

CRFU 2021 DISCIPLINARY DECISION



Match	Fidelity Cayman Storm v Advance Fire & Plumbing Buccaneers		
Player's Union	Cayman RFU	Competition	Alex Alexander Cup
Date of match	13 February 2021	Match venue	South Sound Pitch
Rules to apply	Regulation 17 World Rugby and CRFU Procedures and Powers of Disciplinary Committees		

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE			
Player's surname	Victory	Date of birth	10 July 1975
Forename(s)	Christian		
Referee Name	Dave Sherwin	Plea	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Admitted <input type="checkbox"/> Not admitted
Offence	Breach of Law 9.12 of the Laws of the Game (Physical Abuse – Punching/Striking).	SELECT:	Red card <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Citing <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> If "Other" selected, please specify:

Summary of Sanction	<p>Four weeks commencing on 13 February 2021.</p> <p>The Player will be suspended for the following matches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturday 27 February 2021 (Storm v Iguanas) • Saturday 13 March 2021 (Pigs v Storm) • Saturday 27th March 2021 (Vase Semi Finals (2nd Place v 3rd Place, 1st Place v 4th Place)) <p>If the Storm play in Vase Final on 10 April 2021, the Player will be suspended for that match and he will be free to resume playing and being involved in on-field match day activities on 11 April 2021.</p> <p>If the Storm do not play in the Vase Final on 10 April 2021, then, having due regard to guidance set out in <i>In re Appeal of Kepu</i>, Autumn Internationals 2017, Jan 17, 2018 at paragraphs 35 – 50 and Regulation 17.21.3(e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if the Player registers with a team to play in the annual autumn sevens series, he will be suspended from the first weekend of that series and all matches played that weekend, provided that he plays in each subsequent weekend event of the series, unless he is unavoidably unavailable (for example, through injury or travel). • if the Player does not register and participate the annual autumn sevens series, he will be suspended from the Storm’s first scheduled game of the 2021-2022 season, the date for which will be confirmed by CRFU in due course.
---------------------	---

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS	
Decision Date	16 February 2021 (Written Reasons provided 15 March 2021)
Chairman	Matthew Dors
Other Members of Disciplinary Committee	James Austin-Smith Christopher Kennedy
Player representative	Unrepresented

List of documents/materials provided to Player in advance of decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Match Referee's Report; • the Assistant Referee's Report; • the Player's own post-match statement; • the post-match statement of Christian de Banks; • video footage of the incident; • a copy of or link to Regulation 17 (Discipline – Foul Play) • a copy of or link to Appendix 1 to Regulation 17 (World Rugby Sanctions for Foul Play); and • a copy of the CRFU Procedures and Powers of Disciplinary Committees.
---	---

BACKGROUND TO THE INCIDENT

1. The Foul Play that is the subject of these disciplinary proceedings occurred at the end of an unfortunate and unnecessary series of escalating acts of Foul Play.
2. The incident began when the Referee awarded a penalty against the Storm following a period of 'advantage'. After the whistle was blown, and whilst the Referee was returning to the 'mark', a Storm player, Alex Mansfield (**Mansfield**), threw the ball away. Mansfield subsequently received a yellow card for this act of Foul Play, which was described by the Referee in his yellow card Report as "cynical".
3. When the Buccaneers' scrum half, Dave Stringer (**Stringer**), set off to retrieve the call, he was 'tackled' to the floor by another Storm player. Stringer returned to his feet and set off again to retrieve the ball. Another Storm Player, Justin May (**May**), then ran after Stringer and shoved him forcefully in the back with both hands knocking Stringer to the Floor. In response, a Buccaneers player, Christian de Banks (**de Banks**), ran approximately 15 yards and headbutted May, knocking him to the ground. As de Banks walked away from the incident, he was approached by a number of Storm players. A number of other Buccaneers players joined them and a scuffle ensued. In the course of that scuffle, Christian Victory (**Victory** or the **Player**), punched de Banks in the head twice.
4. Both de Banks and Victory were Ordered Off by the Referee resulting in an automatic referral to the Disciplinary Committee (the "**Committee**"). This decision is concerned solely with the actions of Victory. The actions of de Banks will be the subject of separate disciplinary proceedings. To the extent that reference is made in this decision to the actions of de Banks and others, such information is referred to only as relevant background information.

SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE MATCH OFFICIAL REPORTS

1. The Referee, Dave Sherwin, issued the Player with a red card in the 30th minute of the second half of a match played between Fidelity Cayman Storm v Advance Fire & Plumbing Buccaneers on Saturday, 13 February 2021 at the South Sound Pitch for a breach of Laws 9.11 and 9.12 of the Laws of the Game.

