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## PREFACE

Volleyball is a great game - just ask the millions of people who play it, watch it, analyze it and referee it. It has been actively promoted in recent years and has developed tremendously as a top competitive sport. Increased excitement, speed, explosive action, a clean healthy image and huge TV audience figures have created an impetus to develop the game even further, to make it simpler and more attractive to an even wider range of viewing public.

However, to make a correct and uniform application of these rules on a world stage is also very important for the further development of the game. This Casebook is a collection of plays with Official Rulings approved by the Rules of the Game Commission and based upon the most up-to-date edition of the Rules. These rulings expand on and clarify the spirit and meaning of the Official Rules, and are the official interpretations to be followed during all sanctioned competitions.
This is the second "short edition" of the Casebook but is nevertheless based upon the same 2013-2016 edition of the Rules Text whose mandate was approved by the FIVB Congress at Anaheim, USA, in September 2012 and by the rules modifications approved by the Congress at Cagliari (Italy) in October 2014.

Sandy Steel
President, FIVB Rules of the Game Commission

## MODIFICATIONS BETWEEN 2014 and 2015 VERSION

| New cases | 2.7 | 3.21 .2 | 4.29 .2 | 9.26 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Deleted

3.10.2 3.28 (similar as 2.6) $\quad 3.28$ (see case 9.26)

| Modified (wording or according new rule) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.12 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.11 | 3.13 | 3.16 | 3.17 | 3.18 | 3.19 |
| 3.20 | 3.21 .1 (old 3.21) |  |  | 3.22 | 3.24 | 3.31 | 3.35 | 3.39 | 3.40 | 3.42 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| 4.8 | 4.17 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.11 | 5.12 | 5.16 | 5.17 | 5.18 |
| 5.19 | 5.23 | 6.3 | 7.7 | 7.10 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 9.12 | 9.15 | 9.17 | 9.22 | 9.23 |  |

## Renumbered cases

3.21 becomes 3.21.1
4.29 becomes 4.29.1
9.0 becomes 9.1 (all numbers increased by +1)
.../...
9.24 becomes 9.25 (i.e. +1)

## PART I - THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF APPLICATION

The referee is the one who puts the rules into practice. For the correct application of the rules, the referees have to know the rules faultlessly and apply them decisively and correctly within the context of the game. Rule 23.2.3 states, "The referee has the power to decide any matter involving the game, including those not provided for in the rules". Only on the basis of full acquisition of the fundamental principles of formulation and application of the rules can this be done.

Remember the referee stays in the background but at the same time acts to promote the game in the best light, and in this way the game is attractive to a wider audience.

We want the game to be popular - making an attractive show is the way to do that.

## THE RULES FOR THE CASEBOOK 2015 EDITION

The 2015 Casebook is a reflection of the rules, which were put into effect by the 2012 and 2014 FIVB Congress. While other rules and philosophical changes are always likely to be considered, as a sport and its society changes, it is worth remembering that the rulings shown here are those relating to the rules in force today.

In the appendix the case numbers are listed together with the corresponding rules. The case numbers are linked with the cases.

## PART II - CASES

## CHAPTER 1 - PARTICIPANTS

## WEARING FORBIDDEN OBJECTS

## 1.1

A prosthetic leg, a leg support, a plaster cast for a damaged wrist.
Is such a device allowed?

## Ruling

Some yes - provided that the device will not cause undue risk to the player or the other players in the game, or in the case of the forearm support will not provide additional control of the ball.
However the rules allow a player to wear compressing devices for injury protection. For FIVB, World and Official competitions their colour should be according to the respective part of the uniform, i.e. pads on arms should be the same colour as the jersey; respectively pads worn under the shorts should be coloured the same as the shorts.

Rules 4.5.1, 4.5.3

## Ruling

Due to the risk of injury a player must remove her ring, or have it taped.

Rule 4.5.1

## CAPTAIN

## 1.3

What is the proper response by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee if a game captain constantly questions $1^{\text {st }}$ referee decisions?

## Ruling

Beyond the limits of Rule 5.1.2, he should warn the game captain with no penalty, as stated in Rule 21.1. If the behaviour continues, the game captain should be sanctioned for rude conduct with a red card (point and service to the opponents).

Rules 5.1.2, 20.1, 20.2, 21.2, 21.3.1, Diagram 9

## 1.4

Is it permitted to verify the positions of players to a game captain?

## Ruling

Yes. However, the right to make this request may not be abused by a team, and only detailed information about his/her own team may be provided. For the opponent team he can only be told "they are correct."

Rule 5.1.2.2

## Ruling

Yes but the only information that will be provided to the opponents will be whether or not the players are correctly positioned. No information will be given about which players are front or back row players.

Rule 5.1.2.2

## 1.6

How does the game captain legally and politely request the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee to ask a line judge if he signalled a fault?

## Ruling

At the end of the rally, the game captain may raise one hand to request an explanation for the interpretation of the judgment. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must honour the request.

Rules 5.1.2.1, 20.2.1

## Ruling

Yes.
On the other hand, the teams are not allowed to protest against normal referee decisions.

Rules 5.1.2.1, 23.2.4

## COACH

## 1.8

Are communication devices allowed for the coaches during the game?

## Ruling

The use of such devices is allowed.

## 1.9

Are coaches permitted to talk to the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee during the match about decisions or protests?

## Ruling

According to Rule 5.1.2, only the game captain is authorized to speak to the referees to request explanations. The coach is not authorized to do so.

Rules 5.1.2, 5.2.3.4, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3

### 1.10

$\overline{\text { May }}$ the assistant coach or player press the buzzer for T/O?

## Ruling

Yes - but the coach must still give the official hand signal.

Rules 5.2.1, 5.2.3.3, 5.3.1

### 1.11

May the assistant coach or others also stand/ move in the free zone during the match?

## Ruling

The rules allow only the coach to move freely in the free zone, between the extension of the attack line and the warm-up area.

Rules 5.2.3.2, 5.2.3.4, 5.3.1

### 1.12

Where may the coach move during the match?

### 1.13

Can the coach if injured or disabled be allowed to use crutches in the free zone to perform his duties during the match?

## Ruling

The coach, and only the coach, has the right to walk in the free zone during the match between the extension of the attack line and the warm-up area. The coach has no right to enter the court to carry out coaching functions.
If the coach tries to go beyond those limits he/she should be warned via the game captain.

Rule 5.2.3.4

## Ruling

To stand or walk with crutches is not forbidden for the coach.

## THE TOSS

W.1
What are the possibilities for a team winning the
toss?

## Ruling

The winner of the toss has the following options:

1. to serve,
2. to receive the service, or
3. to choose the side of the court,

The opponent takes the remaining option.
Rule 7.1.2

## POSITIONAL AND ROTATIONAL FAULTS

## 2.2

The team's setter from position 1 was standing clearly in front of player position 2 , but jumped at the moment before the service hit. Is this legal position?

## Ruling

Fault. When players jump from the floor, they retain the position that they had from their last contact with the floor. Therefore, while the back row player was in the air, the point of his last contact with the floor was retained.

Rules 7.4, 7.4.2, 7.4.3

## Ruling

Legal position. Only the feet which are in contact with the floor are considered when determining whether players make a positional fault.

Rules 7.4.3, 7.5

## $\underline{2.4}$

If a player's foot is in contact with the opponent court at service hit, is this a fault?

## Ruling

Yes-fault because at the moment of the service hit all players must be within their own court. There is a difference between playing court ( $18 \times 9$ ) and court ( $9 \times 9$ ). Players must be within their own court at the service hit and that includes being on, or completely on their own side, of the centre line.

Rules 1.3.3, 7.4

## 2.5

After the service hit, the scorer announced the fault of the incorrect server.
What happens now?

## 2.6

A team was given incorrect information about which player was to serve. Play continued. This incorrect information was noticed at a later point in the set.
What happens now?

## Ruling

Service goes to opponents (who rotate); team at fault corrects positions. Any points scored when at fault are cancelled.

Rules 7.7.1, 23.2.3

## Ruling

The teams must revert to as close to their original line-up as possible. The score reverts to the point where the wrong information was given. T/O and TTO and sanctions remain valid.
These events must be recorded on the score sheet.

## 2.7 (new)

The teams were not ready to play because five (5) or seven (7) players were on court when the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was ready to whistle for service.

What should have occurred?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should whistle for service when he/she is sure that the teams are ready to play and that the server is in possession of the ball.
Because the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee noticed the mistake before he/she whistle for service, he/she must award a delay sanction to the team at fault. The next team to serve depends on the type of delay sanction.
But if the 1st referee still whistled for service when only 5 or 7 players were on court, he/she must stop the rally immediately and replay without any sanction.

Rules 7.5, 7.7, 12.3, 12.4.3

## CHAPTER 3 - PLAYING ACTIONS

## PLAYING THE BALL

## 3.1

The $1^{\text {st }}$ hit flew outside of the antenna. The setter pursued the ball into the opponent's free zone and tried to play it back - but the ball went towards the court and net on the opponent's side.
The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled and signalled "ball out". At what moment does the ball become "out"?

## Ruling

This ball had become "out" when it had left completely the space above the free zone and entered the space above the court on the opponent's side of the net.
The ball would also have been out if it had hit an opponent player in the free zone, so long as he/she was not attempting to prevent an opponent's return of the ball to the other side of the net.

Rules 10.1.2, 10.1.2.2

## 3.2

Can a player legally hit the ball with the palm of one hand up?

## Ruling

The hit must be judged by the quality of the ball contact - i.e. is it a soft or hard rebound or whether or not the ball was caught and/or thrown. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must not be too hasty in whistling this play unless he can clearly see that the ball is caught and/or thrown.

Rules 9.2.1, 9.2.2, 9.3.3, 9.3.4

## 3.3

During a first hit the ball rebounded from one arm to the other and then onto the chest of a player during one action and without being caught or thrown. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee allowed the game to continue. Is this correct?

## Ruling

The decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was correct. "First hit" cases, in which successive contacts are allowed, are:

1. Reception of the service.
2. Reception of an attack hit. This can be either a soft or a hard attack.
3. Reception of a ball blocked by one's own team.
4. Reception of a ball blocked by the opponent.

Rules 9.2.3.2, 14.2

## 3.4

After a block, can a player double contact the ball if in one action?

## Ruling

A blocker has the right to make successive contacts after a block, so long as she makes only one action to play the ball. It is possible, however, to whistle a "catch" or "throw" on the first hit if two different phases (first catch, then throw) are recognised within the action.

Rules 9.2.2, 9.2.3.2, 14.2

## Ruling

This depends on whether the ball is caught or thrown (fault) rather than rebounding (no fault). It is legal to block the ball and direct it back to the opponent's court. The illegal contact of "catch" can be whistled during blocking.

Rule 9.2.2

## 3.6

A player jumped into the air trying to retrieve the ball near the spectator seats. After contacting the ball, he/she landed in the seats. Is this a legal action?

## Ruling

Legal play. Outside his/her own side of the free zone, a player is allowed to play a ball and even take support to hit the ball. This would include his/her own team bench since this is outside the free zone.

Rules 9, 9.1.3

## 3.7

During a rally, a player chased the ball into the spectator stands. Just as she was about to hit the ball, a spectator reached up to catch the ball. The coach requested a replay because of the spectator's interference. The referee refused. Was this a correct decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## 3.8

Must the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistle for a handling fault if the player is making a spectacular recovery?

## 3.9

A ball went off the blocker $A$ 's head, over the antenna into the free zone of ' $B$ '. A player of ' $A$ ' pursued the ball to play it back to his side of the net. Is it possible to play it back like this?

## Ruling

Yes. The player is allowed to retrieve the ball from anywhere outside her own side of the playing area, including the team bench/ spectator seats, etc.
On the other hand, while the player has priority for the ball within the playing area, she has no such priority outside of the playing area.

