



# Protest and discipline 2024

**Appeal-**

**Dear Amrik,**

The appeal committee has considered the request to set aside your suspension.

Here is the appeal committee response, "The conduct for which Mr. Rai was suspended was very serious. Our decision should not be taken as any condonation of Mr. Rai's conduct. However, we have given weight to the remorse expressed by Mr. Rai on his conduct, the assurance given by him to not repeat such conduct in the future and the volunteer work done by Mr. Rai for the game of Cricket. Considering all the circumstances the appeal committee has decided to set aside the suspension with immediate effect. We ask the protest and discipline committee of BCMCA to monitor the conduct of Mr. Rai for the next 18 months.

No leniency should be shown for any future violation of the BCMCL Code of Conduct."

As we discussed, I trust you that going forward, you will act in best interest of BCMCL, and members around and will not do anything which will jeopardize your or other safety or reputation.

---

Decision 001/2024

Dated: April 27, 2024

Background:

On April 22, 2024, Surrey Warriors Cricket Club (Warriors) filed a protest for game # 904 played on April 21, 2024 at Delview Park between Newton Surrey Cricket Club (Newton) and Warriors. In their complaint, the Warriors alleged that Newton players Kinchit Yadav BCMCL ID# 4250262 and Narinder Singh BCMCL ID# 4254748 did not have their profile pictures uploaded on BCMCL website. The Warriors relied on BCMCL Committee directive communicated by the BCMCL Secretary to all clubs on April 6, 2024 that each player MUST upload his /her picture on their respective BCMCL profile. 4 points will be deducted of the infringing team if a dispute in made in this regard. The following evidence was provided by Warriors to corroborate their allegations:

- BCMCL Secretary emailed dated April 6, 2024.
- Screenshots from the BCMCL App for the above-mentioned players.
- Newton Team list for game # 904.
- Screenshot of the scorecard for game # 904.



# Protest and discipline 2024

On April 23, 2024, BCMCL Secretary apprised Newton of the protest for game # 904 and requested to provide a response within 7 days.

## Investigation:

On April 23, 2024, Newton provided a response by clarifying that the pictures attached by Warriors are from the BCMCL App, but the BCMCL website clearly shows the photos of both players on their profiles. Newton suggests that there could be some glitch as the photos are not showing up on the app. Newton provided profile screenshots of both players from the BCMCL website.

On April 23, 2024, a request was made to BCMCL Stats Desk to check from the backend when the photos of the above-mentioned players were uploaded to the BCMCL website.

On April 25, 2024, the BCMCL Stats Desk reported that Kinchit Yadav ID # 4250262 profile photo was upload on April 15, 2024 at 00:28:31 hours and Narinder Singh ID # 4254748 profile photo was upload on April 16, 2024 at 22:22:15 hours. The profile photos of the above-mentioned players were uploaded before April 21, 2024 (game #904).

## Decision:

Based on the available information and P&D's investigation, Warriors' protest for game # 904 is dismissed because Newton players Kinchit Yadav ID # 4250262 and Narinder Singh ID # 4254748 had their profile photos on the BCMCL website before game # 904. Therefore, the result of the game # 904 stands.

---

Decision 002/2024

Dated: June

3, 2024

Background: on May 12, 2024, IndCan Cricket Club protested the game result of match number 504 played on April 21, 2024 between Windies Cricket Club



# Protest and discipline 2024

(Windies) and IndCan Cricket Club (IndCan). In their protest, IndCan allege Windies committed a breach of BCMCL Governing Rule number 28 (Fair use of players) by moving Steven Gallimore ID # 2700327 between Premier Division and Division 5. The following evidence was provided by IndCan to corroborate their allegations:

- In 2023, Steven Gallimore played 12 out of 20 games in the Elite Division.
- In previous years, including 2022, Gallimore played either in the Premier Division or Division 4.
- Gallimore played in Division 5 in the first game of the 2024 regular season, and in the second game, he participated in a Premier Division match against Cosmos for Windies 1.
- The scorecard of Match No. 504 confirms Gallimore's impactful performance in the game against IndCan 3. However, impact on the game is not a factor that was considered in making this decision.
- The second game for Windies 2 was scheduled for the weekend of April 26th/27th, 2024, but was rained out, leading to Gallimore's appearance in the Premier Division game against Cosmos on May 5th, 2024.

