

BUCS MISCONDUCT CASES DECISIONS 2024-25

UPDATED | OCTOBER 2025

BUCS reserves the right to publish decision sheets and/or case summaries for Misconduct charge hearings, to aid transparency and understanding of its disciplinary processes and to be used as an educational tool. These may contain, but shall not be limited to, a summary of the charge(s) considered and any response(s) from the institution/Playing Entity charged, a summary of discussions at the hearing, the decision of the panel and any sanctions imposed. Published decisions sheets/case summaries will not carry the names of any institution/Playing Entity or individuals involved and other elements may be removed or redacted as deemed necessary by the BUCS Executive.

This document contains summaries of Misconduct Cases ruled on in the 2024-25 season.

Please note:

- A. Decision sheets and/or case summaries may not be published for all Misconduct Cases.
- B. Whilst these case summaries may be helpful for institutions/Playing Entities to refer to when involved in a Misconduct Case or as an educational tool, and Panels 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.
- C. The rules and regulations stated herein are valid at the time of publication and remain subject to future review and potential amendments.

Sport: Lacrosse

Regulation(s): REG 5.1

Summary of the Charge:

BUCS has received an official complaint submitted by the Home Team regarding the conduct of (name redacted), Head Lacrosse Coach of the Away Team (hereafter referred to as "Coach A"), during the men's lacrosse match held on (date redacted) between the two teams. The complaint highlights two incidents towards the end of the match that raise serious concerns about Coach A's behaviour.

The first incident occurred after Player A of the Home Team received a personal foul and proceeded to the penalty box. At this time, it is alleged that Coach A approached Player A aggressively and verbally abused him, making inappropriate and derogatory comments, including remarks that Player A should "be deported" and calling him a "dirty player" and a "disgrace to the game." Additionally, Coach A is reported to have made physical contact by shoving Player A, despite Player A asking him not to touch him. The verbal harassment allegedly continued in the penalty box. This incident is marked on video footage at 1:32:55.

The second incident took place after the match concluded. Coach A reportedly re-approached Player A and continued to verbally abuse him until being physically pulled away by the Away Team's assistant coach. Witnesses state that Away Team players also verbally harassed Player A during this time, further exacerbating the situation. This altercation is marked on video footage at 1:36:20.

Two witness statements support these allegations. Player A detailed the physical and verbal abuse he experienced, emphasizing his shock at being confronted in such a manner by a staff member. He expressed disappointment that such behaviour occurred and stated that it has no place in the sport. The Home Team's Captain, Player B, provided further context, noting Coach A's breach of game regulations by entering the field of play and the penalty box without authorization. Player B also highlighted Coach

A's verbal abuse of both Player B and the referees, audible to spectators, as well as the negative impact Coach A's actions had on the game, particularly for inexperienced players and first-time spectators.

The complaint also references Coach A's previous disciplinary action for abusive behaviour towards match officials, raising broader concerns about his conduct. (Redacted), Coach A is expected to serve as a role model, upholding the highest standards of professionalism and sportsmanship.

BUCS has also received a further report alleging that Coach A continued to exhibit abusive behaviour towards the officials during the Women's fixture as well, to the point that one was visibly upset, adding to the initial concerns raised.

Decision and Sanction(s):

1. Ordinarily, a coach found to have engaged in threatening behaviour and abusive language should expect to receive an immediate touchline ban for a number of matches. The Panel came close to imposing an immediate touchline ban but decided not to do so because of the unusual and significant mitigation in this case: (1) the aggressive play by the Player A throughout the game, which undoubtedly did create a significant risk of injury to the Away Team's players and which was provoking to a high degree; (2) the fact that the misconduct was admitted, which avoided a contested hearing, and (3) Coach A has no previous findings of misconduct against him and this whole event appears to be out of character for him.
2. In these circumstances, the Panel felt it would be disproportionate and unfair on the Away Team to lose their coach at matches for the final few games of the season, which may involve them in a National Championship final, given that the team as a whole was not responsible for this situation.

Accordingly, the Panel decided to impose the following sanction:

1. A touchline ban for three matches, to be suspended for the remainder of the 2024-25 season and the whole of the 2025-26 season.
2. What this means in practice is that in the unlikely event that during this season or next Coach A is found to have engaged in any further misconduct, then a three-match touchline ban will be imposed, in addition to any sanction arising from the further misconduct. If, however, Coach A does not engage in any further misconduct during this season or next, then the touchline ban will not be implemented.

Sport: Futsal

Regulation(s): REG 5.1

Summary of the Charge:

BUCS has received a formal complaint from the Away team regarding an incident involving the Home Team's Futsal Women's Coach during the match between the two institutions on (date redacted).

The report outlines multiple incidents that took place during and after the game. The first incident occurred when an Away Team player experienced an asthma attack. It is alleged that the Home Team coach made inappropriate comments directed at the injured player and then walked away, laughing. This incident is supported by Veo footage, which has been provided.

Later in the match, the Away Team's goalkeeper suffered a shoulder injury and dislocated it. During this time, the Home Team coach was reportedly heard using derogatory and foul language toward the injured player. It is also alleged that the coach was impatient, insisting the game resume quickly, and attempted to rush the injured player off the pitch. Despite the referee's efforts to ensure adequate time was provided to attend to the injury, and despite supportive behaviour from the Home Team players, the inappropriate comments from the Home Team coach reportedly continued throughout the match.

Following the match, a photo was posted on Instagram by the Away Team squad, where the coach can allegedly be seen mimicking the injured Away Team player. A screenshot of this post has been submitted as evidence.

The complaint includes witness statements from players who were present, providing further detail about the comments made during the match. The Away Team has raised concerns about the Home Team coach's behaviour and has requested that BUCS address the matter to prevent similar incidents in the future.

Supporting evidence for this complaint includes Veo footage of the incidents and a screenshot of the Instagram post.

