

## JUDGES NEWSLETTER

WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #82

NOVEMBER 2012

### Content

1. Editorial from our Chairman
2. Judges Committee Meeting – Weisbaden, GER
3. International Judges Conference in 2013
4. Appointment of judges to 2013 events
5. Candidates upgraded to full international status
6. Honorif Titles
7. Recently Approved bye laws by Dion Buhagiar
8. News from the Continental association
9. Proper acknowledgement
10. An Italian judge at Lord's
11. New International Judge Candidate
12. Case studies 81 – summing up
13. New Case Studies

### 1. Editorial

**By Morten WILMANN, Chairman**

Dear Judges,

We are now approaching the end of 2012 – another important year for judges, with the Olympics and Paralympics as the most important events. Your committee has recently been busy with the updating of the Judges Guide Book, which should be ready shortly and with the appointment for duties next year, among other issues.

The distribution of duties is always a difficult task, and I believe it is vital to tell you that you cannot count on being used on World Archery level every year. This distribution of duties is not based on skills, but rather on where you actually apply and the various aspects of gender, geography and nationality (not more than one judge from a MA at the same event). It is a puzzle.

But even if you haven't got any duty at WA events, we urge you to be updated and get some practice at regional or national level. Actually you have a duty to assist in educating judges at national level, as we would like judging to be as consistent as possible throughout the world, to avoid confusion and bad habits regarding rules, procedures and their understanding.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank you for providing various case studies. Continue to send us those ...

All the best to all of you

Morten



## **2. Judges Committee Meeting– Weisbaden, GER – 31 October – 1 November 2012**

---

The World Archery Judge Committee held its annual meeting in Weisbaden, Germany on 31 October – 1 November. Its three members were present together with Séverine Dériaz from the Office in Lausanne.

Some of the topics addressed at the meeting included upgrading from international Judge Candidate to full status, appointments for 2013, honorific titles, judges guidebook, power point presentations on the website, procedures, judges newsletter, new uniforms, committee budget, 2013 conference, etc.



The Committee working at the headquarters of the German Federation

## **3. International Judges Conference in 2013**

---

The International Judges' Conference to be held in Asia in 2013 is planned to take place in Bangkok, Thailand, immediately after the World Para Championships. Please, do not forget that you are expected to participate in at least one of the three conferences scheduled for the 2012-2014 reaccreditation period. The 2014 conference will be held in Europe. Further information on exact days and costs will be provided as soon as it is available.

#### 4. Appointment of judges to 2013 events

WA Judge Committee has just appointed the following judges to officiate in 2013:

**Indoor world cup – Las Vegas, USA**  
**No appointments to be made by our committee.**

##### World Cup 1 – Shanghai, China

James Larven (Chair)	AUS	OC
Jean P. Galeyrand	FRA	EU
Elsie Luk	HKG	AS
Angelina Chan	SIN	AS
Mahmoz Abdolkarimi	IRI	AS
Yu Husan Pan	TPE	AS
Alt: Ahmed Tanvir	BAN	AS

##### World Cup 2 – Antalya, Turkey

Pedro Sanz (Chair)	ESP	EU
Laura Churchill	CAN	AM
Pecilius Tan	SIN	AS
Marya Larkina	RUS	EU
Andrea Bortot	ITA	EU
Wolfgang Böcker	GER	EU
Alt: Klaus Lykkebæk	DEN	EU

##### World Cup 3 – Medellin, Colombia

Morten B. Wilmann (Chair)	NOR	EU
Sunethra Seneviratne	SRI	AS
Gloria Rosa	PUR	AM
Johnny Hernandez	VEN	AM
Randall Jones	CAN	AM
Lenny Schwade	USA	AM
Alt: Daniel Rugeroni	ARG	AM

##### World Cup 4 – Wroclaw, Poland

Luca Stucchi (Chair)	ITA	EU
Paola Praschker	ARG	AM
Buyantseseg Namkhai	MGL	AS
Andjelko Praskalo	CRO	EU
Kathy Lipscombe	GBR	EU
Robert Erica	NED	EU
Alt: Ahmed Rousdhy	EGY	AF

##### World Cup Final – Paris, France

Xiuzhi Zhang (Chair)	CHN	AS
Jean P. Galeyrand	FRA	EU
Raoula Tamer	LEB	AS
Alt: Flemming Skjoldborg	DEN	EU