Rules 9, 9.1.3

## Ruling

The referee should consider the principle of "keep the ball flying". It means, if a player makes a quick movement and a big effort to recover the ball, and during the hit a slight double contact has occurred, he/she must be less severe, than in a normal situation

## Ruling

Yes. The ball passed over the antenna into the opponent's free zone partially through the external space. Therefore it was legal for team ' $A$ ' to return the ball to its own court through the external space on the same side of the court. Line judges should not signal while the ball moves in this way until the moment it is finally out of play.

Rule 10.1.2

### 3.10.1

Should the line judge signal when after the second hit of a team the ball crosses the net plane through the external space into the opponent's free zone?

## Ruling

No. This ball could legally be played back with the $3^{\text {rd }}$ hit of the team (or some fault could occur with opponents). It therefore remains in play.

Rules 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 9.1,
10.1.2, 10.1.2.1, 10.1.2.2
3.10 .2 (3.10.3/2014)

Team A's setter hit the ball above the net so that at the moment of the hit his/her fingers were in the opponent's space. After the set the ball flew parallel to the net toward an attacker. The blocker of team B touched the ball in team's A space, so that the team A player could not execute the attack hit.
How should the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee decide?

## Ruling

According to Rule 9, each team must play the ball within its own playing area and space (except in the case of Rule 10.1.2).
Therefore, since the setter has hit the ball in the opponent's space, the setter committed a fault. The blocker also committed a fault by touching the ball in the opponent's space before the attack hit. However, only the first fault is penalized.

Rule 9

## PENETRATION UNDER THE NET

### 3.11

A spiker landed with his heels on the centre line, but with most of his feet on the feet of the opponent's blocker preventing his ability to move. Is this interference?

## Ruling

Yes.
Rule 11.2.1 states, "It is permitted to penetrate into the opponent's space under the net, provided that this does not interfere with the opponent's play." Interference means a player stops an opponent from moving, or playing the ball, or disturbing the opponent while attempting to play the ball.

Rules 11.2.1, 11.2.2.1, 11.2.4

## Ruling

No, many contacts actually occur in a match - but the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should whistle an attacker if he/she interfered with or stopped the opponent's ability to play.

Rule 11.2.1

## PLAYER AT OR CONTACTING THE NET

### 3.13

A setter slightly touched the mesh of the net between the antennae as he/she was in the action of playing the ball. The referee whistled this net contact. Was the decision correct?

## Ruling

The decision was correct. According to the rules this is a net fault.
Contact with the net, between the antennae, during the action of playing the ball is a fault.

Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4

### 3.14

The setter reached above and beyond the plane of the net and set the ball, so that his/her attacker could make an attack hit. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled the play as a fault. Is this play illegal?

## Ruling

The decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was correct. Above the top of the net, a player must contact the ball on his own side (except if blocking).
A similar play under the net is different. Here the play is illegal only if the ball has completely crossed the vertical plane of the net.

Rules 9, 11.2.1

## Ruling

If the contact is truly simultaneous by opponents, and the ball lands outside a court, it is the fault of the team on the opposite side. Team A get service.

Rules 9.1.2.2, 9.1.2.3

### 3.16 <br> Ruling

An attack hit drove the net into the blocker's forearms.
Is this a net fault?

### 3.17

After a blocker landed securely, he turned and hit the mesh of the net between the antennae with his shoulder.
Should this have been called a fault?

### 3.18

The attacker from Team A hit the ball from position 4, as an opponent player (having be confused by a fake attack) hit the net in Team's A position 2.
Is this a net fault?

### 3.19

While attempting to block, but without touching the ball, which was close to him, the blocker touched the net.
Is this a fault?

### 3.20

A middle blocker reached over the net and touched its top band while attempting to stop a combination play close to him. Is this a fault?

If the net hits the blocker, there is no fault. On the other hand, if the blocker hits the net between antennae during this action, he/she commits a fault.

Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4

## Ruling

No. Because the action of playing the ball was complete before he/she turned, the contact with the net is not a fault.

Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4

## Ruling

No, contact with the net between the antennae during the action of playing the ball is the fault since the opponent was not near the ball, he/she did not commit a fault.

Rule 11.3.1, 11.4.4

## Ruling

Yes - since this is "in the action" of playing or attempting to play the ball, even though no contact was made.

Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4

## Ruling

Yes - the touch of the net was indeed a "net fault": the blocker was close to the action, and the contact was between the antennae.

Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4

### 3.21.1 (3.21/2014)

An attacker landed securely on the floor then took two steps and brushed against the net outside of the antenna while the ball was still in play.
Is this a fault?

## Ruling

No the player did not commit a fault because,

- he/she has already finished the action of playing the ball
- he/she did not use the net as support or stabilizing aid, and
- the contact was outside the antenna

Rules 11.3.1, 11.3.2, 11.4.4

### 3.21.2 (new)

An attacker landed on the floor off balance, took two steps and pushed with his chest against the net between the antennae while the ball was still in play. If the player had not caught the net, he/she would have fallen onto the opponent's court. Is this a fault?

## Ruling

Yes, if a player is using the net as a support or stabilizing aid, between the antennae, his/her action is considered as interference with the play.

Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4

### 3.22

When an attacker hit the ball, he/she also hit the setter with his/her knee. This hit caused the setter to brush against the net.
Is this a fault?

## Ruling

No, because the setter was not in the action of playing the ball and did not interfere with the play.

Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4

## SERVICE

### 3.23

As soon as a player had hit the ball for service, the scorer signalled "wrong server" or rotational fault to the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee, who stopped the game. Is this the correct action by the scorer?

## Ruling

Correct action by the scorer. When a wrong server is ready to serve the ball, the scorer must wait until the service action has been completed before notifying the referees of the fault. The scorer may have a bell, buzzer or some other sound device (but not a whistle) to signal the fault.

Rules 7.7.1, 12.2.1, 12.7.1, 25.2.2.2

## Ruling

Yes - provided the service is made by the correct player within 8 seconds from the whistle for service. The 1st referee does not whistle a second time.

Rule 12.4.4

### 3.25

The server threw the ball up into the air, but then let it drop to the floor. He/she then caught the ball from the bounce and immediately served before the end of the 8 seconds allowed for service.
Was this a legal action for the server?

## Ruling

The action of the server was not legal. The ball must be hit with one hand or any part of the arm after being tossed or released from the hand(s). Any action considered by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee to be a "toss for service" must end with the ball being hit for the service.

Rule 12.4.2

### 3.26

The served ball touched the net and the antenna before being played by the receiving team. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled for a service fault. Is this a correct decision by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee is correct. A ball touching the antenna is "out".

Rule 8.4.3, 27.2.1.3

### 3.27

A served ball hit the net just under the white band at the top of the net. When should the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistle?

## Ruling

Whistle the instant it is clear the ball will not cross the net through the crossing space. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must not wait until the ball hits the floor or a player of the serving team.

Rule 12.6.2.1

### 3.28 (see 9.26)

### 3.29

Team ' $A$ ' served. The ball hit the net and dropped towards the floor on 'A's' side of the net. A player of ' $B$ ' reached under the net and caught the ball before it hit the floor.
Is this allowed?

## Ruling

Yes - the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must whistle immediately the ball fails to cross the net. At this moment the ball is out of play.

Rule 12.6.2.1

## ATTACK HIT

### 3.30

A back row setter jumped from within the attack zone and set the ball while it was completely above the height of the net, directing it towards an attacker. Before the attacker could contact the ball, it penetrated the vertical plane of the net where it was blocked by the opponent's setter. Was there a fault?

## Ruling

Yes. The set became an illegal attack hit by a back row player when the attack hit was completed (in this case by contacting the opponent's block). The rally should have been won by the opponents.

Rule 13.1.3

## Ruling

Yes - this was an attack hit by the back row player. As soon as the ball was touched by the blocker, the illegal attack hit was completed.

Rules 13.1.1, 13.1.3, 13.2.2, 13.3.3

## Ruling

Even though it was only the second team hit, if the ball is moving in the direction of the opponent's court, it is an attack hit. Because, in the referee's opinion, no player of ' $A$ ' could possibly have reached the ball, the block of ' $B$ ' was legal.

Rules 13.1.1, 14.3

### 3.33

A back row player took off in the front zone and as a second hit spiked the ball which was completely higher than the top of the net. The ball rebounded and did not cross to the opponent. Is this a fault?

### 3.34

' $A$ ' $s$ ' receiver jumped from behind the attack line and contacted the served ball from completely higher than the top of the net. The contact was behind the attack line.
Should play continue?

## Ruling

No. Since the ball neither crossed the plane of the net nor was contacted by the blocker, the attack hit was not completed.
The rally continues.
Rules 9.1, 13.1.3, 13.2.2, 13.3.3

## Ruling

Yes, since the contact point of the hit was completely behind the attack line.

Rules 13.3.4, 19.3.1.3

## BLOCK

### 3.35

' A ' passed badly and the ball crossed the plane of the net. The middle blocker of ' $B$ ' hit the ball across the net against the raised arm of the back row setter from ' $A$ ', who was still above the height of the net. The ball then rebounded across the net into ' $B$ 's' court.
Who committed the fault?

## Ruling

The setter's "block" was illegal because he/she was a back row player. Intercepting a ball from opponents is a block if a part of the body is above net height.

Rules 14.1.1, 14.1.3, 14.6.2

## Ruling

It is a fault to block a set. However, it is absolutely necessary for the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee to determine the action of the setter. He/She must know whether the set was

- made parallel to the net (block fault) or
- was going towards the net, thus making it an attack hit (no fault).

Rules 14.1.1, 14.3

## Ruling

Yes, to block is to intercept a ball coming from the opponent's side, thus it is legal to block an opponent's block.

Rule 14.1.1

## Ruling

Correct ruling by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee this time. But if the ball had struck the foot of the blocker well above the floor, the blocker could have interfered with the opportunity of the other team to play the ball and therefore the blocker would have committed a fault.

Rule 11.2.1

### 3.39

A ball blocked by the legally penetrating blocker of team B flew some meters parallel to the net before a second player of $B$ hit the ball with a blocking action down to the floor on the side of team ' A '. The ball had never penetrated into the air space of ' $B$ '. Who gets next service?

## Ruling

Team A. The second player's action cannot be considered as block, because the ball was coming from the block of his/her teammate.
Thus he/she was attacking in the opponent's space which is a fault according to the rules.

Rules 11.1.2, 14.1.1, 14.2, 14.3

### 3.40

Can an attacker hit the ball coming from the reception of his/her teammate with both hands using a blocking action, directing the ball to the other side of the net?

### 3.41

The ball made multiple contacts with the head and hands of several blockers.
Should this be permitted?

## Ruling

It is a legal play, provided it is not a double contact or a catch or throw.
The contact must be on the player's own side of the net, however - not on the opponent's.

## Ruling

Provided it is a blocking action and not separate actions, this counts as one block contact. After the block, a team is allowed three more ball contacts.

Rules 9.1, 14.2, 14.4.1

### 3.42

Back row player's illegal attack versus illegal block (simultaneous contact)
What is the fault?

## Ruling

Double fault and therefore replay.
Rules 13.3.1, 13.3.3, 14.1.1, 14.6.1, 14.6.2

## Ruling

No. The player was not part of the collective block and was not higher than the top of the net when the ball contacted him/her.
Therefore she cannot be a blocker.
Rules 9.3.1, 14.1.1

## Ruling

Yes - having part of the body above the net is critical; the team would therefore have three more hits.

Rules 9.1, 14.1.1, 14.4.1

### 3.45

A blocker hit the ball when he/she had already come down from his jump and his whole body was lower than the top of the net. When he/she hit the ball again, the referee called a "double hit".
Was this correct?

