



TAS / CAS

TRIBUNAL ARBITRAL DU SPORT
COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT
TRIBUNAL ARBITRAL DEL DEPORTE

CAS 2025/A/11904 Asaria SC v Libyan Football Federation (LFF) & Wefaq Ejdaya & Al-Dhara SC & Al-Khoms FC

ARBITRAL AWARD

delivered by the

COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

sitting in the following composition:

Sole Arbitrator: Mr Patrick Grandjean, Attorney-at-law, Belmont-sur-Lausanne, Switzerland

in the arbitration between

Asaria SC, Al-Zawiya City, Libya

Represented by Mr Gauthier Bouchat, Attorney-at-Law, Eleven & Law, Liège, Belgium

- Appellant -

and

Libyan Football Federation, Tripoli, Libya

Represented by Mr Fahmi Belhadj Mohamed, Attorney-at-Law, Sousse, Tunisia

- First Respondent -

Wefaq Ejdaya, Ejdaya, Libya

- Second Respondent -

Al-Dhara SC, Tripoli, Libya

Represented by Mr Lamjed Belkahia, Attorney-at-Law, Belkahia & Partners Law Firm, Bizerte, Tunisia and Global Promotion for Sport, Ontario, Canada,

- Third Respondent -

Al-Khoms Sport, Cultural and Social Club, Al-Khoms, Libya

- Fourth Respondent -

* * * * *

I. PARTIES

1. Asaria SC is a football club with its registered office in Al-Zawiya City, Libya (“Asaria”). It is a member of the Libyan Football Federation.
2. The Libyan Football Federation is the national governing body of football in Libya, with its registered office in Tripoli, Libya (“LFF”). It is affiliated with the *Fédération Internationale de Football Association* (“FIFA”).
3. Wefaq Ejdabya is a football club with its registered office in Ejdabya, Libya (“Wefaq”). It is a member of the LFF.
4. Al-Dhara Club (also known as Al-Dhahra Club or Al-Dahra Club) is a football club with its registered office in Tripoli, Libya (“Al-Dhara”). It is a member of the LFF.
5. Al-Khoms Sport, Cultural and Social Club is a football club with its registered office in Al-Khoms, Libya (“Al-Khoms”). It is a member of the LFF.
6. The LFF, Wefaq, Al-Dhara and Al-Khoms are jointly referred to as the “Respondents”.
7. Asaria and the Respondents are jointly referred to as the “Parties”.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Introduction

8. Below is a summary of the relevant facts and allegations based on the Parties’ written submissions and evidence adduced in these proceedings. References to additional facts and allegations found in the Parties’ written submissions and evidence will be made, where relevant, in connection with the legal analysis that follows. While the Sole Arbitrator has considered all the facts, allegations, legal arguments, and evidence submitted by the Parties in the present proceedings, he refers in his Award only to the submissions and evidence he deems necessary to explain his reasoning.

B. The LFF 2024/2025 Premier League

9. The LFF Premier League is structured into several stages, which can be summarized as follows:
 - 36 teams are divided into two regions: East and West.
 - Each region is further divided into two groups, for a total of four groups.
 - **The group stage:**
 - The nine teams compete within their respective groups in a round-robin format.
 - The top three teams from each group qualify for the second phase.
 - The last-ranked team in each group is automatically relegated.

- The teams finishing 7th and 8th in each group compete against each other in a home-and-away relegation play-out championship. From this playoff, two teams from each region are relegated.
- Wefaq was competing in Group A whereas Asaria, Al-Dhara and Al-Khoms were competing in Group D.

- **The Regional Championship Stage**

- The qualified teams compete in a new championship within their respective region (East and West compete separately).
- Each regional championship includes six teams.
- The top three teams from each regional championship advance to the final stage.

- **The Final Stage**

- The six qualified teams compete in a single championship round to determine the league champion.

C. The proceedings before the LFF

10. Since 5 November 2024, Al-Khoms has been subject to registration bans, due to several disciplinary or employment-related proceedings pending before FIFA.
11. Between November 2024 and 18 February 2025, notwithstanding the registration bans, Al-Khoms signed several employment contracts with new players (the “Ineligible Players”), namely:
 - Mr Abdullah Al-Bahloul;
 - Mr Mohammed Ayad;
 - Mr Dirar Al-Heshani;
 - Mr Amine Mhadhebi;
 - Mr Ouweis Esswaih;
 - Mr Abdulraouf Shoshan.
12. On 6 January 2025, Asaria lost its match against Al-Khoms with an on-field result of 0–2. It is undisputed that it did not lodge any protest following the match.
13. On 27 February 2025, Al-Khoms fielded several Ineligible Players in a match against Asaria. The match initially ended in a 3–1 victory for Asaria.
14. On 17 March 2025, following a protest lodged by Al-Khoms, the LFF Appeals Committee overturned the result of the match played on 27 February 2025 and imposed a 2–0 forfeit defeat on Asaria, on the grounds that it had fielded a suspended player.
15. On 21 March 2025, Asaria complained to FIFA that Al-Khoms had fielded Ineligible Players during the match played on 27 February 2025 and requested “*that the FIFA Disciplinary*

Committee open formal disciplinary proceedings against Al Khoms FC for breaches of the FIFA Disciplinary Code, and impose disciplinary sanctions on Al Khoms FC, including the forfeiture of all matches played since the first breach on 30 November 2024”.

16. On 1 April 2025, FIFA wrote the following to Al-Khoms:

“Request for information

Players

Player First Name Last Name Date of Birth Nationality

1	Abdullah	Al Bahloul	28/03/1997	Libya
2	Abdullah	Ben Khalil	25/07/1994	Libya
3	Mohammed	Ayad	15/02/1993	Libya
4	Dirar	Ellafi	18/04/2001	Libya
5	Ahmed	Al Abed	30/03/2001	Libya
6	Abdulraouf	Shoshan	04/09/2000	Libya
7	Ouweis	Esswaih	01/01/2000	Libya
8	Amine	Mhadhebi	07/11/1989	Tunisia

Case Reference: 3988

Dear Sir,

In our role as Regulatory Compliance of the FIFA Regulatory Governance and Compliance department, we are responsible for ensuring compliance and the proper application of FIFA regulations. This is how our department contributes to fulfilling FIFA's objectives, which include protecting and ensuring global integrity in football

We contact you regarding the above-mentioned players, (hereinafter, “the players”).

According to information online as well as at our disposal, it would appear that the players were registered for your, from November 2024 and onwards.

Moreover, we note that your club has had a registration ban since 5 November 2024, which prohibits new player registrations, internationally and domestically.

If established, this would appear to be in breach of provisions relating to art. 5 and 6 of the FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (“the Regulations”), and failure to respect a decision issued by a body, a committee or an instance of FIFA, in violation with art. 21 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code.

Consequently, and in accordance with art. 6 3 of Annexe 3 of the Regulations, we kindly request that you provide us with the following information:

- 1) Your position on the above-mentioned matter;*
- 2) The players' full registration details with your club [...];*
- 3) Any correspondences between your club and [the LFF] on this matter; and*
- 4) The team sheets from your club’s official matches from November 2024 to March 2025. Your club is kindly requested to comply with this request for information by 10 April 2025 at the latest.”*

17. The case file does not contain Al-Khoms' response to this letter.
18. On 1 April 2025, FIFA sent a similar "request for information" to the LFF.
19. On 4 April 2025, the LFF answered as follows to FIFA:

"[...] I would like to inform you that the registration of the players mentioned in your letter was done based on your last correspondence dated 18/2/2025, stating lifting the ban at national level (a copy of which is attached). The club also confirmed that they have settled all cases (three cases) (copies are attached)

All players listed are registered at the national, professional level, except the players: 1- Abdullah Al Bahloul been registered at first registration before ban 2- Abdullah Ben Khalil, not registered with the team club, and there are no international transfers.

We have noticed, through the TMS Platform, and after registering the players, that there was still a ban on Al-Khums Club, and therefore no player was registered for the aforementioned club after that date both at national level and of course at international level.

In addition, that their registration applications requests were pending until the date of receiving the concerned letter. (attached registration forms of the players) (team sheets of three different three matches during requested months)

Would like to assure that The Libyan Federation did not take any decision to register with the intention of disrespecting FIFA's decisions, and the registration of players was not intended to show favoritism towards Al-Khums Club but as we mentioned based on your letter and confirmation from the club."

