

DISCIPLINARY DECISION



Match	Argentina U20s V Fiji U20s		
Player's Union	Argentina	Competition	U20 World Cup
Date of match	08.06.2019	Match venue	Santa Fe
Rules to apply	Regulation 17 World Rugby Handbook		

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE			
Player's surname	De La Vega Mendia	Date of birth	
Forename(s)	Joaquin		
Referee Name	Andrea Piardi (Italy)	Plea	<input type="checkbox"/> Admitted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not admitted
Offence	Dangerous tackle under Law 9.18	SELECT:	Red card <input type="checkbox"/> Citing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
		If "Other" selected, please specify:	
Summary of Sanction	No Sanction		

HEARING DETAILS			
Hearing date	10.06.2019	Hearing venue	Skype between Wales, England, Argentina, NZ & SA
Chairman/JO	Roger Morris (Wales)		
Other Members of Disciplinary Committee	Stefan Terblanche (South Africa) and Olly Kohn (Wales)		
Appearance Player	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	Appearance Union	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Player's Representative(s)	Aaron Lloyd	Disciplinary Officer and/or other attendees	Ben Rutherford (World Rugby) Nicolas Bia Palombo (Argentine Team Manager) and Jose Pellicena (Argentine Coach)
List of documents/materials provided to Player in advance of hearing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Citing Report from John Byett 2. Notice of Hearing 3. Player's responses to standing directions 4. Statement from Simione Kuruvoli (F9) 5. Statement from Fiji RFU re: medical condition 6. Statement from Player 7. Statement from Jose Pellicena (Coach) 8. Submissions from Aaron Lloyd (Player's Representative) 9. Video footage 		

SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF CITING

The Citing Commissioner, John Byett, alleged that the Player had committed a breach of Law 9.18 such that he should have been shown a red card and ordered from the field of play.

The narrative of the Citing Commissioner's report read as follows:

"From a breakdown in mid-field just outside the Fiji 22 the ball is passed to the Fijian 9 Simone Kuruvoli. He goes into contact with two Argentine players, Arg 10 Joaquin De La Vega and Arg 22 Juan Kruz Perez Rachel. As can be seen on the video Arg 10 is the initial tackler, followed by Arg 22 and they wrap Fiji 9 standing up. Arg 10 then uses his right arm to lift up Fiji 9 completely off the ground under his right leg with Arg 22 helping. Fiji 9's leg goes above the horizontal with both Arg 10 and Arg 22 still holding the Player as they go to ground. Fiji 9 makes contact with the ground in the area of the neck/head. The referee awards a penalty for the tackle and Fiji take a quick tap penalty and the game continues. After review and getting statements from Fiji 9 and a medical report provided I have deemed it is foul play by Arg 10 under Law 9.18 and duly cite the Player. Arg 22 for his part in the tackle has been given a CCW under the same Law".

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF OTHER EVIDENCE (e.g. medical reports)

F9 had provided a written statement in the following terms:

"I ran in between the middle of two players and it was when I was off-loading the ball, one of the two Argentinian defenders lifts me up and tip tackles me to the ground. My head hits the ground. I stood up and played again. The ball was then turned over, played by the opposition and it was that following ruck where our Fijian player was yellow carded. It was to the last seconds of the game and I was being called out to have HIA".

The medical report from the Fijian Team Doctor read as follows:

"Following the game yesterday with Argentina one of our players Simone Kuruvoli (half back) was taken for HIA assessment after a call made by the MDD for suspected concussion.

The footage/reviews confirms a dangerous tackle made on the above mentioned player with the player showing signs that warrants HIA assessment. This was around the last minute of play.

Head Injury Assessment (1) was done and due to variations in his results he was called back for Head Injury Assessment (2) a few hours later. He passed the second test".

SUMMARY OF PLAYER'S EVIDENCE

The Player's position was set out in detail in his written statement, in the detailed written submissions made on his behalf by Mr Lloyd and was supported by the written statement of his coach. All three documents are copied below.

In essence, the Player accepted that the tackle he executed was a dangerous tackle which amounted to foul play contrary to Law 9.18 but in the gradation of seriousness of foul play from mere penalty through yellow card, citing commissioner warning, red card and the three levels of seriousness applicable to a red card, his offence was at the least serious end of that gradation.

In relation to a particular aspect of the tackle, in response to a question from the Chair, the Player (and his coach) confirmed that his intention, assisted by A22 as they confronted F9, was to "wrap" F9 and to hold him up from the ground so that a maul would be formed from which, if the ball was killed, a scrum would be awarded to Argentina thus turning over possession in his team's favour.

