

BUCS MATCH APPEAL DECISIONS 2024-25

PUBLISHED | 12 JANUARY 2026

Upon the conclusion of initial, full and final match appeal hearings, BUCS publishes a summary of each case, including the decision and any sanctions imposed, to aid transparency of BUCS's match appeals processes, and to be used as an educational tool. Published summaries of cases do not carry the names of any institution/Playing Entity or individuals involved.

This document contains summaries of all match appeals ruled on in the 2024-25 season to date. Where there is a gap in the numbering, this is because an appeal was withdrawn before it was ruled on.

Please note:

- Whilst these case summaries may be helpful for institutions/Playing Entities to refer to when considering whether to submit an appeal, and Panels may consider 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.
- The rules and regulations referenced within each case summary, and any links provided to them, were valid at the time each case was heard. Since then, these rules and regulations may have been removed or amended. Therefore, at the time this document is read, it may no longer be possible to find a rule or regulation, or its content may have changed in a way that would impacts its relevance to a case.

Appeal Number: 1

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Basketball

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 1

Regulation(s) considered: [BAS 8.1](#), [BAS 8.1.1](#), [BAS 8.1.2](#), [BAS 8.3](#), [REG 10.5](#), [REG 12](#), [REG 12.1.2](#), [REG 12.7](#)

Decision: Upheld – Walkover to Away team

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has upheld the appeal lodged by the Away team. The result will be recorded as a walkover win for the Away team.

The Away team appealed on the grounds that the Home team failed to provide match officials who met BUCS's requirements, as outlined in BAS 8.1 and Appendix 5 ('BUCS Match Officials Requirements'). The Away team's appeal noted that one referee did not meet the qualification requirements (for the Crew Chief to be Level 3) and the other failed to meet neutrality requirements (as per REG 10.5). The Home team acknowledged these breaches, citing challenges in securing qualified officials and the inexperience of their new committee.

Referees' Qualifications:

The Panel notes that based on the submissions it appears that the Away team became aware of the referees' qualification levels during the game, but that the Playing Under Protest (PUP) form was not completed until a time that appears to be after the fixture would have been concluded. The Away team

had signed the form at 18:45, but it was not signed by the Home team until 19:18. As such, under REG 12.1.2 the Away team are deemed to have accepted this condition which would amount to a breach of regulations and so cannot appeal regarding it.

Neutrality of Referees:

One of the referee's not being neutral as per REG 10.5, however, was not identified until after the fixture had finished. As such, it was not possible for the Away team to play under protest regarding this and so they can appeal regarding this regulation breach (REG 12.7). The Home team acknowledges in their response that the Umpire "did not fit the neutrality requirements outlined in REG 10.5". As per BUCS Appendix 5 and BAS 8.1, Tier 1 fixtures require neutral referees, which the Home team failed to provide.

Notification and Advance Communication:

According to BAS 8.1.1, if appropriate officials cannot be appointed, institutions are to inform the opposing team at least 48 hours before the match start time, allowing the Away team the option to host the fixture and ensure compliance with officiating standards. The Home team did not notify the Away team of the referees' not both being of the required level of qualification or not meeting the neutrality requirements in advance, thereby preventing the Away team from exercising this option. They also did not exercise the option of using BAS 8.3 to seek agreement from the Away team to go ahead without the officials' requirements being met.

Under BAS 8.1.2, failure to provide appropriate officials and lack of 48-hour advance notice results in forfeiture, granting a walkover to the opposing team. In light of the Home team's acknowledged officiating breaches and lack of prior notification, the Panel finds the Away team's appeal valid. Accordingly, the result is overturned, and the Away team is awarded a walkover.

The appeal is upheld in favour of the Away team, and the result will be recorded as a walkover in the Away team's favour, with the Home team charged the £50 Lodging Fee.

Recommendation: The Panel recommends that the Home team ensures compliance with officiating regulations in future fixtures, particularly in cases where appropriate officials cannot be secured. The Home team should notify the opposing team at least 48 hours in advance, as per BAS 8.1.1, allowing the opposition the opportunity to host or make alternative arrangements, or make use of BAS 8.3.

Additionally, the Panel advises both institutions to ensure correct completion of Playing Under Protest forms in line with REG 12 to avoid future confusion.

Appeal Number: 2

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Rugby Union

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 1

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 12](#), [REG 12.3](#), [REG 12.3.2](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away team.

While the Away team completed a PUP form, this form was not filled in accordance with all procedural requirements of BUCS REG 12.3. Notably, essential details such as the name of the institution were

omitted. As stipulated in REG 12.3.2, an incomplete form does not meet BUCS standards and cannot be used to support any subsequent match appeal. Thus, although the Away teams PUP form indicated their concern, the procedural incompleteness renders the appeal insufficient under BUCS regulations.

In light of the fact that the PUP form was not fully completed as per BUCS REG 12.3, the Away team does not hold grounds for an appeal on this basis, and the original fixture result will stand. The Panel acknowledges that the procedural aspects of the PUP form completion are integral to the match appeal process. Because of these considerations, this decision does not make any judgment regarding the impact of the artificial pitch on the game outcome.

The appeal is rejected with the Away team charged the £50 Lodging Fee.

Recommendation: The Panel advises both institutions to ensure correct completion of Playing Under Protest forms in line with REG 12 to avoid future confusion. The home team are also advised to review its processes for fixture notifications in order to ensure compliance with BUCS requirements.

Appeal Number: 3

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Rugby Union

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Premier Tier

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 11.1.2](#), [REG 11.1.2.2](#), [REG 12](#), [REG 12.3](#), [REG 12.3.2](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away team.

After reviewing the appeal submitted by the Away team and the response provided by the Home team, BUCS has considered the validity of the Playing Under Protest (PUP) form and the broader concerns surrounding player eligibility and normality in team selection under BUCS regulations. The decision rests on two primary areas of focus: the validity of the PUP form submitted by the Away team and the concept of team selection "normality" as outlined in REG 11.1.2.

