



FIDE ETHICS AND DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

The First Instance Chamber of the Ethics & Disciplinary Commission (hereafter called “the EDC Chamber”), sitting in the following composition –

Chairperson	:	Mr Ali Nihat Yazici
Members	:	Mr Alan Borda
		Mr David Hater

during an exchange of correspondence and online meetings, made the following –

DECISION

Case no: 8/2025 “Alleged cheating at the 26th HZ University of Applied Science Chess Tournament 2024.”

INTRODUCTION

1. The EDC Chamber **notes** its establishment by the EDC Chairperson on 10th June 2025.
2. The EDC Chamber **notes** the report of the FIDE Fair Play Commission (“FPL”) received by the EDC on the 22nd of May 2025, representing a complaint of the alleged violations of the FIDE Code of Ethics (“the Code of Ethics”) by Joeri Harreman, (“the Respondent”) (FIDE ID 40111725)), more specifically:
 - 2.1. Art. 11.4d—Failure to cooperate—of the Disciplinary Code
 - 2.2. Art. 11.7(e)—cheating—of the Disciplinary Code
3. The EDC Chamber **notes** the following reports, documents, and e-mails received as part of the case file: Arbiter's report on the cheating incident (19th August 2024,), The statement of Mr. Huub Blum (13th December 2024,), the statement of Mr. Ruben (16th December 2024), the report of Prof. Dr. Regan (8th May 2025), The statement of the National Committee, “Tuchtcommissie oordeel Harreman Vlissingen” (6th January 2025), The FPL IP received the Statement of the Respondent on the 19th of January 2025, followed by the 2nd Statement on the 22nd of January 2025, the Testimony of Mr. Paauwe on the 3rd of May 2025, and the FPL Report on the 22nd of May 2025.



FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Parties

4. The Complainant is **FIDE FPL IP** (“Investigatory Panel”).
5. The Respondent is **Mr. Joeri Harreman** (born in 2006).
6. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the Respondent appointed Mr. Marc Delissen (lawyer) as his representative on 25th June 2025 by means of the power of attorney.
7. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the Respondent was allowed to respond to the complaint by way of notice dated 10th June 2025.
 - 7.1. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the Respondent’s lawyer requested an extension of the deadline to June 24, 2025, claiming that the charges against the Respondent had not been communicated to them.
 - 7.2. Following a review conducted together with the FIDE Office, it was determined that all relevant information was included in the notice sent to the Respondent on 10 June 2025, and that there was a read receipt confirming that the message and all its attachments had been received by the Respondent. Therefore, as the justification provided for the extension request does not reflect the facts, the request was denied by the Chair of the EDC Chamber pursuant to FIDE EDC Procedural Rules, Rule 32.
 - 7.3. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the Respondent submitted their defense on 1 July 2025, on time.
8. The EDC Chamber **notes** the report of the FIDE Fair Play Commission (“FPL”) received by the EDC on the 22nd of May 2025, representing a complaint of the alleged violations of the FIDE Code of Ethics (“the Code of Ethics”) by **Mr. Joeri Harreman** (“the Respondent”) (FIDE ID 40111725), more specifically an alleged violation of Art.11.4(d)(ii) of the Ethics Code.

the Complaint

9. The EDC Chamber **notes** the subject matter of the complaint and defense(s):
 - 9.1. On 19 August 2024, a written complaint regarding the Respondent was submitted to the FIDE Fair Play Panel (FPL) through a report sent by the Chief Arbiter of the “26th HZ University of Applied Sciences Schaaktoernooi.”.
 - 9.2. According to the Chief Arbiter’s (IA Bart De Vogelaere (FIDE ID: 214850)) report:
 - 9.2.1. It is stated that after the Respondent defeated his opponent, FM Esper van Baar (2248), in round 5 of the tournament, he reviewed all game scores following a tip-off received via email from Mr. van Baar.
 - 9.2.2. The Chief Arbiter notes that in round 6, they played on a live broadcast board, where players were subject to mandatory checks using X-ray detectors upon entry. The Respondent lost his game in this round easily.



