

# BUCS MISCONDUCT CASES DECISIONS 2022-23

UPDATED | AUGUST 2024

---

To aid transparency of BUCS's disciplinary processes, upon the conclusion of initial, full and final Misconduct/Disciplinary Hearings, BUCS publishes a summary of each case, including the findings and penalties imposed. Published cases do not carry the names of any institution/Playing Entity or individuals involved.

This document contains summaries of all Misconduct Cases ruled on in the 2022-23 season to date. Where there is a gap in the numbering, this will be because of a REG 5 charge having been withdrawn before it was ruled on.

**Please note:**

- A. Whilst these case summaries may be helpful for institutions/Playing Entities to refer to when considering whether to submit an REG 5, and the BUCS Disciplinary Panel will refer to previous cases of a similar nature when making a ruling, it is important to note that every case is different and so however similar cases may seem, no specific outcome is guaranteed.
  - B. The rules and regulations stated herein are valid at the time of publication and remain subject to future review and potential amendments.
- 

**Sport:** Baseball

**Regulation(s):** REG 5

**Summary of the Charge:**

Institution A have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of players of Institution B's Baseball team in relation to the BUCS Open Baseball Scottish Tier 1 fixture on XXXXXX.

The complaint cited that:

"Institution A players have been left shocked and appalled by the conduct of certain Institution B players. The lack of respect was distressing in what is usually a friendly and enjoyable fixture between both clubs. We hope something like this never happens again in future fixtures.

**Decision:**

The Panel concluded that the behaviour constituted 'obscene or provocative conduct or language' under Reg 5.

On the running through incident the panel was open minded about the words used but believed it was likely that the Institution B player had used some inappropriate language. The Panel however felt that this had been intended only as a warning but had been misinterpreted by the Institution A player as a threat.

In relation to the accused 'reaching out for his privates', the Panel also felt this was misinterpreted and was in fact an offer to shake hands.

The Panel decided that the following sanction should be applied:

1. Educational and restorative sanctions

- Institution B to review names and numbers on shirts that could be deemed provocative and offensive.
- Team to receive guidance on appropriate language to be used on and off the field of play.

Institution B will be required to notify BUCS on what the education programme will cover and the timeframe over which they plan to implement this programme. BUCS will contact Institution B to check on progress.

Institution A thanked the panel for their time and are pleased this matter will be closed. They hope that the relationship can remain amicable into the next season.

**Sanction(s):**

- Educational and restorative sanctions

---

**Sport:** Basketball

**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute, **Reg4** – Individual Eligibility

**Summary of the Charge:**

As part of match appeal proceedings relating to the Premier (South) Playoff fixture between Institution A and Institution B on [REDACTED], it was brought to the attention of the BUCS Executive that Institution B's men's 1 basketball team had breached REG 4 by fielding ineligible players. The two players who have been identified by the BUCS Executive as ineligible are [REDACTED]. These two players are deemed ineligible as Institution B stated that their "student access ended on 31st December 22".

BUCS has therefore identified this as a breach of REG 4 as both players are deemed ineligible to play the fixtures post their studies. This in accordance with REG 4.6 raises REG 5, as an act of misconduct.

**Decision:**

The Panel upheld the charge brought by BUCS, confirming that Institution B did breach regulation 4. However, the Panel acknowledged Institution B's perspective and decided to focus solely on the match in question, refraining from imposing sanctions on any additional fixtures or wider than this fixture.

After careful deliberation, the Panel reached a decision regarding the case of the breach of regulation by Institution B's men's 1 basketball team. The charge stemmed from the Premier (South) Playoff fixture between Institution A and Institution B on [REDACTED], where it was discovered that Institution B had fielded ineligible players, namely [REDACTED], who were deemed ineligible as their "student access ended on 31st December 22" according to [REDACTED] statement.

Considering the circumstances and the absence of any intent to violate the rules or regulations, the Panel expressed its reluctance to impose excessive punishment on the institution. The decision was reached to penalise Institution B with a walkover solely for the unintentional breach in the specific fixture under scrutiny. This decision was based on the regulation's potential ambiguity, and BUCS was advised to revise the wording to eliminate any potential misinterpretations.

