

Housebets — DrWgamba: questionnaire response

Prepared for the arbitration · answers the player's 29-question document ("Housebets Questionnaire") · username DrWgamba · joined 25 Jan 2026 · to be read with "Housebets — DrWgamba: a point-by-point response" and the audited reconciliation corrigendum of 7 July 2026 · all figures re-verified 8 July 2026 directly against the permanent transaction record, the reward engine's settlement register, and independent recomputation of each disputed settlement from the engine's locked configuration.

Scope & method. Every YES/NO below is answered from the permanent record: the itemised register of all 406 reward claims, the slider-setting history (logged to the millisecond), the certified daily activity record, and the complete deposit/withdrawal registers. Where a question asks what a support agent *said*, we state that the transcript sits with the support desk and give the ledger fact in every case. One structural point applies to all such questions: **customer-support agents do not have access to back-office player records** — a deliberate player-protection measure — and can only describe what the player-facing site itself displays. An agent's description of an on-screen credit is therefore not a settlement determination and cannot override the permanent record. The same redaction discipline applies as in the main response: no wallet addresses, transaction hashes or third-party personal data; any figure can be verified privately by an independent reviewer on request.

Summary. The dispute rests on four premises — a weekly bonus claimed on 25 May; a monthly slider retroactively changed from 50/50; competitor accounts that were fake or fake-money; and ~\$91,000 of losses caused by reliance on Housebets statements. The permanent record contradicts each one. The credit of 25 May at 01:05:52 UTC was a **VIP level-up bonus of \$750.00**, not a weekly; a monthly settlement is governed by the slider position **locked at the start of the settlement month** — May therefore settled on the 0% rakeback / 100% lossback position the player himself set in late April, while the 50/50 he chose at 00:12:07 on 1 May (after the lock) took effect for June, exactly as the engine's June audit confirms; the flagged accounts were funded with **real, on-chain-verifiable deposits**; and the player finished May approximately **\$54,800 ahead** on gameplay, so a 100%-lossback monthly correctly paid \$0. Lifetime, he has withdrawn **\$39,471.76 more than he deposited**, received **\$51,431** across 406 rewards and **\$12,384.03** in additional discretionary bonuses, and all 35 withdrawals were paid.

The account in narrative

Before the individual answers, the account in full — because the questionnaire presents fragments of a record that, read whole, answers itself.

Wagering. Between 25 January and 30 May 2026 the player wagered approximately **\$3.81 million** across some 2,700 casino rounds and 7 sportsbook bets — principally Blackjack (\$1.50M), Dice (\$1.44M) and Mines (\$0.70M) — plus TRX-denominated play. This is a high-volume, sophisticated profile, and the platform served and paid it accordingly.

Profit and loss. Lifetime, his net gaming loss was **\$23,097 — about 0.6% of turnover**. He beat Blackjack for **\$76,835**. He deposited **\$690,285.67** (171 deposits, all credited), withdrew **\$729,757.43** (35 withdrawals, every one completed), and finished **+\$39,471.76 in cash ahead of the platform** (audited corrigendum, 7 July 2026).

Bonusing. On top of that cash surplus, the reward engine paid him **\$51,431.40 across 406 claims** — instant, VIP and daily rakeback, weekly and monthly reloads, wager-race prizes and VIP level-ups — every one computed by the same engine, on the same published rules and cycle locks, from his own slider choices, exactly as for every other player. The disputed settlements have been independently recomputed from the engine's locked configuration and reconcile to the cent.

Personal bonusing above the system. Beyond anything the reward program produced, the account received **10 additional manual bonuses totalling \$12,384.03** — discretionary bonuses granted personally to this player over and above the engine. These were not compensation payments and are not tied to any service issue; they were extra bonuses, extended at the platform's discretion.

The terms. Under the platform's General Terms, bonuses, promotions, reloads and contest prizes are **discretionary benefits, not contractual entitlements**: they may be amended, withheld or withdrawn at the platform's discretion. The record nevertheless shows that every amount the rules produced was paid in full — the claim here is not that a discretionary benefit was refused, but that paid-in-full settlements were somehow underpaid, which the recomputations disprove.

