

STANDARDS OF PROOF OF THE JURISDICTIONAL BODIES OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN SPORTS FEDERATIONS IN DISCIPLINARY DISPUTES****Ilia A. Vasilyev, Natalia A. Sidorova, Evgeniya G. Lukyanova***St. Petersburg University, St. Petersburg, Russia***Article info**

Received –
2025 September 30
Accepted –
2026 January 12
Available online –
2026 March 20

Keywords

All-Russian sports federations,
sport dispute, jurisdictional body,
obligatory pre-trial litigation of
sports disputes, standard of proof,
evaluation of evidences, balance of
probabilities, comfortable
satisfaction

The subject. Some All-Russian sports federations have established jurisdictional bodies for mandatory pre-trial dispute resolution in professional and high-performance sports. Pre-trial dispute resolution is regulated by the rules of the federations. There are no literal “standards of proof” in Russian civil and arbitration procedural legislation. However, standards of proof have been developed at courts’ practice. The situation is different with regard to the rules of the All-Russian sports federations for resolving disputes in a pre-trial manner. Some federations have established literal standards of proof (“comfortable satisfaction”, “balance of probabilities”). Most federations either referred to dispute resolution by members of their jurisdictional bodies “according to their inner conviction” (in different versions of the phrase) or did not regulate this issue.

The purpose of the study. The article analyzes the norms of the All-Russian sports federations governing the procedure for mandatory pre-trial resolution of disciplinary disputes in sports in order to consolidate the standards of proof and the principle of evidence assessment by the members of the jurisdictional bodies of the federations “according to their inner conviction, based on a comprehensive, complete and objective study of the totality of all the circumstances of the case” in various versions of the above wording.

Methodology. The authors used the method of monitoring the norms of acts of All-Russian sports federations, the method of analyzing the norms-results of monitoring, and the method of comparing the analysis results.

The main results. As a result of the monitoring, it was revealed that the consolidation of one of the two standards of evidence (“comfortable satisfaction” and “balance of probabilities”) used in global sports for dispute resolution takes place among individual federations. It is much more common to include references to “one’s inner conviction” in regulatory norms when evaluating evidence. The latter can be considered as a standard of proof, but its compliance with “sufficient conviction” or “balance of probabilities” remains uncertain. There is also a widespread lack of a requirement in the regulatory norms of federations for members of arbitrators of jurisdictional bodies to evaluate evidence “according to their inner conviction”. However, such a legal policy of federations should not be treated critically, mistakenly equating it to ignoring the guarantees of sports entities for the predictability of disciplinary decisions. The authors also consider it necessary to consider the possibility of lowering the threshold of proof for clubs in disputes over so-called “strict liability” to a “balance of probabilities”.

Conclusions. All-Russian sports federations rarely establish literal “standards of proof”. To make progress, we may turn to the practice of courts in civil and arbitration proceedings, which has developed several “standards of proof”.

Conclusions. The legal framework of Russian smart cities, represented by sublegislative acts implementing plans and programs, is characterized by flexibility, mobility, and inconsistency.

** The research was financially supported by the Russian Science Foundation, project No. 24-28-00565, “Standards of proof in the Russian legal system”, <https://rscf.ru/project/24-28-00565/>.

1. Introduction.

In one of our previous studies, we came to the conclusion that the distribution of standards of proof depending on the category of a sports dispute can be considered as the correct normative policy of sports organizations [1, p. 79]. To continue studying the issue, we turned to the websites of the All-Russian sports federations (hereinafter also referred to as federations) according to the registry of the Ministry of Sports of the Russian Federation as of August 22, 2025¹ regarding the availability in the public domain of norms regulating the procedure of jurisdictional bodies for mandatory pre-trial dispute resolution (hereinafter also referred to as jurisdictional bodies) in accordance with the principle of self-regulation [2].

Our aim is to identify the literal and implied “standards of proof” used by the jurisdictional bodies of federations to resolve disciplinary disputes. The latter combine the consideration of so-called “disciplinary offenses”, that is, violations of the federations’ regulatory norms on duties and prohibitions, which is the basis for bringing subjects recognizing such norms to sports responsibility [3].

