DISCIPLINARY DECISION

Match	South Africa v Italy		
Competition	2025 July Internationals		
Date of match	12 July 2025	Match venue	Nelson Mandela Bay Stadium
Applicable rules	Regulation 17 World Rugby Handbook		

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE

Player's surname	Wiese	Player's forename(s)	Jasper
Player's Union	South Africa	Date of birth	21 / 10 / 1995
Referee's name	Andrew Brace (Ireland)		
Foul Play	☒ Admitted ☐ Not admitted	Red card warranted	☐ Admitted ☒ Not admitted
Offence	Law 9.12: "A player must not physically or verbally abuse anyone. Physical abuse includes, but is not limited to . . . . . striking with . . . head."	SELECT: Red card ☒ Citing ☐ Other ☐ If "Other" selected, please specify:	
Summary of Sanction	4 weeks		

HEARING DETAILS

Hearing date	15 July 2025	Hearing venue	Zoom hearing
Chairman/JO	Rhian Williams (Wales)		
Other Members of Disciplinary Committee	Donal Courtney, former International Referee (Ireland) Valeriu Toma, former Referee (Romania)		
Appearance Player	Yes ☒ No ☐	Appearance Union	Yes ☒ No ☐
Player's Representatives	Chantal du Pisani, South African Rugby Union Isma-eel Dollie, MyPlayers, Players' Union Jaco Peyper, National Laws SA Rugby Attie Heyns, Legal Representative	Disciplinary Officer and/or other attendees	Brian Hammond, DDO World Rugby Joyce Hayes, Disciplinary & Eligibility Coordinator World Rugby
List of documents/materials	• Referee's report – Andrew Brace • TMO's report – Tual Trainini • Statement of Italy Team Manager – Giovanbattista Venditti		

provided to Player in advance of hearing	• Video footage – various clips • Player submissions • Copies of RFU decisions of Gary Graham and Gigena Facundo (both 2022) and Sanzaar decision of Antonio Kiri Kiri (2018) together with video clips of the incidents

PRELIMINARY ISSUE

It was noted that the Referee had referred in his report to a breach of Law 9.11 whilst the TMO had indicated in his report that the nature of the offence was a breach of Law 9.12.

The Player's responses to the Standard Directions had addressed both Law 9.11 and Law 9.12.

The Chair confirmed that the Committee has the power, pursuant to World Rugby Regulation 17.26.2, to amend the offence for which the Player was shown the Red Card. She mentioned that the Committee could hear submissions from the parties at this stage before making a decision as to the appropriate Law in this case or the Committee could listen to all of the evidence and make a decision on the appropriate Law at a later stage in the hearing.

Mr Heyns submitted on behalf of the Player that Law 9.12 was the more appropriate Law in this case. Mr Hammond advised of the Laws' different entry points contained in Appendix 1 of Regulation 17 and the fact that the mandatory 'mid range' entry point applies to Law 9.11 but not to 9.12. Mr Heyns reaffirmed his view and, there being no objections, the Chair confirmed that the Committee would amend the offence from 9.11 to 9.12.

The hearing proceeded in this manner.

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

Law 9.12 states: "A player must not physically or verbally abuse anyone. Physical abuse includes, but is not limited to, biting, punching, contact with the eye or eye area, striking with any part of the arm, shoulder, head or knee(s), stamping, trampling, tripping or kicking."

The Referee's report of the incident which happened at 21:08 minutes into the first half stated, *"Following a TMO referral, I reviewed the incident in question where Italy 1 + SA8 were holding each other following the whistle being blown. SA8 takes exception to this and leads with his head to the player which warranted a permanent red card."*

The TMO's report was as follows: *"At 21.08, a niggle started between 1 ITA and 8 SA after the referee blew his whistle. There were push and shove between these two players. Then 8 SA did a head butt to 1 ITA. A formal TMO review has been done, and after checking multiple angles, it led to a permanent red card."*

The Chair asked that, first, the video clips entitled 'WINT_RSAVITA' and 'TX720' be watched without sound or comment. The video showed a maul, on the Italian left, ending with the Referee awarding a penalty to Italy. As the players from both teams dispersed from the maul, the Player and Italy 1 Danilo Fischetti ("I1") could be seen in physical engagement. Each of them, with strong outstretched arms, held the other by his shirt under his chin. Players from both sides intervened and gathered around to separate the two protagonists. It was in the middle of this gathering, with both players still holding the other, that the alleged offence for which the Red Card was issued, occurred.

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

A statement from Italy's Team Manager, Giovanbattista Venditti, said:

"*We would like to confirm that following the incident which led to the red card shown to Jasper Wiese, he immediately attempted to clarify the situation with our player involved.*

At the end of the match, the opposing player came to our locker room voluntarily to express his apologies once again. As a sign of respect, he brought a small gift – a match pennant – and showed genuine regret for his actions. The two players had a calm and respectful conversation, exchanged shirts, took a photo together, and finally shared a beer in a very friendly atmosphere.

