



# **RULES OF THE GAME CASEBOOK**

**2009 Edition**  
(Rev. 1.5)

Compiled and Prepared  
by the FIVB Rules of the Game Commission

©2009 Fédération Internationale de Volleyball

## INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TOPIC OF RULINGS</u>	<u>CASES</u>
2	INDEX	
3	PREFACE	
4	PART I: THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF APPLICATION	
9	PART II: CASES	
9	<b>CHAPTER 1: PARTICIPANTS</b>	
9	Wearing Forbidden Objects .....	1.1 – 1.2
9	Captain .....	1.3 – 1.7
10	Coach .....	1.8 – 1.13
13	<b>CHAPTER 2: PLAYING FORMAT</b>	
13	The Toss .....	2.1
13	Positional and Rotational Faults .....	2.2 – 2.8
16	<b>CHAPTER 3: PLAYING ACTIONS</b>	
16	Playing the Ball .....	3.1 – 3.10
18	Penetration Under the Net .....	3.11 – 3.13
19	Player At or Contacting the Net .....	3.14 – 3.25
22	Service .....	3.26 – 3.32
24	Attack Hit .....	3.33 – 3.37
25	Block .....	3.38 – 3.51
30	<b>CHAPTER 4: INTERRUPTIONS AND DELAYS</b>	
30	Substitutions .....	4. – 4.16
34	Time-Outs & Technical Time-Outs .....	4.17
34	Improper Request .....	4.18 – 4.20
35	Injuries .....	4.21 – 4.24
37	Delays to the Game .....	4.25 – 4.27
38	External Interference .....	4.28 – 4.29
38	<b>CHAPTER 5: LIBERO</b> .....	5.1 – 5.25
47	<b>CHAPTER 6: PARTICIPANTS' CONDUCT</b> .....	6.1 – 6.9
50	<b>CHAPTER 7: REFEREES AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES</b> .....	7.1 – 7.11
53	<b>CHAPTER 8: SPECIAL CASES</b> .....	8.1 – 8.7
56	<b>REGISTER</b>	

## 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.

This is the background to the continued development of the Rule Text.

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.

The 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.

In publishing the FIVB Casebook, key situations are highlighted to promote and unify the decision-making process. It is anticipated that this edition of the book will therefore continue to be of great benefit to players, coaches and especially to referees, so that everyone can be confident of consistent decision-making, regardless of who directs the match or at what level of competition.

This edition of the Casebook has been compiled by Klaus Fezer from original work by Yoshiharu Nishiwaki, based on a format by the late Dr Jim Coleman. This foreword acknowledges special help and contributions from other Members of the Rules of the Game Commission, and Gavriel Kraus, President of the International Refereeing Commission, along with other Members of his Commission.

This edition is based upon the 2009-2012 edition of the Rules Text whose mandate was approved by the FIVB Congress in 2008.

Sandy Steel  
President, FIVB Rules of the Game Commission

## ***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. But the more important thing is that they should acquire the basic principles of rule formulation. If not, they could never have the correct comprehensive understanding of the rules and naturally would have great difficulty in applying the rules properly. Especially when a situation, occurs which has not been clearly stated in the rules, the referees can correctly make decisions with authority. **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.

For the purpose of correct application of the rules, the referees should have a complete knowledge about the following principle functions and theoretical principles of formulation and application of the rules.

### 1. The Function of the Rules:

Naturally, if you want to apply the rules correctly, you must know what the functions of the rules are. Generally speaking, the Rules as a whole have the following functions:

#### A. Characterization of the Game:

The rules give the characteristics of the game and differentiate volleyball from other sports.

- a. The rules stipulate the conditions, facilities and equipment of the game, the court surface and measurements, the regulations of the net and the balls, etc.
- b. The rules regulate the number of participants, the number of players in play and their positions, rotational order, etc.
- c. The rules set up the methods of play, how to keep the ball in play, the crossing space, and how to win a point, a set and a match.

#### B. Legalization of Techniques:

Many of the Rules give the clear definition and distinct differentiation of the proper techniques from improper and illegal techniques. These rules, under the category of techniques, are the rules which need to be studied and clarified very definitely by the referees for their correct application.

#### C. Play Under Fair Conditions:

All the rules concerning court, facilities and equipment, techniques or even conduct are equal for all the players of both teams. That is "FAIRNESS". This is a very critical point for refereeing. If the application of the rules is different for the teams that are playing, even if it is not intentionally applied by the referee, it will be unfair. So, accuracy in understanding and application of the rules is the basic element of fairness and justice.

#### D. Educational Function:

To have Sportsmanlike Conduct is a basic behavioral objective for athletes in all kinds of sports. Chapter Seven, "Participants' Conduct", is stated especially for this purpose. All referees must put their emphasis on this function for this is the core of sports. The aim of the sport is not only to compete, but also to create an atmosphere of sportsmanship and fairness and to develop understanding and universal friendship.

## 2. The Influential Factors in Formulation of the Rules:

The rules must be in accordance with the demands of the development of sports. So in formulation and modification of the Rules, the following factors should naturally be taken into consideration:

### A. Technical and Tactical Development:

The rules should not only fit the demands of technical and tactical development, but also take the initiative in *leading* the development of the sport as well.

### B. The Spectacular Requirements:

The promotion of any sport event, to a considerable extent, depends on its attractiveness. The attractiveness is shown by the level of the emotional motivation of the crowds. That is, therefore, a measure of the SPECTACULAR components generated by the game.

### C. The Social Publicizing Requirements:

The development of modern sport depends greatly on the social element, the society. Publicity is the most important and effective way to build up the interest and acceptance of the public to the sport. This is one of the core factors to be considered.

### D. The Economical Requirements:

Naturally, in promoting any kind of sport, it is absolutely necessary to have a financial support. Certain concessions should be made for this factor.

## 3. The Fundamental Principles of the Application of the Rules:

The fundamental principles of the application of the rules are naturally based on the above two phases: the function of the rules and the influential factors. On the basis of the requirements of the above two phases, the following points may be recognized as the prominent principles for the application of the rules:

### A. Good and Fair Conditions of Play:

The very basic principle is to give all the possible proper conditions and chances to allow the players to play at their highest level of performance. The level of performance shows the level of the sport. Athletes have been trained for years in order to participate in the competition. So, the competition is an important circumstance for athletes to show and to evaluate their training effect and their real playing level. The fair evaluation of the level of athletes, or the real result of a match or competition, comes only from the full exhibition and utmost performance of the players. For a referee, it is necessary to be conscious of the fact that every single technical judgment will have an obvious psychological influence on the players. Any psychological influence will cause a positive or negative effect. Therefore, one of the fundamental requirements for the referees is to give the proper chances for the highest level of performance of the players.

From this point of view, the very critical point regarding the judgment of the referee is its evenness and stability. The material basis of evenness and stability of judgment is accuracy, and the mental basis is fairness. Another point for referees to facilitate a high level of performance is to control properly the tempo of playing. It should be neither too fast nor too slow.

**B. Encourage the Spectacular:**

Spectacle is a very core element in the promotion of the sport. To arouse the enthusiasm of the spectators is also a factor, which should be fully considered by the referee. For example, the referee should consider how to reduce and shorten the interruptions, and how to develop more highlights during play. The referee may not take the initiative to motivate the spectators, but at least the referee must neither discourage the crowds nor dampen their enthusiasm. The referee also has a responsibility to promote the sport.

**C. The Collaboration of the Officials:**

The administrative basis for the best refereeing work, the proper match direction, is the collaboration within the refereeing corps. Each member of the referee corps has particular authorities and responsibilities as stipulated in the rules. Each member of the refereeing corps has a special position on the court optimally designated to carry out the duty assigned. Although this position may cause a limitation to the over-all vision of the game by that person, it is designated so that the refereeing team may have a better view of the total game. Thus, full collaboration between officials is the only way to insure correct judgment and to carry out exactly the duties and responsibilities assigned.

In conclusion, by synthesizing all of the above points, we may realize that a referee is not only the person who carries out the duty of directing the match and correctly applying the rules, but also the one who should consider the influences of the psychological, social and technical factors of the game. The referee is not only an organizer nor a referee, but also an educator and a promoter.

***THE RULES FOR THE CASEBOOK 2009 EDITION***

The 2009 Casebook is a reflection of the rules, which were put into effect by the 2008 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*.

Note: Where teams and players have not been identified by name, as a means of properly understanding each situation outlined in the plays, the code letter "S" has been used to designate the serving team and members of that team. The code letter "R" has been used to designate the receiving team and players. In both cases, positions 2, 3, and 4 are front line players. S-1 is the correct server on the serving team and R-1 is the last receiver on the receiving team.

The changes of the 2009 edition, compared with the 2007 edition:

A lot of cases remained the same, only small modifications in wording or tenses have been made.

The cases had to be re-numbered, the old numbers are in brackets.

The following listed cases have been modified according to new rules or interpretations which better match the current philosophy of keeping the ball flying:

1.12 (2.12) For FIVB World and Official Competitions there is a coach's restriction line.

- 3.14 (4.13) New net fault rule.
- 3.16 (4.16) New rule 9.1.2.3.
- 3.18 (4.18) New net fault rule.
- 3.19 (4.19) New net fault rule.
- 3.21 (4.22) New net fault rule.
- 3.22 (4.23) New net fault rule.
- 3.23 (4.24) New net fault rule.
- 3.24 (4.25) New net fault rule.
- 4.5 (5.6) New substitution procedure.
- 4.19 (5.19) Improper requests have to be marked in the score sheet.
- 4.20 (5.20) Improper requests have to be marked in the score sheet.
- 5.5 (6.5) New rule 19.1.1
- 5.11 (6.11) New rule 19.1.1
- 5.15 (6.15) New rule 19.1.1
- 5.17 (6.18) A referee is not allowed to prevent a team from making a mistake.
- 5.19 (6.21) New rule 19.1.1
- 5.22 (6.25) New rule 19.1.1

Completely deleted are the cases:

- 1.1
- 2.13
- 4.14
- 4.21
- 5.2
- 6.17
- 6.20
- 6.24

New cases are:

- 3.13
- 3.49
- 3.50
- 3.51
- 4.16
- 4.24
- 5.23
- 5.24
- 5.25
- 6.8
- 6.9
- 8.6
- 8.7

## List of contents:

Chapter 1: Participants	Cases 1.1 – 1.2	Page 9
• Wearing forbidden objects	Cases 1.1 – 1.2	Page 9
• Captain	Cases 1.3 – 1.7	Page 9
• Coach	Cases 1.8 – 1.13	Page 10
Chapter 2: Playing format	Cases 2.1 – 2.8	Page 13
• The Toss	Case 2.1	Page 13
• Positional and rotational faults	Cases 2.2 – 2.8	Page 13
Chapter 3: Playing actions	Cases 3.1 – 3.51	Page 16
• Playing the Ball	Cases 3.1 – 3.10	Page 16
• Penetration under the Net	Cases 3.11 – 3.13	Page 18
• Player At or Contacting the Net	Cases 3.14 – 3.25	Page 19
• Service	Cases 3.26 – 3.32	Page 22
• Attack hit	Cases 3.33 – 3.37	Page 24
• Block	Cases 3.38 – 3.51	Page 25
Chapter 4: Interruptions and delays	Cases 4.1 – 4.29	Page 30
• Substitutions	Cases 4.1 – 4.16	Page 30
• Time-Outs and Technical Time-Outs	Case 4.17	Page 34
• Improper Requests	Cases 4.18 – 4.20	Page 34
• Injuries	Cases 4.21 – 4.24	Page 35
• Delays to the game	Cases 4.25 – 4.27	Page 37
• External interference	Cases 4.28 – 4.29	Page 38
Chapter 5: Libero	Cases 5.1 – 5.25	Page 38
Chapter 6: Participant's Conduct	Cases 6.1 – 6.9	Page 47
Chapter 7: Referees and their responsibilities	Cases 7.1 – 7.11	Page 52
Chapter 8: Special Cases	Cases 8.1 – 8.7	Page 56
Register		Page 59

**PART II: CASES****CHAPTER 1: PARTICIPANTS****WEARING FORBIDDEN OBJECTS**

<p><b>1.1 (2.1)</b> The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee noticed that a player reporting as a substitute had a prosthetic leg. Is such a device allowed?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee will allow the entry, provided that the device will not cause undue risk to the player or the other players in the game. On the other hand, a player wearing a cast is not allowed to play or sit on the bench. <b>Rule 4.5.1</b></p>
<p><b>1.2 (2.2)</b> <b>During a women's competition, a player wore a ring with a sharp diamond on her finger. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee asked her to remove it. She replied that it would be impossible. Is she allowed to play with the ring?</b></p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The principle of the rule is that she must remove her ring. If this is really impossible, it must be taped, so that she and the other players are protected from injury. It is important for the referee to tell both the player and the coach, that the player in violation of the rule is liable for the consequences of any injury caused by this ring. <b>Rule 4.5.1</b></p>

**CAPTAIN**

<p><b>1.3 (2.3)</b> In the Americas' Cup, the game captain of Argentina, Hugo Conte, on numerous occasions, questioned the referee's decisions. What is the proper response by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> When in the 1<sup>st</sup> referee's opinion this behaviour exceeds the limits of <b>Rule 5.1.2</b>, he should warn the game captain with no penalty, as stated in <b>Rule 21.1</b>. If the behaviour continues beyond the limit of reasonable expression of disagreement, the game captain should be sanctioned for rude conduct with a yellow card (point and service to the opponents). <b>Rules 5.1.2, 20.1, 20.2, 21.2, Diagram 9</b></p>
<p><b>1.4 (2.4)</b> In the Women's Norceca Championships, the game captain of the Puerto Rican team was not sure if the service order of her team was correct. She asked the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee to verify the positions of her players before the game continued. Is this a permitted action by a game captain?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is a legal request. However, the right to make this request may not be abused by a team. <b>Rule 5.1.2.2</b></p>