"9.11 Players must not do anything that is reckless or dangerous to others.

9.12 A player must not physically or verbally abuse anyone. Physical abuse includes, but is not limited to, biting, punching, contact with the eye or eye area, striking with any part of the arm (including stiff-arm tackles), shoulder, head or knee(s), stamping, trampling, tripping or kicking."

2. The Referee, stated in his report that:

"Following the incident involving head-to-head contact between Christian de Banks and Justin May, the Player retaliated and, in the ensuing fracas, threw at least two punches with a closed fist which connected with Christian de Banks; head and neck area. I had an excellent view of events unfolding and accordingly would have had no hesitation in ordering the Player off in any event. However, given the extent of the incident I also conferred with Tim Coak who had stood next to me as events unfolded. He agreed with all I had seen and with my decision."

3. The Assistant Referee, Tim Coak, stated in his report that:

"After the Buccaneers was (sic.) headbutted the Storm scrum half, a number of Storm players ran over to him and were joined by a number of Buccaneers players. Among the Storm Players, Christian Victory struck the Buccaneers No. 5 twice on the head and neck with a closed fist. This occurred about 15 metres away from me in clear sight."

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF OTHER EVIDENCE

1. Video footage of the incident has been provided to the Committee. The video footage is from a single camera positioned in line with the halfway line approximately 40 metres from the incident. The footage is of good quality and was available to be viewed at both normal speed and in slow motion.
2. The Committee watched the video footage multiple times. The Committee considers that the following can be observed:
 - May shoved Stringer forcefully in the back knocking him to the floor.
 - de Banks ran in from approximately 15 yards and headbutted May.
 - As de Banks walked away, he was surrounded by 3 or 4 Storm Players, including the Player.
 - The Player was the third Storm player to reach de Banks.
 - The Player approached de Banks and grabbed him from behind.
 - de Banks was also being held by another Storm Player.
 - Whilst positioned behind de Banks, the Player punched de Banks twice with a closed fist with his right-hand making contact with the side/back of de Banks head.
 - The Player was then pulled away by another Storm player before the various players involved in the scuffle then dispersed.
3. Christian de Banks provided the following written statement:

"David Stringer went to get the ball after a penalty had been given. In doing so he was randomly tackled off the ball and was understandably a little annoyed with this but walked away. As he was walking away Justin the really aggressively shoved Dave Stringer in the back. Because of this I ran up to Justin to get "up in his face" to tell him how "out of order" he was but he stopped moving away and my momentum made us clash heads. To be clear I did mean to get in his face but did not mean for us to clash heads. I would like to note the clash was no hard. Immediately after this, there was a melee. I was punched several times and surrounded by storm players but I did not retaliate and tried to get away. I was immediately very sorry for confronting Justin, I should have left it for the referee to deal with. After everything calmed down Justin and I shake (sic.) hands and hugged and apologised to each other. I also appologised (sic.) to the referee after the game."

4. There was no evidence of de Banks having sustained any injury.
5. On 16 February 2021, the day of the Hearing, the Chairman sent the following email to the Player:

"Christian,

The only other information that you should be aware of is that, at the request of the Committee, the following request was sent to the Referees:

"Good Morning All

The DC have requested the red/yellow card history of the above noted players [Christian Victory and Christian De Banks], in both 15s and 7s tournaments. If you have any record(s) of past cards in relation to these players, please could you send this on to me?

Kindest regards

Rhian"

Thus far, the following responses have been received:

- *"Sorry don't store them personally. I think I have given one yellow to Christian but can't recall specifics. Kind regards Alasdair" [Robertson].*
- *"Rhian, I have no recollection unfortunately, although I'm fairly confident I haven't personally cautioned either of them before. Tim" [Coak].*

- *"I can confirm that over the years I have issued a number of yellow cards to Christian Victory – probably 4 to 5 over 9 seasons. I am afraid I don't have documentary evidence. Dave"*
[Sherwin].

Kind regards, Matt"

6. On the same day, The Disciplinary Liaison Officer sent the following follow up email to the Player:

"Further to the below, I also received the following from Justin Colgan:

"Min 2 to Chris V from me too. One was definitely a team yellow and another was for a high tackle. I believe there was a yellow for dangerous play for Chris m [Christian de Banks] last year against the pigs in which Eddie W got split open but again have nothing documented."