The player acknowledged that his reaction was impulsive, but not violent or intentional, and stated that such behavior does not reflect his usual conduct on the field.

We also confirm that our player did not suffer any injury and considers the matter completely resolved in the spirit of fair play."

SUMMARY OF PLAYER'S EVIDENCE

The Player accepted that he had committed an act of foul play but not that it warranted a Red Card.

In his responses to the Standard Directions, Mr Heyns, on behalf of the Player, had stated as follows:

"THE PLAYER'S ACCOUNT

- The Player's conduct must be understood in the full context of the on-field events.
- Immediately following the conclusion of a maul, while getting to his feet, the Player felt rubbing and tapping on his head, accompanied by the words "well done number 8, well done" coming from the Italian loosehead prop, who was facing him.
- The tone and gesture carried a taunting undertone, and the Player turned to face his opponent.
- Both players instinctively reached for each other's jerseys, engaging in a "square-up".
- Each player held the other by the front of the jersey, and the proximity between them decreased rapidly as other players began crowding around.
- In this moment, the Player and the Italian prop simultaneously stepped toward each other, maintaining a strong grip on each other's jerseys.
- The Player intended to assert himself in the confrontation by stepping in closer to square up face-to-face, but did not intend to deliver a blow or make forceful contact with the opponent's head.
- Both players moved their heads towards one another in the course of the confrontation, although the Player advanced slightly more than his opponent.
- As a result, both players contributed to the head contact that followed.
- The resulting contact was slight and fleeting. It was not driven by force, aggression, or malicious intent. It was the unintended consequence of two players moving toward each other in the heat of a confrontation.
- The Player did not lead with his head, did not use his head as a weapon, and did not attempt to strike. There was no follow-through, no injury, and no attempt to simulate a blow."

The Player was invited to add to this explanation and to refer the Committee to any video footage he wished.

He reiterated that after the maul, he had felt I1 rubbing his head and "went to grab him by the shirt". His intention had been "to square up, get eye to eye with him".

Mr Heyns asserted that both players had moved their heads towards each other and "pushed their heads together". He referred to the incidents of head contact in 'Graham', 'Gigena' and 'Kiri Kiri' – which, he submitted, were more forceful and significant than in the present case and which had, in each occasion, led to the respective disciplinary committees overturning the red cards. The Chair confirmed that, whilst the Committee would consider all of the evidence before it, each case in rugby discipline must be determined upon its own unique facts weighed against the provisions of the relevant Law, and should not be influenced by interpretations of different facts in different contexts.

In response to questions from the Committee regarding a number of inconsistencies in the Player's responses, it was accepted by Mr Heyns that the Player "does push his head forward." And the Committee was to disregard the reference in the responses to the Player's conduct being accidental. He declined to take the Committee through the Player's written account step by step by reference to the video and urged the Committee to watch the footage at full speed and not frame by frame.

The Player was given the opportunity to make further representations but confirmed he had said all he wished to say.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Committee left the meeting and considered in private all of the evidence that had been produced and everything they had heard and seen. The Committee reminded themselves that the standard of proof in their factual determinations is the balance of probabilities and it was for the Player to establish that the Referee was wrong to issue a Red Card.

With careful analysis of all video evidence available, the Committee found the following:

The Player had been provoked by the action of I1 who, as the maul broke up, reached over and rubbed the Player's head as illustrated by the following screenshot:

As confirmed by the Player, this led to an altercation between the two players and the physical confrontation shown in the following pictures:

The Committee found that, in the melee that resulted from the players' confrontation, the Player raised his head and moved it towards I1's face. Contact was made by the Player's forehead with I1's face. See below:

In the unanimous view of the Committee, this contact was not, as had been described "slight and fleeting" and "negligible" but rather, it amounted to a strike with the head in clear contravention of Law 9.12.

The Committee concluded that the Player had not shown on the balance of probabilities that the Referee was wrong to issue him with a Red Card. The Red Card was therefore not overturned but upheld by the Committee.