Decision:

1. This was a clear and serious case of misconduct by the Coach, rightly admitted by the Home Team. He sought to place pressure on the players of the opposing team to continue the match in a hurry even when it was obvious that the goalkeeper had a serious injury. To make matters worse, he belittled and abused the players of the opposing team, using vulgar and offensive language. After the game, he mocked the injured goalkeeper by lying on the ground in the same position as her for the team's celebratory photo, which was then published on Instagram.
2. It was a significant mitigating factor that the Home Team had suspended the Coach soon afterwards and he no longer coaches for the team. That was the right course of action, and it is a credit to the Home Institution that it took these steps promptly and of its own initiative, before these disciplinary proceedings started. However, there was evidence that the former coach has attended a match as a supporter, although the Home Institution has since explained to him that this is not allowed. The Panel also took into account that the Home Institution had admitted the misconduct, which is always an important mitigating factor.
3. The Home team's misconduct consisted of the social media post, which was highly insensitive towards the injured keeper. While the Coach bore primary responsibility for mimicking the injured player, the team should have picked up that this was offensive and hurtful and should not have posted the photograph online. The keeper said in her statement that when she saw that Instagram post that she thought it was very rude and "made her feel so sad". While teams have every right to celebrate their victories and sometimes to express themselves in ways that may be at the expense of the opposing team, to mock someone who has suffered a serious injury in this way is unsporting and brings the game into disrepute.
4. The Panel was disappointed to learn that the social media post was still online at the time of the hearing. The Home Institution has known of this disciplinary charge since 18 November and will also have seen the evidence of the Away Team's witnesses about this incident, showing what hurt and offence this Instagram post caused. Yet the Home Institution Students' Union staff did not think to ask for the post to be taken down (the post is controlled by the team, not the Union or University). Furthermore, although there was an informal apology about the Coach's conduct on the day, there was no formal apology by the Home team to the Away Team for the shameful

and unsporting behaviour of their coach or for the hurtful team photograph, even after these disciplinary proceedings were brought. The Panel regarded these as significant failures and considered that the responsibility for these lay with the Home Institution Students' Union staff, rather than the students themselves, who may well not have appreciated the impact of their post.

Sanction(s):

1. The former coach of the Home Team, (name redacted), is banned from attending all remaining Home Team women's futsal BUCS fixtures in the 2024-25 season and the 2025-26 season.
2. The Home Institution shall draw up a Code of Conduct for coaches (including both paid and volunteer coaches) and ensure that all its coaches have been trained on its terms. Before the start of the 2025-26 season, the Home Institution will report back to BUCS on how the Code has been implemented.
3. The Home Institution women's futsal club must delete the social media post referred to above immediately.
4. The Home Institution shall write a formal written apology to the Away Team and their injured player, apologising for the misconduct of their Coach and the Instagram post.
5. A deduction of three league points, suspended for the remainder of the 2024-25 season and the 2025-26 season. This means that if the Home Team is found to have engaged in further misconduct during this period, whether relating to social media use or otherwise, BUCS will deduct three league points from the team. If there is no further misconduct found during this period, no league points will be deducted.

Sport: Hockey

Regulation(s): REG 5.1

Summary of the Charge:

BUCS has received a formal complaint from the Away Team regarding an incident involving Home Team B team during a Tier 3 hockey match between Home Team A and the Away Team on (date and time redacted).

The report outlines the alleged incidents that took place during and after the game. During the above game, around halfway through the fixture Home Team B arrived at the sideline after their game, and started shouting abuse at the Away Team players, some of which being on racist nature.

The Away Team players have reported feeling like they could no longer continue to play the game after the people in question would not stop and given the nature of abuse, therefore the game was called early.

The complaint includes statements from players who were present, providing further detail about the comments made during the match.

Decision:

1. The Panel considers that it is necessary to reach a finding as to whether the racist abuse was committed by one individual or more than one as this affects our approach to the appropriate sanction. In this respect, the Home Institution's response to the charge is unhelpful in that it does not answer squarely the allegation made by the Away Team that multiple individuals were

involved in the racist abuse. The Home Institution's response at the hearing that they were only able to identify one individual does not mean that more than one individual was not involved. Had the Home Institution asserted in terms that the racist abuse was committed by one individual only, BUCS likely would have given consideration to calling one or more of the Away Institution's students who had provided statements to give evidence to the contrary.

2. As it happens, BUCS was only able to rely on hearsay evidence in the form of the Away Team's statements. Ordinarily, hearsay evidence carries less weight than the evidence of a witness who has given live testimony. However, given the way that the charge was responded to, we do not feel that BUCS' decision to rely on hearsay evidence only should be held against BUCS.
3. The Panel has considered the statements of the nine students. They are consistent in their accounts of the racist abuse being committed by more than one individual. They confirm that the abuse was perpetrated by members of Home Team B, together with other spectators. Evidence is also given that some of the perpetrators were intoxicated.
4. No statement of any witness was provided by the Home Institution to counter the allegations made.
5. We have no hesitation in finding, therefore, that on the balance of probabilities, the racist abuse was committed by more than one individual, some of whom belonged to the Home Team B and some of whom were drunk.
6. In any event, however, even if only one individual was involved, there is no evidence that any of the other spectators/first team members did anything to stop the individual concerned. This leads us to conclude that there are concerns about the culture within the Home Team B, making it appropriate to issue a sanction against not only individuals but against the team as a whole.
7. So far as aggravating features are concerned, the Panel notes that: -
 - a. The misconduct consisted of racist abuse of an abhorrent kind which has no place in society in 2024;
 - b. The racist abuse was committed while some individuals were intoxicated;
 - c. The racist abuse was committed while some individuals were in team uniform, giving the impression that their behaviour was in a representative capacity.
8. So far as mitigating features are concerned, the Panel notes: -
 - a. The admission by the Home Institution of the misconduct and that the behaviour was racist;
 - b. The prompt action by the Home Institution to discipline the individual identified;
 - c. The behaviour of the Home Team A that was involved in the match in denouncing the behaviour of Home Team B and in enquiring after the welfare of the Away Team's players (which was noted by more than one of the Away Team witnesses);
 - d. The apology made by the Club Development Officer from the Home Institution.
9. The Panel's decision as to sanction is underpinned by the following considerations: -
 - a. The need to issue a sanction which is proportionate to the misconduct;
 - b. The need to set down a marker as to the severity of the misconduct in this case;
 - c. The need to ensure that individuals undergo appropriate education to understand the severity of their misconduct;

- d. The need to ensure that the Home Institution's Club has an incentive to ensure that all players conduct themselves appropriately.

Sanction(s):

Taking all of the above into account, the Panel issues the following sanctions: -

1. A deduction of 6 points imposed on Home Team B for the 2025-26 season, suspended on condition that all individuals who have played for the Team B during the 2024-25 season (and who shall remain enrolled as students at the Home Institution during the 2025-26 academic year) shall undertake education and training in relation to both of the following topics and provide proof of satisfactory completion to BUCS by 31st August 2025: -
 - a. Active bystander training;
 - b. Training relating to the impact of racist abuse on individuals affected by such abuse.
2. Any such Team B member who has not undergone such training is ineligible to participate in BUCS hockey competitions until such time as they have done so;
3. Home Team B shall provide a formal written apology to the Away Team.

Sport: Rugby Union

Regulation(s): REG 13.6

Summary of the Charge:

The Home Institution are charged with misconduct for a breach of REG 13.6 for deliberately entering a result on BUCS Play for a fixture which had not taken place.