<p><b>1.5 (2.5)</b> The game captain of team A had problems to detect which of the players of team B are playing in the front line. Therefore the game captain asked the 1<sup>st</sup> referee for a line-up check of the opponents. Is this allowed?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> If such request is of an infrequent nature, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee will direct the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee to make a line-up check of the opponents. However, 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. <b>Rule 5.1.2.2</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>1.6 (2.6)</b> The game captain saw a line judge signaling a touch of the ball by a block. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not see this signal. How does the game captain legally and politely request him to ask the line judge for his signal?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> At the end of the rally, the game captain may raise one hand in a polite gesture to request to speak to the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. He may request an explanation for the interpretation of the judgment. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee must honour the request. <b>Rules 5.1.2.1, 20.2.1</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>1.7 (2.7)</b> A decision, involving the failure of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to impose a correct penalty, was protested by the game captain of A. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee stated that a referee's decision is final and that no protest would be accepted. Is this a correct statement by the referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee is wrong. The referee must clearly state the reason for the decision. If not satisfied, the game captain may reserve the right to record the disagreement on the score sheet as an official protest at the end of the match or let the scorer record it on his/her behalf. Protests involving rules or the application of penalties are allowed and must be accepted. No discussion of the incident is permitted during the match. In FIVB competitions with a Control Committee, the coach of the protesting team may ask the Game Jury President for the match to hold a Judge's Conference. Procedures for the Judge's Conference are given in the Refereeing Guideline and Instructions. On the other side, the teams are not allowed to protest against normal referee's decisions. <b>Rules 5.1.2.1, 23.2.4</b></p>
--	--

## COACH

<p><b>1.8 (2.8)</b> In the Olympic Games in Athens, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee noted that the Brazil coach had an ear-piece and was communicating with a statistician seated behind the advertising</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The use of such devices is allowed. Two statisticians are permitted at the end of the playing area at a table behind the panels, but they may not enter the court, playing area or</p>
---	--

panels. Are such devices allowed?	the control area or go near the team benches.
<p><b>1.9 (2.9)</b> In sets one and two of a match between Germany and Canada, the German coach had disagreements with the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. The coach then walked to the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee and insisted on explanations about the judgment of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. Twice the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee talked with him for more than ten seconds. Is this the correct application of the rules by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> According to <b>Rule 5.1.2</b>, only the game captain is authorized to speak to the referees to request explanations. The coach is not authorized to do so. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee should refuse to talk with the coach and should ask him to return to his designated place. If this is not effective, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee should immediately inform the 1<sup>st</sup> referee for the appropriate sanctions. Normally the 1<sup>st</sup> referee will warn the coach about the behaviour, communicating through the game captain. There is no penalty. If the behaviour of the coach continues, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee will sanction the coach by issuing a penalty (yellow card) for rude conduct, through the game captain, resulting in a point and service to the opponents. <b>Rules 5.1.2, 5.2.3.4, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3</b></p>
<p><b>1.10 (2.10)</b> During a match in the Pan American Games the coach of the USA women's team stood up at the end of a rally and complained loudly about the referee's decision and asked the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to reconsider it. What is the correct response of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee may issue, through the game captain, to the coach or any other team member a minor misconduct warning. In extreme cases the 1<sup>st</sup> referee may sanction the coach with a penalty for rude conduct (yellow card) as described in the sanctioning scale, <b>Diagram 9, Rule 21.3</b>. Only the game captain is authorized to speak to the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to ask for an explanation of a decision. <b>Rules 5.1.2, 5.2.3, 20.1, 21.2, 21.3</b></p>
<p><b>1.11 (2.11)</b> In a CEV Cup match the Hungarian coach moved in the free zone. When he desired to request a time-out, he signalled to the assistant coach to push the buzzer after which the coach gave the official signal for a time-out. Is this an acceptable procedure to request a time-out?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is an acceptable procedure to call a time-out. The coach has the responsibility to request a time-out which includes both, pushing the buzzer and giving the hand signal. In order to facilitate the flow of the match along with the new rights of the coach to move in the free zone, he is allowed to authorize another team member, not necessarily the assistant coach, to push the buzzer, but the coach must still give the official hand signal. <b>Rules 5.2.1, 5.2.3.3, 5.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>1.12 (2.12)</b> During the Women's World Championships, the Japanese were playing against the</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The rules allow only the coach to move freely in the free zone, between the extension of</p>

<p>Russians. During the match the assistant coach and the trainer of the Japanese team jumped off the bench and followed the coach by running along the side line. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did nothing to prohibit this behavior. Is this an acceptable behavior of the Japanese team members?</p>	<p>the attack line and the warm-up area. For this competition the coach is constrained to performing her function from behind the coach's restriction line. The other members of the staff must sit on the bench or be in the warm-up area. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee should have warned the Japanese coach about this matter through the game captain, and have instructed the assistant coach and trainer to sit down.</p> <p><b>Rules 5.2.3.2, 5.2.3.4, 5.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>1.13 (2.14)</b> In the European Cup between Nyborg and Austrat, the coach of Austrat entered the court by way of the back line to give instructions to his Libero. On another occasion, the coach illegally stood between the extended attack line and the extension of the centre line. His position there blocked the scorer's view of the server. What is the correct response of the referees to this behaviour?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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. He was therefore not correct on three points. He is not allowed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be behind the court in the service zone</li> <li>2. be within the extension of the attack line and the centre line</li> <li>3. enter the court</li> </ol> <p>On the first occurrence in the match, the first referee should issue, through the game captain, a minor misconduct warning to the coach. He should be reminded of the limits of the coaching freedom.</p> <p><b>Rule 5.2.3.4</b></p>

## CHAPTER 2: PLAYING FORMAT

### THE TOSS

<p><b>2.1 (3.1)</b> After winning the toss of the coin before the first or the fifth set of a match, the team captain of 'A' asked for the left court and the service – did he have this right?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The winner of the toss has the following options;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. to serve,</li> <li>2. to receive the service,</li> <li>3. to choose the side of the court, .</li> </ol> <p>Therefore, if the winning team captain chooses a court, the losing team captain must take the other court and may also choose whether to serve or to receive. If the winning captain chooses to serve, the losing captain must receive but may choose the appropriate court. If the winning captain chooses to receive, the losing captain must take the service but may choose the appropriate court.</p> <p><b>Rule 7.1.2</b></p>
---	--

### POSITIONAL AND ROTATIONAL FAULTS

<p><b>2.2 (3.2)</b> In the USA National Championships, Sato, the centre back player was standing clearly in front of Miller, the centre front player. Just before the service hit by the opposing team's server, Sato jumped into the air and was therefore not in contact with the court in front of Miller at the moment of the hit for the service. Was this a legal position for Sato's team?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> When players jump from the floor, they retain the status that they had at the point of their last contact with the floor. Therefore, while Sato was in the air, the point of his last contact with the floor was retained and he was in front of Miller and out of position, so award of a point and service to the opponents should be the result.</p> <p><b>Rules 7.4, 7.4.2, 7.4.3</b></p>
<p><b>2.3 (3.3)</b> At the moment of the service hit, the centre back, R-6, was standing with both feet slightly behind the feet of the centre front, R-3. R-6 had a hand on the floor clearly in front of the feet of R-3 at the time the ball was contacted for service. Is this a legal position for the receiving team?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Legal position. Only the feet, which are in contact with the floor, are considered when determining whether players make a positional fault.</p> <p><b>Rules 7.4.3, 7.5</b></p>

<p><b>2.4 (3.4)</b>          During the hit for service, the American setter, Jeff Stork, was standing with a part of a foot encroaching onto the opponent's court and the remainder of the foot on the centre line. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee whistled Stork for being in faulty position by not being fully within the boundary lines of his court at the time the opponent server hit the ball for service. Is the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee's decision correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          Correct decision by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee.  <b>Rules 1.3.3, 7.4</b></p>
<p><b>2.5 (3.5)</b>          Brazil played a match at the Women's Grand Prix. In the third set Brazil received the service and won the rally. Player # 6 of Brazil should have rotated to serve. However, actually player # 5 served. This fact was missed by the scorer. Player # 5 served three points. After two more rallies it was again Brazil to serve.          Player # 11, following # 5, naturally rotated to the service position.          After the service hit, the scorer announced the fault of the incorrect server. A check on the score sheet showed, that the only fact that could be identified was, that # 5 should be the server. A later viewing of a video tape showed the facts, but these were unable to be detected from the score sheet.          The referee decided to give a point and the service to the opponents because of the service of # 11 from Brazil, and Brazil had to return to the correct rotational position. There was no cancellation of points. Was the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          Based on the information available to the referee, the decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct.  <b>Rules 7.7.1, 23.2.3</b></p>
<p><b>2.6 (3.6)</b>          The Korean team won a rally and with it point and service. Before rotating to serve, the game captain of Korea asked the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee for a line-up check to determine the correct server. The scorer told the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee that player #10 was the correct server.          Player #10 then served four points. Before #10 could serve again, the scorer informed the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee that in fact player #8 should have been the server.          The 1<sup>st</sup> referee ruled that the four points scored by player #10 would be cancelled. The team returned to the score and position in which #8 should have served.          All team time-outs and substitutions</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          The referee's decision was correct.          In situations like this, misconduct sanctions and Technical Time-Outs remain as played. The teams must revert to as close to their original line-up as possible.          These events must be recorded on the score sheet.</p>

<p>occurring during those four rallies were cancelled, but not the TTO's. Player #8 for Korea was then allowed to serve and the game continued from the point that the game captain requested to know the correct server. Was this the correct decision for the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to make?</p>	
---	--

<p><b>2.7 (3.7)</b> After the whistle for service, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee noticed that there were only five players on the court. Both the Libero and the replacement player were still in the warm-up area, with no apparent intention to take part in the rally. What should be the action of the referees?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee should whistle for service when he is sure that the teams are ready to play and that the server is in possession of the ball. Common sense tells us that certain things are team responsibilities. For example, the referee will not inform a player if he/she is serving from the wrong place, or standing with one foot off the court at a service hit. Because the 1<sup>st</sup> referee only noticed the mistake after the whistle for service, he had to whistle immediately to stop the play, to award a delay sanction to the team at fault and let the game continue due to the result of the delay sanction. <b>Rules 7.5, 7.7, 12.3, 12.4.3</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>2.8 (3.8)</b> In a match team A served. Just after the service hit, the line judge #2 raised the flag to indicate that a part of the foot of player #13 of Team B was outside of the court at the moment of the service hit. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee saw his flag signal, whistled and called the positional fault. Was the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to take up the flag signal of the line judge to call the positional fault was correct. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee has authority over all members of the refereeing corps and the teams so that he can take up any indication by the refereeing corps for his judgment, even though he did not see the fault and watched the serving team when the ball has been served. <b>Rules 7.5, 23.2.1</b></p>
--	--

## CHAPTER 3: PLAYING ACTIONS

### PLAYING THE BALL

<p><b>3.1 (4.1)</b> In the Grand Champions Cup Japan played against the Netherlands. The Japanese receiver passed the service very poorly and the ball flew over the net outside of the antenna. The Japanese setter Narita pursued the ball into the Netherlands' free zone and played it back in the direction of his court. Unfortunately for Narita, the ball did not pass over the net, but went towards the net on the Netherlands side where the Netherlands middle blocker caught the ball. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled before the ball was caught and signalled "ball out". Is this the correct signal by the referees? At what moment does the ball become "out"?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The signal of the referee was correct, because this ball had become "out", when it had left completely the space above the free zone on the Netherlands' side of the net. The ball would also have been out if it had hit a Netherlands' player in the free zone so long as he was not attempting to prevent an opponent's return of the ball to the other side of the net. <b>Rules 10.1.2, 10.1.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>3.2 (4.2)</b> In an attempt to play the first ball in the back row, Papi, the Italian attacker, hit the ball with the palm of one hand up. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee allowed the game to continue. Was this the proper response of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The hit must be judged by the quality of the ball contact – i.e. whether or not the ball was caught and/or thrown. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee must not be too hasty in whistling this play unless he can clearly see that the ball is caught and/or thrown. <b>Rules 9.2.1, 9.2.2, 9.3.3, 9.3.4</b></p>
<p><b>3.3 (4.3)</b> In a women's match between the USA and China, Li from China spiked the ball into a block by Elaina Oden. The ball rebounded back into the Chinese court where Li attempted to play the ball with her forearms. The ball rebounded from one arm to the other and then onto her chest during one action and without being caught or thrown. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee allowed the game to continue. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. This was the first team hit of a ball being received from the opponents. Therefore, successive contacts are legal since they occurred during one playing action of Li and the ball was not caught or thrown. "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. <b>Rules 9.2.3.2, 14.2</b></p>
<p><b>3.4 (4.4)</b> At the Pan American Games, a Brazilian player attempted to block an attack hit of Tee</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The contact of the ball will determine whether it is legal or a "catch". Since it is a first team</p>