## Ruling

The decision was correct. At the moment of the ball contact, no part of the body of the blocker was higher than the top of the net. So the action could not be considered as a block, and his later contact made this a double hit.

Rules 9.1, 14.1.1, 14.4.1

## Ruling

The attack hit becomes a mistake at the moment when the ball has crossed the net totally or the block touched it. The attempt of the Libero to block was an action before the completion of the opponent's attack hit and is therefore the first mistake.

Rule 19.3.1.3

## SUBSTITUTIONS

## 4.1 <br> Three substitute players entered the substitution zone. After the request was recognized and acknowledged by the scorer, the coach decided to make only two substitutions. <br> What is the procedure for the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee?

## Ruling

This is legal as long as this does not cause a delay. Therefore the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee simply carries out a double substitution.

Rules 15.10.2, 15.10.3a, 15.10.4, 16.1

## 4.2

One substitute player entered the substitution zone while another one was just leaving the warm-up area to try to enter the substitution zone.
How many substitutions should be allowed under the current rules?

## 4.3 <br> A substitution was "requested" by a team, by sending the player into the substitution zone. Because the player was not ready to play (wrong paddle/ no paddle/ track suit, etc), his team was sanctioned with a delay warning and the substitution was rejected. As soon as the delay sanction was applied, the team again requested the substitution. Was it allowed to make this second request during the same interruption?

## Ruling

The moment of the request is the entrance of the substitute player(s) into the substitution zone. In this case the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should grant only the one for the player who actually entered the substitution zone. The second request should be rejected as improper.

Rules 15.10.3a, 15.10.3b, 15.11.1.3

## Ruling

The substitution was not legal and therefore not allowed. As the first request for substitution was rejected, the team was not authorized to request a second consecutive substitution in the same interruption. At least one rally must be completed before there can be another request for substitution by the same team.

Rule 15.3.2

## 4.4

The substitute player had entered the substitution zone with the wrong "numbered paddle" for substitution. He fumbled to get the correct one. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee awarded a delay sanction, but allowed the substitution.
Is this the correct response by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## 4.5

If a substitute steps into the substitution zone just as the whistle sounds for service, should the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee permit the substitution?

## Ruling

Not correct. In FIVB, World an Official Competitions, the substitute player must enter the substitution zone with the correct "numbered paddle". Thus, the request for substitution by the team must be rejected, and a delay sanction must be awarded.

Rules 15.10.3a, 16.1.1, 16.2

## Ruling

Generally this situation is a typical case of an improper request: reject and allow the game to continue.
However, if the game has been stopped due to this request (the player on court goes to the substitution zone or the teams wait for the referee's decision, etc ...) it should be considered as delay. The substitution should not be granted, and a sanction for delay will result.

Rules 15.10.3a, 16.2

## 4.6

Player \#8 entered the substitution zone with paddle \#10. The coach insisted on the substitution with \#9. After a short discussion, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee rejected the substitution and the team was sanctioned with a delay warning.
Was the decision correct?

## 4.7

A player became injured and had to be substituted exceptionally. During the same game interruption, the team requested an additional substitution. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee accepted the request.
Was the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee's decision correct to accept the request?

## Ruling

The decision was correct. The substitution of \#8 and \#10 would have been legal. However, the coach insisted on the substitution of \#8 for \#9. Because the wrong paddle was shown and this caused a delay, the referee correctly sanctioned the team for delay.
Substitution should be rejected.
Rules 16.1.1, 16.2

## Ruling

Yes, the decision was correct.
The first player had to be substituted by an exceptional substitution due to injury. The team still had the right to REQUEST a substitution in the same interruption.

Rule 15.7

## 4.8

A starting player was substituted, then returned to court - but became injured and was not able to continue in the match.
Who can substitute for this player?

A player listed on the line-up sheet was injured before the start of the match. Can he be substituted before the match?

## Ruling

Even though the player cannot be substituted by a legal substitution, he/she can be substituted exceptionally by any player not on court, except the Libero or his/her replacement player. This is recorded in the score sheet but does not count as one of the six allowed substitutions.

Rule 15.7

## Ruling

Yes - but it should be shown formally by substitution signal (coach and 2 nd referee so that everyone understands the situation) and must be recorded on the score sheet as a regular substitution.

Rules 7.3.2, 7.3.4

### 4.10

Player \#7 of team ' $A$ ' was found to be on the court when he should have been on the bench. Team ' $A$ ' had used the allowable six team substitutions. Since there were no legal substitutions remaining, what was the proper procedure to be used by the officials?

## Ruling

Since team ' $A$ ' had an incorrect line-up, the procedure given in Rule 15.9 .2 should be the following:
a. Point and service for team ' $B$ '.
b. The substitution must be rectified. \#7 has to be removed from the set and the correct player must return to the court. This correction does not count as regular substitution.
c. All points scored by team ' $A$ ' while \#7 was in the game illegally must be cancelled, but the score of the opponent's team will remain as it is.
d. There is no further penalty for team ' A '.

Rule 15.9.2

### 4.11

After team 'B' had used five substitutions, two substitute players entered the substitution zone. What is the proper response of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee has to remind the coach that only one substitution will be possible and ask the coach which one will be made.
Provided there is no delay, the other substitution will be rejected as an improper request which is marked in the score sheet.

Rules 15.5, 15.6, 15.11, 16.1

## Ruling

No.
The Libero replacement player cannot substitute for ${ }^{N}{ }^{\circ} 5$.

Rule 15.7

### 4.13

A team requested two substitutions. When checking the substitutions, the scorer indicated that the first of the requests for substitution was legal and the other request for substitution was illegal. What is the proper response of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee allows the legal substitution to take place. The illegal substitution must be refused no matter in which order the substitute players approach the side line. The request for an illegal substitution must be sanctioned with a "delay sanction". If the delay is the first, only a warning is issued; others are penalized.

Rules 15.6, 16.1.3

## Ruling

The procedure of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee was correct.
Changing decisions, however, can create a very unfavourable impression about the refereeing team.

### 4.14

A team was refused a requested substitution by the scorer pressing the buzzer a second time. When the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee checked the score sheet, he/she discovered that the substitution was, in fact, "legal", and "re-corrected" the situation. This was quite embarrassing. What should have been the response of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee?

### 4.15

A substitute player was standing in the substitution zone, ready to enter. However, the player on court initially refused to leave the court. Is this delay?
Should the substitution be refused?

## Ruling

Yes, it is delay.
However, the substitution THIS TIME should be allowed:
Where the substitute player is not ready and causes a delay, the correct application of the rule is to reject the substitution and give a sanction to the team for delay.
However, the player in play caused this special case, and the substitute player did not cause the delay.

Rules 16.1.1, 23.2.3

## Ruling

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should show the line-up sheet to the coach and ask what he wants to do. If the coach wishes to keep what is on court, he needs to make legal substitutions at 0:0. This is one situation, where the coach must give the hand signal to avoid misunderstandings. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee also must carry

this out formally for public understanding of the situation.

Rules 7.3.5.2, 7.3.5.3

### 4.17

Player \#6, ready to play, entered the substitution zone during an interruption. The scorer acknowledged the request by using the buzzer. At that moment the coach changed his/her mind and ordered the player back into the warm-up area. Should the substitution have been applied and what should have been the correct procedure?

## Ruling

The request for substitution was correct and already acknowledged by the scorer in using the buzzer. Due to the request, the game was stopped. It is not obligatory to apply the substitution, but the procedure caused a delay and should be sanctioned.

Rules 15.10.3a, 15.10.3c, 16.1.1

## Ruling

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee was correct. This was a typical case of an improper request, which had to be recorded in the score sheet. If this was a repeated improper request, a delay sanction must have been issued.

Rules 15.11.2, 16.1.1

### 4.19

If a scorer presses the buzzer for substitution by mistake (after whistle for service/ player doesn't enter substitution zone), should the team be charged with an improper request?

### 4.20

An unregistered player was found to be on court. What do the officials do?

## Ruling

Since the fault is made by the scorer, this should not be considered either as improper request or as a delay.

Rules 15.10.3a, 15.10.3c

## Ruling

The coach and the team captain have the duty to control the registration of players and confirm it with their signature.
Unregistered players who have played in the match will be removed from the court as soon as this is discovered, in favour of a legitimate registered player. All points scored while this unrecorded player was on court will be cancelled, and the opponents will gain a point and the next service.
If the mistake is detected after the end of the set, the set would be lost by team ' $A$ '. If the mistake is discovered after the end of the match, the whole match would be lost due to the unregistered player in the match.

Rules 4.1.3, 4.2.2, 5.1.1, 5.2.2, 7.3.5.4, 15.9.2

### 4.21

During an interruption, the receiving team ' A ' requested a substitution. During this interruption, team ' $B$ ' was penalized, which caused team ' $A$ ' to rotate one position. After this, team ' $A$ ' requested a new substitution.
Is this possible?

## Ruling

Yes. A completed rally is the sequence of playing actions which results in the award of a point. This includes the award of a penalty and being penalized for serving out-with the time limit. So there was in fact a completed rally between the two requests for substitution.

Rule 15.2.2

### 4.22

At the control of the line-up, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee detected that the number of the Libero was in the starting line-up. He asked the coach to correct the line-up sheet and informed the scorer about it. After this the match started. Was the procedure correct?

## Ruling

The Libero is not allowed to be on the court in the starting six, and must leave the court until the situation has been resolved. Normally, of course, it is not possible to change a number on the line-up sheet.

In this case, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should ask the coach for a new and correct line-up sheet (which can be changed only in the position, where the Libero was recorded by mistake). Once the corrected line up sheet has been checked against the new line up on court, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee will allow the Libero to enter the court.

Rule 7.3.5.2

## TIME-OUTS AND TECHNICAL TIME-OUTS

### 4.23

Team B executed a service by a wrong player.
This fault was discovered later in the set, at the end of next TTO. After the respective consequences (cancellation of points gained by team ' $B$ ' with the faulty rotation, rectifying the line-up, service and point to team ' $A$ ')
Should the referees apply again a TTO, when the leading team reaches the same score for TTO?

## Ruling

No, only 1 TTO is to be applied in the first 4 sets at the following score: when the leading team reaches the $8^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ points.

### 4.24

Which comes first - an automatic Technical Time out or a request for time out by a coach?

## Ruling

A TTO has to be granted before a regular game interruption. If after the TTO the coach wanted to have also a normal TO, he should request this again.

Rule 15.4.2

## IMPROPER REQUESTS

### 4.25

Can a team request a substitution before AND after a time out, all taking place in the same interruption in play?

## Ruling

No - while two Time outs can be called by the same team in the same interruption, two successive substitution requests are NOT allowed and the second one should be considered as improper request.

Rules 15.3.1, 15.3.2, 15.10.3a, 15.11.1.3, 25.2.2.6

### 4.26

A coach made a third request for time-out, which was granted by the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee. At that moment the scorer realized that it was the third time-out for this team and notified the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee about this.
What is the proper procedure for the officials?

## Ruling

Normally this is improper request - but here an actual delay occurred. So reject or immediately curtail the time-out. Players return to court. The Game Captain is informed of the actual delay and a delay sanction is applied.

Rules 15.11.1.4, 16.1.5, 25.2.2.6

### 4.27

Can a player play with a nose bleed?

## Ruling

Referees must use discretion if an injury occurs in which a player bleeds. If an immediate medical treatment does not rectify the injury he/she must be substituted or replaced until the bleeding is stopped and the blood is removed from the player's uniform. A substitute player must be permitted a reasonable time to take off his/her training suit and enter the game without sanctions.