- 9.2.3. In round 7, the Chief Arbiter reports that the Respondent did not play on a live board and therefore was not required to undergo an X-ray check at the entrance.
- 9.2.4. The Respondent went to the toilet just after the round started. The Arbiter and another arbiter waited for him, and upon his return, they informed him that they intended to conduct an X-ray body scan. The Respondent reacted strongly, reportedly responding in Dutch: *“Of course I have an objection! What kind of nonsense is this! Yesterday, you told me I was allowed to visit the toilet. Why should you scan me? You never scanned players before. This is ridiculous! Why should I be the first player to be scanned?”*
- 9.2.5. The Chief Arbiter informed the Respondent that he had the right to refuse the X-ray check, but in that case, *“the game he was playing would be declared lost for him, that he would not be paired for future rounds, and that a report would be sent to FIDE, all in line with the tournament rules.”*
- 9.2.6. After initially refusing several times, the Respondent eventually agreed to the X-ray check. During the inspection, a mobile phone was found inside the Respondent’s sock.
- 9.2.7. The Respondent stated in his oral defense before the Chief Arbiter that carrying a phone inside a sock was entirely natural at this age among youngsters. However, he refused the chief arbiter’s request to turn on the phone and allow it to be inspected.
- 9.2.8. The Chief Arbiter reported that, in accordance with the tournament rules, the Respondent was declared to have lost his game due to possession of a mobile phone and was not paired for the remaining rounds.
- 9.2.9. The Chief Arbiter stated that he invited the Respondent to switch on his phone and allow the arbiters to inspect it. However, the Respondent refused this request, saying, “A phone is private.” The Chief Arbiter further states that he told the Respondent that, by switching on his phone, he could prove to the arbiters whether there was any chess software on it and whether the game he was playing was on his phone. The Chief Arbiter states that the Respondent replied to this request by saying, “What a stupid remark this is! Every chess player has chess engines on his smartphone!”
- 9.2.10. In the Chief Arbiter’s report, it is stated that, following the Respondent’s refusal to cooperate with the arbiters by switching on his phone, the game he was playing was declared lost by the arbiters, and, in accordance with the tournament regulations, the Respondent was expelled from the tournament and was not paired in the remaining rounds.



The testimony of Mr. Bloom

9.3. The FPL IP also took witness statements from the other arbiters mentioned in the Chief Arbiter's report. One of these statements is the written witness statement of Mr. Bloom, who served as a tournament arbiter.

9.3.1. Mr. Bloom emphasizes that he has not seen the Chief Arbiter's report.

9.3.2. In his written witness testimony submitted before the FPL IP, tournament arbiter Mr. Bloom stated that he was with the Chief Arbiter during the incident in question, and that during the x-ray scan they conducted, they first received a signal due to the Respondent wearing a watch. After the watch was removed, they continued the X-ray scan, and this time, following another signal, they found a mobile phone hidden in the Respondent's sock.

9.3.3. In his written witness statement, Mr. Bloom also stated and confirmed that the Respondent refused the request of arbiters to switch on his phone.

The written testimony of IA Eric Ruben

9.4. IA Eric Ruben made a written testimony before the FPL IP.

9.4.1. IA Eric Ruben emphasized that he has not seen the Chief Arbiter's report; that during the incident he was invited by the Chief Arbiter to assist with the inspection; that when the Respondent returned from the bathroom he appeared surprised at the request for an x-ray scan; that he initially refused the Chief Arbiter's request; and that after the Chief Arbiter's warning the Respondent agreed to the x-ray search.

9.4.2. He further stated that the scan first detected a watch on the Respondent's wrist, and subsequently a mobile phone was found in his sock. Mr. Eric Ruben also notes, just as indicated in the Chief Arbiter's report and in Mr. Bloom's witness statement, that the Respondent refused the arbiters' request to switch on his phone and allow its contents to be checked.

Prof. Regan's Report

9.5. The EDC Chamber **notes** that Prof. Regan is a mathematician and scientist and serves as an expert on the FIDE FPL Commission, utilizing statistical methods to assess whether the moves played in games align with the general playing characteristics and strength of the players. The FPL IP appointed Prof. Dr. Kenneth Regan to carry out a full statistical analysis of the Respondent's games during the 26th HZ University of Applied Science Chess Tournament 2024.