<p>Williams from the USA. The ball hit her hands and dropped down between her and the net. She retrieved the ball with an underhand swing of one arm. The ball briefly hit her arm and body. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled and signalled a "catch". Is this correct?</p>	<p>hit of the ball for Brazil, the blocker has the right to successive contacts 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. <b>Rules 9.2.2, 9.2.3.2, 14.2</b></p>
<p><b>3.5 (4.5)</b> In a match between Canada and Brazil in the Pan American Games, a Brazilian player received the service. She passed the ball over the net where the Canadian front row centre player, in a blocking action, "redirected" the ball to the floor of Brazil. Is this legal?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> It is legal to block the ball and direct it back to the opponent's court. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee must decide upon the legality of the blocker's contact with the ball. The only consideration is whether the ball was legally hit or "caught and/or thrown". The illegal contact of "catch" is possible to occur in blocking. <b>Rule 9.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>3.6 (4.6)</b> The US-player, Dan Landry, while playing against the Netherlands, jumped into the air trying to retrieve the ball near the spectator seats. After contacting the ball, he landed in the seats. Is this a legal action?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Legal play. A player is allowed to play a ball beyond his/her own side of the free zone. Outside of the playing area, but only on his/her side of the court, a player may take support from a team-mate or any structure in order to reach the ball. <b>Rules 9, 9.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.7 (4.7)</b> The USA women played against Canada. During a rally, a Canadian 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 Canadian coach requested a replay because of the spectator's interference. The referee refused. Was this a correct decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes. The player is allowed to retrieve the ball from his/her own side of the spectator stands or anywhere outside the playing area including the team bench. 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. <b>Rules 9, 9.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.8 (4.8)</b> In a World Championship match between the women of Japan and the Soviet Union, there was a very powerful attack by a Soviet player. The reception of the Japanese player was not very successful and the ball rebounded far off the court. Another Japanese player raced after the ball and made a sensational set as she fell over the advertising panels marking the edge of the free zone. The extraordinary effort caused great applause from the crowd. However, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee blew his whistle and signalled that the ball was caught and thrown. The crowd</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee should not be considered only as a person who directs the match and mechanically applies the rules, but also as someone who has responsibility for the promotion of volleyball. For this, allowing spectacular actions is a very core element. The referee should not initiate action for the pleasure of the crowd, but he also should not discourage it! He should make an appropriate balance between the technical and the social effects of his actions. So it is absolutely necessary, to a certain extent, to sacrifice something technically for some</p>

<p>was quite vocal in expressing displeasure with the referee's decision. Was the referee correct, and how should the 1<sup>st</sup> referee control his whistle in this situation?</p>	<p>more basic social effects. This is the "art" of refereeing!</p>
---	--

<p><b>3.9 (4.9)</b>          Player R-5 received a very strong straight line attack directly from the opponent's attacker S-2. The ball bounced far outside of the playing area in the direction of the spectators. R-6 jumped over the panels limiting the free zone and ran up the spectator stands to retrieve the ball. The hit was with a "doubtful" contact of the ball. The crowd was highly motivated and cheered by this spectacular play. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not whistle neither an "assisted hit" nor for a "catch". Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. The ball may be retrieved from beyond the free zone. "Assisted hits" are only penalized if they are within the playing area. Concerning the ball contact, each contact must be judged separately by the referee. The modification to <b>Rule 9.2.3.2</b> was made with the aim of allowing better defence play and more attractive, sensational volleyball. Even though this was not the "first hit", it is very important to improve the "art of refereeing" to allow such spectacular actions so that volleyball will become more attractive and popular.  <b>Rule 9.2.3.2</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>3.10 (4.10)</b>          In a match between Japan and Italy in the Men's World Cup, an Italian player spiked the ball against the Japanese blocker. The ball went off the blocker's hands, over the antenna partially outside the crossing space and over the 1<sup>st</sup> referee into the free zone of Italy. A Japanese back row player pursued the ball to play it back to his side of the net. The line judge signalled the ball "out" and the 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled the rally won by Italy. The Japanese game captain argued that the ball had passed over the antenna partially through the external space and thus was able to be played back by his team. Has the ruling by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee been correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision was not correct. The ball passed over the antenna into the opponent's free zone partially through the external space. Therefore it was legal for the Japanese team to return the ball to its own court through the external space on the same side of the court. The line judge should have given no signal while the ball was still in play.  <b>Rule 10.1.2</b></p>
---	--

### ***PENETRATION UNDER THE NET***

<p><b>3.11 (4.11)</b>          The Netherlands were playing against Cuba in the Men's World Cup. At one point the dramatic Cuban attacker Joel Despaigne was back row player. He jumped from behind the attack line, made a sensational attack and landed with his heels on the centre line, but with most of his feet on the feet of the Netherlands blocker Ron Zwerver. Zwerver</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>  <b>Rule 11.2.1</b> 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." It is quite clear that interference is not allowed. It is reasonable to assume that a player who is entirely on his own court and is hit or is stepped on by an opponent has experienced "interference". In</p>
--	---

<p>made an attempt to play the next ball but could not move rapidly enough to get it. Zwerver appealed to the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee for interference, but he ignored this appeal. Similar confrontations occurred numerous times during the match and were ignored each time by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee. Is this a correct ruling by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p>this case, the offending player should be penalized. It is one of the responsibilities of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee to observe this potential fault and whistle when it occurs, as in this case. <b>Rules 11.2.1, 11.2.2.1, 11.2.4</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>3.12 (4.12)</b> A Brazilian attacker swung a foot so that it accidentally hit the Netherlands blocker under the net. The contact prevented the Netherlands player from playing the ball rebounding from the block and his team lost the rally. What should be the response of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee should have whistled the Brazilian player for an illegal action since he interfered with the Netherlands player. The rally should have been won by the Netherlands. <b>Rule 11.2.1</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>3.13 (new)</b> In the fifth set of a match, after an attack hit, the player landed on the floor, lost his balance and fell with his knees onto the opponent's court, where he left a wet spot. The ball was still in play on the opponent's side, when the 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled and stopped the game. He awarded point and service to the opponent's team. Was his decision according to the rules?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> If the referee considers the wet spot to be dangerous for the opponent's players, then it is an interference, which hinders the team on its legitimate attempt to play. <b>Rule 11.4.4</b></p>
--	--

### **PLAYER AT OR CONTACTING THE NET**

<p><b>3.14 (4.13)</b> The USA women's team was receiving. Lori Endicott, a back row player, was the American setter. Tee Williams passed the ball poorly and Endicott had to move into the back zone to set the ball. When she turned, she slightly touched the net. The referee did not whistle this net contact. Was the decision correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision was correct, since the action did not interfere with the play. <b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>3.15 (4.16)</b> In a men's match between Argentina and the USA at the Olympic Games, a USA player passed the ball towards the net. The ball penetrated its vertical plane. Stork, the USA setter reached across the plane of the net and set the ball, so that his attacker, Buck, could make an attack hit. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled the play as a fault. Is this play illegal?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. Above the top of the net, a player is not allowed to penetrate the vertical plane to contact the ball and return it to his own court. Thus, the action of Stork was not legal. 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.</p>
---	---

<b>Rules 9, 11.2.1</b>	
<p><b>3.16 (4.16)</b> At the Women's World Championships in a match between Japan and the Soviet Union, a Japanese player attacked the ball which was set on top of the net. A Soviet blocker contacted the ball at the same time without reaching beyond the net. After the simultaneous contact, the ball landed outside the Soviet's court. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee awarded the rally to the Japanese team. Was this a correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was wrong. If after a simultaneous contact by opponents the ball lands outside a court, it is the fault of the team on the opposite side. The rally should have been won by the Soviets. According to the decision of Congress 2006, even if the contact of the ball by the two opponents on the top of the net is of an extended duration, the rally is simply allowed to continue. <b>Rules 9.1.2.2, 9.1.2.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.17 (4.16)</b> Lai Yawen from China was blocking the American attacker Tammy Liley. Liley's ball drove the net into Lai's forearms. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not signal a touch of the net even though Lai was in the action of playing the ball. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision was correct. If the net hits the blocker, there is no fault. If the blocker hits the top of the net (white band) during his action, she commits a fault. <b>Rules 11.3.3, 11.4.4</b></p>
<p><b>3.18 (4.18)</b> During a match a player blocked a ball which was spiked very hard by an opponent attacker. The ball bounced off the hands of the blocker and far beyond the end line of his court. The Libero ran off the court and made a diving slide to retrieve the ball. All of the spectators concentrated on this exciting play and cheered the great play of the Libero. After the blocker landed from the block, finishing his blocking movement, he turned to continue to play. Just as he turned, he slightly touched the net with his shoulder. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee whistled touch of the net. Should this have been called a fault?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee was not correct. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b> states that the contact of the net is not a fault except where it interferes with the play. <b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4</b></p>
<p><b>3.19 (4.19)</b> When Cuba played against the USA, a Cuban player attacked the ball which missed the American blocker. The ball was retrieved from the back court. Before the American blocker landed from the block, he touched the lower part of the net. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled a fault. Was this a correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was not correct, since the action of playing the ball did not interfere with the play. <b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4</b></p>
<p><b>3.20 (4.20)</b> The USA men played against Cuba. Cuba was on offence and the US players were preparing to block. Three Cuban attackers ran towards the net and the Cuban setter, set</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> No, the decision of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee was not correct. The attack was from Cuban position 4 and the net contact was in Cuban position 2. Since neither the attacker nor the blocker</p>

<p>a very deceptive ball to his attacker in position 4. The USA block deflected the ball into its back court. At the same time, as the Cuban attacker hit the ball from position 4, an American player hit the net trying to block the Cuban attacker in position 2. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee whistled because the American blocker touched the net. Is this the correct decision of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p>were involved in playing the ball in any way, and the touch of the net did not interfere with the play, it is a legal action and the game should not have been stopped. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.21 (4.22)</b> In a match between Arizona State University and the University of Oregon in the US NCAA Leagues, the Arizona State University middle attacker approached to hit the ball. His setter mistimed the set and it went over the attacker's head and fell to the floor untouched by any other player. While attempting to block, the Oregon middle blocker touched the top band of the net. This occurred before the ball touched the Arizona court. The referee whistled a fault on the Oregon middle blocker. Was the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. The Oregon middle blocker was playing the ball when making contact with the top band of the net, even though the ball contacted neither the attacker nor the blocker. <b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4</b></p>
<p><b>3.22 (4.23)</b> The Japanese men's team was running a quick combination play with two attackers and the setter in the middle of the court. Instead of setting to the middle, the setter set the ball to an attacker in position 4. As he did so, the Korean middle blocker reached over the net and touched its top band while attempting to stop the combination play. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled the Korean middle blocker for a net fault. Is the decision correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the decision was correct. If the referee considers the player and the ball are close enough to each other and the player touches the top band of the net, the decision was correct and the touch of the top band of the net was indeed a "net fault". <b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4</b></p>
<p><b>3.23 (4.24)</b> In the Japanese Women's League Championships Daiei received the service for match point. After attacking the ball, the attacker landed on the floor a little off balance, took two steps and slightly brushed against the net outside of the antenna while the ball was still in play. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled the fault which ended the match. Was this the correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was not correct. Since there was no interference of the play, the net touch was not a fault. <b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.3.2, 11.4.4</b></p>
<p><b>3.24 (4.25)</b> In a match between China and Korea the Korean setter set the ball to her attacker. When the attacker hit the ball, she also hit</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee <b>was not</b> correct, because the net contact of the setter did not interfere with the play.</p>

<p>the setter with her knee. This hit caused the setter to brush against the net. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee called this a fault. Is this a correct interpretation of the rule?</p>	<p><b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4</b></p>
---	------------------------------------

<p><b>3.25 (4.26)</b>          In an effort to set the ball coming from his receiver, the front row setter of team A jumped and hit the ball with one hand over the net so that at the moment of the hit his fingers were in the opponent's space. The ball was not totally in the opponent's space and flew parallel to the net towards an attacker of team A. The blocker of team B touched the ball before the player of team A, so that the team A player could not execute the attack hit. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled a fault by the setter for setting the ball while penetrating into the opponent's space. Did the 1<sup>st</sup> referee make the correct decision?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. According to <b>Rule 9</b>, each team must play the ball within its own playing area and space <b>(except in the case of Rule 10.1.2)</b>. 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.</p>
---	--

## SERVICE

<p><b>3.26 (4.27)</b>          In the Women's NORCECA Championships, the USA server, Elaine Youngs, had moved into the serving position instead of the correct server Stephanie Thater. As soon as Youngs had hit the ball for service, the scorer signalled to the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee who stopped the game. Is this the correct action by the scorer?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          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 infraction. The scorer may have a bell, buzzer or some other sound device to signal the fault.  <b>Rules 7.7.1, 12.2.1, 12.7.1, 25.2.2.2</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>3.27 (4.28)</b>          At the Olympic Qualification Tournament in France, after a Technical Time-Out a wrong server was preparing to serve. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled for service. The serving team recognized the mistake and the correct server entered the service zone ready to serve. The referee whistled to authorize the service again. Is this a correct action by the referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          The decision of the referee is wrong. Authorization for the service is made only once by the whistle and the hand signal - the service must be made by the correct player within 8 seconds from that authorization.  <b>Rule 12.4.4</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>3.28 (4.29)</b>          In a NORCECA match between Puerto Rico and Mexico, the Puerto Rican server threw the ball up into the air, but then let it drop down. She then caught the ball from the bounce and immediately served before the</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>          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<sup>st</sup> referee to be a "toss for service" must end</p>
---	---

