending the outcome of its investigation and the disciplinary process. That had remained in place until the date of the Panel hearing.

JURISDICTION

18. The EB Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Code clearly apply to those who are within its membership at the time of their alleged misconduct (see page 4 of the Code of Conduct and Ss2.1 & 2.4 of the Disciplinary Code). The Panel derives its jurisdiction from the wider provisions of the Disciplinary Code.
19. The Disciplinary Code is not express, however, as to EB (and therefore this Panel) having jurisdiction over a person who was a “Participant” at the time of their alleged misconduct, but has ceased to be so prior to the disciplinary proceedings concerned. ST had withdrawn from membership by the time of the Panel hearing. Indeed, the Panel was told he had done so on 11th November 2025 i.e. on the day following the alleged incident, before any EB disciplinary process was (or even could have been) initiated.
- [REDACTED]

20. The Panel considered S1.6 of the Disciplinary Code to be instructive. It reads: *“This Code shall apply to any misconduct or disciplinary matter at the sole discretion of EB”* (emphasis added). In that context, *“any misconduct”* (and so, *“disciplinary matter”*) is necessarily referring to conduct contrary to the Code of Conduct¹ to which all Participants/participants² are subject whilst members – as ST was. S1.6 of the Disciplinary Code does not restrict its application to misconduct allegedly committed by those who are still “Participants” at the time of any disciplinary action being taken.
21. S2.4 of the Disciplinary Code further provides: *“EB has disciplinary jurisdiction over any participant defined within these procedures and/or those defined by the Code of Conduct”* (emphasis added).
22. It follows, in the Panel’s view, that the EB disciplinary process retains jurisdiction over misconduct allegedly committed by ST whilst he was a Participant/participant/EB member, notwithstanding that he was no longer a Participant as defined in the Disciplinary Code at the time when disciplinary proceedings were initiated and the Panel hearing was held.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Hearing in absence of participant

23. Given the lack of response to the charge from ST and, as Mr. Hurst explained on behalf of EB at the hearing, his apparent lack of engagement with any part of this disciplinary process (the chronology of which is set out further below), the Panel considered that it had to satisfy itself that he had been made aware of (i) the charge and disciplinary process that was in progress, including his ability to respond in writing thereto, and (ii) the Panel hearing date/time and his right to attend and participate in it, with or without representation.
24. Mr. Hurst explained that there had been a series of emails sent to ST informing him of those matters. The emails were not evidenced in the material provided to the Panel and so were requested and produced by Mr. Hurst at the hearing, to no unfair prejudice of ST, by way a three-page PDF file entitled, *‘Emails to ST’*. They showed that emails were sent by Mr. Hurst to [REDACTED] (the same email ST had himself used to withdraw his membership of EB, as shall be seen below) on:
- 13th November 2025, informing him of his interim suspension on account of the alleged misconduct concerned in this case and procedural matters related thereto.
 - 3rd February 2026, inviting him to provide his version of events by 10th February 2026, at risk of the interim suspension otherwise remaining in place; and

¹ Or any other EB rule, regulation, policy, code, procedure and/or guideline, as applicable.

² *“Participant”* is defined at page 2 of the EB Disciplinary Code. The Code of Conduct does not offer an exhaustive definition of *“participant”*, however, and on any view ST was *participating* in EB regulated activity for the purposes of the Code of Conduct when attending the All Stars gym on the date in question.

- 11th March 2026, informing him of the charge and disciplinary process that would follow, as well as giving him the opportunity to respond by 11th March 2026, with a view to the Panel hearing being held on 26th March 2026, as it was.
25. The Panel was therefore satisfied that ST had been properly informed about the charge, the applicable procedure as would follow, his rights and options in response thereto, and the Panel hearing date, all without response. And had he engaged, he would have had full access to all material relevant to the Panel hearing. As such, the Panel concluded that it could properly hear this matter in ST's absence, on the basis that his lack of engagement and non-attendance at the hearing was entirely of his own volition.

