

DISCIPLINARY DECISION



Match	Fiji v Canada		
Competition	Pacific Nations Cup ("PNC") 2026		
Date of match	12 September 2026	Match venue	Hanazono Rugby Stadium
Applicable rules	Regulation 17 World Rugby Handbook; PNC Disciplinary Manual, Global Off Field Sanctioning Process 2026		

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE			
Player's surname	Nasilasila	Player's forename(s)	Isoa
Player's Union	Fiji	Date of birth	13 September 1999
Referee's name	Katsuki Furuse		
Foul Play	☒ Admitted ☐ Not admitted	Red card warranted	☐ Admitted ☐ Not admitted
Offence	Law 9.20 d - A player may remove the jackler from the tackle area by pushing/driving them backwards (including by grabbing the knee/leg), but must not roll, pull or twist an opponent. Law 20 e - A player must not drop their weight onto an opponent or target the lower limbs	SELECT: Red card ☒ Citing ☐ Other ☐ If "Other" selected, please specify:	
Summary of Sanction	One (1) week translated to one (1) match		

HEARING DETAILS			
Hearing date	Wednesday, 16 September 2026	Hearing venue	Remote
Chairman/JO	Wang Shao-ing		
Other Members of Disciplinary Committee	Donal Courtney, former-international referee (IRE) Juan Pablo Spirandelli, former-international referee (ARG)		
Appearance Player	Yes ☒ No ☐	Appearance Union	Yes ☒ No ☐
Player's Representative(s)	Bill Gadolo – Team Operations Manager Dave Ellis – Defence Coach Ana Tuiketeti – Legal Counsel	Disciplinary Officer and/or other attendees	Brian Hammond, DDO, World Rugby
List of documents/materials provided to Player in advance of hearing	1. 4 Video Clips 2. Referee Report by Matthew Carley 3. Foul Play Review Officer (FPRO) Report by TMO, Graham Cooper 4. Statement from Ethan Fryer, CAN#20		

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Medical Reports from Canada Team Doctor dated 12 September 2026 and 13 September 20266. Player's Submissions Reply to the Standing Directions7. FPRC Player Submission Form8. Letters from Head Coach JR East Green Warriors and Fiji Operations Manager |
|--|--|

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

1. The hearing was convened before the Disciplinary Committee ("DC) under PNC Disciplinary Manual following the Ordering Off of the Player.
2. The Red Card Report citing Law 9.20(d) states:

"A player attempted to remove a steeler but twisted and put body weight onto lower limb"

3. The FPRO Report citing Law 9.20(e) states:

"Player 19 attempts to clean the jackler. In doing so he drops his weight on the lower limb causing a twist and hyper extension of the lower limb. This is a high degree of danger."

4. The video clips of the incident showed:

- a. as FIJ#6 is tackled to the ground CAN#20 moves into a jackal position over the ball;



- b. the Player makes contact over CAN#20's back and wraps his arms around CAN#20's torso driving forward by pushing his right and then shifting his left foot;



- c. he then loses balance and starts to fall sideways to his right whilst maintaining contact with CAN#20's torso;



- d. the Player's body lands on CAN#20's knee and/or lower left calf and CAN#20 falls to the ground.



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

5. CAN#20 provided a statement setting out the events:

"I got over the ball attempting to jackal, it felt like the Fijian player attempted to clear me out and then slipped up over my shoulders. He then grabbed my torso and croc rolled towards my left side. His body went down onto my knee/lower leg, pinning my foot down and pushing the knee down and in. Then the next Fijian player came through and cleared me out which put the rest of my body over the pinned lower leg, twisting my foot/shin and knee."

6. CAN#20 has sustained a knee injury which the Team Doctor has assessed to be grade 1 medial collateral ligament strain on the night of the incident and continues to be monitored by team doctor.

SUMMARY OF PLAYER'S EVIDENCE

7. The Player accepted that he had committed an act of foul play and that a Red Card was warranted under Law 9.20 (d) and Law 9.20 (e) (more on this later).
8. In his written and oral submissions, the Player recalled that:
 - a. he had clocked a knock to the head from his own ball carrier, FIJ#6, and had to jump over the Canadian tackler to reach the breakdown where CAN#20 was already in a jackal position over the FIJ#6;
 - b. he started in a good position with both his feet under him driving forward onto CAN#20's back. He then lost stability and support through his right leg as it became overextended, and he lost contact with the ground;
 - c. at the same time, FIJ#18 applied force to his left hip causing him to rotate sideways. He could not keep his balance as FIJ#18 put pressure on him from the back as he came to assist in the cleanout;
 - d. he was not moving at a great speed, he used minimal force and was not dynamic in the cleanout;
 - e. he did not target CAN#20's head or neck nor did he have any intention to "croc roll" or to cause injury to CAN#20. He acknowledged that responsibility rested with him to ensure that his actions were controlled and safe and that he must learn from this incident and improve his technique. To his end, a letter provided by the Fiji Operations Manager outlined a 60-day coaching intervention program for the Player conducted by the Teams Collision Coach.
9. The Player further submitted that the incident was at the low-end of offending and that Ordering Off was sufficient under Regulation 17.18.1. In support of this, the Player and his counsel repeated his approach to the cleanout, the contribution of FIJ#18 to the mechanism of the incident and highlighted that CAN#20 only suffered a minor injury.