The fixture for which this false result was entered is the Tier 1 BUCS Rugby Union match between the Home Team and the Away Team, which was at the time scheduled to have taken place on (date redacted).

Following concerns being raised to BUCS that a false result may have been entered for this fixture the BUCS Executive began investigating. A timeline was compiled relating to the entry of a result for the fixture by the Home Institution, a subsequent request from the Home Institution to BUCS for its removal, and the rescheduling of the fixture following this by the Home Institution and the Away Institution.

On (date redacted), the Home Institution were informed by BUCS of the concerns raised and that an investigation was taking place in relation to a potential breach of REG 13.6 by the Home Institution. As part of this communication, it was explained to the Home Institution why there were concerns that this was a false result, rather than a genuine error, with the Home Institution requested to provide a response regarding the inputting of the result and the reasons given for why this happened when it was requested to be removed.

On (date redacted), the Home Institution responded, confirming that a false result had been entered by one of their Institution Administrators (IAs), detailing why this result was entered and why it was subsequently requested to be removed and the fixture rescheduled.

Decision:

The Panel concluded, based on the comprehensive evidence and on the Home Institution's admission, that the charge was proven in full. The Panel found that this misconduct was a breach of BUCS Regulation 13.6.

Sanction(s):

The Panel noted that the Home Institution were not advantaged by the falsified result. The Panel further noted that no other teams had been advantaged or disadvantaged.

The Panel gave credit to the Home Institution for their good misconduct record and for their partial admission of the charge at an early stage. The Panel noted that this was an isolated incident which involved the actions of one person at the Home Institution only.

The Panel noted the steps outlined by the Home Institution to avoid repetition.

The Panel agreed that a reasonable member of staff, regardless of their length of service, would be aware that entering a falsified result was wholly unacceptable. The Panel did not accept the Home Institution's suggestion that Staff Member A's actions resulted from a lack of training / knowledge or was the result of naivety. The Panel agreed that this potentially demonstrated a lack of appropriate 'ownership' for the misconduct.

The Panel agreed that Staff Member A's initial act was dishonest, and this was aggravated by the reasons stated in the match result change request. The Panel were disappointed that the Home Institution had not accepted the charge in full.

The Panel agreed that the misconduct had the potential to impact other clubs and the integrity of the competition. The Panel agreed that this was a serious matter.

The Panel agreed that it would not be appropriate in these circumstances for the players and coaching staff of the Home Institution Rugby Club to be directly impacted by any sanction.

The Panel agreed that having carefully considered the evidence, the conduct of the Home Institution fell below that expected. The importance of BUCS having mechanisms in place to address behaviour that is not acceptable was noted. The Panel noted that all participants benefit when BUCS acts to ensure that misconduct is addressed.

Following a discussion of all the options available and whilst remaining cognisant of proportionality, the Panel decided to impose the following sanctions:

1. A written reprimand.
2. A fine of £350, of which £100 is suspended until the end of the 2025/26 season. The suspended element will only be payable in the event of a proven breach of regulation 13.6

Sport: Football

Regulation(s): REG 4.6

Summary of the Charge:

The Away Institution are charged with misconduct under REG 4.6 for a breach of REG 4 for allowing an ineligible participant to represent them.

The fixture in which the Away Institution fielded an ineligible participant was the Tier 5 BUCS Football match between the Home Team and Away Team which took place on (date redacted).

This breach of regulations was self-reported by the Away Institution on (date redacted).

On (date redacted), BUCS responded to the Away Institution advising that a charge would have to be raised if they have fielded an ineligible participant and seeking clarification on a few points to help confirm if a charge did need to be raised.

On (date redacted), the Away Institution responded, confirming that the ineligible participant was a Player A, a former player who, by the time of the fixture, had graduated from the Away Institution.

Decision:

As the Away Institution had admitted that the facts set out above amount to a breach of BUCS Regulation 4 (i.e. the player was not a “*registered student*” and thus not an “*eligible player*”), we now deal with matters relevant to sanction.

In light of the written and oral submissions made on behalf of BUCS and the Away Institution, the Panel considers that the relevant aggravating and mitigating factors in the present case are as follows:

Aggravating factors

- A. This is not the first time that an Away Institution team has breached BUCS Regulation 4. In the 2023-24 season, another Away Institution team, a hockey team, was sanctioned by BUCS for fielding an ineligible player, also an alumnus;

Mitigating factors

- B. The Away Institution self-reported this matter to BUCS very shortly after the Match;
- C. This was an isolated incident for the Away Team;
- D. The Away Institution has accepted the charge; and
- E. The Away Institution did conduct compulsory training on eligibility for BUCS teams at the start of the 2024-25 season. However, as the facts of this matter clearly demonstrate, the training was of limited effect. Therefore, we do not attribute significant weight to this factor. We also note that Staff Member A only began their role in December 2024, some time after that training took place and shortly before the Match. During the hearing, they helpfully acknowledged that, prior to the start of the 2025-26 season it will be necessary for the Away Institution to provide more effective training to all teams, to ensure that they fully understand the individual eligibility rules.

We do not consider that the assertion to the Away Institution by the Away Team captain - that he was unaware that fielding an alumnus was against the BUCS Rules - is a relevant mitigating factor. If the training the Away Institution conducted had been effective, the captain would have known that it was against the rules. But in any event, we consider that, even without detailed knowledge of the content of BUCS Regulation 4, it is a matter of common sense that, in competitive sport between universities, all participants must fulfil the fundamental requirement of being a registered student at the institution they represent. It is therefore incumbent upon those selecting teams to check the eligibility rules and to ensure the players they select comply with those rules.

Sanction(s):

In light of the BUCS Regulations (including the sanctions policy), the submissions of the parties and the facts of this matter, the Panel imposes the following sanctions:

Forfeiture of the Match: The Away Team shall forfeit the Match, with the consequences that (1) the Home Team is awarded a walkover; and (2) BUCS shall deduct 3 league points from the Away Team.

League points deduction: A deduction of 6 league points, suspended until the end of the 2025-26 season. This means that if the Away team is found by any BUCS Judiciary Panel to have committed any further breach of BUCS Regulation 4 during that period, BUCS shall immediately deduct 6 league points from the team's points tally. For the avoidance of doubt, this suspended sanction will take effect entirely separately from any additional sanction imposed by any BUCS Judiciary Panel for any such further breach; and

Education: Within 14 days of receiving this Ruling, the Away Institution shall send a written communication, copied to BUCS, to the captains and presidents of all Away Institution teams who have played, are playing or will play in any BUCS competition in the 2024-25 or 2025-26 season, communicating to them (1) that an Away Institution team has this season been disciplined and sanctioned by a BUCS Judiciary Panel for fielding an ineligible player; (2) that this is the second recent instance following a similar breach by an Away Institution team in the 2023-24 season, which also resulted in disciplinary action and a sanction; and (3) of the importance of complying in all respects with BUCS Regulation 4 at all times.

