



# The Casebook

2006 Edition  
(Rev. 1.3)

FIVB Rules of the Game Commission

©2006 Fédération Internationale de Volleyball

## INDEX

Page	Topic of Rulings	Cases
2	<b>INDEX</b>	
3	<b>PREFACE</b>	
4	<b>PART I: THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF APPLICATION</b>	
7	<b>PART II: CASES</b>	
7	<b>CHAPTER 1: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT</b>	
7	Net Heights	1.1
8	<b>CHAPTER 2: PARTICIPANTS</b>	
8	Wearing Forbidden Objects	2.1 – 2.2
8	Captain	2.3 – 2.7
9	Coach	2.8 – 2.14
12	<b>CHAPTER 3: PLAYING FORMAT</b>	
12	The Toss	3.1
12	Positional and Rotational Faults	3.2 – 3.9
16	<b>CHAPTER 4: PLAYING ACTIONS</b>	
16	Playing the Ball	4.1 – 4.10
18	Penetration Under the Net	4.11 – 4.12
19	Player At or Contacting the Net	4.13 – 4.27
23	Service	4.28 – 4.34
25	Attack Hit	4.35 – 4.39
26	Block	4.40 – 4.50
30	<b>CHAPTER 5: INTERRUPTIONS AND DELAYS</b>	
30	Substitutions	5.1 – 5.16
34	Time-Outs & Technical Time-Outs	5.17
34	Improper Request	5.18 – 5.20
36	Injuries	5.21 – 5.23
37	Delays to the Game	5.24 – 5.26
38	External Interference	5.27 – 5.28
39	<b>CHAPTER 6: LIBERO</b>	6.1 – 6.25
47	<b>CHAPTER 7: PARTICIPANTS' CONDUCT</b>	7.1 – 7.7
50	<b>CHAPTER 8: REFEREES AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	8.1 – 8.11
54	<b>CHAPTER 9: SPECIAL CASES</b>	9.1 – 9.5

## 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 Mr. Yoshiharu Nishiwaki, from a format by the late Dr Jim Coleman, with special help and contributions from other Members of the Rules of the Game Commission, and Mr. Gavriel Kraus, President of the International Refereeing Commission, along with other Members of the Commission.

This edition is based upon the 2005-2008 edition of the Rules Text whose mandate was approved by the FIVB Congress in 2004, and includes those modifications approved by the Board of Administration in 2005.

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 behavioural 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 the 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 2006 EDITION**

The 2006 Casebook is a reflection of the rules, which were put into effect by the 2004 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.

## PART II: CASES

### CHAPTER 1: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

#### Net Heights

<p><b>1.1</b> In a regional Under-13 championship, the net height was set at 2.20 m. Is this permitted and are there different heights for net placement in accordance with the age and sex of the players?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes! The various net heights for different recreational or educational purposes are not official around the world and are fixed by each National Federation to be standard in that country. However, for National Leagues, International and FIVB Competitions, the height of the net is defined in FIVB official rules.</p> <p><b>Rule 2.1.1</b></p>
---	---

## CHAPTER 2: PARTICIPANTS

### Wearing Forbidden Objects

<p><b>2.1</b> The second referee notices that a player reporting as a substitute has a prosthetic leg. Is such a device allowed?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second 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>2.2</b> During a women's competition, a player wore a ring with a sharp diamond on her finger. The first referee asked her to remove the ring. She replied that it was impossible to remove it from her finger. Is she allowed to play with the ring on her finger?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The principle of the rule is that she must remove her ring. If it is really impossible for her to remove this ring, the ring 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 which is caused by this ring. <b>Rule 4.5.1</b></p>

### Captain

<p><b>2.3</b> In the Americas' Cup, the game captain of Argentina, Hugo Conte, on numerous occasions questioned the referee's decisions and asked questions as to why certain decisions were being made. What is the proper response by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> When, in the first referee's opinion, this behaviour exceeds the limits of <b>Rule 5.1.2</b>, the first referee 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 5.1.2.1, 20.1, 20.2, 21.2, Diagram 9</b></p>
<p><b>2.4</b> In the Women's Norceca Championships, the game captain of the Puerto Rican Team was not certain that the service order of her team was correct. She asked the second referee to verify the positions of her players before play continued. Is this a permitted action by a game captain?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This was 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>2.5</b> The game captain of the serving team is having trouble trying to determine which of the receiving team players are playing in the front line. As a means of making that determination, the game captain asks the first 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 first referee will direct the second referee to make a line-up check of the opponents. However, the only information that will be provided pertaining to the opponents will be whether or not the players are correctly positioned. No information will be disclosed as to which players are front or back row players. <b>Rule 5.1.2.2</b></p>

<p><b>2.6</b> The game captain sees a line judge signal a touch of the ball by a block. The first referee does not see the signal of the line judge. How does the game captain legally and politely request that the first referee 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 first referee. He may request an explanation for the interpretation of the judgment. The first referee must honour the request. <b>Rules 5.1.2.1, 20.2.1</b></p>
<p><b>2.7</b> A decision involving the failure of the first referee to impose a correct penalty was protested by the game captain of "S". The first referee stated that a referee's decision was final and that no protest would be accepted. Is this a correct statement by the referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was wrong. The referee must clearly state the reason for the decision. If not satisfied, the game captain may reserve his/her right to record the disagreement on the score sheet as an official protest at the end of the match or have the scorer record it on his/her behalf. Protests involving rules or the application of penalties are allowable and must be accepted. No discussion of the incident is permitted during the match. In FIVB competitions in which there is a Control Committee, the coach of the protesting team may ask the Game Jury President for that match to hold a Judge's Conference. Procedures for the Judge's Conference are given in the Refereeing Guideline and Instructions. <b>Rules 5.1.2.1, 23.2.4</b></p>

## Coach

<p><b>2.8</b> In a match at the Olympic Games in Athens, the first referee noted that the Brazil Team's Coach had an ear-piece and was communicating with a statistician seated behind advertising panels. Are such devices allowed?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The use of such devices is allowed.</p>
<p><b>2.9</b> In sets one and two of a match between Germany and Canada, the German coach had disagreements with the first referee. The Coach then walked to the second referee and insisted on explanations about the judgment of the first referee. Twice the second referee talked with him for more than ten seconds. Is this the correct application of the rules by the second 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 speak to the referees. The second referee should refuse to talk with the coach and should ask him to return to his designated place. If this is not effective, the second referee should immediately give notification to the first referee for the appropriate sanctions. Normally the first referee will warn the coach about the behaviour, communicating through the game captain. There is no penalty.</p>

	<p>If the behaviour of the coach continues, the first 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.</p> <p><b>Rules 5.1.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.3.4, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3</b></p>
<p><b>2.10</b> At the Pan American Games in Argentina, the Coach of the USA Women's Team stood up at the end of a rally and loudly complained about the referee's decision and asked the first referee to reconsider the decision. What is the correct response of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee may issue, through the game captain, to the coach or any other team members not on the court, a minor misconduct warning. In extreme cases the first 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 first referee to ask for an explanation of a decision.</p> <p><b>Rules 5.1.2, 5.2.3, 20.1, 21.2, 21.3</b></p>
<p><b>2.11</b> In a BSE-Galatasaray CEV Cup match the Hungarian Coach moved in the free zone near the sideline of the court. 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, the Coach 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.</p> <p><b>Rules 5.2.1, 5.2.3.3, 5.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>2.12</b> During the Women's World Championships in Japan, the Japanese were playing the Russians. During the match the assistant coach and the trainer of the Japanese team jumped off the bench and followed the Coach running along the side lines. The first referee did nothing to prohibit this behaviour. Is this acceptable behaviour by the Japanese team?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The rules only allow the Coach to move freely along the side line, between the extension of the attack line and the warm-up area. The other members of the staff must sit on the bench or be in the warm up area. The 1st referee should have warned the Japanese coach about this matter, through the game captain, and required 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>2.13</b> At the USA Open Volleyball Championships, the Coach of the Dominican Republic Women's team was standing very close to the court encouraging the play of his players. At times the Coach would be between the second referee and the players on the court. When this occurred, the second referee</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> <b>Rule 5.2.3.4</b> states that "the coach may give instructions while standing or walking within the free zone in front of his/her bench without disturbing the match." In this instance, the Coach was very close to the court lines, clearly interfering with the ability of the second referee to see the events occurring on the court. Thus the request by the second referee was correct. <b>Rule 5.2.3.4</b></p>

<p>requested that the Dominican Coach move away from the sideline to give the referee clear view of the court. The Dominican Coach disputed this, stating that he was in a legal position. What is the correct ruling in this situation?</p>	
<p><b>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 player. 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 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. The Coach was therefore not correct on three counts. 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. The Coach should be reminded of the limits of the coaching freedom.</p> <p><b>Rule 5.2.3.4</b></p>

