

DISCIPLINARY DECISION



Match	Scotland vs Wales		
Player's Union	Wales	Competition	Women's 6 Nations
Date of Match	22-03-2025	Match venue	Hive Stadium
Applicable rules	2025 SIX NATIONS DISCIPLINARY AND ANTI-DOPING RULES		

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE			
Player's Surname	Evans	Player's Forename(s)	Georgia
Player's Date of birth	22-08-2000	Referee's Name	Kat Roche
Foul play	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Admitted <input type="checkbox"/> Not admitted	Red card warranted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Admitted <input type="checkbox"/> Not admitted
Offence	For the 1 st yellow card: 9.20 c – A player must not intentionally collapse a ruck or a maul. amended to: 9.7 A player must not: a. Intentionally infringe any law of the game. corroborated with: 16.9 All other players in a maul must endeavour to stay on their feet. For the 2 nd yellow card: 9.13 – dangerous tackle	SELECT: Red card <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Citing <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> If "Other" selected, please specify:	
Summary of sanction	Sending off was sufficient		

HEARING DETAILS			
Hearing date	25-03-2025	Hearing venue	Zoom call
Chairman/JO	Marcello d'Orey		
Other members of Disciplinary Committee	- Val Toma - Stefan Terblanche		
Appearance Player	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appearance Player's union	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Player's representative(s)	- Angela Daw (Team Manager) - Mandi Venn (Disciplinary and Anti-doping manager WRU)	Disciplinary Officer and/or other attendees	- Tom Price - Holi Smith - Annie Quantrill

List of documents/ materials provided to Player in advance of hearing	<p>1st Yellow Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Referee Yellow Card Report Kat Roche - - Footage of the incident from four camera angles <p>2nd Yellow Card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Referee Report– Kat Roche - Television Match Official Report – Oli Kellet - Foul Play Review Officer Report – Ian Tempest - Foul Play Review Officer Correspondence - Foul Play Review Officer Incident Report Form – Ian Tempest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Referee Red Card Report – Kat Roche - Statement – Dr. Morgan Robertson (Scotland Team Doctor) - Player’s Replies to the Standing Directions - Players Disciplinary Schedule - Red Card Letter - Hearing confirmation letter - 4 clips of the incident
--	--

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

The referee reported the 1st Yellow Card as an offence against Law 9.20 c "A player must not intentionally collapse a ruck or a maul."

The Description of Incident reads as follows:

«8 Wales cynically collapsed a maul moving forward at speed inside the 22.»

The referee reported the 2nd Yellow Card as an offence against Law 9.13 "A player must not tackle an opponent early, late or dangerously" and stated that "Wales 8 Tackled a player dangerously, making head contact. The tackler was upright so she was at fault and it was foul play, the degree of danger reached a yellow card threshold so it was sent for off field review."

TMO Report on a Temporary Suspension: Yellow Card stated that "The Welsh 8 made a upright tackle on Scotland 15 making head contact with her right shoulder. The Welsh player was at fault and I judged it met the yellow card threshold."

Foul Play Review Officer Report stated that "I was sent a bunker review for a tackle made by W8. I deemed the contact not to be a high degree of danger and the contact was in direct. The hand of S15 is the first contact point followed by contact through the arms of both players. As a result the YC remained a YC."

Referee Red Card Report stated that "When a player is being cautioned and suspended for 10 minutes, the referee will show that player a yellow card. If that player later commits another yellow card offence, the player must be sent off."

After receiving a YC for a cynical maul collapse, Wales 8 tackled a player dangerously, making head contact with a not high degree of danger. She was shown a YC and RC for the second YC. The YC came back from the bunker as a YC, but the red remained as it was a second."

Footage:

There were 6 video clips of the incidents, but in the hearing, there was no need of reviewing them, because the Player accepted both yellow cards. The Player also accepted that in consequence of both yellow cards, the red card was worth.

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

Statement – Dr. Morgan Robertson (Scotland Team Doctor):

«I am replying to your email below. I am Team Doctor for Scotland Women and was pitch side during today's match v Wales.

I attended and treated Scotland No. 15 Chloe Rollie on the pitch. She sustained an epistaxis (bleeding nose) and required treatment to stop the bleeding on pitch, considering of compression to the nasal passage and a nasal tampon was inserted into the nostril.

