



PRESS RELEASE No 108/26

Luxembourg, 16 July 2026

Judgment of the Court in Joined Cases C-424/24 and C-425/24| FIGC and CONI

Sports justice: disciplinary sanctions must be amenable to judicial review that is consistent with EU law

On 1 April 2022, the Federal Public Prosecutor's Office of the Italian Football Federation (FIGC) brought disciplinary proceedings against a number of clubs, including Juventus FC, and against some of their directors suspected of having participated in a system of artificial capital gains in respect of player transfers, intended artificially to inflate their book value.

Subsequently, two directors of Juventus were prohibited from carrying on any activities within the FIGC. Those sanctions were then extended globally by the Fédération internationale de Football Association (FIFA) and upheld by the highest Italian sports court.¹

After an action was later brought before an Italian administrative court, that court, whose power is limited to awarding compensation, without having the possibility of annulling such sanctions, asked the Court of Justice whether those sanctions are compatible with the freedoms of movement guaranteed by EU law,² and whether such a system of judicial review is consistent with EU law.³

In the first place, the Court of Justice finds that **a sanction prohibiting the pursuit of a professional activity in all of the Member States infringes the freedoms of movement of the directors concerned.**

Nevertheless, **that restriction may be justified if it pursues a legitimate objective in the public interest and if it is proportionate to that objective. It is for the national court to ascertain whether those requirements are met**, it being noted that the first requirement appears to have been met in the light of the role that compliance with the financial and accounting standards applicable to football clubs has in ensuring the proper conduct of sporting competitions. As regards observance of the principle of proportionality, the national court must be satisfied not only that the temporary prohibitions on the pursuit of a professional activity provided for by the FIGC form part of a consistent and comprehensive system intended to put an end to unlawful conduct and to prevent any recurrence thereof, but also that the determination of those sanctions is subject to transparent, objective and non-discriminatory criteria.

In the second place, **individuals must have an effective legal remedy against acts infringing the freedoms recognised by EU law, and thus, in particular, against acts imposing such sanctions.** In order for Member State law to meet that requirement, it must, first of all, allow individuals **to bring an action before a court or tribunal having the power to annul those sanctions and, if necessary, to order interim measures.** Next, the Member States must guarantee **the independence** of that court or tribunal, in particular from any external pressure liable to be exerted by the sports organisations concerned. Furthermore, it is essential that **the existence, composition and organisation of that court or tribunal be governed by law.** Lastly, the court or tribunal in question must provide the parties with the **requisite procedural guarantees**, in particular respect for the rights of the defence and observance of the principle that the parties should be heard, and **exercise effective judicial review** over the acts submitted before it.

By contrast, EU law does not require a second level of jurisdiction: the existence of a court or tribunal guaranteeing

effective access to justice is sufficient.

It is for the national court to ascertain whether the Italian sports courts or, at the very least, the court giving a decision at last instance satisfies all of those conditions in the present case.

NOTE: A reference for a preliminary ruling allows the courts and tribunals of the Member States, in disputes which have been brought before them, to refer questions to the Court of Justice about the interpretation of European Union law or the validity of a European Union act. The Court of Justice does not decide the dispute itself. It is for the national court or tribunal to dispose of the case in accordance with the Court's decision, which is similarly binding on other national courts or tribunals before which a similar issue is raised.

Unofficial document for media use, not binding on the Court of Justice.

The [full text, and, as the case may be, an abstract](#) of the judgment is published on the CURIA website on the day of delivery.

Press contact: Jacques René Zammit ☎ (+352) 4303 3355.

Images of the delivery of the judgment are available on '[Europe by Satellite](#)' ☎ (+32) 2 2964106.

Stay Connected!



¹ The Italian sports justice system in disciplinary matters, as regards football, provides for two levels of jurisdiction exercised by the FIGC (the Federal Court at first instance and the Federal Court of Appeal at second instance), and for a legitimacy review on the part of the Sports Guarantee Board of the Italian National Olympic Committee (CONI), a body governed by public law that is responsible for coordinating the activities of the various Italian sports associations.

² Articles 45 and 56 TFEU.

³ Article 19(1) TEU and Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.