##### World Games – Cali, Colombia

Friedrich Karle (Chair)	GER	EU
Patti-Jo Middlesbrough	CAN	AM
Davood Nematinia	IRI	AS
Robert Erica	NED	EU
Nico Tomaselli	ITA	EU
Didier Gras	FPO	OC
Daniel Rugeroni	ARG	AM
Alt: Marya Larkina	RUS	EU

##### World Youth Championships – Wuxi, China

Schendorff Vang (Chair)	FRO	EU
Yap-Jin Chong (DoS)	MAS	AS
Macide Erdener	TUR	EU
Ahmed Rousdhy	EGY	AF
Henk Wagemakers	NED	EU
Lorraine van der Westhuizen	RSA	AF
Cesar Araujo	MEX	AM
George Loh	SIN	AS
Mildred de Leon	PHI	AS
Kay Thi	MYA	AS
Maya Shalaby	SLO	EU
Joanne Orbell	GBR	EU
Martino Miani	ITA	EU
Alt: Indranil Datta	IND	AS
Eddie Yip	HKG	AS



**World 3D Championships - Sassari, Italia**

Jay Ben-Ari (Chair)	ISR	EU
Vigdis Landskaug	NOR	EU
Roger Garrod	CAN	AM
Lena Fazzolari	ARG	AM
Indranil Datta	IND	AS
Vladimir Sincek	CRO	EU
Hannah Brown	GBR	EU
Shinji Egashira	JPN	AS
Karen O' Malley	AUS	OC
Alt: Friedrich Karle	GER	EU
Robert Pian	USA	AM

**World Target Championships – Antalya, Turkey**

Graham Potts (Chair)	GBR	EU
Tom Green (DoS)	USA	AM
Andras Hegedus	HUN	EU
Sergio Font	CUB	AM
Fai-Keong Leon	SIN	AS
Dion Buhagiar	MLT	EU
Celine Gravel	CAN	AM
Xiuzhi Zhang	CHN	AS
Charmaine Ho	RSA	AF
Annamalai Murugason	MAS	AS
Ahmed Tanvir	BAN	AS

Sabrina Steffens	GER	EU
Hossein Nasirinejad	IRI	AS
Ting-Ni Chen	TPE	AS

Alt: Susanne Womersley	AUS	OC
Irena Rosa	SLO	EU

**World Para Championships – Bangkok, Thailand**

Frankie Hoong (Chair)	SIN	AS
Marty Swanson (DoS)	USA	AM
Yap-Lee Chong	MAS	AS
David Martin	RSA	AF
Davood Nematinia	IRI	AS
Adam Martinez	PUR	AM
Nobutomo Takeushi	JPN	AS
Richard Breese	GBR	EU
Ahmed Koura	EGY	AF
Ranjan Bhowmik	IND	AS
Sun Hee Kim	KOR	AS
Jay Ben-Ari	ISR	EU
Christiane Murphy	CAN	AM
Katarina Plakouda	GRE	EU
Alt: Marco Cattani	ITA	EU
Flemming Skjoldborg	DEN	EU

**5. Candidates upgraded to full international status**

WA Judge Committee has just upgraded the following candidates to international judges:

Ahmed Koura	(EGY)
Andjelko Praskalo	(CRO)
Vladimir Sincek	(CRO)
Lorraine Vanderwesthuizen	(RSA)
Ahmed Roushdy	(EGY)
Ranjan Bhowmik	(IND)

## 6. Honorific Titles

---

International Judge TANG Yip Kay (SIN) has been awarded the title of Honorary Judge. Mr. Tang has been an International Judge for many years and officiated at several world class events, including the 2001 World Championships, the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney and the 2004 Paralympic Games in Athens. He has also been very active in Asia, where he has chaired several judge commissions.



## 7. Recently Approved Bye Laws by Dion Buhagiar

---

The World Archery (WA) during recent council meetings (17 December 2011 and 31 January 2012) approved a number of new by-laws; in fact, Book 1: 14 in number, Book 2: 13 in number, and Book 3: 13 in number, along with a number of changes to books 4 and 5. As international judges we all know that it is absolutely essential that we periodically refer to the WA web page and to update ourselves on newly approved by-laws, and interpretations issued by WA. I take this opportunity to urge everyone to make themselves aware of the new by-laws; a lot of them come into effect on the 1 April 2012, and the 2012 competition season is now ramping up to full swing.