<p>end of the 8 seconds allowed for service. Was this a legal action for the server?</p>	<p>with the ball being hit for the service. <b>Rule 12.4.2</b></p>
<p><b>3.29 (4.30)</b> The served ball touched the net and the antenna before being played by the receiving team. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled for a service fault. Is this a correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee is correct. A ball touching the antenna is "out". <b>Rule 8.4.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.30 (4.31)</b> In the Westcup in Norway, during the match between Klepp and Oslo, the served ball hit the net just under the white band at the top of the net. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled immediately to stop the game. When should he whistle?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled at the correct time. The served ball must pass through the crossing space. If it does not, the service is automatically a fault and must be whistled by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee at that moment. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee must not wait until the ball hits the floor or a player of the serving team. <b>Rule 12.6.2.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.31 (4.32)</b> Team Great Britain was in possession of the ball in preparation to serve. The 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 on player #1 to be the server. He was still not satisfied and while attempting to approach him, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled for service. Amidst confusion, team G.B. was penalized for not serving within the allowed 8 seconds. In the score sheet it was found that the coach of team G.B. 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 surmised. What is the correct ruling by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Common sense must prevail in resolving this case. The initial error was that of the coach of Team G.B. when he submitted his incorrect line-up. This was compounded by the inattention of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee and the scorer. Therefore, team G.B. 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<sup>nd</sup> referee must request a new line-up sheet from the coach.</p>
<p><b>3.32 (4.33)</b> In a World Cup match for men, Canada served. The ball hit the net and dropped towards the floor on the Canadian side of the net. A Spanish player on the opposite side of the net reached under the net and caught the ball before it hit the floor. Is this allowed?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The ball is in play until the 1<sup>st</sup> referee will be sure that the ball will not cross the net legally and that a fault has occurred. Then the 1<sup>st</sup> referee must whistle immediately. Thus, the Spanish player may catch the ball as soon as the referee blows the whistle to indicate a fault. <b>Rule 12.6.2.1</b></p>

**ATTACK HIT**

<p><b>3.33 (4.34)</b> Lloy Ball, the back row setter of the USA men's team jumped from within the attack zone and set the ball while it was completely above the height of the net towards an attacker. Before the attacker could contact the ball, it penetrated the vertical plane of the net where it was blocked by the Brazilian setter Lima. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee allowed the rally to continue. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision was not correct. The set by Ball became an illegal attack hit by a back row player when the attack hit was completed (in this case by contacting Lima's block). The rally should have been won by Brazil. <b>Rule 13.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.34 (4.36)</b> On a second team hit, Lima, the back row setter of Brazil, jumped from within the front zone and contacted the ball while it was fully above the height of the net. Instead of setting the ball to a teammate, he decided to tip the ball across the net. Before the ball reached the vertical plane of the net, the Cuban blocker Hernandez reached fully beyond the plane of the net and blocked the ball. What was the correct call of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The correct decision is that Cuba won the rally, because the completed attack hit was made within the front zone by a back row player who contacted the ball entirely above the height of the net. As soon as the ball was touched by the blocker, the illegal attack hit was completed. <b>Rules 13.1.1, 13.1.3, 13.2.2, 13.3.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.35 (4.36)</b> On the US team's second hit, Liley passed the ball near the net towards the Chinese court. The ball did not penetrate the vertical plane of the net. In the 1<sup>st</sup> referee's opinion, no American player could possibly reach the ball. The Chinese blocker Qi, reached across the plane of the net and blocked the ball. What is the correct decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Even though it was only the second team hit, if the ball is moving in the direction to the opponent's court, it is an attack hit. Because, in the referee's opinion, no American player could possibly have reached the ball, the block of Qi was legal. <b>Rules 13.1.1, 14.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.36 (4.37)</b> In the World Cup for women, Toson, a back row player for Egypt, took off in the front zone and spiked the ball which was higher than the top of the net as Egypt's second hit. After having hit the top of the net, the ball rebounded into Egypt's court. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not whistle. Was the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee's decision was correct in allowing the rally to continue. Since the ball neither crossed the plane of the net nor was contacted by the blocker, the attack hit by Toson was not completed. Team Egypt had a third hit remaining to direct the ball into the opponent's court. <b>Rules 9.1, 13.1.3, 13.2.2, 13.3.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.37 (4.38)</b> In a match against the women of the USA, China served. The American receiver Tee Williams jumped from behind the attack line and contacted the served ball from</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Legal action. Although it is illegal to block or to complete an attack on the service from completely above the height of the net over the front zone, the attack by Williams was</p>

<p>completely above the height of the net. The contact took place behind the attack line and the ball returned to the serving team's side of the net. Was the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct in allowing this play to continue?</p>	<p>legal since the contact point of the hit was completely behind the attack line. However, it would have been illegal if it had been the Libero who had blocked or attacked the service from completely above the height of the net, even if the hit was made behind the attack line. <b>Rules 13.3.4, 19.3.1.3</b></p>
---	--

## **BLOCK**

<p><b>3.38 (4.39)</b> In the Women's NORCECA Olympic Qualifying Tournament, Sawatzke, the Canadian setter, who was a back row player, penetrated into the front zone for a jump set. Soucy passed the received ball so that it came down near the net, but it was too high for Sawatzke to reach and the ball crossed the plane of the net. Then the Dominican Republic's middle attacker hit the ball across the net against the raised arm of Sawatzke who was still above the height of the net. The ball then rebounded across the net into the Dominican's court. Was the decision of the referee correct when he whistled an illegal block?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, Sawatzke's block was illegal because she was a back row player. Even though she had not intentionally attempted to block, her contact of the ball higher than the top of the net and near the point of the ball crossing the net made her a blocker. <b>Rules 14.1.1, 14.1.3, 14.6.2</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>3.39 (4.40)</b> In a match between the women's teams of Korea and Germany, a German player reached over the net to block the second hit of the Korean setter. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not blow his whistle. Is it legal for the blocker to reach over (beyond) the net to block an opponent's "setting" action?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> It is absolutely necessary for the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to determine the action of the setter. He must know whether the set was made parallel to the net or was going towards the net, thus making it an attack hit. In the first case, the blocker would be at fault because the ball was not "coming from the opponent". In the second case, the set was "coming from the opponent" and should therefore be considered to be an attack hit which may be blocked. According to <b>Rule 14.3</b>, it is not a fault to block an attack hit beyond the net. It is important for the referee to be able to differentiate between a "set" and an attack using an overhand pass. <b>Rules 14.1.1, 14.3</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>3.40 (4.41)</b> Sarmientos of Cuba blocked the attack of Timmons of the USA. Then Buck, the USA middle blocker blocked the block of</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, to block is to intercept a ball coming from the opponent's side, thus it is legal to block an opponent's block.</p>
---	--

Sarmientos. Is it legal to block a blocked ball?	<b>Rule 14.1.1</b>
<p><b>3.41 (4.42)</b> In a match between the Netherlands and Greece at the Men's World Championships, two blockers from the Netherlands made a successful block. Just before the ball landed on the Greek floor, the ball slightly touched the penetrating foot of one of the Netherlands' blockers who had landed legally partially on the Greek side of the centre line. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee ruled a successful block. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Correct ruling by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. The foot position was legal and the ball touching the foot should be treated as though it had landed on the floor. The Netherlands consequently and correctly won the rally. In a similar situation, if the ball had struck the foot of the blocker before the foot was in contact with the floor, the blocker would have interfered with the opportunity of the other team to play the ball and therefore the blocker would have committed a fault. <b>Rule 11.2.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.42 (4.43)</b> The USA player on position 2, Karch Kiraly, blocked the ball on the Soviet's side of the net. The ball flew some meters parallel to the net before the US front row player Doug Partie hit the ball with a blocking action down to the floor on the Soviet's side of the net. The ball had never penetrated into the air space of the USA team. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee signalled a fault on the block of Partie. Was this a correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. The action of Partie was not legal. It has not been "one action" with that of Kiraly and could not be a collective block. Therefore it was an attack hit by Partie carried out immediately after the block of Kiraly within the Soviet's air space. <b>Rules 11.1.2, 14.1.1, 14.2, 14.3</b> If after the block by Kiraly the ball had penetrated the plane of the net, the initial contact (attack hit) by Partie would have had to be made on his side of the net to be legal. <b>Rules 13.2.1, 13.3.1, 14.1.1, 14.2</b></p>
<p><b>3.43 (4.44)</b> The USA player Tammy Liley passed the received ball so, that it would have crossed the net if not touched by another American player. The US setter, Endicott was in position to make a legal play on the ball. The Chinese blocker Li reached across the vertical plane of the net and blocked the ball before Endicott could play it. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee called a fault on Li. Is this a correct decision of 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision was correct, and the block was illegal. Blockers may not contact the ball across the net until the attack hit is executed, except when in the judgment of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee, no possibility exists for further play of the ball by the attacking team. <b>Rule 14.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.44 (4.45)</b> In the World Cup for Men, the USA played against Cuba. Lloy Ball, the American back row setter in the front zone, attacked the ball higher than the top of the net. Simultaneous with his contact of the ball, the Cuban blocker Hernandez reached across the plane of the net and contacted the ball in a blocking</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The correct decision is to call a double fault. The attack hit by Lloy Ball was illegal, but the simultaneous block by Hernandez was also illegal. If the contact by Hernandez had been <i>after</i> the contact by Lloy Ball, then only the attack hit by Ball should have been a fault. <b>Rules 13.3.3, 14.3, 14.6.1, Diagram 7</b></p>

<p>action. What was the correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	
<p><b>3.45 (4.46)</b> In the Women's World Cup, the Japanese team was playing against Korea. Chang Yoon-Hee served for Korea and Obayashi was receiving for Japan. Nakanishi was the Japanese setter who was a front row player. When Obayashi passed the ball, it approached but had not flown beyond the top of the net. Nakanishi, apparently believing that the ball was going to go over the net, jumped and hit the ball with both hands using a blocking action, directing the ball to the Koreans' side of the net into the blocking hands of Chung Sun-Hye. Is this a legal play by the Japanese setter?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> If the first action at the net is the "blocking" action of Nakanishi, then her contact must be judged as an attack hit. Therefore a "Double contact" cannot be allowed and the ball cannot be caught or thrown. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee must judge whether the ball contact by Nakanishi was a legal contact and not caught and/or thrown. Of course, as blocker, Chung Sun-Hye may use two hands and more than one contact would be allowed, again provided that the ball is not caught and/ or thrown.</p>
<p><b>3.46 (4.47)</b> In a Women's World Cup match, Egypt was playing against the USA. The USA attacker Tara Cross-Battle hit a very hard spike at the Egyptian blocker Toson. The ball hit Toson's hands, then her head, then rebounded off the back of her hand into the back of her court. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee allowed Egypt to dig, set and then attack the ball. Was it a correct decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee allowing these three hits by Toson, followed by the three more hits of her team?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision was correct. Even though Toson had three distinct contacts of the ball, these were made during only one action to block the ball. After the block, a team is allowed three more ball contacts. <b>Rules 9.1, 14.2, 14.4.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.47 (4.48)</b> Argentina played against Germany in a match at the Men's World Championships. In one rally, a German player set the ball over the net into the Argentine space. An Argentine back row player within the front zone jumped and reached higher than the top of the net to block. A German attacker 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<sup>st</sup> referee signalled a double fault. Was the referee's decision correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee's decision was correct. The German attacker, even though he 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 (<b>Rule 14.1.1</b>). Since the initial contact of the ball by the attacker was in the opponent's space, the attack was illegal. (<b>Rule 13.3.1</b>) The Argentine back row player completed the block by the contact with the ball higher than the top of the net (<b>Rule 14.1.1</b>). A back row player completing a block makes a fault (<b>Rule 14.6.2</b>). 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</p>

	<p>the net, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee must observe the play very carefully.</p> <p>If the German player touched the ball first, he should be charged with the only fault. If the Argentine player touched the ball first, he should be charged with the only fault.</p>
<p><b>3.48 (4.49)</b> In the Women's Final Olympic Qualification Tournament, the Netherlands led against China 24-20. The Netherlands blocker, Ataelens, was too slow to form a collective block and was about two steps away from the collective block when the Chinese attacker hit the ball.</p> <p>Before Ataelens could reach to the top of the net to block, the ball hit her at a height about half way between the top and the bottom of the net. Her team then played the ball with three more contacts before winning the rally. Was the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct in allowing the rally to be won by the Netherlands?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee was not correct in allowing the Netherlands to win the rally. Ataelens was not part of the collective block and was not higher than the top of the net when the ball contacted her. Therefore she cannot be a blocker. Since her ball contact was the first of the team's three contacts, the Netherlands team committed the fault of four hits and should have lost the rally.</p> <p><b>Rules: 9.3.1, 14.1.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.49 (new)</b> After a Greek attack in the European Champions League match between Vienna and Piraeus the ball touched the head of an Austrian blocker, who reached with his hands over the net. The contact with the ball was lower than the top of the net. After this hit, the Austrian team played three more times and at the third hit, the referee whistled and called "four hits".</p> <p>Has this decision been correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision was not correct. Even the contact of the blocker with the ball was lower than the top of the net, the action was a block, because a part of his body was higher than the top of the net.</p> <p><b>Rules 9.1, 14.1.1, 14.4.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.50 (new)</b> In the European League match between Slovakia and the Netherlands, two Netherlands players tried to block an attack, but the Slovakian attacker made a tip. One of the blockers hit the ball when he already came down from his jump and his whole body was lower than the top of the net. When he hit the ball again, the referee called a "double hit".</p> <p>Was this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, it was. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> contact was a double hit.</p> <p><b>Rules 9.1, 14.1.1, 14.4.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.51 (new)</b> A back row player made an attack hit by jumping from the attack zone, the ball has been hit totally higher than the net. On the opponent's side, the Libero tried to block the</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The interpretation of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee is correct. The attack hit becomes a mistake at the moment, when the ball crossed the net totally or the block touched it. The attempt of the</p>