DECISION

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

SANCTIONING PROCESS

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS

Assessment of Intent – R 17.18.1(a)-(b) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
Intentional ☒	Reckless ☐
State Reasons	
The Player had "wanted to square up" to his opponent. He had moved his forehead towards the face of I1. This was a deliberate act even if it not been his aim to 'headbutt' I1.	
Nature of actions – R 17.18.1(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
The Player had raised and moved his head forward, hitting I1 in the face. The strike was of a low force and I1 had suffered no injury.	
Existence of provocation – R 17.18.1(d) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
Justifiably or not, the Player was provoked by the actions of I1 who had rubbed and tapped his head and spoken to him in a "taunting" manner.	
Whether player retaliated – R 17.18.1(e) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
The Player acted, again, whether justifiably or not, in retaliation to the provocation.	
Self-defence – R 17.18.1(f) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
N/A	
Effect on victim – R 17.18.1(g) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
The Italy Team Manager confirmed that I1 had not suffered injury	
Effect on match – R 17.18.1(h) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
There was no adverse reaction from the other players.	
Vulnerability of victim – R 17.18.1(i) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
I1 was upright, facing the Player and not in a vulnerable position.	
Level of participation/premeditation – R 17.18.1(j) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	

The Player participated fully in the strike with his head. The Committee accepted that his actions were not pre-meditated but a disproportionate reaction to I1's actions.
Conduct completed/attempted – R 17.18.1(k) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
The Player's strike to the head was completed.
Other features of player's conduct – R 17.18.1(l) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
N/A

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS CONTINUED

Entry point (*select entry point and indicate n° of weeks/matches starting point*)		
Top end* ☐	Mid-range ☐	Low-end X
N° of Weeks/Matches	N° of Weeks/Matches	N° Weeks/Matches 6

*****If Top End, the JO or Panel should identify, if appropriate, an entry point between the Top End and the maximum sanction and provide the reasons for selecting this entry point, below.

In making this assessment, the JO/Committee should consider World Rugby Regulations 17.18.1(a), 17.18.1(g), and 17.18.1(h) or the equivalent provisions within the Tournament Rules referred to above.

Reasons for selecting Entry Point above Top End

RELEVANT OFF-FIELD MITIGATING FACTORS

Acknowledgement of commission of foul play – R 17.19.1(a) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	Player's disciplinary record – R 17.19.1(b) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
The Player had acknowledged that he had committed an act of foul play at the earliest opportunity.	The Player produced the following disciplinary record: 📋 **Jasper Wiese – Foul Play Disciplinary Record** **Date** / **Club/Team** / **Incident** / **Law / Offence** / **Sanction** Feb 2021 / Leicester Tigers / Dangerous ruck clear-out vs Wasps / Law 9.20(a) – Head contact at ruck / 4-week suspension Dec 2021 / Leicester Tigers / Accumulation of 3 yellow cards in Premiership / Multiple foul play yellows (technical ban) / 2-match suspension Sept 2021 / South Africa (Springboks) / Illegal clean-out vs Australia – **Cited** / Law 9.12 – Striking with head (TMO review) / **Citing dismissed** May 2024 / Leicester Tigers / Dangerous lift and drop vs Exeter Chiefs / Law 9.20 – Lifting and dropping, head contact / 6-match suspension After questioning from the Committee, it was established that he had received two earlier suspensions whilst playing for the Cheetahs in the (former) Pro14.

Youth and/or inexperience of player – R 17.19.1(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	Conduct prior to and at hearing – – R 17.19.1(d) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
The Player is aged 29 and has played a great deal of rugby since turning professional in 2018. He is an experienced international player.	Despite English not being his first language, the Player took an interested and courteous part in proceedings.
Remorse and timing of remorse – R 17.19.1(e) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	Other off-field mitigation – R 17.19.1(f) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
The Player had apologised to I1 after the incident and again after the match. This was confirmed by the Italy Team Manager.	Jaco Peyper described the Player as "fully professional", "a great team man" and "a leader."

Number of weeks/matches deducted | 2 |

Summary of reason for number of weeks/matches deducted:
The Committee reminded itself that, when considering a reduction from the entry point suspension under 17.19.2 of the Regulations, Disciplinary Committees are required to start at 0% and work up to a maximum of 50%. The Committee acknowledged that a number of mitigating factors were present: acknowledgement of commission of foul play, conduct and remorse. No deduction could be made in respect of the Player's disciplinary record due to his previous suspensions.

ADDITIONAL RELEVANT OFF-FIELD AGGRAVATING FACTORS

Player's status as an offender of the Laws of the Game – R 17.20.1(a) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Although the Player has served a number of suspensions for foul play, it was noted that this was the first suspension under Law 9.12.
Need for deterrence – R 17.20.1(b) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
N/A
Any other off-field aggravating factors – R 17.20.1(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
N/A

Number of additional weeks/matches | 0 |

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	4 weeks	Sending off sufficient ☐
Sanction commences	12 July 2025	
Sanction concludes	6 September 2025 *	
Matches/tournaments included in sanction	19 July 2025: South Africa v Georgia 16 August 2025: South Africa v Australia 23 August 2025: South Africa v Australia 6 September 2025: New Zealand v South Africa * The Player's pre-season club schedule (with Urayasu D-Rocks) has yet to be finalised. He / his club are to inform the Committee and World Rugby if he would be expected to play in any matches before the end of his suspension.	
Costs	N/A	

Signature (JO or Chairman)		Date	15 July 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)