2. Standards of evidence and “internal conviction” at disciplinary disputes.

Our monitoring of the regulatory norms of the federations confirms that mainly the jurisdictional bodies have been created to resolve disciplinary disputes. This is quite logical, since this category covers any harassment by federations of the behavior of sports subjects, which is fixed in their regulatory norms as unlawful [4].

The application of ethical standards, which in the last decade have been actively included to the acts

of federations and have received a mechanism to ensure their implementation in the form of sports responsibility measures [5], also belong to the category of disciplinary disputes.

In the regulatory norms of the federations, we found two examples of the consolidation of standards of “sufficient conviction” (comfortable satisfaction) and “balance of probabilities” for the procedure of resolving disciplinary disputes.

The “sufficient conviction” of the members of the jurisdictional body is referred to in the Regulations on the Disciplinary Commission of the All-Russian public organization All-Russian Athletics Federation². According to paragraphs 8.2, 8.3 of article 8 of the above Regulations, “the standard of proof is considered to be met if the board of the Disciplinary Commission has established the commission of the alleged violation to a greater extent than the “balance of probabilities”. At the same time, the “balance of probabilities” standard means a standard of proof when an event could have occurred (or not occurred) with a probability of more than 50%. We called this standard, which is not named in the norms of the federation, “sufficient conviction”, since it is the latter that is one level higher in the vertical of the strictness of the evidentiary requirements³. At the same time, the mention of evaluating evidence based on internal conviction is also included to paragraph 9.4 of article 9 of

² URL: <https://rusathletics.info/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/polozhenie-o-disciplinarnoj-komissii-vfla.pdf>.

³ Arbitration CAS 2023/A/9364 Hisham Nasr v. International Handball Federation (IHF), award of 23 October 2023, para. 141. URL: <https://jurisprudence.tas-cas.org/Shared%20Documents/9364.pdf>.

¹ URL: <https://minsport.gov.ru/sports-federation-registers>.
Law Enforcement Review
2026, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 84–93

the cited Regulations: “The Board evaluates evidence based on its internal conviction, based on a comprehensive, complete and objective investigation of all the circumstances of the case”. As a result, there is an interesting combination of providing members of the jurisdictional body with the right to evaluate evidence based on internal conviction, which must meet the standard of proof above the “balance of probabilities”.

The “balance of probabilities” is used when considering disputes by a jurisdictional body in accordance with the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian Public Organization The Russian Powerlifting Federation (FPR). According to paragraph 7.9 of the Regulations, “when establishing the fact of a violation, the FPR jurisdictional authority proceeds from the “balance of probabilities”. The “balance of probabilities” refers to a standard of proof when an event could have occurred (or not occurred) with a probability of more than 50%”. However, the federation does not supplement the standard with an assessment of evidence based on an internal belief. Such a rule-making approach seems quite logical to us when the “softest” of the standards of proof is used, since there is no risk of a “lowered internal conviction” of the jurisdictional body in the presence or absence of the fact(s).

It should be noted that the difference in the standards of evidence used in resolving disciplinary disputes is predetermined by examples of both the norms of various sports organizations and Russian procedural branches of law, in which one can find a “balance of probabilities” [6; 7]; “sufficient conviction” [8; 9; 10; 11]; “the preponderance of evidence”, “clear and convincing evidence”, “beyond reasonable doubt” [12; 13].

The consolidation or absence of the principle of “internal persuasion” in the regulatory norms allows us to identify several approaches of federations.

The first approach is the standard rule for Russian procedural codes on the assessment of evidence by members of jurisdictional bodies “according to their inner conviction, based on a comprehensive, complete and objective investigation of all the circumstances of the case”: article 52 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization All-Russian Federation of Dance Sports, Breaking and Acrobatic Rock’n’roll⁴; article 59 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Bowling Federation of Russia”⁵; paragraph 9 of article 24.1 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Handball Federation”⁶; article 62 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Kickboxing Federation”⁷; article 70 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Computer Sports Federation”⁸; paragraph 7 of article 37.1 of the Code of Ethics of the All-Russian sports public organization “Russian Practical

⁴ URL: https://fdsarr.ru/federation/documents/aktualnye-normativnye-dokumenty-/distsiplinarnyy-reglament-ftsarr-ot-04-10-2024-/?sphrase_id=557772.