<p>ball. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled and decided on point for the attacking team. On the request of the game captain of the opponent's team, the referee explained him, that the block attempt of the Libero has been the first mistake.</p> <p>Is the ruling correct?</p>	<p>Libero to block was an action before the completion of the opponent's attack hit and has therefore been the first mistake.</p> <p><b>Rule 19.3.1.3</b></p>
--	---

## CHAPTER 4: INTERRUPTIONS AND DELAYS

### SUBSTITUTIONS

<p><b>4.1 (5.1)</b> 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. What is the procedure for the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is legal as long as this does not cause a delay. Therefore the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee simply carries out a double substitution. <b>Rules 15.10.2, 15.10.3a, 15.10.4, 16.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.2 (5.3)</b> In the 3<sup>rd</sup> set of a match, one substitute player entered the substitution zone while another one was just leaving the warm-up. How many substitutions should be allowed under the current rules?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The moment of the request is the entrance of the substitute player(s) into the substitution zone. In this case the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee should grant only the one for the player who entered the substitution zone. The second request should be rejected as improper request. <b>Rules 15.10.3b, 15.11.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.3 (5.4)</b> During the 3<sup>rd</sup> set of a match between Cuba and Cameroon a substitution was requested by the Cuban team. Because the player was not ready to play, his team was sanctioned with a delay warning and the substitution was rejected. As soon as the delay sanction was applied, the Cuban team again requested the substitution. Was it allowed to make this second request?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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. At least one rally must be completed before there can be another request for substitution by the same team. <b>Rule 15.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.4 (5.5)</b> The coach of the Brazilian men's team requested a substitution. The substitute player had entered the substitution zone with the wrong "numbered paddle" for substitution. He fumbled to get the correct one. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee awarded a delay sanction, but allowed the substitution. Is this the correct response by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the referee was not correct. In FIVB World Competitions, the substitute player must enter the substitution zone with the correct "numbered paddle". Thus, the request for substitution by the Brazilian team must be rejected, and a delay sanction must be awarded. <b>Rules 15.10.3a, 16.1.1, 16.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.5 (5.6)</b> In a match between the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico, the coach of the Dominican Republic gave the signal for a substitution. At that moment, the player coming into the set began running from the warm-up area to be ready to enter the court when the coach's signal was recognized by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee. Since there was only a minor delay caused by</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee was not correct, the substitution should not have been allowed. The referee must handle this case with discretion. <b>Rule 15.10.3</b> states that the actual request is the entrance of the substitute player into the substitution zone. If the substitute player is not there, the team must be sanctioned for "delay", and the</p>

<p>the substitution, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee allowed the substitution. Is this a proper decision by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p>substitution will not be granted. <b>Rules 15.10.3, 16.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.6 (5.7)</b> In a match between Germany and Turkey, the Turkish team requested a substitution. Player # 8 approached the substitution zone with paddle # 10. The coach insisted on the substitution with # 9. After a short discussion, the 2nd referee rejected the substitution and Turkey was sanctioned with a delay warning. Was the decision correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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. <b>RULES 16.1.1, 16.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.7 (5.8)</b> In the match between Saudi-Arabia and Kuwait in the GGC men's senior championship, player #5 of Saudi-Arabia became injured in the 2<sup>nd</sup> set and had to be substituted exceptionally. Then, during the same game interruption, Saudi-Arabia requested an additional substitution. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee accepted the request. Was the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee's decision correct to accept the request?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the decision is correct. Player #5 of Saudi-Arabia had to be substituted by an exceptional substitution due to force majeure. There were no regular substitutes available and the injury was unforeseen. Because there was originally no substitution request by Saudi-Arabia in the game interruption, they still had the right to request a legal substitution. Consequently, an exceptional substitution and regular substitution can be taken during the same game interruption. <b>Rule 15.7</b></p>
<p><b>4.8 (5.9)</b> Player #6 of team A was disqualified from the match, legally substituted by # 7. This was the first substitution for team A during the set, and there have been 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<sup>st</sup> 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?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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. <b>RULES 15.7, 15.8</b></p>
<p><b>4.9 (5.10)</b> During the official warm-up before the start of the first set of a match between the USA and Argentina, Kantor, the setter for Argentina, became injured and could not play. He was listed on the line-up sheet as the starting server. The referee allowed the Argentine</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> No, the referee correctly allowed the injured player to be removed by a legal substitution. Once the line-up sheet has been submitted to the 2nd referee or to the scorer, the only changes, except for Libero replacements, which can be made, are those made through</p>

<p>coach to make a substitution for Kantor. Must he have participated in the game before being substituted?</p>	<p>the regular substitution process. Since legal substitutions are possible, such substitutions count as one of the six substitutions allowed to the team in the set. <b>Rules 7.3.2, 7.3.4</b></p>
<p><b>4.10 (5.11)</b> R-7 was found to be on the court when he should have been on the bench. "R" had used the allowable six team substitutions. Since there were no legal substitutions remaining, what was the proper procedure used by the officials?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> "R" had an incorrect line-up. The procedure given in <b>Rule 15.9.2</b> should be the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Point and service for "S".</li> <li>The substitution must be rectified. R-7 has to be removed from the set and the correct player returns to the court. This correction does not count as regular substitution,</li> <li>All points scored by "R" while R-7 was in the game illegally must be cancelled, but the score of the opponent's team will remain as it is.</li> <li>There is no further penalty for "R".</li> </ol> <p><b>Rule 15.9.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.11 (5.12)</b> After "R" has used five substitutions, two substitute players entered the substitution zone. What is the proper response of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since "R" has used five substitutions, the request for the sixth substitution is valid. The 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 without any sanction. <b>Rules 15.5, 15.6, 15.11, 16.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.12 (5.13)</b> At the USA National Championships two very strong teams played. R-2 and R-5 were the best attackers of their team. 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 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?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is not legal. R-2 cannot substitute 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. <b>Rule 15.7</b></p>

<p><b>4.13 (5.14)</b> In a match in the Kuwait League 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<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee allows the legal substitution to take place. The illegal substitution must be refused no matter in which order the substitutions were requested. 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. <b>Rules 15.6,16.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.14 (5.15)</b> In a World Championship match between Korea and Germany, Korea requested a substitution. After the substitution was completed, the scorer announced that it was "illegal". The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee then corrected it. The Korean game captain then disagreed with the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee. When the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee checked the score sheet, he discovered that the substitution was, in fact, "legal", and "re-corrected" the situation. This was quite embarrassing to the referees. What should have been the response of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The procedure of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee was correct, however, in such a case, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee must check the facts on the score sheet before making his decision. It is quite important for a referee to make a decision based upon "facts". Changing decisions can create a very unfavourable atmosphere for the match. It creates in the players and the spectators a distrustful and hostile feeling for the referees.</p>
<p><b>4.15 (5.16)</b> A substitute player of team A was standing in the substitution zone, and ready to enter. However, the player on court initially refused to leave the court. The referee judged that this created a delay and sanctioned the team. Nevertheless he also authorized the substitution - is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. 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. The referee showed good knowledge of the rules and the spirit of the rules in allowing the substitution. <b>Rules 16.1.1, 23.2.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.16 (new)</b> During the check of the line-up before the second set of the Hungarian Cup Final, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee realised 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</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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 should give the hand signal to avoid</p>

<p>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<sup>st</sup> referee realised, 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 “not necessary” substitution. The game continued without any sanction. Was it a correct procedure?</p>	<p>misunderstandings.</p>
--	---------------------------

### **TIME-OUTS AND TECHNICAL TIME-OUTS**

<p><b>4.17 (5.17)</b>  During the match Thailand against Japan in the Asian Women’s Senior Championships, after Thailand won a rally to lead 7:6, player # 5 of Thailand, who was in the wrong rotation order, served and Thailand won a point. The score was now 8:6.  A Technical Time-Out was applied and the same player continued to serve until Thailand led 10:6. At that moment, the scorer realised that player # 5 had been in the wrong rotation order for some time. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee applied a penalty (point and service to the opponents) for having the wrong server, and deleted the points gained by Thailand during this period of the game. The game continued after having rectified Thailand’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.</p>	<p><b>Ruling</b>  The 1<sup>st</sup> referee’s decision was correct. Technical Time-Outs 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 one should be allowed until the score of the leading team reaches 16 points.  <b>Rule 15.4.1</b></p>
---	--

### **IMPROPER REQUESTS**

<p><b>4.18 (5.18)</b>  In the Men’s World Championships, the Cuban coach requested a substitution late in the set. The substitute player did not hear the coach’s summons and was not near the substitution zone at the time of the request. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee 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. Brazil then called a time-out followed by a substitution. Cuba followed this</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b>  This is not a correct ruling by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. His first action to reject the substitution for the delay and to give a delay warning was correct, since the coach had signalled to request the substitution while the player was not in position for the substitution. It was also legal for the Brazilian coach to request a time-out and a substitution after the delay warning. However, the improper request was the second substitution request by Cuba, coming directly after the time-out. Before a</p>
--	--

<p>with a substitution request which this time was granted. The game continued with Cuba winning the set and match. Is this a correct ruling by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p>team is allowed to have a new request for substitution, there must be a completed rally following the previous request.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Rules 15.3.1, 15.3.2, 15.10.3, 15.11.1.3, 16.1.1, 16.1.2, 25.2.2.6</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>4.19 (5.19)</b> The Mexican team playing against the Dominican Republic in the NORCECA Championships had used his two team time-outs. Later in the set, the Mexican coach made a third request for time-out which was granted by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee. At that moment the scorer realized that it was the 3<sup>rd</sup> time-out for the Mexican team and notified the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee about this. What is the proper procedure for the officials?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The request for a third time-out is an improper request and should have been rejected immediately without punishment, but recorded in the score sheet. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee was notified about the error and the time-out period was immediately terminated. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee notified the game captain of the Mexican team about the fact and issued a delay warning because the action caused a delay.</p> <p><b>Rules 15.11.1.4, 16.1.5, 25.2.2.6</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>4.20 (5.20)</b> In the Top Teams Cup Szeged (HUN) was playing against Kakanj (BIH). During the match a substitute player entered the substitution zone slightly after the 1<sup>st</sup> referee's whistle for service. The scorer pushed the buzzer, and the game stopped. The 1<sup>st</sup> 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.</p> <p>The 1<sup>st</sup> referee urged Szeged to serve. At the moment of the service hit, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee blew his whistle and signalled a positional fault on the serving team because there were seven players on the court.</p> <p>After a short discussion between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> referee, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee signalled again for the service. Was this a correct decision?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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, Szeged 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.</p> <p><b>Rule 15.11.1.1</b> The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee has neither the right nor the responsibility to judge the serving team's positional faults. When the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee blows his/her whistle in such a case, the rally must be replayed.</p> <p><b>Rules 15.11, 23.3.2.3.a, 24.3.2.2, 25.2.2.6</b></p>
---	---

## INJURIES

<p><b>4.21 (5.21)</b> During a match at the US National Championships, the American player Lewis was hit in the nose by the elbow of a team-</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Referees must use discretion in cases where substitutions are not pre-planned. A substitute must be permitted a reasonable</p>
--	--

<p>mate while blocking. He received a "bloody nose". His coach requested a substitution. The substitute reported to the scorer's table in a training suit. What is the correct response of the referee?</p>	<p>time to take off his or her training suit and enter the game without sanctions. It should be further noted that if an injury occurs in which a player bleeds, he must be substituted or replaced until the bleeding is stopped and the blood is removed from the player's uniform. <b>Rules 4.4, 15.5, 15.10.2, 15.10.3, 17.1.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.22 (5.22)</b> In the Men's World Cup, the Netherlands setter Peter Blangé 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, Blangé declared that he was able to play again. The referee then signalled to continue the match with Blangé. Was this the correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. For the safety of the player, the 1<sup>st</sup> 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<sup>st</sup> 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. <b>Rules 15.7, 17.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.23 (5.23)</b> In a set the German team had used 5 substitutions. After that, a player who had been substituted and returned to the match became injured. An exceptional substitution was used to replace him. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee ruled that this exceptional substitution was now the sixth substitution for the team and that they had no more substitutions in the set. The coach questioned this rules interpretation. What is the correct interpretation of the rules?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The correct interpretation of the rules is that the injured player may be substituted by an "exceptional substitution". The German coach may use any of the players who are not on the court at the moment of the injury except the Libero and his/her replacement player. The exceptional substitution is not counted as one of the six substitutions and the number of substitutions has not changed. <b>Rules 15.1, 15.6, 15.7</b></p>
<p><b>4.24 (new)</b> During a rally a player received a blood injury. After the end of the rally the 1<sup>st</sup> referee called him and instructed him 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<sup>st</sup> referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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 injury and instruct the player to ask a medical intervention. The team is not obliged to substitute the player. Therefore it was an acceptable procedure by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to give neither a delay sanction nor to ask the team for a game interruption.</p>