A brief overview of the more important by-laws follows, it should be noted that this by no means an exhaustive representation of all the by-laws that have been approved by WA. **Be aware that the bylaw changes refer to the Rule Books valid at the time, while the structure of the books has been changed by the 1 April 2012.**

**Book 1 :** *deals mainly in procedural matter, and we see the clarification or the addition of by-laws relating to ; forfeited matches, breaks in practice, dress regulations, disqualification of teams, judges observer, Judges availability, Judges test, Judges re-accreditation test, Judges with drawl, scoring procedures, and the Olympic games match play.*

**Forfeited matches:** a clear definition of a forfeit match is given, a forfeit now occurs if one of the two teams or one of the individual athletes do not show up when the order of shooting is decided (match play), similarly in simultaneous shooting, if a team or individual is not present at the start of the match, then the team or athlete present will be declared the winner of the match. It can be seen that a forfeit is automatic in these conditions and no arrows need to be shot.

**Practice:** the limitation of practice ending at least 15mins before the competition has been removed. The end of practice ends with the pulling of the practice arrows on completion of the final end of practice.

**Dress regulations:** we are all aware of what a hot topic this can be. The changes in the by-law concern the difference in dress between categories. The different categories of a country may have different uniforms so long as the athletes in the same category are wearing the same uniform. We also need to be aware that in team match play the athletes making up the team must all be wearing the same colour and style of shirt, and the same colour pants/shorts/skirt (not necessarily the same style).

**Disqualification of teams:** A team will consist of the highest 3 (2 in Mixed team) ranked athletes of a country, as decided during the qualification round. The composition of the team may be changed so long as the team captain notifies the DoS (Director of Shoot) or the CoJ (Chairman of Judges) in writing at least 1 hour before the start of the round of the competition. If in the unfortunate circumstance that this procedure is not followed the team in violation will be disqualified.

**Judges' availability:** Judges are required to make themselves available for at least 1 Judging duty where the Judges committee is responsible for appointing Judges every two years, the deletion here has been with regard to World ranking events, where the Judges committee may not be consulted in the appointment of Judges.

**Judges test:** As you are all aware as international Judges we are required to undertake an open book re-accreditation exam, recent changes require that this will now take place in the second half of the year before the accreditation expires. In addition to this a closed book-exam will be taken at the first conference of participation within the accreditation period. This additional closed book exam, aims to assess the judges ability to deal with specific situations which may arise unexpectedly on the competition field. Judges need to be aware of this and the first test will be taken in Ogden, USA, this coming June. In addition to the above Judges need to be aware that **judges failing the open book exam will no longer be given the opportunity to take a second exam.** If you fail the open book exam, its simple, you are not re-accredited.

**Judges withdrawal/suspension:** Many of you are aware of the unfortunate incidents that took place in several high level competitions during the second half of 2011. Our chairman has on many an occasion highlighted that it take years to build up our reputation, but that it takes a few unfortunate incidents and a few seconds to destroy it. We cannot be complacent and we must be alert at all times. The WA judges committee through a new by-law has the ability and responsibility to withdraw or suspend for a period of time a Judges accreditation if in committee's opinion the judge concerned is not handling judging issues to the required standard. I trust that this rule will never have to be used.

**Scoring Procedures:** A streamlined procedure is being implemented during scoring of the Elimination and Finals of the Olympic Round. The procedure is as follows: the value of the arrows will be recorded by the scorer in the order that they have been shot. These unofficially recorded values will be checked by the agents if requires when official scoring takes place at the target. To verify the scores the Target Judge calls the arrow scores in descending order at the target, and will sign any change score.

**Book 2 :** *clarifications and new by-laws; media line, discontinuing use of 5 ring 80cm target faces, Distance between scoring zones, emergency equipment, round to be shot first, practice during byes, disqualification of a team/individual, arriving after shooting has started, un-sportsmanlike behaviour and the removal of the red card.*

The changes approved here have a direct bearing on some of the procedures normally adopted during competitions, and we should all be aware of these changes.

**Media line:** You are all well aware that we normally lay down a media lane, now an amendment clarifies that a media line will be marked one metre in front of waiting line.

**Discontinuing the use of the 5 ring 80cm target faces:** recent changes in the layout and number of scoring zones on target faces has resulted in the use of a 6 ring (5-10) 80cm face at 50m, whilst a 5 ring (6-10) 80cm target face was introduced at 30m. WA has taken the decision to unify the two faces and to discontinue the use of the 5-ring target face at 30m. This rule change comes into full effect on the 1 January 2015.