⁵ URL: https://russianbowling.ru/netcat_files/multifile/1699/876/Distsiplinarnyy_reglament_FBR_31_1224_ot_24.12.2024.pdf;

⁶ URL: https://rushandball.ru/Files/Documents/disciplinary_regulations_2025.pdf.

⁷ URL: <https://xn--j1amk.xn--p1ai/kontrolno-disciplinarnyyj-komitet-fkr>.

⁸ URL: <https://resf.ru/about/documentation/?ysclid=mfv7co84o839449330>.

Shooting Federation”⁹; article 28 of the Regulations on The Control and Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Rugby Sports Federation (Union)”¹⁰; paragraph 4 of article 35 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian Physical Culture and Sports public organization “All-Russian Federation of Hand-to-Hand Combat”¹¹; paragraph 4.5 of article 4 of the Regulations on the Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian Public Organization “Federation of Fitness and Aerobics of Russia”¹²; article 67 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Football Union”¹³; article 34 of the Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Football Union” on ethics¹⁴; article 29 of the Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Football Union” on dispute resolution¹⁵; article 73 of the Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Hockey Federation”¹⁶; paragraph 28.3 of article 28 of the Regulations on Arbitration at the public organization “All-Russian Volleyball Federation”¹⁷; paragraph 57.3 of article 57 of the Regulations on Sports Sanctions in

the sport of Chess¹⁸.

The second approach is to consolidate the modified wording, which is reflected at paragraph 6.2 of article 6 of the Regulations on the Ethics Commission of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Chess Federation”¹⁹: “In its activities, the Commission also proceeds... and makes decisions based on internal beliefs, based on a full, comprehensive and objective *study of each specific case*” (highlighted by us – authors). In comparison with the previous version, there is a difference that allows the jurisdictional body to act in a larger range of discretion, simplifying the dispute resolution procedure. Please note that an arbitrator of a jurisdictional body is not required to justify his or her inner conviction, which must be disclosed in the reasoning part of the full decision²⁰, by a comprehensive, complete and objective investigation of all the circumstances of the case. It is enough to provide arguments that confirm a full, comprehensive and objective study of each specific violation of the federation's ethics standards, without paying attention to the “totality of circumstances”.

The third approach is to reduce the standard wording to “assessment of evidence based on an internal conviction” without disclosing that the latter should be based on “a comprehensive, complete and objective investigation of the totality of all the circumstances of the case”. Let us refer to article 19 of the Regulation on the Court of Appeal of the All-Russian Public organization of Motor Sports “Russian Automobile Federation” as an example: “judges

⁹ URL: <https://disk.yandex.ru/d/mAJNDb8VoXjIhA/11.%20Дисциплинарный%20комитет>.

¹⁰ URL: <https://rugby.ru/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Polozhenie-o-KDK-2023.pdf>.

¹¹ URL: <https://rffrb.ru/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/Distsiplinarnyj-Reglament-.pdf>.

¹² URL: <https://disk.360.yandex.ru/i/c11-Axxoi7vPiw>.

¹³ URL: https://rfs.ru/subject/1/documents?cat_id=59.

¹⁴ URL: https://rfs.ru/subject/1/documents?cat_id=60.

¹⁵ URL: https://rfs.ru/subject/1/documents?cat_id=57.

¹⁶ URL: https://fhr.ru/upload/iblock/8bb/Distsiplinarnyi-reglament-FKHR-_v-red.-ot-10.12.2024_.pdf.

¹⁷ URL: [https://volley.ru//assets/files/documents/5381/%D0%9F%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B5%20%D0%BE%D0%B1%20%D0%90%D1%80%D0%B1%D0%B8%D1%82%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B6%D0%B5%20%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%B8%20%D0%92%D0%A4%D0%92%20\(1\).pdf](https://volley.ru//assets/files/documents/5381/%D0%9F%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B5%20%D0%BE%D0%B1%20%D0%90%D1%80%D0%B1%D0%B8%D1%82%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B6%D0%B5%20%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%B8%20%D0%92%D0%A4%D0%92%20(1).pdf).

¹⁸ URL: <https://ruchess.ru/upload/iblock/57d/57d0ef54ee9b759e74f6f66f4884bb6b.pdf>.

