



London, 12 June 2025

Appeals Committee:

Chair Jonathan Speelman (ENG)

Member HiSham Al-Taher (UAE)

Reserve Aris Marghetis (CAN)

Round 6, Match 1, Board 6

<https://chess-results.com/PartieSuche.aspx?art=36&id=5968867>

Incident Description:

White played the move 21.Ra1, released the piece, then immediately grabbed it again, and played it to b2. Black claimed to the Match Arbiter that the piece had been released on a1. The arbiter had not seen the incident, and decided to continue with the position on the board, which was with the White Rook on b2. Several minutes later, the Captain of the team of the Black player approached the Chief Arbiter, to provide video evidence that White had indeed released the White Rook on a1 for move 21.Ra1

Chief Arbiter decision:

The Chief Arbiter decided that, all things considered, it would be more fair to the spirit and integrity of the game to return to the position after Black's 20th move, and continue with 21.Ra1

Appeal Complaint:

Whereas White eventually agreed to continue the game with the application of the Chief Arbiter's corrective decision, the Captain of the team of the White player claimed that the retroactive change in the status of that game affected how the rest of the team had approached other games within the same match.

Committee Evaluations:

- a) In reviewing the video evidence, the Appeals Committee understands that in the heat of battle, the White player believed that he hadn't fully released the piece.
- b) Black was correct in claiming that White had released his Rook on a1.
- c) As the Match Arbiter had not directly witnessed the incident, it is normal that he prioritised the position on the board.
- d) It is completely understandable that the Captain of the Black player provided the video evidence to the Chief Arbiter.
- e) The current Laws of the Game do not provide for retroactive correction of "touch-move" claims. However, the Chief Arbiter was provided with incontrovertible evidence that White had

released his Rook on a1. Therefore, the Chief Arbiter decided that the best decision, the most fair decision, for the spirit and integrity of the game, was to continue with 21.Ra1

f) It is understandable that the White player and his Captain filed this appeal.

Committee Decisions:

a) All parties to this incident (both players, both Captains, both arbiters), they all seem to have acted in good faith.

b) The decision to proceed with 21.Ra1 was the most fair to the actual game.

c) Therefore, there is nothing to change, and the result of the game stands.

d) Whereas the Appeals Committee considered alternative remedies, they were all deemed inferior to this decision. Note that any alternative has pros and cons, but the only actual “wrong” was that the White player really had released on 21.Ra1

e) The Appeals Committee finds this appeal was reasonable and recommends refunding any Appeals Deposit to the Appellant.