On May 26, 2024, BCMCL Secretary apprised Windies of the protest for game # 504 and requested to provide a response within 5 days.

## Investigation:

On May 29, 2024, Windies provided a response refuting IndCan's evidence by clarifying the following:

- Mr. Gilmore started the 2024 season playing with our Team II, as he had ended the 2023 Season playing with our Team II.

In 2022, the entire members of Team 2 of Windies Cricket Club played in the Division 4. This team was subsequently downgraded to Div 5 - the entire Team of players. Mr. Gallimore started the 2024 Season on the Windies Team II. His first game was April 21st. The following second game for this Team II was rained out, and the third game, for which he was



# Protest and discipline 2024

unavailable, was called mid-way due to rain. According to the BCMCL bylaws, rain outs/abandoned matches count as games played, therefore Mr. Gallimore started his first 2 games of the 2024 Season with the Windies Team II and was unavailable for the third game (which Team II had as an abandoned game). His unavailability to play on the Team II's 3rd game on May 5th, does not mean that Mr. Gallimore was playing for our Team 1 at this time.

· Between April 21st to May 5th, 2024, after 3 weeks/games with Windies II, only then was Mr. Gallimore called up to play with Windies Team I on May 11th, 2024. He has since remained with Windies 1. On May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2024, Windies provided further response which pointed out the following errors in IndCan's protest:

- a) "The Division 5 game on April 4th, 2024 (Match No: 504)." Windies did not play any games on April 4th, our first game 2024 Season game, against the IndCan Cricket Club, Div 5 Team, was played on April 21st.
- b) "In 2023, Steven Gallimore played 12 out of 20 games in the Elite Division" The cricket season has a maximum of 18 games, quoting that Mr. Gallimore played 20 games for the season is incorrect!

The P&D Committee conducted in depth analysis of Mr. Gallimore's BCMCL career and found the following:

- I. In 2022 season, Mr. Gallimore played 10 games in Division 4 for Windies II Team.
- II. In 2023 season, Mr. Gallimore played 12 games in Elite Division for Windies I Team and played 8 games in Division 4 for Windies II Team.
- III. In 2023 season, Mr. Gallimore started the season by playing first 5 games in Elite Division and then played 3 games in Division 4. Subsequently Mr. Gallimore played 1 more game in Elite Division and played 3 games in Division 4. Mr. Gallimore then played 4 games in Elite Division and played 1 game in Division 4



# Protest and discipline 2024

Thereafter, Mr. Gallimore played 2 more games in Elite Division and played last game of the season in Division 4.

IV. Review of Mr. Gallimore's 2023 seasons suggests that he was in breach of BCMCL Governing Rule 28 (d) which states that "*No player is ALLOWED to play in any of the LAST three (3) games of the season, unless he is sent down for ALL those three (3) games, and he misses 3 games from the higher division.*"

V. Mr. Gallimore commenced his 2024 season with Windies II Division 5 Team on April 21, 2024 in a game against IndCan. However, after 3 weeks, on May 11, 2024, started playing in Premier Division for Windies I team. As per the player search performed Mr. Gallimore is registered with Windies I.

VI. The Premier Division rained out games (game #2005 for April 28 and game # 2006 for May 05) do not list any of the Windies I players including Mr. Gallimore on the online scorecard and neither any of the opposing team players were listed.

VII. The Division 5 rained out game number 507 for April 27 also do not list any of Windies II players including Mr. Gallimore nor opposing team players were listed on the online scorecard.

