IN THE MATTERS OF:

ENGLAND BOXING

-and-

ANTHONY HULL

ENGLAND BOXING

-and-

DANIEL CAHILL

DECISION

Introduction

1. The disciplinary cases brought against Mr. Hull and Mr. Cahill arise out of the same events that took place following the final bout at a boxing event held at Kings Norton Ex Servicemen's Club on 14 November 2025 when, on the case of England Boxing, a judge, Mr. Jacob Homer **("Mr. Homer")** was confronted by a number of people (led by Mr. Hull and including Mr. Cahill) questioned about his judging during the event. England Boxing allege that, during the course of this confrontation, Mr. Cahill slapped Mr. Homer and that Mr. Hull was verbally threatening towards Mr. Homer and assaulted him by grabbing and pulling him.
2. The cases of England Boxing are supported by statements provided by Mr. Homer together with statements from another judge, a supervisor and the ringside doctor. We note that Mr. Homer was shown the video footage relied upon by Mr. Hull (see below) and he provided a response in relation to the same.
3. Mr. Hull is the Head Coach and Welfare Officer for DnA Boxing School. He has denied the case against him.
    a. He has provided 18 statements from witnesses to support his denial together with video footage of part of the incident.
    b. Mr. Hull elected for the case to be determined at a personal hearing. When making this election he stated that he intended to be assisted by a solicitor,

"whose role will be limited to assisting with correspondence and procedural matters".

c. A Lily Lengyel of Riaz Law has corresponded with England Boxing. In doing so she has described herself as: *"Representative for Mr. Hull".* In the course of this correspondence Mr. Hull has also provided a witness statement from Lily Lengyel setting out her evidence as to what she observed at the event. By her correspondence she has referred to Riaz Law being instructed on behalf of Mr. Hull and has made a number of what can be described as "legal submissions" in an attempt to persuade England Boxing and the Panel that there is no basis for disciplinary action.

d. Lily Lengyel has not referred to herself as a solicitor or legal executive. Online research by the Panel prior to the hearing found no record of her being a solicitor or legal executive. This is relevant for the reasons set out below.

e. Notwithstanding the initial election for an in-person hearing, Mr. Hull subsequently elected for the Panel to deal with the case against him on the basis of the correspondence (including the witness statements enclosed), all of which was provided to and read by the Panel.

4. Mr. Cahill is a boxer at DnA Boxing School. He previously had coaching qualifications, but they have lapsed. He has also denied the case against him. He has also stated (19 December 2025 e-mail to England Boxing) that he is unable to deal with any further correspondence in relation to the matter due to caring responsibilities. Beyond providing the e-mail of 19 December 2025, in which he set out his version of events, he has taken no part in the proceedings.

5. On 10 August 2026 the Panel met via Zoom to consider the cases against both Mr. Hull and Mr. Cahill. Prior to meeting the Panel had been provided with and had read the Panel Packs. The unanimous decisions of the Panel were communicated to England Boxing via e-mail following the meeting. Those decisions and the reasons for the same are set out below.

Approach of the Panel

Mr. Hull

6. The facts underlying the case against Mr. Hull are disputed. He relies not only on his own statement as to what transpired but also of the witnesses for whom he has provided statements. As Mr. Hull (despite his initial election) elected to have the proceedings

against him dealt with on the basis of correspondence, the Panel has been deprived of the opportunity of assessing all/any part of the evidence adduced both in support of and in defence of the case against Mr. Hull.

7. Notwithstanding this, the Panel is required to determine the case on the balance of probabilities.
8. The video produced by Mr. Hull was of no assistance to the Panel in determining the case as it was of events that happened after the alleged altercations that found the disciplinary cases.
9. The case of England Boxing against Mr. Hull is supported by the evidence of Mr. Homer, the alleged victim. That evidence is supported by another judge, a supervisor and the ringside doctor who were present at the event and observed what happened.
10. The Panel was of the view that, there being no apparent cogent reasons to reject or doubt the same, the evidence of the other judge, supervisor and ringside doctor had to be treated as credible evidence supporting the evidence of Mr. Homer. England Boxing has to, absent good reasons not to, rely on the integrity of its volunteer officials and (in the case of ringside doctors) professionals and the Panel could see no reason to depart from this in this situation.
11. The Panel considered whether it might be suggested in a case such as this that a fellow official's evidence/recollection might not be independent due to a wish (conscious or otherwise) to support a fellow official. The Panel's view was that this did not override the approach referred to in paragraph 10 above, but in any event, it was a suggestion that was redundant in a case such as this where the evidence of the officials was supported by the evidence of the ringside doctor who was clearly independent and with no reason to "get involved" unless they believed in what they had stated.
12. Whilst Mr. Hull has adduced statements from a number of witnesses, the consideration of competing evidence is not a "numbers game" in that all because one case has 3 supporting witnesses and the other has 30, it does not mean that the other case is correct and the 30 witnesses right as to the facts they state.
13. It is simply not possible for the Panel, when considering this matter on the basis of the correspondence and not having heard from Mr. Hull or any of his witnesses, to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that the evidence relied on by England Boxing is not reliable or cannot be safely relied upon in view of the amount and content of the statements produced by Mr. Hull.