## CHAPTER 3: PLAYING FORMAT

### The Toss

<p><b>3.1</b> Upon winning the toss of the coin before the first or the fifth set of a match, the team captain has what options?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The winner of the toss has the following options; 1. to serve, 2. to receive the serve, 3. to choose the side of the court. Thus, if the winning team captain chooses a court, the losing team captain must take the other court and may 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 serve but may choose the appropriate court. <b>Rule 7.1.2</b></p>
--	---

### Positional and Rotational Faults

<p><b>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 not in contact with the court in front of Miller when the ball was hit for the serve. 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 last contact with the floor. Therefore, while Sato was in the air, the point of last contact with the floor was retained and Sato was considered to be in front of Miller and out of position, hence the loss of rally should be the result. <b>Rules 7.4, 7.4.2, 7.4.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.3</b> At the moment of the service hit, the centre back, R-6, is standing with both feet slightly behind the feet of the centre front, R-3. R-6 has a hand on the floor clearly in front of the feet of R-3 at the time the ball is 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 are out of position. <b>Rules 7.4.3, 7.5</b></p>
<p><b>3.4</b> At the time the ball was contacted for service, the American setter, Jeff Stork, was standing with part of a foot encroaching onto the opponent's court and the remainder of the foot on the centre line. The second referee whistled Stork for being "out of position" by not being fully within the boundaries of the receiving team's court at the time the ball was contacted for service. Is the second referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Correct decision by the second referee. <b>Rule 1.3.3, 7.4</b></p>

<p><b>3.5</b> Brazil was playing a match at the Women's Grand Prix. In the third set, the receiving team, Brazil, won a rally. Player number 6 of Brazil should have rotated to serve. Actually, player number 5 served. This fact was missed by the scorer. Player number 5 served three points. After two more rallies it was again Brazil's turn to serve. The player who followed number 5, number 11, naturally rotated to serve. After the hit of the serve, the scorer announced the fault of the incorrect server. After a through check on the score sheet, the only fact that could be identified was that number 5 should be the server. A later viewing of a video tape showed the facts, but these were unable to be determined from the score sheet. The referee ruled a "loss of rally" (point and service to the opponents) to Brazil on the serve of number 11, and Brazil was returned to the correct rotational position. There was no cancellation of points. Was the decision of the first referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Based on the information available to the referee, the decision by the first referee was correct. <b>Rules 7.7.1, 23.2.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.6</b> The Korean team won the rally to earn a point and the right to serve. Before rotating to serve, the game captain of Korea asked the second referee for a line up check to determine the correct server. The scorer told the second referee that player #10 was the correct server. Player #10 then served four points. Before the #10 could serve again, the scorer informed the second referee that, in fact, player #8 should have been serving for Korea. The first referee ruled that the four Korean points scored by player #10 would be cancelled. The Korean team returned to the score and position in which #8 should have served. All team time outs and substitutions occurring during those four rallies were cancelled. Player #8 for Korea was then allowed to serve and the game was continued from the point that the game captain of Korea requested to know the correct server. Was this the correct decision for the first referee to make?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee 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 is possible. These events must be recorded on the score sheet.</p>

<p><b>3.7</b> In a match in the Czech Republic the home team served and the visiting team won the rally. When the home team server served the ball, the scorer did not see the server's number. At the conclusion of the rally, the scorer saw the number on the home team server. She immediately called attention to the second referee that the server for the home team had been the incorrect server. The referee awarded the rally and point to the visiting team and corrected the line up of the home team. The coach of the visiting team protested that his team had won the rally and that he should also receive a second point because the home team was out of rotation. Was the first referee correct awarding the visiting team a single point?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee was correct in awarding only one point. Even though the rally was played out, after the scorer discovered that the home team was out of rotation, the rally had actually ended at the moment of the positional fault. The visitors received the one point based on the fact that the serving team committed the positional fault. <b>Rule: 7.7.1</b></p>
<p><b>3.8</b> After the whistle for service, the 1<sup>st</sup> Referee noticed that there were only five players on court. The Libero and replacement player were both still in the warm up area, with no apparent intention of entering and taking 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 court at the service hit. Because he only noticed the mistake after the whistle for service, the referee had only the following option - as soon as the service was hit, the referee should have whistled and indicated a positional fault. However, in the case where the 1<sup>st</sup> referee noticed in advance of the whistle that only five players had entered the court after a time out, there was an opportunity to award a delay sanction to the team. In this case, the team would (depending on no earlier delays) retain service and possibly no point would have been awarded. <b>Rules 7.5, 7.7, 12.3, 12.4.3</b></p>
<p><b>3.9</b> In a match between A and B, team A put the rally in play by a service hit. Just after the service hit, the line judge positioned #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 2<sup>nd</sup> referee did not see the action of the line judge, but the 1<sup>st</sup> referee saw the flag signal of the line judge and whistled</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> referee was correct to take up the flag signal of the line judge to call the positional fault. Because 1<sup>st</sup> referee has authority over all members of the refereeing corps and the teams so that 1<sup>st</sup> referee can take up any indication by the refereeing corps for his judgment, even though the 1<sup>st</sup> referee did not see the fault and watched the serving team when the ball</p>

and called the positional fault by the receiving Team B. Was the 1<sup>st</sup> referee correct?

is being served as the refereeing guideline and instructions instructed.

**Rules 7.5, 23.2.1**

## CHAPTER 4: PLAYING ACTIONS

### Playing the Ball

<p><b>4.1</b> In the Grand Champions Cup for Men, Narita was the setter for the Japanese Volleyball team playing against the Netherlands. The Japanese serve receiver passed the Netherlands' serve very poorly and the ball passed over the net outside of the antenna. Narita pursued the ball into the Netherlands' free zone and hit it in the general direction of the Japanese court. Unfortunately for Narita, the ball he hit did not pass over the net, but went toward the net on the Netherlands side where the Netherlands middle blocker caught the ball. The first referee whistled before the ball was caught by the Netherlands middle blocker and the signal of "ball out" was given by the referees. 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 is correct; the ball is "out". The ball becomes out when it completely leaves the space above the free zone on the Netherlands' side of the net. Thus, the ball is out when it completely crosses the sideline on the Netherlands' side of the net. The ball would also be out if it hit a Netherlands' player in the free zone so long as the Netherlands' player was not attempting to prevent an opponent's return of the ball to the Japanese side of the net. <b>Rules 10.1.2, 10.1.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.2</b> In an attempt to play the first ball in the back row, Papi, the Italian spiker, hit the ball with one hand with the palm of the hand up. The first referee allowed the play to continue. Was this the proper response of the first 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. Referees must not be too hasty in whistling this play unless they can visibly see that the ball is caught and/or thrown by Papi. <b>Rules 9.2.1, 9.2.2, 9.3.3, 9.3.4</b></p>
<p><b>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 arm and then onto her chest during one action and without being caught or thrown. The first referee allowed the play to continue. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was correct. This was the first team hit of a ball being received from the opponent. Therefore, successive contacts are legal since they occurred during one playing action of the Chinese player and she did not catch or throw the ball. There are a number of "first hit" cases in which successive contacts are allowed. Among these are: 1. Reception of the serve. 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 opponents. <b>Rule 9.2.3.2</b></p>

<p><b>4.4</b> At the Pan American Games, a Brazilian player attempted to block an attack hit of Teee Williams from the USA. The ball hit the Brazilian's hands and dropped between the blocker and the net. The blocker retrieved the ball with an underhand swing of one arm. The ball briefly hit the arm and body of the Brazilian blocker. The first referee whistled and signalled a "catch". Is this a correct call?</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 hit of the ball for Brazil, the Brazilian blocker does have 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</b></p>
<p><b>4.5</b> In a match between Canada and Brazil in the Pan American Games, a Brazilian player received the serve. 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 first 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 whether it was "caught and/or thrown". The illegal contact of "catch" is possible to occur in blocking. <b>Rule 9.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.6</b> The American player, Dan Landry, while playing against the Netherlands, jumped into the air to try to save a ball near the spectator seats. After contacting the ball, Landry landed in the seats. Is this a legal action by Landry?</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, a player may take support from a team-mate or any structure, but only on his/her side of the court, in order to reach the ball. <b>Rule 9, 9.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.7</b> The USA Women were playing Canada. During a rally, a Canadian player chased the ball up into the spectator stands. Just as the player was about to hit the ball, a spectator reached up to catch the ball. The Canadian coach requested a replay because of the spectator interference. The referee refused. Was this a correct decision of the first 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. <b>Rule 10.1.2</b> On the other hand, while the player has priority for the ball within the playing area, the player has no such priority outside of the playing area. <b>Rules 9, 9.1.3, 10.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>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 defensive player of Japan 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. Because of the extraordinary effort which drew great applause from the crowd, the player's ball contact had a little</p>	<p><b>Answer:</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 the responsibility for promotion of the sport of volleyball. Allowing spectacular action is the very core element in the promotion of volleyball. 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.</p>