She also underwent an on-pitch check for any symptoms or signs of concussion. The assessment was negative and I reported this to the Match Day doctor (Niall Elliot) who asked for this information after he had seen the injury on the video pad. »

SUMMARY OF PLAYER'S EVIDENCE

The Player was invited to give her explanation of what had happened. The essence of what she said was as follows:

For the First Yellow Card:

- Scotland had a Line Out on the Wales 22 meters line.
- The Player lifted her jumper from the back, and Wales Jumper was not able to catch the ball.
- Scotland subsequently formed a maul, the Player was caught inside and tried to disrupt the advancing of the maul.
- While doing that and trying to get to the ball, she almost got above a Welsh player and almost stopped feeling the contact of her feet with the floor.
- In doing so, and also due to the other disrupting movements of the other Welsh defenders, the maul collapsed.
- She never intended to collapse the maul, but she accepted that she failed to stay on her feet.
- In response to a question from the panel, the Player submitted that she never attempted an action that would have directly caused the maul to collapse, such as a pull down of any of the participants.
- As the maul was advancing, and it was a possible try situation, the Player accepted that by her failure to stay on her feet she committed an act foul play, and that it warranted a Yellow Card.

For the second Yellow:

- There was a kick for the area close to the Scotland try area, and the Player ran to try to grab the ball.
- S#15 got there first.
- When the Player realized that S#15 got the ball, she prepared to tackle her.
- But as S#15 turned around and made a small change in direction and height, the Player could not adapt herself, and after hitting S#15 arms, she made contact to her face and/neck.
- It was an indirect contact.
- The Player tried to be in a good position to tackle but realized to late that she was a bit too upright and was unable to adjust and tackle lower.
- In consequence there was an indirect contact to the face of S#15.
- The Player knows that her technique was incorrect.
- The contact was not intentional.
- The Player is considered a good tackler, and knows that should have been lower in that incident.
- It was a mistake from her and she accepted that, but she wished to reiterate that she never intended to tackle so high.
- She apologized to S#15.
- She also stated that she is proud of her tackle technique and that she works a lot in that.
- She also stated that she never received a red card before and that she considers herself a very correct player.
- Mrs. Angela Daw also stated that the Player has a very good tackle technique and that she has always been a very correct player that was never known for playing dirty and she doesn't believe that she would ever do an act like that intentionally.

FINDINGS OF FACT

No preliminary points arose.

The Player accepted that she was the player involved in both of the alleged foul play.

The Player did accept that there was foul play in both of the alleged incidents.

The Player did accept that both incidents met the Yellow card threshold, and in consequence that the red card was correct.

In relation to the 1st yellow card, the panel found that:

- the Player was caught in the maul in an upright position;
- the Player attempted to disrupt the advancing of the maul and in doing so she lost control of her stability on her feet. At some point the Player can be seen on her toes with little to no control of her balance;
- Wales no 3 who had been bound in from the maul formation goes to her knees and this is the action that causes the maul collapse inception;
- the Player fails to stay on her feet and goes to ground along with the other maul participants;
- the Player's action contributed to the maul collapse but it was not the main and primary reason.

Having regard of the clause 2.7.16 of the Disciplinary Regulations "Disciplinary Committees and Appeal Committees, prior to or at any stage during a hearing, may amend the offence for which the Union, Person or Player was (as appropriate) Temporarily Suspended, shown a red card, cited, or made the subject of a Misconduct complaint or allegation of an Anti-Corruption Offence unless, having regard to the circumstances of the case, such amendment cannot be made without causing injustice.", the panel was satisfied that it is in the interest of justice and fairness to amend the offence to:

Law 9.7 A player must not: a. Intentionally infringe any law of the game.

corroborated with:

Law 16.9 All other players in a maul must endeavor to stay on their feet.

The amendment to a technical offence is supported by the referee's description of the incident:

«8 Wales cynically collapsed a maul moving forward at speed inside the 22.»

On balance of probabilities, the referee awarded the yellow card not because of the danger associated with the alleged Player's action but because of its unfair nature of deliberately and illegally preventing Scotland to imminently gain territory and to eventually score points. And this is in essence a technical offence.

In relation to the 2nd yellow card, the panel considered that the action was reckless and not intentional, that there was a low degree of danger and there was no mitigating factor.

Therefore, the Red Card was upheld and the Disciplinary Committee was required to consider what further action should be taken as a result of the Player being red carded for the 2 Yellow Cards.

According to Appendix 3 of the Disciplinary Regulations:

There is deliberately no guidance within the World rugby sanctions table(s) to assist a Judicial Committee to determine the appropriate sanction in relation to accumulated Temporary Suspension. This is an area where judicial discretion is required given the multiple permutations that could emerge. Ordinarily, the appropriate entry point for persistent offending within a single match is a suspension of one or two weeks.

But the Judicial Committee may decide that sending off was sufficient when any of the Temporary Suspensions were awarded for so-called technical offences not involving a breach of laws 9.11 to 9.28 inclusive.

The Player's behavior prior to and during the hearing was impeccable and she showed remorse for her actions. To her credit, the Player also took full responsibility of the offence associated with the 1st yellow card when in fact there has been a collective fault of a number of the Welsh maul participants.

The Player disciplinary record prior to this incident was clean.