20. When questioned on this matter in the course of the present arbitration proceedings, the LFF confirmed that, as of February 2026, it had not received any communication from FIFA regarding its requests for information of 1 April 2025.
21. On 11 April 2025, Al-Khoms and Al-Dhara played the last fixture of the group stage of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League. Al-Khoms hosted the match, fielded several Ineligible Players and won with a score of 3-2 (the "Match played on 11 April 2025").
22. On 11 April 2025, the standings of group D of the group stage of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League were as follows:

	Team	P	Pts
1	Ahli Tripoli	16	42
2	Al Madina	16	34
3	Eletti had Musrati	16	23
4	Al Watan	16	19
5	Libyan Stadium	16	18
6	Al Khums	16	16
7	Abelashhr	16	15
8	Al Dahra	16	15
9	Asaria	16	12

23. As a consequence and while Asaria was relegated, Al-Dhara as well as Abelashhr were required to participate in the relegation play-out championship, comprising six matches, in an attempt to retain their place in the LFF Premier League. Al-Dhara finished last in its group and failed to avoid relegation.
24. In a timely manner, Al-Dhara filed a protest alleging that Al-Khoms had fielded several Ineligible Players during the Match played on 11 April 2025.
25. On 26 July 2025, having exhausted all internal legal remedies within the LFF and in the absence of a satisfactory outcome, Al-Dhara filed an appeal before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (“CAS”), which was registered under case number CAS 2025/A/11619.
26. On 11 October 2025, the LFF Board of Directors issued the following decision (as translated from Arabic into English by Asaria – the “Appealed Decision”):

“Libyan Football Federation

Board of Directors – Decision No. (155) / 2025

Concerning the implementation of the outcome of the Board of Directors Meeting No. (06) held on Thursday, October 9, 2025

After reviewing:

- *Law No. (14) of 1962 regarding the establishment of the Libyan Olympic Committee and its amendments;*
- *The Statutes of the Libyan Football Federation, adopted by the General Assembly at its ordinary meeting held on Monday, 14/10/2024;*
- *The final results of the elections of the Board of Directors of the Federation at the Extraordinary Electoral Session of the General Assembly held on Saturday, 04/01/2025;*
- *The regulations governing the game of football applied by the Libyan Football Federation, and the complementary decisions, administrative instructions, and circulars issued concerning the registration and transfer of players;*
- *The deliberations and resolutions adopted by the Board of Directors of the Federation at its meeting held on Thursday, 09/10/2025.*

Preamble

Whereas the Libyan Football Federation has received numerous complaints regarding the procedures for registration and the exemptions and extensions granted to clubs in this respect, as well as the registration and transfer of players among clubs, which has necessitated investigation into these complaints and the adoption of preventive measures to ensure the proper conduct of the upcoming 2025/2026 sporting season and to avoid any suspension;

And in order to coordinate the Federation’s administration with the decisions and rulings of the International Federation, and to ensure that the Libyan Football Federation does not incur sanctions that could affect its recognition and participation internationally;

The Board of Directors of the Libyan Football Federation convened, reviewed all legal grievances, examined the statistics and related information, and after extensive deliberations, has resolved as follows:

Article (1)

To implement the resolutions of the Board of Directors Meeting No. (06) / 2025, held on Thursday, October 9, 2025, and to immediately adopt all necessary administrative procedures and preventive measures to ensure the smooth conduct of local competitions.

Article (2)

Wefaq Ejdaabya is granted the right to remain in the Premier League as compensation for the harm suffered and the loss of opportunities resulting from numerous administrative violations that infringed upon its rights, and in accordance with the recommendations of the International Federation.

Article (3)

Dhahra SC shall continue to participate in the 2025/2026 Premier League, in accordance with its rights as stated in the legal correspondence received and the established legal violations concerning the registration of players that affected the results of matches and subsequently its position in the general competition table.

Article (4)

All committees and departments affiliated with the Libyan Football Federation shall be instructed to coordinate the work necessary to include the aforementioned clubs within the competition plans and schedule for the 2025/2026 Premier League season, and to take all measures required to ensure the proper conduct of the competition in a manner consistent with the regulations of the International Federation of Football Associations and in accordance with the Basic Statutes of the Libyan Football Federation.

Article (5)

This decision shall enter into force as of the date of its issuance, and any decision contrary to it shall be annulled. The concerned clubs shall be notified, and the competent authorities shall implement it accordingly”

27. On 17 October 2025, Asaria wrote to the LFF to state that its exclusion from the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League constituted manifestly unequal and unjust treatment. Asaria requested its immediate reinstatement to the LFF Premier League, failing which it indicated that it would challenge the Appealed Decision before the CAS.
28. On 23 October 2025, the LFF replied that it refused to consider Asaria’s request on the grounds that it did “*not have a complaint or grievance pending before any judicial, arbitration, or supervisory body, whether national or international, related to the subject matter or concerning previous decisions of the Federation*”. It further indicated that it would reconsider its position only if the CAS issued a final decision in its favour.
29. The LFF Premier League competition for the 2025/2026 sports season was scheduled to start on 11 December 2025.

III. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

30. On 30 October 2025, Asaria lodged its Statement of Appeal with the CAS against the Appealed Decision in accordance with Article R47 *et seq.* of the Code of Sports-related Arbitration (the “Code”). It also filed a Request for Provisional Measures.
31. On 5 November 2025, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of Asaria’s Statement of Appeal and Request for Provisional Measures as well as of its payment of the CAS Court Office fee. It took note that Asaria had chosen English as the language of the arbitration proceedings and, in this respect, informed the Respondents that, unless they objected by 10 November 2025, the procedure would be conducted in English. The CAS Court Office granted the Respondents a deadline until 10 November 2025 to comment on Asaria’s request to refer the present matter to a sole arbitrator and to indicate whether they intended to proceed with the payment of their respective share of the advance on costs. The CAS Court Office invited the Respondents to submit their observations on Asaria’s Request for Provisional Measures by 12 November 2025.
32. On 5 November 2025, Asaria requested a fifteen-day extension of the deadline to file its Appeal Brief.
33. On 6 November 2025, Al-Dhara informed the CAS Court Office that it had only become aware of these arbitration proceedings through communication received from the LFF, as the email address used by Asaria in its Appeal Brief was incorrect. It maintained that “*the time periods for procedures specified above cannot be said to start counting from earlier than when effective notification arrives at correct address given here*”.
34. On 7 November 2025, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that, pursuant to Article R32 (2) of the Code, the first ten days of Asaria’s request for an extension of time to file its Appeal Brief had been granted and invited the Respondents to indicate by 11 November 2025, whether they agreed to a further extension of the remaining time limit. The CAS Court Office also confirmed that the deadlines set for the Respondents in its letter of 5 November 2025, were extended by one day for Al-Dhara, given the circumstances explained by the latter in its letter of 6 November 2025.
35. On 10 November 2025, the LFF informed the CAS Court Office that it agreed to refer the present matter to a sole arbitrator, requested that the proceedings be conducted in both French and English, confirmed that it did not intend to pay its share of the advance on costs, and requested that the time limit for filing its Answer to the Appeal Brief be fixed only once Asaria had paid its share of the advance on costs.
36. On 11 November 2025, the CAS Court Office invited Asaria, Wefaq, Al-Dhara and Al-Khoms to state by 11 November 2025, close of business, whether they consented to the proceedings being conducted in English, with the possibility of filing documents in French without the need for a translation. It also indicated that in the absence of any response from Wefaq and Al-Khoms, it would be for the President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division to determine the number of arbitrators in accordance with Article R50 of the Code. The CAS Court Office confirmed that the LFF would be invited to file its Answer only once Asaria’s payment of its share of advance on costs has been received.
37. On 11 November 2025, Al-Dhara informed the CAS Court Office that it objected to Asaria’s request for an additional fifteen days to file its Appeal Brief. It also confirmed that it agreed to

the appointment of a sole arbitrator and to English as being the language of the proceedings. It indicated that it did not intend to pay its share of the advance on costs and requested that the time limit to file its Answer be set after Asaria had paid its share of the advance on costs.

38. On 11 November 2025, the LFF informed the CAS Court Office that it did not object to Asaria's request for an extension of the deadline to file its Appeal Brief. The LFF further sought an additional extension until 13 November 2025 to file its response to the Request for Provisional Measures.
39. On 12 November 2025 and in view of the Respondents' respective positions or their silence, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that it would be for the President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division or her deputy to decide on the language of the proceedings, on the extension of Asaria's time limit to file its Appeal Brief and on the number of arbitrators to hear the present matter. It confirmed that the extension of time sought by the LFF to file its response to the Request for Provisional Measures had been granted pursuant to Article R32 (2) of the Code, and that, in accordance with Article R55 (3) of the Code, Al-Dhara would be invited to file its Answer only upon receipt of Asaria's payment of its share of the advance on costs.
40. On 12 and 13 November 2025, respectively, Al-Dhara and the LFF filed their response to the Request for Provisional Measures submitted by Asaria.
41. On 14 November 2025, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of the responses to Asaria's Request for Provisional Measures and confirmed that the Deputy President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division had decided to submit the dispute to a sole arbitrator, that the proceedings would be conducted exclusively in English and to grant Asaria a further five-day extension of its time limit to file its Appeal Brief.
42. On 27 November 2025, in response to the CAS Court Office's inquiries of 24, 25 and 26 November 2025 regarding the start date of the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League, the LFF confirmed that the official kick-off of the championship had been set for 11 December 2025.
43. On 1 December 2025, the CAS Court Office transmitted to the Parties the Order rendered that day by the Deputy President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division, dismissing Asaria's Request for Provisional Measures.
44. On 4 December 2025, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of Asaria's Appeal Brief, filed on 26 November 2025 in accordance with Article R51 of the Code. It informed the Respondents that Asaria had paid the advance of costs and granted them twenty days to file their Answer.
45. On 7 December 2025, Al-Dhara requested a thirty-day extension of the deadline to file its Answer.
46. On 8 December 2025, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that, pursuant to Article R32 (2) of the Code, the first ten days of Al-Dhara's request for an extension of time to file its Answer had been granted and invited the other Parties to indicate by 11 December 2025, whether they agreed to a further extension of the remaining time limit, it being specified that their silence would be deemed to constitute acceptance thereof.