<p>extra follow-through. The first referee blew his whistle and signalled that the ball was caught and thrown. The crowd was quite vocal in expressing displeasure with the referee's decision. Was the referee correct, and how should the first referee control his whistle in this situation?</p>	<p>Practically speaking, it is absolutely necessary, to a certain extent, to sacrifice something technically for some more basic social effects. This is the "art" of refereeing!</p>
<p><b>4.9</b> Player R-5 received a very strong, straight line attack directly from the opponent's spiker, S-2. The ball bounced far outside of the playing area into 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 first referee did not whistle for either an "assisted hit" or for a "catch". Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was correct. The ball may be retrieved from beyond the free zone as stated in Rule 9. "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 that is made to Rule 9.2.3.2 was made with the aim of allowing for better defence 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 plays so that volleyball will become more attractive and more popular. <b>Rule 9.2.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.10</b> In a match between Japan and Italy in the Men's World Cup, the Italian attacker spiked the ball into the Japanese blocker. The ball went off the blocker's hands, over the antenna partially outside the crossing space and over the first referee into the free zone of Italy. A Japanese back row player pursued the ball to play it back to the Japanese side of the net. The line judge signalled the ball "out" and the first referee whistled with the decision being in favour of the Italian attacker. The Japanese argued that the ball had passed over the antenna partially through the external space and thus was playable by the Japanese player. Was this the correct ruling by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was not correct. The ball passed over the antenna into the opponent's free zone partially through the external space. Therefore it is legal for the Japanese to return the ball to their 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>4.11</b> The Netherlands was playing Cuba in the Men's World Cup. At one point the dramatic Cuban spiker Joel Despaigne was a back row player. He received a set which was in front of the attack line. He jumped from behind the attack line, made a sensational attack and landed with his heels on the centre line, but with most of</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. Whether, or not, this specific case was interference cannot be determined in this Casebook. It is reasonable to assume that a player who is</p>
---	--

<p>his feet on the feet of the Netherlands blocker Ron Zwerver. Zwerver made an attempt to play the next ball but could not move rapidly enough to get to the ball.</p> <p>Zwerver appealed to the second referee for interference, but the second referee ignored his appeal. Similar confrontations occurred numerous times during the match and were ignored each time by the second referee. Is this a correct ruling by the second referee?</p>	<p>entirely on his own court and is hit or is stepped on by an opponent has experienced "interference". In this case, the offending player should be penalized. It is one of the responsibilities of the second referee to observe this potential fault and whistle the fault when it occurs, as in this case.</p> <p><b>Rules 11.2.1, 11.2.2.1, 11.2.4</b></p>
<p><b>4.12</b> A Brazilian spiker 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 the rally was lost by the Netherlands Team. What should be the response of the second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second referee should whistle the Brazilian player for an illegal action since he interfered with the Netherlands player. The rally should have been won by the Netherlands.</p> <p><b>Rule 11.2.1</b></p>

### Player at or Contacting the Net

<p><b>4.13</b> The USA Women's Team was serve-receiving. Lori Endicott was the American setter penetrating from the back zone. Tee Williams passed the ball poorly and Endicott was forced to move into the back zone to set the ball. As Endicott returned to the back zone to set the ball, she slightly touched the net. The referee did not whistle this net contact. Was the referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee was correct. Since the action of playing the ball is separate from, and later than, the movement off the net, Endicott's contact of the net was not a fault. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.14</b> After playing the ball, Brazilian player, Ana Moser, made a turning movement near the net and her hair contacted the net. What was the correct ruling in this case?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This was not a fault. Contact of the net by any part of the body, including hair, wiping towel, or any part of the uniform, is a fault only when the player is in the action of playing the ball.</p> <p><b>Rules 11.3.1, 11.4.4</b></p>
<p><b>4.15</b> In the Olympic Games in a men's match between Argentina and the USA, Ctvrtlik, the American player, passed the ball toward the net. The ball penetrated the vertical plane of the net. 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 first referee whistled the play as a fault. Is this play illegal?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first 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 that player's court. Thus, the play by Stork was not legal. A similar play under the net is different. Under the net the play is illegal only if the ball has completely crossed the vertical plane of the net.</p> <p><b>Rules 9, 11.2.1</b></p>

<p><b>4.16</b> At the Women's World Championships in a match between Japan and the Soviet Union, a Japanese spiker 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 out of bounds on the Soviet side of the net. The first referee awarded the rally to the Japanese. Was this a correct decision by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> If the ball does not come to rest during a simultaneous contact by opponents, and the ball lands out of bounds, the fault was made by the team on the side of the net opposite to the position of the landing of the ball. Thus, the first referee was wrong. The Japanese should have been credited with hitting the ball out of bounds and the rally should have been won by the Soviets. However, if the Soviet blocker touched the ball beyond the net during the simultaneous contact, it is a fault of the Soviet blocker. Also, if the ball was caught on the top of the net by opponents, it is a double fault and the rally is replayed. <b>Rule 9.1.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.17</b> The Chinese blocker Lai Yawen was blocking American attacker Tammy Liley. As Lai was blocking, Liley's spiked ball drove the net into Lai's forearms. The first 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 first referee was correct. If the net is hit into the blocker, there is no fault. If the blocker hits the net during the blocking action, the blocker commits a fault. <b>Rule 11.3.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.18</b> During the World Championship for Men, a Japanese blocker blocked a ball which was spiked very hard by a Korean attacker. The ball bounced off the hands of the Japanese blocker and far beyond the end line of his court. The Japanese Libero player 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 Japanese Libero. After the Japanese blocker landed from the block, finishing his blocking movement, he then turned to prepare to continue play. Just as he turned, he slightly touched the net with his shoulder. The second referee whistled for a fault of touching the net. Was this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision by the second referee was not correct. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b> states that contact of the net is not a fault except when a player touches the net during his/her action of playing the ball. Especially when there is a very spectacular performance beyond the end line, far from the net, the touch should not be penalized. The whistle for the fault makes the player discouraged and the spectators astonished and disappointed. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.19</b> In the World Cup, a Cuban player attacked the ball which missed the American blocker. The ball was retrieved by Eric Sullivan who was in the American back court. Before the American blocker, Jeff Nygaard, landed from the block, he touched the net. The first referee whistled a fault. Was this a fault?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the first referee was correct. Since the action of playing the ball caused the blocker to touch the net, the net touch is a fault. Note the difference between this case and the previous one. In this case the contact of the net resulted from the continuation of playing the ball at the net. In the former case, the contact of the net occurred after the completion of the playing action at the net. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>

<p><b>4.20</b> The USA Men were playing Cuba in a crucial match in the Men's World Cup. Cuba was on offence and the US players were preparing to block. Cuba ran three attackers toward the net and the Cuban setter, Diago, set a very deceptive ball to his attacker in position four. The USA block deflected the ball and it was played in the USA back court. At the same time as the Cuban attacker hit the ball from position four, an American blocker hit the net trying to block the Cuban attacker in Cuban position two. The second referee whistled because the American blocker touched the net while trying to play the ball. Is this the correct response for the second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> No, the second referee was not correct. The attack was from Cuban position four and the net violation was in Cuban position two. Since neither the attacker nor the blocker were in any way involved with playing the ball, and the touch of the net did not interfere with play, the touch of the net is a legal action and play should not have been stopped. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.21</b> At the Men's World Cup, the Brazilian setter jumped close to the net to set the ball. After he set the ball he landed on the floor. As he turned to go to his defensive position he touched the net. The second referee did not call a fault. Was this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second referee was correct. Since the setter was not in the act of playing the ball, touching the net accidentally was not a fault. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.22</b> In a match between Arizona State University and the University of Oregon in the US NCAA Leagues, the following event occurred. The Arizona State University middle attacker approached to hit the ball. The Arizona State setter mistimed the set and it went over the attacker's head and fell to the floor untouched by any other player. The Oregon middle blocker touched the net while attempting to block the Arizona State middle attacker. The net touch occurred before the ball touched the Arizona court. The referee whistled a fault on the Oregon middle blocker. Was the first referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee was correct. The Oregon middle blocker was "playing the ball," even though the ball contacted neither the attacker nor the blocker.</p>
<p><b>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 Japanese setter set the ball to an attacker in position four. As he did so, the Korean middle blocker reached over the net but touched it while attempting to stop the combination play. The first referee whistled the Korean middle blocker for a net fault. Is the first referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the first referee was correct! The Korean middle blocker was indeed <i>in or close to the action of playing the ball</i> (even though he did not touch it) when the Japanese setter cleverly set the ball to position four. Hence the Korean blocker who touched the net is considered to have committed a "net fault". <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>

