APPEAL

Two appeals are received from GM Nepomniachtchi and GM Dubov regarding the decision of the Chief Arbiter Mr Syrovy (CA) on Dubov - Nepomniachtchi game from Round 11 played on 29 December 2023 of the World Blitz Championship (here attached).

Both players have accompanied their appeals with the explanations (here attached).

We would like to comment on each of them.

Comments on the explanations of GM Nepomniachtchi.

Point 1.
Comment 1: Irrelevant, not to the point.
Comment 2: The first appeal of the day took much time indeed, about 57 minutes.
This appeal takes much more. It's always important to take into consideration the argument of all parties involved. Thus, the verbal conversation with both players took about 30 minutes, receiving written explanations - about 90 minutes. So, it's hard to agree that the first appeal took much time.

Point 2.
Comment: Not exactly to the point.
Short draws are not prohibited in this event, they are not deemed to be a disrepute. So, if both players are happy with this result, draw can be achieved very quickly not being prearranged.
CA states that clearly prearranged draws are disreputes. The players are seen in a video discussing the result to be a draw before start of the game.
E.g. a football match where none of the teams tries to cross the middle line would undoubtedly be deemed a disrepute.

Point 3.
Comment: GM Nepomniachtchi is right saying that detailed description is missing for 'disrepute'.
In this situation the decision is supposed to be fully on shoulders of CA.
All three members of the Appeal Committee share the Chief Arbiter's point of view.

Point 4.
Comment: This is the fair point. We agree that it would be much better if CA has taken the decision earlier.
Nevertheless, the Laws of Chess don't specify that a sanction shall be imposed immediately after the infringement.

Comments on the explanations of GM Dubov.

Point 1.
Comment: In our opinion, high playing chess qualification is not required for this particular case.

Point 2.
Comment 1: No examples given on the actions of the arbiters' team that 'led to massive delays on most of the days'. Disregard.
Comment 2: No explanation is given why this day was 'by far the worst in terms of the organisation and the arbiters work'.
Disregard.

Point 3.
Comment 1: We agree that CA could have taken the correct decision earlier. See the comment to Point 4 of GM Nepomniachtchi.

Point 4.
Comment 1: Not to the point. We cannot be responsible for decisions of FIDE, other arbiters, other appeals committees.
Comment 2: Many games played in a 'normal manner' can hardly be proven prearranged.

Point 5.
Comment: No clear infringement evidence of prearrangement. See the comment to Point 2 of GM Nepomniachtchi.

Point 6.
Comment 1: Irrelevant. We cannot comment on decisions of other people.
Comment 2: Infringements committed by other players don't remove responsibility from GM Dubov.

Point 7.
Comment: see Comment 2 to Point 6 above.

Point 8. We agree with GM Dubov.
This would only be possible if all players respect the Laws of Chess.

CONCLUSION

After taking into consideration the explanations of both players, we fail to find the facts proving that the Chief Arbiter's decision is wrong.

DECISION

The Chief Arbiter's decision shall stand.

Both appeals are rejected.

Appeals Committee
Chair: Pavel Tregubov
Members: Benard Wanjala
Rajai Al Susi

Samarkand, 30 December 2023, 2:15 AM