

**IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT
UNDER THE ICC ANTI-CORRUPTION CODE**

Between:

THE INTERNATIONAL CRICKET COUNCIL

and

MR PRAVEEN JAYAWICKRAMA

Decision pursuant to Article 5.1.12 of the ICC Anti-Corruption Code

Introduction

1. The International Cricket Council (the "ICC") is the international governing body for the game of cricket and as such is responsible for the development, co-ordination, regulation and integrity of cricket worldwide.
2. As part of its continuing efforts to maintain the integrity, public image and popularity of cricket, the ICC has adopted and implemented the ICC Anti-Corruption Code for Participants (the "Code"), which sets out a framework of rules designed to provide: (a) an effective means to deter any Participant from engaging in any form of Corrupt Conduct; and (b) a robust disciplinary procedure pursuant to which all matters of Corrupt Conduct can be dealt with fairly, efficiently, and expeditiously.¹
3. Praveen Jayawickrama is a Sri Lankan cricketer who has represented Sri Lanka in 15 International Matches, including 5 One Day Internationals, 5 T20 Internationals and 5 Tests, having made his international debut in April 2021, as well as representing Sri Lanka at the Under 19 level. At the time of the relevant events in this matter, Mr Jayawickrama was playing domestic cricket in Sri Lanka.
4. Pursuant to Code Article 1.7.3.3 the ICC and Sri Lanka Cricket have agreed that the ICC would take action in respect of all the charges faced by Mr Jayawickrama, notwithstanding the fact that charge no. 2 relates to approaches to fix in the Lanka Premier League 2021, a domestic event under the jurisdiction SLC. Following this agreement, and in line with Code Article 1.8.1,

¹ Unless otherwise indicated in this decision, capitalized terms are defined terms and their respective definitions are set out in the Code.

references to International Match in the Code are deemed to be extended to cover the relevant Domestic Match.

Status as a Participant bound by the Code

5. At all material times, Mr Jayawickrama constituted a Participant for the purposes of the Code. In particular, as a consequence of his participation in Domestic Matches in Sri Lanka since January 2019 he constituted a Player and thus a Participant under the Code. As such, he was automatically bound by the Code and agreed, among other things, (i) to comply with the Code; (ii) not to engage in conduct that would constitute a breach of the Code; and (iii) to submit to the jurisdiction of the Designated Anti-Corruption Official to investigate apparent or suspected Corrupt Conduct that would amount to a violation of the Code and to hear and determine any consequent breaches of those rules and related issues.

Summary of relevant background facts

6. Mr Jayawickrama was approached by an old school friend, [MR X], who bets on cricket, to speak to the Sri Lankan player, [PLAYER A], and ask [PLAYER A] whether he would agree to fix in upcoming Lanka Premier League games. Mr Jayawickrama's friend's aim was to make money for himself by betting on fixes he had set up.
7. Mr Jayawickrama's friend told him that if he spoke to [PLAYER A] and [PLAYER A] agreed to fix matches, [PLAYER A] would be paid 60 lakhs Sri Lankan rupees for the fixes, and Mr Jayawickrama would be paid 50 lakhs Sri Lankan rupees.
8. Mr Jayawickrama refused to speak to [PLAYER A] on his friend's behalf, telling his friend he would have to speak to [PLAYER A] himself. Mr Jayawickrama did, however, share [PLAYER A'S] telephone number with his friend.
9. Mr Jayawickrama did not report his conversation with his friend to the Designated Anti-Corruption Official (despite having recently received anti-corruption education). Nor did he tell [PLAYER A] about the matter.
10. Mr Jayawickrama's friend subsequently did contact [PLAYER A] and made a corrupt approach to him. [PLAYER A] immediately rejected the approach and reported the matter to the Designated Anti-Corruption Official.
11. Mr Jayawickrama was subsequently again contacted, at a later date, by his friend who told him that once he (Mr Jayawickrama) started playing for the national team, he could earn a lot of money just by doing a few little things, for example bowling a no-ball. Mr Jayawickrama immediately rejected this approach as well. However, he also did not report that approach to the Anti-Corruption Unit.
12. Mr Jayawickrama subsequently deleted all of the messages that he had had with his friend after his friend told him to, following his friend being the subject of an investigation by the Sri Lanka

Police. The messages that were deleted included the messages in which the corrupt approaches were made, and the messages which included details of the amounts that would be paid if the fixes were agreed.

Relevant Provisions of the Code

13. Code Article 2.4.4 makes the following an offence:

“Failing to disclose to the ACU (without unnecessary delay) full details of any approaches or invitations received by the Participant to engage in Corrupt Conduct under the Anti-Corruption Code.”

14. Code Article 2.4.7 makes the following an offence:

“Obstructing or delaying any investigation that may be carried out by the ACU in relation to possible Corrupt Conduct under the Anti-Corruption Code (by any Participant), including (without limitation) concealing, tampering with or destroying any documentation or other information that may be relevant to that investigation and/or that may be evidence of or may lead to the discovery of evidence of Corrupt Conduct under the Anti-Corruption Code.”

Disciplinary Proceedings

15. On the basis of the above facts, on 6 August 2024, the ICC charged Mr Jayawickrama with the following breaches of the Code:

Charge No. 1 – Breach of Code Article 2.4.4 in that he failed to report to the Anti-Corruption Unit (“ACU”), without unnecessary delay, details of the approach he received from [MR X] to carry out fixing in future Sri Lanka International Matches once he was selected for the national team.

Charge No. 2 – Breach of Code Article 2.4.4 in that he failed to report to the ACU, without unnecessary delay, details of the approach he received from [MR X], in which [MR X] asked him to speak to another player, [PLAYER A], to see if he ([PLAYER A]) would be interested in fixing in the 2021 Lanka Premier League.

