

DECISION FORM

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE			
Player's Name	Thomas Finell		
Player's Club	Helsinki Warriors Rugby Club		
Match	Warriors Rugby Club vs Tallinn Kalev Rugby Club		
Competition	Men's Finnish Championship		
Date of match	9 August 2025		
Match Venue	Myllypuro, Helsinki		
Rules to apply	2025 SRL Competition Regulations & World Rugby Regulation 17		
Referee Name	Alessandro Begnoni	Plea	□ Admitted
			☑ Not admitted
Offence	Punch or strike contrary to	□ Red card	
	Law 9.12	☑ Citing	
		□ Other	
		If "Other" selec	ted, please specify:

PANEL DETAILS			
Hearing date	On papers	Hearing venue	Via Slack
Chairperson/JO	Palemia Field		
Other Members of	George Mossford		
the Disciplinary Panel	Stephan Whittaker		
List of documents /	1. Intention to cite email from Kalev dated 10 August 2025		
materials provided to	2. Video stream link from YouTube		
Player in advance of	3. Statement from The Player		
hearing			

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

The Disciplinary Officer received the report from Kalev Rugby Club:

Player #10 punched deliberately Kalev player #6 in the genitals. This is clear bad sportsmanship and physical abuse.

Video footage was provided by Kalev Rugby Club via YouTube link. As per Regulation 17 requirements, audio was removed from the video clips (ie no referee audio link was available) and this was also made available to the Disciplinary Panel.

As part of the procedure in receiving the citing request and prior to convening the Panel, the SRL Disciplinary Officer consulted with the Match Officials, and it was confirmed that this event was







undetected by them. Therefore, he was permitted to proceed with the formation of the panel and sourcing evidence from both clubs.

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

No other evidence provided

SUMMARY OF PLAYER'S EVIDENCE

The Player's and his Club submitted the following

This is my personal statement in response to the citation regarding an alleged punch to the genitals of player #6. I would like to present my account of the incident and respectfully direct your attention to the accompanying video footage, which I believe offers essential context.

During the breakdown, I was contesting the ball in a jackal position when player #6 made direct contact with my head, then grabbed my neck and applied force. My cited action, described as a punch, was a reflexive attempt to push him away in order to release his grip around my neck and prevent further injury. At no point did I intend to strike him in the groin. My response was instinctive and aimed at protecting myself in what I perceived to be a dangerous and escalating situation.

The footage further shows that following this initial contact, player #6 delivered a punch and a knee to my head. These actions indicate a clear intent to engage in foul play and reinforce my position that my response was defensive in nature.

I regret that the situation escalated, but I firmly believe my actions were a direct and proportionate reaction to player #6's illegal and aggressive conduct. I urge the committee to review the video footage thoroughly, as it clearly demonstrates that I was not the instigator and that my actions were justified under the circumstances.

I also want to emphasize that my conduct was in no way intended to violate the spirit of good sportsmanship. I hold the values of rugby in highest regard, and I deeply regret that this incident has raised concerns.

Thank you for your time.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Panel was reminded that the onus is on Kalev Rugby to provide the evidence in support of the citing and that the standard of proof for disciplinary matters is on the balance of probabilities. As The Player both denied that there was any Foul Play (and therefore no incident reaching the Red Card threshold). The Panel proceeded with determining the findings of fact.

The Panel was provided with the citing report from Kalev Rugby Club, video footage from a link provided by Kalev Rugby Club, and The Player's written statement.







Kalev are in possession 15m into the Warriors (WRC) half. Kalev 15 receives the ball and is tackled by The Player and goes to ground. The Player releases the tackler and attempts to jackal the ball. Kalev 6 enters the tackle area in a clear out attempt on The Player which is initially has the bulk of the force shoulder to shoulder, but his left forearm pushes down on the back of The Player's neck.



As The Player is then pushed back towards his own side of the breakdown by Kalev 6 who moves into an upright position, the Kalev player's torso pushes The Players head to one side and The Player loses grip of the Kalev player on the ground. Kalev 6 is still attempting to twist The Player out of the breakdown as the WRC player loses his grip, and at this point his arm swings back and goes forward. Simultaneously with the forward momentum, Kalev 6 makes a sudden increase in height that sees him almost on the back of The Player changing the dynamics of the clear out.



After the alleged strike, Kalev 6 is in obvious discomfort and attempts to get the attention of the referee. The referee then stops the game because of concerns of the welfare of the original ball carrier and doesn't appear to have noticed the foul play.







We determine the following on the balance of probabilities:

- 1. WRC 10 (The Player) was in a legal position to jackal the ball
- 2. Kalev 6 attempted to clear out, and was legally justified in doing so, WRC 10
- 3. WRC 10 lost the contact and to get loose of the Kalev clear out, swung his arm out to either strike or punch the Kalev player.
- 4. The breakdown competition above the ball that WRC 10 had attempted to jackal, suddenly disintegrated resulting in a change in height of Kalev 6 suddenly which resulted in WRC 10 contacting his groin area.
- 5. The Panel doesn't believe that The Player deliberately targeted the groin, but contact was still made.