Sport: Rugby Union

Regulation(s): REG 5.2

Summary of the Charge:

It is alleged that Institution A has named 2 players on 10 of their team sheets, despite them not playing in or being present at the fixtures. This alleged misrepresentation is believed to allow the players to be eligible to play in a playoff fixture on (date redacted) under the provisions of RUU 2.4.3 which states that "In order to be eligible to compete in each of the Men's BUCS Super Rugby playoff matches players must have been named on Team Sheets (REG 11.2) in at least 33% of the league fixtures that season for the team they wish to represent."

BUCS REG 11.2.4 states that "Each team is responsible for ensuring that all individuals they wish to represent them are selected for the fixture and listed on the match team sheet on BUCS Play". It is understood that the process to be completed by teams if they believe a team sheet is incorrect was not actioned by any of the opposition teams for the aforementioned fixtures, however Institution B believe that if the correct checks were completed by the opposition Institution A would not have been able to comply with the request.

Institution B also challenge the eligibility of the 2 players to take part in the playoff fixture on (date redacted), as whilst they were named on the team sheets, it is believed that neither individual played or was available to play.

Support from other Universities has also been provided in relation to the actions of Institution A bringing BUCS into disrepute.

Decision:

In terms of the Rules and their interpretation, this case comes down to the question as to whether RUU 2.4.3 means simply that players must be named on Team Sheets for 33% of the league fixtures for that season (Institution A's narrow interpretation), or whether the naming of a player on a Team Sheet also amounts to a representation that the player is present and available to play at the relevant matches (Institution B's wider interpretation).

In the Panel's view, the wider interpretation is clearly right for the following reasons. First, the purpose of RUU 2.4.3 is to ensure that teams competing in the league playoffs should be competing with players

who have previously represented them for a significant number of matches – at least 33% – in the preceding season. This is to prevent teams from gaining an unfair advantage in the playoffs by parachuting in strong players who have not previously played for the club that season. Yet on the narrow interpretation this would be perfectly permissible and in fact this is precisely what Institution A is seeking to do.

Secondly, it is important to give effect to the proper meaning of the word “represent” as it appears in the Rules. Under RUU 2.4.3 the Rule is that players “must have been named on Team Sheets in at least 33% of the league fixtures that season for the team they wish to represent” (emphasis added). The word “represent” also appears in REG 11.2.3, which provides that “Each team is responsible for ensuring that all individuals they wish to represent them are selected for the fixture and listed on the Match Team Sheet on BUCS play.” (emphasis added).

A player represents a team by attending a match and being available to play for the team. So, putting a person’s name on a Team Sheet is not a mere formality but a statement of fact or a representation that a specific player is representing that team, in other words that they are attending and available to play for that team at the match in question.

Thirdly, this interpretation is supported by all the other Rules relating to Team Sheets in Regulation 11 and specifically those set out above at paragraph 12. Regulation 11.2.4. makes it clear that teams who wish to have a player represent them must select them and name them on the Team Sheet for that fixture. “Represent” here clearly means either playing, or being available to play, for the team at that fixture. Furthermore, the Rules are premised on the ability of teams, on match day, to check that the opposing team comprises the persons who are named on the Team Sheet. This can only happen if the Team Sheets are an accurate and honest representation of the make-up of the team.

It is admitted by Institution A that the two players were named on the Team Sheets but were not present at the matches and not available to play, except in one instance. Institution A accepted in evidence at the hearing that the purpose of naming the players on the Team Sheets was to meet the 33% target and bring those players in for the playoffs. Institution A also accepted that if they had been challenged at a game under Regulation 11.2, they would have had to remove the two names from the Team Sheet and hence those names would not have counted towards the 33% target.

Institution A’s evidence was that they genuinely believed that their actions were in compliance with RUU 2.4.3. But this could only be the case if RUU 2.4.3 was read narrowly, without regard to its purpose and in isolation from Regulation 11. Interpreting the Regulations as we do, the Panel finds that by naming these two players on the Team Sheets Institution A did represent that these two players had each attended 5 matches and been available to play for Institution A this season, when they had not. The Panel accepts Institution B’s submission that by doing so Institution A was breaking the Rules for a competitive advantage.

The Rules on Team Sheets are about ensuring fair play. Without reliable Team Sheets, teams are unable to check that the opposing team is adhering to the Rules, for example, that they are not players who are ineligible, or “playing down” players who have established normalcy for a higher ranked team. Equally, as this case demonstrates, without reliable Team Sheets it would be difficult to enforce Rules that are designed to prevent teams from getting an unfair advantage by bringing in better players at the playoff stage of a competition.

Accordingly, making untrue statements on Team Sheets undermines their role in holding teams to account and ensuring fair play in the way envisaged by the Regulations. For this reason, it is conduct that is likely to bring BUCS into disrepute. This complaint of misconduct is upheld – Institution A has breached Regulation 5.2.

Sanction(s):

It follows from our decision that neither Player A nor Player B are eligible to play for Institution A in the playoffs this season. They are ineligible because they have not played or been available to play in at least 33% of the league games for Institution A this season.

In terms of sanction, the Panel considers that this was a serious and repeated breach of the Regulations. There was also little in the way of mitigation, although Institution A did not dispute the underlying facts. However, the decision about the Team Sheets was made by staff at the University, not student rugby players. Secondly, although the Team Sheets were submitted in this form with the expectation of the rugby team gaining a competitive advantage, this did not in fact happen, because of Institution B's intervention. The Panel accepts that this was adventitious; nonetheless, looking at matters in the round, it is relevant. Institution A's team has done well enough to reach the playoffs (without gaining any unfair advantage) and given that the team is not responsible for the breaches, the Panel believes that forcing the team out of this competition would be disproportionate.

For these reasons, the Panel decided to impose a formal reprimand and a fine. The Panel was informed that previous fines have been in the range £250 to £1,000. Considering this case to be at the serious end of the spectrum, we issue Institution A with a formal reprimand and a fine of £750.

Sport: American Football

Regulation(s): REG 4.6

Summary of the Charge:

Institution A is charged with misconduct under REG 4.6 for a breach of REG 4 for allowing an ineligible participant to represent them.

On (date redacted), Institution A self-reported the breach in regulation and named the individual as being Player A, confirming he was a former player who was awarded his Master's degree on (date redacted), at which point he no longer met BUCS's eligibility requirements under REG 4.