Rules 4.4, 15.5, 15.10.2, 15.10.3a, 17.1.1

### 4.28

A setter injured his knee while playing defence. He remained lying on the floor while the coaches gathered around him and the team doctor checked his injury. After about two minutes of therapy, the setter declared that he was able to play again. The referee then signalled to continue the match with him.
Was this the correct decision by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was correct. For the safety of the player, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must stop the rally immediately when an injury occurs and permit the team doctor and/or medical assistance to enter the court. If the injury appears to be serious and severe enough, the player should be removed from the court for at least one rally.
The principle decision by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee is to give the player or/and the team doctor a reasonable time to know the seriousness of the injury, yet to limit the time before the substitution is required. The removal of the injured player must take place by a regular substitution. If this is not possible, an exceptional substitution must be used.

Rules 15.7, 17.1.2

### 4.29.1 (4.29/2014)

An accident occurs at the moment of a substitution, which causes the substitute player's nose to bleed.
What is the correct procedure?

## Ruling

First of all the referee should request medical assistance. It is necessary to stop the game. If the player cannot recover, a legal substitution should be applied although it is a second substitution within the same interruption. If no legal substitution is possible an exceptional substitution will be applied.

Rules 15.11.1.3

### 4.29.2 (new)

The team captain is injured before the start of the match.
How should the situation be handled?

## Ruling

The process is determined by the moment of the injury. The main principle is written in rule 4.1.3, when the score sheet has been signed by captains and coaches, i.e. after the toss, the team has no right to change the roster (except, when the Libero is injured, no chance to play and coach wants to redesignate the original team captain as new Libero).

Based on this if the injury of team captain occurred before the toss and he/she cannot play, the coach should designate a new team captain, putting a stripe under the number and circling the player's


## DELAYS TO THE GAME

### 4.30

Prior to the start of the third set of a match, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled the teams to enter the court. One team did not react. When they were too slow to respond, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee issued a delay warning to them.
The team then entered the court. Was this the appropriate action by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

Yes, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee acted correctly. The teams must be summoned to take their positions on the court. If they do not react, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must issue a delay warning to them pointing to the wrist with yellow card, and this must be recorded on the score sheet. If the team still did not react, a delay penalty, indicated by a red card, would have been given. If this also proved to be ineffective, it would have been judged a refusal to play, the team would have been declared to be in default and the match would have been forfeited. In such a case, the score would have been recorded as $0: 3$ ( $0: 25,0: 25,0: 25$ ).
If a team is returning slowly to the court after a timeout, the same procedure should be followed.

Rules 6.4.1, 16.1

### 4.31

Will a team be sanctioned for delay if it forms a huddle on court?

## Ruling

There is no requirement for the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee to allow more than a reasonable time for the players to move to their positions for the next rally. He must allow for appropriate enthusiasm and cheering but cannot allow the game to be delayed.

Rules 16.1.2, 16.1.5

### 4.32

A player refused to play because of a wet place on the floor caused by a team member diving for a ball. What is the proper response of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should never accept the request of the team wiping a wet spot on the floor, because the request is the subject for a delay sanction. The "quick moppers" should mop the wet spot on the floor. Players may also use their own small towels to mop the floor. When the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee deems it necessary to mop the floor by the moppers, he may give the order. The control of the match is always by decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee, if there is no Control Committee. In a match with a Control Committee, the Game Jury

| $l$ |
| :--- | :--- |$|$| President may authorize the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee to allow |
| :--- |
| extra mopping if the wet patch is large and the |
| temperature is above 25 degrees Celsius and the |
| humidity is above $61 \%$. |
| If finally the team still refuses to play, the referee can |
| sanction the team with either delay or default |
| sanctions. |

Rules 1.5, 5.1.2.2, 6.4.1, 16.2

### 4.33

During an interval between two sets, an entire team went to their locker room and returned after 5 minutes. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee issued a delay sanction, and the game was continued.
Was this an appropriate reaction of the referee?

## Ruling

Firstly a team is not allowed to leave the competition area without permission of the referees. Nevertheless, after two and a half minutes, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should go to the team and remind them to immediately enter the court so as not to be declared in default. After they are back on the court, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should issue a delay sanction.

Rules 4.2, 6.4.1, 6.4.2, 18.1

## EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE

### 4.34

What is the correct response of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee if spectators interrupt the match?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should stop the match and the organizer or the Control Committee should take steps to re-establish the order. This interruption should be recorded on the score sheet.

Rules 17.2, 17.3

### 4.35

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee did not stop the play when the TV boom hit the server The server was not hurt or disturbed during the service execution. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee had let the rally continue. There was no protest by the serving team. Is this the correct decision by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was correct in this instance because it was spectacular and caused great interest and enthusiasm among the crowd. However, in other situations the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should consider repeating the rally.

## 5.1

Can the Libero enter the game without the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee's permission after checking the line-up before the set?

## Ruling

The starting player must be on the court at the time of the line-up check. As soon as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee checked the line-up, the Libero may replace the back row player. The team does not need to start with or use a Libero.

Rule 19.3.2.4, 19.3.2.8, 24.3.1

## Ruling

The expelled/disqualified player should be immediately substituted legally. Since there is no possibility for that, the team has to be declared incomplete and will lose the set. (Note: exceptional substitutions are not an option here).

Rules 6.4.3, 15.7,15.8

## 5.3

Can the Libero be allowed to enter the match by a regular substitution procedure in place of an injured player?

## Ruling

No. The Libero is not allowed to participate in any substitution, regular or exceptional.

Rules 15.5, 15.7, 17

## 5.4

The Libero was on the court for player \#5 and was expelled from the set. What is the correct process to continue the match?

## Ruling

If the team has two Liberos, the coach may replace the sanctioned acting Libero immediately by the second Libero.
If the team has only one Libero, the team may chose:

- to send Player \#5 back to the court in place of the Libero and play without a Libero for the remainder of the set, or
- the coach re-designates a new Libero from the players not on the court in the moment of redesignation and the new Libero may immediately and directly replace the expelled acting Libero (who is not allowed to play for the remainder of the match).

Rules 6.4.3, 19.1.1, 19.3.2, 19.3.2.8, 19.4

## Ruling

Yes - because the "replacement" is not a "substitution" and vice versa.

Rules 15.3.2, 19.3.2, 19.3.2.8

## 5.6

The Libero replacing the player in position 1 did it after the referee's whistle for service but before the service hit. What is the proper response by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

If this was the first occurrence in the match, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should allow the rally to continue uninterrupted. After the rally, he/she should advise the game captain that this is not a correct procedure. Subsequent late replacements should trigger delay sanctions immediately, interrupting the rally. The Libero replacement remains valid, however.
If the replacement has been made after the service hit, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should whistle this as a positional fault.

Rule 19.3.2.5

## 5.7

A team made an illegal Libero replacement, but it was noticed before the service hit was made.
How should this be handled?

## Ruling

If noticed, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee will use the whistle to call back the player. The illegal replacement will be cancelled and the team will be sanctioned for delay.

Rules 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2.9, 23.2.3

## 5.8

Five players were on court when the referee whistled for service; meanwhile the Libero who was sitting on the bench apparently forgot to return after the previous rally.
What procedures must the referees follow?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must only whistle for service if both teams are ready to play and the server is in possession of the ball. If the Libero's late entry delays the whistle for service significantly, the team should be sanctioned for Delay.
If the $1^{\text {st }}$ Referee by mistake authorises the service, he/she should interrupt the rally and replay it without penalty.

Rules 7.5.1,12.3, 19.3.2.3, 19.3.2.5

## Ruling

Not directly. The coach may re-designate a new Libero from one of the players not on the court (replacement player excepted) at the moment of the request for re-designation.
If the coach wants player $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 4$ to be the new Libero, $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 4$ at first has to return to court and be substituted legally. Then he can be re-designated as new Libero.

Rules 19.1.3., 19.3.2.2, 19.3.2.8, 19.4.2

### 5.10

Is it allowed to be a coach and the Libero at the same time?

## Ruling

Yes.
The rules state that the Libero cannot be the team or game captain. The rules do not forbid the Libero from being the coach or instructing the team behind the coach restriction line.

Rule 5.2.3.4

### 5.11

A mistake by two players led to the Libero/ replacement player leaving the court briefly (this event had not yet been recorded on the Libero control sheet) - but they corrected the mistake immediately themselves.
Is this counted as a replacement?

## Ruling

Rule 19.3.2.1 states that there must be one rally between two Libero replacements. This was an obvious mistake but should not be counted as a fault.

Rules 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2.2

### 5.12

A team forgot to replace the Libero when he rotated to the front row in position 4. After three points, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee noticed that the Libero was on court illegally.
What is the correct decision for the referee to make?

### 5.13

During the official warm-up the team's single Libero was injured.
Can the captain become the new Libero?

## Ruling

The Libero does not commit a positional fault until the server hits the ball.
When there is a properly registered player not legally on court, this must be penalized with a point and service to the opponent, the line-up must be rectified and the points scored by the team at fault since the moment the fault was committed (if it can be determined) must be cancelled.

Rules 15.9, 19.3.1.1, 26.2.2.1, 26.2.2.2

## Ruling

If the team has two Liberos, the coach may replace the injured active Libero immediately by the second Libero. If the second Libero becomes injured, or if the team only has one Libero, the coach may redesignate a new one from one of the players not on the court at the moment of the re-designation.
While it is true that the Libero cannot be team or game captain the team captain can give up his position and all rights and duties linked to it, in order to play as the re-designated Libero.

Rules 5, 19.2, 19.3.2.8, 19.4.2.5,

## Ruling

No. This is a typical case for illegal Libero replacement. At the moment of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ replacement the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should reject it, and the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should issue a delay sanction. Where an assistant scorer acts, it is his/her duty to check the Libero replacements.
In this case, in the moment he/ she should press the buzzer, signalling the fault committed.

Rules 19.3.2.9, 23.2.3

### 5.15

The Libero was replaced by a normal player. After the service, a reserve ball penetrated into the playing court, and the rally was stopped. Before the whistle for the replayed rally, the Libero attempted to replace the player in position \#6. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee called him back.
Is this a correct action by the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee?

## Ruling

This is a typical case for illegal Libero replacement, because there was no completed rally between two Libero replacements. At the moment of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ replacement the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should reject it, and the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should issue a delay sanction.

Rule 19.3.2.1

### 5.16

The Libero of a team became injured during the match, and the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee authorized the medical doctor, with the coach in attendance, to be on the court for checking the seriousness of the injury. They decided to take the Libero out of the court and send the replaced player back on the court. After he was led off the court, the Libero claimed he had recovered and insisted on returning to the court to play. The referees allowed the Libero to go back on the court and to resume the match.
Was this correct?

## Ruling

No, it should not have been allowed. Even though it was the case of injury, the Libero could be replaced through a regular replacement. Also, the Libero still has the right to participate in the match until he/she is declared unable to continue (Rule 19.4.2).
Thus, this situation was a mistake because two consecutive replacements took place without any rally in between. This is a case for illegal Libero replacement. According to the rules, at the moment of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ replacement the referee should reject it, and the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should issue a delay sanction.

Rules 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2.8

### 5.17

The Libero of team ' $A$ ' injured his/her arm during the match, and a new Libero was re-designated. The original Libero sat on the bench for the remainder of the match.
Should this have been permitted?

## Ruling

Yes. The player was mobile, not providing any obstruction or danger to himself/herself or teammates.
This last point is crucial to the ruling. The player should be permitted to stay on the bench. Had the player to be treated, the team doctor should have been advised to place the player behind the bench or in a place of safety outside the Competition-Control area.

## Diagram 1a and Definitions.

Rule 19.3.2.8

### 5.18

When can two Libero replacements take place in the same interuption?