Statement of Joaquin De La Vega Mendia

10 June 2019

My name is Joaquin De Law Vega Mendia. I am part of the Argentina U20 team presently playing in the World Rugby U20 World Championships, in Argentina.

I was playing as Argentina 10 in the game against Fiji U20s on 8 June 2019 in Santa Fe, Argentina.

I am aware that I have been cited by the Citing Commissioner for a tip or lifting tackle on the Fijian 9. I remember what happened, and set out my memory of it for the Committee.

I was in the backline when Fiji were passing the ball along their backline following a ruck. The ball was passed to Fiji 9, who dummied and stepped back between me and Argentina 22. As a result, I tackled Fiji 9 on one side, and Argentina 22 tackled him on the other side.

Whilst I was relatively upright, as a result of his step, I tackled him around the waist area. I tried to wrap both of my arms all the way around his body. I was intending on pulling his body toward me and tackling him to the ground.

Because Argentina 22 was on the other side, I did not get my arms all the way around Fiji 9. Instead, I ended up with my right arm around Fiji 9's left thigh. I recall trying to pull him toward me, but because I had my arm around his thigh, I lifted him up.

I remember the weight of Argentina 22 coming forward and starting to push me off balance. I realised that Fiji 9 was up off the ground, and I immediately tried to hold him up and support him so I could help lower him safely. I tried and tried to hold him up, but eventually the weight of Argentina 22 and the pull of him and Fiji 9 to the ground became too much and I fell to the ground also.

Even when I was falling to the ground I did not drop Fiji 9. I tried to hold him up as much as possible even as we fell to the ground. When we landed I saw that he had landed on his back.

The Referee penalised us, and I thought that he was penalizing me which I thought was not fair as I had tried everything I could to hold Fiji 9 up. However, I accepted it and I looked at Fiji 9 before getting up to see that he was okay. He got up and appeared to be okay, so I played on.

My lawyer has asked me to confirm my playing and judicial record.

I am 20 years old, my birthday is 30 April 1999. This is my second U20 World Championship tournament, and I have played 7 official U20 games for Argentina. I have also played club rugby for Hindú Club (in Argentina) for 16 years. I have never received a Red Card, or been suspended in rugby ever before.

Joaquin De La Vega Mendia

Written Submission – Judicial Hearing – Joaquin De La Vega Mendia

World Rugby U20 World Championships 2019

Argentina U20 v Fiji U20, 8 June 2019

Citing, Dangerous Tackle (Law 9.18, Lifting Tackle)

Aaron Lloyd, Counsel for the Player (aaron.lloyd@minterellison.co.nz)

Standard Directions

In accordance with the Standard Directions, and as communicated to Ben Rutherford of World Rugby, we confirm as follows (responses are set out below the question):

- 1. *Whether the player accepts that he was Argentina no. 10 against Fiji.***
 - a. *Yes***

- 2. *Whether the player intends to argue any preliminary matters (and if so, what they are).***
 - a. *No***

- 3. *Whether the player accepts that the citing commissioner’s report is a true and accurate account(s) of the incident [and/or] Whether the player intends to show that the citing commissioner was wrong (and, if so, on what grounds and what evidence and/or authorities he will rely on — in such circumstances the player should set out a short statement summarising his arguments attaching any written evidence and/or ‘authorities’ and the names of any witnesses to be called on the player’s behalf).***
 - a. *No, the Player does not accept the Citing Commissioner’s report is accurate in all respects.***
 - b. *The Player accepts that he was in breach of Law 9.18, but says the Citing Commissioner was wrong to cite him as the level of the breach does not meet the Red Card threshold.***
 - c. *The Player will give evidence that he was not the dominant force in the tackle, and that when he realised that the tackled player was horizontal, he did everything he could to try and hold the tackled player up and bring him to the ground safely.***

- d. We will present submissions and an analysis of the video footage available highlighting how the Player's account is correct, that his culpability is low, and that overall his actions do not reach the Red Card threshold.*
- 4. Whether the player wishes any person to answer questions from him/his representative at the hearing (and if so, whom, so that arrangements can be made for their attendance).**
- a. No person is required by the Player to attend.*
- b. However, the Player will give evidence to the Committee, as will his coach Jose Pellicena (and brief statements from each witness will be tendered to the Committee in advance).*
- 5. Who will be attending the hearing with the player (at his location or from elsewhere) and in what capacity.**
- a. In addition to the Player the following people will also attend – Nicolas Bia Palombo (Team Manager), Jose Pellicena (Head Coach) [both at same location] and Aaron Lloyd (Legal Counsel) [by Skype, from New Zealand]*
- b. It is possible a translator may also be present, although I note that it is likely that Nicolas can act to translate as or if required.*