**Distance between scoring zones on adjacent target faces:** the distance between the scoring zones of two adjacent targets (5 or 6 ring) at the same height has been reduced from 10 cm to 2 cm.

**Size of target numbers:** clarification here stipulates that the numbers for outdoor archery should be 30 cm tall, whilst for indoor archery the numbers should not be less than 15cm tall.

**Emergency equipment:** if plates are used as a back-up solution in the vent that electronic timing devices fail, the plate's used to control timing have had their markings and colours up dated by this by-law change. The side that was previously required to be covered in alternating yellow and black strips at 45 degrees has now been substituted with the colour green. The reverse side will be yellow. The yellow side of the plate is used to indicate that 30seconds remain.

**Practice on the competition field during byes:** practice will be limited to three arrows per end and a max of three sets for recurve and five sets for compound. If more than three arrows are shot by an athlete, the athlete will be warned by a Judge, if the athlete persists, they may be denied further practice on the competition field, such a violation will not affect the next match.

**Arriving late:** Previously if an athlete arrived late to the competition, it was the DoS who decided whether the athlete could make up the lost arrows, or whether the arrows would be forfeited. The responsibility of deciding on this matter is now in the hands of the CoJ, or his designee.

**Red Card:** All references to the use of red card has been deleted, as the red card has no significance for the rules themselves. The use of red card is only a judge procedure to indicate that the highest score of the end will be deducted.

**Un-sportsmanlike behaviour:** three new by-laws have been introduced. Basically Un-sportsmanlike conduct shall not be tolerated. Guidance is given on this issue. If the conduct of an athlete or anyone deemed to be assisting an athlete is un-sportsmanlike, the athlete shall be disqualified, in the case of the assisting person, they may be removed from the FoP. Un-sportsmanlike behaviour could result in suspension from future events.

**Falsification or unauthorised alteration of a score:** will result in immediate disqualification. In addition to this, and most importantly,

**Arrows withdrawn from the target prior to scoring:** A repeated offence may result in the disqualification of the athlete in question.

**Book 3 :** many of the by-laws implemented in Book 2 carry over to book three, which deals with indoor competitions. New by-laws refer to: the distance between scoring zones, size of target numbers, emergency equipment, arriving after shooting has started, un-sportsmanlike behaviour, removal of the red card. By far the most important by-law change refers to the new triangular and vertical triple faces for use in indoor competitions.

**Indoor target face:** there are 4 new target faces (a) 40 cm – R triangular triple face, (b) 40 cm-C triangular triple face, (c) 40cm – R vertical triple face, and (d) the 40cm – C vertical triple face. The distinction between these faces and the regular triple faces is that the recurve (R) and compound (C) have different sized and singular ten rings. The 40cm (R) has a 40mm 10 ring, whilst the 40cm (C) has a 20mm 10 ring, the combined normal face has both ten rings.

**Distance between scoring zones:** Where a four target setup, using triple vertical faces is used, the horizontal distance between target 2 and 3 should not be less than 10cm, whilst the horizontal distance between targets 1 and 2, 3 and 4 should not exceed 2cm. A three target setup, will allow a minimum of 10cm between targets 1, 2 and 3. In the case of a 2 target setup a minimum of 25 cm between vertical columns will be allowed.

It should once again be stressed that this is by no means and attempt to substitute the need for each and every Judge to refer to the by-laws as approved and displayed on the WA web site. The relevant article reference has purposely been left out for this reason.

On a parting note, please be aware that WA has recently issued the 2012 rule books. It should be noted that the rule books are still under development and review, and that it is immediately apparent that the new rule books are sub divided in a very different manner to previous versions of the rule book.

Happy reading!

## **8. News from the Continental Association**

A continental Judges seminar was carried out in Mar del Plata, Argentina, on 21 – 23 September. Candidates from Argentina and Paraguay were in attendance at the seminar conducted by WA Judge Committee Member and WAA Chairman of Judges Sergio Font.

As a result of the seminar, the following continental judges have been named:

Jose Luis del Torno (ARG)  
Martin Nasser (ARG)  
Patricia Dukardt (ARG)  
Omar E. Ghio (ARG)



The participants in the Seminar in Argentina



The list of continental, international candidate and international judges in World Archery Americas now includes a total of 82 judges from Canada, the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Colombia, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador and Chile.