Player A partook in seven Open American Football Tier 1 league fixtures as an ineligible participant.

Player A also partook in the two Open American Football National Trophy fixtures as an ineligible participant.

On (date redacted), BUCS responded to Institution A advising that a charge would have to be raised as they had fielded an ineligible participant.

Decision:

The Panel was not minded to order retrospective walkovers in Institution A's seven league fixtures because, notwithstanding that BUCS did not push for that outcome, the inevitable consequence of such an order would be an instant relegation to the division below. Whilst it is something of a departure from the previous BUCS sanctions for fielding ineligible players, for the following reasons the Panel was persuaded that there was good reason to do so on the facts of this case:

1. The health and safety concerns raised by both parties. The Panel wanted to avoid introducing unnecessary physical risks at all costs. There was some discussion in the hearing that, in the event the Panel was minded to make an order which resulted in Institution A's relegation, for collision sports, there is a process by which a team who have good grounds to say they are in the wrong division, can apply to play in a higher standard on account of health and safety risks. The Panel did not see the practical sense in making such an order and necessitating further

administration if it would merely result in the same outcome (i.e. Institution A back in this league).

2. The severity of the breach. The breach was caused by administrative oversight arising from the proximity in time of the Player's initial registration and then late award of his Master's degree. No Institution A opponent or any other official at any of Institution A's subsequent nine fixtures picked up the issue.
3. The competitiveness / integrity of the league. For a team which was hugely dominant in the 2024-25 season, imposing an order which would force them to play at an inferior level would not serve the integrity or usefulness of university sport. The Panel noted that in this division in the 2024-25 season they received two mid-match concessions – by that logic, a relegation to the division below may have entailed even more concessions. The Panel also took from the submissions from both sides that American Football in the UK has a shallower pool of ability; in other words, meaning there is a bigger disparity between strong and weak teams.
4. The nature of the league and sport. We had in mind that this is a five-team league, with eight fixtures in total and 2 points for a win. In the 2024-25 season, Institution A won all eight of its fixtures, thereby securing the maximum 16 points available (and thereby qualifying for the National Trophy which, somewhat akin to the playoffs). The currency of a point is therefore far higher than, by way of example, three points in a football league season consisting of 38 games and 114 points available. So, any points deduction has to be considered in light of that higher currency.
5. The weight of mitigating factors identified above, as against the absence of aggravating factors.

Sanction(s):

1. A deduction of seven league points to take effect from the start of the 2025-26 season, one point for each of the seven league fixtures in which the ineligible Player took to the field in the 2024-25 season;
2. A further deduction of seven league points, suspended until the end of the 2025-26 season (to include the culmination of the National Trophy, should Institution A qualify). This means that if Institution A is found by any BUCS Judiciary Panel to have committed any further breach of BUCS Regulation 4 during that period, BUCS shall immediately deduct a further 7 league points from the team's points tally (i.e. 14 in total). For the avoidance of doubt, this suspended sanction will take effect entirely separately from any additional sanction imposed by any BUCS Judiciary Panel for any such further breach; and
3. The deduction of all BUCS Points earned in respect of the team's participation in the two games in the National Trophy in the 2024-25 season (the Panel not wishing to disturb the outcome of a completed cup knockout competition qualification of which was earned by the seven preceding league results).

Sport: Hockey

Regulation(s): REG 5.1

Summary of the Charge:

It is alleged that the Away Team are in breach of REG 5.1 for failing to ensure their supporters and coaches conducted themselves in an orderly fashion at the BUCS Women's Hockey Conference Cup match between the Home Team and the Away Team which took place on (date redacted).

It is alleged that a group of the Away Team supporters repeatedly directed inappropriate comments at an umpire who was using a wheelchair whilst officiating the fixture. The umpire was made aware of the alleged comments when a Home Team player informed her of what she had heard from the sidelines.

The allegations against the Away Team are as follows:

1. That a group of the Away Team's spectators: -
 - a. Used the term "hot wheels" towards the umpire, who was a wheelchair user;
 - b. Said "*Imagine her running onto the pitch... red card... leaving skid marks*";
2. That the matters in (1)(a) and/or (1)(b), above, constitute misconduct;
3. That the Away Team's coaches: -
 - a. Said "*Should we bring the boys back in to wind her up?*";
 - b. Were dismissive of the umpire's complaints about the above when bringing them to the coaches' attention;
4. That the matters in (3)(a) and/or (3)(b), above, constitute misconduct.

The umpire attempted to raise this issue with the spectators in question at which point it is alleged that she was met with a mix of silence and laughter from the spectators in question. The supporters were asked to leave the side of the pitch before the match was restarted, and the Away Team coaches were informed that if the supporters re-entered the match would be abandoned. It is noted that the Away Team coach's response to the incident was deemed to be inappropriate. It is further alleged that a pitch side first aider approached the umpire after the match and informed her of inappropriate comments made by the Away Team coaches dismissing the severity of the situation.

CCTV footage sourced from the venue features individuals which the umpire confirmed made the alleged comments.

Decision:

We agree with Staff Member A's analysis that for all four of the factual allegations, this is essentially a case of one person's word against another. Given that BUCS has the burden of proving the allegation, we find that BUCS cannot point to any evidence which causes us to prefer BUCS' statements over the Away Team's.

As to BUCS' submissions that there would be no reason for the BUCS witnesses to make their accounts up, respectfully, this is a self-fulfilling argument that asserts what it needs to demonstrate. The same argument can equally validly be made by the Away Team. The question of which side's evidence to prefer is taken no further by asserting that there is no reason to disbelieve it.

As to BUCS' argument that the Away Team spectators did not deny making the statements complained of, leaving open the possibility that the statements were made, respectfully, this does not go far enough. In order to discharge the burden of proof, BUCS must show that it was not merely possible but probable that the statements were made. Furthermore, it is for BUCS to prove the allegations and not for the Away Team to disprove them.

Finally, the allegation about the coaches being dismissive of the umpire's complaints has the additional weakness in that it depends on one's perception of the coaches' attitude, which cannot be determined on the papers.

We note here the decision to rely on written evidence alone rather than calling oral evidence. Hearsay evidence inevitably carries less weight than oral testimony and we are unable to find on the basis of conflicting written evidence alone that it is more likely than not that the statements alleged were made or that the coaches displayed a dismissive attitude. Our findings may well have been different if oral evidence was called.

In the circumstances, we find that BUCS has not discharged the burden of proving the allegations. Note that this is not the same as us finding positively that the statements were not made or that the coaches were not dismissive. However, given that BUCS has not proved the allegations, the charges are dismissed.