<p><b>4.24</b> The Japanese men's team was running a quick combination play with two attackers in the middle of the court. Instead of setting to the middle, the Japanese setter set the ball to an attacker in position four. As he did so, a Korean blocker, thinking that a Japanese attack may come from the back row from position one, touched the net. The second referee whistled the Korean blocker for a net fault. Is the referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> No, the second referee is not correct! The ball was neither near the blocker nor the attacker, therefore, the player was not in the action of playing the ball. Thus, the net touch is not a fault. <b>Rule 11.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.25</b> In the Japanese Women's League championships Daiei received the serve 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 first referee whistled the fault which ended the match. Was this the correct decision by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The part of the net outside the antenna is part of the net and the first referee must consider this in his decision. However, under the <b>2005-8</b> rules, the decision by the first referee would not be correct. Since the attacker took two steps before touching the net, since outside the net is away from the play of the ball, and since there was <i>no interference of the play</i>, the net touch is not a fault. <b>Rule 2.2, 11.3.1, 11.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.26</b> In a match between China and Korea at the Women's World Championships, the Korean setter, S. J. Lee, set the ball to attacker Yoon-Hee Chang. As Chang hit the ball, she also hit Lee with her knee. The hit of Lee caused her to brush against the net. The second referee called a fault on Lee. Is this a correct interpretation of the rule?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second referee was correct, since Chang was in the action of playing the ball when she caused Lee to contact the net. Had Lee just casually brushed the net <i>after</i> setting the ball and/or was preparing for the <i>next</i> play of the ball; the net contact would have been incidental contact which the second referee would not have whistled as a fault. The action of playing the ball includes the take off and landing of the attacker. It was during this time that the contact of the net took place. <b>Rule 12.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.27</b> The front row setter of team A, in an effort to set the ball coming from his receiver, jumped and hit the ball with one hand over the net such that, at the moment of the hit, his fingers are in the opponent's space. The ball is not totally in the opponent's space. The ball from the setter travelled parallel to the net toward 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 first referee whistled a fault on the setter for setting the ball while penetrating into the opponent's space. Did the first referee make the correct decision?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> According to <b>Rule 9</b>, each team must play the ball within its own playing area and space (except in the case of <b>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. The referee was correct.</p>

## Service

<p><b>4.28</b> In the Women's NORCECA Championships, the scorer noticed that the American server, Elaine Youngs, had moved into the serving position instead of the correct server Stephanie Thater. As soon as Youngs had contacted the ball for service, the scorer signalled to the second referee who stopped play. 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 referees of the infraction. The scorer may have a bell, buzzer or some other signalling device to signal the fault. <b>Rules 7.7.1, 12.2.1, 12.7.1, 25.2.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.29</b> At the Olympic Qualification Tournament in France, after a technical time out, a wrong server was preparing to serve. The first 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 serve again. Is this a correct action by the referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee is incorrect. Authorization for the service is made only once by means of the whistle and hand signal - the service must be made by the correct player within 8 seconds from that authorization.</p>
<p><b>4.30</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. She then caught the ball from the bounce and immediately served before the expiration of the 8 seconds allowed for service. Was this a legal action for the server?</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 first referee to be a "toss for service" must end with the ball being hit for the service. <b>Rule 12.4.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.31</b> The served ball touches the net and the antenna before being played by the receiving team. The first referee whistled for a service fault. Is this a correct decision by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee is correct. A ball touching the antenna is "out". <b>Rule 8.4.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.32</b> In the West Cup, 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 first referee whistled immediately to stop the play. When should the referee whistle?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The fault is that the served ball has not crossed to the opponents through the crossing space. The served ball <i>must</i> pass through the crossing space. If it does not, the serve is automatically a fault and is 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 on the serving team. <b>Rule 12.6.2.1</b></p>

<p><b>4.33</b> Team G.B. is in possession of the ball in preparation to serve. The game captain requests confirmation of the correct server. The scorer gives the information that player #6 is the server. The game captain disputes that information and is told again that player #6 is the server. The game captain is still not satisfied and while attempting to approach the referee, the first referee whistles for service. Amidst confusion, Team G.B. is penalized for not serving within the allowed eight seconds. In rechecking the score sheet, it is 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 first referee at this time?</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 second referee and the scorer. Player #1 should be allowed to serve. Team G.B. should not be penalized for the incorrect server. On the other hand, the original error of the coach caused a delay of the game, thus a delay sanction should be applied. Further, the second referee must request a new line-up sheet from the coach.</p>
<p><b>4.34</b> Lloy Ball, a back row setter for the USA Men, jumped from within the attack zone and set the ball while the ball was completely above the height of the net. He set the ball towards team-mate Ctvrtlik. Before Ctvrtlik could contact the ball, the ball penetrated the vertical plane of the net where it was blocked by the Brazilian setter Lima. The first referee allowed the rally to continue. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee 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). As soon as the ball was touched by the opponent, even though it had not completely crossed the plane of the net, the attack hit was completed and was illegal. The rally should have been won by Brazil. <b>Rule 13.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.35</b> In a World Cup for men, a Canadian serve hit the net and dropped toward 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 first referee determines that the ball will not cross the net legally and that a fault has occurred. The first referee must whistle when she/he determines that the ball will remain on the serving team's side of the net. 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>4.36</b> On a second team hit, Lima, a back row setter for 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 team-mate, he decided to tap the ball across the net past the blocker Hernandez of Cuba. Before the ball reached the vertical plane of the net, Hernandez reached fully beyond the plane of the net and blocked the ball. What was the correct call of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee correctly signalled that Cuba won the rally. Any action which directs the ball towards the opponent, except service and block, is an attack hit. An attack hit is completed at the moment the ball completely crosses the plane of the net or the ball is touched by an opponent blocker. In this case, as soon as the ball was touched by the blocker Hernandez, the attack hit was completed. Since that completed attack hit was made within the front zone by a back row player who contacted the ball which was entirely above the height of the net, the attack hit by Lima was illegal. <b>Rules 13.1.1, 13.1.3, 13.2.2, 13.3.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.37</b> On the US Team's second hit, Liley passed the ball near the net toward the Chinese court. The ball did not penetrate the vertical plane of the net. In the first 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 first 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 considered as an attack hit. Since, 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>4.38</b> In the World Cup for Women, Toson, a back row player for Egypt, took off in front of the attack line and spiked the ball, which was higher than the top of the net, on Egypt's second hit. The ball hit the top of the net and rebounded back into Egypt's court. The first referee did not whistle this attempted attack by the back row player Toson. Was the first referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since the ball neither crossed the plane of the net nor was it 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. The referee was correct in allowing play to continue. <b>Rules 9.1, 13.1.3, 13.2.2, 13.3.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.39</b> In a match between the women of the USA and China, the Chinese served the ball. The American receiver, Tee Williams jumped from behind the attack line and contacted the served ball from completely above the height of the net. The contact took place behind the attack line and the ball was returned to the serving team's side of the net. Was the first referee correct in allowing this play to continue?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Legal action. Although it is illegal to block served balls, or to attack served balls from completely above the height of the net, the attack by Williams was legal since the contact point of the hit was completely behind the attack line. However, it would have been illegal if the Libero had blocked or attacked the served ball from completely above the height of the net, even completely behind the attack line. <b>Rule 13.3.4</b></p>

## Block

<p><b>4.40</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 ball from serve reception so that it came down near the net. The ball was too high for Sawatzke to reach and the ball crossed the plane of the net. Then the Dominican Republic's middle hitter 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 referee correct when he called Sawatzke for the illegal block?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the block was an illegal block by the back line player Sawatzke. Even though she had not intentionally attempted to block, Sawatzke's 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>4.41</b> In a match between the women's teams of Korea and Germany, a player from Germany reached over the net to block the second hit of the Korean setter. The first 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 of the ball?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> It is absolutely necessary for the first referee to determine the action of the setter. He must know whether the set was made parallel to the net or whether the set was going toward 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>4.42</b> Sarmientos of Cuba blocked the attack of Timmons of the USA. Buck, the USA middle blocker then blocked the block by Sarmientos. Is Buck's block legal – i.e. Is it legal to block a blocked ball?</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. <b>Rule 14.1.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.43</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</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Correct ruling by the first referee. The foot position was legal and the ball touching the foot should be treated as though it had landed on the floor. 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</p>