Advice was given to BUCS to consider the language of regulation 4.2.2 to remove ambiguity.

**Sanction(s):**

- Walkover conceded by Institution B Men's 1s resulting in a win for Institution A Men's 1s.

---

**Sport:** Football

**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute

**Summary of the Charge:**

The Charge was brought by Institution A who have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of members of Institution B.

The complaint cited that: "The Institution B's football team displayed an extreme level of threatening and aggressive behavior towards Institution A's team in the changing rooms following the completion of the fixture" and that "Institution B's players entered their changing room with balaclavas on and seriously insinuated to our players that they had concealed weapons on their person in the form of knives. As per the statement you can see that the behavior of the Institution B players is assumed to have been triggered by an on-field incident that occurred with 30 minutes remaining of the game. We are currently internally investigating this on-pitch incident as we have a zero tolerance for racism."

**Decision:**

The Panel upheld the complaint and found Institution B to be in breach of Reg 5 as a result of the players entering the [REDACTED] dressing room and behaving aggressively.

The Panel noted that the allegations of balaclavas, weapon possession and threatening behavior in the corridors have not been sufficiently proven by the parties.

Institution B expressed that they were disappointed in the outcome and criticised the Panel composition and the outcome.

Institution B queried what evidence had been provided that assisted the decision, factoring that the only objective evidence is the video and the sanction of the team.

The Chair explained that there is no dispute that three or more players entered the dressing room and acted inappropriately.

**Sanction(s):**

- Ban from BUCS competitions/events – The Panel concluded that Institution B will be banned from participating in the competition for the remainder of the season. This results in the remaining 5 fixtures not being played by the Institution B, meaning walkovers will be conceded and a total of £150 be amounted in fines as a result.
- Suspended sentence – The Panel concluded that a suspended sentence be applied and therefore should an incident of a similar nature arise again with the team, the team will be suspended for that season and the following season.

---

**Sport:** Football

**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute

**Summary of the Charge:**

Institution A have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of a member of the Institution B's Football Team at the BUCS & ALDI Men's Football fixture.

The complaint cited that: "During the fixture, there was a tackle which resulted in a coming together between a player from each team. It is then alleged that the number 6 from Institution B made the following comment to one of our players; "fuck off brown boy, get off the fucking pitch".

Following this, our player caused an altercation as he was upset and then decided to leave the pitch on his own accord. The referee claimed he did not hear the comment but decided to book the Institution B number 6."

**Decision:**

Based off of the evidence provided by both parties the Panel were unable to prove and therefore conclude that the alleged comment had been made. Due to this the Panel will not be upholding the complaint raised by Institution A against Institution B.

The Panel has recommended that Institution B complete an education piece with their football team outlining the seriousness of allegations, BUCS disciplinary proceedings and the potential outcomes of these. The Panel requested that progress on this is reported by Institution B to the BUCS discipline team.

In reaching their conclusion the Panel felt there was a lack of supporting evidence provided by Institution A in support of their witness testimony to corroborate their statement and their location.

The Panel felt that Institution B had been thorough in their investigation with the evidence available to them at the time.

The Panel also felt that it would have been of benefit to have individuals present at the incident in the hearing on the day and therefore made the recommendation to BUCS that additional guidance is provided to institutions surrounding individual attendance at hearings.

Institution A asked for future what evidence would the Panel have wanted to see. The Chair expressed that additional witness statements confirming the alleged event did take place or additional statements / evidence supporting the witness testimony would have benefited the Panel.

Institution B expressed that inclusion is an area which they are always wanting to improve on and specific EDI training with respect to sport is taking place.

**Sanction(s):**

- N/A

---

**Sport:** Football

**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute

**Summary of the Charge:**

Institution A have submitted a REG 5 charge against Institution B regarding the violent behaviour of Institution B's Football team.

**Decision:**

The Panel accepted that Institution B had imposed an appropriate sanction on the player in question. The Panel concluded that no additional sanctions would be issued.

The Panel recommended that Institution B review their training for both player and committee members ahead of next season.

The Panel concluded that it would not be appropriate in this instance to punish a whole team for the actions of one player, and therefore no sanction was imposed on the team. The Panel concluded that the official process via the referee should support addressing future issues that may occur.