## Decision:

Based on the available information and P&D's investigation, it is uncontroverted that Mr. Gallimore was "picked to play" for Division 5 in the very first game of the 2024 season and did not "play" three (3) games in that lower division.

The preamble of Rule 28 of the Governing Rules determines the applicability of that rule. The preamble clearly states that this rule is to deal with situation of movement of



# Protest and discipline 2024

players between teams within a club. It captures movement of any player between teams within a club.

Rule 28(a) of the Governing Rules applies to a player who is either sent down from a higher division of a club to a lower division of that club or is picked to play in a lower division (emphasis added). In both scenarios such a player must play a minimum of three (3) games in the lower division for which he was picked to play.

The P&D committee had reached a similar decision in *Game #838 of the 2022 season played between Surrey United and Kings Cricket Club*. However, that decision was overturned by the appeal committee on the ground that the player in question in that case was a new registrant in BCMCL as such did not have an established division.

We are bound by decisions of the appeal committee but this case differs from the *Surrey United v Kings Cricket Case*, in as much as Mr. Gallimore was an established player of Elite Division in 2023 and was registered with Windies I for the 2024 season. As such he was either a higher division player who was sent down or was a player picked to play in the lower division and in either case should have played three (3) games in that lower division. A failure to play three (3) games in the lower division resulted in the breach of Rule 28(a).

We also have to consider whether the protest was made on time and we have determined that it was. The infraction of Rule 28(a) did not occur until May 11, 2024 as such the seven days to protest the decision of “any game” based on the infraction started to run from May 11, 2024. The protest was filed on May 12, 2024 as such it was filed in time and in accordance with the Rules.

Based on the above, IndCan’s protest for game # 504 is allowed and the game is awarded to Indcan.



# Protest and discipline 2024

Mr. Gallimore's breach of BCMCL Governing Rule 28 (d) in the 2023 season is beyond the scope of present protest due to significant time has lapsed and more importantly no complaint was received by the P&D Committee. However, we ask Windies to ensure strict compliance with the requirements of Rule 28.

---

Decision 003/2024  
10, 2024

Dated: June

## Background:

Cosmos has protested the result match 302 played with PakCan III ("PakCan"). Cosmos has alleged that PakCan, which was batting second, refused to return back to the playing field despite a direction from the umpires as such they forfeited the game.

In their response PakCan deny receiving such a direction from both umpires (emphasis added). They claim that one of the umpire was in favor of resumption, whereas the other umpire was not. They claim that both umpires should have been in favor of resuming play and without a consensus between the umpires a direction from one umpire was not binding. Essentially, they do not dispute that a direction to resume play was issued but claim that it was non-binding because it was not issued by both umpires.

## Investigation:

As part of our investigation, the chair of the P&D committee spoke to the umpire who was the junior of the two umpires officiating the game that day. That umpire confirmed that initially there was a disagreement between the two umpires regarding conditions of play but both umpires eventually agreed with each other that play should resume, their decision to resume play was then communicated to the batting and fielding team by the umpire, who according to the umpire we spoke to was the senior of the two umpires. The score sheet submitted by PakCan contains a notation which confirms that the teams were called into play at 6:34 pm and the game was called off at 6:45 pm.

Decision: BCMCL has adopted MCC laws relating to conditions of the ground for play to take place. According to Law 2.7 and 2.8 of the BCMCL Playing Rules both umpires



# Protest and discipline 2024

have to agree that the conditions are no longer dangerous or unreasonable for play to resume and upon taking that decision they shall call upon the players to resume play. The umpire's decision can be can be communicated by any one of the two umpires on the ground. Once an umpire informs the players that conditions are suitable for play players should accept that the decision has been made by both umpires, absent a recorded disagreement, and must comply with the direction and promptly resume play.

