

DECISION FORM

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE		
Player's Name	Antonio Maltez	
Player's Union/club	Portugal	
Match	Portugal v Belgium	
Competition	Rugby Europe U20 Championship	
Date of match	13/11/2022	
Match Venue	Car Jamor Stadium, Lisbon, Portugal	
Rules to apply	Regulation 17 World Rugby Handbook;	
Referee Name	Franco Rosella	Plea Charge
Offence	9.12 Punching or striking with the hand, arm, elbow or shoulder	☐ Red card☒ Citing☐ OtherIf "Other" selected, please specify:

HEARING DETAILS		
Hearing date	15/11/2022	Hearing venue: On remote
Chairperson/JO	Jennifer Donovan	
Other Members of the	Michiel van Dijk	
Disciplinary Panel	Rose Alice Murphy	
Appearance Player	⊠ Yes □ No	Appearance Union: ⊠ Yes □ No
Player's Representative(s)	Jose Carlos Augusto (Lawyer) Francisco Martins, FPR Vice President Nuno Filipe, Team Manager	Other attendees David Baird- Smith, Rugby Europe
List of documents / materials provided to Player in advance of hearing	 Citing commissioner report Game sheet Video Clip Notice of Hearing 	

SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF CITING/REFEREE'S REPORT/INCIDENT FOOTAGE

The Citing Commissioner, Dana Sue Teagarden, reported that an incident involving several players occurred in the 71st minute of the match. A number of players congretated and were involved in pushing and pulling opponents. The CC reported that in the course of this incident the player threw a punch with his right hand which connected with the left side of the Belgian No.19's ("BEL19") head. The report indicated that the point of contact was visible on the camera angle but would not have been visible to the referee, given his position. The player was given a yellow card as was an opposition player, BEL 13, for shoving an opponent.

rugby europe

BEL19 was interviewed briefly after the match. He confirmed that contact was made in the vicinity of his left ear but that he did not require medical treatment.

The Citing Commissioner also cited the player for a breach of Law 9.28 for continuing to play after the whistle.

The match footage showed the initial incident in which a large number of players were involved. Towards the end of that gathering of players, the player can be seen striking BEL19 with his fist, making contact with the left side of BEL19's head as indicated in the report.

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

Nil

SUMMARY OF PLAYER'S EVIDENCE

Mr. Martins acted as interpreter for the player. The player admitted foul play but argued that same did not meet the red card threshold. The player said that he was trying to help to break up the larger incident but that BEL19 would not release him. He said that he made a punching action or sign to try to get the other player to cease. He said that he did not intend to punch the other player and the action and direction of movement of his arm was not really indicative of a punch. The player initially indicated that he could not remember where the point of contact was. The player was invited the view the footage a further time. When questioned the player then admitted striking BEL19 and that contact had taken place close to the ear of BEL19. The player admitted that this constituted contact with the head of BEL19.

The player apologised for his actions and said that he had apologies to BEL19 after the match. He accepted that his reaction to what he perceived as provocation was not acceptable.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The committee found that the player had committed an act of foul play contrary to Law 9.12. It was found that the player had deliberately struck an opponent with his fist, making contact with the side of the opponent's head. This finding was supported by the match footage. The committee was satisfied, having considered all matters, that the offending met the red card threshold and therefore the citing in respect of that offence was upheld. The committee found that head contact had occurred and that the minimum mandatory entry point of midrange would apply.

The committee informed the player at the outset of the hearing that it did not intend to hear evidence in respect of the cited breach of Law 9.28 as the committee was of the view that same did not meet the standard necessary to uphold the citing.

DECISION	
☑ Proven ☐ Not proven ☐ Other disposal (please state)	

SANCTIONING PROCESS

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS
As per Article 4.5 of Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby
Assessment of Intent
State Reasons
The committee found that the offending was intentional based on the the match footage
Gravity of player's actions
Grave in that head contact resulted.
Nature of actions
Striking of head with fist albeit without out significant force
Existence of provocation
The offence occurred in the midst of a larger incident in which the player did feel provoked
Whether player retaliated
The player reacted the goings on in the larger incident.
Self-defence
The player indicated that he was trying to extricate himself from the larger incident
Effect on victim
Nil
Effect on match
Nil
Vulnerability of victim
Not particularly vulnerable
Level of participation/premeditation
Full participation
Conduct completed/attempted
Conduct completed
Other features of player's conduct
Nil
Entry point
☐ Top end Weeks ☐ Low-end Weeks
*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.
Reasons for selecting Entry Point above Top End
ADDITIONAL RELEVANT OFF-FIELD AGGRAVATING FACTORS
As per Article 4.5 of Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby
Player's status as an offender of the Laws of the Game
N/a
Need for deterrence
N/a
Any other off-field aggravating factors
N/a

Number of additional weeks: 0

Summary of reason for number of weeks added:
N/A

RELEVANT OFF-FIELD MITIGATING FACTORS	10 1: 47 (14 110 1
As per Article 4.5 of Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulation Acknowledgement of guilt and timing	Player's disciplinary record/good character
Player acknowledge having committed an act	No previous disciplinary issued
of foul play at the outset of the hearing	
Youth and inexperience of player	Conduct prior to and at hearing
Player is 20 years old and relatively	Some issues surrounded the player's
inexperienced.	remote attendance but these were
	satisfactorily resolved after a time.
Remorse and timing of remorse	Other off-field mitigation
Player apologised to victim player after the	
match	

Number of weeks deducted: 3

Summary of reason for number of weeks deducted:

The committee considered all of the relevant criteria in respect of sanction and after deliberation, agreed that the maximum 50% reduction should be applied.

SANCTION

NOTE: Players ordered off or cited by a citing commissioner are provisionally suspended pending the hearing of their case, such suspension should be taken into consideration when sanctioning – RE Discipline Regulations 4.1.4 / 4.4 (or equivalent Tournament rule)

Total sanction	3 weeks / Matches	☐ Sending off sufficient
Sanction commences		13/11/2022
Sanction concludes		Midnight 15/01/2022
Matches/tournaments included in sanction		27/11/22 Agronomia v Direito
		10/12/22 Agronomia v Direito
		14/01/23 Belenenses v Agronomia

Costs	Nil
-------	-----

Date	15/11/2022
Signature	Jennifer Donovan

NOTE: You have 48 hours from notification of the decision of the chairman/jo to lodge an appeal with the tournament director – RE Discipline Regulations 4.6.2 (or equivalent Tournament rule)