The Panel recommended that Institution B should highlight to the team the potential consequences of their actions and the severity of the BUCS Reg 5 process.

**Sanction(s):** N/A

---

**Sport:** Football

**Regulation(s):** REG 5, REG 9 and REG 13

**Summary of the Charge:** Institution A have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of Institution B in relation to the BUCS Men's Football Tier ■ fixture which was 'rescheduled' to ■■■■■

Institution A would like to bring a charge against Institution B for breaking Regulations REG 9.2.1.1 Teams from the same institution/Playing Entity in the same league, REG 13.4 Falsification of results and REG 5.

**Decision:**

The Panel also made the following recommendations:

- 1) Mandated attendance of the captains of the Institution B football teams to the BUCS Captains Training Webinar
- 2) Institution B to review admin processes in order to improve communication to avoid a situation like this arising again.

The panel also noted Institution A's comment that "As a proud Institution we follow rules and do not allow our teams to forge games or play against regulations, so it is only fair every other team competes as the same from all institutions" and considered the comment to be inappropriate given that Institution A does not have a blemish free record of compliance with BUCS' regulations.

**Sanction(s):**

- Fine of £1500 which is to be split by the Institution B Men's 2 paying £1000 and Institution B Men's 3 paying £500.
- The result for this fixture will be changed to VOID.
- Suspended sentence to the Institution B Men's 2 and 3 Football Teams. If any breach of REG 13 is proven to have occurred during the 2022-23 season, then the teams will be banned from all BUCS competitions for the remainder of that season and the duration of the following season.

---

**Sport:** Futsal

**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute

**Summary of the Charge:**

Institution A have submitted a REG 5 charge pertaining to Person X who allegedly physically assaulted their striker, used verbal and physical provocation throughout the match, and verbally abused the goalkeeper with discriminatory intent.

Institution A fully accept the result of the match, as ██████ deserved the win, however we ask for disciplinary action to be taken with regards to ██████ player, Person X.

**Decision:**

The Panel were unable to conclude from the evidence provided that verbal racial abuse had occurred.

The Panel felt that following the issue, the Institution B had taken appropriate action in imposing a 3-match ban and escalating this through the institution disciplinary channels. It is felt that the sanctions as a result of the institution disciplinary investigation are appropriate and proportionate.

The Panel concluded that the issue had been appropriately dealt with by Institution B and no further action is mandated by the Panel.

**Sanction(s):** N/A

---

**Sport:** Hockey

**Regulation(s):** REG 5

**Summary of the Charge:**

Institution A University have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of representatives of Institution B University at the BUCS Men's Hockey Premier National fixture which took place on Wednesday 27 October 2021.

The complaint cited that:

*“Throughout this match the spectators were shouting abuse/sexual remarks aimed at the players with 1 particular player being targeted.*

*Some spectators wore t-shirts with printed pictures stuck to them of a family member belonging to an Institution A player.*

*This behaviour is unacceptable and on occasions throughout this game we spoke with the officials as well as the director of Hockey for ██████. This did not stop the abuse and it continued throughout the game”.*

The alleged misconduct comes under regulation 5, which states:

*REG 5.1 Each BUCS member institution/Playing Entity and its clubs shall be responsible for ensuring that its student-athletes, officials and all persons purporting to be its supporters or followers conduct themselves in an orderly fashion whilst attending or taking part in BUCS competitions. They shall also be responsible for ensuring that its student-athletes, officials and all persons purporting to be its representatives do not*

conduct themselves in a way, or print/have published any material, which will bring the company into disrepute, including on social media platforms.

REG 5.1.1 Failure to adhere to this regulation may render the institution/Playing Entity and its club(s) liable to a charge of misconduct for failing to fulfil its said responsibilities and an additional charge of bringing BUCS into disrepute. Examples for which BUCS would deem an institution and its clubs liable to a charge of misconduct and/or bringing BUCS into disrepute are:

- Violent, threatening, abusive, obscene or provocative, conduct or language.
- Disregarding requests/instructions of Tournament Directors or appointed officials.
- Encroachment on the playing area by spectators or unauthorised persons, save for reasons of safety.
- Throwing missiles, bottles or other potentially harmful or dangerous objects at, onto or adjacent to the playing area.
- Entering, or attempting to enter the venue of a BUCS competition while in possession of recreational drugs.
- Entering, or attempting to enter the venue of a BUCS competition while in possession of a flare, smoke bomb or firework.