Upon review, it is concluded that the PUP form submitted by the Away team does not meet BUCS regulatory requirements. According to REG 12.3, a PUP form must be signed by the designated team captain on the day of the match to be deemed valid. In this instance, the PUP form was completed by a remote representative, Daisy Gillie, who signed electronically on behalf of the Away team's captain, Emma Gerrard. The Home team captain subsequently signed the form at halftime; however, the Away team captain did not sign in person, resulting in a procedural breach. Due to this incomplete signature process, the PUP form is determined to be invalid under REG 12.3.2. Consequently, the appeal based on this document alone is insufficient and would typically warrant rejection on these grounds.

While the PUP form is invalid, the question of whether the Home team breached team selection regulations by fielding players from their Women's 1st team in the 2nd team remains under consideration. REG 11.1.2 outlines that institutions must select their first team as the strongest available, with subsequent teams selected in descending order of player strength. The Away team's concern primarily rests on the involvement of players who have recently participated in the Home team's 1st team and who may regularly compete at an elite level, including for (team name redacted) and various national teams.

The Home team has explained that several players who appeared in the 2nd team for this fixture were returning to their designated positions in the squad after covering for absences due to injury,

international duty, or other extenuating circumstances in the first two matches of the season. They argue that player movement between teams is not only inevitable but necessary to maintain compliance and field competitive teams, particularly in the early part of the season when rosters may not have reached "normality." The BUCS Panel agrees that normality has not been breached and therefore this cannot be considered as a valid reason to uphold the match appeal. The Panel also notes that players might not have established themselves in a particular team at the start of the season and therefore one cannot retrospectively award a walkover later on in the season if a player does go on to achieve normality for a higher ranked team. Therefore, as per REG 11.1.2.2, the Panel is of the view that the Home team players have not established normality.

Given that the PUP form submitted by the Away team is invalid and that team selection normality is not yet established, BUCS concludes that there is insufficient evidence to uphold the Away team's appeal at this time. This decision respects both the procedural requirements of BUCS regulations and the developmental structure of early-season team selection.

The appeal is rejected with the Away team charged the £50 Lodging Fee.

Recommendation: The Panel advises both institutions to ensure correct completion of Playing Under Protest forms form in line with REG 12 to avoid future confusion.

Appeal Number: 4

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Volleyball

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 2

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 10.6.2](#), [REG 12.7](#), [Appendix 5](#)

Decision: Upheld – Walkover to Away team

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has accepted the appeal lodged by the Away team and awards a walkover win in their favour.

The Away team alleged a breach of BUCS regulations related to referee qualifications (Appendix 5 and REG 10.6.2), as well as the absence of prior communication regarding the lack of qualified referees.

Evidence was provided confirming that the officials for the match were unqualified club players from the Home team, as verified by an email from the Home team's Sports Administrator. This is a direct breach of BUCS Appendix 5, which mandates that at least one qualified referee must officiate, and REG 10.6.2, which requires appropriate notification of such circumstances.

The Away team further clarified that they were unaware of the refereeing situation until after the match, which, as per REG 12.7, exempts them from needing to submit a Playing Under Protest form. Furthermore, there was no response from the Home team, therefore, the Panel has come to a decision based purely on the submission provided by the Away team.

The appeal is accepted with the Home team charged the £50 Lodging Fee.

Recommendation: The Panel advises both institutions to ensure correct completion of Playing Under Protest forms form in line with REG 12 to avoid future confusion. The Panel also emphasises the need for timely communication to both institutions to avoid such scenarios in the future.

Appeal Number: 5

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Volleyball

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Premier Tier

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 9.3.4.3](#), [REG 12](#), [REG 12.1](#), [REG 14](#), [VOL 4.1.1](#), [VOL 10.1](#)

Decision: Rejected – Fixture to be rearranged

Justification of decision: The BUCS Match Appeal Panel has reviewed both the appeal from the Away team and the response from the Home team in conjunction with the BUCS General and Volleyball-specific Regulations. After careful consideration, the Panel has determined that this match should be classified as abandoned under VOL 10.1. Consequently, the fixture is to be rearranged, with the Away team hosting the rescheduled match.

The fixture was unable to reach its conclusion due to a hard stop imposed at 8:00 PM for a subsequent booking. While the hard stop was argued as unexpected for the Away team, the Home team demonstrated that the hall booking aligned with the required 2.5-hour minimum under VOL 4.1.1. However, delays caused by an overrun of the prior women's match meant that the full-time allocation for the men's match was insufficient. As the fixture was stopped prematurely and did not conclude, it meets the criteria for abandonment under VOL 10.1. The Away team argued that the result should stand under REG 9.3.4.3, as 75% of the scheduled 2.5-hour match duration had elapsed. However as mentioned above, this regulation does not apply to Volleyball fixtures, as per VOL 10, which explicitly states that all matches must be played to a conclusion.

The Home team booked the court for 2.5 hours per match in line with VOL 4.1.1. The Panel acknowledges that unforeseen delays in the preceding fixture were beyond the immediate control of the Home team but notes that better contingency planning may have mitigated this issue.

The Away team also cited a pre-match agreement recorded on the scoresheet, stating that the match would be awarded to the Away team (3-0) if not concluded by 8:00 PM. The Home team disputed this agreement, clarifying that the signature on the scoresheet did not reflect a formal acceptance of this condition. The Panel has also disregarded the PUP form submitted as this was signed after the end of the fixture. The Panel advises both institutions that PUP forms are only valid if signed as soon as a grievance was noted either before or during the fixture as per REG 12.1.

The match is to be rearranged, with the Away team hosting the fixture as per VOL 10.1. Both institutions must collaborate to schedule the new fixture in compliance with REG 14, ensuring adequate time is allocated to complete the match fully.

