



LAW RULINGS 2006

RULING 10: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

29 November 2006

The IRFU has requested a ruling with regard to Law 10 Foul Play

Foul Play is anything a person does within the playing enclosure that is against the letter and spirit of the Laws. It includes obstruction, unfair play, repeated infringements, dangerous play and misconduct. Is this inclusive of half time and after the final whistle?

The definition refers to a person not specifically a player. Are team officials within the enclosure subject to this Law and therefore can be dealt with the same way as a player?

What is the extent of the authority of the referee in applying sanctions under this Law: in the dressing room before the match, at half time and after the match; en route to/from the dressing room at half time; en route to/from the dressing room at full time?

The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:

From the time the referee blows the whistle to start the match and blows it to finish the match, including half time, the Laws of Rugby and appropriate sanctions apply. The definition of 'person' includes players and team officials if they are in the playing enclosure, and the latter can be dealt with in the same way as a player.

For incidents in the dressing room and en route to and from the dressing room, IRB Regulation 17.21 Misconduct can be applied which also covers non-players.

RULING 9: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

29 November 2006

The FFR has requested a ruling with regard to Law 17 Maul

1. During a maul the ball carrier and one of his team mates leave the maul.
 - a. Can an opponent tackle the ball carrier?
 - b. Does the ball carrier have to be the lead player?



2. During a maul. The defending team's players leave the maul, with the exception of only one player who remains bound.
 - a. Can this player tackle the ball carrier?

3. During a lineout, the players who won the ball from a maul but no opponent goes to join this group of players.
 - a. Does this group of players constitute a maul?
 - b. Can an opponent tackle the ball carrier?
 - c. Does the ball carrier have to be the lead player?

The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:

1.
 - a. Yes as it is no longer a maul.
 - b. Yes otherwise it is obstruction.

2.
 - a. It is still a maul, and the maul cannot be collapsed.

3.
 - a. It is not a maul by definition.
 - b. Yes
 - c. Yes otherwise it is obstruction.

RULING 8: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

29 November 2006

The FFR has requested a ruling with regard to Law 16 Ruck

Question:

1. Can the referee allow a defender coming from his side to intervene on an opponent as soon as his opponent has his hands on the ball, by diving over the players on the ground in front of him?

2. Can the referee allow a defender coming from his side to intervene on the ball as soon as it emerges from the ruck, by diving over the players on the ground in front of him?

3. Can the referee allow a player coming from his side to hit the arm of the opponent as this opponent has the ball in his hands, by diving over the players on the ground in front of him?

4. Can the referee allow a player coming from his side to hit the arm of the opponent as this opponent has the ball in his hands, by staying on his feet but being in contact with players on the ground in front of him?



The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:

1. No. See Laws 16.2(d) and 16.3(d).
2. No. See Laws 16.2(d) and 16.3(d).
3. No. See Laws 16.2(d) and 16.3(d).
4. Yes. If the player was on his feet and came from an onside position.

RULING 7: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

14 November 2006

The SRU has requested a ruling with regard to Law 10.2 Obstruction and Law 10.4(n) Flying Wedge

Team A win their lineout and as the jumper returns to the ground his team mates bind onto him and stay and drive him forward. At no point do players from team B contest for the ball or bind on to any members of their own team or members of team A.

Is this deemed to be a “flying wedge” if the ball remains with the initial ball carrier who is at the front of the group of team A players and not preventing any player from team B tackling the ball carrier?

Is this deemed to be a “flying wedge” if the ball is transferred to a player in the middle of the group of team A players and preventing any player from team B from tackling the ball carrier?

Is this deemed to be a “flying wedge” if the ball is transferred to a player on the edge or at the back of the group of team A players and not preventing any player from team B tackling the ball carrier.

If the scenarios listed above are not deemed to be in the flying wedge category should they be considered obstruction?

The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:

1. In this situation, players of the defending Team B have not committed to make any contact or tackle of the ball carrying Team A. Play should continue as the actions of the Team A players are not preventing Team B players from making a tackle. Subsequently if the ball is not held by the lead player of the group of Team A players, and a Team B player attempts to tackle the ball carrier and cannot, then a PK should be awarded against Team A for obstruction.



RULING 6: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

14 November 2006

As there appears to be a variation in interpretation in certain instances of high tackles, the IRFU request a ruling on Law 10.4(e) Dangerous tackling.

Situation:

A tackle is made, or attempted, where the initial contact is made below the line of the shoulder, but the arm(s) of the tackler subsequently make contact with the head or neck of the tackled player.

Question:

Even if the subsequent contact with the head or neck is not intentional, but the contact is dangerous, should the referee rule on the intent (initial tackle) ie. No sanction; or should the referee rule on the consequence ie. Sanction?

If the ruling is sanction, would the referee be correct in considering the dangerous aspect as accidental, and consider cards only if he deemed the tackling action to be careless?