Anonymity

26. [REDACTED]
27. [REDACTED]

EVIDENCE RECEIVED & THE HEARING PROCESS

28. Prior to the hearing, the Panel received EB's nine-page PDF file entitled, '*S.Tria England Boxing Disciplinary Panel - Case File...*', which comprised EB's case and evidence in support (the "**EB Case File**")⁴.
29. No further evidence was heard at the hearing, as no witnesses (most notably, the Complainant) attended in support of EB's case and, as stated above, ST (nor any other witness as might have given evidence in his case) did not attend either.
30. At the hearing, therefore, Mr. Hurst simply made submissions as to EB's case in opening (as to liability on the charge in the first instance) and answered questions as were posed to him by the Panel, which was caused to consider whether the charge was proved, or not, by reference to the documented evidence in the EB Case File alone.

³ Pursuant to his powers at section 7.1(g) of the EB Disciplinary Code.

⁴ All matter stated as 'Background' at §§5-17 above are taken from the EB Case File, the copies of documents in which will be available in full therein.

31. The hearing otherwise followed the procedure provided for under section 10 the EB Disciplinary Code⁵ (“*Full Disciplinary Procedure*”), which the Panel had no cause to be concerned had not been complied with throughout these disciplinary proceedings as a whole.

BURDEN AND STANDARD OF PROOF

32. EB bore the burden of proving the charge on the balance of probabilities.
33. Accordingly, in order to find the charge proved, the Panel had to be satisfied that upon the evidence presented to it, it was more likely than not that ST had done as alleged by EB. And, further, that ST’s conduct was subject to the requirements of the EB Code of Conduct at the time in question (answered as at §§18-22 above) and amounted to a violation of that Code, pursuant to which the charge against him was brought – taking account of any applicable defence he might have raised in response.
34. EB would also have the burden of disproving any defence raised by ST (whether as to his alleged conduct and/or whether it fell within the ambit of, and breached the Code of Conduct), also on the balance of probabilities. But ST had not raised any defence in this case – he had failed to respond to the charge at all.
35. In those circumstances and to ensure fairness to ST, especially where the hearing itself would also take place in his absence, the Panel proceeded as if the charge were denied i.e. it was not taken to be admitted, or proved, simply on account of ST’s lack of response/denial. EB was required to prove its case to the standard explained above.

DECISION AS TO LIABILITY

36. Having determined that it had jurisdiction over ST’s alleged misconduct, the Panel speedily concluded that if such misconduct were proved against him on the facts, it would self-evidently violate the provision of the EB Code of Conduct pursuant to which he was charged (as well as various other provisions therein, but they need not be listed). It would be, as EB described it, serious violent behaviour within a regulated boxing setting.
37. The Panel found no evidential weight in the emails from [REDACTED] as summarised at §§5 & 8 above, in terms of establishing what ST did or did not do on the day in question. At most, those emails provided some temporal context for when he was said to have acted as alleged – being on 10th November 2025 – and the investigation (to the extent there was any) that followed.

⁵ Version 2.0, dated 22nd May 2025.