¹⁹ URL: <https://ruchess.ru/upload/iblock/ddd/0xeyy34gu903bo8ym7pxma3b5jn9rx0/Polozhenie-o-komissi-po-etike-Fin.pdf>.

²⁰ If the requirement to provide a justification for accepting or rejecting evidence and, in general, to motivate the decision is established in the regulatory norms, we will return to this nuance of the regulatory policy of the federations later in this article.

evaluate evidence based on their own internal conviction”²¹. An identical norm is contained at paragraph 1.7.4 of the Regulations on the Court of Appeal of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Motorcycle Sports Federation”²². The absence of a requirement for arbitrators of jurisdictional bodies to form their internal conviction on a comprehensive, complete and objective study of the totality of all the circumstances of the case theoretically opens up the possibility for them to evaluate the evidence without a systematic appeal to others.

The fourth approach – the federation's norms governing the resolution of disciplinary disputes do not establish any standard of proof, nor the assessment of evidence “according to one's inner conviction, based on a comprehensive, complete and objective study of the totality of all the circumstances of the case”, an amended or abbreviated version of this wording: Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “All-Russian Federation of Dance Sports, Breaking and Acrobatic Rock'n'roll”²³; Regulations on the Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian public organization “All-Russian Federation of Dance Sports, Breaking and Acrobatic Acrobatic Rock'n'roll”²⁴; Regulations on the Appeal Committee of the All-Russian Public organization “All-Russian Federation of Dance Sports, Breaking

and Acrobatic Rock'n'roll”²⁵; Regulations on the Sports and Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian Sports Public organization “National Badminton Federation of Russia”²⁶; Regulations of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Basketball Federation” “Player Status”²⁷; Regulations on the Disciplinary Commission of the All-Russian Public organization “Russian Basketball Federation”²⁸; Regulations on the Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian public organization of the Biathlon Federation “Union of Biathletes of Russia”²⁹; Disciplinary Charter All-Russian public organization “Billiard Sports Federation of Russia”³⁰; Regulation on the Disciplinary Commission of the all-Russian public organization “Billiard Sports Federation of Russia”³¹; the Regulations on the Disciplinary and ethics Commission of the Russian public organization “Federation of Boxing of Russia”³²; the Regulations on the Disciplinary Commission of public organization “All-Russian Volleyball Federation”³³; Regulations on the Sports-Arbitration Commission of the Russian public organization “The Handball Federation of

²⁵ URL: <https://fdsarr.ru/federation/documents/obshchie-polozhenie-ob-apellyatsionnom-komitete-ftsarr-izmeneniya-utverzhdny-protokolom-ot-04-12-2020-137>.

²⁶ URL: [https://nfbr.ru/files/File/docs/2013/pologSDK1\(3\).doc](https://nfbr.ru/files/File/docs/2013/pologSDK1(3).doc).

²⁷ URL: <https://russiabasket.ru/federation/documents>.

²⁸ URL: <https://russiabasket.ru/Files/Documents/Polozhenie-o-Distsiplinarnoj-komissii-RFB-280916.pdf?ysclid=mee5wae1ke2483566>.

²⁹ URL: <https://biathlonrus.com/upload/iblock/d95/irsxjzzzqm6n14s9812eaaro26ke16c/Polozheniya-o-Distsiplinarnom-komitete-SBR-v-redaktsii-ot-04.10.2024.pdf>.

³⁰ URL: http://www.fbsrf.ru/sites/default/files/03-disciplinarnyy_ustav_fbsr_2024-01.pdf.

³¹ URL: https://www.fbsrf.ru/sites/default/files/polozhenie_o_disc_komissii_1.pdf.

³² URL: <https://rusboxing.ru/about/Documents>.

³³ URL: https://volley.ru/assets/files/documents/1783/4190_document.pdf.

²¹ URL: <https://raf.su/search?query=%D0%9F%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B5%20%D0%BE%D0%B1%20%D0%90%D0%BF%D0%B5%D0%BB%D0%BB%D1%8F%D1%86%D0%B8%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BC%20%D1%81%D1%83%D0%B4%D0%B5&type=2>.