Submissions before the Committee

Summary of the Player's Position

- 1. Joaquin De La Vega Mendia (the Player) comes before the Committee after being cited for a breach of Law 9.18. It is alleged that the Player executed what is colloquially referred to as a lifting or tip tackle on the Fijian number 9, in or about the 35th minute of the second half of the game between Argentina U20 and Fiji U20 on 8 June.**
- 2. In formal terms, a lifting or tip tackle occurs when a player breaches Law 9.18, which states that:**
- “A player must not lift an opponent off the ground and drop or drive that player so that their head and/or upper body make contact with the ground.”***
- 3. Oftentimes, those analysing a tip or lifting tackle focus on matters such as whether the tackled player went through the horizontal, whether their feet were lifted above their head, and what the first point of contact with the ground was. Those matters are relevant to the overall consideration of Law 9.18 but are no longer mandatory considerations. Instead, a breach of the law is made out in circumstances where:**
- a. a player lifts an opponent from the ground; and*
- b. drops the player or drives the player; and*
- c. this results in the tackled player hitting the ground on his (or her) upper body.*

4. *Once a breach is made out, it is for the Referee, Citing Commissioner or Judicial Committee (as the case may be) to decide whether the breach warrants a penalty only, or a more severe consequence (such as a Yellow Card, Red Card, Warning or Suspension).*
5. *It is immediately clear that in the course of the tackle, the Player (along with Argentina 22) lifts the Fijian player from the ground. It is also clear that the Fijian player's upper body made contact with the ground (a close review of the video shows the Fijian player landing on his shoulder).*
6. *However, it is tempting to argue in this case that technically, a breach of Law 9.18 did not occur, because the Player did not "drop" or "drive" the Fijian player into the ground in the sense that he did not drop the player, nor did he forcefully push the player into the ground. However, given the emphasis on player safety, Counsel and the Player accept that Law 9.18 must be interpreted in a purposive and practical way, and not an overly technical way. The law is designed to prevent tip and lifting tackles as they are colloquially referred to. Although the Player did not apply force to bring the tackled player to the ground, he nevertheless was in contact with the tackled player as he came to the ground. Accordingly, the player accepts that he was in breach of Law 9.18, but seeks to show that his actions did not constitute a breach of Law 9.18 severe enough to warrant to the issue of a Red Card.*
7. *The matters before the Committee therefore are:*
 - a. *Was the Citing Commissioner wrong to cite the Player – that is, is the Committee satisfied that the Player's actions did not warrant a Red Card? and*
 - b. *If the Citing Commissioner was wrong to cite, is the incident nevertheless close to the level of the Red Card such that a Warning is warranted, (or should the Player receive no further sanction)? or*
 - c. *If the Citing Commissioner was correct to cite the Player, what sanction should the Player receive?*
8. *With respect to these matters we say the following:*
 - a. *the Player accepts that he breached Law 9.18 when he (along with Argentina 22) tackled the Fijian player - however, his breach of Law 9.18 did not meet the Red Card Threshold because:*
 - i. *his culpability for the incident is low – he was not the dominating force in the tackle (Argentina 22 was), and his only culpable actions amounted to a split-second lifting of the tackled players leg that was inadvertent;*
 - ii. *once he realised the Fijian player was in a horizontal position, the Player took deliberate and positive steps to try and bring the tackled player to ground safely;*
 - iii. *this deliberate attempt to protect the tackled player meant that the player did not "drop" and nor did he "drive" the tackled player to the ground in the sense that the player did not apply any force to the tackled player;*
 - iv. *instead, he did everything he could to hold the tackled player up, resulting in the tackled player landing on his shoulder, rather than his head; and*
 - v. *the effect of the Player's actions were that the tackled player received no injury of significance as a result of the tackle.*