#### **Decision:**

It was acknowledged that Institution B had taken the matter seriously and the Panel appreciated the proactive steps they had gone to immediately, to tackle the issues around the supporter/club behaviour, showing a genuine effort to improve the student sport experience.

The Panel appreciate that the Goalkeeper did not react and retaliate during the match, but this does not mean it did not affect how he played.

The Panel also made the following recommendations:

- The perpetrators who have been identified to be removed from the Hockey Club.
- Bystander training to be extended to all committee members. If unable to cover all 60 sports clubs, then the priority is the Hockey committee, and any other club regarded as being at high risk of suffering similar incidents.

Institution B asked for clarification on what happens next. The BUCS representatives explained that a written decision would be shared and that there is an appeals process should they wish to use this. Institution B will have 24 hours, from receiving the written decision, to submit an appeal. An extension can be requested on reasonable grounds. A new Panel would then be formed, chaired by the Chair of BUCS or his nominee, at which the Panel Chair would explain the Panel's decision and its reasons therefor. This would need to be heard by the results deadline for this league (Thursday 17 February) to allow for consideration of any potential impact on the National Championship fixtures.

#### **Sanction(s):**

- £750 fine.
- Institution B Men's Hockey 1st Team deducted 3 league points.
- Deduction of 50 BUCS Points.

A suspended sentence to the Men's Hockey Club. If any further breach of REG 5 of this nature connected with Institution B Men's Hockey Club is proven to have occurred during the remainder of the 2021-22 season or the 2022-23 season, then Institution B's Men's Hockey Club will be banned from all BUCS competitions for the remainder of that season and the duration of the following season, such ban to be treated as a relegation for each team when it has been served; this being without prejudice to any decision reached with regard to that further transgression.

---

**Sport:** Korfball

**Regulation(s):** REG 4/REG 4.6/REG 5/KOR 3.5

**Summary of the Charge:**

After the BUCS Korfball Preliminaries, an allegation was made that a player X from Institution A did not meet BUCS eligibility requirements (REG 4) due to not being enrolled in a course for the current academic year. BUCS requested the team's registration form from the event and discovered that Student X's Card ID was recorded and marked as checked, though his eligibility was in question. Contacting Institution A for confirmation and evidence, it was revealed that X's studies were suspended, rendering him ineligible. Despite this, video evidence showed he participated in matches.

As per KOR 3.5, teams with ineligible players face disqualification and potential further disciplinary action. Institution A's team were disqualified and barred from the Qualifier event. REG 4.6 confirms that allowing ineligible participants could lead to misconduct charges against the institution and additional disciplinary action under REG 5. A charge was raised, leading to a Disciplinary Panel hearing for appropriate action.

Later, Institution A acknowledged another breach involving their 1st team player, Player Y, who was in a similar position and had participated in two events before the charges were raised. Both teams were disqualified.

**Decision:**

Factoring in these considerations, the Panel arrived at a verdict. Noting that both teams had already been disqualified as a result of confirmed breaches of KOR 3.5 being confirmed, a suspended fine amounting to £250 was determined as appropriate. This suspended fine shall remain in force for a designated period of two seasons (2023-24 and 2024-25), contingent upon the absence of any subsequent violations of the same regulations within the specified timeframe. The suspended fine was seen as a mechanism to dissuade future breaches while encouraging heightened vigilance and accountability among team members and administrators.

Institution A was advised to communicate the Panel's decision to team captains and to integrate it into their training protocols, fostering a greater awareness and adherence to the regulations.

As part of its recommendations, the Panel proposed that BUCS disseminate the anonymised decision within their system. Such a dissemination would serve as a valuable educational tool for other institutions, promoting a better grasp of eligibility regulations and their implications.

**Sanction(s):**

Suspended Sanction of £250 in force for a designated period of two seasons (2023-24 and 2024-25), contingent upon the absence of any subsequent violations of the regulations noted in this hearing within the specified timeframe.