38. [REDACTED] email amounted to multiple hearsay evidence in the form it was presented to the Panel i.e. someone (unknown) appears to have told [REDACTED] what occurred, from their point of view; she in turn told [REDACTED] by her email; and that email was now being presented to the Panel as matter stated by [REDACTED] who was not present at the hearing to give such evidence herself, allowing the Panel to scrutinise it.
39. It was not clear whether [REDACTED] had seen the incident herself and, on balance, it appeared to the Panel (given the tense of her language) that she had simply rehearsed that which she had heard from others. Whilst hearsay evidence is admissible in these proceedings, it is of no weight when it amounts to a mere recitation of matters stated by one or more (unknown) persons to another. Neither, in those circumstances, could [REDACTED] recitation of what she had heard from others be capable of supporting, by corroboration, that which anyone else (for example, the Complainant) had said – because [REDACTED] might have heard the account from them and simply been reciting it in the first place. The Panel did not have sufficient information on what had led to [REDACTED] email, nor the source of the information presented within it, and therefore was unable to place any real weight upon its contents.
40. Similarly, [REDACTED] email adds nothing to the evidence in support of EB's case, as it would appear clear that he was not witness to the incident that concerned. [REDACTED] merely offers opinion on what had gone before and what should happen as a result.
41. Those two emails did, however, give the Panel real cause for concern as to how the aftermath of ST's actions were dealt with by those concerned. It is not for the Panel to opine or report on such matters here, but its concerns as to how the situation was managed were directly relevant to its assessment of the evidence, for the reasons that follow.
42. This was an incident in which a young boxer (ST would have been 20 years of age at the time⁶) was said to have attended a gym with a knife and attempted to stab another boxer – seemingly successfully, but thankfully not to the extent he might have been. The seriousness of his alleged actions and the extreme danger they posed it obvious. Yet, what followed seems to have amounted to this:
- (i) A relatively informal email was sent from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], informing him of the incident and requesting his assistance to deal with the aftermath (essentially, to prevent ST from enrolling at other boxing clubs), but otherwise requesting that “...*this be kept quiet, while the investigation is going on*”; and
 - (ii) An email from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], asking whether [REDACTED] would want this dealt with at EB level or by London Boxing, again proposing various gym bans for ST within the London region. But, as Mr. Hurst informed the Panel in response to questions at the hearing, [REDACTED] served no official investigatory/disciplinary role for EB, at all. The Panel was left clueless as to why others felt they needed to do no

⁶ Assuming his details as recorded on the EB Disciplinary Case Overview to be correct, albeit that is not material to the Panels' decisions.

more than take this issue to [REDACTED] (at a different gym) for his decision as to what should happen next, save that it is understood that he is well-regarded in the amateur boxing community, especially in London, as opposed to reporting it straight to EB themselves. These were not decisions to be discussed and made between Messrs. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] especially in such a serious case. And that raised the question in the Panel's mind as to whether what had happened (if anything) was, really, as serious as was being alleged – hence the relevance of all this.

43. In fairness to those named above, the Panel notes that it was only appraised of the material in the EB Case File and so it does not know what [REDACTED] response was, if any, or if/why the police might have guided [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] to do as they did, or if there were any other relevant documents showing steps taken by [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED]. The Panel makes no direct criticism of either [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] given those factors. Nonetheless, it remained concerning that EB had not been their first port of call. Thankfully, EB did eventually become aware of the alleged incident.
44. Even at that stage, though, it is yet more surprising (given the police had been leading the investigation to begin with, the obligations the All Stars club and its personnel owe to EB, and EB's powers to ensure their full compliance with its investigations) that EB was informed the police investigation was closed due to, *"a lack of witnesses willing to make statements, no weapon recovered and no CCTV being provided by the club"*, and that EB itself had not secured any such evidence, either.
45. Even if the Complainant and/or others might not have wanted to give statements to the police, or anyone else, and even if the All Stars gym had no CCTV evidence to provide, the circumstances described by [REDACTED] (and later by the Complainant in [REDACTED] interview with Mr. Hurst) involved ST attacking with and being disarmed of a knife before he left the gym. And yet the knife had never been recovered. There were no photographs or even a description of it. Such matters naturally factored into the Panel's considerations as to the evidential strength (or otherwise) of EB's case.
46. The only meaningful evidence of ST's misconduct was the transcript of the Complainant's account in interview with Mr. Hurst.
47. Mr. Hurst expressed his opinion at the hearing that the Complainant had presented – to him – as being clearly honest, credible and reliable in that interview. But that was not relevant to the Panel's considerations. The disciplinary process works by EB investigating and collating evidence for presentation to the Panel, for its scrutiny and assessment vis-à-vis the issues it has to resolve. A regulatory investigator/case presenter (or any party) opining that their own witness appeared credible and with no reason to lie in a private interview between them, so that their evidence can simply be accepted as true, is of no evidential value to the Panel in its assessment of the account the witness gave therein. Especially when the witness concerned has not attended to give evidence before the Panel itself, which can then scrutinise their evidence and assess them as a witness in coming to its own, independent decision as to their reliability.