As noted above the umpire who was initially not satisfied that the conditions had improved to the extent that it was no longer dangerous or unreasonable for play to resume, eventually agreed that play can resume and it was the joint decision of the umpires that was communicated to the batting team with a direction to resume play at 6:34 pm. It was further discovered from our investigation that it was PakCan that essentially refused to resume play. Time was lost as a result of this conduct of PakCan. If play had resumed at 6:34 PM a few more overs could have been played by the time conditions again became unplayable, which would have allowed both teams an opportunity to out play the other on run rate. Our rules are very clear that players and team captains do not get to decide about ground conditions and that issue is solely within the jurisdiction of the umpires. A failure to comply with umpire direction is not acceptable and cannot be condoned as this conduct essentially overruled the umpires' decision.

In the circumstances a refusal to resume play by PakCan amounted to forfeiture of the game by PakCan.

Based on the foregoing match 302 is awarded to Cosmos IV.

---

Decision 004/2024

Dated: June

10, 2024

We have received an umpire's report from umpire, Mr. Gagan Singh ("Mr. Singh"). In his report Mr. Singh has cited the behavior of PakCan player, Waqar Younas BC MCL





# Protest and discipline 2024

ID 1246808 (Mr. Younas”) during a first division game played between Richmond and PakCan on May 12, 2024 (match 115). In his report Mr. Singh has complained that Mr. Younas hurled abuses at Mr. Singh after being given out caught behind, he also showed unreasonable dissent on the umpire's decision.

## Decision

As noted in our previous decisions, BCMCL has zero-tolerance for umpire abuse. We have concluded that Mr. Younas committed a level 2.7 offense under the BCMCL Code of Conduct for which he is suspended for two-games. This suspension shall take effect immediately upon publishing of this decision.

---

## Decision 005/2024

Dated: June 10, 2024

On May 19, 2024 we received an umpire’s report from a club umpire Manav Arora of PakCan Cricket Club. The report was made to the statistician of BCMCL and not to the secretary of BCMCL, which is a requirement of our Governing Rules. Be that as it may and given our policy of zero tolerance for umpire abuse, we

have accepted Mr. Arora’s report despite the irregularity. In his report Mr. Arora has cited Mandeep Shah BCMCL ID 2553286 (“Mr. Arora”) of the West Vancouver Cricket Club during a game played between Cosmos Cricket Club and West Vancouver Cricket Club on May 18, 2024. Mr. Arora has complained that Mandeep Shah “cursed” the umpires and used offensive language against them.

## Decision

As noted in our previous decisions, BCMCL has zero-tolerance for umpire abuse.

We have concluded that Mr. Shah committed a level 2.7 offense under the BCMCL Code of Conduct for which he is suspended for one game. This suspension shall take effect immediately upon publishing of this decision.

---



# Protest and discipline 2024

Decision 006/2024  
10, 2024

Dated: June

## Background:

Abbotsford Cricket Club has protested the result of game 2008 played with Surrey Hawks Cricket Club on May 4, 2024 on the basis that Surrey Hawks committed manipulation of statistics by playing an inactive player by the name of Harman Singh Rai. Surrey Hawks, in their response, vehemently deny the allegation made by Abbotsford. In their response Surrey Hawks state that the player of concern, Mr. Harman Singh joined Surrey Hawks cricket club in 2023.

Mr. Harman Singh was playing for Abbotsford Cricket Club before joining Surrey Hawks in 2023. For unknown reasons, Abbotsford had created 2 different ID one as Harman Singh (2129363) and the other as Harman Singh Rai (1244705). Both the ID were linked with Harman Singh's email id that is [singh.harman7383@outlook.com](mailto:singh.harman7383@outlook.com). When Harman Singh submitted his waiver form this year ID 2129363 was activated.

Harman Singh has played many games for Abbotsford cricket club under ID number 2129363 for many years.

Surrey Hawks attached the screenshot from BCMCL website for reference.