9.5.1. Prof. Regan, in his written report submitted to the FPL IP, states that, based on all the modeling and statistical analyses conducted using different scenarios and various chess engines on the Respondent's games, the resulting average Z-score coefficient was above



the FIDE-accepted threshold of 2.5.

- 9.5.2. In his report, Prof. Regan further states that, as a result of the statistical modeling analysis of the Respondent's games, and also considering that a phone had been concealed, there is a comfortable satisfaction that cheating is employed.

The investigation and decision of the Royal Dutch Chess Federation

- 9.6. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the "Tuchtkommissie," the competent court of the Royal Dutch Chess Federation, investigated the case and subsequently decided to reject the application filed against the Respondent on the following grounds:

- 9.6.1. It was not made sufficiently credible that the defendant (Harreman) had intentionally used or intended to use an electronic device.
- 9.6.2. In particular, no statistical report based on Prof. Regan's method was available.
- 9.6.3. The matter was considered merely a breach of "other fair play rules," namely bringing a mobile phone into the tournament hall.
- 9.6.4. However, this does not justify the imposition of a disciplinary sanction under the regulations of the Royal Dutch Chess Federation (KNSB).
- 9.6.5. The Royal Dutch Chess Federation lodged this appeal, and as soon as the FPL IP became aware of it, it requested that the proceedings be suspended until a decision was rendered by the FIDE. The KNSB accepted this request.

Report of the FPL IP

- 9.7. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the FPL IP in its report submitted to the FIDE EDC, summarized the complaint as follows after collecting the statements, information, and documents:

- 9.7.1. The FPL IP found that the available evidence comfortably proved Mr. Harreman used an electronic device during the 7th round of the 26th HZ University of Applied Sciences Chess Tournament 2024 in Vlissingen.
- 9.7.1.1. Mr. Harreman was found with a mobile phone on the day in question.
- 9.7.1.2. He initially refused to be scanned.
- 9.7.1.3. He refused to switch on the phone for a history check.
- 9.7.1.4. He hid the phone in his sock — an unusual location, suggesting intentional concealment to avoid detection.
- 9.7.2. The FPL IP concluded that statistical evidence supported this finding.
- 9.7.3. The FPL IP rejected Mr. Harreman's objections:
- 9.7.3.1. The only disputed fact—whether the phone was intentionally hidden in his sock—was contradicted by witness statements and implausible explanations.
- 9.7.3.2. The claim of being unaware of carrying the phone was refuted by its unusual location.



- 9.7.3.3. The argument that the toilet visit was too short to use a chess engine was deemed a protective statement; the actual time spent was unclear, and refusal to allow phone inspection hindered evidence collection.
- 9.7.4. The FPL IP stated it was not bound by the Dutch Chess Federation's "Truchtkommissie" decision.
- 9.7.4.1. That body lacked a statistical expert opinion, which it had criticized in its own decision.
- 9.7.4.2. Certain procedural issues considered under Dutch regulations had no relevance for the IP.
- 9.7.5. The FPL IP concluded that Mr. Harreman's actions breached FIDE Ethics & Disciplinary Code Art. 11.7(e), and that the absence of direct observation of phone use was irrelevant given the weight of other evidence.
- 9.7.6. The FPL IP added that refusal to cooperate with an investigation into mobile phone use is itself a violation under Art. 11.4(d) of the Code, citing previous EDC Appeal Chamber decisions (Case 6/2023, para. 16; Case 1/2021, para. 7.4).

9.8. The FPL IP recommends that the Respondent be sanctioned with a two-year ban.

Defenses Provided by Respondent

10. The Respondent has submitted their defense to both the FPL IP and the EDC Chamber.

Respondent's statements before the FPL IP

- 10.1. The Respondent, in his written statement sent by e-mail on 19th January 2025 to the FPL IP, replied to FPL IP's question as follows:
- 10.1.1. He admits to having had a mobile phone on him and accepts being disqualified for that reason. He states that he did not intentionally bring the phone into the playing hall; after a long day, he simply forgot to leave it outside. When confronted by the arbiter, he panicked and did not react as he should have.
- 10.1.2. He denies having used any form of electronic assistance during the games.
- 10.1.3. He disputes the claim that he "performed above expectations," explaining that his FIDE rating was based on only a handful of official games, which makes such a comparison misleading.
- 10.1.4. He emphasizes that in the KNSB (the Royal Dutch Chess Federation) Tuchtcommissie decision, there was no finding that the phone was hidden in a sock or any proof of actual cheating.
- 10.1.5. He refers to a report from a representative of his chess club and to the KNSB procedure



documents, suggesting that if FIDE conducts an additional investigation, these documents should be consulted for a more complete picture of the events.