## Ruling

Normally there has to be a completed rally between successive Libero replacements. However, in the case where a PENALTY to the opponent would force the Libero to rotate to position four, it is permitted, as the situation is not of the team's choosing. The award of a penalty counts now as a completed rally.

Rules 19.3.2.1

### 5.19

The Libero complained of feeling sick. Is it permitted to re-designate a new Libero?

## Ruling

If the team has two Liberos, in case of injury or illness of the Acting Libero, he/she can be replaced by the second Libero. In the case where a team has only one Libero or the second Libero has become unable to play while on court, he/she can be replaced by the redesignation procedure.

Rules 19.3.2.2, 19.3.2.8

## Ruling

This is an administrative mistake and will not have any consequences for the team. The scorer will correct the number in the 'Remarks' box.

Rule 19.1.2

### 5.21

In the $1^{\text {st }}$ set of a match, the Libero of ' $A$ ' played in a shirt with the same colour and design as the rest of the team. Before the start of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ set, the coach of ' $B$ ' protested against this situation. What is the correct decision?

## Ruling

Because the wrong shirt had no influence on the game, the result of the $1^{\text {st }}$ set will not be cancelled. The Libero has to change his/her shirt, however.

Rule 19.2

### 5.22

Two players tried to block an opponent's attack and jumped at the net. Between them the Libero also jumped, but didn't reach at any time with any part of his/her body higher than the top of the net. Nevertheless the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee whistled this as block attempt. Was this decision correct?

## Ruling

The decision was not correct. Because the Libero didn`t reach at any time with any part of his body higher than the top of the net, his/her jumping could not be considered as a block attempt.

Rules 14.1.1, 14.1.2, 14.1.3

## Ruling

This service (fault) is to be considered as a completed rally. Therefore the Libero will be allowed to replace the player.

Rules 6.1.3, 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2

## Ruling

Except for the regular replacement player, any player on the bench at the moment of the request for redesignation can be re-designated as the new Libero. The original Libero cannot come back into the match at any time.
If the coach wants the regular replacement player to be the new Libero, he/she first must substitute him/her legally.

Rules 19.3.2.8, 19.4.2.1, 19.4.2.4

## 6.1

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee warned a player for minor misconduct, going directly to STAGE 2 of the minor misconduct procedures, and showing the player a yellow card, to be recorded on the score sheet. Is this a correct action by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

This is a correct action by the referee. Such minor misconducts must be controlled by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee. The yellow card must therefore be recorded.
The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee may give a verbal warning to the team via the game captain (stage 1) if the minor misconduct is of a general nature.
Although, depending of the seriousness of minor misconduct he/she may start with stage 2 showing a yellow card directly to the concerned player or team member through the game captain.
The referee has the authority to go directly to the issuing of sanctions if an offence is of a serious nature.

Rules 21.1, 21.2

## 6.2

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee observed an attempted deception (a blocker pulled the net) and whistled for the attacking team to win the rally. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee then signalled a warning to the player by using a yellow card. Is this the correct penalization for him/her?

## Ruling

The decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was not correct.
The rally should have been won by the attacking team because of the net contact by the opposite player which interfered with the play. The blocker then should have received a penalty, (red card: point and service to the opponents), for the rude conduct of attempting to mislead the referees.

Rules 21.2.1, 21.3

## 6.3

The Coach of ' $A$ ' stood up at the end of a rally and waved his arms in a manner that suggested disgust with the referee's decision.
Is this allowed?

## Ruling

The coach should be allowed to express certain normal responses. If the response is judged to be minor misconduct reaching the stage 2 level, the coach should be warned by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee by use of a yellow card. If repeated, he should be penalized with a red card for rude conduct.
If the infraction occurred during a rally, the penalty should be given at the end of the rally in addition to the result of the rally.

Rules 5.2, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3

## Ruling

Sanctions imposed between sets are set against the next set. Thus, before the first service, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should signal the penalty for team A. The team B gains one point, rotates and serves.

Rule 21.5

If there is an occasion in which there are penalties to both teams, the serving team is penalized first, and then the receiving. The following is a summary of

|  | infractions which occur between sets, the penalties for which must be recorded on the score sheet: <br> - Warning against a player of the serving team (yellow card). No penalty, but to be recorded on the score sheet. <br> - Warning against a player of the receiving team (yellow card). No penalty, but to be recorded on the score sheet, <br> - Penalty (red card) against a serving team player only. The receiving team gains a point, rotates and gains the service. <br> - Penalty (red card) against a receiving team player only. Point awarded to the serving team. <br> - Penalties (red cards) against each team no matter in which order. <br> Point for the receiving team, This team rotates one position, and will then be penalized with point and service to the opponent. The original serving team rotates one position and starts to serve with the second player in the service order. The score is 1-1. <br> The score is counted only when each team has been penalized. Thus, a double penalty at the score of 24-25 would not end the set at 24-26, but the score would be 25-26. |
| :---: | :---: |

## 6.5

After the end of a rally, the setter pulled down the bottom of the net.
Should this have been a fault?

## Ruling

According to Rule 21.3, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee has the authority to sanction a player according to the seriousness of the offence. Pulling down the net may be a normal emotional reaction of a disappointed player and can be controlled by the art of refereeing. In some cases, intentional pulling down of the net may be considered as a rude conduct.

Since this case was not an attempt to mislead the referee during play, there should be no penalty for rude conduct.

Rules 21.2, 21.2.1, 21.3

## Ruling

This should be regarded as Offensive Conduct, and sanctioned by red and yellow cards jointly.

Rules 21.1, 21.2, 21.3

## 6.7

A player was expelled directly from the court with no prior warning.
How should we regard a subsequent minor misconduct from any other member of the same team?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should normally try to prevent a team from reaching the sanctioning level.
However, should a clear case of offensive conduct be committed in the first instance, the referee must expel the player without a previous sanction (red and yellow card showed jointly).
The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee may issue a warning to other team members after the expulsion - but once the yellow card is shown, it may not be shown again to any member of the team.

Rule 21

## 6.8

After the match one team captain showed very unsportsmanlike behaviour against the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee. What is the correct procedure of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The player must still be sanctioned in some way. However, for FIVB events, since the match is regarded as not finished by the last whistle of the referees, the behaviour of the team captain must be reported to the Game Jury, and the details of the misconduct recorded in the REMARKS box of the score sheet. The FIVB Control Committee has a range of sanctions at its disposal, including suspension from the Competition.

## 6.9

The Libero replacement was sitting on the bench. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee sanctioned him/her by issuing a penalty. The player did not stop this behaviour and applauded the referee. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee sanctioned him/her with an expulsion. The expelled player continued the behaviour and received a disqualification. What is the correct procedure?

## Ruling

The expelled or disqualified player should be substituted immediately. Therefore he/she has to be substituted legally.
The sequence of procedure is the following:

- the Libero should leave the court, then
- the substitute player enters the substitution zone with the appropriate paddle, gives it to the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee; meanwhile the scorer records the legal substitution.
The Libero may return to the court after one completed rally. The score at the moment of expulsion (or disqualification) must be recorded.

Rules 6.4.3, 15.8

## 7.1

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee told a coach not to talk with or distract the scorer.
Is this a correct action by the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee?

## Ruling

In the spirit of the art of refereeing, if such situations can be resolved by the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee without formality, this can be done.

Rule 23.3.2.2

## Ruling

Players are not required to stand in the warm-up area. On the other hand, players may not sit on benches, chairs, rails or walls in the warm-up area.

Rules 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 24.2.4, 24.2.5

## 7.3

Can a coach ask the scorer for information about the number of time-outs that had been taken by the other team?

## Ruling

The scorer should not respond to the coach.
Generally, coaches are not permitted to ask the scorers for any information.
However, where an electronic scoreboard is used, but the number of used game interruptions is not indicated, the coaches have the right to ask the scorer for this information, but only about their own team and at a time which is neither distracting to the scorer nor delaying the match.

Rule 25.2.2

## Ruling

If at the time of any incident, the game captain made no mention of a protest, he cannot make a written protest on the score sheet at the end of the match.

Rules 5.1.2.1, 5.1.3.2, 23.2.4

## Ruling

Yes. Up to the start of the next set, referees are allowed to correct their decisions immediately concerning the application of the rules, if they realize they were mistaken. The match score will be corrected as appropriate.

## 7.6

After a request for a third time out was refused, the coach changed her mind and sent a player for substitution.
Is this allowed?

## Ruling

Provided there was no whistle for service, the request for substitution should have been allowed as proper - only the time out was improper. However, the improper request for time-out should be recorded on the score sheet.

Rules 15.1, 15.2.1, 15.11,
16.1, 16.2, 24.2.6, 24.2.7

## 7.7

After the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee urged the teams to enter the court the coach of ' $B$ ' apparently observed the players of ' $A$ ' in their positions on the court, and then submitted his/her line-up to the $2^{\text {nd }}$
referee. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee sanctioned team ' $B$ ' with a "delay warning".
Is this correct?

## 7.8

During a time-out a coach met with his entire team in the very back corner of the free zone near the warmup zone.
Is this permitted?

## 7.9

The assistant coach came to the sideline to assist the players to find a wet spot.
The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee called the game captain and told him/her to tell the assistant coach to stay on the bench.
Did the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee make a correct decision?

### 7.10

After a rally a coach asked the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee if his/her server was correct. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee checked the rotational order with the scorer and replied that the correct player was ready to serve. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee continued the match.
Is this the correct process of the referees?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee made an error by directing team ' $A$ ' to take the court before the coach of ' $B$ ' had submitted his line-up sheet to the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee.
Team B was guilty of delay and the coach behavior taking advantage of the situation- should be considered as Rude conduct. Sanctions should have been given as appropriate.

## Ruling

Rule 15.4.4 states that the team must "go to the free zone near their bench" during a time-out. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee should tell the team to go near to their bench.

Rule 15.4.4

## Ruling

The decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was correct. The assistant coach is allowed to sit on the bench and may not intervene in the match. Only the coach may walk near the sideline behind the coach's restriction line.

Rules 5.2.3.4, 5.3.1

## Ruling

The process was not correct. The only team member allowed to speak with the referees is the game captain. Thus, the coach is not authorized to request information from the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should have called the game captain and asked her to remind the coach of the fact that he/she has no right to ask the referees for information.

Rule 5.1.2

## CHAPTER 8 - SPECIAL and EXTENDED CASES

## 8.1

Team 'B' intentionally slowed down the tempo of the game. How should the referee respond?

## 8.2

A floor wiping towel from one of the players of ' $B$ ' fell on the court of $A$.
What should the referees do?

## 8.3

The match was resumed on another playing court after the lights failed.
What is the correct ruling on the use of a disqualified player in the third set when it started again

## PRINCIPLE

The referee should keep the game at a constant tempo within the normal flow of the game. The referee should never allow any external influences to retard the flow of a good match and ruin the good performance of one of the teams. This is another "art" of refereeing.

## Ruling

If, according to the judgment of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee, the situation is dangerous, he should stop the game immediately and direct a replay. But if the rally is finished and the falling towel will have no influence on its outcome, there is no need to direct a replay.

Rule 17.2

## Ruling

Rule 17.3.2.2 states that the interrupted set on a different court has to be cancelled and replayed with the same team members and the same starting lineups (except expelled or disqualified ones).
When such a set is resumed, neither disqualified nor expelled players are allowed to participate. Another player who was on the team and not in the starting line-up must take his place.
Furthermore, all other sanctions which have been recorded on the score sheet up to the point that the lights went out must be carried over into the new set.

Rule 17.3.2.2

## 8.4

When passing the net post to retrieve a $1^{\text {st }}$ hit passing outside the antenna, a player grabbed the post to turn rapidly enough to get to the ball. Is this taking support?