During the hearing, the Panel was informed by Staff Member A of the education being provided by the Away Team to student athletes on equality, diversity and inclusion, sexual violence and active bystander training. We would recommend that the Away Team continues the work that has been put in place in this regard, which will help avoid possible situations like the one we have been dealing with arising in the future.

Sport: Water Polo

Regulation(s): REG 5.1

Summary of the Charge:

It is alleged that the Away Team are in breach of REG 5.1 for failing to ensure their players and coach conducted themselves in an orderly fashion at the BUCS Open Water Polo Premier tier match between the Home Team and the Away Team which took place on (date redacted).

It is alleged that during the first quarter of the match, the Away Team coach started shouting at the match officials due to a disagreement on the issuing of a foul. They were given a warning for this conduct. The verbal abuse from the coach continued following an alleged incident with a player in which the coach passed the 6m line and began shouting at both officials. This incident resulted in the coach being red carded and asked to leave pool side.

The coach moved to the stand; however, they were directly behind one of the match officials, and the verbal abuse continued, resulting in both match officials having to speak with the coach and ask him to leave the stands.

Furthermore, during the match, when a player received three fouls and was asked to leave the pool, it is alleged the player was then very argumentative towards one of the match officials, Official A, and refused to leave the pool meaning the match again had to be stopped. The player then attempted to approach the table officials to review the sheet himself, which technically he is not allowed to do.

It is also alleged that following completion of the match the coach failed to follow the requests of the match officials with regards to leaving the table. As a result, Official A, reports to have felt extremely uncomfortable, small, and questioning if they will officiate again in the future. They noted the way the coach spoke to them and the aggression when he spoke at them made them feel scared. This is not the experience which we expect for match officials supporting the delivery of our programmes.

Following BUCS receiving the initial report from Official A, it was raised with the Away Institution who were asked to investigate. Upon first reply, the response failed to address the alleged misconduct and

instead focused on concerns relating to the facility, officiating quality and scoring errors. Following this reply, the Away Institution were asked to provide clarity on the steps that were taken to investigate and the conclusion on the outcomes of any investigation with reference to the alleged misconduct of individuals as a result of their conduct towards the referees included in the report. The Away Institution then responded noting that they asked the University team (who coordinate their coaches' employment and volunteers), to speak with the coach mentioned in the report and remind them that this type of behaviour is not acceptable. They also noted that they have also contacted their club/team to remind them that this type of behaviour is not acceptable, and a reminder of the processes in place if the rules/regulations are not being upheld, especially in regard to scoring, player safety and officiating standards.

Under REG 5.3, BUCS deems that the Away Team have failed to adhere to the provisions of REG 5.1, with the alleged behaviour being examples listed under REG 5.1.1. Under REG 5.3 and REG 5.5 BUCS is raising this charge as the Away Institution have been provided with two occasions to demonstrate how they have handled the alleged misconduct and treated it with seriousness and taken appropriate action and BUCS does not deem the Away Institution to have taken appropriate action to ensure that its student-athletes and employees conduct themselves in an orderly fashion.

Decision:

The Panel concludes that the coach has breached Regulation 5.1 by failing to behave in an orderly manner. He left the coach's area and approached one of the coaches, shouting at her and a colleague, for which he was issued a red card; he then failed to return to his coach's area and walked to the other side of the pool to continue the argument with Official A, resulting in him being asked to go to the stand. From the stand, he continued to argue with Official A. He also called into question Official A's qualifications.

It is normal that coaches may sometimes disagree with referees' decisions, but the coach's behaviour here was intimidating, disrespectful and involved a lengthy argument that was very unpleasant for the referees and detracted from the game. This kind of behaviour cannot be tolerated as it risks deterring people from volunteering to do the difficult job of refereeing, which is vital in all sports. The team also engaged in misconduct by a player refusing to accept a third foul and taking a long time to leave the pool.

As to the Away Team's points, it is clear from the video footage that Official B did in fact see the incident in which the player claimed a neck injury (she confirmed in verbal evidence that this was the case) and Official A stopped the game at that point. There is scope for argument about whether or not a foul should have been awarded but the Panel notes that the player concerned was able to continue playing for the rest of the game (until he was sent off for his fouls). The coach should have behaved in a sporting way and respected a decision which did not go his way. As to the alleged "backchat" from both sides that may have been the case, but the evidence clearly shows that one side in this case engaged in behaviour that clearly overstepped the mark into misconduct – that was the Away Institution.

Sanction(s):

There was little in the way of mitigation. The Away Institution did not make any formal apology for their coach's misconduct. Nor did the Away Institution take any formal disciplinary action against the coach. The substance of the allegations was not admitted, with the Away Institution not making admissions while also saying that they did not tolerate misconduct. This sort of inconsistent "sitting on the fence" position thus required a contested hearing and witnesses being called when their evidence and that of the video footage told a clear story.

When initially presented with this evidence, the Away Institution's reaction was not to engage with the substance of the complaint but to raise other issues e.g. complaining about the facilities. This was unprofessional and discourteous to BUCS, and the Panel regards this as a significant aggravating factor.

Accordingly, the Panel imposed the following sanctions:

1. The Away Institution shall prohibit this coach from attending the first five of the Away Team's BUCS fixtures in the 2025-26 season. This poolside ban applies to anywhere in the swimming pools where these matches are played.
2. A deduction of six league points for the Away Team, suspended until the end of the 2025-26 season. This means that if the Away team is found by any BUCS Judiciary Panel to have engaged in further misconduct during this period, BUCS shall immediately deduct six league points from the team. For the avoidance of doubt, this suspended sanction will take effect entirely separately from any additional sanction imposed by any BUCS Judiciary Panel for any such further breach.
3. The Away Institution shall write a formal written apology to the two referees, Official A and Official B. The Panel is not going to dictate how this is carried out, but our view is that the most appropriate course would be a personal apology from the coach.

Sport: Hockey

Regulation(s): REG 4.6

Summary of the Charge:

A charge of misconduct against the Home Team is required to be raised in accordance with REG 4.6 for a breach of REG 4 for allowing an ineligible participant to represent them.

The fixture in which the Home Team fielded an ineligible participant was the BUCS Men's Hockey Tier 3 match between the Home Team and the Away Team which took place on (date redacted).

This breach of regulations became apparent when the Away Team submitted a match appeal which was subsequently withdrawn following the Home Team conceding a Walkover for the fixture. The initial email trail between the institutions prior to the appeal being withdrawn shows the Home Team denying that an illegible participant was fielded in the match. The Home Team subsequently admitted it was believed that their Captain and Vice-Captain had both lied about the use of an illegible participant after an internal investigation.