---

**Sport:** Rowing 4s and 8s Head 2023

**Regulation(s):** REG 5/ROW 4

**Summary of the Charge:**



Institution A is alleged to have breached BUCS regulations at the BUCS 4s & 8s Head event held in February 2023. The alleged breach involves changing crew members in the Men's Intermediate 4+ and Men's Intermediate 8+ events without following the proper substitution procedure outlined in the Event Guide. Specifically, Player X, the then President of Institution A University Boat Club, was replaced by Player Y in both crews. This change was not officially registered as per the required process.

The charge of misconduct against Institution A is based on their breach of ROW 4 and REG 5, which pertains to the behaviour and conduct of institutions, clubs, student-athletes, and officials at BUCS competitions.

**Decision:**

After thorough review and careful contemplation of the testimonies and viewpoints presented, the Panel rendered its decision.

Noting that a confirmed breach of ROW 4 already brings a penalty of disqualification of the crews in question, the Panel determined that an imposition of a suspended financial penalty amounting to £500 shall be levied upon Institution A. This suspended financial penalty shall remain in force for a designated period of two seasons (2023-24 and 2024-25), contingent upon the absence of any subsequent violations of the same regulations within the specified timeframe.

Importantly, should a breach of regulations occur during the stipulated two-year period, the suspended financial penalty shall be invoked and enforced. The decision's publicising shall be conducted in an anonymous manner, in adherence with established guidelines outlined within the misconduct page. It is noteworthy that the publication of the decision shall avoid explicit reference to the suspended financial penalty to ensure an informed yet non-lenient approach. This information is intended for publication in the entry guide or informational materials as well aimed at ensuring all institutions comprehend the consequences that arise from non-compliance with technical regulations.

Institution A acknowledged the Panel's decision and thanked them for their time. Institution A also noted that they didn't believe they would have been the only institution to have breached these regulations and asked that BUCS consider whether additional steps could be put into place by BUCS to reduce the likelihood of such incidents occurring in future, sharing more responsibility with the institutions for ensuring the correct individuals are on the water. Institution A highlighted the examples of procedures currently in place at BUCS athletics and swimming events, which they felt could be considered to see if viable for rowing, as they felt these provided practical illustrations of how event organisers, from their perspective, can play a further part in ensuring only the correct individuals compete. The BUCS representatives acknowledged this suggestion and noted that they would discuss this with the Rowing Event Management Group.

**Sanction(s):**

- The Panel has determined that an imposition of a suspended financial penalty amounting to £500 shall be levied upon Institution A. This suspended financial penalty shall remain in force for a designated period of two seasons (2023-24 and 2024-25), contingent upon the absence of any subsequent violations of regulations within the specified timeframe.

---

**Sport:** Rugby

**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute

**Summary of the Charge:**

This REG 5 claim relates to a serious accusation of racism from an Institution B spectator at a recent BUCS Conference Cup match.

**Decision:**

The Panel acknowledges that it is may be a challenge for Institution B to control spectators who are not members of the club, however note that BUCS regulations does place responsibility for them on the institution.

The Panel commended Institution A for the Bystander training that is delivered by the Institution A to all students. The Panel recommended that Institution B explore implementing bystander training with their club and committee members, and possibly wider students. The offer was extended for Institution B to speak to Institution A on how to deliver this. The Panel requested that Institution B update BUCS on the progress of this.

The Panel strongly feels that hate crimes need to be addressed and are unacceptable.

The Panel acknowledged that the issue was not involving a member of the team on the field and therefore did not want to sanction the team for action they did not commit, however felt that some action is needed.

The Panel will be issuing a £750 fine to Institution B and recommend that this outcome is shared with the University to support their investigation.

The Panel also recommended to BUCS that this disciplinary case is anonymised and made available as a case study to highlight the implications of actions such as those addressed today.

**Sanction(s):**

- Institution B will be issued a £750 fine by BUCS.