## **9. Proper acknowledgement**

---

A judge and his performance is mostly a “backstage” thing in archery. We do our job and for most events we “are just there” and no notice is taken.

However, sometimes we earn some credit – and below you’ll find a translation of an article from the Italian magazine “Arcieri” interviewing our fellow judge Fulvio Cantini.

The article is somewhat shortened.

## **10. An Italian judge at Lord’s**

---

Fulvio Cantini had the honour of judging two of the finals in the Olympics and enjoyed a privileged position in the Italian history of international glory in archery

In addition to the archers we found another person in the main role at Lord’s Cricket Ground in London: Fulvio Cantini. He has been an international judge since 1995, and after many years of waiting, his dream of an Olympic performance finally came true.

“Before every Olympic Archery Event since I started, I have been ready to step in, and I had some hope already for the Athens Olympics” says Fulvio. “When they finally invited me to London, I hardly believed that it was a reality”. I work as a police officer at the border by Gran San Bernardo, and it is not easy for me to get a leave for long periods.

Still I hope I have done my duty for the police and I have to thank them for giving me the opportunity to be in London, and fortunately I did not have to use my vacation “

Fulvio’s contribution has always been worthy of the standard set by Italian international judges, and these have also always been well represented within World Archery. “Luca Stucchi was judging the Gold Final in Beijing 2008”, Fulvio says. “The very morning of the female team Gold Final, I was told to judge it! That was a real emotional moment and totally unexpected as we were totally 13 judges. It was very nice to judge other matches too, but a Gold Final is a Gold Final”.

In the Olympics the athletes are, of course, always the main characters, however Fulvio Cantini had his TV moments. “With all those TV-cameras and crowded public stands, each match is like a Final. I got lots of messages and calls from friends and relatives who had seen me on TV.”

When Italy’s Gold Team Match for men, Fulvio was closely around after having finished his bronze match.

“ I knew that I had to swap with another judge if Italy reached the Gold Final and so it was. However, I enjoyed being present and it was indeed a moment of strong feelings. Of course, as an



international judge I had to keep a straight face, but I really experienced the moment 120% and was quite exhausted. Afterwards I had to be one week on antibiotics to fully recover, but of course it was a fantastic experience. And now I can truly say: I was there !”



The 2012 London Olympic Games Judges Commission



The 2012 London Paralympic Games Judges Commission

---

## **11. New International Judge Candidates**

As a conclusion of a very successful Judge Seminar in Wiesbaden recently, the attendants sat for the usual exams and the results were the best ever for such a large group, and all 17 made the cut with a margin. It seems that the educational structure with a continental seminar and then international experience before you may attend an international seminar, makes a more solid platform for our new judge candidates.

We welcome the following International Judge Candidates; representing 14 different Member Associations;:

Ringa Baltrusaite	LTU
Mohammed Faruque Dhali	BAN
Neil Foden	GBR
Maren Haase	GER
Francisco Giminez Hernandez	ESP
Peter Holt	SWE
Martino Miani	ITA
Drasko Mihinsac	CRO
Dennis Paquet	FRA
Christophe Pezet	FRA
Yinan Qu	CHN
Louis Simon Peter	MAS
Bjarne Strandby	DEN
Sabine Szymanski	GER
Rubens Terra Neto	BRA
Lian Wang	CHN
Eva Width	NOR

---

## **12. Case Studies 81 – summing up**

First of all we would like to say that a lot of our judges made a good evaluation of these case studies and how to handle them. You will find your committee's considerations below:

### **81. 1**

In an individual finals match with shooting alternation, the judge in the blind notices that archer B shoots an arrow within the same time frame as archer A when it was archer A's turn to shoot. When the judge, the scorer, and the agents moved to the target, the judge deducted archer B's highest scoring arrow. The scorer reported the deduction to the spotter who made the correction on the scoreboard. The line judge claimed that he had not seen the violation and had thus not raised his red card and not informed the target judge that a penalty was to be applied.

If you are the chairman here, how would you handle this discrepancy between the line judge and the target judge? Would you still allow the deduction?

### **Answer:**

Unfortunately too many judges fell into the trap of discussing which of the judges (Line judge or Target judge) had the right to decide.

As most of the judges correctly stated: It is a matter of fairness to the archers, not who decides.....

The question will therefore be if an arrow was shot in the wrong sequence or not; that is the question you have to look into.