²² URL: <https://www.mfr.ru/upload/iblock/16d/f37a2llak8b6zw7hgjx9eysw7s66jkuw/Regulations-on-Court-of-Appeal-of-MFR.pdf>.

²³ URL: https://fdsarr.ru/federation/documents/aktualnye-normativnye-dokumenty-/distsiplinarnyy-reglament-ftsarr-ot-04-10-2024-/?sphrase_id=557772.

²⁴ URL: <https://fdsarr.ru/federation/documents/obshchie-polozhenie-o-distsiplinarnom-komitete-ftsarr-izmeneniya-utverzhdny-protokolom-ot-04-12-2020-137>.

Russia”³⁴; Statute of the Control and disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian public organization “Russian Ski Federation”³⁵; Disciplinary Regulations of the All-Russian physical culture and sports public organization “Federation of Darts Russia”³⁶; Regulations on the Control and Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian sports public organization “Federation of Karate of Russia”³⁷; Regulations “On the disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian public organization “Federation of Curling of Russia”³⁸; Disciplinary Code of the Russian public organization “Federation of Equestrian Sports of Russia”³⁹; Regulations on the Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian physical culture and sports public organization “Federation of Kudo of Russia”⁴⁰; Disciplinary and Ethical rules of the All-Russian public organization “Federation Russia backgammon”⁴¹; Provision on Sports disciplinary Commission of the Russian public sports organization “Table Tennis

Federation of Russia”⁴²; Disciplinary Code of the Russian public organization “Federation of Underwater Sports Federation”⁴³; Regulations on the Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian physical culture and sports public organization “All-Russian Sambo Federatio”⁴⁴; Statute of the Commission for Ethics and Discipline All-Russian public organization “Federation of Luge Russia”⁴⁵; Regulations on the Disciplinary Commission of the All-Russian public organization “Federation of Climbing of Russia”⁴⁶; Disciplinary Regulations of the Russian public organization “Federation of Wrestling of Russia”⁴⁷; Regulations on the Disciplinary Committee (Disciplinary Rules) of the All-Russian physical culture and sports public organization “Sport Knife Throwing”⁴⁸; Disciplinary Regulations of the Russian public organization “Federation of Orienteering Russia”⁴⁹; Regulations on the Disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian public organization “Russia’s Tennis Federation”⁵⁰; Regulations of the Disciplinary

³⁴ URL:
https://rushandball.ru/Files/Documents/pologenie_SAK.pdf.

³⁵ URL: <http://fgssr.ru/sites/default/files/FGSSRDocument/27-03-2017/%D0%9F%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B5%20%D0%BE%20%D0%9A%D0%BE%D0%BD%D1%82%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B%D1%8C%D0%BD%D0%BE-%D0%B4%D0%B8%D1%81%D1%86%D0%B8%D0%BF%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%80%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BC%20%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%BC%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%B5.pdf>

³⁶ URL: <https://dartsrf.ru/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/reglament-disciplina-20250517.pdf>.

³⁷ URL:
<https://ruswkf.ru/upload/iblock/6ab/ygdw373kqzd6zcogzugcju94v0fx1kx/%D0%9F%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B5%20%D0%BE%20%D0%9A%D0%94%D0%9A.pdf>.

³⁸ URL:
<https://curling.ru/data/1678800039/files/1680100402.pdf>.

³⁹ URL:
https://fksr.org/files/uploads/Disciplinarnyj_kodeks_s_prilozhenijami__utv___protokol___B_20-09_21_ot_03_09_2021_.pdf.

⁴⁰ URL: <https://kudo.ru/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/disciplinary-commission-2020.pdf>.

⁴¹ URL: https://sportnardy.ru/images/NARDI/Disciplinarnyieticeskij_reglament%20FNR.pdf.

⁴² URL:
<https://kcr.tftr.ru/storage/media/925/c344bc50a48e56f8f45e5c362971caaf8402fbe7.pdf>.

⁴³ URL:
https://ruf.ru/assets/files/doc_FPSR/disciplinarnyi_kodex_fpsr_03.05.2023.pdf?ysclid=mg556r30iq862411316.

⁴⁴ URL:
https://sambo.ru/media/resource/2018/10/24/dlya_sajta_polozhenie.docx.

