

## WRITTEN REASONS OF THE FAST TRACK TRIBUNAL



### IN THE MATTER OF A WRONGFUL DISMISSAL CLAIM BROUGHT BY:

**Dumbarton FC (the Club)**

**on behalf of**

**Finlay Gray (the Player); together “the Claimants”**

1. These are the written reasons for a Determination made by a Fast Track Tribunal which convened on 10 December 2024 to deliberate this Claim.
2. In the 44<sup>th</sup> minute of the William Hill League 1 fixture between Stenhousemuir FC and Dumbarton FC on 7 December 2024, the Player was dismissed from the field of play by the Referee for Denying a Clear and Obvious Goalscoring Opportunity (“**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 should not have been dismissed for DOGSO. This was on the basis that the incident took place a significant distance from the Penalty Area, the Stenhousemuir player’s touch took him towards the touchline and not towards goal, the Stenhousemuir player took a heavy touch and may not have retained possession and that defenders were in covering positions.
6. The Referee provided a statement explaining the act which he decided was DOGSO. He formed the view that the Player made no attempt to play the ball and tripped his opponent. He went on to explain that there was only 1 defender in close proximity, the opponent was in full control of the ball, the opponent was running at pace and would likely retain possession in the attacking half with no defenders realistically being able to challenge him. He would have had the “freedom of the attacking half” with only the Goalkeeper to beat.
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, noting that the following factors must be considered: distance between the offence and the goal, general direction of play, likelihood of keeping/gaining control of the ball and location and number of defenders.
8. Having considered all the evidence, the Fast Track Tribunal decided that the Claimants had been **PARTIALLY SUCCESSFUL** in demonstrating that an Obvious Refereeing Error had **OCCURRED**. The Fast Track Tribunal considered that the offence took place in close proximity to the half way line and that the Stenhousemuir player took a heavy touch. This resulted in the ball travelling some distance away from him and towards the touchline, as opposed to towards the goal down the

middle of the field of play. The Fast Track Tribunal did not believe upon viewing the footage that the Stenhousemuir player would automatically retain control of the ball. The Club's goalkeeper can be seen in the video footage in a position whereby he could have won possession of the ball before the Stenhousemuir player.

9. The Determination of the Fast Track Tribunal was that the Claim be PARTIALLY UPHeld, the sending off offence and original sanction should be RESCINDED, and that the lesser sanction of a caution for committing an offence which interferes with or stops a promising attack outwith the penalty area (B1(g)) be IMPOSED.
10. The Determination of the Fast Track Tribunal is final and binding on all Parties and is not subject to Appeal.