14. In accordance with the approach referred to in paragraphs 10 – 11 above, the Panel considered whether the statement of Lily Lengyel provided by Mr. Hull could be accepted on the basis that it was from a witness who was subject to professional obligations in terms of their conduct and therefore needed to be treated in the same manner as the evidence of the officials and, in particular, the ringside doctor. The Panel, taking account of the points made in paragraph 3(b) – (d) above, decided that it had no basis upon which to treat the evidence as evidence from such a professional and/or that, on its own, and absent the Panel being able to assess the evidence of Mr. Hull, the evidence could not override the approach referred to in paragraphs 10 – 11 above.
15. In these circumstances the Panel unanimously and on the balance of probabilities found the case against Mr. Hull proven
16. To have found, in the circumstances of the way in which it was elected to have the case dealt with, that the credible case against Mr. Hull was not/could not be proved against him because a large number of witnesses had stated a contrary case in writing, would have been a derogation of the responsibility of the Panel to determine the case before them and would have undermined the England Boxing Disciplinary Procedure

Mr. Cahill

17. It followed from the approach adopted in relation to Mr. Hull, that the Panel also unanimously and on the balance of probabilities finds the case against Mr. Cahill proved.

Consequences of the cases being found proved

18. The cases found proved against Mr. Hull and Mr. Cahill meant that they have been found guilty of, inter alia:
    a. Assaulting and abusing an official;
    b. A failure to respect officials;
    c. A failure to protect officials from verbal or physical abuse and threatening or intimidating behaviour;
    d. A failure to accept success and failure, victory and defeat with dignity;
    e. A failure to set a positive example to others, in particular to those spectators at and those boxers participating at the event.

19. All of the above meant that each of Mr. Hull and Mr. Cahill have fallen below the standards to be expected of them such that the Panel proceeded to consider the appropriate sanction(s).

Sanction

20. In any sport, this conduct towards an official would be viewed as extremely serious. It is particularly so in the context of a sport that relies on volunteer officials. Without them the sport cannot function. There is no situation in which such conduct towards them can be justified or tolerated and if such conduct does arise they (together with everyone else who participates in and/or has an interest in England Boxing and the events that it puts on) are entitled to expect it will be met with appropriate sanctions by way of punishment and deterrent.

Mr. Hull

21. In relation to Mr. Hull, the Panel noted that he was the instigator of not only the confrontation with Mr. Homer but the events that led to the same. He was identified by England Boxing's witnesses as being particularly vocal in his criticisms of the officiating throughout the event that also encouraged a number of others (including Mr. Cahill) to join him, all of which contributed to an ugly atmosphere during and, in particular, at the end of the event.
22. In addition to this the Panel took into account the fact(s) that:
    a. He is a Head Coach and Club Welfare Officer.
    b. He has not at any time recognised that his conduct was unacceptable nor has he apologised for the same.
    c. In response to England Boxing putting the allegations to him, he responded (e-mail sent on 24 November 2025) and as part of his response he made serious allegations against the officials at the event including suggestions that decisions involved racial discrimination. Such allegations had no place in his response. If they were to be made, then they should have been raised in the proper manner and forum with England Boxing.
23. In all these circumstances the Panel concluded that **the appropriate sanction was by way of a fixed term ban from all England Boxing activity for a period of 14 months such ban to commence on 14 September 2026.**

Mr. Cahill

24. Taking into account the factors set out in paragraph 20 above and the lack of any (a) recognition by Mr. Cahill that his conduct was unacceptable and/or (b) apology , but noting the age of Mr. Cahill and that Mr. Hull (who should have known better) was the instigator of the confrontation with Mr. Homer, the Panel concluded that **the appropriate sanction was a fixed term ban from all England Boxing activity for a period of 12 months (such ban to commence on 14 September 2026), the last 4 months of which will be suspended on condition that he complies during that period act towards England Boxing Officials and other volunteers with respect.**

Costs

25. There was no application for costs.

Appeal

26. There is a right of appeal in accordance with England Boxing's Disciplinary Procedure.

Mark Harper KC (Chair)

Tracy Davies

James Severn

14 August 2026