

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 310(4) of the Racing and Wagering Act 2024 and section 85(2) of the Racing and Betting Act 1983)
COMPLAINANT:	Mr T (the Complainant)
LICENSEE:	Sportsbet Pty Ltd (Sportsbet)
HEARD BEFORE: (on papers)	Alastair Shields (Presiding Member) Susan Kirkman Rachael Shanahan
DATE OF DECISION:	30 June 2025

DECISION

1. For the reasons set out below, the Northern Territory Racing and Wagering Commission (**the Commission**) is satisfied that Sportsbet Pty Ltd (**Sportsbet**) has, in relation to its dealings with the Complainant, acted in compliance with the regulatory environment imposed on it by the *Racing and Betting Act 1983* (**the RBA**), its licence conditions, and the terms and conditions that were in effect at the time of the events the subject of this gambling disputes.
2. It therefore follows that the Commission has determined that the wager the subject of this dispute has been correctly settled by Sportsbet.

REASONS

Background

3. Sportsbet was originally granted a sports bookmaker licence by the former Northern Territory Racing Commission (former Commission) under the licensing regime contained within the now repealed RBA. Under the transitional arrangements contained within the Racing and Wagering Act 2024 (RWA), which commenced on 1 July 2024, any licence issued under the repealed RBA that was valid immediately before the commencement of the RWA continues in effect on the commencement of the RWA as a licence under the RWA.
4. As noted in quite a number of previous decisions, all sports bookmakers licensed by the Commission are required to announce a comprehensive set of terms and conditions for wagering which both parties are bound by when an account is opened and each time a bet is struck. These terms and conditions operate to ensure legislative compliance and the commercial efficacy of the business model of a sports bookmaker.

The Complaint

5. On 4 November 2022, the Complainant lodged a complaint with the former Commission in relation to his dealings with Sportsbet.
6. The Complainant stated that on 4 January 2022 he placed a 2 leg multi bet on two separate games to be played on that day with a total stake of \$15,661. The first leg was on an American Basketball game, with the second leg an American Football League (NFL) match. The Complainant stated that Sportsbet voided the first leg of the bet while the game was in play, and that as a result, Sportsbet should have either refunded him his stake or paid out the second leg of the bet as a winning bet.
7. The complaint the subject of this Decision Notice was lodged on 4 November 2022 and had not been determined by the former Commission prior to the commencement of the RWA. Given this and in accordance with the transitional arrangements under the RWA, the Commission has determined to hear the dispute and make its determinations pursuant to subsection 85(4) of the RBA.

Out of Time Consideration

8. The complaint was lodged on 4 November 2022, some 10 months after the wagering activity the subject of the complaint took place. Regulation 17 of the now repealed *Racing and Betting Regulations* require a dispute to be lodged with 14 days, however the Commission may, where the circumstances warrant it, accept a complaint outside the 14-day period.
9. Given the period of time that has elapsed since the complaint was lodged with the Commission under the now repealed RBA, and that the complaint has been investigated by Licensing NT staff, the Commission has determined to accept the complaint outside of the 14-day timeframe.
10. The Commission has since revised its procedures so that requests for Commission consideration of late lodgement of complaints are dealt with promptly, and before an investigation has been undertaken.

Sportsbet Response to the Complaint

11. In response to the complaint, Sportsbet acknowledged that while the first leg of the multi bet was in play, it was incorrectly voided due to an error by Betradar, a third-party feed provider contracted by Sportsbet, but that the error was identified by Sportsbet and manually rectified prior to the commencement of the second leg of the Complainant's wager. Sportsbet stated that the Complainant's wager was subsequently correctly recorded as a losing wager.
12. Sportsbet sought to rely upon the following provision from its terms and conditions as justification for correcting the error:

"1.12 Errors

1.12.1. *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.”

Commission Findings

13. Pursuant to section 85(4) of the Act, the Commission determined to investigate the matter and hear the dispute in the absence of the parties, and make its determinations based on the written material before it, including material obtained from Betting Inspectors who have had access to the independent audit log for Sportsbet that contains the record of the wager the subject of this dispute, and who have verified the outcomes of the sporting matches that were the subject of the relevant multi bet.
14. The Commission makes the following findings:
 - a) On 4 January 2022, the complainant placed a 2 leg multi bet with a stake of \$15,661 as follows:
 - Leg 1 – National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) basketball game between Alabama State and Miss Valley State (total points under 149)
 - Leg 2 – The National Football League (NFL) match between Cleveland Browns and Pittsburgh Steelers (alternate total points under 45.5)
 - b) While the first leg of the multi bet was in play, it was incorrectly recorded as being voided.
 - c) Prior to commencement of the second leg of the multi bet, the error was manually rectified and the first leg of the multi bet was correctly recorded as a loss.
 - d) The second leg of the multi bet won, however due to the loss of the first leg of the multi bet, the multi bet was recorded as a loss.
15. It is the Commission’s view that the extract of Sportsbet’s terms and conditions relied upon by Sportsbet to correct the error is not applicable, because it deals with errors in setting markets or accepting wagers. The Commission is however satisfied that Sportsbet is able to correct errors in recording the outcomes of sporting events such as the one the subject of this complaint.
16. In accordance with the principles of natural justice, and to ensure that all relevant information and evidence was before the Commission for its consideration prior to the making of its final determinations, a draft of the Commission’s preliminary findings was supplied to both parties for comment. Sportsbet confirmed that all relevant facts and arguments are correctly reflected in the decision notice. No response was received from the Complainant.

Conclusion

17. The Commission has determined that the complaint is without merit because the wager the subject of this dispute has been correctly recorded as a losing wager by Sportsbet.

NOTICE OF RIGHTS

18. 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 Shanahan