47. On 8 December 2025, Asaria informed the CAS Court Office that it objected to Al-Dhara's request for an additional twenty days to file its Answer.
48. On 8 December 2025, the LFF requested a twenty-day extension of the deadline to file its Answer.
49. On 30 December 2025, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Deputy President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division had appointed Mr Patrick Grandjean, Attorney-at-law, Belmont-sur-Lausanne, Switzerland as Sole Arbitrator and decided to grant the LFF and Al-Dhara a further ten-day extension of their time limit to file their Answer.
50. On 8 and on 13 January 2026 respectively, the LFF and Al-Dhara filed their Answer in accordance with Article R55 of the Code.
51. On 20 January 2026, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of the Answers filed by the LFF and Al-Dhara and noted that, at that time, no communication had been received from Wefaq and Al-Khoms. The CAS Court Office drew the Parties' attention "*in particular to the objections as to the jurisdiction of the CAS and the admissibility of the appeal raised in the respective Answers. In accordance with Article R55 of the Code, [Asaria] and [Wefaq, Al-Dhara and Al-Khoms] are invited to file their positions on the objections raised by the [LFF] within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this letter by email. Within the same time limit, [Asaria, the LFF, Wefaq and Al-Khoms] are likewise invited to file their positions on the objections raised by [Al-Dhara]*".
52. On 22 January 2026, Al-Dhara filed its submissions regarding the admissibility of the appeal as well as the jurisdiction of the CAS. It requested the Sole Arbitrator to bifurcate the proceedings and determine, as a preliminary matter, the issues of CAS jurisdiction and the admissibility of the appeal, including the existence of an appealable decision, Asaria's standing and legal interest, and the exhaustion of internal remedies. Al-Dhara further requested that any procedural steps on the merits be stayed pending the determination of these preliminary objections, in the interest of procedural economy and to avoid unnecessary costs.
53. On 4 February 2026, Asaria filed its submissions addressing the objections to the jurisdiction of the CAS and the admissibility of its appeal raised by the LFF and by Al-Dhara.
54. On 6 February 2026, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of the submissions filed on 22 January 2026 by Al-Dhara and on 4 February 2026 by Asaria and noted that no communication had been received from the other Respondents within the prescribed time limit.
55. On 12 February 2026, the CAS Court Office invited Asaria, the LFF, Wefaq and Al-Khoms to comment on Al-Dhara's request for bifurcation of the present proceedings by 17 February 2026. Pursuant to Article R44.3 of the Code, it also requested the following documents to be produced within the same deadline:
 - by Asaria, a copy of the LFF Statutes and a copy of the LFF Competition Organising Regulations;

- by the LFF, the minutes of the deliberations and resolutions adopted at its Board Meeting held on 9 October 2025 and the complete regular-season rankings of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League;
- by the LFF and by Al-Khoms “*any and all decisions, findings, communications, rulings, or closing reports issued by FIFA and/or CAS in relation to disciplinary case no. 3988, including any measures, sanctions, or assessments rendered by the competent bodies.*”

56. On 16 February 2026, Asaria requested a seven-day extension of the time limit to respond to the CAS Court Office’s requests of 12 February 2026, which was granted.
57. On 17 February 2026, the LFF informed the CAS Court Office that it was in favour of the bifurcation of the present arbitration proceedings. It further indicated that no minutes of the deliberations or resolutions adopted at its Board Meeting held on 9 October 2025 existed and that the Appealed Decision constituted the only resulting document. The LFF also filed the full standing of Group A and Group D at the end of the group stage of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League and confirmed the following:

“Files Nos. 3987 and 3988 concern the same subject matter and the same incident, but were addressed to two different recipients. FIFA communication No. 3988 was sent directly to Al Khoms FC, which duly acknowledged and responded to it in a timely manner. FIFA communication No. 3987, concerning the same subject matter, was addressed to the Libyan Football Federation, which also responded within the required time.

The LFF produces as an annex a copy of FIFA communication No. 3987 and the response it submitted thereto, as well as the elements relating to communication No. 3988 and the response submitted by Al Khoms FC, to the extent these are in its possession.

The LFF confirms that, as of the date of submission of this response, no decision, subsequent communication or closing report has been issued by FIFA or any other competent authority in respect of either of these files, and that no notification relating to additional proceedings has been addressed to it. The documents produced thus represent the entirety of the materials available in the possession of the LFF, in compliance with the obligation of full production as ordered by the Sole Arbitrator.”

58. On 24 February 2026, Asaria confirmed that it agreed with the bifurcation of the present arbitration proceedings and asked for an additional seven-day extension of the time limit to file a copy of the LFF Statutes and a copy of the LFF Competition Organising Regulations, which was granted.
59. On 27 February 2026, the CAS Court Office acknowledge receipt of the mails sent by the LFF on 17 February 2026 and by Asaria on 24 February 2026 and noted that no communication was received from Wefaq and from Al-Khoms with respect to the bifurcation of the proceedings.
60. On 3 March 2026, Asaria filed a copy of the LFF Statutes and of the LFF Competition Organizing Regulations together with certified English translations. In light of these new documents, it amended paragraph 40 of its appeal brief.

61. On 9 March 2026, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of Asaria's correspondence of 3 March 2026 and invited the other Parties to submit their observations, strictly limited to that correspondence, by 16 March 2026. Within the same deadline, it ordered the Parties to produce the detailed format of all phases of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League and to indicate whether they wished for a Case Management Conference ("CMC") and/or a hearing to be convened in this matter. The CAS Court Office also informed the Parties that the Sole Arbitrator had decided not to bifurcate the present proceedings.
62. On 16 March 2026, Al-Dhara formally objected to Asaria's letter of 3 March 2026, arguing that it constituted an improper attempt to amend the Appeal Brief without procedural basis. It complained that it had been unable to access or download the exhibits from the link provided by Asaria on 3 March 2026, and requested that the exhibits be made available to it and that a new deadline be set for its comments. Furthermore, Al-Dhara requested that a brief CMC be convened, as well as an oral hearing. Finally, it submitted the detailed format of all phases of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League 2024/2025, as well as the final standings.
63. On 17 and 18 March 2026, Asaria submitted the detailed format of all phases of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League 2024/2025, as well as the final standings. It confirmed that it did not consider a CMC or a hearing necessary.
64. On 23 and 24 March 2026, within the extended deadline granted to it, the LFF submitted the detailed format of all phases of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League, as well as the final standings and a certified translation of the relevant decisions governing the said competition. The LFF did not express a view on the need for a CMC or a hearing.
65. On 27 March 2026, the CAS Court Office acknowledge receipt of the communications received from Asaria, the LFF and Al-Dhara.
66. On 9 April 2026, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that, pursuant to Article R56 of the Code and in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Sole Arbitrator had excluded from the case file the relevant parts of Asaria's letter of 3 March 2026 insofar as they constituted amendments to the submissions filed with its Appeal Brief. The CAS Court Office further provided Al-Dhara with a link to access the exhibits submitted by Asaria on 3 March 2026 and granted it until 14 April 2026 to file observations limited to those documents. Finally, the CAS Court Office invited Asaria, the LFF, Wefaq, and Al-Khoms to submit observations on the requests made by Al-Dhara in its correspondence of 16 March 2026 by 14 April 2026, specifying that any failure to respond would be deemed as an objection to such requests.
67. On 11 April 2026, Al-Dhara filed submissions with respect to various articles contained in the translations of the LFF Regulations provided by Asaria on 3 March 2026.
68. On 14 April 2026, Asaria informed the CAS Court Office that it considered most of Al-Dhara's requests of 16 March 2026 to have already been addressed, and confirmed that it did not consider a CMC or a hearing to be necessary.
69. On 14 April 2026, the LFF submitted extensive written observations, together with new requests for relief, some of which overlapped with comments made by Al-Dhara on 11 April 2026. It further requested a CMC and a hearing to be held.

70. On 16 April 2026, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of the correspondence sent to by Asaria, the LFF and Al-Dhara.
71. On 28 April 2026, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the requests submitted by Al-Dhara in its communication of 16 March 2026 were denied and so were the requests and/or allegations submitted or raised by the LFF in its communication of 14 April 2026, insofar as they were new, with the reasons to be set out in the final award. It further advised the Parties that the Sole Arbitrator considered himself sufficiently well informed to decide the matter on the basis of the written submissions alone, without holding a hearing.
72. On 6 May 2026, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of the Order of Procedure duly signed and returned by Asaria on 29 April 2026, by the LFF on 3 May 2026 and by Al-Dhara on 6 May 2026. Al-Wefaq SC and Al-Khoms SC failed to return a signed copy of the Order of Procedure within the prescribed deadline.

IV. SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

A. *The Appellant*

73. In its Appeal Brief, Asaria submitted the following requests:

“ [Asaria] *requests the Court of Arbitration to:*

1. *Declare this Appeal admissible;*
2. *Partially set aside the Decision under Appeal;*
3. *Order the Libyan Football Federation to reinstate [Asaria] in the Libyan Premier League;*
4. *Order the Libyan Football Federation to cover the costs of proceedings before the Court of Arbitration for Sport, including the reimbursement of CHF 1,000 paid by [Asaria] as CAS Court Office Fee;*
5. *Order the Libyan Football Federation to pay [Asaria] a contribution towards its legal fees and expenses of CHF 10,000. “*

74. The submissions of Asaria, in essence, may be summarized as follows:

The Appeal is admissible

- The appeal against the Appealed Decision is admissible as all the requirements of Article R47 of the Code and of Article 67 of the LFF Statutes are met.