<p>side of the centre line. The first referee ruled a successful block. Is this correct?</p>	<p>have interfered with the opportunity of the Greek team to play the ball and therefore the blocker would have committed a fault. <b>Rule 11.2.1</b></p>
<p><b>4.44</b> The American blocker, Karch Kiraly, contacted the ball on the Soviet's side of the net. The ball travelled several meters parallel to the net then the American 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 American team. The first referee signalled a fault on the block of Partie. Was this a correct decision by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was correct. The action of Partie was not legal. The action of Partie was not "one action" with that of Kiraly and could not be considered to be a collective block. It was, therefore, an attack hit by Partie carried out immediately after the block of Kiraly within the Soviet 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 the American side of the net in order for it to be legal. <b>Rules 13.2.1, 13.3.1, 14.1.1, 14.2</b></p>
<p><b>4.45</b> The American serve-receiver, Tammy Liley, passed the serve so that it would cross the net if not touched by an 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 had an opportunity to play it. The first referee called a fault on Li. Is this a correct decision of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee 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 first referee, no possibility exists for further play on the ball by the attacking team. <b>Rule 14.3</b></p>
<p><b>4.46</b> In the World Cup for Men, the USA played Cuba. Lloy Ball, an American back row setter in front of the attack line, attacked the ball from a height greater than the top of the net. Simultaneous with the contact of the ball by Lloy Ball, the Cuban blocker, Hernandez, reached across the plane of the net and contacted the ball in a blocking action. What was the correct decision by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee called a double fault. The spiking action was illegal by Lloy Ball, but the simultaneous contact of the ball by Hernandez was an illegal block. If the contact by Hernandez had been <i>after</i> the contact by Lloy Ball, then only the attack hit by the back row player Ball should have been a fault. <b>Rules 13.3.3, 14.3, 14.6.1</b> <b>Diagram/ Fig. 7</b></p>
<p><b>4.47</b> In the Women's World Cup, the Japanese team was playing Korea. Chang Yoon-Hee served for Korea and Obayashi was the serve-receiver for Japan. Nakanishi was the Japanese setter who was a front row player. When Obayashi passed the ball, the ball approached but had not travelled beyond the top of the net. Nakanishi, the setter for</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> If the first action at the net is the "blocking" action of Nakanishi, then the contact of Nakanishi must be judged as an attack hit. "Double contact", therefore, cannot be allowed and the ball cannot be caught or thrown. The first referee must judge whether the ball contact by Nakanishi was a legal contact and not caught and/or thrown.</p>

<p>Japan, 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, and into the blocking hands of Chung Sun-Hye. Is this a legal play by the Japanese setter Nakanishi?</p>	<p>Of course, as a blocker, Chung Sun-Hye may use two hands and more than one contact would be allowed provided the ball is not caught and/ or thrown.</p>
<p><b>4.48</b> In a Women's World Cup match, Egypt was playing the USA. The American attacker, Tara Cross-Battle, hit a very hard spike at the Egyptian blocker Toson. The ball hit Toson's hands, then hit Toson in the head, then rebounded off the back of Toson's hand into the back of the Egyptian court. The first referee allowed Egypt to dig the ball, set the ball and then attack it. Was the first referee correct in allowing these three hits by Toson followed by the three more hits of the Egyptian team?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee 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>4.49</b> Argentina played Germany in a match at the Men's World Championships in Greece. In one rally, the 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 first 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 upon contact with the ball higher than the top of the net (<b>Rule 14.1.1</b>) A back row player completing a block is 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 the net, the first referee must observe the play very carefully. 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>

**4.50**

In the Women's Final Olympic Qualification Tournament the Netherlands led China 24-20. The Netherlands blocker, Chaine Ataelens, was slow to form a collective block and was about two steps away from the collective block when the Chinese attacker hit the ball.

Before Ataelens could reach to top of the net to block, the ball hit Ataelens at a height about half way between the top and the bottom of the net. The Netherlands then played the ball with three more contacts before winning the rally. Was the first referee correct in allowing the rally to be won by the Netherlands?

**Ruling:**

The first 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 considered to 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.

**Rules: 9.3.1, 14.1.1**

## CHAPTER 5: INTERRUPTIONS AND DELAYS

### Substitutions

<p><b>5.1</b> A Coach requested a substitution and indicated that three substitutions would be made. After the request was recognized, the Coach decided to make only two substitutions. What is the process for the second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is legal so long as this does not cause a delay. The second referee simply carries out a double substitution. <b>Rules 15.10.2, 15.10.4, 16.1</b></p>
<p><b>5.2</b> During the Women's World Cup, Kojima, the Coach of Japan, signalled for substitution without indicating the number of substitutions desired. Two substitutes reported to the second referee to enter the set. The second referee allowed one substitute and rejected the second as an improper request. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second referee was correct. Since Kojima did not indicate that more than one substitution was desired, therefore, only one was allowed. If, at the time of the request, both of the players were in the proper position for entry, Kojima, without delaying the game, had the option to decide which substitute should enter. <b>Rule 15.10.4</b></p>
<p><b>5.3</b> In the third set of the Italy versus Cameroon match in the Men's World Championships, the Italian coach requested two substitutions. At the time of the request, there was only one substitute standing near the substitution zone while the other one was just leaving the warm-up area. How many substitutes should be allowed under the current rules?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> At the moment of the request, the player(s) must be standing close to the substitution zone ready to enter the court. Although the coach requested two substitutions, he can be granted only the one for the player who was standing near the substitution zone. The second substitution should be rejected without sanction because the request for substitution was legal and there was no delay. <b>Rules 15.10.2, 15.10.3</b></p>
<p><b>5.4</b> During the third set of a match between Cuba and Cameroon at the World Championships, a substitution was requested by the Cuban Coach. Because the player was not prepared to make the substitution, the Cuban team was sanctioned with a delay warning and the substitution was rejected. As soon as the delay sanction was applied, the Cuban Coach again requested the substitution. Is he allowed to make this substitution?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The substitution is not legal. As the first request for substitution was rejected, the team is not authorized to request a second consecutive substitution. At least one rally must be played to a conclusion before there can be another request for substitution by the same team. <b>Rules 15.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.5</b> The coach of the Brazilian Men's team requested a substitution. The second referee signalled for the substitution but the substitute arrived with the wrong "numbered card" for substitution. He fumbled to get the correct one. The first referee awarded a delay warning, but allowed the substitution. Is this the correct response by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee was not correct. The delay warning is the correct sanction, but it should include a rejection of the substitution. <b>Rules 15.10.3, 16.1.1, 16.2</b></p>

<p><b>5.6</b> In a Women's NORCECA Olympic Qualifying 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 set when the Coach's signal was recognized by the second referee. Since there was only a minor delay caused by the substitution, the second referee allowed the substitution. Is this a proper decision by the second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second 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 substitute must be close to the substitution zone at the moment of the request. If the substitute is not there, the team is sanctioned with a "delay" sanction and the substitution is not granted. <b>Rules 15.10.3, 16.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.7</b> In the match between Germany and Turkey in the Junior women's European Championship 2002, the Turkish Coach requested a substitution of No.8. for No.9. But, player No.8 approached the substitution zone with paddle No.10 who was also on the court. The Coach insisted his players execute the substitution as he thought originally. After a short discussion, the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee rejected the substitution and Turkey was sanctioned with a delay warning. Was the decision correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee was correct. The substitution of No.8 and No.10 would have been legal. However, the Coach insisted on executing a substitution of No.8 for No.9. Because the wrong paddle was shown and because of the confusion this caused, the Turkish team was deemed to have delayed the game, and the referee correctly sanctioned them for delay. <b>Rule 16.1.3, 16.2</b></p>
<p><b>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 by another player as an exceptional substitution. Then, during the same game interruption, the Saudi-Arabian Coach <i>requested</i> an additional substitution. The 2<sup>nd</sup> referee accepted the request. Was the 2<sup>nd</sup> referee correct to accept the request?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, this is correct. Player #5 of Saudi-Arabia <i>had to be</i> substituted by an exceptional substitution due to <i>force majeure</i>. There were no regular substitutes available and the injury was unforeseen. Thus, there was originally no substitution request by the Saudi-Arabian Coach in the game interruption so that he still had the right to request a regular substitution. Consequently, exceptional substitution and regular substitution can be taken during the same game interruption. <b>Rule 15.7</b></p>
<p><b>5.9</b> Player #6 of team A is disqualified from the match. There is a legal substitution for #6 by #7. This is the first substitution for the team A during the set, and there are three more players on the bench. During the next rally, team A player #7 is injured and is not able to continue to play. Then, the 1<sup>st</sup> referee authorizes team A to substitute player #7 with another player as 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 in this situation, the rule was followed exactly. A legal substitution of # 6, the disqualified player, with #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</p>