The Match Appeal lodging fee will be split (£25 each) equally between the Away team and the Home team as the match is declared abandoned, and neither party is deemed entirely at fault for the disruption.

Recommendation: The Panel emphasises the importance of proactive communication and contingency planning in multi-fixture bookings to prevent similar issues in the future. Institutions are encouraged to thoroughly confirm match timings, allocate buffer periods between fixtures, and clearly communicate with all stakeholders.

The Panel advises both institutions to ensure correct completion of Playing Under Protest forms in line with REG 12 to avoid future confusion.

Appeal Number: 6

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Football

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 5

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 11.2.1](#), [REG 11.2.3](#), [REG 11.2.5](#), [REG 11.2.7](#), [REG 11.2.13.1](#), [REG 15.5](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Home team.

The Panel has concluded that the result of 5-3 in favour of the Away team stands, with no further action taken beyond a written warning to the Away team for their failure to submit a team sheet prior to the match. The Home team's appeal is dismissed due to insufficient steps taken under REG 15.5 and the failure to dispute the team sheet on BUCS Play.

The overriding principle of REG 11.2.3 is to ensure that fixtures are completed wherever possible. The Away team's inability to submit a team sheet prior to the match did not prevent the fixture from being played or concluded. Both teams proceeded with the match despite the team sheet irregularities, fulfilling the core aim of the regulations. However, the Away team did not adhere to REG 11.2.1, which requires teams to complete and verify a team sheet prior to the match. However, as this was the Away team's first failure to comply, REG 11.2.13.1 specifies that a written warning is the appropriate sanction. Despite procedural breaches, the match was completed without evidence of eligibility violations or other significant infractions that would warrant overturning the result.

The Home team completed a Playing Under Protest (PUP) form and re-directed their concerns to the Away team before submitting the appeal, satisfying some elements of REG 15.5. However, they did not take adequate steps to verify or challenge the eligibility of specific players as required. The appeal does not name any specific individuals or provide evidence to suggest that players were either ineligible or eligible. The regulations clearly require such steps to be taken when raising eligibility concerns.

While the Home team disputed the team sheet via the PUP form, they had the opportunity to verify the names of the Away team players, including checking photographic identification as required by REG 11.2.5 and REG 11.2.7 should have been followed. The Home team did not complete this process, and their failure to do so undermines the validity of their claim. Verification steps outlined in the regulations are designed to address concerns at the point of the match and were not fully utilised by the Home team.

The appeal is rejected with the Home team charged the £50 Lodging Fee.

Recommendation: Both the Home team and the Away team are reminded of their responsibilities to adhere to team sheet regulations. Repeated failures to comply with these regulations may result in additional sanctions, including point deductions or fines, as per REG 11.2.13.

Both the Home team and the Away team are reminded that future appeals must comply with REG 15.5 by naming specific individuals and providing detailed reasoning for questioning their legitimacy. All institutions are encouraged to resolve such matters directly with their opponents' Athletic Union prior to lodging an appeal.

The Panel emphasises the importance of adhering to team sheet protocols and ensuring compliance with the relevant regulations. Both institutions are encouraged to plan for contingencies, such as travel delays, to avoid future procedural breaches.

Appeal Number: 7

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Basketball

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 5

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 11.2.1](#), [REG 11.2.3](#), [REG 11.2.13](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Home team.

After careful consideration, the appeal is rejected on the grounds that the outcome of the match was not materially impacted by the issues raised. However, the lodging fee for the appeal is waived due to procedural compliance by the Home team in following the Playing Under Protest (PUP) process. Additionally, the Away team will receive sanctions for failing to complete and upload the required team sheet.

The Home team completed the PUP form and appropriately disputed the team sheet on BUCS Play as per REG 11.2.3. This adherence to procedure allowed the match to proceed under protest, ensuring that the overriding principle of completing fixtures was upheld.

While the Away team did not upload a team sheet on BUCS Play prior to the match, their response clarified that this was due to an administrative oversight. Despite this breach, there was no evidence to suggest that any ineligible players participated in the match. All players present were confirmed to be valid students at the Away teams institution, registered with BUCS Play, and eligible under BUCS regulations.

As this is a breach of REG 11.2.1, the Away team will incur sanctions in their league under REG 11.2.13, in line with BUCS disciplinary guidelines for missing/incomplete team sheets.

The appeal raised concerns about the Away teams delay in starting the match and their use of makeshift kits with taped numbers due to a delayed arrival of their official kit. While this situation was not ideal, all parties, including match officials and the Home team, agreed to proceed with the fixture. The Panel finds that these issues did not have a material impact on the fairness or outcome of the match. The Away team won the game comprehensively, with no evidence suggesting undue advantage or the use of ineligible players.

The appeal lodging fee is waived in recognition of the Home team's adherence to procedural requirements, including the completion of a PUP form and the timely dispute of the team sheet.

Recommendation: Both institutions are reminded of the importance of adhering to BUCS team sheet regulations. Future breaches may result in further disciplinary action, including additional point deductions or fines. The Panel emphasises that procedural adherence and mutual cooperation are essential to maintaining the integrity of BUCS competitions. Institutions are encouraged to resolve logistical and administrative issues proactively to avoid similar situations in the future.

Appeal Number: 8

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Rugby Union

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 3

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 11.1.3](#), [REG 12](#), [REG 12.1.1](#), [REG 12.3](#), [REG 12.3.2](#), [REG 15](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away team.

The Panel carefully reviewed the Away team's appeal regarding the match against the Home team. The Away team claimed the Home team violated REG 11.1.3 by fielding their Men's 2nd Team while conceding their Men's 1st Team's fixture on the same day. According to the regulations, institutions must prioritise fulfilling the highest-ranked team's fixtures before lower-ranked teams. The Away team argued that players from the Home team's 2nd or 3rd teams should have been moved up to fulfil the 1st team's fixture.