Standing to appeal

- While Asaria is not expressly mentioned in the operative part, the Appealed Decision directly affects its situation. “*By determining the list of clubs admitted to the Premier League for the 2025/26 season and reinstating some clubs affected by registration violations, the decision necessarily and definitively excludes [Asaria] from the division, thereby confirming and concretizing its relegation.*”

- The Appealed Decision addresses registration violations in Group D of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League that affected match results and standings, including matches involving Asaria, thereby directly concerning its sporting rights. While the Appealed Decision reinstated Al-Dhara and Wefaq on the ground that those irregularities harmed their sporting outcomes, Asaria was affected by the same violations, having lost a match to Al-Khoms, which fielded Ineligible Players, ultimately leading to its relegation.
- *“When an association adopts a measure intended to remedy the consequences of regulatory violations that distorted a competition, all clubs whose sporting results were directly altered by those violations are ‘sufficiently affected’ within the meaning of the CAS test. They do not need to be explicitly named in the dispositive section of the decision to have standing to challenge it.”*
- *“[Asaria] has a direct sporting interest in the annulment or revision of the Decision under Appeal. Had the LFF applied its own reasoning consistently, [Asaria] would have been reinstated in the Premier League in the same manner as Dhahra SC. The interest asserted is therefore neither hypothetical nor political: it is a concrete and legally protected interest relating to league participation, ranking, and the consequences of the unlawful fielding of ineligible players [...]. [Asaria’s] relegation cannot be considered ‘final’ in a legal sense when the very results that produced this relegation were tainted by violations later acknowledged by the LFF and used as grounds for reinstating other clubs. [Asaria] therefore has a legitimate interest in ensuring that corrective measures are applied uniformly and without discrimination.”*
- Asaria’s interest is also financial in nature, since participation in the LFF Premier League confers sporting revenues, visibility, contractual rights, and regulatory benefits that are unavailable to clubs that have been relegated.

Unequal treatment and reinstatement of Asaria

- With its Appealed Decision, the LFF Board of Directors failed to reinstate Asaria, which *“was the direct sporting victim of the unlawful fielding of ineligible players by Al Khoms in Group D matches, including against [Asaria], which should have resulted in forfeits in its favour”*.
- By reinstating other clubs affected by similar or less serious violations while denying Asaria the same corrective remedy, the LFF Board of Directors acted in a discriminatory and inconsistent manner, in breach of the principles of sporting fairness, competitive integrity, and equal treatment under football regulations
- *“The Decision under Appeal expressly acknowledges that ‘registration violations affected the results of matches and subsequently [the] position in the general competition table.’ This acknowledgement is systemic in scope. It is not confined to Dhahra; it refers broadly to the competitive distortions generated by unlawful registrations. These violations occurred in Group D of the Premier League, in which both Dhahra and Asaria competed, including in matches directly involving [Asaria]”*.
- *“[Had] Al Khoms forfeited the two matches in which it fielded ineligible players, namely against Asaria and Dhahra, it would have finished the league with 10 points instead of 16, while Asaria would have finished with 12 or 15 points outside the direct relegation*

zone and Dhahra with 18 points [...]. Consequently, Al Khoms would have ranked last in Group D of the Libyan Premier League – below both Dhahra and Asaria – and would have been directly relegated in lieu of Asaria.”

- “[Although] *Asaria* was retrospectively sanctioned for fielding a suspended player, *Al Khoms* fielded four ineligible players, placing both clubs in breach. This scenario admits three possible regulatory solutions: (i) sanctioning the club responsible for the more serious violation, namely *Al Khoms* (hierarchy of infractions); (ii) applying the CAS principle articulated in CAS 2017/A/5186, whereby in cases of regulatory lacunae the original sporting result should be preserved [...]; or (iii) considering that both clubs committed infractions and awarding no points to either”. In all these scenarios, *Al Khoms* would ultimately finish last in Group D, while *Asaria* would finish outside the direct relegation zone.
- The Appealed Decision reinstates *Al-Dhara* on the ground that the registration violations “*affected the results of matches and subsequently its position in the general competition table.*” It reinstated *Wefaq* due to “*numerous administrative violations*” that affected results and caused harm. Despite being affected by comparable irregularities that altered its position in the championship, *Asaria* was not reinstated. In the absence of any explanation from the LFF for this disparity, the exclusion constitutes arbitrary treatment incompatible with the principles of equality and non-discrimination.
- *Wefaq* was reinstated because the LFF found that the wrongful deduction of two points deprived the club of the opportunity to participate in the home-and-away relegation play-out championship. The LFF determined that the only adequate remedy was full reinstatement in the LFF Premier League. *Asaria* suffered the same type of harm, as *Al Khoms*’ use of Ineligible Players placed it in direct relegation and deprived it of the opportunity to participate in the home-and-away relegation play-out championship. Granting reinstatement to *Wefaq* for the “*loss of opportunity*” while denying the same remedy to *Asaria* constitutes inconsistent and arbitrary treatment in violation of the principle of equal treatment.

The absence of a protest by *Asaria* in relation to its match against *Al-Khoms* is irrelevant.

- *Asaria*’s situation cannot be considered “final” merely because it did not file a timely protest following matches played against *Al-Khoms*. “[*Asaria*] is not contesting match sheets or seeking reopening through the protest procedure. The LFF itself re-opened the assessment of competition outcomes months after the season, through a general corrective decision adopted on 11 October 2025. [*Asaria*] is challenging that autonomous decision. Once the LFF reopened the classification, it could not restrict the corrective effect to clubs it chose arbitrarily. Protest deadlines are irrelevant to a federation’s later systemic corrective act”.
- “Match protests are irrelevant in the present case because they are, by nature, team-specific and limited to individual games. They cannot address systemic issues that span an entire season. By contrast, the Decision under Appeal is a season-wide autonomous reclassification decision adopted by the LFF, which reassessed league standings months after the competition.”

- The *Res Judicata* Principle does not apply here as there is no previous ruling addressing issues such as the fielding by Al-Khoms of Ineligible Players or the impact of their participation on the LFF Premier League standings.

B. The Respondents

1.- The LFF

75. In its Answer, the LFF submitted the following requests for relief:

“For all the foregoing reasons, the Libyan Football Federation respectfully requests the Panel to:

- 1. Declare the appeal inadmissible, for lack of an appealable decision, lack of CAS jurisdiction ratione materiae, failure to exhaust internal remedies, lack of standing and legal interest, and/or absence of any subsisting object of dispute;*
- 2. Alternatively, should the Panel consider the appeal admissible quod non, dismiss the appeal in its entirety on the merits;*
- 3. Order the Appellant to bear all costs of the arbitration, pursuant to Article R64 of the CAS Code”.*

76. The submissions of the LFF, in essence, may be summarized as follows:

Inadmissibility of the appeal

Lack of jurisdiction ratione materiae

- Under Article R47 of the Code, an appeal before CAS requires the existence of an appealable decision under the applicable federation’s statutes and regulations. Under the LFF regulatory framework, only decisions issued by judicial bodies are appealable, whereas administrative decisions adopted by executive organs, such as the LFF Board of Directors, cannot be appealed. *“Where the applicable regulations exclude appealability by design, CAS cannot substitute itself for internal governance mechanisms or act as a court of first instance in administrative matters.”*
- The Appealed Decision is an administrative measure adopted by the LFF Board of Directors in response to exceptional circumstances affecting other clubs which had actively pursued internal remedies and whose legal situations remained pending before judicial bodies, including the CAS. The sole objective of the Appealed Decision is to safeguard the integrity and organization of the 2025/2026 season. *“It was not rendered in the context of adversarial proceedings, did not involve the examination of claims between opposing parties, and did not result in the determination of rights or obligations attributable to specific clubs. Its legal nature is therefore administrative”.*

Failure to exhaust internal remedies

- The LFF Regulations on Protests and Appeals establish a mandatory and exclusive mechanism for challenging match results, player eligibility, alleged registration irregularities, and competition standings. Clubs participating in LFF competitions wishing to protest procedural, legal, administrative, or technical violations must first

notify the referee verbally and then submit a written protest to the competent authority within 48 hours following the end of the match. The Competitions Organising Committee will then issue its decision and may impose sporting sanctions.

- By failing to challenge the match results through the available procedural avenues under the LFF Regulations, Asaria accepted both the results and its final standing in the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League. It cannot now seek to remedy its own passivity by challenging the Appealed Decision. As a consequence, the results of the matches played between Asaria and Al-Khoms on 6 January and 27 February 2025, as well as the final standings approved on 11 April 2025, acquired definitive and binding force.
- By contrast, Al-Dhara *“pursued internal remedies diligently and within the prescribed deadlines, thereby creating live disputes that justified administrative intervention to preserve competition stability.”*

Absence of standing and legal interest

- The Appealed Decision *“does not mention Asaria Sports Club, does not address it, and does not alter its sporting or legal position in any manner. Asaria SC’s relegation was the direct result of its sporting performance and became final months before the adoption of the challenged decision”*.
- *“The mere fact that an administrative measure refers to other clubs does not confer standing on third parties whose legal position remains unchanged. Standing cannot be derived from comparative dissatisfaction or from the alleged favourable treatment of others.”* As the Appealed Decision has no legal effect on Asaria, the club lacks standing to challenge it.

Loss of object

- Asaria’s attempt to indirectly reopen final match results and standings through an appeal against the Appealed Decision is incompatible with the principles of legal certainty, *res judicata*, and the stability of sporting competitions.
- The Appealed Decision *“did not revive, suspend, or affect any concluded proceedings relating to Asaria SC. It did not alter the final standings of the 2024/2025 season and did not reopen any settled sporting outcomes. Any annulment of the challenged decision would therefore have no practical effect on [Asaria’s] situation, rendering the appeal devoid of purpose.”*

The Merits

The Appealed Decision was taken by the competent body

- The Appealed Decision was lawfully adopted by the competent body responsible for the overall governance of national competitions. The LFF Board of Directors has the authority to take administrative and preventive measures to ensure the orderly organisation of competitions, in particular where pending proceedings or institutional irregularities may compromise the stability of the forthcoming season.