- 10.1.6. He states that incorrect and unsubstantiated information about the incident was leaked to the press and tournament participants, leading to online bullying and permanent reputational damage as a chess player.
- 10.1.7. He offers to resubmit all relevant documents if needed and expresses willingness to cooperate again.

10.2. The Respondent submitted his second statement before the FPL IP with an email on 22nd January 2025:

- 10.2.1. The Respondent admits to having had a mobile phone on him and accepts being disqualified for that reason. He states that he did not intentionally bring the phone into the playing hall; after a long day, he simply forgot to leave it outside. When confronted by the arbiter, he panicked and did not react as he should have.
- 10.2.2. He denies having used any form of electronic assistance during the games.
- 10.2.3. He disputes the claim that he “performed above expectations,” explaining that his FIDE rating was based on only a handful of official games, which makes such a comparison misleading.
- 10.2.4. He emphasized that in the KNSB (Dutch Chess Federation) Tuchtcommissie decision, there was no finding that the phone was hidden in a sock or any proof of actual cheating.
- 10.2.5. He refers to a report from a representative of his chess club and to the KNSB procedure documents, suggesting that if FIDE conducts an additional investigation, these documents should be consulted for a more complete picture of the events.
- 10.2.6. He states that incorrect and unsubstantiated information about the incident was leaked to the press and tournament participants, leading to online bullying and permanent reputational damage as a chess player.
- 10.2.7. He offers to resubmit all relevant documents if needed and expresses willingness to cooperate again.

10.3. The Lawyer of the Respondent listed the following arguments in their submissions to the EDC Chamber.:

- 10.3.1. The Respondent claims that the matter has already been heard and dismissed by the Disciplinary Committee of the Dutch Chess Federation. Bringing the same allegations before FIDE is, in their view, contrary to general legal principles prohibiting double jeopardy.
- 10.3.2. The Respondent argues that the IP, whose mandate is limited to investigation, overstepped



its authority by drawing conclusions and recommending sanctions. The Respondent emphasises that he was not informed of the IP's quasi-judicial role and was not provided with a fair opportunity to present a defense or seek legal representation during the investigative stage.

- 10.3.3. The Respondent points out that there is no physical, written, or eyewitness evidence that the Respondent used the phone during the game.
- 10.3.4. The Respondent claims that the report of the FPL IP is based largely on unverified suspicions and assumptions. The allegation that the phone was hidden in a sock does not appear in Chief Arbiter's own report, and witness statements on this point are inconsistent. The lawyer further states that performance comparisons based on rating are misleading, as the Respondent's rating did not reflect his true playing strength.
- 10.3.5. The Respondent mentions that they requested additional time to respond to this analysis, but the request was denied, which the Respondent considers a restriction of defense rights. They also point out that, under FIDE Fair Play Regulations, even a high Z-score requires corroborating evidence, which is absent in this case.
- 10.3.6. The Respondent claims that the phone was switched off and fell between his feet when he tried to put it in his pocket after leaving the toilet. He acknowledges that he initially did not fully cooperate due to panic but did permit scanning by the arbiters.
- 10.3.7. The Respondent asserts that the tournament organizers publicized the incident within one hour, without due process, leading to significant online abuse and long-term reputational harm for the Respondent.
- 10.3.8. The Respondent reiterates that he played all games fairly and did not use the phone in any round. He states that the process has caused considerable stress and will leave a lasting negative mark on his life and reputation. The Respondent requests a full acquittal. Alternatively, if the Panel decides to impose a sanction, he requests a fully suspended sentence of three months.