FINDINGS OF FACT

10. Whilst the Player's admission of the Foul Play warranting a Red Card meant that the DC could proceed directly to sanctioning, the DC sought clarification on the following:
 - a. two different foul play laws were cited in the RC Report and the FPRO Report. The Player explained that he accepted that the Red Card was warranted for both acts of foul play under Law 9.20(d) and Law 9.20 (e);

- b. the Player accepted that the Red Card was warranted but maintained he bore no fault for his actions. The DC found it curious that the Player accepted responsibility for the outcome of the contact but could not say which part of his actions contributed to the foul play. When asked about two specific features of his actions:
- i. on his admitted the loss of stability by the overextension of his right leg - the Player put down his fall to unfortunate timing from FIJ#18's intervention and that he would not have landed on the CAN#20's leg otherwise;
 - ii. on not letting go of CAN#20 as he was falling sideways and onto CAN#20's lower limb - the Player was directed to 4:27 (FR Corner SMM) of the video where both his arms continued to be wrapped around CAN#20 as he fell. The Player maintained that he was unable to release right arm as it was tucked under CAN#20 and he could not remove his left arm as FIJ#18's body had impeded him from doing.



11. Having considered all the evidence, the DC found:

- a. the timing (the Player was already off balance) and nature (degree of force and direction) of FIJ#18's contact with the Player did not absolve the Player from his role in the foul play;
- b. the Player lost his balance when he shifted his left leg. He failed to support his body weight when he overextended his right leg and started to fall sideways. By continuing to hold onto CAN#20 with this left arm, the Player pulled the right side of CAN#20's upper torso upward whilst his body fell onto CAN#20's lower limb causing CAN#20's knee to cave inward;
- c. the video angle (9 High Behind Left) showed that the Player's left arm was free from interference from FIJ #18 as he fell sideways;



- d. the Player's knew or should have known his actions would have resulted in the dangerous twisting of of CAN#20's upper body in relation to his lower left limb which was pinned under weight of the Player.

12. The DC determined that on the applicable law, the sum total of the Player's actions resulted in the removal of the jackler through a twisting of CAN#20, which was an act of foul play under Law 9.20 (d):

A player may remove the jackler from the tackle area by pushing/driving them backwards (including by grabbing the knee/leg), but must not roll, pull or twist an opponent.

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 DC accepted that the Player had not set out with the intention to croc roll CAN#20 nor did he target CAN#20's leg. However, the Player acted recklessly. (See Para 11)	
Nature of actions – R 17.18.1(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)	
See Para 11.	

Existence of provocation – R 17.18.1(d) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Not relevant.
Whether player retaliated – R 17.18.1(e) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Not relevant.
Self-defence – R 17.18.1(f) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Not relevant.
Effect on victim – R 17.18.1(g) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
CAN #20 has suffered a knee injury (strain to his medial collateral ligament)
Effect on match – R 17.18.1(h) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
The was not a significant effect to the game. 73 minutes had elapsed when the Player was yellow carded. The Player's team were leading by a comfortable margin and played with one less player.
Vulnerability of victim – R 17.18.1(i) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
CAN#20 was in a vulnerable position as a jackler, with his head in downward position and the Player's arms wrapped around him, he had no means to prevent the twisting motion and/or protect his lower limbs.
Level of participation/premeditation – R 17.18.1(j) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
The Player participated fully in the foul play. The DC accepted that he had not planned to do so.
Conduct completed/attempted – R 17.18.1(k) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
The act of foul play was completed.
Other features of player's conduct – R 17.18.1(l) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
Not relevant.

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS CONTINUED

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

*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
There were no reasons to select an entry point above the Low 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)
Notwithstanding his submissions, the Player accepted foul play and the Red Card.	The Player has a clean disciplinary record.
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 29 years old and is experienced and skilled. He has represented Fiji for more than a decade. He captained his county at U20 level and on four occasions at a senior level.	The Player was at all times respectful of the 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 apologised to CAN#20 immediately and demonstrated remorse at the hearing.	The letters in support of the Player reflect the Player's contribution to his community.

Number of weeks/matches deducted

1

Summary of reason for number of weeks/matches deducted:

Having had consideration for all the circumstances, the DC determined that it would apply maximum 50% mitigation under Regulation 17.19.2.

The DC did not find any on or off-field factors which would render the sanctions wholly inappropriate to justify a reduction of more than 50% under Regulation 17.18.1

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)
The Player has a clean disciplinary record.
Need for deterrence – R 17.20.1(b) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
NA
Any other off-field aggravating factors – R 17.20.1(c) (or equivalent Tournament rule)
NA

Number of additional weeks/matches

-

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	1 week (translated to 1 match)	Sending off sufficient ☐
Sanction commences	12 September 2026	
Sanction concludes	20 September 2026	
Matches/tournaments included in sanction	Japan v Fiji - 19 September 2026	
Costs	NA	

Signature (JO or Chairman)		Date	17 September 2026
-------------------------------	---	------	-------------------

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)