48. What the Panel was left with here was a hearsay document, in the form of a transcript of matters stated by the Complainant outside the Panel hearing that was now being put before the Panel – in his absence – as being true of its content . The Panel approached it cautiously as a result. That said, hearsay evidence is admissible in these proceedings, as has been observed above, and a case can be proved by the word of one witness alone. The Panel ultimately had to decide whether it was more likely events did occur as the Complainant alleged in that transcript, or not.
49. The mere fact that an allegation is made – however unusual and/or serious – cannot, of itself, prove the facts alleged. But, in this case, the making of the allegation combined with events that followed clearly indicated that ST was aware of there having been a complaint against him – at the very latest, by the time the Panel had found he was informed of his interim suspension (see §24 above).
50. The lack of any response to that allegation at any stage meant that whilst there had been some cause for the allegation to be made (whatever it was), there had had been no response to it whatsoever, by way of explanation, denial, or the offering of a reason as to why a false allegation might have been made, in whole or part, despite the gravity of the allegation being surely obvious to ST. And, thus, his need to respond to it, if untrue.
51. In the absence of any such response, the Panel had no basis to come to any conclusion as to why the allegation might have been made in first place other than that it might have been – as EB asserted – true. There was also some background given within the allegation as to why the incident might have occurred i.e. there having been a previous dispute of sorts between those involved, over a water bottle, rather than it being suggested that such an extreme act was committed by ST out of the blue, with no reason for it (however incongruous his taking a knife [REDACTED] following a dispute about a water bottle might still be).
52. It could be asked, of course, whether the fact of the previous dispute over the water bottle might have given cause for a false, injurious complaint to be made against ST by [REDACTED] who then did not want to repeat it to the police, with the consequences that would follow if it were false. But, in the Panel’s view, the nature of the complaint being made would have been so unwarranted and egregious as to make that very unlikely. And, again, there was no evidence to support any such assertion as might be made against the truth of the Complainant’s account, given ST’s lack of engagement with the disciplinary proceedings.
53. Matters also went further than ST’s mere lack of engagement with the proceedings. Page 5 of the EB Case File showed that on a Tuesday (the document itself is undated), which Mr. Hurst said was the day after the incident alleged in this case (and 10th November 2025 had indeed been a Monday), ST had had emailed EB in the following terms: *“I would like to permanently delete my England Boxing membership and all my personal data from the Sport80 system”*. A ‘Michael’, on behalf of EB, had replied: *“Your personal details and membership have been deleted on your request”*. ST’s withdrawal of his membership has been referenced above in other contexts.

54. Lacking any evidence or assertion to suggest otherwise, the irresistible inference to be drawn from that sequence of events, in the Panel's view, was that ST had reason to withdraw his membership on the very day after which he had been involved in a serious incident and, given he has offered no response or denial of his role in it at any time since, he had known at that time that blame would attach to him for it and that he had no answer to the complaint that would likely come – about his conduct, as the wrongdoer. It might also be inferred that he believed taking this course would remove him from EB's jurisdiction, although, if that is considered speculative, one does not have to so conclude in order to come to the decision the Panel has, below.
55. ST did indeed refuse to engage in the EB disciplinary process on later occasions, as highlighted at §24 above, whereas, had he, he could have sought further information and/or responded to the allegation as he wished, including by denying it.
56. There is no rule in the EB Disciplinary Code mandating how the Panel must assess a person's silence in response to an allegation and the Panel cautioned itself against reaching a conclusion against ST based upon his silence alone. But, it was left with evidence from the Complainant that raised a *prima facie* case capable of proving the allegation brought by EB to the requisite standard of proof (even if a yet stronger case could have been built), supported by the anomaly of ST withdrawing himself from EB membership the day after the alleged incident and then then not responding in any form to the allegations against him⁷, so that there was no evidential basis for the Panel to conclude that the evidence upon which EB brought its case was false for any reason, on account of the Complainant's credibility, accuracy and/or therefore his reliability overall.
57. In those circumstances, having considered the issue of liability privately following the presentation of EB's case, the Panel decided unanimously that the charge as brought by EB against ST was proved and returned to inform Mr. Hurst as such.

