

# NORTHERN TERRITORY RACING AND WAGERING COMMISSION

## DECISION NOTICE AND REASONS FOR DECISION

---

|                              |                                                                                                                                                                |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MATTER:                      | Gambling Dispute for determination by the Northern Territory Racing and Wagering Commission pursuant to section 224 of the <i>Racing and Wagering Act</i> 2024 |
| COMPLAINANT:                 | Mr Y ( <b>Complainant</b> )                                                                                                                                    |
| LICENSEE:                    | Entain Group Pty Ltd ( <b>Neds</b> )                                                                                                                           |
| HEARD BEFORE:<br>(on papers) | Mr Alastair Shields<br>Ms Susan Kirkman<br>Mr Ian Curnow                                                                                                       |
| DATE OF DECISION:            | 15 June 2026                                                                                                                                                   |

---

### DECISION

1. The Northern Territory Racing and Wagering Commission (**Commission**) has determined that Entain Group Pty Ltd (**Neds**) has correctly resulted the disputed wager as a losing wager, and that the complaint is therefore unsubstantiated.

### JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE

2. Neds is authorised by the Commission to conduct the business of a sports bookmaker and to operate a digital wagering platform under the name Neds.
3. The Complainant lodged a complaint in accordance with section 224 of the *Racing and Wagering Act* 2024 (the RWA) on 31 October 2024, however the subject matter of the complaint was a wager placed by the Complainant on 12 June 2024, prior to the commencement of the RWA, when Neds was licensed under the provisions of the now repealed *Racing and Betting Act* 1983 (the RBA).
4. The RBA was repealed upon commencement of the RWA on 1 July 2024. The transitional arrangements in section 310(4) of the RWA do not apply to this complaint, because it was not under consideration by the Commission when the RWA commenced on 1 July 2024. The complaint has therefore been investigated and determined using the practice and procedure established by the RWA.
5. The 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 the Complainant and Neds, a draft of the Commission's determinations was supplied to each of them for comment. Neds responded by indicating that they did not wish to make a submission, and the Complainant failed to make a submission by the due date that was extended at his request.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

### **Scope of Complaint**

7. The Complainant has lodged a complaint alleging that he is entitled to \$248,000 in winnings from a 19-leg mixed multi bet with a stake of \$1,000 made by the Complainant utilising a bonus bet on the Neds App on 12 June 2024. This wager was ultimately settled by Neds as an unsuccessful wager.
8. Through his lawyer authorised by him, the Complainant stated that on or around 12 June 2024 he placed a 19-leg multi bet, and that for the 16<sup>th</sup> leg of the bet, he chose a baseball game between the Baltimore Orioles and the Atlanta Braves (Orioles Game). He further stated that he attempted to select two different line bets ('over 5.5', and 'over 6.5') on the number of home runs that would be hit during the Orioles Game.
9. According to the Complainant, after he selected a further three legs on the multi-bet, he attempted to finalise the bet and was informed by an error message on the Neds App that the betting slip could not be submitted, because he had selected both over 5.5 and over 6.5 runs in the Orioles Game and that a mixed multi bet could not include a same game multi.
10. The Complainant stated that he then reviewed the betting slip, and the Neds App was at that time displaying a 20-leg multi bet on the betting slip. According to the Complainant, he then removed the 'over 6.5' runs from the Orioles Game and he successfully submitted the bet, which was then showing as a 19-leg multi bet.
11. The Complainant has further stated that on 13 June 2024 at approximately 8.35 AM AEST, he was notified by the Neds App that leg 16 of the wager on the Orioles Game was successful, and that at around 9.10 AM AEST, the final leg of the wager, a baseball game between the Boston Red Sox and the Philadelphia Phillies concluded, the Complainant was notified on the Neds App that the final leg was successful, and that the entirety of his wager was successful, with the status recorded as 'pending'.
12. Ten minutes later the Neds App recorded the status of the wager as 'unsuccessful', and when the Complainant contacted Neds customer service he was advised that a same game multi could form part of a multi leg bet. The Complainant has stated that his subsequent attempts to request Neds to correctly settle the wager as a winning wager have been unsuccessful, in spite of the Complainant being advised by his relationship manager that a same game multi could not form part of a multi leg bet, and the Complainant being able to replicate the error message when seeking to place a new multi leg bet with a same game multi bet.
13. The Complainant is seeking that his 19-leg multi bet be settled as a winning wager and that he be paid approximately \$248,000 in winnings.

### **Background**

14. Following the lodgement of the complaint and review of the materials provided, the Director of Racing and Wagering (**Director**) determined to investigate the complaint on behalf of the Commission pursuant to section 222(1) of the RWA and assigned the matter to an inspector.
15. The Director's investigation affords each party the opportunity to submit relevant evidence in relation to the matter, and where required, for the parties to provide evidence at the request of the inspector.

16. At the completion of the investigation, the Director must prepare a report on the investigation and submit it to the Commission in accordance with section 223 of the RWA. Section 223(2) provides that the investigation report must contain:
  - a summary of the findings of the investigation;
  - any submissions provided by the parties to the complaint;
  - any relevant evidence obtained during the investigation; and
  - any recommendations that the Director may have in relation to the complaint.