Upon examination, the Panel identified procedural deficiencies in the Playing Under Protest (PUP) Form submitted by the Away team. The form lacked essential information (as per REG 12.3), including the name of the institution/Playing Entity playing under protest (this had been added digitally after the fact), time of fixture, and the time of signing by both captains. Therefore, as per REG 12.3.2, this PUP Form is to be rejected as incomplete and insufficient to support any match appeal.

Additionally due to most of the information added to the standard form having been typed out, including the alleged regulation breach, with a space added for the Away team captain to insert the specific time, it appeared that the form might have been completed before the Away team captain travelled to the venue, suggesting prior knowledge of the concerns. As per REG 12.1.1, a team traveling to a fixture under such conditions is deemed to have accepted the conditions of play and forfeited their right to later appeal on those grounds. The Away team captain also missed an opportunity to raise their concerns with the Home team or BUCS before the match, which might have pre-emptively resolved the issue.

The Panel rejected the appeal on procedural grounds due to the deficiencies in the PUP Form. However, it was the Panel's view that the Home team violated REG 11.1.3 by fielding their Men's 2nd Team while conceding the Men's 1st Team's fixture on the same date, and that the BUCS Executive can, and has previously, taken action regarding breaches of this regulation outside of the match appeals process. The Home team stated that their Men's 1st Team was under an internal suspension imposed by their Students' Union, but this does not exempt the Home team from their obligations under BUCS regulations.

As a result, the BUCS Executive will be reviewing the breach of REG 11.1.3 and will impose any sanctions under REG 11.1.3 as appropriate. This outcome of this review will be communicated to the Home team separately to this appeal process.

The appeal is rejected with the Away team charged the £50 Lodging Fee.

Recommendation: The Panel strongly recommends that the Away team review the procedural requirements outlined in REG 12 and REG 15 for future cases. Ensuring that PUP forms are completed in full and raising known concerns with BUCS or the opposition in advance of fixtures will help prevent similar procedural issues. The Home team, on the other hand, is reminded of their responsibility to adhere to BUCS regulations, especially when internal decisions impact their ability to fulfil fixtures.

Appeal Number: 9

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Badminton

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 3

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 12.1.2](#), [REG 12.3](#), [REG 12.3.3](#), [Appendix 8](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away team.

The core issue raised by the Away team was that the floor of the courts was alleged to be slippery due to dust, which they claimed made them unplayable and affected the course of the match. However, the Panel notes that four rubbers were completed before the Playing Under Protest (PUP) Form was completed. According to REG 12.1.2, if a team begins or continues a fixture with knowledge of conditions that may contravene the regulations and fails to raise a PUP immediately, they are deemed to have accepted those conditions.

Moreover, it was noted that the way the PUP form completed, it was not entirely clear at that time the protesting captain had signed the form, undermining its validity under REG 12.3.3. Furthermore, evidence from the Home team that the facility staff promptly swept the courts once the issue was raised, and the match proceeded to completion without further objections.

The Panel found no substantial evidence suggesting that the playing conditions materially changed for the worse during the match, and so no justification for not having completed the Playing Under Protest Form at an earlier point – when they became aware of the court conditions. Thus, the Panel concluded that the Away team accepted the conditions of play by proceeding with the match initially.

The appeal submitted by the Away team is rejected. The Panel finds that the conditions of play were accepted as per REG 12.1.2, and there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate a breach of regulations that impacted the match outcome.

The appeal is rejected with the Away team charged the £50 Lodging Fee.

The Panel strongly advises the Away team to ensure their teams use the current version of the BUCS Playing Under Protest Form (Appendix 8) which it is considered is clearer and easier for captains to complete, and that PUP forms are completed accurately and in compliance with REG 12.3, and that they are completed as soon as conditions which are a concern are known.

Both the Home team and the Away team are also advised to speak to their teams about checking courts before matches and raising any concerns at this point, or as soon as they arise if they occur later, to try and resolve any potential issues without the need for playing under protest.

Appeal Number: 10

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Netball

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 4

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 9.3.4](#), [REG 9.3.4.1](#), [REG 9.3.4.2](#), [REG 12.1.2](#), [REG 15](#), [NET 3](#), [NET 4.2](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The core issue raised by the Away Team related to two of the four quarters in the match being shortened from 15 minutes to 14 minutes by the match official. The Away Team claimed that they were unaware of this until the end of the match meaning they were unable to complete a Playing Under

Protest (PUP) form. However, the Panel noted that a member of the Away team (the player doing scoring) was made aware of the first quarter being shortened as per all statements provided and failed to notify any other members of the team, such as the captain who can fill out a PUP form, of this indiscretion at the time. Therefore as per REG 12.1.2, if a team begins or continues a fixture with knowledge of conditions that amount to a breach of regulations but fails to complete a PUP form immediately they are deemed to have accepted the conditions of play and can therefore not later 'play under protest' regarding them, nor submit a match appeal based on those grounds.

The appeal submitted by the Away Team was therefore rejected as the Panel found that the conditions of play were accepted as per REG 12.1.2.

The Panel advises the Away Team to ensure all members of their team are aware of BUCS regulations especially relating to REG 12, Playing Under Protest to ensure they are able to follow process correctly in future when grievances may arise.

Furthermore, the Panel recommends that the Home Team speak to the match official in question to get an understanding for their reason for cutting the match short by two minutes and to discuss that if there aren't time restraints, such as court bookings, that it would be hoped that matches can always be played in full, even if there are slight delays, and if there is a possible need to change timings, to request that this is clearly communicated to captains to help reduce the possibility of situations like this happening in future

Appeal Number: 11

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Rugby Union

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 3

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 11.1.2.2](#), [REG 11.2.10](#), [REG 11.2.10.3](#), [REG 11.2.12](#), [REG 11.2.13](#), [REG 11.2.13.2](#)

Decision: Upheld – Walkover to Away team

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has upheld the appeal lodged by the Away Team. The result will be recorded as a walkover win for the Away Team.

