

# NORTHERN TERRITORY RACING AND WAGERING COMMISSION

## DECISION NOTICE AND REASONS FOR DECISION

---

<b>MATTER:</b>	Gambling Dispute for determination by the Northern Territory Racing and Wagering Commission (pursuant to section 310(4) of the <i>Racing and Wagering Act 2024</i> and section 85(2) of the <i>Racing and Betting Act 1983</i> )
<b>COMPLAINANTS:</b>	Mr V (Complainant One) Mr U (Complainant Two) Mr L (Complainant Three) Ms E (Complainant Four) and Mr M (Complainant Five)
<b>LICENSEE:</b>	Sportsbet Pty Ltd
<b>HEARD BEFORE: (on papers)</b>	Mr Alastair Shields Ms Susan Kirkman Mr Scott Perrin
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	25 May 2026

---

### DECISION

1. The Northern Territory Racing and Wagering Commission (**Commission**) is satisfied that Sportsbet has, in relation to its dealings with each of the five complainants, acted in accordance with the regulatory environment in place, its licence conditions, and the relevant terms and conditions applicable to each of the complainants' wagers.
2. It therefore follows that Sportsbet was entitled to void the wagers the subject of the five complaints before the Commission, and that none of the complaints are substantiated.

### JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE

3. Sportsbet Pty Ltd (**Sportsbet**) is authorised by the Commission to conduct the business of a sports bookmaker and to operate a digital wagering platform under the same name.
4. In accordance with the transitional arrangements contained at subsection 310(4) of the *Racing and Wagering Act 2024 (RWA)*, any matters under consideration by the former Commission that were not determined under the now repealed *Racing and Betting Act 1983 (RBA)* before the commencement of the RWA are to be determined by the Commission in accordance with the repealed RBA as if it had not been repealed.
5. These preliminary findings for the complaint have been determined on the papers, having regard to submissions from the Complainant and the wagering operator and evidence obtained by the Commission.
6. As a matter of procedural fairness to Sportsbet and each of the Complainants, a draft of the Commission's determinations was supplied to all parties for comment. Comments were received on behalf of 2 of the parties and have been considered in finalising this Decision Notice.

## REASONS FOR DECISION

### Scope of Complaints

7. Each of the Complainants lodged a complaint on either 11 or 12 September 2023 concerning the cancellation on 5 September 2023 by Sportsbet of their Same Game Multi wagers on the AFL Women's (AFLW) game between North Melbourne and Carlton that was due to be held on 10 September 2023.
8. Complainant One stated that on 5 September 2023, he placed 3 same game multi bets on the second round of the AFLW. Each of these wagers was voided by Sportsbet. One of these wagers, which had a stake of \$20, would have been a winning wager at odds of 2601. Complainant One stated that he did not accept the voiding of the wager by Sportsbet, and he requests that winnings from the voided wager be paid into his Sportsbet account.
9. Complainant Two stated that on 5 September 2023 he placed a \$10 wager on an 'anytime goal scorer' multi bet on the AFLW North Melbourne v Carlton game to be played on 10 September 2023. This wager, which would have been a winning wager at odds of 2501, was subsequently voided by Sportsbet, despite the contract formed when the wager was placed. Complainant Two requests that the appropriate winning funds be paid into his Sportsbet account.
10. Complainant Three stated that on 5 September 2023, he placed 11 same game multi bets on the various goal kicker combinations for the AFLW North Melbourne v Carlton game due to be played on 10 September 2023. All of these wagers were subsequently voided by Sportsbet, notwithstanding the agreed betting transaction (or contract) accepted by Sportsbet. Of the 11 wagers that were voided, 7 would have been winning wagers, with stakes and odds as follows:
  - \$5 at 131
  - \$5 at 1626
  - \$5 at 2501
  - \$10 at 751
  - \$15 at 276
  - \$15 at 226; and
  - \$29 at 131.Complainant Three requests that the appropriate winning monies be paid into his Sportsbet account.
11. Complainant Four stated that on 5 September 2023, she placed a 3-leg same game multi on the North Melbourne v Carlton AFLW match to be played on 10 September 2023. Her wager was for \$10, at odds of 2501 (which increased to 2550 as a power play price). This wager, which would have been a winning wager, was subsequently cancelled by Sportsbet, and Complainant Four requests that the bet be honoured and that the winning monies be paid to her.
12. Complainant Five placed 2 multi bets on 5 September 2023 on the upcoming North Melbourne v Carlton AFLW match due to be played on 10 September 2023. Both of these wagers were voided by Sportsbet. One of the wagers would have lost, but the second wager,

a 3-leg same game multi bet with a stake of 2501 (increased to 2550 as a power play price) would have been a winning wager if it had not been voided. Complainant Five requests that this wager be honoured by Sportsbet and that it be correctly settled as a winning wager.

13. Because all of the complaints involve similar factual circumstances, the Commission has elected to deal with them together in a single Decision Notice.