DECISION AS TO SANCTION

58. The Panel invited Mr. Hurst to make submissions as to the appropriate nature and degree of sanction.
59. The Panel's sanctioning options are set out at S11 of the Disciplinary Code.
60. Mr. Hurst submitted that whilst there are no generally applicable sanctioning guidelines, this case was clearly an extremely serious one and a lengthy fixed-term bar (suspension) from all EB activity, including but not limited to attendance at gyms and events under its jurisdiction, should be considered, for a period of no less than five years, but perhaps no more than ten years.

⁷ The Panel having already found that he was aware he could and had opportunity to do so.

61. The Panel again considered this matter in private and noted that the nature of the misconduct was so serious that the possibility of imposing a permanent bar (ban) from EB activity (effectively banning ST from membership for life) needed considering. It decided against taking that course, however, noting that ST is now 21 years of age and that the sport has often served as a means for rehabilitation and redemption for those who have encountered troubled periods and misconducted themselves earlier in life. Mr. Hurst had himself made reference to the same during submissions and observed that lifetime bans were to be reserved for the truly most exceptional cases.
62. Clearly, nonetheless, the severity of ST's misconduct required severe punishment and a means of ensuring that should he ever return to EB regulated activity, in any capacity, such a period of time had passed that would offer as much assurance as possible that he was safe to do so, and by means that any gym at which he might participate would be fully aware of these proceedings, so that it could take its own risk assessment and preventative measures against any level of risk it identifies at that time.
63. The Panel therefore reached a unanimous decision on sanction as is set out in the summary of its decision overall, at §64 below.

THE PANEL'S DECISION

64. For clarity and ease of reference, the Panel decided unanimously that:

As to liability:

- (i) The charge brought by EB against ST was proved, upon the balance of probabilities.

As to sanction:

- (ii) ST shall receive a fixed term bar (suspension) from EB activity in accordance with S11.1(a) of the EB Disciplinary Code, to include but not being limited to his being barred from attendance at all gyms and events under its jurisdiction, for a period of 10 years from the date upon which he became subject of an interim suspension, being 13th November 2025, as permitted by S11.2 of the same Code.

Assuming ST is not currently an EB member on account of his withdrawal from membership, the suspension shall nonetheless be deemed to have commenced on 13th November 2025 and to apply for 10 years from that date, as if he were a member, should he become so again in future. Whilst he is not a member, it is understood that he cannot participate in any EB regulated activity in any event.

- (iii) Thereafter, before participating in any activity at any gym/club or event under the jurisdiction of EB, ST must:

- a. Make disclosure of a full copy of this written decision to each of the Chairperson, Head Coach *and* Welfare Officer of the gym/club concerned, or the equivalent of those positions on its management committee;
- b. Make disclosure of a full copy of this written decision to the management committee of any EB-regulated event that is held outside a gym/club; and
- c. Inform EB of the gym/club and/or event at which he is to participate and confirm that he has complied with (iii)(a) and/or (iii)(b) above, as applicable, to the satisfaction of EB, which should so satisfy itself by communication with the personnel listed in each of those paragraphs above.

For the avoidance of doubt, this paragraph (iii) shall apply to ST in perpetuity (i.e. for life) and to each gym/club/event that ST intends to attend, not merely the first following the expiry of his suspension as in (ii) above. The Panel considers the duration of that requirement (for life) to be reasonable and proportionate in light of the severity of the misconduct found proved in this case and the need to protect other participants from that, or any similar type of misconduct in future.

Further matters:

- (iv) There was no order for costs; and
- (v) No further orders.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

65. Parties are reminded of their right to appeal any decision made by the Disciplinary Panel in accordance with S12 of the EB Disciplinary Code and whilst the above decision was announced at the hearing as being effective as of that date (26th March 2026), any timeframes that apply to appeals brought under the Disciplinary Code, or any other remedy either Party might seek against any aspect of this decision with which they disagree, shall apply as of the date on which such Party was provided with a copy of this written decision.

31st March 2026

Craig Harris (Chair)

Andrew Street