### **Ned's Submissions**

17. In response to the complaint, Neds has submitted that the wager in question was correctly resulted as an unsuccessful wager.
18. Neds also stated that, notwithstanding the Complainant's assertions that he received an error message when attempting to place the disputed wager, and his claims that he removed the over 6.5 leg from the multi bet, Neds' audit log unequivocally confirms that neither of these claims can be substantiated.
19. To further support Neds' argument that the Complainant was aware that a mixed multi bet could include a same game multi, Neds cited two wagers placed by the Complainant on 13 June 2024 which included same game multi as part of a mixed multi bet.

### **Commission Considerations**

20. Section 224 of the RWA sets out the actions available to the Commission following receipt of a report from the Director in accordance with section 223 of the RWA.
21. The Commission has considered the investigation report provided by the Director, including the evidence provided by the parties and obtained by the inspector.
22. That 18 of the 19 legs in the multi bet placed by the Complainant were winning legs is not in contention by the parties. What is in contention is whether the 16<sup>th</sup> leg of the wager, which included the wager on the Orioles Game, correctly included two contingencies: namely that there needed to be 'over 5.5' runs, and 'over 6.5' runs, noting that if 'over 6.5 runs' had been satisfied, then 'over 5.5 runs' must also have been satisfied. In this case, the game was won by 6 runs, so that 'over 5.5' runs was satisfied, but 'over 6.5' runs was not.
23. The argument advanced by the Complainant is that it is not possible to place a multi bet wager with this same game multi bet element, and Neds has argued that it is possible, and that the evidence shows that the wager was placed including both contingencies.
24. As part of the assessment of this complaint, consideration has been given to the approved wagering control system that Neds is required to maintain in accordance with the provisions of both the RBA and the RWA. That system establishes an independent audit log of all wagering transactions carried out by Neds.
25. The audit log is a tamper-proof chronological record that captures how wagers are processed within the Neds backend systems, including who placed the wager, when the wager was placed, what the wager was placed on, and the stakes and the relevant odds. In the case of a multi bet, the audit log also records the details of each leg of the multi bet, including when each leg was added and whether it was amended prior to submission of the wager. The audit log also records any changes to the wager (for example voiding or cashing-out of the wager), and the subsequent result and payout calculation, and how the wager was settled.

26. The audit log provides reliable evidence of how a wager was processed within Neds' system. In this case, the independent audit log record for this wager details that the Complainant placed the disputed wager at 5:12:13 PM on 12 June 2024, and that the wager was accepted by Neds shortly thereafter. The independent audit log record shows that the wager was placed by the Complainant and included the contingency 'over 6.5 runs', as well as 'over 5.5' runs on the Orioles Game.
27. As noted in quite a number of previous decisions, all sports bookmakers licensed by the Commission are required to expose 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.
28. In the case of Neds, clause 13 "Placement of Bets, Including Refusal and Cancellation" of the terms and conditions in place at the time that this complaint arose relevantly provides:  

"13.7 In the case of a bet placed via the internet, the responsibility to verify that the bet details are correct prior to the submission of a bet resides with you."
29. It is clear from this term that the Complainant was responsible for being satisfied with the details of his wager prior to placing it on the Neds App.
30. The Commission has listened to the recording of a telephone call made by the Complainant to Neds customer service on 13 June 2024, shortly after the disputed wager had been resulted as a losing wager. The Commission notes that the Complainant made no mention of having received an error message that resulted in him removing the 'over 6.5' runs component of his multi bet during this call. The argument raised by the Complainant in the call was that it should not have been possible to place a wager including the 'over 5.5' and 'over 6.5' runs in the same game, and that the odds calculated by the Neds App included the odds for 'over 5.5' runs, which made the 'over 6.5' runs component of the wager irrelevant.
31. During the call, the Complainant stated that he had tried without success to replicate a similar wager on a later game, however the Neds operator stated that he was able to replicate the wager using both 'over 5.5' and over '6.5' runs on the same game.
32. The Director's investigation report indicates that inspectors appointed by the Director also independently replicated the type of wager using the Commission's Neds account and successfully placed a mixed multi bet that included a same game multi bet.
33. Having considered the investigation report provided by the Director, the complaint and associated material supplied on behalf of the Complainant, and the response provided by Neds, the Commission is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the 19-leg multi bet wager placed by the Complainant and accepted by Neds included the contingency 'over 6.5' runs on the Orioles Game. It therefore follows that the wager was correctly settled by Neds as a losing wager.

### **Findings**

34. The Commission therefore makes the finding that Neds has correctly resulted the disputed wager as a losing wager.

### **Decision**

35. The Commission has determined that the Complainant's complaint to the Commission is unsubstantiated.

**NOTICE OF RIGHTS**

36. Section 239(1)(g) of the RWA sets out when a decision or action by the Commission taken pursuant to section 224 of the RWA is reviewable by the Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal (**NTCAT**).
37. In this case, because the disputed winnings from the wager placed by the Complainant are larger than the amount of \$20,000 prescribed by the *Racing and Wagering Regulations 2024* (Regulations), the Complainant and Neds may make an application to NTCAT for a review of this decision within 14 days of receipt of this Decision Notice.



Alastair Shields  
Chair,  
Northern Territory Racing and Wagering Commission

On behalf of Commissioners Shields, Kirkman and Curnow