With respect to the disputed game #2008, Surrey Hawks used ID 2129363 as it was showing active on BCMCL website and used the same ID on their team list.

They also attached the team list for the game #2008 to their response.

## Investigation:

We verified the claims made by Abbotsford and the information supplied by Surrey Hawks in Response with BCMCL statistician and he confirmed that the information provided by Surrey Hawks is accurate, in as much as the date of birth



# Protest and discipline 2024

and email id attached to both player IDs noted above matched. As such Harman Singh and Harman Singh Rai are one and the same individual.

## Decision:

Based on the available information and P&D's investigation, the complaint of Abbotsford Cricket Club is unfounded and the same is dismissed.

---

Decision 008/2024 Dated: June 16, 2024

### Background and Investigation

On June 06, 2024, West Coast Tamils Cricket Club ("West Coast"), protested the result of game# 329 played against Surrey Stars Cricket Club ("Surrey Stars") on June 1, 2024. In their protest, West Coast claims that Surrey Stars played Manpreet Singh Hari who had forfeited his registered registration in BCMCL as a result of playing in another league, outside of BCMCL.

Manpreet responded to the claim of West Coast by accepting his mistake of playing in another league and apologizing for it. Manpreet claimed that he was not aware of Rule 10 of the BC MCL Governing Rules. He provided an assurance that he will not participate in any other league other than BCMCL going forward.

### Decision

Rule 10 of the Governing Rules states that a player who registers or plays cricket for any other league in the lower mainland forfeits his or her registration with BCMCL. As such Manpreet forfeited his registration with BCMCL when he registered to play for Last Man Stands Canada, thereby making Manpreet is an unregistered player as at June 01, 2024. While Manpreet pleads ignorance of Rule 10 in his defense, his ignorance cannot be treated as a defense, it is a well-known maxim that "ignorance of law is not a defense."

Since Manpreet forfeited his registration in BCMCL all consequences for playing an unregistered player should follow. However, given Manpreet's apology and his candid admission we have decided to be flexible in our sanctions flowing from Manpreet's conduct. It is our decision that game 329 is forfeited to West Coast, but we are not issuing any suspension to the captain of Surrey Stars or to any other



# Protest and discipline 2024

player including Manpreet. If Manpreet applies for registration in BCMCL as a player for Surrey Stars, then his registration should be accepted immediately.

---

Decision 009/2024 Dated: June 16, 2024

## Background and Decision

On June 12, 2024 we received an umpire report from league umpire Waqar Younas (“Waqar”) in which Waqar has cited Gagan Singh player ID 1245775 of Meralomas Cricket Club for alleged misbehavior during a pre-season T20 game played on March 24, 2024.

Interestingly, this report was made by Waqar almost 3 months after the alleged incident and immediately following the suspension of Waqar by the P&D based on an umpire report filed by Gagan Singh.

T

he timing of Waqar’s report and the delay in making the report lower the overall credibility of Waqar’s report and makes it questionable. Without commenting further on this we simply dismiss this umpire’s report on the ground of lateness. We warn Waqar, that being a certified league umpire, his conduct on and off the field will be monitored closely by P&D both as a player as well as an official.

We also request VCUSA to discuss the requirements of continuing as a certified league umpire with Waqar.

---

Decision 010/2024 Dated: June 16, 2024

## Background and Decision

On May 30, 2024 Surrey Warriors Cricket Club (“Surrey Warriors”) protested the result of midweek T20 game # 226 played against Richmond Cricket Club (“Richmond”) on May 30, 2024,

on the basis that Richmond played Maninderjit Singh Aulakh, who had played 3 games for the



# Protest and discipline 2024

Division I team of Richmond in the 2024 regular season, as such could not have played in Division 2 of the midweek T20 tournament. Maninderjit had been granted permission by the Special Events Committee to play in Division 2 of the midweek T20 tournament.