The appeal centred around the Away Team claiming seven players playing for the Home Team were in breach of REG 11.1.2.2 as they had established normality or were on the cusp of establishing normality for a higher ranked team at their institution. The appeal by the Away Team also outlined two occasions where the Home Team had not entered team sheets into BUCS Play, meaning checks for normality could not be sufficiently completed. The Home Team were asked to provide paper team sheets in place of the missing information on BUCS play, however the Panel agreed that the evidence provided by the Home Team did not provide satisfactory evidence of individual player involvements in certain matches, as the evidence provided in place of team sheets missing from BUCS Play were written on a piece of paper which do not meet the requirements stated in REG 11.2.10.3. As the Home Team were unable to provide adequate records of team sheets to allow to normality to be disputed, as per REG 11.2.12 they automatically lose the appeal.

The Panel unanimously agreed that due to the Home Team not providing enough satisfactory evidence to prove that the named players had not established normality and the provisions of "REG 11.2.12", that the appeal is upheld, and a walkover win is awarded to the Away Team.

The Home Team will also be receiving a written warning from the BUCS Executive for failing to comply with REG 11.2.13 relating to team sheet administration.

Recommendations: The Panel advises the Home Team not to field any of the players in question, who based on the missing team sheets could be considered as having established normality for the higher ranked team in any subsequent lower ranked team matches for the remainder of the current season to avoid a situation such as this occurring again.

The Home Team are also advised to ensure that their team are familiar with the provisions of REG 11.2.10 and to carry paper teams sheets to fixtures.

Appeal Number: 12

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: American Football

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 1

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 1.2](#), [REG 14.3.1](#), [REG 14.3.2](#), [RULE 13-8-8 of the BAFA Rule Book](#)

Decision: Upheld – Match declared Void

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has upheld the appeal lodged by the Home Team. The result will be recorded as void.

The Panel discussed at length the context surrounding this fixture and the reasons for postponement. Whilst this context did not necessarily bear any weight in the panel's decision making, it was agreed to share the discussion to show reasoning.

The origins of the appeal focused on the Away Team not meeting the requirements set out in REG 14.3.1, to offer two dates for the rearrangement of the original fixture, one of which was required to be a weekend date and the other a weekday date. Due to both teams having free weekends available at the time, the Home Team could have rightfully claimed a walkover.

However, a new date for the fixture was eventually offered, making any potential walkover claim irrelevant. The fixture which was rearranged for 29 January 2025 was also postponed by the Away Team due to bad weather. The Panel agreed the postponement was valid, and both teams attempted to rearrange the fixture. But, again the two alternative dates offered by the Away Team were weekdays, not fulfilling the requirement of one weekend date and one weekday date as per REG 14.3.1. However, as per RULE 13-8-8 of the BAFA Rule Book a game cannot be scheduled if the kick-off time is within 36 hours of the scheduled start time, which impacted the possibility of offering a Saturday fixture, as both teams had matches scheduled for corresponding Sundays. Therefore, the Home Team could also not be expected to fulfil REG 14.3.2.

Due to the sport specific regulations of American Football superseding the BUCS General Regulations and the Panel considering it unlikely that the Chair of the Rules Committee at BAFA would provide an exception. It was therefore deemed that neither team could claim fault as neither was able to fulfil their requirements under REG 14.3.

The decision of the Panel was therefore that the Away Team did not have grounds to claim a walkover – nor would it be deemed appropriate for a walkover to be awarded to the Away Team for the Home Team not being able to follow REG 14.3.2 – and therefore that this match shall be considered void. REG 1.2 states that “At any point, an issue not covered by BUCS’ regulations shall be referred to the BUCS Executive or the Board for a decision, depending on the nature of the query.” This Appeals Panel is made

up of representatives of the BUCS Executive and is therefore making this decision in line with this competition related regulation, where the issue is not appropriately covered by the regulations.

Appeal Number: 13

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Water Polo

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Conference Cup

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 10.1](#), [REG 10.2](#), [REG 10.6](#), [REG 12.1.2](#), [REG 12.3.3](#), [REG 15.3](#), [Appendix 5](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The appeal submitted by the Away Team focused on the presence of only one referee for the Conference Cup match against the Home Time.

In their submission the Away Team stated: “On arrival to the pool for warm up, only one official was present. Our team prepared themselves for the start of the fixture, anticipating that the second official (as required by Appendix 5 for Water Polo) must be running late, as we had not received any notice of any issues in appointing the officials prior to the fixture. However, the fixture started with only one official present, in breach of the Appendix 5 stipulated requirements. Our team were not happy that the required number of officials were not present to oversee such an important fixture (a Conference Cup match), and a paper playing under protest was completed as soon as possible whilst the fixture was taking place.”

Based on this, the Away Team were aware that there was only one referee present when the match started. On arrival it is reasonable that they might not question where the second referee was, but when entering the pool for the match to start the absence of the second referee would have been apparent to them and so they would be required to have completed the Playing Under Protest (PUP) Form at this time to comply with REG 12.1. The Panel therefore determined that the Away Team accepted the conditions of play as outlined in REG 12.1.2, as the team were aware of there being only one referee present instead of the required two when the fixture began. The Away Team’s appeal stated that they started the match with only one official present, which invalidated their ability to sign a PUP Form, given they had prior knowledge of the regulatory breach.

Further to this, the Panel noted that there was contradictory information from both institutions regarding when the match started and when the Away Team filled in the PUP Form and presented this to the Home Team – though it being consistent that neither party suggested that the PUP Form was filled in and presented to the Home Team prior to the match starting and when the breach of Appendix 5/REG 10.1/REG 10.2 would have been apparent.

The Panel also noted that REG 12.3.3 outlines the process that should have been followed by the Away Team, if, as they allege, the Home team captain refused to sign the PUP Form. The Away Team have provided no evidence that their team informed their Athletic Union (or equivalent) or the alleged refusal to sign at the time they are claiming this happened, and/or that this was logged with BUCS. Therefore, the PUP Form cannot be considered valid, again meaning that the Away Team are considered to have accepted the conditions of play under REG 12.1.2.