Equal treatment. Nothing in this account's history was bespoke: the slider locks, the settlement engine, the migration bridge window (18–28 May) and the wager races applied platform-wide, by rule, to all players alike. In total he has received **\$63,815** in rewards and additional bonuses against a lifetime gaming loss of \$23,097 — roughly 2.8× his losses returned. The only respect in which this player was treated differently from anyone else was in his favour.

The three credits at the centre of questions 1–10

Claimed (UTC)	Reward type	Amount	What it is
2026-05-21 01:52:27	Weekly reload	\$719.49	Settlement of the last ordinary weekly cycle (closed before 18 May), pre-migration engine.

2026-05-25 01:05:52	VIP level-up bonus	\$750.00	Not a weekly. A tier-progression reward. This is the credit the “25 May weekly” claim refers to.
2026-05-28 01:52:06	Weekly reload	\$0.28	Settlement of the single migration-extended cycle 18–28 May, independently recomputed — reconciles to the cent.

Answers 1–10 · the weekly cycles

1. Weekly bonus paid every Thursday until May 21?

NO as stated — the question conflates the offer with the payment. Weekly claims are **offered every Thursday at 00:00 UTC**; they are **paid when the player claims them**. His register shows 8 weekly-reload claims (29 Jan, 5 Feb, 12 Feb, 19 Feb, 19 Mar, 20 Apr, 21 May, 28 May): most were claimed within hours of the Thursday offer, and one — the Thursday 16 April offer — he did not claim until Monday 20 April. Weeks with no claim are cycles in which nothing accrued under his play and his own slider settings; a cycle that accrues \$0 produces nothing to claim, and no accrued weekly is unpaid. The Thursday offer cadence itself never broke — including 21 May and 28 May.

2. Support confirmed the May 21 weekly was claimed at 01:52 for \$719?

YES — the underlying fact is correct: a weekly reload of **\$719.49** was claimed 2026-05-21 01:52:27 UTC.

3. Both ledgers show the May 21 weekly at 01:52 for \$719?

YES. Your ledger and ours agree on this claim exactly.

4. Support confirmed a May 25 weekly claimed at 01:10?

NO. There is **no weekly claim on 25 May** anywhere in the itemised register of all 406 claims. The credit nearest that time is a **VIP level-up bonus of \$750.00 at 01:05:52 UTC** — a different reward type. If an agent described that credit as “the weekly”, the description was wrong — support agents work from the same on-site display the player sees, without back-office ledger access (a player-protection measure) — and the permanent register is definitive.

5. Was one bonus cycle affected by the platform migration?

YES. The engine's settlement record shows a single extended weekly window, **18 May → 28 May 2026**, bridging the cutover.

6. Was the migration cycle May 21–24?

NO. No “21–24 May” cycle exists in the settlement record. The only migration-affected cycle is 18–28 May.

7. Does that cycle match Thursday, Support's explanation, and the \$719 payment?

NO. The \$719.49 claimed on 21 May settled the ordinary cycle that closed *before* 18 May, on the pre-migration engine. It is not the migration cycle's payment.

8. Was the migration cycle (May 21–24) claimed on May 25?

NO. Nothing was claimed under the weekly program on 25 May (see 4).

9. Is a separate 10-day weekly cycle (May 18–28) even possible?

YES — it is not only possible, it is what happened, because the premises in 4, 6 and 8 are false. Two consecutive, non-overlapping cycles: the ordinary cycle offered and claimed Thursday 21 May (\$719.49), then the migration-extended cycle 18–28 May offered and claimed Thursday 28 May (\$0.28). Even the extended cycle kept the standard Thursday-midnight offer cadence — the migration lengthened one settlement window; it never moved the offer day.

10. How can the May 18–28 cycle coexist with the weeklies already evidenced? Were there two weeklies inside another weekly?