	<b>Decision of the Medical Commission of FIVB</b>
--	---

**DELAYS TO THE GAME**

<p><b>4.25 (5.24)</b> Prior to the start of the third set of a match in the Men's World Cup with Japan playing against China, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled the teams to enter the court. The Japanese team did not react. When they were too slow to respond, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee issued a delay warning to them. The team then entered the court. Was this the appropriate action by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee acted correctly. The teams must be summoned to take their positions on the court. If they do not react, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee must issue a delay warning to them, and this must be recorded on the score sheet. If the team still did not react, a delay penalty, indicated by a yellow 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 time-out, the same procedure should be followed. <b>Rules 6.4.1, 16.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.26 (5.25)</b> After winning a rally, the Brazilian women's team formed a huddle to discuss strategy for the next rally. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee allowed an adequate time for the players to move to their positions, if they had not huddled together, and then blew the whistle and charged Brazil with a delay warning because they were not ready to serve. Is this a correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This was a correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. There is no requirement for the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to allow more than a reasonable time for the players to move to their positions for the next rally. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee must use good judgment in this case. He must allow for appropriate enthusiasm and cheering but cannot allow the game to be delayed. <b>Rules 16.1.2, 16.1.5</b></p>
<p><b>4.27 (5.26)</b> 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<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> 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. Therefore he must consider many facts. 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<sup>st</sup> 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<sup>st</sup> referee, if there is no Control Committee. In a match with a Control Committee, the Game Jury President may</p>

	<p>authorize the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. <b>Rules 1.5, 5.1.2.2, 6.4.1, 16.2</b></p>
--	---

### EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE

<p><b>4.28 (5.27)</b> During a set, spectators ran onto the court after close plays and interrupted the match by protesting decisions made by the officials. What is the correct response of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee should interrupt 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. <b>Rules 17.2, 17.3</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>4.29 (5.28)</b> In the Olympic Games during the women's match between Cuba and Canada, while a Cuban player was serving the ball, the TV "boom" arm at the end of the court swung down and struck her. She continued her serving action despite the interference and managed to serve the ball into the court and the rally continued. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not stop the play or order a replay and there was no protest by the Cuban team. Is this the correct decision by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> 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<sup>st</sup> referee should consider repeating the rally.</p>
---	---

### CHAPTER 5: LIBERO

<p><b>5.1 (6.1)</b> At the beginning of a match in the World Championships the USA men's coach, Doug Beal, submitted his starting line-up. Before the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee could check it, the US Libero Eric Sullivan replaced the back row player Nygaard. What is the response of the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee during the line-up check before the start of the match?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The starting player must be on the court at the time of the line-up check. Nygaard must quickly replace Sullivan with no warning or penalty. As soon as the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee checked the line-up, Sullivan may replace Nygaard. If this will happen again in the match or if the delay will be too long, and the 1<sup>st</sup> referee judges this action as a delay, the referee will issue a delay sanction. <b>Rule 19.3.2.2</b></p>
---	--

<p><b>5.2 (6.2)</b> A team had seven players including the Libero. In the second set, the starting player</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision is correct. The Libero cannot participate in any substitution</p>
---	---

<p>#6 was sanctioned by disqualification. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee declared the team incomplete and the match won by the opponents. Is the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct?</p>	<p>and the disqualified player must be substituted by a legal substitution, but there are no players available for regular substitutions. <b>Rules 6.4.3, 19</b></p>
<p><b>5.3 (6.3)</b> The red team had only eight players including the Libero. In the second set of a match, player #6 for the red team has been substituted and later returned to the match. Player #6 is then sanctioned by disqualification. The Libero is on the bench at the time of the disqualification. What is the proper decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since player #6 cannot be substituted legally, his team has to be declared incomplete and will lose the 2<sup>nd</sup> set. <b>Rules 6.4.3, 15.7, 15.8, 19.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.4 (6.4)</b> A team had seven players including the Libero. In the second set, the starting player #6 was injured. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee allowed the Libero to enter the match by a regular substitution procedure in place of the injured player and finished the match with this lineup. Is this correct decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the referee is not correct. The Libero is not allowed to participate in any substitution, regular or exceptional. There are two possibilities for the team. If #6 is in the front zone at the moment of the injury, the team has the right to request three minutes for recovery. If the player cannot continue to play, the team loses the set or possibly the match. However, if the injured player #6 is in the back zone and the Libero is on the bench, the team may replace #6 by the Libero until the Libero must rotate to the front zone. At this time, player #6 must either return to play or the team is incomplete. <b>Rules 15.7, 15.8, 17, 19.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.5 (6.5)</b> The Libero was on the court for player #5. He was expelled from the set. What is the correct process to continue the match?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> In case of an expelled or disqualified Libero and if the team has two Liberos, the coach may replace the sanctioned active Libero immediately by the reserve Libero. If the team has only one Libero, Player #5 must return on the court in place of the Libero. In this case, the team has no right to use this Libero for the remainder of the set. The Libero is allowed to play during the next set. If the sanction had been disqualification, the team would have no right to use this Libero for the remainder of the match. <b>Rules 6.4.3, 19.1.1, 19.3.2, 19.3.3</b></p>
<p><b>5.6 (6.6)</b> Eric Sullivan, the Libero of the USA men's team, was in position 5. The team won the</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The process is correct. But the terminology is important to avoid unnecessary protests.</p>

<p>rally and rotated. The Libero was replaced correctly by the starting player Jeff Nygaard # 2 who moved into the front zone. Before the game continued, the USA coach Doug Beal decided to substitute #2 by player #7 Tom Hoff. Both of these actions occur in one interruption of the game. Is the 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision correct to allow both player exchanges?</p>	<p>The Libero is "replaced" by the starting player Nygaard #2. #7 Hoff, then, "substitutes" Nygaard. So there is only one substitution between the two rallies which is recorded on the score sheet, and no rule infringement occurs. <b>Rules 15.3.2, 19.3.2</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>5.7 (6.7)</b> In the Norway's Westcup, the Libero replacing the player in position 1 was late. The replacement took place after the referee's whistle for service but before the service hit. What is the proper response by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee should allow the rally to continue uninterrupted. After the rally, he should issue a verbal caution for the late replacement. Subsequent late replacements should be sanctioned by delay sanctions immediately, interrupting the rally. However, if the replacement has been made after the service hit, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee should whistle this as a positional fault. <b>Rule 19.3.2.3</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>5.8 (6.8)</b> During the NORCECA Junior Girls Championships the USA were playing against Mexico. USA service specialist McNamee substituted into the game for middle blocker Holmquist. After she had served, McNamee was replaced by the Libero Bird. When Bird rotated into the front row, she was replaced by Holmquist with a normal "Libero replacement". At this moment, the USA coach Deitre Collins recognized that Holmquist had entered the game illegally, pushed the buzzer for a normal substitution of McNamee for Holmquist and attempted to have Holmquist back on the court so that this substitution could take place legally. Since the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was prepared to authorize the USA server to serve, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee refused the improper request by the US team. On the other hand, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee recognized that he was going to authorize a service in which the USA team had an illegal player on the court, authorized the appropriate substitution and sanctioned the USA team with a delay warning, with very little disruption of the game. Was this the proper response by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Clearly, the 1<sup>st</sup> 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<sup>st</sup> referee made the correct decision. If such errors continued by the USA team, sanctions should be applied.</p>
---	--

<b>5.9 (6.9)</b>	<b>Ruling:</b>
------------------	----------------

<p>In the Men's World Championship match between the USA and Greece, the starting middle blocker for the USA was Jeff Nygaard.</p> <p>When he rotated to serve, his coach Doug Beal substituted him by service specialist Chip McCaw. After losing the service, McCaw was replaced by Libero Eric Sullivan. When Sullivan had to rotate to the front row, Nygaard raced onto the court to replace him. After two rallies, the Greek team realized that the replacement was not legal because Nygaard had not been substituted back for McCaw. The Greek team protested the situation.</p> <p>A Judges Conference was convened after which the USA team was allowed to substitute Nygaard into the match for McCaw with no penalty. Was this the correct ruling?</p>	<p>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<sup>st</sup> referee has the power to decide any matter involving the game including those not provided in the rules.</p> <p>Secondly, given that situation, the USA team 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 USA team. If not, no additional points should be deducted. To get Nygaard legally back into the match, the team USA should have requested a regular substitution for McCaw.</p> <p>Thirdly, the proper replacement/substitution process for this situation is the following: At the time that Sullivan was about to rotate to the front row, he should have been replaced by McCaw. Then Nygaard should have substituted McCaw.</p> <p>These replacements/substitutions must be made in the same interruption of the game.</p> <p><b>Rules 19.3.2.1, 23.2.3</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>5.10 (6.10)</b></p> <p>During a match in the Men's World Cup Argentina was playing against Canada. The referee whistled for Hugo Conte to serve. At that moment, Conte realized that the Argentine Libero had left the court but had not been replaced, so that his team had only five players on the court. He delayed the service as long as he considered to be legal, then he served. At the moment of the service hit, the replacement player was on the court in position 1, but his legal position was in position 4. He clearly committed a positional fault. The teams played the rally which was won by Argentina.</p> <p>The game captain of Canada then approached the 1<sup>st</sup> referee requesting an explanation of the decision to play the rally. He expected his team to win the rally because Argentina committed a positional fault. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee rejected the plea and allowed the rally to remain as played.</p> <p>What should have been the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>There were three errors in this situation. Firstly the 1<sup>st</sup> 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.</p> <p>He should have delayed the whistle for the service. If this caused a delay, the Argentine team should have received a delay sanction.</p> <p>The second is that a replacement can only take place before the whistle for service. And the third is, that the Argentine team committed a positional fault at the moment of the service hit,</p> <p>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 Argentine team should have been sanctioned according to <b>Rule 19.3.2.3.</b></p> <p><b>Rules 7.5.1, 12.3, 19.3.2.2, 19.3.2.3</b></p>
---	---

<p><b>5.11 (6.11)</b> During a match the Libero was on the court replacing player # 6. While running after a ball, the Libero injured his leg muscle and could not continue to play. The coach then decided that he wanted player # 6 to become the re-designated Libero. Is this possible?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> In the case of an injured/ill Libero and if the team has two Liberos, the coach may exchange the injured active Libero immediately by the reserve Libero. If the reserve Libero is getting injured, the coach may re-designate a new one from one of the players not on the court at the moment of the re-designation. If the team has only one Libero, the choice is the same, as in case of injured reserve Libero. Thus, the situation depends on how many registered Liberos the team has. If only one, the player #6 must first replace the injured Libero. The coach must then use a regular substitution to allow player #6 to be on the bench. He may then re-designate player #6 as the new Libero. If player #6 cannot be substituted legally during that set, he cannot be the re-designated Libero during the set. In case the team has a reserve Libero, the coach has right to use only him/her. <b>Rules 19.1.3., 19.3.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>5.12 (6.12)</b> In a European match between Nyborg and Varhaug, Nyborg's coach was also the Libero. When the coach was not on the court, he walked in the zone between the extended attack line and the warm-up area giving instructions to his team. The referee did not prevent this activity. Was this a correct ruling by the referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the referee was correct. The rules state that the Libero cannot be the team or game captain. The rules do not prohibit the Libero from being the coach. Therefore, the Libero-coach was allowed this dual function and the referee did not insist on the Libero to remain on the bench. <b>Rules 5.2.3.4, 19.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>5.13 (6.13)</b> The USA men were playing against Argentina in the Olympic Games. USA middle blocker, Tom Hoff, was sitting on the bench having been replaced by Libero Eric Sullivan. When Sullivan rotated from position 6 to position 5, Hoff, absentmindedly, came onto the court and Sullivan, apparently thinking the same way or prompted by the actions of his colleague, started to come off the court and actually left the court briefly. Almost immediately, Hoff recognized that he had made a mistake and quickly exchanged positions again with Sullivan. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee ignored the mistaken replacement and whistled for the service. Was this the correct</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> <b>Rule 19.3.2.1</b> states that there must be one rally between two Libero replacements. However, due to the momentary nature of the exchange, the referee considered it not to be a completed replacement. Where such an event takes place, obviously by a mistake, and with no delay to the game, it is allowed to continue without additional interruption. This is part of the art of refereeing. If on the other hand Sullivan had left the court and immediately replaced a different player without a rally between the replacements, the team would have been penalized with a point and service to the opponent, and the incorrect replacement</p>

decision by the 1 <sup>st</sup> referee?	would have been corrected. <b>Rule 19.3.2.1</b>
--	--

<p><b>5.14 (6.14)</b> In a match in the Kuwait League the Libero was in the front row on position 4. After three points, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee noticed the positional fault. What is the correct decision for the referee to make?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The Libero does not commit a positional fault until the server hits the ball. It is the duty of the assistant scorer to notify the referees if the Libero is in the game when he/she should be on the bench. The referee should immediately determine, with the help of the assistant scorer, in how many rallies the Libero was in the wrong position The team which commits a positional fault is penalized with a point and service to the opponents and loses any points scored while the team committed the positional fault. The line-ups are corrected and the game resumes. <b>Rules 7.5.4, 19.3.1.1, 26.2.2.1, 26.2.2.2</b></p>
---	--

<p><b>5.15 (6.15)</b> In a match of the Asian Senior Men's Championships during the official warm-up the Libero was injured. The coach asked for a re-designation – the new Libero should be the team captain, who was already on the starting line-up of the team for the first set. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee initially rejected the request because the rules forbid the Libero to be either team or game captain. Was the decision of the referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's decision was not correct. If the team has two Liberos, the coach may exchange the injured active Libero immediately by the reserve Libero. If the reserve 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 re-designation. If the team has only one Libero, the choice is the same, as in case of injured reserve 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, where there is <i>force majeure</i>, 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Substitution of the team captain with another player by a regular substitution before the match begins.</li> <li>2. Request by the coach to appoint a new team captain.</li> <li>3. Re-designation of the new Libero.</li> <li>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</li> </ol>
---	--