---

**Sport:** Rugby**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute

**Summary of the Charge:** During the BUCS Canoe Slalom Championships, a representative from the Institution A participated in the Open Team event and was alleged to have opened and consumed a can of beer during their run. This incident was witnessed by many attendees, including families, children, and members of the British Canoeing Slalom Committee, causing anger and concern. The tournament organisers informed ██████ captain about the inappropriate behavior and subsequently reported the incident to BUCS.

BUCS views this behavior as unacceptable and reckless, compromising the safety of the athlete and others participating. It also tarnishes the reputation of BUCS and Higher Education sport, which already faces negative stereotypes concerning alcohol consumption. As a result, the Institution is charged with misconduct for breaching REG 5.1, which requires ensuring orderly conduct of student-athletes and supporters during BUCS competitions.

Additionally, they are charged with bringing BUCS into disrepute due to the public nature of the incident and potential damage to BUCS's reputation. REG 5.1.2 specifically prohibits the consumption

of alcohol or recreational drugs by competitors during BUCS events, and a retrospective disqualification is intended to be applied in accordance with this regulation.

**Decision:**

Institution A were called back into the room to receive the Panel's decision. The Panel clarified that there was no doubt regarding the breach of regulation and acknowledged Institution A's intent to find a suitable sanction. The Panel then conveyed their decision to the Institution A representatives highlighting that the Panel felt due to the Panel not being able to impose sanctions on individuals and considering the severity of the breach, the institution had to be sanctioned in the following manner.

The Panel found Institution A Kayak Club to be in breach of BUCS regulations and acknowledged their acceptance of the incident witnessed by spectators and judges. The primary concern was the adequacy of penalties for individual athletes involved in the incident.

- Institution A must undertake a comprehensive review of their training procedures, with a focus on ensuring all members, especially but not only relevant captains, receive clear and detailed information regarding event-specific guidelines and regulations.
- The Panel strongly recommends providing tailored training for different sports, particularly for high-risk and event-based sports, to enhance awareness and understanding among athletes.
- In response to the severity of the breach, the Panel decided to impose a ban on Institution A Kayak Club's participation in BUCS canoe slalom competition for the 2023-24 season. This decision aims to underscore the importance of adherence to regulations and maintaining a high standard of discipline within the club.

The Panel expressed their hope that these measures would lead to improved compliance and a safer sporting environment in the future.

**Sanction(s):**

- Kayak Club is banned from participating in the next seasons BUCS Canoe Slalom Championships.

---

**Sport:** Rugby Union

**Regulation(s):** REG 5

**Summary of the Charge:** Institution A have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of a player from the Institution B's Men's Rugby Union team fixture which took place on Wednesday [REDACTED]

The complaint cited that: *"During the game a player from Institution B conducted an illegal play which led to one of our players receiving a serious injury and a trip to the hospital. This tackle was done off the ball and our team saw our player being slammed into the ground twice."*

**Decision:**

The Panel expressed sympathy for the Institution A Player who suffered the injury and were pleased he had made a full recovery. The Panel felt that as Rugby Union is a collision sport, some injuries are expected, and agreed with Institution B that incidents causing injury need to be judged on the play itself and not on the severity of the outcome.

The Panel felt they should not intervene in this case, for two reasons.

First, the citing provisions enshrined in the RFU's regulations and adopted within BUCS rules exist specifically to enable a review of incidents which the referee has not seen or over which the referee had been, in the view of the citing party, too lenient. REG 5 should not be seen as an alternative course.

Secondly, absent very clear evidence, such as a video of the incident, the Panel could not be expected to substitute its own judgement of an incident for that of the qualified official who has seen and acted upon it. To do so would open the 'floodgates' to complaints wherever a team believed an official has made a mistake.

The Panel acknowledged that Institution A could have been provided with guidance from BUCS at the beginning of their complaint, to use the RFU citing process instead, and recommend that in future BUCS give such guidance where appropriate.

The Panel recommend that coaches of both institutions redouble their efforts to ensure all players, whatever their level of skill, are made aware of the boundaries of acceptable physicality in the game.

**Sanction(s):** N/A

---

**Sport:** Rugby Union

**Regulation(s):** REG 5

**Summary of the Charge:** Institution B have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of representatives of Institution A in relation to the BUCS Men's Rugby Union National Vase fixture on Wednesday [REDACTED].