There were no “two weeklies inside a weekly”. Three credits are being conflated — see the table above. Why the 18–28 May cycle paid \$0.28: on 23 April (re-confirmed 1 May 00:12:07) the player set his weekly slider to **0% rakeback / 100% lossback**; lossback pays only on net losses, and across 18–28 May he finished approximately **\$49,000 ahead** on gameplay, so the payout floors at ≈\$0. An independent audit recomputed this settlement from the engine's locked configuration and it reconciles to the cent. **Recomputed = stored — reconciles**

Answers 11–13 · the monthly slider

11. Did the monthly UI show 50% Losses / 50% Wager throughout the month?

YES — and it was accurate as *the current slider*. The slider on screen always shows the player's live choice, which governs the **following** settlement: a monthly payout is computed on the position **locked at 00:00 UTC on the 1st of the settlement month** (i.e. the previous month's position). The player set 50/50 on **1 May 2026 at 00:12:07 UTC** — twelve minutes *after* the May lock — so 50/50 governed **June** (the engine's June settlement audits at exactly 50/50), while **May settled on the 0% rakeback / 100% lossback position he himself set in late April**.

12. Did the slider still show 50/50 with an hour left before claiming?

The screenshot is the player's to evidence, but a 50/50 display up to settlement is **consistent with the record**: the slider shows the current (next-cycle) choice, which stayed 50/50 from 1 May 00:12:07 onward. It does not show the locked position of the cycle being settled.

13. If you now claim it was actually 100% Losses, why did the UI show 50/50? Was it a UI bug?

There was no UI bug and no retroactive change. The May monthly settled on **100% lossback because that was the position locked coming into May — the player's own late-April setting**; the 50/50 on screen was his new choice, effective the following cycle (the June settlement independently audits at exactly 50/50, confirming the lag works as designed and disclosed). On the substance, the setting made no difference to what he believes he was denied: he finished May approximately **\$54,800 ahead** on gameplay, and a 100%-lossback monthly on a net-winning month correctly pays **\$0**.

Setting changed (UTC, to the millisecond)	Program	Setting the player chose
2026-04-23 00:00:00	Weekly reload	0% rakeback / 100% lossback
2026-05-01 00:00:00	Monthly bonus	0% rakeback / 100% lossback
2026-05-01 00:12:07.570	Weekly reload	0% rakeback / 100% lossback
2026-05-01 00:12:07.583	Monthly bonus	50% rakeback / 50% lossback — unchanged since; governs the June settlement onward

A settlement is governed by the slider position locked at the start of its cycle (for the monthly: 00:00 UTC on the 1st of the settlement month — i.e. the previous month's position). Changes made after the lock apply to the following cycle.

Answers 14–24 · the leaderboard accounts and the migration

14–15. Did the player complain about accounts massively wagering / wrong game categories?

These concern the player's support conversations; the transcripts sit with the support desk and are not disputed here.

16. Did Support confirm the categories were a bug and fix them?

Whether an agent acknowledged a display issue is a transcript matter. What is decisive: category labels are **display-only**. Wager totals, rakeback and contest settlements are computed from the transaction ledger, not from on-screen category labels, so no category display issue affected any amount paid or owed — including the wager-race prizes this player was paid on 1 June.

17–18. Did Support / Housebets confirm the accounts (elmourabut, lucasmartirini) were real, legitimate, eligible and manually reviewed?

What agents said must come from the transcripts — and a support agent **could not** have “manually reviewed” or vouched for other players' accounts, because support has no access to any player's account information (a deliberate player-protection measure); agents can only reference what is visible on the site. Any such reassurance was therefore necessarily general, not an account-level determination. What the permanent record shows: both named accounts were **real-money accounts, funded with on-chain USDT deposits that are independently verifiable on-chain**, wagering real balances. They were not fictitious or fake-money accounts. Evidence of any risk review sits with the risk desk.