### **Sportsbet's Submissions**

14. Sportsbet submitted that it was entitled to void all of the Same Game Multi wagers placed by the Complainants in accordance with its terms and conditions, which allow for Sportsbet to make corrections and void wagers after a wager has been accepted and where there is a "material technical, human or other error".
15. As noted above, each of the wagers in question were placed on 5 September 2023 on same game multi bets on the AFLW match between North Melbourne and Carlton which took place on 10 September 2023. Sportsbet stated that there was a material technical error in their systems which caused the process for the 'anytime goal scorer' market to be materially inflated.
16. Sportsbet has stated that:
  - the market for the relevant AFLW match was opened on 4 September 2023;
  - the error was identified on 5 September 2023 (5 days before the match was held); and
  - all affected wagers (which totalled 44 separate wagers placed by 22 Sportsbet customers) were voided that day and customers were notified.
17. In order to illustrate the errors, Sportsbet provided information that compared the offered odds with its calculation of the correct odds. Sportsbet also provided a comparison with the odds provided by two other wagering operators.
18. In the submission of Sportsbet, the odds offered by Sportsbet on the wagers the subject of these complaints were overstated by a factor ranging from 88 to 1185 times the correct odds. Sportsbet has calculated that the total correct payout for the disputed wagers if they had not been voided would have been \$658.90, compared with \$234,335.79 at the incorrect odds.
19. Sportsbet has stated that the errors were caused by a technical issue with the trading model for AFL and AFLW games. This error meant that when North Melbourne AFLW players were combined in a same game multi bet, the odds were materially inflated. Sportsbet has advised that it has since implemented a technical solution and introduced further controls to assist with detection and limiting similar incidents in the future.

### **Commission Considerations**

20. As noted in quite a number of previous decisions, all sports bookmakers licensed by the Commission are required to blazon a comprehensive set of terms and conditions for wagering which both parties are bound by when an account is opened and each time a wager is struck. These terms and conditions operate to ensure legislative compliance and the commercial efficacy of the business model of a sports bookmaker.
21. Wagering operators licensed by the Commission typically include price error limiting clauses in their terms and conditions, so that the wagering operator does not have unlimited liability in the event that a human or system error results in materially inflated odds being offered for

a sporting event. These clauses operate to form part of the wagering contract that is formed each time a wager is placed.

22. In the case of Sportsbet, paragraph 1.13 – “Errors” from the Sportsbet terms and conditions in place at the time that these complaints arose relevantly provides:

”1.13. Errors

1.13.1. Sportsbet endeavours to ensure that no errors are made in setting markets including but not limited to errors in prices offered, available selections offered, bets accepted on an Account or any errors in exclusions for certain selections. However, we reserve the right to correct errors and to void any bets prior to or after an event in circumstances where a bet has been accepted and where there has been a material technical, human or other error in setting a market and/or in accepting a bet.

1.13.2. Where a bet is voided by Sportsbet prior to an event commencing, Sportsbet will endeavour to contact the Member by email promptly to inform them that the bet has been voided.

1.13.3. For the purposes of 1.13.1, an error in setting a market or accepting a bet will be material in any of the following circumstances:

- i. the price struck for a bet is materially greater than a price historically offered on the same or a similar market by Sportsbet or a competitor bookmaker;
- ii. there is an error in the price of at least one selection which forms part of a multiple bet; the combined effect of which results in a materially erroneous price;
- iii. the available selection(s) on a market are so different from the selection(s) historically offered on the same or a similar market by Sportsbet or a competitor bookmaker; or
- iv. a person with a good understanding of wagering would reasonably understand that there was an error in a relevant market or in the acceptance of the bet.

1.13.4. For the purposes of 1.13, and in any of the above circumstances:

- i. A bet includes a single bet or a multiple bet; and
- ii. If the erroneous price or selection is part of a multiple bet placed by a Member, the multiple bet will be either re-calculated at adjusted (correct) prices or by excluding the event to which the error relates, at Sportsbet's absolute discretion.”

23. Having considered the material provided by Sportsbet, the Commission is satisfied that there was a material technical error in setting the market for the relevant same game multi bets for the AFLW match on 10 September 2023 between North Melbourne and Carlton.
24. In forming this view, the Commission has reviewed each of the relevant wagers and is satisfied that they were all impacted by the material error and that Sportsbet was, in accordance with the relevant terms and conditions in place, entitled to void the wagers placed by the complainants.
25. To illustrate this, the Commission has chosen as an example one of the wagers placed which had the smallest price differential. This wager, which was placed at odds around 88 times the

correct odds, was on team members Thalia Randall and Kate Shierlaw. The individual odds for each player was \$1.25, the correct odds for the multi bet were \$1.48, and the odds offered by two other wagering operators on the same contingency were \$1.65 and \$1.50. The incorrect odds used when the wager was struck were \$131.00, which the Commission has assessed as clearly meeting the threshold of being a material error.

26. The Commission notes that because the wagers were voided by Sportsbet some 5 days prior to the AFLW match being played, it was open for each of the complainants to place a further wager at the correct odds, either with Sportsbet or another wagering operator.

### **Conclusion**

27. The Commission is satisfied that Sportsbet has, in relation to its dealings with each of the five complainants, acted in accordance with the regulatory environment in place, its licence conditions, and the relevant terms and conditions applicable to each of the complainants' wagers.
28. It therefore follows that Sportsbet was entitled to void the wagers the subject of the five complaints before the Commission.

### **NOTICE OF RIGHTS**

1. Section 85(6) of the RBA provides that a determination by the Commission of a dispute referred to it pursuant to section 85 of the RBA shall be final and conclusive as to the matter in dispute.



Alastair Shields  
Chair,  
Northern Territory Racing and Wagering Commission

On behalf of Commissioners Shields, Kirkman and Perrin