The complaint cited that: "It is with regret that I have to submit a formal complaint against the behavior of the Institution A supporters. In particular, the complaint is made against the language and conduct of the supporters towards Institution B players".

**Decision:**

It was acknowledged that Institution A had taken the matter seriously and the Panel commended its candor in how they have approached the disciplinary process and appreciated the proactive steps they had gone to identify the perpetrators.

The Panel also recommended that Institution A should:

- Continue the investigation to identify the remaining perpetrators and take through University Disciplinary process.
- Continue work on creating a policy to cover behaviors of spectators, with the support of BUCS and other institutions.
- Educate staff in their role at fixtures – whether they are there in an official capacity or not, they must be a point of contact or intervene to deal with behavior that is considered unacceptable.

**Sanction(s):**

- £750 fine.
- Deduction of 50 BUCS Points

- A suspended sentence to the Men's Rugby Club. If any further breach of REG 5 of this nature connected with any team representing Institution A Men's Rugby Club is proven to have occurred during the 2022-23 season, then Institution A Men's Rugby Club will be banned from all BUCS competitions for the remainder of that season and the duration of the following season, such ban to be treated as a relegation for each team when it has been served; this being without prejudice to any decision reached with regard to that further transgression.

---

**Sport:** Rugby Union

**Regulation(s):** REG 5, REG 4

**Summary of the Charge:**

Institution B brought to the attention of the BUCS Executive that their Men's Rugby Union 1st Team had breached REG 4 by fielding ineligible players for their fixture against Institution A's Men's Team on Wednesday [REDACTED].

This admission by Institution B confirmed that they were in breach of REG 4 as their team had fielded individuals who did not meet the eligibility requirements of either REG 4.1 or REG 4.2.

This charge of misconduct is therefore raised in accordance with REG 4.6 to be taken to a Disciplinary Panel to determine the appropriate disciplinary action to be taken:

REG 4.6 Allowing ineligible participants to represent an institution/Playing Entity will result in a charge of misconduct being raised against the institution/Playing Entity and appropriate disciplinary action taken in accordance with REG 5. Athletic Union or equivalent staff should in cases of doubt refer the circumstances to the BUCS Sport Compliance and Governance Manager.

**Decision:**

It was acknowledged that the institution had taken the matter seriously and the Panel appreciated the proactive steps they had taken to investigate the matter. The panel expressed sympathy for the situation the Institution B Rugby Team are in. They had not made this decision to gain advantage on the opposition but to allow students the opportunity to play.

The panel noted that from the perspective of BUCS Regulations, however, only two of the players were ineligible. As Institution B played non eligible players in this fixture, the result will be changed to a win by walkover for the opposition.

The Panel made the following recommendations:

- Institution B to review if BUCS is the most appropriate competition for the rugby team. If they struggle to meet the minimum player requirements due to issues with student availability, especially on Wednesdays, to attend training and fixtures, it may be in their best interests to consider a different competition.
- The Rugby Club to note that at the level of competition at which they play there is flexibility with regard to numbers in a team.
- Institution B to put in place training for the SUMS, BUCSPlay and BUCS Rules and Regulations for captains of all sports at the beginning of the season. If the Rugby Team had been more familiar with the systems and rules, there were ways this incident could have been avoided.

- Institution B to review their requirements around membership. Some memberships may be required by the university, but this does not exclude them from being able to play in the BUCS Competition.

The Panel asked Institution B if they had any questions or comments.

Institution B asked who will be responsible for changing the result to a walkover. The BUCS executive said that once this matter has been closed, then the BUCS Competitions Team will change the result. This will appear as 'Walkover due to Disciplinary'. The opposition – Institution B, will also be made aware of the result change.

The BUCS executive offered to support Institution B in training and queries with BUCSplay. There are Help Guides available, as well as 1-to-1 support from the Competition Team for training. Institution B said they would be contacting BUCS to arrange this.

The BUCS Executive also suggested that the Rugby Club familiarise themselves with the BUCS Rugby Rules and Regulations on the website. There are different requirements for Tier 5 and below that could be used to ensure matches can go ahead.

**Sanction(s):**

- Result changed - Walkover given to Institution A.