Kind regards, Rhian"

7. Later on the same day, the Player sent the following reply email:

"Thank you Matt and Rhian

This is very much appreciated and I would like to most humbly and respectfully, but also most carefully, note that there is no documentary record which might include any detail for any of the yellow card history mentioned below – although neither do I dispute the general recollection of the Referees whatsoever.

I would be most grateful for the opportunity to touch very briefly on this, however, as part of the hearing of submissions in relation to sanction, with the leave of the Discipline Committee of course, if I may.

I would also like to most respectfully and carefully note that the second sentence of Justin's email is clearly not referring to me – as I thought it may have been when I read it first.

My sincere and genuine thanks again and my repeated apologies for how much of everyone's time this is taking up.

Kind regards, Christian"

SUMMARY OF THE PLAYER'S SUBMISSIONS AND EVIDENCE

2. The Player provided the following written statement immediately after the incident:

"Buccs player headbutted/charged our 9 (J. May). I retaliated in the ensuing mele protecting my teammate."

3. In the Hearing Form that the Player was asked to complete in advance of the Hearing, he provided the following additional statement in response to the question *"Does the Player accept that the act(s) of Foul Play which is the subject of the disciplinary hearing warranted the Player being Ordered Off?"*:

"Yes. I most contritely and remorsefully wish to admit to the offence with which I am charged and I contest neither the Match Referee's nor the AR's reports. I have read and considered Regulation 17 (Discipline - Foul Play) and Appendix 1 to Regulation 17 (World Rugby Sanctions for Foul Play).

On this basis - but remaining entirely at the disposal of the Discipline Committee - I understand that, based on 3.11 of the CRFU Disciplinary Procedures, the Discipline Committee should proceed immediately to hear submissions in relation to sanction. Assuming my understanding is correct, I most humbly and respectfully request that the Discipline Committee kindly consider the following in mitigation please:

1. *I genuinely and sincerely regret my actions and I have spoken with and personally apologised to Christian*

de Banks early this morning (15 February). I did not speak with Christian on the day of the game as I could not find him following the game. I did, however, speak with and personally apologised to other members of the Buccaneers team with whom I shared good natured conversation and fellowship in the Clubhouse following the game.

- 2. I also apologised personally to Director Jovan following the game.*
 - 3. I respectfully followed the request to leave the field and shook hands with and apologised personally to the Match Referee, David Sherwin, immediately following the final whistle.*
 - 4. Earlier in the game following an unintentional collision with Ben Blair -whom I also count as a personal friend - I remained with him until I was confident that his neck compression did not seem to be too serious, in my experience at least - and I only wish to emphasise by this my general and genuine concern for the wellbeing of not just my Storm teammates but also that of the players of the other teams. I also accept and admit, however, that I momentarily and seriously failed in this aspect with regard to the instant matter.*
 - 5. I would most respectfully and humbly request that the Discipline Committee kindly take into account (a) the unprecedented nature of the provocation involved, (b) the human factor of wishing to stick up for one's teammate and (c) the disparity in size and height between Christian de Banks (much larger) and I plus the distance between us when the incident occurred.*
 - 6. I have been very conscious of my behaviour both on and off the pitch this season both towards my fellow players and our officials, whom I hold in high regard and count as personal friends. I have deliberately and consciously sought to maintain a quiet, positive and respectful attitude and have not - to the best of my recollection - received any sanction this season before Saturday's game and apologise unreservedly again for my retaliation in what had been, up to that point, a punishing but clean and well fought encounter. I do acknowledge that I was sanctioned either 9 or 10 years ago for retaliation, following receipt of a deliberate kick to the head when on the ground, but have never received a sanction for initiated foul play.*
 - 7. I will, of course, respectfully and contritely accept the decision of the Discipline Committee and I also apologise to the Discipline Committee for your time taken and inconvenience caused in having to deal with this matter."*
4. At the hearing, the Player was informed that the Committee were content to accept the above statement as the Player's evidence but that was free to add to it as he considered appropriate. He was further informed that, in light of him not contesting the reports of the Referee and Assistant Referee and admitting that the Foul Play warranted him being Ordered Off, the Committee would proceed to immediately to consider the issue of the appropriate sanction, if any.
5. In his further submissions and evidence:
- The Player apologised again for his actions. He explained that was never his intention to go out and commit an act of foul play but seconds before the incident he thought he had seen punches being thrown by de Banks. He further explained that he was not contesting what he did at all but was offering his explanation in mitigation. He accepted that his "instinctive action was poor", that he "let himself down" and he was "very sorry for letting the Game down and everything that means" but, in the heat of the moment, he thought he was defending his friends.
 - The Player expressed his concern that he had an unjustified reputation as an offender of the Laws of the Game that was contributed to by the commentators on CRTV. The Committee confirmed that they did not listen to the commentary on the incident and that their decision would be based only on the evidence before them.
 - The Player repeated his concern that the information provided by the Referees in relation to his disciplinary record was lacking in detail and not properly documented. The Committee explained that we fully accepted these comments and would take them into consideration. The Player accepted the Referee's recollections, lacking in detail as they are, that he had received 8 yellow cards in 11 years of playing Rugby in Cayman, fewer than one per season on average.