	<p>able to continue to play. Even though player #7 cannot be substituted through regular substitution, player #7 can be substituted by the exceptional substitution. <b>Rule 15.7, 15.8</b></p>
<p><b>5.10</b> During the official warm up preceding the start of the first set of the match between the USA and Argentina, Kantor, the setter for the Argentine Men's Team became injured and could not play. The injured player was listed on the line-up sheet as the starting server. The referee allowed the Argentine Coach to make a substitution for Kantor. Since Kantor was listed on the line-up sheet, must he participate in play before being substituted?</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 second referee or to the scorer, the only changes, except for Libero replacements, which can be made are those made through the regular substitution process. Since legal substitutions are possible, such substitutions count toward the six substitutions allowed to the team in the set. <b>Rule 7.3.2, 7.3.4</b></p>
<p><b>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> was followed: a. Loss of rally for "R", resulting in a point for "S". b. The substitution is rectified. R-7 is removed from the set and the correct player is returned to the set. This correction does not count as a substitution, but the removal of R-7 does not cancel the substitution, if one were used, to get R-7 into the game. c. All points scored by "R" while R-7 was in the game illegally are cancelled, but the score of the opponent team will remain as it is. d. There is no further penalty for "R". <b>Rule 15.9.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.12</b> After "R" has used five substitutions, the coach of "R" is granted a request for substitution and indicates with two fingers that two substitutions are to be made. What is the proper response of the second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since "R" has used five substitutions, the request for the sixth substitution is valid. The second referee has to remind the coach that only one substitute will be possible and ask the coach which one will be substituted. 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>5.13</b> At the USA National Championships two very strong teams were playing when the following occurred. R-2 and R-5 are very strong attackers. During a set, R-5 is substituted out and then returns to the set. Late in the set, while R-5 is at the net, R-5 is injured and must be replaced by an exceptional substitution. As the Coach sees R-5 lying on the court, apparently injured very badly, the Coach signals his team to replace R-2 with the Libero. The Libero is now in the back row and R-2 is on the bench. After it has been determined that R-5 cannot play, the Coach then requests R-2 to enter the game at the net 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 for R-5 since he was on court at the moment of the injury. The injured player, R-5, should be attended to first - 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>5.14</b> In a match in the Kuwait League a coach 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 not legal. What is the proper response of the second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second referee allows the request for the legal substitution to take place. The request for the illegal substitution is refused no matter in which order the substitutions were requested. The request for an illegal substitution is sanctioned with a "delay". 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>5.15</b> In the fourth set of a World Championship match between Korea and Germany, the coach of Korea requested a substitution. After the substitution was completed, the scorer announced that the substitution was "illegal". The second referee then corrected the illegal substitution. The Korean game captain then disagreed with the second referee. As the second 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 second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> In a case such as this, the second 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>5.16</b> Team A's coach used the buzzer in good time, and gave the correct hand signal to request substitution. The substitute player was close to 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. However, he also authorized the substitution to take place - is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the 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 <i>in play</i> caused this special case, and the substitute player or the coach did not cause the delay. The referee showed good knowledge of the rules and the spirit of the rules in allowing the substitution to take place. <b>Rules 16.1.1, 23.2.3</b></p>
--	---

### Time Outs and Technical Time Outs

<p><b>5.17</b> During the match Thailand v Japan in the Asian Women's Senior Championships, after Thailand won a rally to lead 7:6, player No. 5 of Thailand, who was in the wrong rotation, served - and her team obtained a point. The score was now 8:6 to Thailand. A TTO (Technical Time-Out) was applied and the same player (No. 5) continued to serve until Thailand led 10:6. At that moment, the scorer realised that player No. 5 had been in the wrong rotational position for some time. The first referee applied a penalty (loss of rally, point and service to the opponents) for having the wrong server, and deleted the points gained by Thailand during this period of the play. The game continued after having rectified Thailand's rotation order. Then, when the score reached 8 points again later in the set, no TTO was called and the game continued.</p>	<p><b>Ruling</b> The first referee was correct. TTOs are an agreed device to allow replays, analysis, and commercial opportunities for TV: much of this is agreed and contracted in advance. Hence, having already had the first TTO in the set, no further TTO should be allowed until the score of the leading team reaches 16 points. <b>Rule: 15.4.1</b></p>
---	--

### Improper Requests

<p><b>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 first 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</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is not a correct ruling by the referee - although the first of his actions to reject the substitution for the delay was correct. i.e. since the coach has both signalled and verbally requested a substitution and the player was not in position for the substitution, the delay warning to Cuba was correct. It was also legal for the Brazilian coach to request a time out and a</p>
--	---

<p>with the referees followed. The first referee issued a delay warning to Cuba. Brazil then called a time out followed by a substitution. Cuba followed this with a substitution request which this time was granted. Play continued with Cuba winning the set and match. Is this a correct ruling by the first referee?</p>	<p>substitution after the delay warning. A request can be improper if made by the wrong team member or made at an inappropriate time – the second request by Cuba, after the time out, was of the latter form and an improper request. There must be a rally following a request for substitution not granted before the same team is allowed a new request for substitution. Thus, the request for a substitution after the time out by Brazil should have been rejected without penalty unless there had been a previous improper request. <b>Rules 15.3.1, 15.3.2, 15.10.3, 15.11.1.3, 16.1.1, 16.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.19</b> The Mexican Team playing the Dominican Republic in the NORCECA Championships was granted two team time-outs. Later in the set, the Mexican game captain made a third request for time-out which was granted by the second referee. Soon after the granting of the third time-out, the scorer realized that it was the third time-out for the Mexican Team and notified the second referee. 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. The first referee was notified of the error and the time-out period was immediately terminated. The first referee notified the game captain of the Mexican Team and issued a delay warning since the action affected and delayed the game. <b>Rule 15.11.1.4, 16.1.5</b></p>
<p><b>5.20</b> In the Top Teams Cup Szeged (HUN) was playing Kakanj (BIH). During the match, the Coach of Szeged requested a substitution by pushing the buzzer and giving the proper hand signal for the substitution. This was done slightly after the first referee's whistle for Szeged to serve. The play stopped. The first 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. The first referee urged Szeged to serve. At the moment of the service, the second referee blew his whistle and signalled a positional fault on the serving team because there were seven players on the court. After a short discussion between the first and second referees, the first referee signalled the service and point to Kakanj. 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 with delay. However, given that this sanction was not a delay penalty, Szeged should, have been given a replay on the serve! <b>Rule 15.11.1.1</b> Concerning the action of the second referee, the second referee has neither the right nor the responsibility to judge the serving team's positional faults. When the second referee blows his/her whistle in this case, the rally must be replayed. <b>Rules 15.11, 23.3.2.2, 22.3.2.3.a</b></p>

## Injuries

<p><b>5.21</b> During play at the US National Championships, the American player, Lewis, was hit in the nose by the elbow of a team-mate while blocking. Lewis received a "bloody nose". The coach of Lewis 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><b>Ruling:</b> Referees must use discretion in cases where substitutions are not pre-planned. A substitute must be permitted a reasonable time to take off his or her training suit and enter the game without sanctions. It should be further noted that when an injury occurs in which there is bleeding of a player, the player 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>5.22</b> In the Men's World Cup, the Netherlands setter, Peter Blange, injured his knee while playing defense. He remained lying on the floor while the coaches gathered around him and the team doctor of the Netherlands checked his injury. After about two minutes of therapy, Blange declared that he was able to play again. The referee then signaled for the match to continue with Blange continuing to play. Was this the correct decision by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> For the safety of the player, the team doctor should be allowed to come onto the court. If the injury appears to be serious, the first referee must stop the rally immediately and permit medical assistance to enter the court. If the injury is severe enough for coaches to come onto the court, the player should be removed from the court for at least one rally. The principle decision by the first referee is to give the player 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 through the regular substitution process. If a regular substitution is not possible, then an exceptional substitution must be used. <b>Rule 17.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>5.23</b> During a set, the German team had used 5 substitutions. One German player, who had started the match, substituted out and returned to the match then became injured. An exceptional substitution was used to replace the injured player. The first referee ruled that this exceptional substitution was now the sixth substitution for the German team and that they had no more substitutions in the set. The German coach questioned this rules interpretation. What is the correct interpretation of the rules?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The injured player may be substituted by means of an "exceptional substitution". The German coach may use any of the players who are not the court at that moment (the moment of injury) except the Libero player and his/her replacement player. The exceptional substitution is not counted as one of the six substitutions and the number of German substitutions has not changed <b>Rules 15.1, 15.6, 15.7</b></p>