Having considered other law applications (namely 9.27) and consulting with another European and World Rugby disciplinary colleague, in this case we don't believe that this incident is contrary to Law 9.27 and find that The Player committed Foul Play contrary to Law 9.12 (Striking or Punching) and that it reaches the red card threshold.

On this finding of facts, The Panel is satisfied that The Player recklessly lashed out which resulted in the strike on the opponent's groin.

DECISION
☑ Proven □ Not proven □ Other disposal (please state)





SANCTIONING PROCESS

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS			
As per Article 1.5 of SRL Competition Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby			
Assessment of Intent			
☐ Intentional/deliberate ☑ Re	☐ Intentional/deliberate ☑ Reckless		
State Reasons			
The Player is bent over because	e of a clear out from a Kalev play	er. The Player knew, or should	
have known, that lashing out ca	rried a risk of committing an act	of Foul Play	
Gravity of player's actions			
While the potential was serious	s, the actual delivery was of a lo	ow enough force that the Kalev	
player was able to immediately	continue without medical attent	ion	
Nature of actions			
Contact was made with the opp	osition groin which is a protected	d area under the Laws.	
Existence of provocation			
	forearm with force on the back	of The Player's neck rendering	
him in a potentially vulnerable s	ituation.		
Whether player retaliated			
See existence of provocation			
Self-defence			
See existence of provocation			
Effect on victim			
Immediate discomfort but was able to continue play after the stoppage that followed the incident			
for an unrelated issue.			
Effect on match			
Minimal effect			
Vulnerability of victim			
See existence of provocation			
Level of participation/premedit	tation		
None			
Conduct completed/attempted			
Completed			
Other features of player's conduct			
None			
Entry point			
☐ Top end [6+] Weeks	☑ Mid-range [4] Weeks	☐ Low-end [2] Weeks	
*If Top End, the JO or Panel sho	ould identify, if appropriate, an e	ntry point between the Top End	
and the maximum sanction and provide the reasons for selecting this entry point, below.			
Reasons for selecting Entry Poin	nt above Top End		
N/Δ	•		







RELEVANT OFF-FIELD MITIGATING FACTORS		
As per Article 1.5 of SRL Competition Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby		
Acknowledgement of guilt and timing	Player's disciplinary record/good character	
No acknowledgement	Player has received the following yellow	
	cards:	
	2/9/2023 Contrary to 9.10	
	9/7/2022 Contrary to 9.25	
	17/8/2019 Contrary to 9.13	
	Red cards issued:	
	20/5/2017 Contrary to 10.3(b) "dangerous	
	tackling"	
Youth and inexperience of player	Conduct prior to and at hearing	
Not applicable. The Player is the most capped	Provided evidence in support of defence that	
member of the Finnish National Team	related to the specific citing.	
Remorse and timing of remorse	Other off-field mitigation	
Regret was expressed in The Player's statement.	Not applicable	
This differs from a red card scenario.		

Number of weeks deducted: 1

Summary of reason for number of weeks deducted:

The Player presented his argument openly. Although he has disciplinary issues, particularly a red card in 2017, it would be unfair to hold this against him indefinitely. However, he cannot receive a full discount due to contesting the citing, and he has received several yellow cards for Foul Play since the red card, with his most recent being a "technical offence". The panel also recognises that although there was no foul play by Kalev #6, that player's actions did result in contact with The Player's head which may have caused some disorientation and may have led to him perceiving himself to be in a potentially dangerous situation. A one-week reduction is therefore imposed.

ADDITIONAL RELEVANT OFF-FIELD AGGRAVATING FACTORS		
As per Article 1.5 of SRL Competition Regulations and Regulations 17 of World Rugby		
Player's status as an offender of the Laws of the Game		
N/A		
Need for deterrence		
N/A		
Any other off-field aggravating factors		
N/A		

Number of additional weeks: 0

Summary of reason for number of weeks added:	
N/A	







SANCTION

NOTE: Players ordered off or cited by a citing commissioner are provisionally suspended pending the hearing of their case, such suspension should be taken into consideration when sanctioning – As per SRL Competition Regulations and (or equivalent Tournament rule)

Total sanction	Three (3) weeks	☐ Sending off sufficient	
Sanction commences		Immediately	
Sanction concludes		7 September 2025	
Matches/tournaments included in sanction		For the avoidance of doubts please note that the sanction must be understood as three weeks where at least one meaningful match was to be played by the player. Based on the information supplied by his club, The Player is suspended for the following matches: 16 August 2025 vs Helsinki Rugby Club 30 August 2025 vs Porvoo OTS 6 September 2025 vs Turku Eagles	
Costs		N/A	
Date		15 August 2025	
Signature (JO or Chairman)		J AAD	

NOTE: You have 48 hours from notification of the decision of the chairman/jo to lodge an appeal with the tournament director – SRL Competitions Regulation 5.5.1 (or equivalent Tournament rule)