- b. If the Committee finds that the Player's actions did not meet the Red Card Threshold, then we say the correct sanction is that given by the Referee, namely a penalty only. However, it is accepted that the Committee may consider a more appropriate sanction is a Warning, being the sanction issued by the Citing Commissioner to Argentina 22. In citing the Player, it appears the Citing Commissioner considered the Player to be more culpable for the tackle than Argentina 22. However, we say the culpability of the Player is less, or at least, no worse than, Argentina 22.**
- c. If the Committee upholds the decision to cite, then we say that the appropriate starting point for a suspension in this case is low end, as there is no clear evidence of contact with the head. We further say that all of the off-field mitigating features present in this case should appropriately reduce the resulting suspension by 50%. We do not expand in detail on this submission below, as we maintain that the appropriate outcome for this matter is a dismissal of the Citing for the reasons set out in summary above. If the Committee does form the view that the citing is upheld, we ask to be heard in more detail on sanction at the hearing.**

Detailed Submission Regarding the Incident

- 9. We ask the Committee to consider the following still photos, taken from the video also available to the Committee. The photos are taken from the best angle of the incident, which starts approximately 1 minute into the video footage.**
- 10. Initial contact - Note that because Argentina 22 is there, the Player cannot get his hands and arms all the way around the Fijian player.**



- 11. Less than 1 second later, the momentum of Argentina 22 results in his body pivoting forward as the Player continues to try and grasp the Fijian player. This results in the Fijian Disciplinary Decision – U20s 2019**

player tipping forward (from the pressure of Argentina 22) and as Argentina 22's body moves across the tackled player and away from the Player, the Player wraps his right arm around the Fijian player's leg. This isn't a deliberate decision, but rather a consequence of the dynamic nature of the tackle and his arm slotting into the gap left when Argentina 22 moves away from under his hand.



- 12. Again, less than 1 second on and the momentum of the Fijian player continues as the weight of Argentina 22 continues to move forward also. It is at this point (less than 1 second after the initial engagement) that the Player realises that the Fijian player has been lifted into a horizontal position at or around the Player's stomach/chest. It is at this point that he deliberately tries to hold the Fijian player's weight to try and bring him to the ground safely.*



13. As time goes on you can see the Player is doing everything he can to hold the Fijian player's weight. He is trying to stop him dropping to the ground. Note the arrival of another Argentinian player to the left of this shot.



14. A little further on (the Argentinian player in the background has now moved around behind the tackle), and Argentina 10 is still trying to keep the Fijian player up so that he is not dropped to the ground. He is trying to hold his weight so he can bring him down safely.



15. Unfortunately though, the momentum which has been generated by Argentina 22's movement becomes dominant over Argentina 10 trying to hold the Fijian player up. The weight of Argentina 22 rolling around the front, and then down, whilst holding the Fijian player, pulls Argentina 10 off balance and down to the ground. Note how Argentina 10 is still relatively upright in the second photo below showing he is still trying to do his best to hold the Fijian player up and not let him drop to the ground.



16. Argentina 10 (the Player) ultimately succumbs to the momentum of the tackle and falls to the ground. He is still trying to hold the Fijian player up and slow his momentum toward the ground as much as possible. Note he does not drop the Fijian player or drive him to the ground – all of his actions up until and including this point are directed at trying to stop the Fijian player go to ground.



17. The Fijian player comes to the ground with his shoulder impacting first. Note that the arm with the tape around the wrist is the Fijian player's arm (see the second photo at 15 above), not the Player's arm and hand (who is still grasping the Fijian player).



18. As the tackle completes, the Fijian player is then rolled onto his back by the momentum of Argentina 10 coming across him. It is unclear whether there is any impact of the head itself with the ground. If there is, it is, thankfully, secondary to the shoulder impacting first and is minimised by the rolling nature of the completion of the tackle. We say this is a positive and direct consequence of Argentina 10 doing everything he could to hold the Fijian player's weight throughout the whole of the above sequence. The lack of any (or any significant) head impact is supported by the lack of any injury to the tackled player (refer medical report, indicating no signs of injury, and the carrying out of precautionary HIA protocols, which were passed).



19. We say that the only part of Argentina 10's actions that is culpable is where he gets his arm around the Fijian player's leg and lifts him early on in the tackle. This happens only very briefly, and came about as a result of the dynamic movement of the tackle. In particular, it is a consequence of the way in which the presence of Argentina 22 initially prevented Argentina 10 from putting his arm around both legs, and then Argentina 10's arm slotting into the gap between the Fijian player's legs when Argentina 22's body moved away – see point 1 to 2 above). This was a brief and unintentional movement, and as soon as Argentina 10 realised that the Fijian player was in a horizontal position at his stomach/chest height, he did everything he could to try and hold him up and to then bring him to the ground safely. He did not simply drop the player, nor did he ride him to the ground, he tried as hard as he could to hold him up.