⁴⁵ URL:
<https://rusluge.ru/upload/iblock/2f3/9zpkrl9hc2ps5j10xap3g41w63clmrzw.pdf>.

⁴⁶ URL:
<https://rusclimbing.ru/upload/iblock/ecf/Polozhenie-o-DK.pdf>.

⁴⁷ URL:
https://hb.bizmrg.com/st.fsbr/documents/common/%7Bitem_id%7D/Дисциплинарный_регламент_ФСБР_от_27_03_2024.pdf.

⁴⁸ URL:
<https://rusmn.ru/assets/images/docs/polopgenia/disciplinarnyireglament.pdf>.

⁴⁹ URL: <https://rufso.ru/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2013-11-30-07-05-46.pdf>.

⁵⁰ URL: <https://tennis-russia.ru/upload/custom/f82/f824f96b1d229932fd50068afd42a56.pdf>.

Committee of the All-Russian public organization “Union Taekwondo Russia”⁵¹; Code of Ethics of the Russian public organization “Sports Federation “Universal combat”⁵²; Disciplinary Regulations of the Russian public organization “Federation fencing Russia”⁵³; Regulations of the Ethics Committee of All-Russian public organization “Federation of figure skating of Russia”⁵⁴; Code of Ethics of the All-Russian physical culture and sports public organization “All-Russian Federation digital sport (functional digital sport)”⁵⁵; Regulations on the Control and disciplinary Committee of the All-Russian public organization “Federation of hockey of Russia”⁵⁶.

In the Russian scientific literature, one can find the opinion that “internal conviction” for the assessment of evidence by a jurisdictional bodies is the domestic doctrinal equivalent of the standard of proof [14]. Adhering to this point of view, the fourth approach of the federations mentioned above does not include either a literal standard of proof (named in the provisions of the act) or an implied one (through reference to “internal conviction”). However, this is not the case. The normative policy of the federations under

consideration means authorizing members of the jurisdictional bodies to decide according to the “softest” version of “conviction” – the “balance of probabilities”.

3. Conclusions.

In the Russian and foreign scientific literature, one can find the use of the terms “standard of proof” [15; 16; 17], “the standard of what has proved” [18] and “the validity of the charge” [19]. Whichever of the above points of view the federations adhere to, it is enough for them to choose and legislatively fix the criterion (or abandon the definition of such), which allows the jurisdictional authority to make a conclusion in terms of probability [20, p. 5]. This will be the standard of proof.

The results obtained from monitoring the federations’ rules on the procedure for resolving disciplinary disputes almost completely coincided with our hypothesis about the rarity of establishing literal standards of proof (in the acts of the two federations). In the remaining array of analyzed norms, the federations either established an implied standard of “sufficient conviction” (by referring to “internal conviction” in full or abbreviated versions of the wording), or determined the actual “balance of probabilities” as the “softest” version of the threshold of “internal conviction”.

Since disciplinary disputes are related to the use of restrictive legal enforcement measures against sports entities, the uncertainty in the arguments of the latter as the unpredictability of negative consequences is a fundamental defect in regulation. Therefore, it seems important that federations that do not refer in their rules to standards of proof or internal conviction oblige their jurisdiction

⁵¹ URL: <https://tkdrussia.ru/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/2025-Дисциплинарная-Комиссия.pdf>.

⁵² URL: https://docs.yandex.ru/docs/view?url=ya-browser%3A%2F%2F4DT1uXEPRrJRXIUFoewruP9DzDBMopaTv-r1KNg9RX3IohxYi3MajX3i66021WWRa7i2Hu6nR6Esom335B986gW0oJJkgJUOeFgje0vzSlrBpVJ8yu-KZeUq2vI8tZLHPJvltS6W-4zJXxa1gO6GEG%3D%3D%3Fsign%3DvhKu7wduu4Q2Nb3zmC6Zn7GkIRN_3CfKN_P9T_ruuAc%3D&name=Kodeks-etiki-OSF-UB-1.doc&nosw=1.

⁵³ URL: <https://www.rusfencing.ru/upload/iblock/630/630e6ce21d02e3306a6979afc04409da.pdf>.

⁵⁴ URL: https://fsrussia.ru/files/docs/commission_code_of_ethics_fsfr.pdf.