Consequently, the Panel rejected the appeal, and the result will stand.

Recommendations: The Panel observed that the Away Team did not provide evidence of their efforts to resolve the match officials issue with the Home Team prior to submitting the appeal, as outlined in REG 15.3. The Panel advises that institutions attempt to resolve such issues directly with one another before submitting a Match Appeal, as otherwise this can be a reason for an appeal to be rejected.

Additionally, the Panel noted that the Home Team's failure to provide a second referee was a contravention of BUCS Match Official requirements for Water Polo, as outlined in Appendix 5/REG 10.1/REG 10.2 and REG 10.6, with the Home Team providing no explanation as to why this requirement was not met. While this did not factor into the Panel's decision, due to the Away Team not appropriately Playing Under Protest regarding this regulation breach, the Home Team should be aware of the expectation that they would adhere to all regulations and noted that the outcome of the appeal could have been different had the Away Team followed the correct process.

Appeal Number: 14

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Baseball

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 1

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 14.3.1](#)

Decision: Rejected – Walkover to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The appeal submitted by the Away Team focused on their belief that the Home Team had wrongfully claimed a walkover after not accepting any dates suggested by the Away Team for the rearrangement of a postponed fixture. The Away Team claimed they 'Provided 3 dates of (dates redacted) within an hour and a half of the first email' and 'Sent over a fourth date of the (date reacted) which could have been an option. We did not receive any communication after the (date reacted) from the Home Team until they sent over the walkover claim form on the evening of the (date reacted) after reaching out with a further date available'. The Panel agreed that the Away Team had not fulfilled the requirements outlined in REG 14.3.1, where a team 'Must offer at least two dates in writing for the match to take place, in accordance with the relevant league deadline date as identified in Appendix 2 ('BUCS Leagues and Knockouts – Dates and Deadlines'), no later than 48 hours (allowing for weekends and Bank Holidays) after the scheduled start time of the match. One of these dates must be a weekend date and one a weekday date and they must avoid other prescheduled BUCS fixtures for both teams.' As the Away Team only offered weekend dates the Panel agreed the Home Team were under no obligation to accept the dates the Away Team shared over to them and were able to claim the Walkover.

The appeal submitted by the Away Team was therefore rejected, as the panel agreed that the Away Team had not followed the process outlined in REG 14.3.1

The Panel recommends the Away Team ensure they are fully aware of all regulations surrounding fixture rearrangements to ensure a situation like this does not occur again.

Appeal Number: 15

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Rugby Union

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 4

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 12.2](#), [REG 15.2](#), [RUU 5.3.1](#)

Decision: Upheld – Walkover to Away team

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has upheld the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The appeal submitted by the Away Team focused on their belief that the Home Team had contravened BUCS Sport Specific Regulation RUU 5.3.1, which pertains to front row players being able to move down one team from the team where they have established normality, but only to play in a front row position. Both the Away Team and the Home Team's appeal submissions referred to the agreement made prior to the match, which stated that a Home Team player who had established normality for the Men's 1 team could take part in the match for the Home Team's 2nd team, but only in a front row position. This indicated that RUU 5.3.1 was correctly followed prior to the fixture. However, the Away Team lodged their appeal on the grounds that the player in question ended up playing in a position other than front row (flanker) by the end of the game, after being substituted on for the last 20 minutes.

The Panel agreed that the screenshots from match footage, shared by the Away Team, clearly showed the player in question playing as a flanker at the back of the scrum. This is a clear contravention of RUU 5.3.1, which states that a player can "play in a front row position only." Therefore, the Panel upheld the appeal and award a Walkover win to the Away Team.

The Panel noted that no Playing Under Protest (PUP) form was provided by the Away Team in their appeal. However, it accepted that, since the scrum in question occurred during the final play of the game, there would have been no opportunity to complete a PUP form and have it signed by both teams before the game ended, as outlined in REG 12.2. Furthermore, the Panel agreed that the Home Team's appeal response, which based its reasoning on player safety—claiming the player had moved out of the front row due to a hand injury—was an incorrect course of action. If the player was unable to continue in their designated position, they should have been removed from the pitch.

The Panel also agreed that the Home Team's admission that, "In the black and white of the situation, RUU 5.3.1 has been contravened for this final scrum," meant that no other decision could be reached except for upholding the Away Team appeal.

While the Panel acknowledged that the Away Team did not consult the Home Team prior to submitting their appeal, as outlined in REG 15.2, it was agreed that, since both teams had agreed to RUU 5.3.1 before the match and the Home Team had clearly contravened this regulation, a match appeal would likely have been raised regardless of any prior discussions between the institutions.

Appeal Number: 16

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Rugby Union

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Conference Cup

Regulation(s) considered: [RUU 10.5.1](#), [RUU 10.5.4](#), [REG 11.2](#), [REG 11.2.11](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The appeal submitted by the Away Team centred around their belief that the Home Team failed to comply with Sport Specific regulation RUU 10.5.1, where the Home Team had not entered their

designated Front Row players on BUCS Play team sheets throughout the season and for the fixture in question. Before the match started the Home Team stated they had requested that the match would be played with uncontested scrums as they were unable to form a full front row with their hooker being unable to play due to an injury incurred in the first attempt at playing this match the week before. In their appeal the Away Team claimed that 'the Home Team requested to play with uncontested scrums citing that they had no available front row players. However, due to the absence of front row player identification on their team sheets all season, there is no way to verify whether this claim is legitimate'.

The Panel noted that it was a significant allegation being made by the Away Team that they "clearly feel that the regulation has been bended to gain a tactical advantage" and the suggestion that it was not the case that the Home Team were not able to field a front row, either having suitably trained players present but not declaring this, or deliberately not selecting them for the fixture even if available.