ADMISSIBILITY

11. FIDE EDC **notes** that to satisfy the admissibility criteria, the complaint must meet the minimum requirements in Article 5 of the EDC Code.
 - 11.1. The FPL is a FIDE organ, and its investigatory panel (the FPL IP) is authorized to conduct investigations on cheating cases. Therefore, the FPL IP has the necessary standing to submit a report to the FIDE EDC (see Article 5.2(d)).
 - 11.2. "The 26th HZ University of Applied Science Chess Tournament 2024" was an international chess event registered in FIDE rating calculations with the tournament ID of "379200." Therefore, the



matter has an international sphere, including players from multiple federations, and compliance with the requirements of Art. 5.1(a)-(e) of the EDC Code.

11.3. For these reasons mentioned in 11.1–11.2 above, the jurisdiction of the EDC Chamber in the present matter and the admissibility of the complaint against the Respondents are confirmed.

11.4. EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** that the case is admissible according to the EDC Code and EDC Procedural Rules.

FINDINGS AND JURISDICTION

12. The EDC Chamber, having reviewed the report submitted by the FPL IP, the Chief Arbitrator's report on which it is based, the witness statements, as well as the defense and statements submitted by the Respondent, has reached the following findings:

Findings regarding the Respondent's Statement

12.1. The Respondent has raised certain objections in response to the FPL IP report and to the request for a defense issued by the EDC Chamber. The EDC Chamber has considered these objections as set out below and has reached the conclusions indicated.

12.1.1. In the Respondent's defense, it is alleged that he was not aware, in the investigation initiated by the FPL IP, that the IP would reach extensive conclusions and propose a punitive sanction. However, in the email sent to the Respondent by the FPL IP, the entire procedure was clearly stated, including that if the investigation were to result in a finding that the offence had been committed, the FPL IP would initiate proceedings against him before the EDC. As evidence of this, the email sent by the FPL IP Chairman, IA/FPO Klaus Deventer, to the Respondent on 19 January 2025 contained the following sentence: "Following the FIDE Fair Play Regulations, an Investigatory Panel (IP) was appointed, consisting of WFM Georgia Grapsa (GRE) and me (GER) as the chairman for this case. The task of the IP is to investigate the case and make a report to the FIDE Ethics Commission to prepare a judgement." Having considered the matter, the EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** that the Respondent's reasoning in his defense of the claim above is without merit.

12.1.2. In the defense submitted by the Respondent to the EDC Chamber, it is alleged that during the investigation conducted by the FPL IP, he was not informed that he should obtain legal representation, nor that the IP could refer the matter to the first instance level, and that therefore he had not been afforded a fair right of defense. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** that, upon reviewing the case file, the FPL IP had duly informed the Respondent of the entire procedure, including his right not to incriminate himself, and that if the IP were to reach the conclusion that he had committed the alleged offense, the matter would be



referred to the EDC as a Case. Furthermore, the Respondent's allegation that the FPL IP failed to inform him that he should obtain legal representation does not reflect the facts. Counsel for the Respondent, Mr. Delissen, contacted the EDC Chamber within the framework of the Case as the Respondent's legal representative and was accordingly requested to submit a power of attorney. In reply, Mr. Delissen informed the EDC Chamber, by means of an email, that he had already been involved as counsel during the Respondent's defense before the FPL IP upon the instruction of the Respondent's father. In light of the fact that the Respondent claims that the FPL IP did not inform him of the need for legal representation, while at the same time an email submitted to the EDC Chamber clearly shows that legal representation had already been appointed and communicated earlier, the **EDC Chamber finds** this claim contradictory and without merit. Moreover, the FPL IP is under no obligation to inform persons under investigation that they require legal representation.