Based on the case we may not know that, but it should not be difficult to find out; we have the reaction of the agents in the blinds (did they react as the Target Judge?), we have coaches on the line that may react, we have the announcer, and as some of you indicated, we have a "neutral" person in DoS who is supposed to have watched the scenery. Maybe even the Chairperson noticed.....?

Some few judges would still give a value to the fact that the red card was not given, but the red card is not vital for the question if a violation has occurred or not. (That was the reason for it being removed from the rules).

If an archer breaks a rule, the proper action must be taken.

### **81.2**

In a Recurve Men match archers A and B are tied at 5 set points each. It is then necessary to shoot an extra arrow to solve the tie. Both archers are shooting at the same target. The judge measures the distance between each arrow and the center of the target and says that the archers are still tied because the difference between the distances for each arrow is less than 2 mm. Neither of the archers agrees with the judge's decision. Even the archer whose arrow was 1 mm further away from the center argues that his opponent must be the winner because his arrow was actually closer. As a result, the judge changes his decision and declares archer B as the winner of the match. What's your opinion on the judge's procedure?

#### **Answer:**

First of all it is important again to mention: When you make a decision on a value (or closest to centre), inform of the decision without any further comments.

In this case it seems to us that the judge said that within two mm the archers would be declared equal (to explain his decision to the archers).

Since he changed his decision, maybe he realized (or was told by the archers) that the guidelines say 1 mm – not 2 mm (which should give a clear winner).

If a judge is aware of his own mistake, he should correct it – which he did. It does not look good for the judge, but it is fair to the archers – which should always be our guideline.

### **81.3**

At 50 meters, one of archer A's arrows penetrates so deeply into the target that it is not possible to see its nock from the front of the target. A judge tries to figure out the value of this arrow by thoroughly checking from the back of the target and comparing the position of the shaft (as seen from the back) with other arrows whose values are easily determinable from the front of the target. By using this procedure to avoid having to push the arrow to determine the value of the arrow, the judge decides that the arrow in question is a 9. Once all the arrows have been scored, the archer pushes his arrow from behind and finds out that the arrow was actually in the ten-ring. He calls the judge and shows him the position of the arrow in the face. The judge refuses to change the value to a ten claiming that neither the arrows nor the face may be touched to decide the value of an arrow. Was the judge's decision correct? Do you think he followed the correct procedure?

**Answer:**

Shortly speaking; the judge followed the correct procedure. (We take it for granted, even if only some few of you mentioned it, that after discovering the arrow deeply embedded, he would first look for the arrow hole in the face).

The arrow should only be pushed back if it is not possible to make a better judgement of the value, and then – as most of you mentioned – that should only be done by the judge. The decision of the judge will stand.

**13. New case studies**

---

**Case study 82.1**

At an International event, during the Team Finals, the last archer of Team A was very excited, there would not be enough time left for him to shoot 2 arrows. As he was moving on to the shooting line, he removed one of his arrows out of his quiver. It was the arrow he carried with him for luck, which had no arrow point on it. As he was putting the arrow on the lawn, the judge showed his yellow card. The archer said that "this is not a complete arrow, I cannot shoot it". He did not return to the 1 meter line and then to the shooting line back again and he shot his arrows in the time period.

The Judge was not satisfied with the answer of the archer to the yellow card he showed and told the Target Judge that the highest valued arrow of team A should be forfeited. They did. The Team Captain of the Team A wrote a complaint to the Jury to appeal.

- a- Do you agree with the decision of the Line Judge?
- b- What would you do if you were the Line Judge?
- c- What would you do if you were a member of the Jury of Appeal?

**Case study 82.2**

In the Recurve Men Team Final (alternate shooting), the 1st archer of Team A moving out of the 1m line too soon and was given a yellow card by the line judge. He returned immediately and moved out of the 1m line again with the arrow still on the bow. No yellow card was given. He shot his arrow with no red card given. The teams completed the shooting for that end and during scoring, the Line Judge ordered the Target Judge to deduct the highest scoring arrow of Team A. The Target Judge did as instructed.

The Team Manager of the Team A protest to the Line Judge for not showing the yellow card for the 2nd offence of arrow out of the quiver while moving out of the 1m Line. Moreover the judge didn't show the red card for the penalty. The Line Judge mentioned that the new rule without showing the red card, the judge still has the right to remove the highest scoring arrow value if there is a penalty.

What is your consideration here...?

**Your reply must be sent to WA at latest on the 1 December 2012**