DECISION FORM

To be sent to discipline@rugbyeurope.eu.

Particulars of offence	
Player's Name: Arthur Blanckaert	
Player's number: 1	
Player's union: Belgium	
Competition: Rugby Europe U20 Championship (XV)	
Host Team (T1): Belgium	Visiting Team (T2): Germany
Venue: Marketa Stadium Prague	
Date of match: 16/11/2025	
Rules to apply: Regulation 17 World Rugby Handbook; Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations	
Referee Name: Diogo INACIO	
Plea: ☐ Admitted ☐ Not admitted	
Offence: ☐ Red card ☒ Citing ☐ Other *If "Other" selected, please specify:*	

Hearing details
Chairperson: Antony Davies (ENG)
Other Members of the Disciplinary Panel: - Francesco Grillo (ITA) - Flaminia Longobardi (ITA)
Hearing date: November 18th, 2025
Hearing venue: On remote
Appearance Player: ☒ Yes ☐ No
Appearance Union: ☒ Yes ☐ No
Player's Representative(s): Thibaut Andre and Armand Mardon
Other attendees: David Baird-Smith (Rugby Europe)
List of documents/ materials considered by the Panel: • Citing Referral • Citing Commissioner report • Game sheet • Video Clip

Summary of essential elements of citing / Referee's report / Incident footage

The report of the Citing Commissioner, David Connolly dated 17th November 2025 referred to an incident in the 51st minute of the game when Belgium 10 is tackled by two German players, one of whom is number 1, Arthur Blanckaert. When the tackle is complete, the player's foot is being held by Red 10 on the ground. The player raises his foot to release it and get back into the defensive line. As the ball is moved from the ruck by Belgium, White 1 moves away from the ruck to follow play and his foot kicks Red 10, who is still on the ground, in the head. The Citing Commissioner was of the view that because of the movement of the player, which was not a natural running motion, the actions constituted foul play under Law 9.12 and reached the threshold for a red card sanction. He formally cited the player for kicking an opponent in the head with his foot.

We viewed the incident footage, which showed the incident exactly as described by the CC. There is a kick with the players boot which connects with the rear of the head/neck of B10 whilst he is on the ground at the

bottom of the ruck, facing back to his own side, so he would not have seen the kick coming or been able to do anything about it.

Essential elements of other evidence (e.g. medical reports)

There was no injury and therefore no medical report.

Summary of player's evidence

The player accepted that what was depicted in the match footage and described in the Citing Commissioner's report was not acceptable and was not a natural movement in trying to run from the breakdown to the next phase of play. He accepted that there was direct contact between his boot and the head of the opponent, for which he was very sorry. He was relieved that there was no injury.

Findings of fact

- There was direct contact between boot and rear of the victim player's head/neck.
- The victim player was vulnerable in that he was at the bottom of the ruck on the ground, facing away from the player so would have had no idea that contact was coming, nor would he have been able to do anything about it.
- The contact was without significant force or consequence. There was no injury. It was not carried out in an aggressive forceful manner.
- It was petulant and cowardly.

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:

☒ Intentional/deliberate ☐ Reckless

State reasons:

To his credit, the player did not attempt to argue that it was an accidental contact as a result of him trying to follow the ball away from the ruck. We agreed with the Citing Commissioner that the actions depicted could not be reckless and were therefore intentional and deliberate, but without an intent to cause injury.

Nature of actions

These are described in the CC report. There was very little force or aggravation and one contact only.

Existence of provocation:
None found.
Whether player retaliated:
Not found.
Self-defence:
N/A
Effect on victim:
None, he was not injured.
Effect on match:
None
Vulnerability of victim:
High.
Level of participation / premeditation:
Full.
Conduct completed / attempted:
Completed, contact made.
Other features of player's conduct:
None found.

Entry point					
Low-end	Weeks	Mid-range	Weeks	Top end	Weeks
☐		☒	8	☐	
Reasons for selecting entry point:					
Contact was clearly with the head/neck and therefore the mandatory minimum mid-range entry point provisions apply.					

Relevant off-field mitigating factors *As per Article 4.5 of Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby*	
Acknowledgement of guilt and timing:	**Player's disciplinary record / good character:**
Full and immediate – the player accepted the citing immediately it was made. That admission was continued at the hearing.	The player has no previous disciplinary record and is of good character.
Youth and inexperience of player:	**Conduct prior to and at hearing:**
The player has been playing since age 6, but is not experienced in the open age game. He plays in France under the Espoir scheme, which recognises his potential. On balance, his age, inexperience and the level at which he plays mitigated the offence.	The player presented well and displayed genuine remorse for his actions.
Remorse and timing of Remorse	**Other off-field mitigation:**
The player said he regretted what he had done immediately and after the game went to apologise to the opponent, and that apology was accepted.	

Number of weeks deducted: 4
Summary of reason for number of weeks deducted:
We saw no reason why the player should not benefit from the maximum permissible mitigation.

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:
Need for deterrence:
Any other off-field aggravating factors:

Number of additional weeks:
Summary of reason for number of weeks added:

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: 4 weeks/matches	☐ Sending off sufficient
Sanction commences: 17th November 2025	
Sanction concludes: 30th November 2025	
Matches/ tournaments included in sanction: • 19th November 2025 U20 Championship Day 2 • 23rd November 2025 U20 Championship Day 3 • 22nd November 2025 – Chamberien v Nevers • 29th November 2024 – Bressane v Chamberien	
Costs: None sought	

Signature
Name of the JO or Chairman: ANTONY DAVIES
Date: 19th November 2025
Signature (JO or Chairman):

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)