## Delays to the Game

<p><b>5.24</b> Prior to the start of the third set of a match in the Men's World Cup with Japan playing China, the first referee signalled for teams to take their places on the court. The Japanese team did not report. When the Japanese were too slow to respond, the first referee issued a delay warning (without penalty) to them. The Japanese team then reported to the court. Was this the appropriate action by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Yes, the first referee was correct. The teams must be summoned to take their positions on the court. If they do not report, the first referee must issue a delay warning to them, and this is recorded on the score sheet. If the team still did not respond, a delay penalty, indicated by a yellow card, would have been given. If the team still did not respond, it would have been considered to be a refusal to play and 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 slow returning to the court after a time out, the same procedure should be followed. <b>Rules 6.4.1, 16.1</b></p>
<p><b>5.25</b> After winning a rally, the Brazilian Women's Team formed a huddle to discuss strategy for the next rally. The first referee allowed time adequate for the players to move to their positions, had they not huddled, 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 first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This was a correct decision by the referee. There is no requirement for the referee to allow more than a reasonable time for the players to move to their positions for the next rally. The 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>5.26</b> A player refused to play because of a wet place on the floor caused by a member of his team diving for a ball. What is the proper response of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee must consider many facts. The "quick moppers" should have mopped the wet spot on the floor. Players may also use their own small towels to mop the floor. In matches in which there is a Control Committee, the Game Jury President may authorize the second referee to allow extra mopping if the wet patch is large and the temperature is above 25 degrees Centigrade and the humidity is above 61%. On the other hand, the control of the match is always by decision of the first referee. If there is no Control Committee and the referee deems it necessary for extra mopping of the floor, he may choose to do so. If, in the final analysis, the team 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>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 first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee should suspend the match and have the organizer or the Control Committee take steps to re-establish order. This interruption should be recorded on the score sheet. <b>Rules 17.2, 17.3</b></p>
<p><b>5.28</b> In the Olympic Games during the women's match between Cuba and Canada, there was a problem between the TV camera and one of the players. As the Cuban player was serving, the TV "boom" arm at the end of the court swung down and struck the server. The player continued her serving action despite the interference and managed to serve the ball into the court and the rally continued. The first 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 first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was correct in this instance because it was spectacular and caused great interest and enthusiasm among the crowd. However, in other situations the first referee should consider replaying the rally.</p>

**CHAPTER 6: LIBERO**

<p><b>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 second referee could check the line up, the US Libero player, Eric Sullivan replaced the back row player Nygaard. What is the response of the second referee during the line up check before the start of the match?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Starter Nygaard 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 second referee checks the line up, Sullivan may replace Nygaard. If this were to happen again in the match, or if the delay is too long, and the first referee judges this action as a delay, the referee will issue a delay sanction. <b>Rule 19.3.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>6.2</b> A team has seven players including the Libero. In the second set, the starting player #6 is sanctioned by disqualification. The first referee declares the team incomplete and the match victory for the opponents. Is the decision of the first referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee is correct since the Libero cannot participate in any substitution and the disqualified players must be substituted by a legal substitution. Since there are no players available for regular substitutions, the decision is correct. <b>Rule 19</b></p>
<p><b>6.3</b> The red team has only eight players including the Libero. In the second set of a match, player #6 for the red team has been substituted for and has returned to the match. Player #6 is then sanctioned by disqualification. The Libero is on the bench at the time of disqualification of #6. What is the proper decision of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since player #6 cannot be substituted by any legal substitution, the first referee declares the team incomplete for the set. <b>Rule 6.4.3, 15.7, 15.8, 19.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>6.4</b> A team has seven players including the Libero. In the second set, the starting player #6 is injured. The first referee allows the Libero to enter the match by a regular substitution procedure in place of the injured player and finishes the match with this line up. Is this correct decision of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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 with 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>6.6</b> Eric Sullivan, the Libero player for the USA Men's Team, is in position 5. The USA wins the next rally and rotates. The Libero player is replaced correctly by the starting player Jeff Nygaard who moves into the front zone. Before play starts, USA Coach Doug Beal decides to substitute, by a regular substitution, Tom Hoff into the game for Nygaard. Both of these actions occur in one interruption of play. Is the first referee correct to allow both player exchanges to take place?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The process is correct. But the terminology is important to avoid unnecessary protests. The Libero player is "<i>replaced</i>" by the starting player Nygaard. Hoff then "<i>substitutes</i>" for Nygaard. Thus there is <b>only one substitution</b> which has taken place in between the two rallies and <b>which is recorded on the score sheet</b>, and no rule infringement occurred. <b>Rules 15.3.2, 19.3.2</b></p>
<p><b>6.7</b> In the Westcup, one of Norway's most prestigious events, the Libero replacing the player in position one was late reacting to the situation. The replacement took place after the referee's whistle for service but before the service hit. What is the proper response by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee should allow the rally to continue uninterrupted. After the rally, the referee 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 were to be made after the service hit, the first referee should whistle this as a positional fault. <b>Rule 19.3.2.3</b></p>
<p><b>6.8</b> During the NORCECA Junior Girls Championships the USA was playing Mexico. USA serving specialist Candace McNamee substituted into the game for middle blocker Amber Holmquist. After McNamee's service, she was replaced by Libero player Erin 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 and pushed the buzzer for a normal substitution of Holmquist for McNamee and attempted to have McNamee back on the court for Holmquist so that this substitution could take place legally. Since first referee was prepared to authorize the American server to serve, the second referee refused the improper request by the US team. The first referee recognizing that he was ready to authorize a service in which the American team had an illegal player on the court, authorized the appropriate substitution and sanctioned the American team with a delay warning, with very little disruption of the game. Was this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Clearly, the first 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 first referee made the correct decision. If such errors continued by the American team, sanctions should be applied.</p>

<p><b>6.9</b> In the Men's World Championship match between the USA and Greece, the starting middle blocker for the USA was Jeff Nygaard. When Nygaard rotated to serve, USA Coach Doug Beal substituted serving specialist Chip McCaw for Nygaard. After losing service, McCaw was replaced by the Libero, Eric Sullivan. When Sullivan was about to rotate to the front row, Nygaard raced onto the court to replace Sullivan. After two rallies, the Greek Team realized that the replacement was not legal because Nygaard had not been substituted for McCaw. The Greek Team protested the situation. A Judges Conference was convened after which the USA was allowed to substitute Nygaard into the match for McCaw with no penalty. Was this the correct ruling?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> There are three parts to the ruling: First, since this situation was not clearly provided for in the rules, Rule 23.2.3 states that the first referee has the power to decide any matter involving the game including those not provided for in the rules. Second, given that situation, the USA Team should have been penalized with a loss of rally for an illegal substitution, but without loss of additional points because the score sheet was unable to identify the moment of the illegal substitution. To get Nygaard legally back into the match, team USA should have requested a regular substitution of Nygaard for McCaw. Third, 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 Coach Beal should have requested a regular substitution of Nygaard for McCaw. These replacements/substitutions must be made in the same interruption in the game. <b>Ruling 19.3.2.1, 23.2.3</b></p>
<p><b>6.10</b> During a match in the Men's World Cup Argentina was playing Canada. The referee whistled for Hugo Conte, Argentina's server, to serve. At that moment, Conte realized that the Argentina Libero had left the court but had not been replaced, thus, Argentina had only five players, including Conte, on the court. Conte delayed the serve as long as he considered legal, then served. At the moment of the service hit, the replacement player was on the court in position one, but his legal position was in position four. He was clearly out of position. The teams played the rally which was won by Argentina. The game captain of Canada then approached the first referee requesting an explanation of the decision to play the rally when he expected that Canada should win the rally because Argentina was out of position. The first referee rejected the plea of Canada and allowed the rally to remain as played. What should have been the decision of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> There were three errors in this situation. The first was that the first referee must not blow the whistle to serve unless the team is ready to play and the server is in possession of the ball. He should have delayed the whistle to serve. If this caused a delay in play, the Argentine Team should have received a delay sanction. Secondly, replacements can only take place before the whistle for service. And third, the Argentine team was out of position at the moment of the service hit. Because Argentina was out of position, they should have lost the rally. Had the replacement player been in position four 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>. In fact, since this was the first occasion of this behaviour, Argentina should have received a verbal caution from the first referee. <b>Rules: 7.5.1, 12.3, 19.3.2.2, 19.3.2.3</b></p>