The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:

The referee should not rule on intent, but on the outcome. In this situation the outcome was a dangerous tackle in that the tackler made contact with the head or neck of the ball carrier. For this type of tackle the referee has three options available: penalty only, penalty and yellow card, penalty and red card.

RULING 5: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

14 November 2006

The FFR has requested a ruling with regard to Law 4 Players' Clothing.

Please provide a definition of jersey, shorts and underwear.

The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:

1. Jersey: a close fitting shirt worn on the upper half of the body which is not attached to shorts or underwear.
2. Shorts: trousers that start at the waist and end above the knees, have an elasticised waist band and/or draw string, and are not attached to the jersey or underwear.
3. Underwear: an undergarment, that covers the body from the waist, having short or no legs but does end above the knees, and worn next to the skin or under clothing, and not attached to the jersey or shorts.



RULING 4: 2006
Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

14 June 2006

SARU has requested a ruling with regard Law 4.1(a) Additional Items of Clothing:

1. Players are wearing elastic 'long sleeves' with the mark of the manufacturer. The mark is approximately 80 sq cms. Does this garment resort under Law 4.1(a) which stipulates that 'A player may wear supports made of elasticated or compressible materials which must be washable'?

The Designated Members have ruled that

"the wearing of elastic 'long sleeves' is not a support as described in Law 4.1(a)"

SARU have also asked:

2. If this garment does not resort under law 4.1 (a) then Regulation 11.5.3 should apply.

The Designated Members ruled that

Regulation 11.5.3 does apply and that "no form of emblem, mark, name, or other form of commercial and/or promotional association may be displayed on any item worn, used, placed or carried onto the playing enclosure that is not referred to in Table 1.

RULING 3: 2006
Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

5 May 2006

The FFR has requested a ruling with regard Law 3.5 (c) Suitably Trained and Experienced Players (U19 Variations) and Law 20.1 (f) Forming a Scrum (Under 19 Variations).

1. An U19 team nominates more than 22 players and a lock is injured. Does the referee have to ask for the replacement to be a player trained for the position?

2. An U19 team nominating more than 22 players cannot comply with the 3 locks availability scenario. Does the referee have to start the match with uncontested scrums?



The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the questions raised:

This request has shown that there is a law anomaly in the U19 variations. The law intimates that if a team nominates 22 players there is no law requirement as to locks, but there is a requirement for there to be six players who can play in the front row in order to cover replacement in the three front row positions. This philosophy is mirrored in senior law where dependent on the number of players nominated, there must be a certain number of suitably trained and experienced players for the front row.

If however in U19 law a team nominates more than 22 players, there is now in current law, a requirement that there must be three players who can play in the lock position. Locks however are not considered to need the specialised requirements of training and experience that players in the front row require. Therefore, the only reason why a team would be required to have three players to cover the lock positions in a team nominating more than 22 players would be tactical.

Having outlined the anomaly, and the philosophy and practicality of law, the answer to the rulings follow:

1. Law 3.5 (b) states that players in the front row and any potential replacements must be suitably trained and experienced and applies to both senior and U19 law. This does not apply to locks in senior or U19 law.
2. The referee does not have to start the match with uncontested scrums.

RULING 2: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of the Rugby Committee

10 January 2006

The FFR has requested a ruling with regard Law 19 Touch and Lineout and Law 21 Penalty and Free Kicks

Law 19.1 (e) stipulates: "Penalty kick. When a player kicks to touch from a penalty kick anywhere in the playing area, the throw in is taken from where the ball went into touch."

Law 19.4 (Exception) has the following precision. "When a team takes a penalty kick, and the ball is kicked into touch, the throw in is taken by the player of the team who took the penalty kick. This applies whether the ball was kicked directly or indirectly into touch."

Finally, Law 21.4 (d) requires for "kicking for touch. The kicker may punt or drop kick for touch but must not place kick for touch."

Following a penalty kick and after the ball was kicked, the ball hits the goal post and goes into touch without having been touched by another player. What decision should the referee give? The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:



If the penalty kick is for goal, then it is a lineout defending team to throw in.
Law 21.4(d).

If the penalty kick is for touch, therefore no place kick, then it is a lineout attacking team to throw in.

The lineout in either of these situations may not be closer than 5 metres from the goal line. Law 19.4 Exception.

RULING 1: 2006

Law Ruling by Designated Members of Rugby Committee

10 January 2006

The FFR has requested a ruling with regard Law 18 Mark and Law 13 Kick off and Restart Kicks

In the definition of Law 18 Mark, it stipulates that a mark cannot be made from a kick off. This implies that it may be made from a restart. However a restart may be kicked from the half way line after a score. Is it possible to harmonise these two cases? The Designated Members have ruled the following in answer to the question raised:

From a kick off there can be no mark.

From a kick off after a score there can be no mark.

From a 22 metre drop out a mark can be taken.