- 12.1.3. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** the Respondent's submissions under the heading of admissibility to be unfounded and without merit. The Respondent's argument that "a verdict was delivered before the case was heard by the first instance panel" is baseless. Pursuant to Article 9 of the EDC Code, the mandate of the FPL IP is to investigate; if it reaches the conclusion that the person concerned has committed an offense under the Code, to determine which provisions have been violated and to propose an appropriate sanction, and to report accordingly. Under the EDC Code and the EDC Procedural Rules, the FPL IP in effect performs the role of the prosecuting authority, exercising its expertise in carrying out this function.
- 12.1.4. In his defense, under the heading of admissibility, the Respondent alleges that his right to a fair trial has been violated. However, during the investigation conducted by the FPL IP, the complaint against the Respondent, the evidence submitted, and the charges were clearly communicated to him. His defense was requested and duly examined, witness statements concerning the allegations were obtained, and the Respondent was given the opportunity to comment on those statements. In full compliance with the EDC Code and the Procedural Rules, the FPL IP duly and properly carried out its mandate and produced its final report. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** the Respondent's allegation of a violation of his right to a fair trial by the FPL IP to be unfounded.
- 12.1.5. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** the Respondent's allegation that his right to a fair trial was violated by the FPL IP to be unfounded. The Respondent's further claim that a decision was already rendered by the RDCF Disciplinary Committee acquitting him of the



alleged offence, and that therefore he cannot be tried again for the same offense, is likewise unanimously rejected by the EDC Chamber. First, the decision of the national federation's disciplinary committee was taken in the absence of statistical evidence. Moreover, regardless of the decision of a national disciplinary body, such a decision cannot in any way preclude the competence of the FIDE EDC, which acts as a higher-instance body in matters falling within its jurisdiction. The Respondent's argument that "no one can be tried twice for the same act" has no legal relevance or similarity to the present case. Secondly, the relevant committee did not acquit the Respondent but suspended the proceedings until the case heard by the FIDE EDC is concluded.

12.1.6. In his defense, the Respondent raised the following arguments under Article 11.7(e) to assert that he did not commit cheating:

12.1.6.1. The EDC Chamber **finds** that the Respondent's claim that there is no evidence he used his phone to cheat is not sufficient defense to the allegations. The facts that the Respondent concealed his phone, took it with him to the toilet, hid it in his socks, initially refused to be scanned, and only agreed to be scanned after learning that refusal would result in expulsion from the tournament and further action are established by the Chief Arbiter's report as well as the witness statements of other arbiters and officials. Moreover, the Respondent himself has confirmed these facts on several occasions in his defense, presented as an expression of remorse. If the Respondent had truly not engaged in cheating, he could have simply complied with the arbiters' request to have his phone examined.

12.1.6.2. In his defense, the Respondent alleges that IA Erik Ruben was not present during the scanning process and that this was a fabricated statement, citing the testimony of Arbiter Huub Blom as evidence. However, no such conclusion can reasonably be drawn from Mr. Blom's statement. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** that the Respondent's claim is not a persuasive defense.

12.1.6.3. In his defense, the Respondent claims that no extension of time was granted to him.

12.1.6.3.1. The document entitled "**Notice of the Respondent**" was sent to the Respondent on 10 June 2025, whereby the charges against him were duly communicated. This document was transmitted by email through the FIDE Office, accompanied by an acknowledgement of receipt.

12.1.6.3.2. On 24 June 2025, counsel for the Respondent submitted a request for an extension of time, alleging that they had not been informed of the charges. This reasoning, however, is self-refuting. If the Respondent had not received the



“Notice of the Respondent”—which the EDC Chamber has verified by reviewing the acknowledgement of receipt — he would not have been aware of the time limit set for the submission of his defense either. If there was any communication issue between the Respondent and his counsel, it is evident that this cannot be attributed to either the FIDE or the EDC Chamber.

12.1.6.3.3. Upon assessment, the EDC Chamber **found** that the reasoning put forward by the Respondent’s counsel was manifestly contrary to the facts and logically untenable, and that such a justification could not be accepted on ethical grounds. The request was therefore dismissed, and the Respondent was informed accordingly.

12.1.6.3.4. The EDC, and her chambers generally accept defense requests for extensions of time when they are based on bona fide and truthful justifications, to allow the defense to be presented in a more comprehensive manner. However, granting an extension of time based on a justification such as “*we were not aware of the charges*”, which is logically impossible, was deemed by the Chamber to amount to stretching the ethical limits and the principles of the Code.

12.1.6.3.5. Accordingly, the EDC Chamber **unanimously found** the Respondent’s claim of not having had sufficient time to prepare his defense to be inadmissible.

