

WRITTEN REASONS OF THE FAST TRACK TRIBUNAL



IN THE MATTER OF A WRONGFUL DISMISSAL CLAIM BROUGHT BY:

Troon FC

on behalf of

Calum Gow.

1. These are the written reasons for a Determination made by a Fast Track Tribunal which convened on Tuesday 26th August 2025 to deliberate this Claim.
2. In the 72nd minute of the West of Scotland Premier League fixture between Troon FC and Auchinleck Talbot FC on Saturday 23rd August 2025, the player was dismissed from the field of play by the Referee for A4 – Denying the opposing team or an opponent a goal or an obvious goal scoring opportunity as defined by Law 12 (DOGSO).
3. The Claimants submitted a Claim of Wrongful Dismissal on behalf of the player. In support of this Claim, the club submitted video footage showing the incident in question and written submissions.
4. In order for a Claim of Wrongful Dismissal to be upheld, the Fast Track Tribunal must be satisfied, by way of evidence submitted and upon the balance of probabilities, that the Referee made an Obvious Refereeing Error in dismissing the player.
5. In summary, the Claimants' submission was that the player did not commit a DOGSO offence. They submitted that the location of the incident on the pitch, the movement of the ball, and the positioning of the club's players meant that there was no DOGSO situation. The Claimants submitted that the Auchinleck Talbot FC opponent who was fouled by the player, was not in control of the ball, that the club had a covering defender who was "visibly getting to the ball first", and that the club's goalkeeper was advancing rapidly. They also submitted that the ball was moving away from goal, and that the Auchinleck Talbot FC attacker was 35 yards away from goal.
6. The Referee provided a statement explaining the act which he decided was a DOGSO offence. The Referee reported that the Auchinleck Talbot FC player gained control of the ball and was advancing directly towards the club's goal, slightly to the left of centre in the field of play when he was fouled by the player. He went on to explain that he did not consider that the club had a covering defender who was in a position to fairly challenge for the ball before a shot was likely to be taken.
7. The Fast Track Tribunal viewed the video footage of the incident and carefully considered the written submissions from the Claimants. It also considered the definition from Laws of the Game in relation to DOGSO offences.
8. Having considered all the evidence, the Fast Track Tribunal decided that the Claimants had unsuccessfully demonstrated that an Obvious Refereeing Error had occurred. The Fast Track Tribunal did not agree with the majority of the Claimants' submission. In particular, the Fast Track Tribunal considered that the Auchinleck Talbot FC player was in control of the ball when he was fouled. The Fast Track Tribunal also considered that the club's covering defender was not visibly getting to the ball first. He was some way away from the incident when the foul took place, and the Auchinleck Talbot FC player was moving at speed when he was fouled. The Fast Track Tribunal

also determined that the club's goalkeeper was not advancing rapidly, and would not have reached the ball before the Auchinleck Talbot FC player. The Fast Track Tribunal supported the account provided by the Referee.

9. The Determination of the Fast Track Tribunal was that the Claim be dismissed and the sending off offence and original sanction should be reimposed.
10. With the Claim having been dismissed, the Fast Track Tribunal considered whether the Claim fell within the scope of Rules 11.9.37 and 11.9.38 of the Judicial Panel Protocol such that an additional match suspension should be imposed. The Fast Track Tribunal considered that the Claim did not merit the imposition of an additional match suspension.
11. The Determination of the Fast Track Tribunal is final and binding on all Parties and is not subject to Appeal.