⁵⁵ URL: <https://phygitalsport.ru/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/Kodeks-etiki-VFFS.pdf>.

⁵⁶ URL: <http://www.rusbandy.ru/document/127>.

al authorities to provide justification for accepting or rejecting evidence and the decision itself as a whole.

The federation's choice between "sufficient conviction" (comfortable satisfaction) and "balance of probabilities" in relation to disciplinary disputes may be based on (a) reference to the regulatory norms of the international federation of which it is a member, or (b) determination of the complexity of the evidence collection process in a particular sport due to the use of procedural institutions (conducting preliminary disciplinary investigations by the federation body; obliging sports subjects to cooperate; establishing an open or closed list of evidence; a broad or narrow understanding of the admissibility of evidence; and some others).

Among the grounds for disciplinary disputes in team sports, a group of violations should be identified that relate to the so-called "strict liability", which occurs, for example, for a sports club, regardless of whether or not it is guilty of the behavior of its spectators. Today, the regulatory norms of federations do not single out their own standard (standards) of proof or special requirements for the internal conviction of members of jurisdictional bodies for this group of disputes. At the same time, it seems possible to consolidate the combination of the two standards in a situation of "strict liability". "Balance of probabilities" – for the club in order to simplify the procedure for proving (a) the absence of a violation event (the behavior of its spectators (fans) and (b) the non-affiliation of spectators (fans) who violated the rules of the federation. "Sufficient conviction" (comfortable satisfaction) is for federations that have a greater opportunity to prove these facts in comparison with the club.

REFERENCES

1. Vasilyev I.A., Vetrova E.G. Freedom of keeping and evaluation of evidence by the jurisdictional bodies of Russian sports organizations. *Pravoprimenenie = Law Enforcement Review*, 2025, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 74–83. DOI: 10.52468/2542-1514.2025.9(1).74-83.
2. Dorskaia A.A., Dorskii A.Yu. Co-regulation as a way to improve the effectiveness of legal regulation in sports. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Pravo = Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law*, 2021, vol. 12, iss. 2, pp. 263–275. DOI: 10.21638/spbu14.2021.202.
3. Van Kleef R. The legal status of disciplinary regulations in sport. *The International Sports Law Journal*, 2014, vol. 14, iss. 1–2, pp. 24–45. DOI: 10.1007/s40318-013-0035-z.
4. Van Kleef R. Reviewing Disciplinary Sanctions in Sports. *Cambridge Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 2015, vol. 4, iss. 1, pp. 3–28. DOI: 10.7574/cjicl.04.01.3.
5. Vasilyev I.A. Legalization of Ethics in Sports and Disciplinary Liability for “Disrepute”. *Kutafin Law Review*, 2023, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 404–425. DOI: 10.17803/2713-0533.2023.2.24.404-425.
6. Vetrova E.G., Khalatova R.I., Kashaeva A.A. Exceptional circumstances beyond International Swimming Federation Doping Control Rules: The Sun Yang case of Court of Arbitration for Sport. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Pravo = Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law*, 2021, vol. 12, iss. 1, pp. 131–143. DOI: 10.21638/spbu14.2021.109.
7. Exner J. Fixed sanction frameworks in the World Anti-Doping Codes 2015 and 2021: Can hearing panels go below the limits in the pursuit of proportionate punishments?. *The International Sports Law Journal*, 2020, vol. 20, iss. 3–4, pp. 126–144. DOI: 10.1007/s40318-020-00173-9.
8. Smolnikov D.I. Myths about standards of proof. *Zakon*, 2015, no. 12, pp. 199–205. (In Russ.).
9. Vasilyev I.A., Pang Donmei, Sidorova N.A., Stoiko N.G., Cai Jun. “Comfortable satisfaction” in resolution of disciplinary disputes on match-fixing of the results of sporting competitions. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Pravo = Tomsk State University Journal of Law*, 2022, no. 45, pp. 20–37. DOI: 10.17223/22253513/45/2. (In Russ.).
10. Jun C., Vasilyev I.A., Izmalkova M.P., Dongmei P., Khalatova R.I. Problems of proof in football clubs’ disciplinary liability for match-fixing: practice of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) (2009-2014). *Zhurnal SFU. Gumanitarnye nauki = Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2019, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 343–362. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0398.
11. Diaconu M., Kuwelkar S., Kuhn A. The Court of Arbitration for Sport jurisprudence on match-fixing: a legal update. *The International Sports Law Journal*, 2021, vol. 21, iss. 1–2, pp. 27–46. DOI: 10.1007/s40318-021-00181-3.
12. Mezinov D.A. The standard “beyond reasonable doubt” as a criterion for achieving the purpose of criminal procedure proof. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Pravo = Tomsk State University Journal of Law*, 2017, no. 23, pp. 40–47. DOI: 10.17223/22253513/23/5. (In Russ.).
13. Sidorova N., Platonova N., Vasilyev I. Standard of proof and Russian procedure law: unknown or well known?. *Balkan Social Science Review*, 2022, vol. 19, pp. 89–106. DOI: 10.46763/BSSR2219089s.
14. Budylin S.L. Inner conviction or balance of probabilities? Standards of evidence in Russia and abroad. *Vestnik Vysshego arbitrazhnogo suda Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, 2014, no. 3, pp. 25–57. (In Russ.).
15. Shchepel’kov V.F., Burlakov V.N., Stoyko N.G., Sidorova N.A. Standard evidence of alcohol intoxication in road traffic cases. Criminal law and criminal procedure value. Realities and perspectives. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Pravo = Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law*, 2019, vol. 10, iss. 2, pp. 373–389. DOI: 10.21638/spbu14.2019.212. (In Russ.).
16. Burmagin S.V. Procedural Standards of Proof in Special Judicial and Criminal Proceedings. *Pravovaya paradigma = Legal Concept*, 2022, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 168–177. DOI: 10.15688/lc.jvolsu.2022.4.23. (In Russ.).
17. Biedermann A., Caruso D., Kotsoglou K.N. Decision Theory, Relative Plausibility and the Criminal Standard of Proof. *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 2021, vol. 15, iss. 2, pp. 131–157. DOI: 10.1007/s11572-020-09527-8.
18. Smirnov A.V. Standards of proof: relationship with presumptions and burden of proof distribution. *Ugolovnyi protsess = Criminal procedure*, 2021, no. 12, pp. 86–94. DOI: 10.53114/20764413_2021_12_86. (In Russ.).
19. Muraviev M.V. On the revision of the legal standards of proof and evidence in criminal proceedings.

