

## **RUGBY FOOTBALL UNION**

### **DISCIPLINARY HEARING**

**At:** Holiday Inn, Bloomsbury, London.

**On:** Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> April 2010.

### **JUDGMENT**

**Player:** Karl Rudski

**Club:** Cambridge RFC

**Match:** Nuneaton RFC v Cambridge RFC

**Venue:** Nuneaton

**Match Date:** 13th March 2010

**Panel:** Jeremy Summers (Chairman), Julian Morris & Mike Cordell.

**Secretary:** Liam McTiernan (RFU Disciplinary Department)

**Attending:** Bob Crooks (Director of Rugby, Cambridge RFC)

**Regarding:** The sending off, on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2010, of Karl Rudski, Cambridge RFC, for receiving two yellow cards (one technical, one foul play) during the match Nuneaton v Cambridge, contrary to Law 10(4)(m).

### **Preliminary Issues**

The Player/Club did not object to the composition of the panel.

Mr. Crooks apologised on behalf of Karl Rudski for the latter's non-attendance. He was currently on a train on the way to the hearing but had been delayed. Mr. Crooks hoped no discourtesy would be inferred, and informed the Panel that, given the ready admission of the offence by the Player, the Panel could proceed with its deliberations if it so wished. The Panel gladly accepted Mr. Crooks' explanation and were grateful for the straightforward nature of Mr. Crooks' disclosure in this regard.

### **Charge and Plea**

The Player admitted receiving two yellow cards (one foul play, one technical), contrary to Law 10(4)(m). The panel has considered:

1. The referee's Sending Off report, dated 15<sup>th</sup> March 2010.
2. The technical Yellow Card report, dated 15<sup>th</sup> March 2010.

3. The foul play Yellow Card report, dated 13<sup>th</sup> March 2010.

#### Sending Off Report

The Sending Off report reported nothing factual of the sending off incident itself, bar referencing the two separate Yellow Card reports. Contained with the Sending Off report, there was some comment on the general spirit in which the game had been played, and offered the view that this had been quite a tetchy affair with lots of pushing and shoving off the ball, and a fair amount of 'verbals'.

#### Technical Yellow Card Report

The technical Yellow Card report made reference to the temporary dismissal from the field of the Player in the 57<sup>th</sup> minute of the game. This report suggested that it had been a sanction against the team and that the Player had committed the most recent in a long line of infringements with which the Referee had lost patience.

#### Foul Play Yellow Card Report

The foul play Yellow Card report made reference to the temporary dismissal from the field of the Player in the 80<sup>th</sup> minute of the game, on the recommendation of the Assistant Referee. This was his second temporary dismissal, thus he would be ineligible to return on the cessation of this period of suspension, as denoted by the subsequent issuing of a Red Card to him. It recorded as follows: "*A maul formed near the Nuneaton tryline about 6 metres in-field. The ball was in the possession of Cambridge. A Nuneaton player forced his way through the centre of the maul and attempted to grapple for the ball. Rudski bound onto the Nuneaton player around the upper body and wrestled him to the ground. As Rudski got to his feet he raked his boot on the prone Nuneaton player, making contact with the player's upper arm and chest. I indicated foul play to the referee and described what I had seen.*"

### **The Cambridge RFC Case**

Mr. Crooks accepted with good heart the decision of the referee to penalise the Player for foul play for the second of the two Yellow Cards. He offered the view that a Yellow Card was perhaps a little harsh, but accepted that if he admitted foul play had taken place, which he did, that the Panel could not interfere with that decision. This, he accepted with good grace.

Mr. Crooks took the view, in relation to the first (technical) Yellow Card, that if the Player was unlucky to receive a Yellow Card in the 80<sup>th</sup> minute, he was very unfortunate indeed to have received one earlier in the 57<sup>th</sup> minute. Mr. Crooks offered the view that the Referee had penalised the wrong player in that incident, and had he not done so the subsequent Yellow Card which heralded the Red Card, would not have been issued, and the Player would not have been summoned to appear this evening. Despite his frustrations in this regard, Mr. Crooks accepted that the Panel had no jurisdiction to revisit a

technical offence<sup>1</sup>, as this would amount to re-refereeing a game. Again, with his customary good grace, he accepted the awarding of the first Yellow Card.

### **Findings**

The Panel found an offence against Law 10(4)(m) had been committed by virtue of the awarding of two yellow cards in a match to the Player. The Panel then conducted an assessment of the Player's conduct<sup>2</sup> and found as follows:

- (a) The Player had acted without malice.
- (b) The foul play for which the Player was shown a Yellow Card consisted of a trampling action on an opposition player who was not injured and was able to continue playing, and which did not warrant (in the view of the Referee) an outright Red Card. The technical offence for which he was also shown a Yellow Card was intended to be a sanction against the team, and may not have warranted a Yellow Card had his act been in isolation.
- (c) There was no effect on the game.
- (d) The conduct was completed.
- (e) There were no other relevant features to the offending.

Having regard to the findings above the Panel categorised the offending as being at the low end of the scale of seriousness. The low entry point for this offence under 10(4)(m) is Sending Off Sufficient.

There was plainly no other factor present to convince the Panel to aggravate the Player's offence<sup>3</sup>, similarly there was no need to consider mitigation<sup>4</sup> having reached the lowest possible sanction available.

### **Sanction**

The Panel concluded that the Player is free to resume playing immediately.

### **Costs**

The Player/Club shall pay the costs of the hearing of £150.<sup>5</sup>

### **Right of Appeal**

The Player is advised of his right of appeal.<sup>6</sup>

**Signed:** Jeremy Summers, Chairman.

**Date:** 7<sup>th</sup> April 2010.

---

<sup>1</sup> As per Appendix 1 of the RFU Disciplinary Regulations, 2009/10.

<sup>2</sup> Under Disciplinary Regulation 8.2.5 of the RFU Disciplinary Regulations, 2009/10.

<sup>3</sup> Under Disciplinary Regulation 8.2.6 of the RFU Disciplinary Regulations, 2009/10.

<sup>4</sup> Under Disciplinary Regulation 8.2.7 of the RFU Disciplinary Regulations, 2009/10.

<sup>5</sup> Under Disciplinary Regulation 8.3.1 and Appendix 6 of the RFU Disciplinary Regulations, 2009/10.

<sup>6</sup> Under Disciplinary Regulation 11 of the RFU Disciplinary Regulations, 2009/10.