

RUGBY FOOTBALL UNION

DISCIPLINARY HEARING

At: Brighouse Holiday Inn, Leeds

On: Tuesday 29th March 2011

JUDGMENT

Player: Peter Anderson

Club: Hull RUFC

Match: Wharfedale v Hull

Venue: Wharfedale

Match Date: 5th March 2011

Panel: Clif Barker (Chairman), Mike Hamlin and David MacInnes

Attending: Liam McTiernan (RFU)

Regarding: The Panel was convened to consider the sending off of Peter Anderson of Hull RUFC for an act of stamping on an opponent during the (33rd minute of the second half) match Wharfedale v Hull on 5th March 2011, contrary to Law 10(4)(b).

Charge and Plea

The Player pleaded guilty to the offence as charged, and requested that the case be heard in his absence.

Evidence as to Fact

The Panel considered the following documents:

1. The sending off report of the referee, Mr Colin Tovey. In his report, Mr Tovey described the incident as follows: *"Hull were attacking on the stand side when a Hull player was tackled between the halfway line and 10 metre line in the Wharfedale side of the pitch. The ball was stolen by a Wharfedale player prior to a ruck commencing. The Wharfedale player was in turn brought to ground on his back in the vicinity of the first tackled player. As further players arrived the Hull no 8 brought down his foot on to the chest of the Wharfedale player who was in possession of the ball but trying to play it backwards towards his own side. The ball was in vicinity of the player but stamping down for*

the ball was reckless and potentially dangerous. I stopped the match and sent off the Hull No 8 who left the field without further comment. The Wharfedale player was able to continue without significant assistance from the physio available. Following the game Mr Anderson came and apologised for his actions which I accepted”.

2. Minutes of a Disciplinary Committee Meeting held by Hull RUFC on 23rd March 2011, which the Player attended. The relevant part of the Minutes reads as follows: *“A copy of the referee’s report had been supplied to Pete Anderson and he confirmed that he did not take issue with any of the comments made by the referee. He was at pains to emphasise that he had not deliberately tried to stamp on the Wharfedale player but had intended to ruck the ball and when he began the movement the ball had been there to be rucked, but the player had moved and he fully accepted that his foot had made contact with the Wharfedale player. Pete asked the Committee to accept that he had not intentionally tried to stamp, he accepted that the referee was entitled to send him off for reckless use of the boot. It was noted that the referee’s report referred to recklessness rather than intent. Pete confirmed that he had apologised to the referee after the game and that he had tried to find the player concerned but had been unable to do so. The player had not been injured as a result of these actions. It was quite clear from Pete’s comments that he was sorry for the incident and for the fact that his previously unblemished disciplinary record now had a black mark on it. It was also noted that Pete had played for the Club for 15 years and that he had contributed significantly to the successful establishment of the Second XV. The Committee decided that they should regard this offence as a lower entry offence carrying with it a recommended sanction of two weeks suspension. Given Pete’s unblemished previous record, the fact that the offence was reckless rather than deliberate and the fact that he had apologised to the referee, the Committee decided it would be fair to reduce the two week ban to one week. The ban was to be imposed with immediate effect so that Pete would not be available for selection for the match on 26th March 2011”.*

Decision

The Panel accepted the Player’s plea of guilty and found the charge against him proved.

Entry Point

Having assessed the seriousness of the Player’s conduct pursuant to RFU Regulation 19.8.2.5, the Panel concluded that the offence was at the lower end of the scale of seriousness. In that respect, the offending was reckless as opposed to intentional, no injury was caused and there was no reaction

from any of the other players. The Panel concluded, therefore, that the appropriate Entry Point was a suspension of 2 weeks.

Aggravating Factors

The Panel, having considered RFU Regulation 19.8.2.7, concluded that there were none.

Mitigating Factors

Having considered RFU Regulation 19.8.2.8, the Panel was satisfied that mitigating factors did exist, which justified the Panel reducing the sentence by 50% to a suspension of one week. In that respect, the Player had admitted his guilt from the outset, had clearly shown remorse and has an excellent disciplinary record hitherto.

Sanction

The Player is, therefore, suspended for one week running from 23rd March 2011 up to and including 30th March 2011. He is free to play again on 31st March 2011.

Costs

The Panel made an award of costs against the Player/Club in the sum of £80.

Right of Appeal

The right of, and procedure on, appeal is set out in RFU Regulation 19.10.

Signed: Clif Barker, Chairman

Date: 1st April 2011