---

**Sport:** Rugby Union

**Regulation(s):** REG 5

**Summary of the Charge:**

Institution A University have submitted a formal complaint regarding the conduct of supporters of Institution B University at the BUCS Men's Rugby Union [REDACTED] fixture which took place on Wednesday [REDACTED].

The complaint cited that: *"The game was a good game of Rugby but unfortunately what occurred during the game on the side-lines effected the game massively and a very worrying, disturbing, hostile environment was created by the 300+ supporters.*

*Prior to the fixture supporters were observing another Institution B home fixture so were already heavily consuming alcohol in most cases it appeared. During the warmup many of these supporters were walking through the pitch areas and directing vulgar abuse at the team, this was only the beginning. As the teams ran onto the pitch to commence the fixture firstly the referee couldn't start the fixture due to supporters walking across the pitch but more worryingly a number of flares were being let off by the supporters in extremely close proximity to the teams. As the fixture was being played the supporters were being overly aggressive to other supporters and the players/coaching staff on the pitch.*

*...supporters (Institution B Rugby Club members I'm led to believe) drinking heavily, performing pretend sexual acts on the pitch whilst the game is going on and most horrifically at one point whilst an injury that could of been severe was going on..*

Towards the very end of the fixture again a flare was lit and thrown towards the [REDACTED] supporters and it exploded in the face of one [REDACTED]. First aid had to be administered to the individual who was taken to [REDACTED] Hospital and today is in with the specialist eye clinic team as he still has blurred vision in his left eye. Nothing more needs to be said on this as it's a situation that as you can see is extremely dangerous and needs to be dealt with accordingly".

**Decision:**

It was acknowledged that Institution B had taken the matter seriously and the Panel appreciated the proactive steps they had gone to, since this incident, to tackle the issues around the supporter/club behaviour, showing a genuine effort to improve the student sport experience.

The Panel also made the following recommendations:

- Institution B are to educate the teams and supporters of what is expected of them during a fixture, on and off the pitch, including highlighting that flares and fireworks are not to be brought to any fixture.
- Institution B to provide education around sexual harassment and unacceptable behaviours – such as initiations.
- No alcohol is to be bought from outside the confines of campus or consumed on the sidelines.

Institution B said it was a shame that the Men's 3rd Team was being banned from playing but understood the severity of the actions by the supporters at this fixture. Institution B also stated that they would welcome any support from BUCS with rebuilding culture and changing behaviours and that it would be helpful for them to be put in touch with another university who have also had to tackle similar issues around antisocial behaviour and guidance in moving away from this culture. The Panel requested that BUCS help to identify examples and make.

**Sanction(s):**

- £250 fine.
- Institution B's Rugby Union 3rd Team to be banned from participating in BUCS competitions for the rest of the 2021-22 season. All the team's previous and upcoming league fixtures will be recorded as null/void. They will be removed from the Midlands Conference Trophy knockout competition and their scheduled Quarter-Final opponents will be given a 'bye'.
- Suspended sentence: If any further breach of REG 5 is proven to have occurred during the remainder of the 2021-22 season or the 2022-23 season, then Institution B's Rugby Club will be banned from all BUCS competitions for the remainder of that season and the duration of the following season.

---

**Sport:** Volleyball

**Regulation(s):** REG 5 – Misconduct and Bringing BUCS into Disrepute

**Summary of the Charge:** Institution A have submitted a formal complaint against Institution B regarding the conduct of spectators which was abusive in nature at the BUCS fixture.

**Decision:**

The Panel determined that they did not feel that it was evidenced that the comments being made negatively impacted the performance of Institution A, however noted that the comments were of an unacceptable nature.

The Panel commended Institution B on the thorough investigation that had been completed and action taken off the back of this.

The Panel gave the recommendation that Institution B should continue with the active bystander training and embed this as standard practice every season.

**Sanction(s):**

2-year suspended sentence will be issued to all of Institution B's men's and women's volleyball teams. This means that should there be a proven breach of REG 5 by Institution B's volleyball (that is, any team or any of that team's supporters) within the next 2 seasons, this would result in a ban of that team for the remainder of the season and the following season.

---

CONFIDENTIAL