On June 2, 2024 Surrey Warriors added to their protest of the same game by alleging that Sanjeet Sadana a Division I player of Richmond had played in the Division 2 game of midweek T20. Sanjeet is a player over 45 years of age.

On June 16, 2024 Surrey Warriors applied to withdraw their protest. Generally, once a protest is made P&D has to adjudicate the protest on its merits and it cannot be withdrawn by the protesting club. However, exceptional circumstances exist here which justify allowing the

withdrawal of this protest. As such we allow the withdrawal of this protest. Surrey Warriors should not be levied any fee for this protest.

We also take this opportunity to request the Special Events Committee to strictly apply the Special Events Rules related to midweek T20. According to the applicable rule all players in Division 2 of midweek T20 should be players who have played in Division 2 and lower in the regular season. If any exception is to be made to this rule it must happen by a majority decision of the Special Events Committee.

We thank Surrey Warriors for withdrawing their protest as it has avoided a situation that could have adversely affected the ongoing midweek T20 tournament.

---

Decision 011/2024 Dated: June 16, 2024

## Background and Decision

On May 23, 2024 we received an umpire's report from league umpire, Balaji Sundarrangan regarding midweek T20 game played between Richmond Cricket Club ("Richmond") and Langley Cricket Club on May 23, 2024. In his report the umpire has reported the conduct of Harpreet Singh Virk ID 1246670 of the Pakcan Cricket Club and Harmandeep Singh ID 1245808



# Protest and discipline 2024

of Richmond. Harpreet was a match official alongside Balaji for that match and Harmandeep was a player participating. Both individuals got into an argument regarding a runout decision made by Harpreet.

We remind both players of the BCMCL Code of Conduct. Both players conduct was a Level I offense under the Code of Conduct. We reprimand both players for their unsportsmanlike behaviour and remind them that any future misconduct may result in severe penalties.

---

**Decision 012/2024 Dated: June 18, 2024**

Meralomas Cricket Club, by correspondence dated June 18, 2024, has requested a reconsideration of our decision dated June 11, 2024, to suspend the player wearing jersey #10.

They state that this player, who has now been identified as Thomas Viljoen, should be given an opportunity to be heard. The decision to suspend the player wearing jersey number 10 was made based on the video evidence reviewed. P&D determined that the player seen on the video violated BCMCL Code of Conduct and his actions amounted to a level 2.5 offense under the BCMCA code of conduct.

Our bylaws do not provide for an opportunity for a hearing in case of suspension or expulsion of a playing member but since Thomas's conduct was discovered during the course of our investigation, we are prepared to give an opportunity to Thomas to provide a response or to clarify any matters that are shown in the video that we have reviewed. In this regard, we are permitting Thomas Viljoen time until June 24, 2024 to provide a response and his suspension is deferred until that date.

---

**Decision 013/2024**  
**2024**

**Dated: July 3,**

**Background: On June 09<sup>th</sup>, 2024, Surrey Hawks Cricket Club (Surrey Hawks) protested the game result of match number 231 played on June 08<sup>th</sup>, 2024**



# Protest and discipline 2024

between Salim Akbar Cricket Club (Salim Akbar) and Surrey Hawks. In their protest, Surrey Hawks allege Salim Akbar committed a breach of BCMCL Governing Rule number 28 (Fair use of players specifically 28a and 28b) and Rule 32 by moving Kai Patrick ID # 2747212 between Division 2 and Premier Division. The following evidence was provided by Surrey Hawks to corroborate their allegations:

- In 2023, Kai Patrick played in Premier Division for Centurion Cricket Club and played his last game of the season in Premier Division on September 10, 2023.
- Surrey Hawks provided screenshots of Mr. Patrick's BCMCL profile and his stats.

On June 10, 2024, BCMCL Secretary apprised Salim Akbar of the protest for game number 231 and requested to provide a response within 7 days.

