

DECISION FORM



Particulars of offence	
Full name of the player: Iga IWINSKA	
Player's number: 6	
Player's union: Poland	
Competition: U18 Sevens Championship	
Host Team (T1): Poland	Host Team (T1): Poland
Venue: Stade Pierre Rajon, Bourgoïn-Jallieu, France	
Date of match: 12 July 2025	
Rules to apply: Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations (4.2); Regulation 17 World Rugby Handbook	
Referee Name: Adele Robert	
Plea: <input type="checkbox"/> Admitted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not admitted	
Offence: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Red card <input type="checkbox"/> Citing <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
If "Other" selected, please specify:	
Hearing details	
Chairperson / JO: Gert-Mark Smelt (NED)	
Hearing date: 12 July 2024	
Hearing venue: On site	
Appearance Player: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Appearance Union: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Player's Representative(s): Team manager Z. Gradys Coach Bator	
Other attendees: none	
List of documents/ materials considered by the Panel:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Game sheet 2. Red card report from Referee 3. Video clip of the incident 4. Disciplinary Statement, given at the hearing 	
Preliminary remarks Player (about panel, procedure, documents): <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If "yes", please specify:	
Summary of essential elements of citing / Referee's report / Incident footage	
<p>The referee reports the Player making an high tackle with head contact. She describes: Direct head contact, High degree of danger, No mitigation → RC She estimates her distance from the incident as 1 meter.</p> <p>The video footage shows the incident at 5:32. The opposite player is carrying the ball in front of her. The Player goes into contact with her upper body almost upright, with both heads at the same height. At the moment of impact the Player's arms are visible behind the back of the opposite player, holding her. Directly after contact the head of the opposite Player jerks back vehemently. The Player holds on to the opposite player and the heads are still at the same height. The footage also shows the referee near the incident and looking in the direction of it.</p>	

After letting go neither player grabs her head. The opposite player gets down on one knee and receives medical attention. According to the game sheet she was not removed from play.

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

N/a

Summary of player's evidence

The Player accepted at the hearing that her action was foul play. She contested that it warranted a red card.

On her behalf the representatives stated that she did try to go low, bending a knee, and that the movement of the head of the opposite player was not caused by head-to-head-contact, but by the ball that she carried in front of her. They pointed out that neither player grabbed her head afterwards and that the opposite player continued playing.

The player emphasized her action was not intentional and she didn't mean to harm anyone.

Findings of fact

The Judicial Officer shall not make a decision contrary to the decision of the referee unless he is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the referee was wrong.

When contesting the head contact it is up to the Player to prove that it is more likely than not that the head contact for which she was sent off did not occur.

Having reviewed the video footage the Judicial Officer finds that it substantiates the report of the referee. Although the footage does not exclude some effect of the ball that the other player was carrying, that is not enough to come, on the balance of probabilities, to the finding that the referee's report of head contact was wrong.

In conclusion the Judicial officer finds that the Player's action was an act of foul play, warranting a red card, and constitutes a dangerous tackle, with head contact (Law 9.13).

Decision

☒ Proven ☐ Not proven ☐ Other disposal (please state)

SANCTIONING PROCESS

Assessment of seriousness
<i>As per Article 4.5 of Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby</i>
Assessment of intent:
<input type="checkbox"/> Intentional/deliberate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reckless
Reasons for finding as to intent:
There are no reasons to deem the action intentional.
Nature of actions
Dangerous high tackle.
Existence of provocation:
N/a
Whether player retaliated:
N/a
Self-defence:
N/a
Effect on victim:
The tackled player did not leave the match
Effect on match:
N/a
Vulnerability of victim:
The head is a vulnerable part of the body.
Level of participation / premeditation:
N/a
Conduct completed / attempted:
Completed
Other features of player's conduct:
N/a

Entry point					
Low-end	Weeks	Mid-range	Weeks	Top end	Weeks
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reasons for selecting entry point:					
Contact to the head or neck carries a mandatory mid range entry point. That means there is no room for a lower entry point, even when the action was merely reckless. The Judicial Officer finds no reason to apply a top end entry point.					
The Judicial Officer will apply the U16-U18 sanction entry point, being 6 matches mid range.					

Relevant off-field mitigating factors	
<i>As per Article 4.5 of Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby</i>	
Acknowledgement of guilt and timing:	Player's disciplinary record / good character:
The Player admitted foul play at the first possible instance.	The Player has no disciplinary record. She is a good and promising player, that has a heart for rugby,

	underlined by the long distances she has to travel to go to her training.
Youth and inexperience of player:	Conduct prior to and at hearing:
This tournament is her first international tournament.	Exemplary. She was open in her answers. He was notably respectful towards the Judicial Officer.
Remorse and timing of Remorse	Other off-field mitigation:
The Player showed remorse at the hearing, more than once. There is no doubt that the remorse is genuine.	N/a

Number of weeks deducted: 3
Summary of reason for number of weeks deducted:
The Judicial Officer awards full mitigation of 50%.


Additional relevant off-field aggravating factors <i>As per Article 4.5 of Rugby Europe Disciplinary Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby</i>
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: none
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: 3 weeks	<input type="checkbox"/> Sending off sufficient
Sanction commences: with the sending off (provisional suspension)	
Sanction concludes: after the match Poland – Czechia (13 July 2025)	
Matches/ tournaments included in sanction: 12/7 Germany - Poland 13/7 Belgium – Poland 13/7 Poland - Czechia	
Costs: N/a	

Signature
Name of the Judicial Officer: Gert-Mark Smelt
Date: 12 July 2025
Signature: 

NOTE: You have **24 hours** from notification of the decision of the Judicial Officer to lodge an appeal with the Rugby Europe Disciplinary Committee – RE Discipline Regulations 4.2.2