Charge No. 3 – Breach of Code Article 2.4.7 in that he admitted deleting messages with [MR X] from his phone, messages in which [MR X] made the approaches / offers re fixing in future International Matches, and also discussed wanting him to speak to [PLAYER A] to get him involved in fixing.

16. Mr Jayawickrama responded to the Notice of Charge, denying the charges, and explaining, in summary, his response to each of the charges.
17. By way of a letter agreement dated 28 September 2024, Mr Jayawickrama formally admitted that he had committed a breach of Article 2.4.7 of the Code (namely he admitted Charge No. 3). As a

consequence, the ICC has agreed not to pursue Charges No. 1 and 2, with such charges being deemed withdrawn.

18. This decision is issued pursuant to Code Article 5.1.12 and sets out the sanction proposed by the ICC, and accepted by Mr Jayawickrama, for his admitted breach of the Code.

Agreed Sanction

19. Code Article 6.2 stipulates that the range of permissible sanctions for a breach of Code Article 2.4.7 is any period of Ineligibility from zero up to a maximum of five (5) years.
20. Code Article 6.1 sets out the relevant factors that an Anti-Corruption Tribunal would be required to consider in determining the relative seriousness of the offence and thereby arriving at an appropriate sanction within that range.
21. It is acknowledged by the ICC that any sanction imposed must be proportionate. In considering what is proportionate, the ICC is entitled to weigh against the impact of a ban on Mr Jayawickrama the importance of the objectives underlying the Code, the seriousness of the particular breach of the Code by Mr Jayawickrama, the need to deter others from similar wrongdoing, the need to protect the image of sport of cricket, and (above all else) the need to maintain public confidence in the determination of the sport of cricket to stamp out corruption.
22. The ICC notes that in order to seek to adequately and effectively protect the sport of cricket against the threat of corruption, the obligation on Participants to cooperate with an investigation and not to obstruct or delay an investigation through concealing, tampering with or destroying documentation or other information which may be relevant to an investigation is key to the ICC being able to fully and properly investigate allegations of Corrupt Conduct.
23. Relevant mitigating factors in Mr Jayawickrama's case include the following:
 - 23.1. Mr Jayawickrama's admission of a breach of Article 2.4.7 following receipt of the Notice of Charge;
 - 23.2. Mr Jayawickrama's previous good disciplinary record;
 - 23.3. Mr Jayawickrama's youth and relative lack of experience – at the time of the relevant events, Mr Jayawickrama was 21 and had not made his debut in the senior Sri Lankan side. At that point he had just played in domestic cricket in Sri Lanka. Further he had only attended one ACU education session, which was conducted in English, not his first language;
 - 23.4. The charge did not relate to Mr Jayawickrama actually engaging in any corruption at matches, nor is there any indication that he has been involved in any kind of actual corruption (he immediately rejected the approach from [MR X]);

- 23.5. His prompt admission that he deleted the messages during his interviews with the ACU and that he had not reported the corrupt approach he received from [MR X];
- 23.6. The fact that the offence did not substantially damage the commercial value and/or public interest in the relevant matches; and
- 23.7. The fact that the offence did not affect the outcome of the relevant matches.
24. The ICC does not consider that any of the aggravating factors listed in Code Article 6.1.1 are relevant in Mr Jayawickrama's case.
25. The ICC has considered all of the circumstances of this case, including giving Mr Jayawickrama credit for agreeing an outcome that avoids the need for a hearing and so saves considerable time and money for use elsewhere in the fight against corruption, and has considered relevant precedents. The ICC therefore considers that a period of ineligibility of one (1) year, of which the last six (6) months is suspended, is reasonable and proportionate.
26. In order to avoid the six (6) month suspended part of the sanction coming into effect, Mr Jayawickrama must comply, in full, with the following conditions during the period of the initial 6-month period of suspension:
 - 26.1. He must not commit any offence under the Code during the initial period of suspension.
 - 26.2. He must participate promptly and fully in any anti-corruption education and/or rehabilitation programmes as specified by the ICC.
27. Mr Jayawickrama has agreed to this sanction. As such, a period of ineligibility of one (1) year, of which the final six (6) months is suspended, is imposed.
28. In accordance with Code Article 6.4, Mr Jayawickrama's period of ineligibility shall commence on the date of this decision.
29. During his period of ineligibility, Mr Jayawickrama's status is as set out in Code Article 6.5 of the Code. This provides:

"No Participant who has been declared Ineligible may, during the period of Ineligibility, play, coach, officiate or otherwise participate or be involved in any capacity in any capacity in any Match or any other kind of function, event or activity (other than authorized anti-corruption education or rehabilitation programs) that is authorized, organized, sanctioned, recognized or supported in any way by the ICC, a National Cricket Federation, or any member under the jurisdiction of a National Cricket Federation, or receive accreditation to provide media or other services at an official venue or Match. The ICC and other National Cricket Federations shall take all reasonable steps within their powers

to give effect to this Article 6.5 to the extent that they have the jurisdiction, power or ability to do so.”

30. In accordance with Code Article 7.2 neither Mr Jayawickrama nor the ICC shall have any right of appeal against this decision.

Conclusion

31. To summarise:

- 31.1. Mr Jayawickrama admits that he has committed a breach of Code Article 2.4.7.
- 31.2. A period of Ineligibility of one (1) year, of which six (6) months is suspended, is imposed pursuant to Code Article 6.2, commencing on the date of this decision.
- 31.3. Mr Jayawickrama’s status during the period of Ineligibility is as set out in Code Article 6.5.
- 31.4. This decision constitutes the final decision of the ICC in this matter and will be disclosed publicly, including on the ICC’s website.
- 31.5. There is no need for any further hearing in these proceedings, which are hereby terminated.

Dubai, 30 September 2024