## Investigation:

On June 12, 2024, Salim Akbar asked for further clarification pertaining to this protest and same day Surrey Hawks provided a response clarifying issues raised by Salim Akbar. On June 14, 2024, Salim Akbar provided their response refuting Surrey Hawks's protest and asked P&D Committee to deny this protest.

P&D Committee conducted a comprehensive review of Mr. Patrick's BCMCL's stats, and it confirmed that Mr. Patrick played majority of his games in Premier and Elite Divisions in the prior BCMCL seasons. Furthermore, it is learned that Mr. Patrick is a paid professional cricketer from Barbados and has skill set appropriate for Premier or Elite Divisions. For this reason, Mr. Patrick's immediate prior year's performance in the BCMCL does count in light of Rule 28 (a) and 28 (b) when placing a player in the new season regardless of whether they are part of old or new club. In addition, Rule 32 comes into play as well due to fact that "clubs must use players in the division to which their skills are most appropriate."



# Protest and discipline 2024

## **Decision:**

Based on the available information and P&D's investigation, it is uncontroverted that Mr. Patrick was "picked to play" for Division 2 in the very first game of the 2024 season and did not "play" three (3) games in that lower division before playing in Premier Division.

The preamble of Rule 28 of the Governing Rules determines the applicability of that rule. The preamble clearly states that this rule is to deal with situation of movement of players between teams within a club. It captures movement of any player between teams within a club.

Rule 28(a) of the Governing Rules applies to a player who is either sent down from a higher division of a club to a lower division of that club or is picked to play in a lower division (emphasis added). In both scenarios such a player must play a minimum of three (3) games in the lower division for which he was picked to play.

In a recent P&D Committee decision in game #504 of the 2024 season played between *IndCan Cricket Club and Windies Cricket Club*, P&D Committee reached a similar decision as in this case and concluded that *Windies Cricket Club* had breached Rule 28.

The P&D committee had reached a similar decision in *Game #838 of the 2022 season played between Surrey United and Kings Cricket Club*. However, that decision was overturned by the appeal committee on the ground that the player in question in that case was a new registrant in BCMCL as such did not have an established division.





# Protest and discipline 2024

We are bound by decisions of the appeal committee, but this case differs from the *Surrey United v Kings Cricket Case*, in as much as Mr. Patrick was an established player of Premier Division in 2023 and was registered with Salim Akbar for the

2024 season. As such he was either a higher division player who was sent down or was a player picked to play in the lower division and in either case should have played three (3) games in that lower division. A failure to play three (3) games in the lower division resulted in the breach of Rule 28(a).

Based on the above, Surrey Hawks's protest for game # 231 is allowed and the game is awarded to Surrey Hawks.

P&D Committee

---

Decision 014/2024 Dated: July 4, 2024

## Background:

On June 14, 2024, Richmond Cricket Club ("Richmond") protested the game result of match number 334 played on June 08<sup>th</sup>, 2024 with Okanagan Royals ("OR"). In their protest, Richmond seeks imposition of penalty points to OR for their slow over rate pursuant to Playing Rules – Law 13. In support of their protest Richmond has provided screen shots from the online scoring app.

## Investigation:

No investigation is required for reasons explained below.

## Decision:



# Protest and discipline 2024

The decision to issue penalty points for slow over rate is squarely within the discretion of the on-field umpires. There are sound reasons for this exclusive discretion to on field umpires one of which is that the on-field umpires are the best judge of whether the slow over rate was excusable or not. Timely warnings are required to be given by the umpires before applying penalty points to allow the offending team to make up the slow over rate. The P&D committee

has the jurisdiction to review and rule on umpire decisions on penalty points however, P&D cannot award penalty points in the first instance after the fact on a protest where the on field umpires have not considered the issue of slow over rate during the game. In this case the umpires did not issue the required warnings to OR for slow over rate, there is no report from the umpires regarding the over rate either or on whether this issue was even considered during

the match. In the circumstances, OR cannot be penalized. As such the protest is denied.

---