	<p>purpose in the reserve equipment) .</p> <p>5. Request the scorer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Re-register the original team captain as the new or re-designated Libero (to replace the original Libero),</li> <li>- Register the new team captain.</li> </ul> <p>The details of these re-registrations/ re-designations must be written in the "REMARKS" box of the score sheet.</p> <p><b>Rules 5, 19.1.4, 19.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.16 (6.16)</b></p> <p>Following two poor receptions of team A, the coach of the team replaced the Libero from position 6 and immediately sent him back to the court in position 5 (without any rally between the two replacements). The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee did not recognize it. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee, however, saw it, yet still authorised the service and after the service hit, he whistled for a positional fault of the receiving team A. Was the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct. No fault has been made until the service hit. In general, the task to whistle the positional fault of the receiving team is included in the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee's responsibilities. But in this case, since the Libero has no right to be on the court during this rally (and the rally begins at the service hit) - and since the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee did not recognize this Libero replacement fault, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee cannot knowingly allow an illegal act, and must help the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee by whistling. In matches where an assistant scorer acts, it is his/her duty to check the Libero replacements. In this case, after the service hit, he/ she should press the buzzer, signalling the fault committed.</p> <p><b>Rules 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2.2, 19.3.2.3, 23.2.3</b></p>
<p><b>5.17 (6.18)</b></p> <p>After the end of a rally, the Libero was replaced by a normal player. The referee whistled for the next rally. After the service, a reserve ball penetrated into the playing court, and the 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled "double fault". Before the whistle for the replayed rally, the Libero attempted to replace the player in position 6. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee called him back.</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee's decision was not correct. It is true, that a rally ends with the award of a point to one of the teams. Since the rally was cancelled, no rally existed between the two replacements, but the referees are not allowed to prevent a team from making a mistake.</p> <p><b>RULE 19.3.2.1</b></p>
<p><b>5.18 (6.19)</b></p> <p>In the Athens Olympic games, The Libero of the Italian men's team became injured during the match, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>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 exchanged by the reserve Libero or the injured reserve Libero is re-designated.</p> <p><b>19.3.3.1</b></p> <p>Thus, this situation was a mistake because two consecutive replacements took place without any rally in between.</p>

Liberi to go back on the court and to resume the match. Was this correct?	<b>RULE 19.3.2.1</b>
<p><b>5.19 (6.21)</b> Team A's Libero was injured at a crucial point in the match. The coach wished an immediate re-designation, and the replacement player entered the court from the bench as the new Libero. Should this have been permitted?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referees should not have permitted this. The wording of the rule is designed to protect teams from ill-thought strategies. For example, once this new Libero rotates to position 4, who can replace him/her? No one. The team would become incomplete. Therefore the following procedure must be used: If the team has two Liberos, the coach may exchange the injured acting Libero immediately by the reserve Libero. If the reserve Libero gets injured, the coach may re-designate a new one from one of the players not on the court at the moment of the re-designation. If the team has only one Libero, the procedure is the same as in the case of the injured reserve Libero: The injured Libero must be replaced by his replacement player. This player should be legally substituted. After the substitution he can be re-designated as the new Libero. He can enter the court only after one completed rally. <b>Rules 15.6.2, 19.3.2.1, 19.3.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>5.20 (6.22)</b> The Libero of Team A injured her arm during the match, and a new Libero had been re-designated. The original Libero sat on the bench for the remainder of the match. Should this have been permitted?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Players, who cannot participate in the warm-up session, should not be written on the score sheet or be allowed to sit on the bench as part of the team. However, in this instance the injury occurred later in the match, the player was able to walk and did not provide an obstruction or danger to the teams. <b>This last point is crucial to the ruling.</b> 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 Control area. <b>Diagram 1a and Definitions</b></p>
<p><b>5.22 (6.25)</b> During the 2<sup>nd</sup> set of the English Cup Final, the Libero complained of feeling unwell. The team doctor realized immediately that the Libero had a temperature of 40.5°C, caused by an acute viral infection, and ruled that he</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> If the team has two Liberos, in case of injury or illness of the acting Libero, he/she can be exchanged by the reserve Libero. In case where a team has only one Libero or the reserve Libero has become injured while on</p>

<p>should not take any further part in the match. Under these circumstances, is it permitted to re-designate a new Libero?</p>	<p>court, he/she can be exchanged by the re-designation procedure. <b>Rule 19.3.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>5.23 (new)</b> In the final match of the 2006 Men's World Championship, the Libero of Poland became injured. The coach decided to replace him immediately by player #17, who at this moment was out of the court and was not replaced before by the Libero. He sent him onto the court without a rally has been played. The referee allowed this procedure. Was this a correct replacement?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Normally at least one completed rally has to be played between two Libero replacements. In this case of injury it is indeed allowed to send the Reserve Libero (if in the team list are two Liberos) or a re-designated Libero onto the court without a completed rally between. <b>Rule 19.3.2.1</b></p>
<p><b>5.24 (new)</b> Before the match the scorer recorded the Libero's name and his number '9' on the list of the 12 players in the score sheet for team 'A'. In the special line for the Libero, the scorer recorded the number '15' for the Libero. The coach and the team captain signed it. At the score of 15:10 for 'A' in the 1<sup>st</sup> set, the scorer found the mistake. What is the correct decision?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is an administrative mistake and will not have any consequences for the team. The scorer will correct the number in the 'Remarks' box. <b>Rule 19.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.25 (new)</b> In the 1<sup>st</sup> set of a match, the Libero of "A" played in a shirt with the same colour and design like the whole team. The set finished at 25:21 for his team. Before the start of the 2<sup>nd</sup> set, the coach of 'B' protested against this situation and the result of the set. What is the right decision?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Because the wrong shirt had no influence on the game, the result of the 1<sup>st</sup> set will not be cancelled. The Libero has to change his shirt. <b>Rule 19.2</b></p>

## CHAPTER 6: PARTICIPANTS' CONDUCT

<p><b>6.1 (7.1)</b> In the World Cup, a disgusted Spanish player kicked the ball after a rally had ended. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee warned the player for minor misconduct. Is this a correct action by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is a correct action by the referee. Such minor misconducts must be controlled by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. If, on the other hand, the kicking is dangerous to players, officials or spectators, or is rude conduct, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee has the authority to judge this to be rude conduct and sanction the player with a yellow card penalty. In this case, the scorer will record the rude conduct under the player's number in the sanctions box of the score sheet. While the 1<sup>st</sup> referee may give a verbal warning to a player for minor misconduct or a team warning to the game captain for persistent minor misconduct of the team, the referee has the authority to go directly to the issuing of sanctions if an offence is of a serious nature. <b>Rules 21.1, 21.2</b></p>
<p><b>6.2 (7.2)</b> The Netherlands played against Cuba in the Men's World Cup. During the hard fought second set, the Netherlands setter Peter Blangé made a sensational set which fooled the Cuban blockers. The Netherlands attacker v.d. Meulen smashed the ball to the floor with great authority. As the confused Cuban blockers attempted to block him, their setter, Diago, intentionally pulled down the bottom of the net to make the referee believe that v.d. Meulen had hit the net. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee observed the attempted deception and whistled for the Netherlands team to win the rally. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee then signalled a warning to Diago. Is this the correct penalization for him?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was not correct. The rally should have been won by the Netherlands team because of the net contact by the Cuban player which interfered with the play. Diago then should have received a penalty, (<b>yellow card</b>: point and service to the opponents), for the rude conduct in attempting to mislead the referees. <b>Rules 21.2.1, 21.3</b></p>
<p><b>6.3 (7.3)</b> In a World League match the coach of Brazil 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?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The coach should be allowed to express certain normal responses. If the response is judged to be minor misconduct, the coach should be warned by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. If repeated, he should be penalized with a yellow 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. In certain major world competitions, Special</p>

	Refereeing Instructions may list further sanctions. <b>Rules 5.2, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3</b>
--	---

<p><b>6.4 (7.4)</b> Between the sets of a match, player #3 of team A made a derogatory remark to an official and a penalty for rude conduct was given by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. Team A has had the first service for the next set. What is the proper action of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Sanctions imposed between sets of a match are assessed prior to the start of the next set. Thus, before the first service, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee will signal the penalty and loss of rally for team A. The receiving team gains one point, rotates and serves.</p> <p><b>Rule 21.5</b> 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 for infractions which occur between sets, the penalties must be recorded on the score sheet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Warning against a player of the serving team. No penalty.</li> <li>2. Warning against a player of the receiving team. No penalty.</li> <li>3. Penalty against a serving team player only. Loss of rally for the serving team. The receiving team gains a point, rotates and gets the service.</li> <li>4. Penalty against a receiving team player only. Point awarded to the serving team.</li> <li>5. Penalties against each team no matter in which order.       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The serving team loses a rally, point for receiving team,</li> <li>b. The receiving team rotates one position. Then a loss of rally is charged to this team.</li> <li>c. The original serving team rotates one position, gains one point, and starts to serve with the second player in the service order. The score is 1-1.</li> <li>d. 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.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
--	---

<p><b>6.5 (7.5)</b> The USA men's team was receiving. Lloy Ball was the setter penetrating from the back zone. An American receiver passed the ball so poorly that Ball had no chance to even touch the ball. In frustration, after the ball touched the floor, he pulled down the bottom of the net. Should this have been a fault?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> According to <b>Rule 21.3</b>, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee has the authority to sanction the player according to the seriousness of the offence. Pulling down the net is a normal emotional reaction of a disappointed player and can be controlled by the art of the refereeing. In some cases, intentional pulling down of the</p>
--	---

	<p>net may be considered as a rude conduct and sanctioned accordingly. Since this case was not an attempt to mislead the referee during play, there should be no penalty for rude conduct.</p> <p><b>Rules 21.2, 21.2.1, 21.3</b></p>
<p><b>6.6 (7.6)</b> A player was outraged by a decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee concerning a touch of the block. The offending player pulled down the net and the 1<sup>st</sup> referee directed him to return to his position. The player then walked towards the 1<sup>st</sup> referee gesturing wildly and shouting to him even after the warning. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee considered this behaviour as offensive conduct and sanctioned him with a red card which expelled the player from the set. Is this an appropriate response by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee's response appears to be correct. He attempted to settle the problem by a warning and by directing the player to go back onto the court to play. When this did not succeed, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was empowered to sanction the player according to <b>Rule 21.3</b>. In this rule, the referee is given the authority to sanction the player according to the seriousness of the offence. For rude conduct he would receive a penalty and his would be penalized with a point and service to the opponents. For conduct of a more serious nature, the player would receive an expulsion for offensive conduct. For aggressive conduct the player must be disqualified from the match. It should be noted that the rude conduct costs the offending team a point and service to the opponent team, whereas the offensive conduct and aggression do not carry a point/service penalty.</p> <p><b>Rules 21.1, 21.2, 21.3</b></p>
<p><b>6.7 (7.7)</b> In the match Brazil versus Canada in the World League, a player was expelled directly from the court. The team had received neither a warning nor a penalty at this stage of the match. What should be the 1<sup>st</sup> referee's response to a subsequent minor misconduct from any other member of the same team?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> 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. Misconduct sanctions are strictly individual sanctions, and shall not take into account previous sanctions given to other team members of the same team. Therefore, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee may issue warnings or penalties to other team members after the expulsion.</p> <p><b>Rule 21</b></p>
<p><b>6.8 (new)</b> At the shake hands after the match one team captain showed very unsportsmanlike behaviour against the 1<sup>st</sup> referee, which during the match would have caused a sanction. What is the correct procedure of</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since the match is not finished by the last whistle of the referees, any team member can be sanctioned until the end of all administrative duties of the match. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee has to inform the respective team</p>

the 1 <sup>st</sup> referee?	member about the sanction, in this case the team captain, and record the sanction in the REMARKS box of the score sheet. All consequences concerning the eligibility of players on following matches must be done by the respective instances.
------------------------------	--

<p><b>6.9 (new)</b> On a Hungarian League match player No. 7 was replaced by the Libero and was sitting on the bench. He complained about a referee's decision loudly. The 1st referee sanctioned him by a penalty. The player did not stop this behaviour and applauded the referee. The 1st referee sanctioned him with an expulsion. The expelled player continued the behaviour and received a disqualification. What is the correct procedure?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The expelled or disqualified player should be substituted immediately. Therefore he has to replace the Libero and must be substituted legally. If this is not possible, the team consists on only 5 regular players and has therefore to be declared incomplete. The score at the moment of expulsion (or disqualification) must be recorded. <b>Rules 6.4.3, 15.8</b></p>
---	--

## CHAPTER 7: THE REFEREES AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

<p><b>7.1 (8.1)</b> The coach of Brazil was detected talking to and distracting the scorer during the play. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee told the coach not to interfere with the scorer. Is this a correct action by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Although only the 1<sup>st</sup> referee may officially warn or penalize a coach, player or another team member, if the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee feels that the situation needs a warning, he must notify the 1<sup>st</sup> referee who must act. <b>Rule 23.3.2.2</b> However, in the spirit of the art of refereeing, if such situations can be resolved by the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee with a word, it would be to the advantage of the game not to stop it for the issue of sanctions.</p>
---	--

<p><b>7.2 (8.2)</b> The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee indicated to the 1<sup>st</sup> referee that the American substitute Eric Sato was sitting on the floor in the warm-up area instead of standing or stretching. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee warned the American team for a minor misconduct and made Sato stand up. Is this a correct action by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This was an incorrect ruling by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee. 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. The warm-up area is designated to the players to be prepared to play. <b>Rules 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 24.2.4, 24.2.5</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>7.3 (8.3)</b> The coach of the USA junior women's team approached the scorer and asked for information about the number of time-outs that had been taken by the Mexican team. What is the proper response of the scorer?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The scorer should not respond to the coach. <b>Generally, coaches are not permitted to ask the scorers for any information.</b> However, where an electronic scoreboard is used, but the number of used game</p>
--	--