It was also noted that the Away Team did not approve or dispute the Home Team's team sheet prior to the match starting as outlined in REG 11.2, bringing into question whether they can appeal as per REG 11.2.11.

The Panel agreed that, based on the submissions of both parties, the Home Team had contravened RUU 10.5.1 throughout the season, however in the instance of this match where uncontested scrums had been requested due to the unavailability of a front row, this brings into question the relevance of RUU 10.5.1 for this match.

The Away Team did not Play Under Protest (if they had concerns pre-match) nor have they appealed based on an alleged breach of RUU 10.5.4 – this is what the Panel would expect if it is alleged that it was not the case that the Home Team were "unable to field a suitably trained front row" and therefore that the match should not have started with uncontested scrums.

Therefore, the appeal was rejected, with the result to stand.

Appeal Number: 17

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Hockey

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Conference Cup

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 11.1.2.2](#), [REG 11.2.1](#), [REG 11.2.2](#), [REG 11.2.3](#), [REG 11.2.7](#), [REG 11.2.9](#), [REG 11.2.10](#), [REG 11.2.11](#), [REG 12.1](#), [REG 12.1.2](#), [REG 12.3](#), [REG 12.3.2](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The appeal submitted by the Away Team focused on their belief that the Home Team had listed on their team sheet, and subsequently fielded, Player A, who based on team sheets on BUCS Play for prior fixtures they believe has established normality for a higher ranked team.

the Away Team claimed that their team informed the Home Team that they "were disputing the team sheet" when checking the team sheet before the match started and it showed 16 players, including Player A, but that they were "unable to approve or dispute the team sheet as the app was not working and has not been working all year for approving". The Away Team stated that the Home Team had subsequently changed their team sheet twice, firstly "once the match had started" to remove Player A and another player, Player B, and then "sometime after the fixture" to add Player C and Player D. The

Away Team also provided a copy of a Playing Under Protest (PUP) Form which they stated their team completed on arrival. The Away Team also stated that Player A “has been identified as taking to the pitch and scoring the second goal” though acknowledged that the video they provided “unfortunately isn’t great quality so it will be hard to identify him” suggesting that “the Home Team should provide evidence he was not on the pitch”.

In the Home Team’s response, they claimed: “the Home Team acknowledged our mistake in discussion with the Away Team and after discussion have proactively told these two players they are not to play and removed them from the team sheet at approximately 14:53.” They added: “At short notice, the Home Team have sourced two players to fill these spots. These players are: Player C and Player D”. The Home Team stated that these players “were retrospectively added to the team sheet after the match to ensure the team sheet was accurate and complete as getting this done whilst the team were playing was not feasible” and that “neither Player A or Player B were played”.

The Panel noted that, whilst not challenging the Away Team’s claim that they were unable to approve or dispute the Home Team’s team sheet on the BUCS Play App, if this was the case, then the Away Team were required to have followed the steps set out in REG 11.2.10. Therefore, as the Away Team are not deemed to have disputed the team sheet when the issue was identified as stated in REG 11.2.3, under REG 11.2.11 they do not have grounds for appeal.

Furthermore, the PUP Form provided as part of the Away Team’s appeal does not contain the following essential information: 1. Name of institution/Playing Entity ‘Playing Under Protest’, 2. Date of fixture. These are essential information as per REG 12.3 and therefore, the PUP Form cannot be used to support the match appeal as outlined in REG 12.3.2 as it “does not meet the requirements of REG 12.3 and will be rejected by BUCS as being incomplete and therefore insufficient to support any subsequent match appeal”.

Therefore, the Panel rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

However, as this is a matter of an alleged breach of REG 11.1.2.2 which has been brought to the attention of the BUCS Executive, the BUCS Governance and Compliance team are investigating the matter further under REG 11.1.2.2.1 case further and will be in touch with the Home Team.

Appeal Number: 18

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Rugby Union

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 3

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 11.1.2.2](#), [REG 11.1.2.2.1](#), [REG 11.2.4](#), [REG 11.2.7](#), [REG 11.2.13.2](#), [REG 12.3](#), [REG 12.3.2](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Home Team.

The appeal submitted by the Home Team focused on their belief that the Away Team had listed on their team sheet, and subsequently fielded, Player A, Player B and Player C, who based on team sheets on BUCS Play for prior fixtures they believe has established normality for a higher ranked team. Furthermore, the Home Team also stated their belief that a Player D had played in the match after not being named on the team sheet on BUCS Play.

The response to the appeal submitted by the Away Team, stated that the players in question either did not take part in the fixture or had not reached normality for the first team so were eligible to compete in

the fixture. The Away Team did admit to fielding Player D but did not allude to the fact he was not originally named on the team sheet. This is a contravention of REG 11.2.4 and will result in a written warning for the Away Team as per REG 11.2.13.2.

The Panel noted that the Home Team provided no evidence of disputing the Away Team's teams sheet on BUCS Play prior to the match starting, as is required under REG 11.2.7 and found no evidence of any disputed team sheets when investigating the incident. Furthermore, the Playing Under Protest (PUP) form provided as part of the Home Team's appeal does not contain the following essential information: 1. Name of institution/Playing Entity 'Playing Under Protest'. This is essential information as per REG 12.3 and therefore, the PUP Form cannot be used to support the match appeal as outlined in REG 12.3.2 as it "does not meet the requirements of REG 12.3 and will be rejected by BUCS as being incomplete and therefore insufficient to support any subsequent match appeal".

Therefore, the Panel rejected the appeal lodged by the Home Team.

However, as this is a matter of an alleged breach of REG 11.1.2.2 which has been brought to the attention of the BUCS Executive, the BUCS Governance and Compliance team are investigating the matter further under REG 11.1.2.2.1 case further and will be in touch with the Away Team.