- The Appealed Decision “*did not adjudicate disputes, impose sanctions, or revisit match results. It addressed the composition of the forthcoming season in a forward-looking manner, with the aim of preventing disruption and safeguarding competition integrity.*”

There is no breach of the principle of equal treatment

- “*Under Swiss law and CAS jurisprudence, equal treatment does not require identical treatment of parties whose factual and procedural situations are materially different. It requires that comparable situations be treated alike and that any differentiation be based on objective and reasonable criteria.*
- “*In the present case, Asaria SC’s situation is not comparable to that of the clubs mentioned in Decision No. 155/2025. Those clubs had actively pursued internal remedies under the LFF regulatory framework, thereby creating unresolved legal situations that justified administrative intervention to avoid structural instability.*”
- By contrast, Asaria remained entirely passive during the relevant period, as it did not lodge any protest or appeal within the LFF. Its relegation resulted exclusively from its sporting performance and the final standings approved in accordance with the Regulations.
- There is no causal link between the Appealed Decision and Asaria’s alleged harm. Its relegation resulted exclusively from its sporting performance and from its own procedural inaction during the 2024/2025 season.

The results of the matches played by Asaria cannot be modified

- Asaria did not challenge the results of the matches played against Al-Khoms through the available procedural avenues. It accepted those results, allowed the standings to be approved, and remained silent until its relegation became final. Its subsequent attempt to obtain reinstatement in the LFF Premier League through an appeal to CAS constitutes an abuse of rights and is incompatible with the principle of good faith.
- “*Granting the relief sought by the Appellant would undermine the integrity of the regulatory framework, reward procedural passivity, prejudice third parties not before the Panel, and destabilise the organisation of competitions. Such an outcome would be incompatible with CAS jurisprudence, Swiss law, and the fundamental principles governing international sport.*”

2.- Al-Dhara

77. In its Answer, Al-Dhara submitted the following requests for relief:

“ *For all the reasons set out in this Answer, and without prejudice to any further arguments that may be developed in the course of these proceedings, Al-Dhara SC, Respondent 3, respectfully requests the Sole Arbitrator/Panel to rule as follows:*

A. PRINCIPALLY - INADMISSIBILITY / LACK OF JURISDICTION

1. Declare the appeal inadmissible and/or dismiss it for lack of CAS jurisdiction, in particular because:

- a. *[The Appealed Decision] is not an appealable decision within the meaning of Article R47 of the CAS Code; and/or*
 - b. *No valid arbitration gateway under the applicable LFF Statutes/Regulations is triggered in the absence of a dispute referred to CAS at the “final stage” within the meaning of Article 67 of the LFF Statutes; and/or*
 - c. *The relief sought by Assaria exceeds the scope and object of the challenged decision and therefore cannot be reviewed within the limits of an appeal procedure.*
2. *Declare the appeal inadmissible for lack of standing (locus standi), as Assaria SC is not directly, personally, or actually affected by the operative part of [the Appealed Decision], which:*
 - a. *does not address Assaria;*
 - b. *does not modify any of Assaria's match results, points, ranking, or competition status; and*
 - c. *confers rights exclusively upon third parties (including Al-Dhahra SC).*
3. *Declare the appeal inadmissible for lack of a legally protectable interest, since Assaria's alleged interest is indirect, reflective, and hypothetical, and is based on a speculative reconstruction of standing rather than on any binding legal effect produced by the challenged decision.*

B. IN THE ALTERNATIVE (QUOD NON) - DISMISSAL ON THE MERITS

4. *Dismiss the appeal in its entirety on the merits, insofar as [the Appealed Decision] constitutes a lawful, proportionate, and necessary corrective/protective measure adopted within the LFF Board's regulatory competence to safeguard competition integrity and legal certainty, without adjudicating match-specific consequences and without reallocating points or amending standings.*
5. *Reject in full all requests by Assaria SC seeking, directly or indirectly:*
 - a. *retroactive forfeits;*
 - b. *reallocation of points; and/or*
 - c. *rewriting, recalculation, or reconstruction of standings, as such relief falls manifestly outside the scope, operative part, and purpose of [the Appealed Decision] and is unsupported by any admissible and/or properly seized match-based adjudication pathway.*

C. COSTS AND CONTRIBUTION

6. *Order Assaria SC to bear all costs of the arbitration, in an amount to be determined by the CAS Court Office and/or the Sole Arbitrator/Panel.*
7. *Order Assaria SC to pay Al-Dhahra SC a contribution of CHF 10,000 as legal fees and expenses incurred in these proceedings (or such higher/lower amount as the Sole Arbitrator/Panel deems appropriate). [...]*

78. Al-Dhara's submissions, in essence, may be summarized as follows:

Inadmissibility of the appeal

Lack of jurisdiction

- The LFF Board of Directors was the competent body to issue the Appealed Decision. It acted in its capacity as a governance and administrative body to preserve the integrity and organisation of the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League season. It did not operate as a judicial authority adjudicating a match dispute. *“Therefore, even if the decision produces operative effects for the clubs it names, it does not constitute the kind of **final adjudicatory act rendered within the LFF judicial chain** whose review is contemplated by Article 67 (1) and Article R47 [of the Code]”.*
- Asaria does not challenge the Appealed Decision as such, but rather seeks retroactive forfeits, the reallocation of points, and a revised competition standing that could ultimately lead to its reinstatement in the LFF Premier League. However, Asaria never lodged a timely protest or appeal through the LFF’s procedural venues in relation to its own matches against Al-Khoms. Consequently, it failed to exhaust the internal remedies available to it, as required in Article R47 of the Code, Article 67 (1) of the LFF Statutes and Article 28 of the LFF Protests & Appeals Regulations.
- Accepting Asaria’s approach that a club can simply disregard the match-protest procedure, wait until the season ends, and then appeal before the CAS a *“subsequent Board integrity decision”*, would render the exhaustion requirement and the internal procedural framework meaningless.

Absence of standing and legal interest

- Asaria is not affected by the Appealed Decision, which does not impose any obligation on it, modify any element of its sporting record, award or deduct any points or change anything in Asaria's favour or against it.
- *“Standing cannot be built on hypotheses about alternative outcomes requiring additional legal steps that do not exist in the operative part of the [Appealed Decision]. Here, Asaria's reinstatement scenario depends on a chain of determinations not contained in [the Appealed Decision] and not self-executing: match reopening, match-specific findings of ineligibility, selection of the applicable sanction, award of forfeits/points, and table recalculation. Such contingent, multi-step assumptions are the opposite of the direct, present and personal legal effect required for admissibility.”*
- Asaria’s reliance on a financial or sporting interest linked to Premier League participation does not establish admissibility. Its standing would arise only if the Appealed Decision granted, withdrew, or modified the legal entitlement giving rise to that interest, which is not the case here. As a matter of fact, the Appealed Decision does not grant Asaria participation rights and does not withdraw them; it addresses other clubs’ rights. *“Any economic harm invoked by Asaria therefore derives from its season-end sporting outcome and its own procedural inaction in pursuing match remedies, not from any direct legal effect of the challenged Board decision.”*

The Merits

The Appealed Decision is a “competition-management measure”

- The Appealed Decision is a “*federation-level governance and competition-management measure*” adopted by the LFF competent body in order to preserve the integrity and stability of the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League. It is not intended to resolve individual match disputes or grant retrospective sporting relief.
- “[This] *characterisation is confirmed by the absence of match-adjudicatory content. [The Appealed Decision] does not adjudicate any protest, does not determine player eligibility for an identified fixture, does not declare any match lost by forfeit, does not award or deduct points, and does not order a recalculation of Group D standings. It therefore cannot be equated to a decision of the Competition Organising Committee (COC) or the Appeals Committee (AC), which are the bodies competent to issue match-dispute determinations within the protest architecture.*”
- The procedural background of the Appealed Decision arises from the appeal filed by Al-Dhara before the CAS (CAS 2025/A/11619). The dispute was properly initiated within the LFF protest system and is currently pending before the CAS. It concerns the Match played on 11 April 2025 between Al-Dhara and Al-Khoms, involving allegations that Al-Khoms fielded Ineligible Players. The pending CAS proceedings created a situation of regulatory uncertainty that required intervention by the LFF Board of Directors in its capacity as the body responsible for the governance and organisation of national competitions. In order to safeguard the integrity, stability, and orderly preparation of the forthcoming season, the LFF Board of Directors adopted the Appealed Decision as a precautionary organisational measure pending the final outcome of the CAS process.
- “*Accordingly, on the merits, Assaria's appeal fails because it seeks to extract match-based sporting consequences from an instrument that was adopted for a different legal purpose and within a different institutional function.*”

The results of the matches played by Asaria cannot be modified

- The mere fielding of ineligible players by Al-Khoms, although irregular, does not automatically result in a match forfeit and points reallocations. A forfeit can only be obtained through the protest procedure set out in the LFF Regulations. With its appeal, Asaria seeks retroactive sporting consequences such as match forfeits, points reallocations and a reconstructed league table. Such relief is procedurally unavailable.
- The Appealed Decision stems from the appeal brought by Al-Dhara before CAS (CAS 2025/A/11619) concerning the Match played on 11 April 2025. That dispute relates exclusively to a match played between Al-Dhara and Al-Khoms and does not involve Asaria in any way. Asaria therefore cannot invoke or attempt to derive sporting consequences from a proceeding with which it has no procedural or sporting connection.
- Since the operative part of the Appealed Decision neither declares any match forfeited, nor awards or deducts points, nor orders the reopening of any match, nor issues any sanction in relation to the fixtures concerned, an appeal against the Appealed Decision cannot produce the outcome sought by Asaria. In particular, such an appeal cannot result

in the forfeiture of the matches it played against Al-Khoms or in the reallocation of the points obtained in those matches.