Findings regarding the complaint

13. The EDC Chamber, after examining the referee report that is the subject of the complaint and the evidence in the FPL IP panel investigation, **reaches** the following conclusions:

13.1. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** that the Respondent was caught with a mobile phone during the search and scanning carried out by the arbiters. The Respondent had even concealed this phone within his clothing, and it was revealed during the search via scanner.

13.2. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds**, according to the report submitted by Prof. Regan to the FPL IP and attached to the complaint, that based on the statistical examination and all the scenarios addressed by Prof. Regan, there is “comfortable satisfaction” that the Respondent cheated.

13.3. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** that even if no phone had been found on the Respondent, according to the mathematical analyses conducted by Prof. Regan and the submitted report, using statistical analysis, and considering FIDE Fair Play Regulations 1.5 and 1.6, a situation of “assumed cheating” and comfortable satisfaction would have arisen. While the question of whether “assumed cheating” and/or “comfortable satisfaction” alone constitutes sufficient evidence of the alleged offense may be open to debate, the combination of concrete findings—such as the concealment of the phone on the Respondent’s body, its discovery during the search, and the



Respondent's refusal to allow the arbiters to inspect the phone—provides sufficient proof that the entire process of committing the offense was completed.

13.4. According to Article 3.10 of the Ethics Code, "*During all their operations, the EDC will draw on precedents.*" Furthermore, Rule 68.1 of the EDC Procedural Rules specifies that "In its decisions the EDC shall ... strive to maintain consistency with its own previous decisions." See para 38 of Case 6/2024(A).

13.4.1. The concealment of an electronic device on the body and/or within clothing, combined with statistical data indicating cheating, has previously been accepted by the EDC in precedent cases as sufficient evidence that the offense was committed: see para. 11.8 of Case 8/2015.

13.4.2. The EDC Chamber **underlines** that the Code's mention of "*uses or attempts to use electronic devices*" is intended to consider the attempt as egregious as the "successful" act of cheating, whereby both instances are considered as the transgression of cheating. See para 15 of Case 6/2024(A).

DECISION

14. Accordingly, and considering all of the above, the EDC Chamber unanimously decides as follows:

14.1. The Respondent, **Mr. Joeri Harreman**, is found **guilty** of Art. 11.4(d)—Failure to cooperate—of the Disciplinary Code.

14.2. Mr. Harreman is found **guilty** of Art. 11.7(e)—of the Disciplinary Code

Aggravating factors

14.3. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** that the lack of cooperation of the Respondent is an aggravating factor.

Mitigating factors

14.4. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** the following mitigating factors for a suitable sanction:

14.4.1. The offense in question is the first offense committed by the Respondent, and he has a clean record.

14.4.2. The Respondent is observed to be young and inexperienced

14.4.3. The Respondent holds no title and has a low ELO rating.

14.4.4. The Respondent has shown remorse in his statement.

15. **Mr. Joeri Harreman** is **sanctioned** to a worldwide ban from participating as a player in any FIDE-rated tournament for a period of **36 months** from the date of this decision, with **12 months** of this **sanction suspended** as a probation period. Should the Respondent commit another breach during the probationary period, the suspension shall automatically be revoked and the original sanction completely applied and added to the sanction imposed. The EDC Chamber **notes** that Case 7/2015 and Case



6/2024(A) are precedents for the appropriate sanction in this Case.

16. The Respondent is referred to Chapter 7 of the EDC Procedural Rules and advised that this decision may be appealed to the EDC Appeal Chamber by giving written notice of such appeal to the EDC Chairperson (ethics@fide.com) within 21 days from the date upon which this decision is received. The notice of appeal must clearly state all the grounds for the appeal. An appeal lodgment fee of **500 EUROS** must at the same time be paid to the FIDE Financial Department. Failing the due exercise of this right of appeal, the EDC Chamber's decision will become final.
17. The EDC Chamber **requests** the FIDE Secretariat to promptly communicate the decision to the Respondent, **Mr. Joeri Harreman**, to the national chess federation of the Respondent (**Royal Dutch Chess Federation**), to the FPL as the Complainant, and to publish the decision on the FIDE website in due course.

DATED ON THIS 1st October 2025

Ali Nihat Yazici

CHAMBER CHAIRPERSON
FIDE ETHICS & DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION