

Dear Michael

You asked me, as a previous Convenor of the Law and Ethics Committee in the circumstance where the appellant was the Chair of that Committee, to seek the ruling of the Committee on that appeal. I was able to ascertain the opinions of John and Shelagh but I was unable to contact Toni by email or text message – she may well be on holiday.

The decision of the Law and Ethics Committee is that the appeal by Rex Anderson against the ruling by Ian Hamilton that a play –off for the remaining place in Premier I should not be upheld.

I am not sure whether we are required to advise the appellant of the reasons for our decision but I have set them out in the following paragraphs and will respect your judgement on how widely they should be publicised.

We noted Rex's differentiation between designated regular and regular members but we did not consider that this difference was sufficiently clear within the present rules to uphold the appeal. Rex argues that his team designated four people as regular members and that that designation should determine which members of the team should be considered as regular members in the event of a team splitting and the two groups wishing to take the place in the league of the previous team. Rex suggests that it is the team that designates regular members (5.1.2) and that, if no notification by the team is made to the organiser, those members remain as regular members.

Rule 5.2.2 however states that 'A regular member, who does not play one-third of the matches, will, after the season is over, be treated as a substitute member for the purposes of Rule 5.6 below.' 5.6 states 'A regular member of a relegated team may only play in the division or league, from which they have been relegated, in the following season as a substitute.'

Neither Paul nor Tyrone played one third of the matches and Rule 5.2.2 states that they should be treated as substitute members in the circumstance that their team was relegated and hence would still be eligible to play in the higher league next season because they were not regular members of the relegated team. Their status as regular members would thus be altered even though that team had not redesignated them.

The question for L and E therefore was whether it is the designation by the team of who is a regular member regardless of the number of matches played or whether the definition of a regular member under 5.2.2 requires that member to have played more than one third of the matches.

Our judgement is that Rule 5.6, which would have allowed Paul and Tyrone to play this season in another Premier 1 team had the Anderson team been relegated suggests that they should not count as regular members for the purposes of determining whether a play-off is needed.

I would be grateful if you could inform all the interested parties at your earliest convenience.

Many thanks

Alan Sharp