Appeal Number: 19

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Lacrosse

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): Tier 2

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 9.3.3.1.2](#), [REG 12.3](#), [REG 12.3.2](#), [LAC 3.1](#)

Decision: Rejected – Result to stand

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The core issue raised by the Away Team was that the astroturf pitch which was played on used 'dotted mats instead of lines making it difficult for officials to make the correct decision and also a safety risk'. In their response, the Home Team noted that the pitch was changed last minute due to the grass pitch being unplayable, so they took every necessary step to ensure the game was played. As outlined in Sport Specific Regulation LAC 3.1 'It is recommended, but not required, that all lines be painted white, and where some line markings are shared with any other sport(s), it is not a requirement that all the line markings being are the same colour'. The Panel did not agree with the Home Team's interpretation of LAC 3.1, as the regulation does not refer to line markings not being mandatory, but the colour of the lines not being mandatory. Furthermore, the Panel did agree as per REG 9.3.3.1.2 that the Home Team should have informed the Away Team of the change in pitch availability.

However, the Playing Under Protest (PUP) form provided as part of the Away Team's appeal does not contain the following essential information: 1. Name of institution/Playing Entity 'Playing Under Protest'. This is essential information as per REG 12.3 and therefore, the PUP Form cannot be used to support the match appeal as outlined in REG 12.3.2 as it "does not meet the requirements of REG 12.3 and will be rejected by BUCS as being incomplete and therefore insufficient to support any subsequent match appeal".

Therefore, the Panel rejected the appeal lodged by the Away Team.

The Panel advises the Away Team to print out PUP forms in future and upload a scanned copy in the instance of a match appeal to ensure validity to any claims made within it. It cannot be specified who has

signed a PUP form from initials on a Word document and does not adhere to the guidance outlined in REG 12.3.

Appeal Number: 20

Type of Appeal: Initial

Sport: Volleyball

League (Tier only)/Knockout (Level only): National Championship

Regulation(s) considered: [REG 9.2.2](#), [REG 10.2](#), [REG 10.6](#), [REG 10.6.2](#), [REG 12.1.1](#), [REG 13.7.1](#)

Decision: Upheld – Walkover to Home Team

Justification of decision: Upon thorough review of all submissions and relevant regulations, the Panel has upheld the appeal lodged by the Home Team.

The appeal submitted by the Home Team centred around their belief that the Away Team did not have grounds to have claimed a walkover for the National Championship match due to take place between both institutions.

The walkover claimed by the Away Team related to their belief that one of the appointed officials for the match did not meet the requirements outlined in Appendix 5 where referees must meet the minimum standard of Grade 3 to officiate any match from the Quarter-Finals onwards in the National Championships. Due to the Away team's concerns regarding the official in question, they decided not to travel to the fixture citing REG 12.1.1 where 'if a team travels to a fixture with prior knowledge of the conditions that amount to a breach of regulations, they are deemed to have accepted these conditions of play and can therefore not later "Play Under Protest" regarding them, nor submit a match appeal'. The Away Team cited VOL 5, REG 10.2, REG 10.6 and REG 13.7.1 as regulations under which the walkover was being claimed.

In their Appeal the Home Team argued that they had not breached VOL 5, REG 10.2 or REG 10.6 as Volleyball England had confirmed that the official in question had been upgraded to a Grade 3 referee before the fixture was due to take place.

The Panel agreed that based on the submissions by both parties relating to communications from Volleyball England, the official in question had been upgraded to a Grade 3 referee before the fixture was due to take place meaning they were appropriately qualified to officiate the fixture and so the Home Team could not be considered in breach of VOL 5, REG 10.2 or REG 10.6. Furthermore, whilst not a regulation cited by the Away Team, as the Home Team had initially highlighted their struggle to obtain appropriate officials for the match 48 hours before the scheduled fixture start time, as outlined in REG 10.6.2, they are not deemed to have breached this regulation.

The Panel agreed that prior to the fixture taking place, and prior to the Away Team travelling, it had been confirmed to the Away Team that the official had been upgraded to be a Grade 3 referee and therefore there was not a "prior knowledge of conditions that amount to a breach of regulations" as grounds for the Away Team to not travel and cite REG 12.1.1.

REG 9.2.2 states: "All knockout competition matches must take place on the date as set by BUCS. Unless REG 14 applies, only in exceptional circumstances and with written agreement of both institutions and written approval from the BUCS Executive may knockout competition matches take place on an alternative date". The Panel agreed that the only reason for the fixture not taking place was the Away Team deciding not to travel to the fixture without any knowledge of conditions that would amount to a breach of regulations.

The Panel agreed that after the fixture had been scheduled to take place, the Home Team were in breach of REG 13.7.1 by having entered a walkover win in for their team on BUCS Play without having claimed it by sending via email to the opposition institution/Playing Entity a correctly completed BUCS Walkover Claim Form (Appendix 9) detailing the reason(s) and Regulation(s) considered under which the walkover is being claimed before doing so. However, the Panel agreed that this was not grounds for the Away Team to be awarded a walkover, with this being something that can be dealt with under the results regulations, but the Home Team are advised to ensure that in future they do not enter any walkovers onto BUCS Play before they have been appropriately claimed/conceded.

Based on all the evidence provided by both institutions, and consideration of all the above, the Panel agreed that the fixture should have taken place, with the Away Team not having grounds for REG 12.1.1 to support their team choosing not to travel, and therefore upheld the appeal lodged by the Home Team and awarded them a walkover win, consistent with previous decisions where a match has not taken place due a team's choosing not to participate whilst having no regulatory grounds to support this decision.

The Panel also wished to note that they could understand the Away Team's frustrations and concerns regarding Volleyball England's (VE) processes for upgrading officials – and why a complaint had been made to VE – but that this process and those frustrations and concerns held no weighting in the decision-making process as evidence was provided that the referee had been confirmed as having the appropriate level of qualification by VE by the time the fixture was due to take place and the processes behind officials becoming qualified does not fall under BUCS's regulations or remit.