6. The Player also raised a concern that he had not fully appreciated that one of the managers/coaches of the Storm, Rupert Stanning, who also works for the same law firm as the Chairman, had a broader role within CRFU as a member of the Men's Rugby Sub-Committee. The Player stated:

"I do not want to insult or compromise anybody in this but I just was a little bit concerned about the fact that it only became clear to me today that Rupert is involved in some sub-committee or some disciplinary function within the club. I wasn't aware of that. I did appreciate that you were colleagues but of course I respect your integrity in every respect and every aspect. However, I did.....not confide in Rupert but I just felt that I perhaps maybe should be a little bit more careful in my language to him because I didn't realise that there were other conversations happening in the background that I wasn't aware of. Not making a big deal of that. I just want to mention that for the record and I think it is something that should be noted."

7. This concern was raised further to an email exchange between the Player and the Chairman in advance of the Hearing. The Player sent the following email to the Chairman:

"Dear Matt,

Conscious that you are colleagues, may I most respectfully ask whether Rupert has discussed or otherwise communicated anything related to this matter with you please and, if so, if it might be kindly shared with me please – purely so that I am fully informed in all respects.

My most sincere and genuine thanks again.

Kind regards, Christian"

8. The Chairman replied by email as follows:

"Christian,

Rupert and I have discussed the events of Saturday generally given his role with the Storm and the involvement of a number of storm players on Saturday. We spoke briefly about the involvement of other Storm players who are not the subject of disciplinary proceedings but who received yellow cards or who were otherwise involved. We have not discussed the specifics of your case other than Rupert confirmed that you would be representing yourself and that you were hoping to minimise the impact of the proceedings on others.

Kind regards, Matt"

9. The Player replied by email as follows:

"Thank you Matt and genuinely appreciated.

Kind regards, Christian"

10. When this issue was raised again at the Hearing, Committee Member James Austin-Smith confirmed that he had seen the email exchange referred to above and said to the Player: *"I'm going to ask you this as a direct question and you must feel free to answer it as you want: Do you have a difficulty with Matt sitting on this panel?"*. The Player responded: *"Absolutely not in any respect whatsoever."*

11. The Committee asked the Player to provide further information in relation to the incident he described briefly in his written statement in the following terms:

"I do acknowledge that I was sanctioned either 9 or 10 years ago for retaliation, following receipt of a deliberate kick to the head when on the ground, but have never received a sanction for initiated foul play."

12. The Player explained that, to the best of his recollection, he had retaliated after being kicked in the head by punching the other player. As a result, he received a red card and was the subject of a Disciplinary Hearing, which resulted in him receiving a short suspension.

DECISION

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

The player has admitted a breach of Law 9.12 of the Laws of the Game that warranted him being Ordered Off.

Law 9.12 provides that:

"A player must not physically abuse anyone. Physical abuse includes, but is not limited to... Punching or striking with hand or arm..."

In light of a) the Player's Admission; b) the video evidence; and c) the unchallenged evidence contained in the reports from the Referee and Assistant Referee; the Committee finds that the Player did punch de Banks twice with a closed fist making contact with the side/back of de Banks' head.

Having concluded that Law 9.12 was breached, it is necessary for the Committee to consider what further sanction, if any, should be imposed. The Committee considers that it is appropriate to impose further sanction.

When imposing sanctions, all Disciplinary Committees or Judicial Officers dealing with an Ordering Off and/or citing shall apply World Rugby's sanctions for Foul Play set out in Appendix 1 (save where Appendix 3 applies) and do so in accordance with Regulations 17.17 to 17.21.

Disciplinary Committees or Judicial Officers are required to undertake an assessment of the seriousness of the Player's conduct that constitutes the offending and categorise that conduct as being at the low end, mid-range or top end of the scale of seriousness in order to identify the appropriate entry point for consideration of a particular incident(s) of Foul Play where such incident(s) is expressly covered in Appendix 1 (Reg. 17.18.1).