On (date redacted) BUCS contacted the Home Institution advising a charge would have to be raised if they had fielded an illegible participant and seeking clarification on a few points to help confirm if a charge did need to be raised as well as sharing evidence provided by the Away Team alleging that an illegible player had participated after the initial denial from the Home Team Captain and Vice-Captain.

On (date redacted), the Home Institution responded, confirming that the ineligible participant was a Player A, an assistant Hockey coach who was neither a current nor former student at the Home Institution. Due to the initial denial and the subsequent admission of fielding an ineligible participant, is alleged that from the various reports that the Home Team Captain and Vice Captain sought to lie or downplay the allegations of an illegible participant being fielded.

Although the fixture has been conceded by the Home Team, this charge of misconduct is required to be raised in accordance with REG 4.6 to be taken to a Judiciary Panel to determine the appropriate disciplinary action to be taken.

Decision:

In light of the written and oral submissions made on behalf of BUCS and the Home Institution, the Panel considers that the relevant aggravating and mitigating factors in the present case are as follows:

Aggravating factors

The account which the team vice-captain gave to the Home Institution on (date redacted) was untrue, in that he said that Player A did not play in the Match. However, he subsequently recognised that it was wrong of him to have given an untrue account and showed remorse for his actions;

Mitigating factors

This is an isolated incident: there have been no misconduct charge against the Home Team in the last 10 years. Also, there have been no misconduct charge against any the Home Institution team in any sport relating to Regulation 4 in the last 10 years;

It appears that Player A was on the field of play for a very short time and his participation in the Match did not affect the outcome;

Very shortly after it became apparent to the Home Institution that Player A had participated in the Match, the Home Team conceded the walkover. Subsequently, the Home Institution promptly accepted the charge;

The Home Institution hockey club has disciplined the team vice-captain. It also took steps to ensure that Player A was banned from attending any other hockey club fixtures in the 2024/25 season; and

Following the incident the Home Institution hockey club took steps to ensure that all other BUCS team captains were made aware of the incident so that there could be no recurrence of it. In addition, following the appointment of new team captains for the 2025/26 season the club has taken steps to ensure that those captains are aware of the BUCS Regulations relating to fielding ineligible players.

Sanction(s):

In light of the BUCS Regulations (including the sanctions policy), the submissions of the parties and the facts of this matter, the Panel imposes the following sanction:

Suspended league points deduction: a deduction of 3 league points, suspended until the end of the 2025/26 season. This means that if the Home Team is found by any BUCS Judiciary Panel to have committed any further breach of BUCS Regulation 4 during that period, BUCS shall immediately deduct 3 league points from the team's points tally.

For the avoidance of doubt, this suspended sanction will take effect entirely separately from any additional sanction imposed by any BUCS Judiciary Panel for any such further breach.

Sport: Water Polo

Regulation(s): REG 4.6

Summary of the Charge:

A charge of misconduct against the Home Institution is required to be raised in accordance with REG 4.6 for a breach of REG 4 for allowing ineligible participants to represent them.

The fixture in which the Home Team fielded two ineligible participants was the BUCS Open Water Polo Premier fixture between the Home Team and the Away Team which took place on (date redacted).

This breach of regulations became apparent when the Away Team contacted BUCS Discipline with the intention of submitting a match appeal which was subsequently withdrawn following the Home Institution conceding a walkover for the fixture after a period of internal discussions and investigations. The Home Institution also provided an update on the punishment their club would receive. The Home

Institution confirmed the ineligible participants were a Player A and a Player B who were neither current nor former students at The Home Institution, but current students at (redacted).

On (date redacted) BUCS contacted The Home Institution advising a charge would have to be raised as they had fielded ineligible participants.

Although the fixture has been conceded by The Home Institution, this charge of misconduct is required to be raised in accordance with REG 4.6 to be taken to a Judiciary Panel to determine the appropriate disciplinary action to be taken.

Decision:

Home Staff Member A confirmed that the charge was accepted. He informed the Panel that the ineligible players did not contribute significantly to the match. He also confirmed that an apology was indeed offered the following week at the reverse fixture. Captains' training had been undertaken where sports leaders were spoken to about tackling bad behaviour and about repercussions that would follow if there were any breaches. The Home Institution's policy on associate memberships has been changed. He informed us that the two-year final warning was the longest that had ever been imposed. He also confirmed that a funding ban was in place, save for exceptional cases or liberation history month funding. Candidly, he told us that he agreed that relegation was appropriate.

Sanctions:

The Panel has considered whether it is necessary to impose a sanction, given the action already taken by the Home Institution. We consider that it is appropriate to do so, in order to set down a marker that the sort of conduct that occurred is unacceptable. However, we do acknowledge the early acceptance of the charge, the contrition showed by the Home Institution and the very substantial work undertaken by Home Staff Member A on behalf of the Home Institution to prevent a recurrence of this situation, which is commendable. Arguably, the punishments that the Home Institution water polo club would find most severe, the lack of funding and relegation, have already been imposed.

Bearing in mind the need to impose a sanction that is proportionate, and in all of the circumstances of this case, we consider that an appropriate sanction is a two point deduction, suspended for this season.

Sport: Golf

Regulation(s): REG 4.6

Summary of the Charge:

The Home Institution are charged with misconduct under REG 4.6 for a breach of REG 4 for allowing an ineligible participant to represent them.

The fixture in which the Home Institution fielded an ineligible participant was the BUCS Mixed Golf Premier fixture between the Home Institution Mixed 1 and the Away Institution Mixed 1 which took place on (date redacted).

This breach of regulations was self-reported by the Home Institution on (date redacted) confirming that the ineligible participant was a Player A, a current the Home Institution student who was believed to be either 16 or 17 years of age at the time of competing for the Home Institution Mixed 1 in the fixture against the Away Institution Mixed 1 on (date redacted) therefore does not meet BUCS individual eligibility regulation REG 4.1.2.

On (date redacted), BUCS contacted the Home Institution advising a charge would need to be raised if they had fielded an illegible participant and seeking clarification on a few points to help confirm if a charge did need to be raised.

On (date redacted), the Home Institution responded, confirming at the time of the fixture Player A was 15 years old as her date of birth was (redacted). The date of birth provided on BUCS Play was (redacted) which allowed Player A to register on BUCS Play as a participant. The Home Institution conceded their BUCS Mixed Golf Premier fixture against another institution due to the fielding of the ineligible participant in the fixture in question.

Although the BUCS Mixed Golf Premier fixture has been conceded by the Home Institution, due to the fielding of an ineligible player in the process of qualifying to participate in the playoff, this charge of misconduct is required to be raised in accordance with REG 4.6 to be taken to a Judiciary Panel to determine the appropriate disciplinary action to be taken.