19. Doesn't Housebets bear responsibility for the ~\$91,000 lost after relying on its statements?

NO. Three facts from the certified daily record: (a) across the leaderboard-dispute window (18–27 May) the player finished approximately **\$49,000 ahead** on gameplay; (b) his heavy losing days — 24–26 May, ≈\$81,000 of gross gaming losses — were his own play, funded by ≈\$230,000 of same-day deposits, immediately after a winning streak of ≈\$136,000 (19–23 May); (c) “~\$91,000” corresponds to no net figure in the certified record — his lifetime net gaming loss is \$23,097, and his lifetime cash position is **+\$39,471.76 in his favour**.

20. Did Support say he would be compensated for this and for a withdrawal delay?

The promise itself is a transcript matter. The record contains **no compensation payments** — and none were owed. It does show the account received **10 additional manual bonuses totalling \$12,384.03** (including \$2,500 on 16 Mar, \$3,000 on 1 Apr, \$3,384.03 on 8 May) — discretionary extra bonuses, not compensation and not tied to any service issue. As to the withdrawal: all 35 withdrawals completed, most within minutes and the longest in ≈5 hours, within normal processing; a hypothetical bet not placed during normal processing is not a loss the record can recognise.

21. Did Housebets have test accounts not playing with real money?

YES — the platform, like any, has internal test accounts; they are excluded from all reporting and leaderboards. The two accounts the player flagged were **not** test accounts — they held real on-chain funds.

22–23. Did every account automatically appear on the leaderboard / could Housebets choose?

Leaderboards are computed from real, ledger-recorded wagering by eligible customer accounts. Internal test accounts are excluded, as are accounts removed for cause; the detailed eligibility configuration is proprietary and applies identically to all players. None of it altered this player's outcomes: his contest results were settled and paid — **\$1,001.49** (weekly wager race) and **\$5,007.46** (monthly wager race) on 1 June — under the same rules as every other participant.

24. Did other players experience similar issues or lost history because of the migration?

The migration was platform-wide, and the extended 18–28 May weekly window was an engine-level rule applied at cutover — not something specific to this account. Other players' account details are not disclosable.

Answers 25–29 · the claims for payment

25. Should the player bear the consequences of the platform's mistakes, or the casino?

Where a platform mistake costs a player money, the platform should bear it. The record shows no platform mistake that cost this player money: every withdrawal was paid, both weeklies settled correctly under his own slider settings, and the settlements have been independently recomputed and reconcile exactly. He has been treated identically to every other player — same engine, same locks, same rules; the only individual treatment on this account was additional discretionary bonuses in his favour.

26. Should he receive the weekly, the monthly, and compensation for the losses?

NO. The weekly was paid twice (\$719.49 and \$0.28 — the latter correct under his 100%-lossback setting in a window he won); the monthly settled under the 100%-lossback position he himself had locked in for May, and since he finished May ≈\$54,800 ahead on gameplay it correctly paid \$0 (his 50/50 change governed June, which audits at exactly 50/50); and the claimed losses arose from his own gameplay in a window he finished ≈\$49,000 ahead. Bonuses and promotions are in any event discretionary benefits under the General Terms, not contractual entitlements — yet everything the rules produced was paid in full, and a further \$12,384.03 in additional discretionary bonuses was extended above them.

27. If NO, explain why clearly.

Because each premise of the claim — a 25 May weekly, a monthly changed from 50/50, fake competitor accounts, \$91,000 of reliance losses — is contradicted by the permanent record, as set out in answers 4, 10, 13, 17 and 19. Every entitlement is either already paid or floors to ≈\$0 by arithmetic that has been independently recomputed from the engine's locked configuration and is offered for independent review.

28. Should Housebets at least compensate the ~\$91,000?

NO — see answer 19. The figure does not exist in the certified record; over the full disputed window the player was ≈\$49,000 ahead on gameplay; lifetime he has taken out **\$39,471.76 more than he put in**; and he has already received **\$12,384.03** in additional discretionary bonuses above the reward program.

29. Answer YES or NO wherever possible and the rest directly.

Done — all 29 questions are answered above, each from the permanent record, with independent verification offered on every figure.