Appendix 1 prescribes the following entry points for a breach of Law 9.12 involving punching or striking with hand or arm:

Low end: 2 weeks	Mid-range: 6 weeks	Top end: 10+ weeks	Max: 52 weeks
------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------

Appendix 1 also contains the following note: *"Any act of foul play which results in contact with the head and/or the neck shall result in at least a mid-range sanction."*

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS

Assessment of Intent – R 17.18.1(a)-(b)	
Intentional/deliberate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reckless <input type="checkbox"/>
The Player's actions were intentional.	
Gravity of player's actions – R 17.18.1(c)	
See below	
Nature of actions – R 17.18.1(d)	
Two punches to the head of de Banks in response to de Banks headbutting May.	
Existence of provocation – R 17.18.1(e)	
The Committee does not regard the act of foul play against a teammate as provocation that would lower the assessment of seriousness in this case.	
Whether player retaliated – R 17.18.1(f)	
The Player was retaliating in response to a headbutt to a teammate. Retaliating is, of itself, a breach of Law 9.21 of the Laws of the Game.	
Self-defence – R 17.18.1(g)	
Not Applicable.	
Effect on victim – R 17.18.1(h)	
de Banks suffered no injury.	
Effect on match – R 17.18.1(i)	
The Player's actions did not have any discernible effect on the match.	
Vulnerability of victim – R 17.18.1(j)	
The Player punched de Banks to the side/back of the head whilst standing behind him.	
Level of participation/premeditation – R 17.18.1(k)	
The Player's actions were clearly the result of a loss of control rather than premeditated.	
Conduct completed/attempted – R 17.18.1(l)	
The Player's conduct was completed.	
Other features of player's conduct – R 17.18.1(m)	
None.	

Entry point			
<u>Top end*</u> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Mid-range</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6 Weeks	<u>Low-end</u> <input type="checkbox"/>

*If Top End, the JO or Committee 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.

Summary of reasons for selecting entry point:

In accordance with the "Note" to Appendix 1: "Any act of foul play which results in contact with the head and/or the neck shall result in at least a mid-range sanction." The Committee considers that the seriousness of the offending is not sufficient to justify a Top End entry point. Accordingly, the Committee considers that the appropriate entry point is the mid-range entry point of 6 weeks.

ADDITIONAL RELEVANT OFF-FIELD AGGRAVATING FACTORS

Regulation 17.19.1 provides that:

“Having identified the applicable entry point for consideration of a particular incident, the Disciplinary Committees or Judicial Officers shall identify any relevant off-field aggravating factors and determine what additional period of suspension, if any, above the applicable entry point for the offence should apply to the case in question. Aggravating factors include:

- (a) the Player’s status generally as an offender of the Laws of the Game;^[4]*
- (b) the need for a deterrent to combat a pattern of offending in the Game where the teams participating in the Match or Tournament have been put on notice that such a need exists; and*
- (c) any other off-field aggravating factor(s) that the Disciplinary Committee or Judicial Officer considers relevant and appropriate (including poor conduct prior to or at the hearing).”*

Footnote 4 provides as follows:

“The Player’s disciplinary record in all competitions and (as appropriate) in other sports during his or her playing career from the age of 18 shall be considered by a Disciplinary Committee or Judicial Officer. In any case in which the Disciplinary Committee or Judicial Officer establishes that the Player has previously been found by a Disciplinary Committee and/or Judicial Officer to have committed any act of Foul Play and/or Misconduct then the Disciplinary Committee or Judicial Officer in imposing any sanction on the Player may take account of such offending as an aggravating factor in determining the appropriate sanction.”

Player’s status as an offender of the Laws of the Game – R 17.19.1(a)
The Player has received 8 yellow cards over a period of 11 years. In addition, the Player received a previous red card and subsequent suspension for punching in retaliation to being kicked in head. Nevertheless, the Committee does not consider his status as an offender of the Laws of the Game is sufficient to warrant in increase from the entry point.
Need for deterrence – R 17.19.1(b)
The Committee considers that, particularly in light of mandatory requirement for a mid-range entry point of 6 weeks for any punch to the head, the Committee does not consider there to be any additional need for deterrence.
Any other off-field aggravating factors – R 17.19.1(c)
None

Number of additional weeks: **Nil**

RELEVANT OFF-FIELD MITIGATING FACTORS

Regulation 17.20.2 provides that:

“Subject to Regulations 17.20.3 and 17.21.1, for acts of Foul Play the Disciplinary Committee or Judicial Officer cannot apply a greater reduction than 50% of the relevant entry point suspension (prior to any increase for aggravating factors). In assessing the percentage reduction applicable for mitigating factors, the Disciplinary Committee or Judicial Officer shall start at 0% reduction and apply the amount, if any, to be allowed as mitigation up to the maximum 50% reduction.”