Yuridicheskaya nauka i praktika: Vestnik Nizhegorodskoi akademii MVD Rossii = Legal science and practice: journal of Nizhny Novgorod academy of the Ministry of internal affairs of Russia, 2017, no. 2 (38), pp. 141–145. (In Russ.).

20. Karapetov A., Kosarev A. *Standards of Proof: Analytical and Empirical Research*, Supplement to *Vestnik ekonomicheskogo pravosudiya Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, no. 5 (63) May 2019. Moscow, Zakon Publ., 2019. 96 p. (In Russ.).

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHORS

Ilia A. Vasilyev – PhD in Law, Associate Professor; Associate Professor, Department of Theory and History of Law; Leading Researcher

St. Petersburg University

7/9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia

E-mail: i.vasilev@spbu.ru

Scopus AuthorID: 57196348447

ResearcherID: I-7480-2013

RSCI SPIN-code: 7524-7480

Natalia A. Sidorova – PhD in Law, Associate Professor; Associate Professor, Department of Criminal Proceedings; Leading Researcher

St. Petersburg University

7/9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia

E-mail: n.sidorova@spbu.ru

Scopus AuthorID: 57771834200 ResearcherID: G-5110-

2015 RSCI SPIN-code: 2834-7677

Evgeniya G. Lukyanova – Research Assistant

St. Petersburg University

7/9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia

E-mail: ginavet@rambler.ru

RSCI SPIN-code: 3881-0972; AuthorID: 1077378

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Vasilyev I.A., Sidorova N.A., Lukyanova E.G.

Standards of proof of the jurisdictional bodies of the All-Russian sports federations in disciplinary disputes.

Pravoprimenie = Law Enforcement Review, 2026,

vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 84–93. DOI: 10.52468/2542-1514.

2026.10(1).84-93. (In Russ.).