If Asaria's theory were to be followed it would open "an Unlimited League-Wide Retroactive Points Claim"

- *"Assaria pleads its reinstatement as if it were anchored in two fixtures - (i) Assaria SC v. Al-Khoms FC (27 February 2025) and (ii) Al-Dhahra SC v. Al-Khoms FC (11 April 2025) - its legal theory is not confined to those matches. [Asaria's] logic is categorical: whenever Al-Khoms fielded a player whose registration occurred during the FIFA ban, the match must be treated as lost by forfeit and the opposing club must be credited with the corresponding points. That is not a narrow grievance; it is a rule of automatic retroactivity which, by its nature, extends to every match played by Al-Khoms during the relevant period."*
- Accepting Asaria's logic would allow any club, even one that failed to protest in time, to reopen a completed season and claim points retroactively based on alleged registration irregularities. Such *"after-season points harvesting"* is incompatible with competition stability as it would be a *"retroactive re-writing of a league competition's final sporting outcomes, with necessary spill-over effects on other clubs, the competition format, and the settled end-of-season classification"*.
- *"Furthermore, allowing Assaria's theory through this appeal would transform a governance measure ([the Appealed Decision]) into a de facto universal reopening mechanism for the entire championship-despite the fact that the Decision itself contains no match-reopening order, no forfeiture declarations, and no points reallocations. The result would be a contradiction: an act that is expressly prospective and stabilising would be judicially converted into an engine of retroactive disruption"*.

There is no breach of the principle of equal treatment

- *"[To] accept Assaria's approach would not promote equal treatment; it would produce the opposite. It would reward a club that did not activate the required domestic mechanism and would penalise the clubs that relied on the finality of results and on the regulatory timelines. Equality in sports disputes is achieved by consistent application of the same procedures to comparable claims-not by granting match sanctions to a party that never seized the competent bodies at the relevant time"*.
- Equal treatment in sports law requires the consistent application of applicable rules to comparable situations. Here, the situations are not comparable because Al-Dhara properly followed the prescribed dispute pathway as it filed a protest, followed by an appeal before the LFF competent bodies and then initiated CAS proceedings regarding the 11 April 2025 fixture. Asaria did not initiate that procedure for its own matches against Al-Khoms.
- The Appealed Decision was adopted after the LFF determined that Al-Khoms had fielded Ineligible Players during the Match played on 11 April 2025, thereby giving rise to a formal dispute properly brought by Al-Dhara and currently pending before CAS (CAS 2025/A/11619). The Appealed Decision was intended to ensure the stability of the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League pending adjudication by CAS of the dispute recorded under CAS 2025/A/11619. Annuling it would cause Al-Dhara concrete sporting prejudice by

preventing it from participating in the LFF 2025/2026 season until the resolution of the matter recorded under CAS 2025/A/11619, while effectively rewarding Asaria notwithstanding its failure to initiate the prescribed dispute resolution mechanism before the LFF.

3.- Wefaq and Al-Khoms

79. Although duly invited by the CAS Court Office, Wefaq and Al-Khoms did not file an Answer to the Appeal Brief.

V. JURISDICTION

80. Article R47 (1) of the Code provides as follows:

“An appeal against the decision of a federation, association or sports-related body may be filed with CAS if the statutes or regulations of the said body so provide or if the parties have concluded a specific arbitration agreement and if the Appellant has exhausted the legal remedies available to it prior to the appeal, in accordance with the statutes or regulations of that body.”

81. Article 67 (1) of the LFF Statutes reads as follows:

“ 1. Disputes arising within the Federation or disputes affecting its members, competitions, clubs, club members, players, and officials may be referred, at the final stage (i.e., after exhausting all internal channels within the federation), to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in Lausanne, Switzerland, which shall settle the dispute definitely outside the ordinary courts, unless expressly prohibited by legislation in Libya.”

82. In substance, the LFF and Al-Dhara submit that CAS lacks jurisdiction on the grounds that the Appealed Decision constitutes an administrative, non-appealable measure adopted solely to safeguard the 2025/2026 LFF Premier League season. According to them, the Decision was neither rendered in adversarial proceedings nor intended to determine specific rights or obligations. The LFF further argues that Asaria should have lodged a protest in relation to the matches played against Al-Khoms and, by failing to do so, it did not exhaust the internal remedies available as required under Articles R47 (1) of the Code and 67 (1) of the LFF Statutes.
83. In accordance with the definition set out in the LFF Statutes, and pursuant to Article 23 (2) thereof, the LFF Board of Directors is the strategic and supervisory body of the LFF. Article 39 of the Statutes describes the powers of the LFF Board of Directors, which may take decisions on all matters not within the scope of the LFF General Assembly or the jurisdiction of other LFF committees or bodies. In particular, the LFF Board of Directors may approve and issue the LFF internal regulations (Article 39.10) or issue decisions regarding the structure and organization of official competitions and any other tournaments, particularly specifying the participating teams, regulatory rules for each competition, in a manner consistent with this Statute and the Federation's regulations, and determine the promotion and relegation mechanism in the various divisions of the national league. The promotion and relegation mechanism may not be modified after the start of the relevant competition (Article 39.17). The LFF Board of Directors develop the LFF's strategic plan (Article 39.19).

84. In light of the foregoing, there is no doubt that the LFF Board was the competent body to issue the Appealed Decision.
85. It is undisputed between the Parties that decisions of the LFF Board of Directors are not subject to any internal appeal within the LFF. It is also not contested that Asaria is a member of the LFF (see Article 12 of the LFF Statutes).
86. The LFF regulations, in particular the LFF Statutes, do not provide any definition for the term “*decision*”. The Sole Arbitrator endorses the definition of “*decision*” and the characteristic features of a “*decision*” stated in the following CAS precedents:
- “[...] *the form of the communication has no relevance to determine whether there exists a decision or not. In particular, the fact that the communication is made in the form of a letter does not rule out the possibility that it constitute a decision subject to appeal*” (CAS 2015/A/4213; para. 49; CAS 2008/A/1633 para. 31; CAS 2007/A/1251 para. 30; CAS 2005/A/899 para. 63; CAS 2004/A/748 para. 90).
 - “*In principle, for a communication to be a decision, this communication must contain a ruling, whereby the body issuing the decision intends to affect the legal situation of the addressee of the decision or other parties*” (CAS 2008/A/1633 para. 31; CAS 2007/A/1251 para. 30; CAS 2005/A/899 para. 61; CAS 2004/A/748 para. 89).
 - “*A decision is thus a unilateral act, sent to one or more determined recipients and is intended to produce legal effects*” (CAS 2008/A/1633 para. 31; CAS 2004/A/748 para. 89; CAS 2004/A/659 para. 36).
 - “*an appealable decision of a sport association or federation is normally a communication of the association directed to a party and based on an 'animus decidendi', i.e. an intention of a body of the association to decide on a matter [...]. A simple information, which does not contain any 'ruling', cannot be considered a decision.*” (CAS 2015/A/4213 para. 49; CAS 2008/A/1633 para. 32).
87. In the present case, the Sole Arbitrator has no difficulty in concluding that the Appealed Decision constitutes a final and binding decision. This document is expressly designated as a “Decision” and embodies a unilateral act adopted by the LFF competent body. It is intended to produce legal effects and to definitively determine the legal situation of several of its members, just as set out in Article 67 (1) of the LFF Statutes. In particular, the Appealed Decision produces immediate and concrete legal effects on the situation of Wefaq and Al-Dhara, which are granted the right to remain in the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League.
88. The LFF and Al-Dhara claim that the LFF regulatory framework excludes appeals to the CAS against decisions adopted by its executive bodies. The Sole Arbitrator finds that this argument is not substantiated in any manner. In particular, no specific provision has been identified that clearly and unequivocally limits the right of appeal solely to decisions issued by judicial bodies. In the absence of such an explicit exclusion, it cannot be inferred that decisions of the LFF Board of Directors are, by their nature, not appealable. Furthermore, the LFF and Al-Dhara’s assertion that CAS cannot substitute itself for internal governance mechanisms remains also purely abstract and unsupported by concrete regulatory references. Such a general statement is insufficient to establish a lack of jurisdiction, particularly where the decision at stake clearly alters the legal position of identifiable members.

89. It follows that the CAS has jurisdiction to decide on the present dispute.

VI. APPLICABLE LAW

90. Article R58 of the Code provides as follows:

“The Panel shall decide the dispute according to the applicable regulations and, subsidiarily, to the rules of law chosen by the parties or, in the absence of such a choice, according to the law of the country in which the federation, association or sports-related body which has issued the challenged decision is domiciled or according to the rules of law that the Panel deems appropriate. In the latter case, the Panel shall give reasons for its decision.”

91. In the absence of any rules of law chosen by the parties, the LFF Statutes and regulations shall apply primarily, and Libyan law subsidiary, as this is the law of the country in which the LFF Board of Directors is domiciled.