## Ruling

No. As long as the player is not in contact with the net post while he is hitting the ball, the play is legal.

Rule 9.1.3

## Ruling

Since the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee changed his/her decision, which was the basis of the substitution, in the spirit of the game the coach's request could be accepted. No substitution would be charged against this team.

The cases shown above are specifically designed to be short, easily read and easily understood -
i.e. to make them accessible to a larger audience.

The following cases contain extended versions of some of the same cases, to permit a more exhaustive analysis of the event as it actually took place.

## 9.1 (9.0/2014)

A player passed the received ball so, that it would have crossed the net if not touched by another player of the same team. The setter was in position to make a legal play on the ball. The opponent's blocker reached across the vertical plane of the net and blocked the ball before the setter could play it. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee called a fault on the block.
Is this a correct decision of 1streferee?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee's decision was correct, and the block was illegal. Blockers may not contact the ball beyond the net until the attack hit is executed, except when in the judgment of the 1streferee, no possibility exists for further play of the ball by the attacking team.

Rule 14.3

## 9.2 (9.1/2014)

The back row setter in the front zone attacked the ball completely higher than the top of the net. Simultaneous with his/her contact of the ball, the opponent blocker reached across the plane of the net and contacted the ball in a blocking action. What was the correct decision by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

The correct decision is to call a double fault.
The attack hit by the back row setter was illegal. The simultaneous block by the blocker was also illegal, because the hit was done in the attacker's team space.

If the contact by the blocker had been after the contact by the setter, then only the attack hit by the setter should have been a fault.

If the simultaneous contact had occurred ABOVE the net, where both teams have the right to play the ball, only the attack hit by the setter should have been a fault.

Rules 13.3.3, 14.3, 14.6.1, Diagram 7

## 9.3 (9.2/2014)

A player of team ' $A$ ' set the ball over the net into the opponent's space, where a back row player within the front zone jumped and reached higher than the top of the net to block. An attacker of ' A ' contacted the ball beyond the plane of the net to hit the ball with two hands in a blocking action. Both players touched the ball at the same time. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee signalled a double fault.
Was the referee's decision correct?

## Ruling

The referee's decision was correct. The attacker, even though he/she hit the ball with a blocking action, completed an attack hit, not a block. A block is an action to intercept the ball coming from the opponent's side of the court, not coming from his own setter (Rule 14.1.1).
Since the initial contact of the ball by the attacker was in the opponent's space, the attack was illegal (Rule 13.3.1).
The back row player completed the block by the contact with the ball higher than the top of the net (Rule 14.1.1). A back row player completing a block makes a fault (Rule 14.6.2).
Since both players committed a fault at the same time, the rally ended with a double fault.
Under this complicated situation at the top of the net, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must observe the play very carefully. If the attacker from ' $A$ ' touched the ball first, he should be charged with the only fault. If the back row player touched the ball first, he/she should be charged with the only fault.

## 9.4 (9.3/2014)

Player \#6 of team ' $A$ ' was disqualified from the match, and legally substituted by \#7. This was the first substitution for team ' A ' during the set, and there were three more players on the bench. During the next rally, team ' $A$ ' player \#7 became injured and was not able to continue to play.
Therefore, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee authorized team ' $A$ ' to substitute player \#7 by another player in an exceptional substitution.
Is this a permitted sequence of actions by the referee?

## Ruling

Rule 15.8 states, "An expelled or disqualified player must be substituted through a legal substitution. If this is not possible, the team is declared incomplete". In the first action a legal substitution of \#6 by \#7 was made. Once the substitution was complete, all of the players of team ' $A$ ' on the court were eligible to play. Then, the second incident occurred, and player \#7 was not able to continue to play. Even though player \#7 cannot be substituted by a legal substitution, player \#7 can be substituted exceptionally.

Rules 15.7,15.8

## 9.5 (9.4/2014)

In a team, R-2 and R-5 were the best attackers. During a set, R-5 was substituted out and then returned to the court. Later in the set, while R-5 was at the net, he/she became injured and had to be substituted exceptionally.
When the coach saw R-5 lying on the court, apparently injured very badly, he signalled his team to replace R-2 with the Libero. Now the Libero was in the back row and R-2 on the bench. After it had been determined that R-5 could not continue to play, the coach requested R-2 to enter the game for R-5, using an exceptional substitution.
Is this a legal sequence of substitutions?

## Ruling

This is not legal. R-2 cannot substitute for R-5 since he was on the court at the moment of the injury. The injured player should be substituted by an exceptional substitution (the coach may use any player not on the court at the moment of the injury, except the Libero or his/her replacement player).
Other actions by the coach must be subsequent to this action.

## 9.6 (9.5/2014)

During the check of the line-up, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee realized there was a discrepancy between the line-up sheet and the actual line-up of team ' $A$ '. In position 1 player \#5 was on the court instead of player \#7, as recorded on the line-up sheet. He mentioned this to the coach, who decided to start the set with the actual line-up on the court. Therefore he used a regular substitution at the score 0-0. The substitution was not executed, but only recorded in the score sheet. Meanwhile, the Libero replaced player \#5. Three rotations later, when the Libero rotated to the position 4, he was replaced by \#7. The coach requested a substitution with \#5 for \#7. After the substitution was executed, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee realized that it was a mistake, since this substitution had taken place already at the score of 0-0. After a short discussion with the game captain, he cancelled the second "unnecessary" substitution. The game continued without any sanction. Was it a correct procedure?

## Ruling

The referees' decision was correct to cancel the second substitution. The problem was that this substitution at the beginning of the set was not clearly executed by the two normal players, and due to this fact, the coach and the players missed it and stopped the game without reason. Since the game stopped for a couple of minutes, a delay sanction should have been given to the team.
This is one situation, where the coach must give the hand signal to avoid misunderstandings.

## 9.7 (9.6/2014)

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled for service, while a substitute player approached the substitution zone. The scorer didn't take care of the whistle of the referee and wrongly pushed the buzzer.
The substitute player realized that he was late, and went back to the bench. The game stopped and the on-court player to be substituted went to the substitution zone.
What should be the correct procedure of the referees in this situation?

## 9.8 (9.7/2014)

A substitute player approached the substitution zone, but did not enter. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled for service, but the scorer did not pay attention to the actual position of the player and pushed the buzzer. The substitute player, realizing that he was late, went back to the bench. The rally didn't stop. After the end of the rally, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee told the scorer to record an improper
request to this team. Was this correct?

## 9.9 (9.8/2014)

Team " $A$ " requested a substitution. The substitute player just entered into the substitution zone ready to play with numbered card, when the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was about to give the signal for the next service of team "B". Neither the scorer, nor the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee realized that the substitute player was already close to the sideline. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee, waving her hands, sent back the player to the team bench. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled for the service and the rally continued.
Was this situation handled correctly?

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee had to stop the rally. Even though there was no real request, the game was delayed by the player on court, who thought he was to be substituted, and the respective team had to be sanctioned for delay. The team to serve next is decided by the result of the delay sanction.
If the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee had not stopped the rally, then after the execution of the service, this team would have made a positional fault.
With the actual substitution procedure, the scorer must pay a lot of attention to requests for substitution. It was the scorer's fault for pushing the buzzer without a real request being made.

Rules 15.11.2, 16.1.1

## Ruling

Because the rally didn't stop, and the fault was made by the scorer, this case could not be considered either as an improper request or as a delay. Therefore the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee was not correct.

Rules 15.10.3a, 15.10.3c

## Ruling

The situation is complex. Although the substitute player entered into the substitution zone at the very last moment, the request was still in correct time, before the whistle for the next service. Based on this the team made no fault, and cannot be sanctioned. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee is obliged to check before his/her authorization for next service, if the teams want to request any game interruption.
He/She was not attentive enough in this, missing this duty. The scorer was also not attentive enough, missing the entering player and not pushing the buzzer to acknowledge the substitution request, which was correct.
The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee has the right to whistle at a substitution, when there is no buzzer sound or the scorer is inattentive.
With a better collaboration by $1^{\text {st }}$ referee or a more definite attitude by the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee such situations can be avoided.

### 9.10 (9.9/2014)

The team ' $B$ ' won a rally to lead $7: 6$. Player \#5 of ' $B$ ', who was in the wrong rotation order, served and ' $B$ ' won a point. The score was now 8:6.
A Technical Time-Out was applied and the same player continued to serve until ' $B$ ' led 10:6. At that moment, the scorer realized that player \#5 had been in the wrong rotation order for some time. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee applied a penalty (point and service to the opponents) for having the wrong server, and deleted the points gained by ' $B$ ' during this period of the game. The game continued after having rectified ' $B$ 's rotation order. Then, when the score reached 8 points again later in the set, no Technical Time-Out was called and the game continued.

## Ruling

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee's decision was correct. Technical TimeOuts are an agreed device to allow replays, analysis, and commercial opportunities for TV; much of this is agreed and contracted in advance. Therefore, having already had the first Technical Time-Out in the set, no more should be allowed until the score of the leading team reaches 16 points.

### 9.11 (9.10/2014)

The coach of team ' $A$ ' attempted to request a substitution late in the set, by calling his substitute player to the substitution zone. The substitute player at first did not hear the coach's summons and was late arriving in the substitution zone. The scorer pressed the buzzer and the game stopped - but by now the 1streferee had whistled for service. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee cancelled the rally and issued a delay warning and refused to allow the substitution of the player (who was by that time in the substitution zone). An argument with the referees followed.
Team ' $B$ ' then called a time-out followed by a substitution. ' $A$ ' followed this with a substitution request which this time was granted. The game continued with ' $A$ ' winning the set and match. Is this a correct ruling by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

This is not a correct ruling by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee. His/Her first action to reject the substitution for the delay and to give a delay warning was correct, since the coach had requested the substitution by sending the player into the substitution zone.
However, the improper request was the second substitution request by ' $A$ ', coming directly after the time-out. Before a team is allowed to have a new request for substitution, there must be a completed rally following the previous request. The final request for a substitution must be rejected without penalty, unless there had been a previous improper request, and recorded in the score sheet.

Rules 15.3.1, 15.3.2, 15.10.3, 15.11.1.3, 16.1.1,16.1.2, 25.2.2.6

### 9.12 (9.11/2014)

See Cases 4.25 and 4.26
A substitute player entered the substitution zone slightly after the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee's whistle for service. The scorer pushed the buzzer, and the game stopped. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee recognized the situation and rejected the request by slightly waving his hand. Meanwhile, both the incoming and outgoing players went to the correct position in the substitution zone ready to perform the substitution.
The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee urged the team to serve. At the moment of the service hit, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee blew his whistle and signalled a positional fault on the serving team because there were seven players on the court. After a short discussion between the $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled again for the service. Was this a correct decision?

## Ruling

This is a typical case of an improper request.
The request for substitution should have been denied, and because of the prolonged interruption and confusion, the team should have been sanctioned for delay. However, if this sanction was not a delay penalty, the team should have been given a replay of the service.

Rule 15.11.1.1

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee has neither the right nor the responsibility to judge the serving team's positional faults. When the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee blows his/her whistle in such a case, the rally must be replayed.

Rules 15.11.1, 23.3.2.3a, 24.3.2.2, 25.2.2.6

### 9.13 (9.12/2014) See Case 4.29.1

During the substitution, when entering the court, the substitute player \#5 was hit by \#9 so, that he got a bleeding nose. The substitution was already recorded on the score sheet when the bleeding was discovered on the court.
What is the correct procedure?

## Ruling

First of all the referee should request medical assistance to solve the problem. If the player recovered within a reasonable time, the game could continue without a new substitution. If the player cannot recover, a legal substitution should be applied. If no legal substitution is possible an exceptional substitution will be applied.
Although removing the bleeding player \#5 was the second substitution in the same game interruption, the rule allows this, because player \#5 on the court is considered as a "player in play".

Rule 15.11.1.3

### 9.14 (9.13/2014) See Case 5.7

A service specialist substituted into the game for the middle blocker. After she had served, she was replaced by the Libero. When the Libero rotated into the front row, she was replaced by the middle blocker instead of the service specialist.
At this moment, the coach recognized that the middle blocker had entered the game illegally, and pushed the buzzer for a normal substitution of the service specialist by the middle blocker -thus attempting to have the middle blocker back on the court so that this substitution could take place legally. Since the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was prepared to authorize the team to serve, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee refused the improper request by the team. On the other hand, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee recognized that he/she was going to authorize a service in which the team had an illegal player on the court, and so authorized the appropriate substitution and sanctioned the team with a delay warning, with very little disruption of the game.
Was this the proper response by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

Clearly, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee was a master of the "art of refereeing".
In the spirit of allowing the players to play the game, with little interference from the officials, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee made the correct decision.
If such errors continued by the team, sanctions should be applied.

### 9.15 (9.14/2014) See Case 5.7

When the middle blocker of team ' $B$ ' rotated to serve, his/her coach substituted him by a service specialist. After losing the service, the service specialist was replaced by the Libero.
When the Libero had to rotate to the front row, the middle blocker raced onto the court to replace him.
After two rallies, team ' $A$ ' realized that the replacement was not legal because the middle blocker had not been substituted back for the service specialist. Team 'A' protested the situation.
After a short discussion with the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee, $1^{\text {st }}$ referee allowed team ' $B$ ' to substitute the middle blocker into the match for the service specialist with no penalty.
Was this the correct ruling?

## Ruling

There are three parts in the ruling.

- At first, since this situation was not clearly provided for in the rules, Rule 23.2.3 states that the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee has the power to decide any matter involving the game, including those not provided for in the rules.
- Secondly, given the situation, team B should have been penalized with a point and service to the opponents for an illegal substitution, and the loss of additional points should be confirmed with any evidence including the Libero control sheet (R6). If the points gained during the illegal situation were able to be identified, they should be deducted from the points of the team B. If not, no additional points should be deducted. To get the
(
middle blocker legally back into the match, team ' B ' should have requested a regular substitution for the service specialist.
- Thirdly, the proper replacement/substitution process for this situation is the following: At the time when the Libero was about to rotate to the front row, he/she should have been replaced by the service specialist. Then the middle blocker should have substituted for the service specialist. These replacements/substitutions must be made in the same interruption of the game.

Rules 19.3.2.1, 23.2.3

## $9.16(9.15 / 2014)$

The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled for service. At that moment, the serving player realized that the Libero had left the court but had not been replaced, so that his team had only five players on the court. He/she delayed the service as long as possible, but at last he served. At the moment of the service hit, the replacement player on the court was not in the correct position, so clearly had committed a positional fault. The teams played the rally which was won by the serving team. The game captain of the opponent team then approached the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee, requesting an explanation of the decision to play the rally. He/she expected his team to win the rally because the serving team committed a positional fault. The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee rejected the plea and allowed the rally to remain as played.

What should have been the decision of the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?

## Ruling

There were three errors in this situation. Firstly the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee must not blow the whistle for the service unless the team is ready to play and the server is in possession of the ball.
He/she should have delayed the whistle for the service. If this caused a delay, the serving team should have received a delay sanction.
The second is that a replacement can only take place before the whistle for service. And the third is that the serving team committed a positional fault at the moment of the service hit, so they should have lost the rally. Had the replacement player been in position 4 before the service hit, the rally should have been played and the serving team should have been sanctioned according to Rule 19.3.2.5.

Rules 7.5.1, 12.3, 19.3.2.3, 19.3.2.5

## Ruling

The 1st referee's decision was not correct.
If the team has two Liberos, the coach may replace the injured active Libero immediately by the second Libero. If the second Libero becomes injured, the coach may re-designate a new one from one of the players not on the court at the moment of the redesignation.
If the team has only one Libero, as in this case, the choice is the same, as in the case of the injured second Libero.
The referee's decision in the case described was not correct.
While it is true that the Libero cannot be team or game captain the team captain can relinquish his position and all rights and duties pertaining to it, in order to play as the re-designated Libero.
Since the team captain was already on the line-up
sheet, the sequence of actions should be as follows:

1. Substitution of the team captain with another player by a regular substitution before the match begins.
2. Request by the coach to appoint a new team captain.
3. Re-designation of the new Libero.
4. Request from the referee that the new Libero changes his / her uniform to that of a Libero (or covers his/ her own uniform by a bib or a jacket kept for the purpose in the reserve equipment).
5. Request the scorer to:

- Re-register the original team captain as the new or re-designated Libero (to replace the original Libero),
- Register the new team captain.

The details of these re-registrations/ re-designations must be written in the "REMARKS" box of the score sheet.

Rules 5, 19.1.5, 19.2, 19.3.2.8

## $\underline{9.18}$ (9.17/2014) See Case 5.14

The Libero of a team became injured during the match, and the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee authorized the medical doctor, with the coach in attendance, to be on the court for checking the seriousness of the injury. They decided to take the Libero out of the court and send the replaced player back on the court. After he/she was led off the court, the Libero claimed he had recovered and insisted on returning to the court to play. The referees allowed the Libero to go back on the court and to resume the match.
Was this correct?

## Ruling

No, it should not have been allowed. Even though it was the case of injury, the Libero could be replaced through a regular replacement. Also, the Libero still has the right to participate in the match until he/she is declared unable to continue (Rule 19.4.2).
Thus, this situation was a mistake because two consecutive replacements took place without any rally in between. This is a case for illegal Libero replacement. According to the rules, at the moment of the second replacement, the referee should reject it, and the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee should issue a delay sanction.

Rules 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2.8

### 9.19 (9.18/2014)

The coach decided to replace the Acting Libero \#7 by the second Libero \#1. He/She sent the second Libero with the paddle \#7 to the substitution zone, where the replacement was made like a substitution. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee informed the scorer to record this in the Remarks box of the score sheet.
Was this procedure correct?

## Ruling

The replacement of the Liberos should have been made in the Libero Replacement Zone without any formality, i.e. without numbered paddles. One Libero can replace the other one freely now, provided there is a completed rally in between.

Rules 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2.2, 19.3.2.7, 19.3.2.8

### 9.20 (9.19/2014)

A Libero played the ball within the front zone with an overhand finger action. The direction of the ball took it above the net where it was hit by his/her attacker and almost at the same time by the opponent blocker.
What should the referees consider in their decision?

## Ruling

A Libero may make an overhand action in the front zone. A Libero may direct the ball to the opponent by an overhand action. It is a fault, however, for the attacker to complete an attack hit from an overhand finger pass if the Libero makes the overhand finger action from the front zone and at the moment of the
P

### 9.21 (9.20/2014) See Substitution Cases

The coach of ' $B$ ' requested a time-out. The 2nd referee whistled for it.
The $1^{\text {st }}$ referee did not hear the 2 nd referee's whistle and he authorized the service by ' $A$ '.
The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee whistled again to allow the requested time-out. Amidst some confusion, the 1st referee awarded a delay warning to ' B '.
Later in the same set, a server of 'B' was sanctioned for delaying the game. This second delay sanction for ' $B$ ' in the same match resulted in a delay penalty and gave ' $A$ ' a point. This was point 24 and took team ' $A$ ' to match point which they subsequently won.
Team ' $B$ ' vehemently protested against the delay sanctions.
Were they justified in their protest?
attack hit the ball was entirely higher than the top of the net. The attack hit becomes complete when the ball completely crosses the plane of the net or contacts the block.
In this situation there are 3 options:

- attacker hits the ball first: attacker completed an attack within the above condition. Team B serves next.
- attacker and blocker hit the ball simultaneously: since the hit was made above the net, i.e. where both players have right to play the ball, the blocker's hit in the same moment of the attack hit was legal. However the attacker completed his/her attack, when the blocker hit the ball - it means he/she made an attack hit fault. Team B serves next.
- blocker hits the ball first: since the blocker blocked a legal attack hit made by the Libero, no fault was committed. The attacker's play should be considered as a block. The rally is to be continued.

Rule 19.3.1.4

## Ruling

Team 'B' had a good reason to protest.
In instances in which the referees have had a genuine misunderstanding, the team should not be penalized. Thus the first delay warning was probably not justified.
Had this been the case, the second instance would have merited only a delay warning and the protest of ' $B$ ' would have never taken place.
On the other hand, team ' $B$ ' should have registered their right to file a protest at the time of the first delay sanction. Once they fail to do this, they give up the right to protest against the decisions of the 1st referee.

Rule 5.1.2.1
9.22 (9.21/2014)

During the second set, the scoreboard which could be seen by the spectators was not correct.
Immediately, the emotional coach of ' $A$ ' challenged the scorer, the referee, and the Control Committee. $\mathrm{He} /$ she was supported by his Head of Delegation who appeared at the Control Committee table from the spectator seats reserved for Heads of Delegation.
The 1st referee whistled the game captain of ' $A$ ' and explained that he/she was sanctioning the coach with a penalty for rude conduct. Although the game captain had to communicate this to his/her coach, he/she did not do so. Furthermore, in the resulting confusion, the 2 nd referee missed the sanctioning of

## Ruling

The initial error was that of the scorer.
Rule 25.2.2.1
The second one was that of the scoreboard operator. The third one was that of the assistant scorer for not checking with the official scorer to be certain that they were each in agreement.

Rule 26.2.2.5
The 1st referee, via his $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee, should have been certain that the penalty was recorded on the score sheet.

Rule 25.2.2.6
The game captain should have communicated the misconduct to his/her coach. When he/she did not do this, he/she should have been sanctioned.
the coach and the penalty for the rude conduct was not recorded on the score sheet.
The score was corrected and the game continued without any mention of an incident recorded on the score sheet.
How should this incident have been handled?

Rule 21
The Control Committee was incorrect in allowing the Head of Delegation to approach the Control Committee's table. The Game Jury President should have stopped the match and after a consultation with the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee and the scorer or e-scorer, if used, he/she should decide upon the continuation of the match.

## See Refereeing Guidelines and Instructions.

 Rules 25.2.2.6, 25.2.2.7
### 9.23 (9.22/2014)

At the start of a set, ' A ' had player \#11 in position 6 instead of player \#15 who was written in the line-up sheet. During the check of the line-up the 2nd referee did not realize the discrepancy. After the line-up check, player \#11 was immediately replaced by the Libero. Later on the Libero was replaced by player \#11. The first TTO happened at the score of $8: 5$ for ' $A$ '. After the TTO player \#11 was preparing to serve. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee signaled the wrong player on the court and started to explain the fault to the game captain and the coach. It was a long discussion and the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee also came down from his chair.
After a check of the Libero control sheet, it was obvious, that player \#11 was in the game since the start of this set. So the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee decided to cancel all points of ' $A$ '. The points of ' $B$ ' remained valid and they were awarded the service at the score of 5:0 for ' $B$ '. Some rallies later, when ' $B$ ' led $8: 5$, the TTO was given again.
Was it the correct procedure by the referees?

### 9.24 (9.23/2014)

The referee decided team ' $B$ ' would serve for the next rally. Immediately ' $B$ ' substituted player \#1 by player \#9. Meanwhile the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee changed his decision due to the line judge's signal and gave the rally to ' $A$ '. Realising this situation, the coach of ' $B$ ' requested to delete the substitution and rectify the line-up. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee permitted this and the game continued with the "original" line-up of ' $B$ '. Was this procedure correct?

### 9.25 (9.24/2014) See Case 4.27

During a rally a player received a blood injury. After the end of the rally the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee called him/her and instructed him/her to ask for immediate medical help to stop the bleeding, because it is forbidden to play with a still bleeding wound. The treatment lasted about one minute. After the bleeding was stopped, the game continued. Was the procedure by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee correct?

## Ruling

It is a very complex situation with some mistakes.

- The first mistake was committed at the beginning of the set. The line-up of ' $A$ ' was not according to the line-up sheet. The 2nd referee did not realize this discrepancy.
- The second mistake happened after the TTO. 'B' should have been given an additional point as penalty for the positional fault of ' $A$ ', so the score had to be 6:0 for ' $B$ '.
- The third mistake was to give a second TTO, when ' $B$ ' reached the 8th point.

If there had been a Control Committee at this match, the Game Jury President also had to check the line-up and to intervene and correct the situation.

## Ruling

Since the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee changed his decision, which was the basis of ' $B$ 's' substitution, in the spirit of the game the coach's request could be accepted. No substitution would be charged against this team.

## Ruling

It is not allowed to play with a bleeding wound, independent of the seriousness of the injury. Referees have to stop the game immediately after realizing the nature of the injury and instruct the player to ask for a medical intervention. The team is not obliged to substitute the player. Therefore, it was an acceptable procedure by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee to give neither a delay sanction nor to ask the team for a game interruption.


#### Abstract

9.26 (new -ex 3.28)

The player \#1 was ready to serve. His game captain requested confirmation of the correct server. The scorer gave the information that player \#6 should be the server. The game captain doubted this information and insisted again that player \#1 should be the server. He was still not satisfied and while attempting to approach him, the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee whistled for service. Amidst confusion, the team was penalized for not serving within the allowed 8 seconds In the score sheet it was found that the coach of the team had submitted an incorrect line-up, which had player \#6 in two positions. It should have been \#6 and \#1. Number \#1 should have been serving as the game captain had surmised. What is the correct ruling by the $1^{\text {st }}$ referee?


## Ruling

Common sense must prevail in resolving this case. The initial error was that of the coach, when hefshe submitted his incorrect line-up. This was compounded by the inattention of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee and the scorer
Therefore, the team should not be penalized for the incorrect server, and player \#1 should be allowed to serve.
On the other hand, the original error of the coach caused a delay of the game, thus a delay sanction must be applied
Furthermore, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ referee must request immediately after discovering and clarifying the situation a new line-up sheet from the coach and the score sheet should be corrected

Rules of the Game Commission decision

## APPENDIX

Here the cases are listed with the numbers of the concerning rules. The case numbers are hyperlinked with the cases, and from the cases you can come back to this appendix.

| Case number | Rule (1) | Rule (2) | Rule (3) | Rule (4) | Rule (5) | Rule (6) | Rule (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.01 | 4.5.1 | 4.5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.02 | 4.5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAPTAIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.03 | 5.1.2 | 20.1 | 20.2 | 21.2 | 21.3.1 |  |  |
| 1.04 | 5.1.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{1.05}$ | 5.1.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{1.06}$ | 5.1.2.1 | 20.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.07 | 5.1.2.1 | 23.2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| COACH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.09 | 5.1.2 | 5.2.3.4 | 21.1 | 21.2 | 21.3 |  |  |
| 1.10 | 5.2.1 | 5.2.3.3 | 5.3.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.11 | 5.2.3.2 | 5.2.3.4 | 5.3.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.12 | 5.2.3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE TOSS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{2.01}$ | 7.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| POSITION/ROTATIONAL FAULTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{2.02}$ | 7.4 | 7.4.2 | 7.4.3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{2.03}$ | 7.4.3 | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{2.04}$ | 1.3.3 | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{2.05}$ | 7.7.1 | 23.2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{2.06}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{2.07}$ | 7.5 | 7.7 | 12.3 | 12.4.3 |  |  |  |
| PLAYING THE BALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.01 | 10.1.2 | 10.1.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{3.02}$ | 9.2.1 | 9.2.2 | 9.3.3 | 9.3.4 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{3.03}$ | 9.2.3.2 | 14.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.04 | 9.2.2 | 9.2.3.2 | 14.2 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{3.05}$ | 9.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{3.06}$ | 9 | 9.1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.07 | 9 | 9.1 .3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{3.09}$ | 10.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.10 .1 | 8.4.1 | 8.4.2 | 9.1 | 10.1.2 | 10.1.2.1 | 10.1.2.2 |  |
| 3.10.2 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## PENETRATION UNDER THE NET

| 3.11 | 11.2 .1 | 11.2 .2 .1 | 11.2 .4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{3.12}$ | 11.2 .1 |  |  |

PLAYER AT OR CONTACTING THE NET

| $\underline{3.13}$ | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{3.14}$ | 9 | 11.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.15 | 9.1.2.2 | 9.1.2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.16 | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.17 | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{3.18}$ | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.19 | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.20 | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.21 .1 | 11.3.1 | 11.3.2 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.21 .2 | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.22 | 11.3.1 | 11.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.23 | 7.71 | 12.2.1 | 12.7.1 | 25.2.2.2 |  |  |  |
| 3.24 | 12.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.25 | 12.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.26 | 8.4.3 | 27.2.1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{3.27}$ | 12.6.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.28 | See <br> Case 9.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.29 | 12.6.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| SUBSTITUTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{4.01}$ | 15.10.2 | 15.10.3a | 15.10.4 | 16.1 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.02}$ | 15.10.3a | 15.10.3b | 15.11.1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.03}$ | 15.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.04 | 15.10.3a | 16.1.1 | 16.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 4.05 | 15.10.3 | 16.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.06}$ | 16.1.1 | 16.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.07}$ | 15.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.08 | 15.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.09 | 7.3.2 | 7.3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.10}$ | 15.9.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.11 | 15.5 | 15.6 | 15.11 | 16.1 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.12}$ | 15.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.13}$ | 15.6 | 16.1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.15}$ | 16.1.1 | 23.2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.16}$ | 7.3.5.2 | 7.3.5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.17}$ | 15.10.3a | 15.10.3c | 16.1.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.18}$ | 15.11.2 | 16.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.19}$ | 15.10.3a | 15.10.3c |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.20}$ | 4.1.3 | 4.2.2 | 5.1.1 | 5.2.2 | 7.3.5.4 | 15.9.2 |  |
| $\underline{4.21}$ | 15.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.22 | 7.3.5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TO/TTO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.23}$ | 15.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.24 | 15.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IMPROPER REQUEST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.25}$ | 15.3.1 | 15.3.2 | 15.10.3a | 15.11.1.3 | 25.2.2.6 |  |  |
| $\underline{4.26}$ | 15.11.1.4 | 16.1.5 | 25.2.2.6 |  |  |  |  |
| INJURIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.27 | 4.4 | 15.5 | 15.10.2 | 15.10.3a | 17.1.1 |  |  |
| $\underline{4.28}$ | 15.7 | 17.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.29 .1 | 15.11.1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.29.2 | 4.1.3 | 5.1 | 5.2.1 | 5.2.2 | 19.4.2.5 | 25.2.2.7 |  |
| DELAYS TO THE GAME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.30}$ | 6.4.1 | 16.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.31}$ | 16.1.2 | 16.1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.32 | 1.5 | 5.1.2.2 | 6.4.1 | 16.2 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.33}$ | 4.2 | 6.4 .1 | 6.4 .2 | 18.1 |  |  |  |
| EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.34 | 17.2 | 17.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{4.35}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| LIBERO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{5.01}$ | 19.3.2.4 | 19.3.2.8 | 24.3.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.02}$ | 6.4 .3 | 15.7 | 15.8 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.03}$ | 15.5 | 15.7 | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.04}$ | 6.4 .3 | 19.1.1 | 19.3.2 | 19.3.2.8 | 19.4 |  |  |
| $\underline{5.05}$ | 15.3.2 | 19.3.2 | 19.3.2.8 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.06}$ | 19.3.2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.07}$ | 19.3.2.1 | 19.3.2.9 | 23.2.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 5.08 | 7.5.1 | 12.3 | 19.3.2.3 | 19.3.2.5 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.09}$ | 19.1.3 | 19.3.2.2 | 19.3.2.8 | 19.4.2 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.10}$ | 5.2.3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.11 | 19.3.2.1 | 19.3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.12}$ | 15.9 | 19.3.1.1 | 26.2.2.1 | 26.2.2.2 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.13}$ | 5 | 19.2 | 19.3.2.8 | 19.4.2.5 |  |  |  |
| 5.14 | 19.3.2.9 | 23.2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.15}$ | 19.3.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.16}$ | 19.3.2.1 | 19.3.2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.17}$ | 19.3.2.8 | Diag. 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.18 | 19.3.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.19 | 19.3.2.2 | 19.3.2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.20 | 19.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.21 | 19.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.22 | 14.1.1 | 14.1.2 | 14.1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{5.23}$ | 6.1 .3 | 19.3.2.1 | 19.3.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 5.24 | 19.3.2.8 | 19.4.2.1 | 19.4.2.4 |  |  |  |  |
| CONDUCT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.01 | 21.1 | 21.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.02 | 21.2.1 | 21.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{6.03}$ | 5.2 | 21.1 | 21.2 | 21.3 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{6.04}$ | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{6.05}$ | 21.2 | 21.2.1 | 21.3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{6.06}$ | 21.1 | 21.2 | 21.3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{6.07}$ | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{6.08}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.09 | 6.4.3 | 15.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| REFEREES RESPONSABILTIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{7.01}$ | 23.3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{7.02}$ | 4.2.1 | 4.2.3 | 24.2.4 | 24.2.5 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{7.03}$ | 25.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{7.04}$ | 5.1.2.1 | 5.1.3.2 | 23.2.4 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{7.05}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{7.06}$ | 15.1 | 15.2.1 | 15.11 | 16.1 | 16.2 | 24.2.6 | 24.2.7 |
| $\underline{7.07}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{7.08}$ | 15.4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.09 | 5.2.3.4 | 5.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.10 | 5.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## SPECIAL CASES

| 8.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.02 | 17.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.03 | 17.3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.04 | 9.1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXTENDED CASES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.01 | 14.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.02 | 13.3.3 | 14.3 | 14.6.1 | Diag. 7 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.03}$ | 13.3.1 | 14.1.1 | 14.6.2 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.04}$ | 15.7 | 15.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.05}$ | 15.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.06}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.07}$ | 15.11.2 | 16.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.08}$ | 15.10.3a | 15.10.3c |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.09}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.10 | 15.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.11}$ | 15.3.1 | 15.3.2 | 15.10.3 | 15.11.1.3 | 16.1.1 | 16.1.2 | 25.2.2.6 |
| 9.12 | 15.11.1.1 | 23.3.2.3a | 24.3.2.2 | 25.2.2.6 |  |  |  |
| 9.13 | 15.11.1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.14}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.15}$ | 19.3.2.1 | 23.2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.16 | 7.5.1 | 12.3 | 19.3.2.3 | 19.3.2.5 |  |  |  |
| 9.17 | 5 | 19.1.5 | 19.2 | 19.3.2.8 |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.18}$ | 19.3.2.1 | 19.3.2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.19 | 19.3.2.1 | 19.3.2.2 | 19.3.2.7 | 19.3.2.8 |  |  |  |
| 9.20 | 19.3.1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.21 | 5.1.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.22 | 25.2.2.1 | 26.2.2.5 | 25.2.2.6 | 21 | 25.2.2.7 |  |  |
| 9.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.25}$ | Medical C | ission |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{9.26}$ | RGC |  |  |  |  |  |  |