	<p>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.</p> <p><b>Rule 25.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>7.4 (8.4)</b> At the US National Championships, the game captain of the Kenneth Allen Club team asked the 1<sup>st</sup> referee for an interpretation of an incident during the play. The explanation appeared to satisfy the game captain. Kenneth Allen lost the match. After the match was over, the team captain of Kenneth Allen attempted to register a protest on the score sheet. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee refused. Was this a correct ruling?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee ruled correctly. At the time of the incident, the game captain of Kenneth Allen made no mention of a protest.</p> <p><b>Rules 5.1.2.1, 5.1.3.2, 23.2.4</b></p>
<p><b>7.5 (8.5)</b> In a tournament in Scotland, the match between Elliots and Grangemouth was tied at 23-23 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> set. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee called Grangemouth for "positional fault". Grangemouth protested the judgment, but to no avail. On the next service, with the score 24-23 to Elliots, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee again called Grangemouth for "positional fault" and declared the set to Elliots. Again the game captain of Grangemouth protested to both referees. After some discussion, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee agreed that both judgments had been incorrect. However, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee stated that the set was over and that no correction could be made. Despite further protests, the referee continued the match with set four. The Grangemouth team captain recorded the protest formally at the end of the match. Was this a proper action by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was wrong. Referees are allowed to correct their decisions concerning the application of the rules. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee should correct the obvious mistake by restarting the match in the third set at 23-23. In FIVB World Competitions, the Control Committee would correct this obvious mistake.</p>
<p><b>7.6 (8.6)</b> At the Women's World Cup China was playing against Korea. In the third set, the Chinese coach, Lang Ping, pushed the buzzer and signalled for a time-out. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee instinctively blew his whistle but then recognized that the Chinese team had already used its two time-outs in the set. He then "waved" for the teams to remain on the court and did not sanction China with an "improper request" because the delay was</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee's decision was not correct. He is in charge of the authorization of interruptions and controls their number. When the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee blew the whistle at the coach's hand signal, he should have known that the Chinese team had no more time-out and should simply have rejected the request without whistling. Since there was only a momentary delay, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee probably showed good judgment</p>

<p>slight. At that moment, the Chinese coach then signalled with her hands that she desired to make a substitution. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee then waved the substitute away as an "improper request" and the game continued. Was he correct in his handling of the situation?</p>	<p>in hastening the game to continue with no other consequences. On the other hand, the substitution request was only one request made in the game interruption between rallies; the request for substitution should have been allowed as a legal substitution. <b>Rules 15.1, 15.2.1, 15.11, 16.1, 16.2, 24.2.6, 24.2.7</b></p>
<p><b>7.7 (8.7)</b> At the Women's NORCECA Championships, the USA were playing a hard fought match with Canada. At the start of the fifth set, the American coach, Kent Miller, submitted his line-up. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee signalled for the teams to enter the court. At the signal, the USA players took their positions on the court while the Canadian players were still gathered around their coach at the bench. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee again signalled for them to take the court. The Canadian coach apparently observed the USA players in their positions on the court, and then submitted his line-up to the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee sanctioned the Canadian coach with a "delay warning". The USA coach Miller protested to the Control Committee that the Canadian team should be sanctioned for "rude conduct" and the USA team should be awarded a point. What should the correct ruling have been in this case?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee made the initial error by directing the American team to take the court before the Canadian coach had submitted his line-up sheet to the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee. Once the American team was on the court, the delay warning given by the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was probably correct. If on the other hand it was clear that the Canadian coach was taking advantage of the situation, the Control Committee should have ruled the rude conduct against the Canadian coach and awarded the USA team a point and service.</p>
<p><b>7.8 (8.8)</b> During a time-out in the match between Cuba and Brazil in the Women's World Cup, the Cuban coach met with his entire team in the very back corner of the free zone near the warm-up zone. The referees did nothing to prevent this. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> <b>Rule 15.4.2</b> states that the team must "go to the free zone near their bench" during a time-out. Therefore the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee should tell the Cuban team to go near to their bench. <b>Rule 15.4.2</b></p>
<p><b>7.9 (8.9)</b> In the Women's Final Olympic Qualification Tournament Croatia was leading against Korea 6 - 5 in the second set. After the rally, the Korean players were trying to find a wet spot on the court. The Korean assistant coach came to the sideline to assist the players to find it. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee called the Korean game</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> 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. <b>Rules 5.2.3.4, 5.3.1</b></p>

<p>captain and told her to tell the assistant coach to stay on the bench. Did the 1<sup>st</sup> referee make a correct decision?</p>	
---	--

<p><b>7.10 (8.10)</b> At the Women's Final Olympic Qualification Tournament Korea was playing against China. At the score of 8-6 in favour of Korea in the second set, the Korean coach asked the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee if his server was correct. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee checked the rotational order with the scorer and replied that the correct player was ready to serve. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee continued the match. Is this the correct process of the referees?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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 speak to the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee should have called the game captain and asked her to remind the coach on the fact, that he has no right to ask the referees. <b>Rule 5.1.2</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>7.11 (8.11)</b> In the Youth World Championships for women, Cuba was playing against Slovakia. The Slovakian coach requested a time-out. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee whistled for it. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not hear the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee's whistle, therefore he authorized the service by Cuba. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee whistled again to allow the requested time-out. Amidst some confusion, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee awarded a delay warning against Slovakia. Later in the same set, a Slovakian server was sanctioned for delaying the game. This second delay sanction by Slovakia in the same match resulted in a delay penalty and gave Cuba a point. This was point 24 and took the Cubans to match point which they subsequently won. The Slovaks vehemently protested against the delay sanctions. Were they justified in their protest?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The Slovaks 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 Slovakian protest would have never taken place. On the other hand, the Slovaks 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 1<sup>st</sup> referee. <b>Rule 5.1.2.1</b></p>
--	---

## CHAPTER 8: SPECIAL CASES

<p><b>8.1 (9.1)</b> During a match between Cuba and Canada, the Cuban women played very hard and fast. The Canadian team intentionally slowed down the tempo of the game of the very emotional Cubans. How should the referee respond?</p>	<p><b>PRINCIPLE:</b> "Tempo" is a very delicate element in volleyball. Every team has its optimum playing tempo. Tempo is not in the rules, but its control is one of the key factors in the performance of a good referee. A suitable tempo will allow a match to be played at a high level. On the other hand, the referee should keep the game at a constant tempo</p>
--	---

	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>8.2 (9.2)</b> In a World Cup match between the women's teams of Cuba and Peru, a floor wiping towel from one of the Cuban players fell from her uniform and landed on the floor between the blockers of Peru. The play continued with the Cuban team winning the rally. What is the correct ruling in this case?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is a judgment of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee to decide the degree of influence which the towel had on the play. Since the towel fell between active blockers of the opponents, the towel had the potential to influence the outcome of the rally and perhaps to cause an injury. If, according to the judgment of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee, the situation is dangerous, he should stop the game immediately and direct a replay. If, on the other hand, the rally is finished and the falling towel will have no influence on its outcome, there is no need to direct a replay. If this had been intentional or a repeated occurrence, other sanctions would apply.</p> <p><b>Rule 17.2</b></p>
<p><b>8.3 (9.3)</b> At the score of 9-7 in the third set of a match in the Kuwait League, the gymnasium lights went out. During that set, a starting player from one of the teams had been disqualified from the match. The match was resumed on another playing court. <b>Rule 17.3.2.2</b> states that the interrupted set has to be cancelled and replayed with the same team members and the same starting line-ups. What is the correct ruling on the use of the disqualified player in the third set when it started again?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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.</p>
<p><b>8.4 (9.4)</b> In a Women's World Cup match, Brazil was playing against the Netherlands. During the second set the scoreboard, which can be seen by the spectators, was not correct. Immediately, the emotional Brazilian coach challenged the scorer, the referee, and the Control Committee. He was supported by his Head of Delegation who appeared at the Control Committee table from the spectator seats reserved for Heads of Delegation. The 1<sup>st</sup> referee whistled the Brazilian game captain and explained that he was sanctioning the coach with a penalty for rude</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The initial error was that of the scorer. <b>Rule: 25.2.2.1</b> 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. <b>Rule 26.2.2.5</b> The 1<sup>st</sup> referee, via his 2<sup>nd</sup> referee, should have been certain that the penalty was recorded on the score sheet. <b>Rule 25.2.2.6</b> The Brazilian game captain should have</p>

<p>conduct. Although the Brazilian game captain had to communicate this to her coach, she did not do so. Furthermore, in the resulting confusion, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee missed the sanctioning of the Brazilian coach and the penalty for the rude conduct was not recorded on the score sheet.</p> <p>By this time, the Control Committee members, without communicating that a Judges' Conference has been called, determined that the scoreboard was not correct. Furthermore the scorer was also not correct, but the assistant scorer agreed with the member of the Control Committee and with the Brazilian coach. 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?</p>	<p>communicated the misconduct to her coach. When she did not do this, she should have been sanctioned.</p> <p><b>Rule 21</b></p> <p>The Control Committee was incorrect in allowing the Brazilian Head of Delegation to approach the Control Committee's table. The Game Jury President should have stopped the match by signalling for a Judges' Conference so that the score could be resolved. It is required for the Game Jury President to include the 1<sup>st</sup> referee and the Refereeing Delegate in the Judges' Conference. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee may be invited but has no vote in the final decision. Other officials with information on the matter can be summoned to inform the Judges' Conference concerning the problems.</p> <p><b>See Refereeing Guidelines and Instructions</b></p> <p><b>Rules 25.2.2.6, 25.2.2.7</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>8.5 (9.5)</b></p> <p>During a match between the USA men and Brazil, a USA player passed the ball on service reception through the external space outside of the antenna and into the free zone of Brazil beyond the centre line. The American setter, Lloy Ball, pursued the ball past the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee into the opponent's free zone. When passing the net post and 2<sup>nd</sup> referee, Ball grabbed the post in order to turn rapidly enough to get to the ball. The referee allowed the play to continue. Is this the correct ruling of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>The ruling was correct. As long as Ball is not in contact with the net post while he is hitting the ball, the play is legal. The play was both legal and spectacular.</p> <p><b>Rule 9.1.3</b></p>
--	---

<p><b>8.6 (new)</b></p> <p>At the start of the 4th set team 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 realise the discrepancy. After the line-up check, player #11 was immediately replaced by the Libero. Later on the Libero was replaced back 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<sup>nd</sup> referee signalled 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<sup>st</sup> referee also came down from his chair.</p> <p>After a check of the Libero control sheet, it</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>It is a very complex situation with some mistakes.</p> <p>The first mistake was committed at the beginning of the set. The line-up of team A was not according to the line-up sheet. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee did not realize this discrepancy.</p> <p>The second mistake happened after the TTO. Team B should have been given an additional point as penalty for the positional fault of team A, so the score had to be 6:0 for B.</p> <p>The third mistake was to give a second TTO, when team B reached the 8<sup>th</sup> point.</p> <p>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</p>
--	---

<p>was obvious, that player #11 was in the game since the start of this set. So the 1<sup>st</sup> referee decided to cancel all points of team A. The points of team B remained valid and they got the service at the score of 5:0 for B. Some rallies later, when team B led 8:5, the TTO was given again. Was it the correct procedure by the referees?</p>	<p>correct the situation. A protest by team B would have created the conditions for a Judges' Conference to award the penalty point missed by the referee.</p>
--	--

<p><b>8.7 (new)</b> In the match between Moscow and Belgorod in the Russian League the referee decided Belgorod to make the next service. Immediately Belgorod substituted player # 6 by player # 9. Meanwhile the 1<sup>st</sup> referee changed his decision due to linejudges' signal and gave the rally to Moscow. Realising this situation, the coach of Belgorod requested to delete the substitution and rectify the line-up. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee permitted this and the game continued with the "original" line-up of Belgorod. Was this procedure correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since the 1<sup>st</sup> referee changed his decision, which was the basis of Belgorod's substitution, in the spirit of the game the coach's request could be accepted.</p>
--	---

## **REGISTER**

### **1. Participants**

- Wearing Forbidden Objects 1.1 - 1.2
- Captain 1.3 – 1.7
- Coach 1.8 - 1.13

### **2. Playing format**

- The toss 2.1
- Positional and Rotational Faluts 2.2 - 2.8

### **3. Playing Actions**

- Playing the Ball 3.1 - 3.10
- Penetration Under the Net 3.11 – 3.13
- Player At or Contacting the Net 3.14 – 3.25
- Service 3.26 - 3.32
- Attack Hit 3.33 – 3.37
- Block 3.38 – 3.51

4.	<u>Interruptions and delays</u>	
•	Substitutions	4.1 – 4.16
•	Time-Outs & Technical Time-Outs	4.17
•	Improper Request	4.18 – 4.20
•	Injuries	4.21- 4.24
•	Delay to the Game	4.25 – 4.27
•	External Interference	4.28 – 4.29
5.	<u>Libero</u>	5.1 – 5.25
6.	<u>Participant's conduct</u>	6.1 – 6.9
7.	<u>Referees and their Responsibilities</u>	7.1 – 7.11
8.	<u>Special Cases</u>	8.1 – 8.7
9.	<u>Register</u>	