VII. ADMISSIBILITY

92. The Sole Arbitrator must determine whether the Appeal was filed in a timely manner and whether it continues to serve a purpose, in light of Asaria’s principal request for reinstatement in the LFF Premier League, and given that this championship has been underway since December 2025.

A. Was the Appeal filed in a timely manner?

93. Article R49 of the Code provides as follows:

“In the absence of a time limit set in the statutes or regulations of the federation, association or sports-related body concerned, or of a previous agreement, the time limit for appeal shall be twenty-one days from the receipt of the decision appealed against. After having consulted the parties, the Division President may refuse to entertain an appeal if it is manifestly late”.

94. In the absence of a time limit to appeal set forth in the LFF Statutes, the appeal was filed within the default deadline of 21 days set by Article R49 of the CAS Code.

B. Has the Appeal lost its purpose?

95. The question of whether the Appeal has lost its object is procedural in nature (TAS 2022/A/9277, para. 100). The Sole arbitrator notes that neither the LFF Regulations nor the CAS Code govern the issue of interest in bringing proceedings. Accordingly, it is appropriate to refer to Swiss law, which is the *lex arbitri* (CAS 2021/A/8427 para. 117).

96. Under Article 59 of the Swiss Civil Procedure Code (“CPC”), the court shall rule on a claim or motion only if the conditions for admissibility are met, in particular if the claimant or petitioner demonstrates a legitimate interest. This provision applies *mutatis mutandis* to arbitration proceedings before the CAS and requires the existence, on the part of the appellant, of a concrete, legitimate, and personal interest to have access to justice (CAS 2022/A/9277, para.

101; TAS 2017/A/5147; CAS 2016/A/4602; François Bohnet, in Commentaire romand, Code de procédure civile, 2e éd., 2019, no 89a ad art. 59 CPC). Any practical or legal interest in seeking the modification or annulment of the contested decision is worthy of protection. This interest consists in the practical benefit that the annulment of the decision would bring to the appellant, by preventing him from suffering harm of an economic, ideal, material or other nature caused by the contested decision. It implies that this interest must be direct and concrete, with the appellant having a sufficiently close, specific, and significant relationship to the contested decision (Decision of the Swiss Federal Tribunal (“SFT”) 137 II 40, para. 2.3). Like any condition of admissibility, this interest must exist at the time of the judgment. It must not have ceased to exist during the proceedings (Decisions of the SFT 140 III 159, para. 4.2.4; 4A_280/2015 of 20 October 2015, para. 6.2.1; Bohnet, op. cit., no. 92 ad Art. 59 CPC and no. 13 ad Art. 60 CPC). An appeal is inadmissible where there is no legitimate interest at the time it is lodged. However, if that interest ceases to exist during the proceedings, the appeal becomes moot (Decision of the SFT 4A_56/2018 of 30 January 2019 para. 4.1).

97. The Sole Arbitrator recalls that he is bound by the Parties’ requests for relief and may not rule beyond the claims submitted (CAS 2024/A/11019, para. 191 and references). Indeed, pursuant to Article 190(2)(c) of the Federal Act on Private International Law (“LDIP”), an arbitral award may be challenged where the arbitral tribunal has ruled beyond the claims submitted to it. This refers to decisions which award more (*ultra petita*) or something other than (*extra petita*) what was requested (Decisions of the SFT 4A_552/2023, para. 5.1; 4A_516/2020 of 8 April 2021, para. 5.3; 116 II 639, para. 3a; 4A_430/2020, para. 6.1; 4P.260/2000 of 2 March 2001, para. 5a).
98. The key points of the Appealed Decision are as follows:
- It was triggered by complaints “*regarding the procedures for registration and the exemptions and extensions granted to clubs in this respect, as well as the registration and transfer of players among clubs*”.
 - Its aim was “*to ensure the proper conduct of the upcoming 2025/2026 sporting season and to avoid any suspension*” as well as “*to ensure the smooth conduct of local competitions*”.
 - It allowed Wefaq “*to remain in the Premier League as compensation for the harm suffered and the loss of opportunities resulting from numerous administrative violations*”.
 - It confirmed that Al-Dhara “*shall continue to participate in the 2025/2026 Premier League, in accordance with its rights as stated in the legal correspondence received and the established legal violations concerning the registration of players that affected the results of matches and subsequently its position in the general competition table*”.
 - It required from “[all] committees and departments affiliated with the Libyan Football Federation [to] coordinate the work necessary to include the aforementioned clubs within the competition plans and schedule for the 2025/2026 Premier League season”.
99. In its Appeal Brief, Asaria’s relevant requests for relief are “*Partially set aside the Decision under Appeal*” and “*Order the Libyan Football Federation to reinstate [Asaria] in the Libyan Premier League*”.

100. In its submissions, Asaria admits that it is not expressly mentioned in the operative part of the Appealed Decision but maintains that it is directly affected by it because the determination of clubs admitted to the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League effectively confirms its relegation, despite being impacted by the same registration violations that justified reinstating Al-Dhara and Wefaq. Asaria argues it has a concrete sporting and financial interest in challenging the decision, since consistent application of the LFF's reasoning would have resulted in its own reinstatement, particularly given that match results involving ineligible players distorted its ranking. By reinstating clubs like Al-Dhara and Wefaq while excluding Asaria without justification, the LFF acted inconsistently and discriminatorily, breaching principles of fairness, equal treatment, and competitive integrity.
101. In view of the foregoing, the Sole Arbitrator needs to answer to the following questions:
- 1.- Does Asaria have an interest in the annulment of the Appealed Decision?
 - 2.- Can Asaria's interest lie in an alleged unequal treatment of its situation compared to Wefaq's and Al-Dhara's?
 - 3.- Is Asaria's interest still subsisting at the time of this award?
- 1.- Does Asaria have an interest in the annulment of the Appealed Decision?
102. The Sole Arbitrator observes that the relief sought by Asaria, namely its reinstatement in the LFF Premier League, cannot be achieved through the mere annulment of the Appealed Decision. Indeed, the Appealed Decision is limited in scope to the adoption of specific administrative and corrective measures concerning certain identified clubs, without addressing or adjudicating the situation of Asaria. Its annulment would therefore not entail any automatic modification of the competition results or standings, nor would it result in Asaria's reinstatement. In other words, setting aside the Appealed Decision would primarily have the effect of removing the benefits granted to other parties, in particular Wefaq and Al-Dhara, without conferring any corresponding advantage upon Asaria. In such circumstances, annulling the Appealed Decision would not improve Asaria's legal or sporting position, but would simply reinstate the prior situation, in which Asaria was relegated based on the original standings.
103. As a consequence, the Sole Arbitrator holds that Asaria has no interest in the annulment of the Appealed Decision.
- 2.- Can Asaria's interest lie in an alleged unequal treatment of its situation compared to Wefaq's and Al-Dhara's?
104. The context in which the LFF Board of Directors adopted its Appealed Decision is not entirely clear. The Sole Arbitrator sought to clarify this by inviting the LFF to produce the "*deliberations and resolutions adopted by the Board of Directors of the Federation at its meeting held on Thursday, 09/10/2025*" referred to in the Appealed Decision. However, it emerged that no additional material existed.
105. Nevertheless, it results from the case file that Al-Dhara had extensively petitioned the LFF regarding the fielding of ineligible players during the Match played on 11 April 2025, in respect of which it lodged a protest, exhausted all internal remedies, and ultimately seized the CAS. It

therefore appears that the Appealed Decision constitutes, at least in part, the response of the LFF to the claims raised by Al-Dhara.

106. As regards Wefaq, the reasons for its inclusion in the Appealed Decision are less explicit. The fact that this club remained entirely passive throughout the present arbitration proceedings did not help. It remains that Asaria could have requested further investigation into Wefaq's situation but failed to do so. However, there is no indication that the LFF Board of Directors acted on its own initiative in this respect. On the contrary, it results from the Appealed Decision that the LFF "*has received numerous complaints [which have] necessitated investigation*". With respect to Wefaq, the Appealed Decision makes it clear that its reinstatement in the LFF Premier League follows "*the recommendations of the International Federation*". In these circumstances, it is reasonable to infer that Wefaq also submitted complaints to the LFF, resulting in the LFF Board of Directors' Decision to maintain its participation in the LFF Premier League.
107. Contrary to Al-Dhara and Wefaq, the case file does not indicate that Asaria took any steps to bring its situation before the LFF prior to the adoption of the Appealed Decision. While Al-Dhara actively pursued its claims through formal protests and exhaustion of internal remedies, and Wefaq's inclusion can reasonably be linked to prior complaints and international recommendations, Asaria remained entirely inactive at the relevant time. This is furthermore established by the fact that Asaria played two matches against Al-Khoms, on 6 January 2025 and 27 February 2025, without ever raising any complaint regarding the alleged fielding of ineligible players. In fact, the second match was the subject of a protest lodged by Al-Khoms, which was upheld, without Asaria invoking at any stage the presence of ineligible players fielded by its opponent. At the very least, no evidence has been adduced to establish otherwise.
108. In these circumstances, the Sole Arbitrator considers that the LFF Board of Directors had no reason to be aware of any grievance on the part of Asaria, nor of any intention on its part to seek reinstatement in the LFF Premier League. In the absence of any complaint, request, or initiative from Asaria, the LFF Board of Directors could not reasonably be expected to consider its situation or to include it within the scope of the Appealed Decision, which appears to respond to specific claims raised by Al-Dhara and Wefaq.
109. In light of the foregoing, Asaria cannot rely on unequal treatment because its situation is not comparable to that of Al-Dhara and Wefaq, which actively pursued complaints before the LFF. The Appealed Decision addresses specific claims raised by those clubs and nothing suggests that it was intended to be a general reassessment of all the teams. Asaria remained entirely passive and did not bring its situation to the attention of the LFF Board of Directors, which cannot be criticised for not extending remedial measures to a club that did not seek them or bring its situation to its attention. Finally, accepting Asaria's argument would effectively impose on the LFF a duty to investigate *ex officio* the situation of all clubs, irrespective of whether they raised complaints, which obviously goes beyond the scope of the Appealed Decision.
110. Consequently, the Sole Arbitrator considers that Asaria's claim cannot find its justification in any alleged unequal treatment compared to Wefaq and Al-Dhara.