20. We accept that Argentina 10's actions resulted in a dangerous tackle, which was appropriately penalised by the referee. However, we say that it is clear that the actions of the Player did not warrant a Red Card as:

- a. he does not drop or drive the player into the ground (in the sense of applying any significant force);**
- b. the breach arises from a combination of:**

- i. the unfortunate way in which both 10 and 22 commence the tackle together, and 10's arm literally slotting into the gap between the legs when 22 moves away; and*
 - ii. the momentum of the tackle (and in particular Argentina 22's momentum) ultimately pulling Argentina 10 and the Fijian player to the ground.*
- c. the Player's culpability is therefore low;*
- d. once he realised the player was horizontal, Argentina 10 did everything he could to bring the Fijian player to the ground safely; and*
- e. his efforts in doing so are likely to have had a material positive effect on the Fijian player's safety, because had he not done everything he could it is likely the Fijian player would have hit the ground with significantly more force.*

21. In all of the circumstances, we say that the Committee should find that the Referee was right to penalise the Player, but that the Citing Commissioner was wrong to cite the player as his offending does not meet the Red Card threshold.

Those are the submissions on behalf of the Player.

Aaron Lloyd

Counsel for Joaquin De La Vega Mendia

Statement of José Pellicena

10 June 2019

My name is José Pellicena. I am the head coach of the Argentina U20 team.

I am a former professional rugby player. I have played rugby in Super Rugby, and in Europe including in the Amlin Challenge Cup and Heineken Cup.

I am now a coach, and in addition to coaching the U20 National Team, I have also been coaching as an assistant coach in Super Rugby with the Jaguares.

I am aware that one of my players, Joaquin De La Vega Mendia, has to appear before the judiciary for a tackle in the game against Fiji.

I have reviewed the video of this tackle, and would like to make the following comments to assist the Judicial Committee:

- 1. I take player safety very seriously.***
- 2. In particular, I have tried to ensure that the players in my U20 team are very clear about tackling at the right height, and that they do not lift players up when they tackle.***
- 3. In this instance, I have seen Joaquin tackle the Fijian player around the hip area, but because his teammate is also in the tackle, Joaquin's right arm goes around the Fijian player's leg.***
- 4. This, added to his teammate's pressure, means that instead of pulling the Fijian player toward him and to the ground, the Fijian player is lifted up.***

5. *On the video I see clearly Joaquin trying to hold the Fijian player up off the ground. This is consistent with what we coach the players, telling them that if another player is lifted off the ground, they must do everything they can to hold their weight so they come to the ground as safely as possible.*
6. *Joaquin tries to do that with this tackle. He tries to hold the Fiji player up for as long as possible before his teammate falls to the ground, pulling the Fiji player and Joaquin with him.*

José Pellicena

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Panel discussed in private everything they had seen and heard.

The Chair reminded his colleagues that the applicable standard of proof for their factual determinations is the balance of probabilities.

He also reminded them that in cases involving “double tackles” it was necessary to identify and analyse the actions of the individual being dealt with in order to assess whether those actions amounted to foul play and whether any foul play committed by that player was so serious as to have warranted his ordering off by the issue of a red card.

In the Panel’s assessment:

- The original intention of the Player as he approached F9 was to tackle him in such a way as to prevent him from getting to ground - colloquially a “wrap tackle”. As he approached the tackle therefore, his intention was to keep F9 from the ground and not to tackle him to the ground.
- This assessment is supported not only by what the Player, his coach and Mr Lloyd said but also by the Citing Commissioner himself who in terms identified the effort of the Argentinian players as an effort to perform a “wrap” tackle.
- That the Player found himself holding F9 firmly around the thigh was the inadvertent consequence of his original intention but nevertheless he would (or at least should) have been aware that the effect of lifting his opponent’s leg to near or slightly above the horizontal would be to tip the opponent dangerously upside down.