With respect to determining the appropriate sanction, the committee took in consideration that the first incident was a technical offence with only limited fault on the part of the Player, and that the second one was justifiable of a Yellow Card and nothing more than that.

As a consequence, the Judicial Committee decided that the sending off was sufficient.

DECISION

Foul play	Admitted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Determined <input type="checkbox"/> Not determined <input type="checkbox"/> Other disposal (please state) <input type="checkbox"/>
Red card warranted	Admitted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Determined <input type="checkbox"/> Not determined <input type="checkbox"/> Other disposal (please state) <input type="checkbox"/>

SANCTIONING PROCESS

References below are to provisions in the 2025 Disciplinary and Anti-Doping Rules, which form Schedule Four of the 2025 Six Nations Terms of Participation documentation.

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS

Assessment of intent – clause 2.5.89 (a) and (b)
Intentional <input type="checkbox"/> Reckless <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
State reasons
The First Yellow Card was for a technical offence with limited fault of the Player. The Second Yellow card was awarded because of a high and dangerous tackle, that did not meet the threshold of a red card. The Player conduct in this case was considered reckless. It was accepted that the Player's offence was not intentional.
Nature of actions – clause 2.5.89 (c)
As described above.
Existence of provocation – clause 2.5.89 (d)
No provocation
Whether Player retaliated – clause 2.5.89 (e)
No retaliation
Self-defence – clause 2.5.89 (f)
No Self defence

Effect on victim – clause 2.5.89 (g)
The victim of the 2 nd Yellow card sustained an epistaxis (bleeding nose) and required treatment to stop the bleeding on pitch, considering of compression to the nasal passage and a nasal tampon was inserted into the nostril. She also underwent an on-pitch check for any symptoms or signs of concussion. The assessment was negative.
Effect on match – clause 2.5.89 (h)
There was no effect on the Match, other than that Wales was reduced to 14 players because of the red card shown. However, this was not a relevant factor in determining the seriousness of the offending by the Player.
Vulnerability of victim – clause 2.5.89 (i)
The victim was not in a vulnerable position.
Level of participation/premeditation – clause 2.5.89 (j)
No premeditation.
Conduct completed/attempted – clause 2.5.89 (k)
Conducted completed.
Other features of Player’s conduct – clause 2.5.89 (l)
None

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS CONTINUED

Entry point					
<u>Top end*</u>	<u>Weeks/matches</u>	<u>Mid-range</u>	<u>Weeks/matches</u>	<u>Lower end</u>	<u>Weeks/matches</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	

*If top end, the JO or Disciplinary Committee must identify, based on his/her/its assessment of the seriousness of the conduct, an entry point between the top end and the maximum sanction and provide the reasons for selecting this entry point, below (see clause 2.5.90).

Reasons for selecting entry point above top end
N/A

RELEVANT OFF-FIELD MITIGATING FACTORS

Acknowledgement of foul play (and timing) – clause 2.5.91(a)	Player’s disciplinary record – clause 2.5.91 (b)
The Player accepted that she committed acts of foul play.	The Player had no previous disciplinary record.

Youth and/or inexperience of Player – clause 2.5.91 (c)	Conduct prior to and at hearing – clause 2.5.91 (d)
The Player is 28	Exemplary
Remorse (and timing if remorse) – clause 2.5.91 (e)	Other off-field mitigation – clause 2.5.91 (f)
The Player showed remorse in the hearing and also apologized to the player in the end of the game.	None

Number of weeks/matches deducted:

N/A

RELEVANT OFF-FIELD AGGRAVATING FACTORS

Player’s status as an offender of the Laws of the Game – clause 2.5.94 (a)
None
Need for deterrence – clause 2.5.94 (b)
None
Any other off-field aggravating factors – clause 2.5.94 (c)
None

Number of additional weeks/matches:

SANCTION

NOTE: PLAYERS ORDERED OFF OR CITED ARE PROVISIONALLY SUSPENDED PENDING THE HEARING OF THEIR CASE, SUCH SUSPENSION SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN SANCTIONING – CLAUSES 2.5.14 AND 2.5.33.

Total sanction	N/A	Sending off sufficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sanction commences	N/A	
Sanction concludes	N/A	
Matches/tournaments included in sanction	N/A	

Costs	None
-------	------

Signature (JO or Chairman)	Marcello d'Orey	Date	26-03-2025
-------------------------------	-----------------	------	------------

NOTE: THE PLAYER WILL HAVE UNTIL 4PM (GMT) ON THE THIRD DAY (EXCLUDING WEEKENDS) AFTER RECEIPT OF THE WRITTEN NOTICE OF THE DECISION OF THE CHAIRMAN/JO TO FILE AN APPEAL WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DISCIPLINARY PANEL C/O THE DISCIPLINARY OFFICER – CLAUSE 2.6.4. APPEAL TO BE EMAILED TO disciplinary@sixnationsrugby.com.