DISCIPLINARY DECISION

Match	England XV v France XV		
Competition	Summer Internationals 2025		
Date of match	21 June 2025	Match venue	Allianz Stadium, Twickenham
Applicable rules	Summer Internationals Disciplinary Manual		

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE

Player's surname	Woki	Player's forename(s)	Cameron
Player's Union	France	Date of birth	7 November 1998
Referee's name	Hollie Davidson (Scotland)		
Foul Play	☒ Admitted ☐ Not admitted	Red card warranted	☐ Admitted ☒ Not admitted
Offence	9.20(a) – charging into a ruck or maul	SELECT: Red card ☒ Citing ☐ Other ☐ If "Other" selected, please specify:	
Summary of Sanction	Red card not upheld, free to play		

HEARING DETAILS

Hearing date	24/06/2025	Hearing venue	Via Zoom
Chairman/JO	Adam Casselden SC (Aus)		
Other Members of Disciplinary Committee	John Langford (Aus), former international player Valeriu Toma (Rom), former referee		
Appearance Player	Yes ☒ No ☐	Appearance Union	Yes ☒ No ☐
Player's Representative(s)	Will Moir, Legal Representative, Northridge Law Raphaël Ibanez, Team Manager, FFR Jérôme Garcès, Refereeing specialist, FFR Edward Reay-Jones, Head of Legal Affairs & Compliance, FFR	Disciplinary Officer and/or other attendees	Brian Hammond, DDO World Rugby Joyce Hayes, Disciplinary & Eligibility Coordinator World Rugby
List of documents/materials provided to Player in advance of hearing	• Referee's red card report • Incident footage including TMO referral • Player submissions		

SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF CITING/REFEREE'S REPORT/INCIDENT FOOTAGE
The Player, Mr Cameron Woki received a Red Card in the 57th minute of a match played between England XV and France XV at Allianz Stadium, Twickenham on Saturday, 21 June 2025. The Red Card was issued to the Player for a breach of Law 9.20(a) namely, "*A player must not charge into a ruck or maul. Charging includes any contact made without binding onto another player in the ruck or maul*." The Referee's Red Card Report described the incident as "*Always illegal – shoulder charge into breakdown. Contact with the head of E2* [England No. 2] – *this met the YC* [Yellow Card] *threshold and was sent off for* [off] *field review*." When the incident was being reviewed by the Referee a discussion can be heard between the Referee and the TMO over the broadcast footage. On two occasions the Referee said she was "*not seeing a high degree of danger*" which was met with agreement by the TMO. Regrettably no match official reports were provided by the Assistant Referees or the TMO. We are informed that for this match there was no Foul Play Review Officer ("FPRO") and that role was fulfilled by the TMO. The TMO, acting as the FPRO, upgraded the Yellow Card issued by the Referee to a 20 minute Red Card. Notwithstanding the absence of a report from the TMO we have some insight into the TMO's reasoning process when deciding to upgrade the Yellow Card to a Red Card. The TMO and the Referee had a further discussion on this issue which is also heard in the broadcast footage. As part of this discussion the Referee questioned the degree of danger. The TMO stated that "*If it was an always illegal action and a high degree of danger, it would be a permanent red card."* The Referee relayed the same message to the French captain, stating that *"Because it is always an illegal act and we're not seeing a high degree of danger, it is going to be upgraded to a 20 minute red* [card]".

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF OTHER EVIDENCE (e.g. medical reports)
N/A

SUMMARY OF PLAYER'S EVIDENCE
When applying World Rugby's Head Contact Process ("HCP") the Player candidly, and rightly, accepted that: 1. The answer to Question 1 of the HCP was "Yes" as his right shoulder did make contact with E2's head; and 2. The answer to Question 2 of the HCP was also "Yes" as he committed an act of Foul Play in breach of Law 9.20(a) and he was, therefore, at fault. The Player also accepted the Referee was correct to issue a Yellow Card. The answer to Question 3 of the HCP namely, "What was the degree of danger?" is the central question for determination in this matter.

The Player contends that his actions were not a high degree of danger. In support of that contention he submits that he entered the ruck at low speed and force. He argued that his shoulder level on entering the breakdown was very low and he attempted to wrap his right arm around E2 upon contact to complete a legal tackle. His intention was not to engage in a shoulder charge into the breakdown. He further submits that E2's body position changed as he entered the ruck such that E2's head moved to be in line with his right shoulder when he was committed to engaging and had already lowered his body height.

FINDINGS OF FACT

World Rugby, through its counsel, also submitted that the Player's actions were not a high degree of danger under the HCP. This is consistent with the Referee's and TMO's assessment when they assessed the degree of danger shortly after the incident. The Referee said on two occasions that she was "*not seeing a high degree of danger*" which was confirmed by the TMO.

The Disciplinary Committee like World Rugby, the Referee and the TMO found that the Player's actions were not a high degree of danger in answer to Question 3 of the HCP. The Player entered the ruck at low speed and from a short distance away. Whilst there was contact with E2's head by the Player's right shoulder it was of low force more in the nature of a glancing contact. There was no injury to E2 and he continued to play in the match.

Accordingly, the Player's Yellow Card should not have been upgraded to a Red Card as it did not meet the Red Card threshold under the HCP. It should have remained a Yellow Card. The Disciplinary Committee, therefore, dismissed the Red Card and directed that the Red Card be expunged from the Player's disciplinary record. The Player is free to resume playing all forms of rugby.

It seems that the Match Officials fell into error when applying the HCP. They seem to have been confused by their assessment that the Player's actions were "always illegal" thereby warranting a 20 minute Red Card. Under the HCP once the degree of danger (Question 3) has been assessed as "not high" it is immaterial whether the player's actions were "always illegal". That determination may be relevant when determining whether an act of foul play has been committed (Question 2) and further whether mitigation should be applied if the degree of danger has been assessed as a high degree of danger (Question 4). Notwithstanding the Match Officials' error, fortunately it had no bearing on the outcome of the match.

DECISION

Foul play	Admitted ☒ Determined ☐ Not determined ☐ Other disposal (please state) ☐
Red card warranted	Admitted ☐ Determined ☐ Not determined ☒ Other disposal (please state) ☐

REMAINDER OF THE FORM LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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 – R 17.12.5(f) / 17.13.7 (or equivalent Tournament rule)

Total sanction	Red card dismissed, to be expunged from Player's record	Sending off sufficient ☐
Sanction commences	N/A	
Sanction concludes	N/A	
Matches/tournaments included in sanction	N/A	
Costs	N/A	

Signature (JO or Chairman)	Adam Casselden SC	Date	24 June 2025

NOTE: YOU HAVE **48 HOURS (15s) / 24 HOURS (7s)** FROM NOTIFICATION OF THE DECISION OF THE CHAIRMAN/JO TO LODGE AN APPEAL WITH THE TOURNAMENT DIRECTOR – R 17.24.2(a) / R 17.38.1 (or equivalent Tournament rule)