Decision:

The Home Institution has admitted that the facts set out above amount to a breach of BUCS Regulation 4 and, following the incident, Home Institution Staff Member A has explained the Home Institution has taken steps to ensure that all students who register to compete for the university will receive individual communications reiterating the BUCS regulations relating to age eligibility for BUCS competitions.

Sanctions:

In light of the BUCS Regulations (including the sanctions policy), the submissions of the parties and the facts of this matter, the Panel imposes the following sanction:

Forfeiture of the Match: The Home Team shall forfeit the Match, with the consequences that (1) the Away Team is awarded a walkover; and (2) in accordance with BUCS Regulation 13.7, BUCS shall deduct 3 league points (or such other number of points specified in the BUCS golf regulations) which will half the Home Team's BUCS points attained from their final league position.

The Panel welcomes the Home Institution's indication that it will ensure that all students who register to compete for the university will receive individual communications reiterating the BUCS regulations relating to age eligibility for BUCS competitions.

Sport: Football

Regulation(s): REG 5.1

Summary of the Charge:

It is alleged that the Home Institution are in breach of REG 5.1 for failing to ensure that their student-athletes and supporters/followers conducted themselves in an orderly fashion at the BUCS Men's Football Conference Cup Final match between the Home Team and the Away Team on (date redacted).

It is alleged a large group of Home Institution supporters/followers arrived together to the fixture under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol and proceeded to abuse other supporters/followers, officials and Away Institution players on the pitch. It is alleged this behaviour got progressively worse as the match continued as Home Institution's supporters/followers repeatedly swore at officials and players and threw cans of beer onto the pitch and set off flares and/or smoke bombs.

It is further alleged that a Home Institution player on the sideline ran on the pitch after a goal was scored into the face of the Away Institution goalkeeper and proceeded to goad and abuse him. The behaviour of Home Institution's supporters/followers was documented through an Instagram account and was also

captured in photos and videos from the Away Institution on recorded match footage. Following correspondence with the Home Institution, it has been confirmed that the Home Institution did not have any non-team staff present, who could have attempted to manage the behaviour of their team and/or their supporters/followers.

The BUCS Executive received two complaints about the behaviour of Home Institution's supporters/followers from spectators. The BUCS Executive also received a complaint from the Away Institution about the behaviour of Home Institution's supporters/followers. Within the email trail, the Away Institution also attached a referee report from the match and their original correspondence with institutions outlining the requirements for institutions to accompany attending supporters.

The BUCS Discipline team contacted the Home Institution informing them of the incidents that had occurred which the Home Institution subsequently investigated as is outlined in their response in which they believe a large amount of the misbehaving supporters were alumni and therefore they are unable to identify the individuals involved.

Decision:

The Judiciary Panel finds that the Home Institution has failed to prove that the conduct in question was solely that of supporters who were not current members (whether students, employees, representatives or other members) of their institution. As the Home Institution falls at the first hurdle in BUCS Regulation 5.1.2, it is not necessary for us to consider the second hurdle, relating to reasonable means of control. Accordingly, we find that the Home Institution has no defence under BUCS Regulation 5.1.2 to the Supporters Charge and we find the entirety of the charge is proven.

Sanctions:

In light of the BUCS Regulations (including the sanctions policy), the submissions of the parties and the facts of this matter, the Judiciary Panel imposes the following sanction:

- **Fine:** a fine of £500; and
- **Education and training:** we order that the Home Institution organises and delivers a pre-season 2025/26 education and training event, to be attended in person by all members the Men's Football Club, including players, coaches and officials, which includes (1) a report on the Match and this Ruling; (2) the delivery of lessons learned from the Match and this Ruling; (3) the delivery of content relating to Club members' on-field and off-field conduct; the culture within the Club; and the role of every member and the Club's culture in actively promoting appropriate, and discouraging inappropriate, conduct by all of the Club's supporters.

Sport: Lacrosse

Regulation(s): REG 4.6

Summary of the Charge:

A charge of misconduct against the Away Institution is required to be raised in accordance with REG 4.6 for a breach of REG 4 for allowing multiple ineligible participants to represent them.

The fixture in which the Away Institution fielded ineligible participants was the BUCS Men's Lacrosse Tier 2 match between the Home Institution Men's 1 and the Away Institution Men's 1 which took place on (date redacted).

This breach of regulations became apparent when the Away Institution self-reported their team travelling with a squad of both male and female players to the fixture and the inputting of what they

believed to be a predetermined score on BUCS Play. On (date redacted) BUCS contacted the Away Institution and the Home Institution advising a charge of Misconduct would have to be raised for the entering of a falsified result.

On (date redacted) the Away Institution contacted BUCS outlining the actions they had taken and confirming from their investigation that no falsified result was put on BUCS Play, however it was confirmed members of their women's lacrosse team had taken part in the men's fixture (a breach of REG 4.4) as well as two players from the Home Team. The Away Institution's response left some potential discrepancies between the Instagram messages exchanged between the Home Institution and the Away Institution, but on (date redacted) the Away Institution reconfirmed that a false result was not entered and the only regulation which was broken was REG 4, with female players having played in a men's fixture as well as the Captain and Vice-Captain from the Home Institution playing for the Away Institution in the final quarter of the match.

This charge of misconduct is required to be raised in accordance with REG 4.6 to be taken to a Judiciary Panel to determine the appropriate disciplinary action.

Decision:

The Away Institution self-reported the incident to BUCS. The Away Institution had admitted the charge.

The Away Institution had taken proactive steps to try to ensure that this did not happen again by discussing the issue with the club, including this issue in its Student Leadership Conference and introducing a new session in the Christmas break to ensure clubs were up to speed particularly where there had been changes in leadership.

The Panel considered that there were very strong mitigating factors in this case. There were no aggravating factors. The Panel was aware of previous decisions in recent player ineligibility cases and took into account the sanctions imposed in those cases.

Sanctions:

The Match shall be recorded as a walkover for the Home Institution.

There shall be a 3-point deduction for the Away Institution Men's Lacrosse 1st Team, suspended for the duration of the 2025/26 season. This means that in the unlikely event that the the Away Institution Men's Lacrosse 1st Team is found by a BUCS Panel to have fielded an ineligible player next season, 3 points will automatically be deducted in addition to any sanction that the future Panel might impose.

The Away Institution shall ensure that the BUCS Sport session at its Future Leadership Conference addresses the issue of player eligibility and draws attention to the decision in this case. The Away Institution shall also highlight the importance of coordinating with IA leads when fixing matches.