Acknowledgement of culpability and timing – R 17.20.1(a)	Player’s disciplinary record/good character – R 17.20.1(b)
The Player admitted that his conduct amounted to Foul Play that warranted him being ordered off at the first opportunity in his Hearing Form. He did not dispute accounts of the Referee and Assistant Referee or seek to justify his actions or minimise his culpability.	The Player has received 8 yellow cards over a period of 11 years. In addition, and more importantly, the Player received a previous red card and subsequent suspension for punching in retaliation to being kicked in head. As such, he cannot be considered to have the sort of exemplary disciplinary record that would warrant the maximum reduction from the entry point.
Youth and inexperience of player – R 17.20.1(c)	Conduct prior to and at hearing – R 17.20.1(d)
The Player is an experienced and senior player.	The Player conducted himself appropriately prior to and at the hearing.
Remorse and conduct to victim – R 17.20.1(e)	Other off-field mitigation – R 17.21.1(f)
In his written statements and at the hearing, the Player demonstrated what the Committee has no doubt was clear and genuine remorse.	None.

Number of weeks deducted: **2**

Summary of reasons for number of weeks added or deducted:

The Committee considers that there are no aggravating features sufficient to warrant any additional weeks above the 6-week entry point.

The Committee considers that, notwithstanding the Player’s early admission, genuine remorse and appropriate conduct during the course of the proceedings, his disciplinary record is such that he should not receive the maximum reduction of 50% or 3 weeks from the entry point. In all the circumstances, the Committee considers that the appropriate reduction in these circumstances is 33% or 2 weeks.

SANCTION

NOTE: PLAYERS ORDERED OFF ARE PROVISIONALLY SUSPENDED PENDING THE HEARING OF THEIR CASE, SUCH SUSPENSION SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN SANCTIONING – R 17.12.5(f)

Total sanction	4 weeks	Sending off sufficient <input type="checkbox"/>
Sanction commences	13 February 2021	
Sanction concludes	11 April 2021 (If Storm play in Vase Final – see explanation below)	

Matches/tournaments included in sanction	<p>Four weeks commencing on 13 February 2021.</p> <p>The Player will be suspended for the following matches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturday 27 February 2021 (Storm v Iguanas) • Saturday 13 March 2021 (Pigs v Storm) • Saturday 27th March 2021 (Vase Semi Finals (2nd Place v 3rd Place, 1st Place v 4th Place)) <p>If the Storm play in Vase Final on 10 April 2021, the Player will be suspended for that match and he will be free to resume playing and being involved in on-field match day activities on 11 April 2021.</p> <p>If the Storm do not play in the Vase Final on 10 April 2021, then, having due regard to guidance set out in <i>In re Appeal of Kepu</i>, Autumn Internationals 2017, Jan 17, 2018 at paragraphs 35 – 50 and Regulation 17.21.3(e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if the Player registers with a team to play in the annual autumn sevens series, he will be suspended from the first weekend of that series and all matches played that weekend, provided that he plays in each subsequent weekend event of the series, unless he is unavoidably unavailable (for example, through injury or travel). • if the Player does not register and participate the annual autumn sevens series, he will be suspended from the Storm’s first scheduled game of the 2021-2022 season, the date for which will be confirmed by CRFU in due course.
Costs	None

Chairman	Matthew Dors	Date	15 March 2021
-----------------	--------------	-------------	---------------

Appeals

THE PLAYER AND/OR THE PLAYER'S HOME UNION/RUGBY BODY (AS APPROPRIATE) MAY APPEAL THIS DECISION. ANY PARTY WISHING TO APPEAL THIS DECISION MUST FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL WITHIN 48 HOURS FROM NOTIFICATION OF THIS DECISION. (Regulation 17.24)

Any Notice of Appeal should be sent by email to rhianminty@gmail.com.

In accordance with Regulation 17.24.5, a deposit of C\$250 must be paid to CRFU within 3 days of filing the Notice of Appeal. In the event of the required deposit not being paid within the required timeframe, the appeal shall be deemed to be abandoned. The deposit shall be refundable in the event that the appeal is successful.