- The Player was reckless in continuing his powerful lift and the consequence of that recklessness was to create a dangerous tackle with all the features of a foul contrary to Law 9.18. Indeed, the Player and Mr Lloyd both accepted the tackle was dangerous and amounted to foul play.
- The referee had recognised a foul but could not identify which part of F9’s body first made contact with the ground and so awarded a penalty in favour of Fiji but issued no sanction beyond that penalty.
- The Citing Commissioner also recognised foul play but alleged that F9’s head/neck was the part of his body to hit the ground first.
- The Panel reviewed the video footage and from some angles and at first sight could understand the Citing Commissioner’s view of events. On a detailed analysis however and assisted by the screenshots at paragraphs 16 and 17 of Mr Lloyd’s submissions, they concluded that F9 had landed on his right side before rolling on to the flat of his back following which his head recoiled to make contact with the ground.
- There was no attempt or intention by the Player to drive his opponent to the ground. That would have been entirely contrary to the initial intention to hold F9 in the “wrap” tackle identified by the Citing Commissioner.
- The force with which F9 made contact with the ground was not concentrated on his head/neck area but spread through the length of his torso.
- The Panel concluded (agreeing with the Player) that the Player had committed an act of foul play contrary to Law 9.18 but that a referee assessing the situation based on the Panel’s factual determinations would not have issued a red card.

In the light of the Panel’s findings the Citing was dismissed.

The full Skype hearing was reconvened and the Panel’s decision relayed to the parties. The Chair confirmed the Player was immediately free to play.

The parties were reminded that the Panel’s decision is subject to their right of appeal.

DECISION

Breach admitted <input type="checkbox"/>	Proven <input type="checkbox"/>	Not proven <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other disposal (please state) <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---------------------------------	--	--

SANCTIONING PROCESS

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS

Assessment of Intent – R 17.19.2(a)-(b) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Intentional/deliberate <input type="checkbox"/> Reckless <input type="checkbox"/>
State Reasons
Gravity of player's actions – R 17.19.2(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Nature of actions – R 17.19.2(d) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Existence of provocation – R 17.19.2(e) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Whether player retaliated – R 17.19.2(f) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Self-defence – R 17.19.2(g) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Effect on victim – R 17.19.2(h) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Effect on match – R 17.19.2(i) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Vulnerability of victim – R 17.19.2(j) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Level of participation/premeditation – R 17.19.2(k) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Conduct completed/attempted – R 17.19.2(l) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Other features of player's conduct – R 17.19.2(m) (or equivalent Tournament rule)

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS CONTINUED

Entry point					
<u>Top end*</u>	<u>Weeks</u>	<u>Mid-range</u>	<u>Weeks</u>	<u>Low-end</u>	<u>Weeks</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	

*If Top End, the JO or Panel should identify, if appropriate, an entry point between the Top End and the maximum sanction and provide the reasons for selecting this entry point, below.

In making this assessment, the JO/Committee should consider World Rugby Regulations 17.19.2(a), 17.19.2(h), and 17.19.2(i) or the equivalent provisions within the Tournament Rules referred to above.

Reasons for selecting Entry Point above Top End

ADDITIONAL RELEVANT OFF-FIELD AGGRAVATING FACTORS

Player’s status as an offender of the Laws of the Game – R 17.19.4(a) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Need for deterrence – R 17.19.4(b) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Any other off-field aggravating factors – R 17.19.4(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)

Number of additional weeks:

RELEVANT OFF-FIELD MITIGATING FACTORS

Acknowledgement of guilt and timing – R 17.19.5(a) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	Player’s disciplinary record/good character – R 17.19.5(b) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
--	--

Youth and inexperience of player – R 17.19.5(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	Conduct prior to and at hearing – R 17.19.5(d) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Remorse and timing of remorse – R 17.19.5(e) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	Other off-field mitigation – R 17.19.5(f) (or equivalent Tournament rule)

Number of weeks deducted:

Summary of reason for number of weeks deducted:

SANCTION

NOTE: PLAYERS ORDERED OFF ARE PROVISIONALLY SUSPENDED PENDING THE HEARING OF THEIR CASE, SUCH SUSPENSION SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN SANCTIONING – R 17.14.5(f) (or equivalent Tournament rule)

Total sanction	NONE	Sending off sufficient <input type="checkbox"/>
Sanction commences		
Sanction concludes		
Matches/tournaments included in sanction		

Costs

Signature (JO or Chairman)		Date	12 June 2019
-------------------------------	---	------	--------------

NOTE: YOU HAVE **48 HOURS** (15s)/**24 HOURS** (7s) FROM NOTIFICATION OF THE DECISION OF THE CHAIRMAN/JO TO LODGE AN APPEAL WITH THE TOURNAMENT DIRECTOR – R 17.22.2(a) (or equivalent Tournament rule) (see Page 6)