3.- Is Asaria's interest still subsisting at the time of this award?

111. The Appealed Decision was issued on 11 October 2025. The Appeal was lodged before the CAS on 30 October 2025. The LFF Premier League competition for the 2025/2026 season was scheduled to start on 11 December 2025.
112. At the time it initiated the present arbitration proceedings, Asaria's concrete legal interest was to take part in the LFF 2025/2026 Premier League championship. To that end, Asaria sought to obtain interim relief aimed exclusively at preserving or restoring its participation in the LFF Premier League. In particular, it requested provisional and conservatory measures seeking to "[order] the LFF to provisionally reinstate [Asaria] in the Premier League for the 2025/26 season until the final award is issued; [and order] the LFF to refrain from taking any measure that would exclude or prejudice [Asaria's] participation in the Premier League for the 2025/26 season until the final award is issued".
113. In support of its request for provisional measures, Asaria expressly acknowledged that provisional reinstatement was necessary to preserve the effectiveness of these Arbitration proceedings. It admitted that "[denying] relief would render any eventual award in [Asaria's] favour largely moot, since the 2025/26 season will have progressed or concluded with [Asaria] excluded. No arbitral award can reconstruct a lost season or retroactively restore sporting opportunities; thus, refusal of relief would irreparably defeat the purpose of the appeal."
114. Following the dismissal of its request for provisional measures on 1 December 2025, the very scenario anticipated by Asaria materialised. By the time the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the evidentiary proceedings were closed, **more than four months have elapsed** since the beginning of the LFF 2025/2026 season. Given that Asaria's exclusive objective in pursuing the present arbitration proceedings was to secure its reinstatement in the LFF Premier League, that objective cannot be achieved anymore. A club cannot be reinstated at such an advanced stage of championship as the competition has already substantially progressed, with matches played and standings firmly established. At that point, it is no longer possible to integrate Asaria under normal sporting conditions. Moreover, as recognized by Asaria itself, the matches and opportunities already lost cannot be reconstructed or compensated for retrospectively, rendering any reinstatement devoid of practical effect.

The Sole Arbitrator notes that Asaria has neither sought financial compensation nor demonstrated, through any evidence, that it has suffered financial harm as a result of the situation at issue. Accordingly, there is no basis for the Sole Arbitrator to consider a claim that has neither been raised nor evidenced.

115. In light of the foregoing, Asaria has failed to demonstrate that it continues to be sufficiently affected by the Appealed Decision or that it retains any tangible legal interest of a sporting or financial nature, which would justify the continuation of these appeal proceedings. In the absence of a current, concrete, and practical interest, the appeal has become moot and must therefore be dismissed.

VIII. OTHER PROCEDURAL MATTERS

A. *The unsolicited new materials submitted by Asaria, the LFF and Al-Dhara*

116. Article R56 (1) of the Code states the following:

“Unless the parties agree otherwise or the President of the Panel orders otherwise on the basis of exceptional circumstances, the parties shall not be authorized to supplement or amend their requests or their argument, to produce new exhibits, or to specify further evidence on which they intend to rely after the submission of the appeal brief and of the answer”.

117. On 8 and on 13 January 2026 respectively, the LFF and Al-Dhara filed their Answer in accordance with Article R55 of the Code.

118. In an unsolicited manner, on 3 March 2026, Asaria filed new submissions before the CAS. On 16 March 2026, Al-Dhara submitted additional procedural requests and on 14 April 2026, the LFF filed further submissions along with new requests for relief (the “New Elements”).

119. Wafaq and Al-Khoms have never given their consent to these New Elements and Al-Dhara expressly objected to Asaria’s submissions of 3 March 2026.

120. Consequently, pursuant to Article R56 of the Code and in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the New Elements filed in an unsolicited manner were excluded from the proceedings and the Sole Arbitrator declined to take them into account in his decision.

B. *The bifurcation*

121. The following CAS precedent (CAS 2019/A/6294) provides a clear summary of the principles governing bifurcation in arbitration proceedings before the CAS:

“The question whether or not to bifurcate proceedings in order to decide on a preliminary question is a procedural issue that is, in principle, governed in international arbitrations by Article 182 of the Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA). The CAS Code only deals with the question whether or not a CAS panel can bifurcate the proceedings in order to decide the preliminary question of its competence (Article R55 (4) CAS Code). However, the Code does not contain any provision on whether or not a CAS panel may bifurcate the proceedings in order to decide on other preliminary issues (be it on procedure or on the merits). According to Article 125 lit. a of the Swiss Code of Civil Procedure (CCP), a court may in order to simplify the proceedings limit the proceedings to individual issues or prayers for relief. This power of the court is directly connected to Article 237 CCP according to which a court may issue an interim decision. When exercising its discretion according to Article 125 lit. a CCP, a court will take into account whether limiting the procedure to certain preliminary questions allows for a (substantial) saving of time or costs. According to legal literature, in the absence of an agreement by the parties an arbitral tribunal is vested with the power to issue interim or final awards. Such power is a particular aspect of the mandate to organise the arbitral proceedings. In exercising its discretion, the panel is guided by the reasoning submitted by the respective parties, in particular why a preliminary decision – according to the requesting party’s opinion – is necessary to safeguard its interests and to prevent it from possible harm or

why a decision on the preliminary issue, for some other reasons, is urgent or, otherwise, how and why the requesting party should legitimately benefit from a preliminary decision. When taking its decision, the panel also takes into account reasons of procedural efficiency.”

122. On 22 January 2026, Al-Dhara submitted an unsolicited request for bifurcation of the proceedings. On 17 and 24 February 2026, respectively, the LFF and Asaria confirmed their agreement to such bifurcation, while Wefaq and Al-Khoms did not express any position on the matter.
123. At the time the request for bifurcation was made, the Respondents had already filed their written submissions on the merits of the dispute. The case file was then complete, subject only to the submission of a translated copy of some of the LFF regulations and clarifications regarding the format of the LFF 2024/2025 Premier League, which was eventually provided. In this context, the Sole Arbitrator had all the necessary elements at his disposal, and the Parties had expressed themselves comprehensively on all aspects of the dispute between them. A bifurcation of the proceedings would not have resulted in any particular procedural efficiency or economy and therefore did not warrant formal implementation.
124. Under these circumstances, the Sole Arbitrator decided not to bifurcate the present proceedings.

C. The Holding of a hearing

125. The Code does not grant the Parties a right to a hearing (CAS 2024/A/10325 para. 111; CAS 2019/A/6463 & CAS 2019/A/ 6464 para. 93). In accordance with Article R44.2 (8) of the Code, which applies to the Appeal Arbitration Procedure by virtue of the reference in Article R57, *“After consulting the parties, the Panel may, if it deems itself to be sufficiently well informed, decide not to hold a hearing.”* In other words and after consulting with the Parties and if he considers to be sufficiently well informed, the Sole Arbitrator has the discretion not to hold a hearing at all.
126. A decision not to hold a hearing does not constitute, as such, a violation of the Parties’ right to be heard. Such a right, as guaranteed by Article 29 (2) the Swiss federal Constitution (“Cst”), includes, in particular, the right for the concerned party to comment on relevant elements before a decision is made affecting his/her legal situation, to have access to the file, to present relevant evidence, to have his/her offers of relevant evidence considered, to participate in the administration of essential evidence, or at the very least, to comment on its result when it is likely to influence the decision to be made. However, Article 29 (2) Cst. does not grant the right to be heard orally (Decision of the SFT 1C_265/2024 of 20 September 2024 para. 4.1 and numerous references).
127. In the present case, Asaria confirmed to the CAS Court Office that it preferred for the matter to be decided solely on the basis of the Parties’ written submissions, whereas the LFF and Al-Dhara requested a hearing. Wefaq and Al-Khoms remained silent on the subject matter.
128. In their submissions, the LFF and Al-Dhara did not request the hearing of any witnesses. Moreover, throughout the proceedings, the Parties were given ample opportunity to respond to the questions posed by the Sole Arbitrator and to comment on the answers provided by the other Parties. The Sole Arbitrator is therefore satisfied that the Parties’ right to be heard has been duly respected.

129. Considering the above, the Sole Arbitrator found that a hearing was unnecessary and would merely result in additional costs for the losing party.

IX. COSTS

(...)

ON THESE GROUNDS

The Court of Arbitration for Sport rules:

1. The appeal filed on 30 October 2025 by Asaria SC against the decision rendered on 11 October 2025 by the Board of Directors of the Libyan Football Federation is inadmissible.
2. (...).
3. (...).
4. All other and further motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.

Seat of arbitration: Lausanne, Switzerland
Date: 11 August 2026

THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

Patrick Grandjean
Sole Arbitrator