<p><b>6.11</b> During a match the Libero player was on the court replacing player number 6. While running after a ball, the Libero injured his leg muscle and could not continue playing. The coach then decided that he wanted player number 6 to become the redesignated Libero. Is this possible?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> <b>Rule 19.3.3.1</b> states that in case of injury to a Libero, a coach may re-designate a new Libero from one of the players not on the court at the moment of the redesignation. Thus, 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 to become the new Libero. Should the situation be that player #6 cannot be legally substituted during that set, he cannot be redesignated during the set. <b>Rule 19.3.1</b></p>
<p><b>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 between the extended attack lines 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 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. Hence, the Libero-coach was allowed this dual function and the referee did not insist that the Libero remain on the bench. <b>Rules 5.2.3.4, 19.1.3</b></p>
<p><b>6.13</b> The USA Men were playing 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 – and briefly left the court. Almost immediately, Hoff recognized that he had made a mistake and quickly exchanged positions again with Sullivan. The first referee ignored the mistaken replacement and whistled for the service. Was this the correct decision by the first referee?</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 this not to be a completed replacement. Where such an event takes place, obviously by mistake, and with no delay to the game, it is not acted upon and the game 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 <i>different</i> player without the requisite rally between the replacements, the USA would have been penalized with loss of rally, and the incorrect replacement would have been corrected. <b>Rule 19.3.2.1</b></p>
<p><b>6.14</b> In a match in the Kuwait League, the Libero was in the front row, position 4. After three points, the first referee noticed the wrong position. What is the correct decision for the referee to make?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The Libero is not out of position until the server serves 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 out of position. The team, which is out of position, is</p>

	penalized with loss of rally and loses any points scored while out of position. The line-ups are corrected and the game resumes <b>Rules 7.5.4, 19.3.1.1</b>
<p><b>6.15</b> In a match of the Asian Senior Men's Championships, during the official warm up of the match, the Libero was injured. The coach asked for a redesignation of the Libero – the new Libero was to be the present Team captain, who was already on the starting line up of the team for the first set. The first referee initially rejected the request because the rules forbid the Libero to be either Team captain or Game captain.</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee was not correct. While it is true that the Libero cannot act as 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 act as the redesignated Libero. Since the 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. 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 by the bib or jacket kept for this purpose in the reserve equipment)</li> <li>5. Request the scorer to: <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> <li>- Write the details of these re-registrations/ re-designations in the "REMARKS" box of the score sheet</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<p><b>6.16</b> Following two poor receptions of team A, the Coach of the team A replaced the Libero from position 6 in the court and immediately sent him back to the court in position 5 (without any rally between the two replacements). The second referee did not recognise it. The 1st referee, however, saw it, yet still authorised the service and after the service hit whistled for a positional fault of the receiving team A. Was the first referee correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first 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 2nd 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 second referee did not recognise this Libero replacement fault, the first referee cannot knowingly allow an illegal act, and must help the second referee by whistling. On the matches where an assistant scorer is acting, it is his/her duty to follow the Libero replacements. In this case, after the service hit, he/ she should press the buzzer signalling the fault committed. <b>Rules 19.3.2.1, 19.3.2.2, 19.3.2.3</b></p>

<p><b>6.17</b> In the World Championships, 2003, the Libero of the German National Team played in position 6. After the end of the rally, the Libero in position 6 was replaced by the player Andrae, but, Andrae thought he was coming back in court position 4. Some moments later, but before the whistle for service, the Libero noticed that Andrae had taken up the wrong position. The Libero quickly returned to the court, replacing Andrae again. The referee allowed the situation.</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The referee was not correct. The Libero replacement had been completed. Player Andrae's responsibility was to take up the correct position in the rotation. And, at least, one rally must take place between two replacements involving the Libero. Therefore, the first referee should continue the game, and the instant when the ball is in play, from the service hit, the first referee should have called the positional fault against the German National Team.</p>
<p><b>6.18</b> After the end of a rally, the Libero was replaced by a normal player. The referee whistled for the next rally. After the service, one of the spare balls penetrated into the playing court, and the first referee whistled "double fault". Before the whistle for the replayed rally, the Libero attempted to replace the player in position 6. The second referee called him back.</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second referee was correct. A rally concludes with the award of a point to one of the teams. Since the rally was cancelled, no rally exists between the two replacements.</p>
<p><b>6.19</b> In the Athens Olympic games, the Libero of the Italian men's team became injured during play, 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 court, the Libero claimed he had recovered and insisted on returning to play. The referees allowed the Libero back on the court and resume the match.</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Even though it was the case of injury, the Libero can be replaced through regular replacement. Also, the Libero still has the right to participate in the match until the role of the Libero is re-designated due to the injury. Thus, this situation was a mistake because two consecutive replacements took place without any rally in between.</p>
<p><b>6.20</b> The following occurred during one of Germany's 2nd league matches: The players' list on the score sheet had been filled out, with the name and number of each team's Libero correctly written into the section specially reserved for this information. However, on the line-up sheet of the 1st set, the coach of team A had forgotten to include the number of the Libero. And had only listed the starting six players. The Libero did not start playing on the court, but sat on the bench. After some rallies, the Libero attempted to replace a back row player, but the 2nd Referee prevented the replacement and told the</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Writing the Libero's name and number on the score sheet creates the conditions for eligibility of the Libero. This was true at the time of the incident. In the 2005-2008 edition of the Rules, it is only necessary to write the Libero on the score sheet; there is no longer a requirement to record the Libero on the line-up sheet as well. <b>Rule 19.1.2</b></p>

<p>Coach that the Libero was not eligible to play, because his number was not on the line-up sheet.</p>	
<p><b>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? Answer is no-one. The team would become incomplete. <b>Rule 17.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>6.22</b> A's Libero injured her arm 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, hence may not 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 in this instance. Had the player been non-ambulatory, the team doctor should have advised to place the player behind the bench or in a place of safety outside the Control area. <b>D1a and Definitions</b></p>
<p><b>6.23</b> During a match in the NORCECA Cup, the Libero entered the court for Team A at 11:11 and the Libero was in position 5. At that moment, a player of Team B was judged to be guilty of rude conduct and Team B was penalized, and Team A gained a rally. Then, team A had to rotate. Realising that this would force the team to replace the Libero within the same stoppage of play, the referees permitted the replacement. Is this correct?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The decision was correct. As Team A gained a point and service, they had to rotate. Normally there has to be a rally between successive Libero replacements - except when occasioned by the award of a penalty to the opponents <b>Rule 19.3.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>6.24</b> During the match, the Libero became injured, and was replaced by the replacement player. A little later, the game captain approached the 1st referee and requested that the team captain, who was sitting on the bench at the moment, should be the re-designated Libero. Is this permitted?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The Libero cannot be a team captain or Game Captain at the same time as being the Libero. However, it is possible for the Team captain to relinquish all team captain's rights and privileges, to be re-designated as the new Libero. <b>Rule 19.3.3.1</b></p>

**6.25**

During the 2nd set of the English Cup Final, the Libero complained of feeling unwell. The team doctor realised immediately that the Libero had a temperature of 40.5°C, caused by an acute viral infection, and ruled that he should not take any further part in the match. In the circumstances, is it permitted to re-designate a new Libero?

**Ruling:**

While the rule specifically refers to injury, this is not the only reason for redesignation. The referees should consider the case as one in which the Libero is unable to play due to factors beyond the control of the Libero. Thus, the 1st referee should be sympathetic to the situation and permit re-designation in this instance.

**Rule 19.3.3.1**

## CHAPTER 7: PARTICIPANTS' CONDUCT

<p><b>7.1</b> In the World Cup, a disgusted Spanish player kicked the ball after a rally had ended. The first referee warned the player for minor misconduct. Is this a correct action by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This is correct action by the referee. Such minor misconducts must be controlled by the first referee. If, on the other hand, the kicking is dangerous to players, officials, or spectators, or is rude conduct, the first referee has the authority to judge this to be rude conduct and sanction the player with a yellow card penalty. The scorer will record the rude conduct under the player's number in the sanctions box of the score sheet. While the first 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>7.2</b> The Netherlands played Cuba in the Men's World Cup. During the hard fought second set, the Netherlands setter, Peter Blange, made a sensational set which fooled the Cuban blockers. The Netherlands spiker v.d. Meulen smashed the ball to the floor with great authority. As the confused Cuban blockers attempted to block v.d. Meulen, the Cuban setter, Diago, intentionally pulled down the bottom of the net to make the referee believe that v.d. Meulen had hit the net. The second referee observed the attempted deception and whistled for the Netherlands team to win the rally. The first referee then signaled a warning to Diago. Is this the correct penalty for Diago?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first 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>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 first referee. If repeated, he should be penalized with a yellow card for rude conduct. Where the infraction occurred during a rally, the penalty should be given at the end of the rally and should be given <i>in addition</i> to the result of the rally. In certain major world competitions, Special Refereeing Instructions may list further sanctions. <b>Rules 5.2, 21.1, 21.2, 21.3</b></p>

<p><b>7.4</b> Between sets of a match, Blue player #3 made a derogatory remark to an official and a penalty for rude conduct was given by the first referee. The Blue team had first service for the next set. What is the proper action of the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Sanctions imposed between sets of a match are assessed prior to the start of play in the next set. Thus, before the first service, the first referee will signal the penalty and loss of rally for the Blue team. The receiving team gains one point then 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 team is penalized. The following is a summary for infractions which occur between sets, they should be recorded on the score sheet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Warning against player of the serving team. No penalty, no record on the score sheet.</li> <li>2. Warning against player of the receiving team. No penalty, no record on the score sheet.</li> <li>3. Penalty against a serving team player only. Loss of rally for the serving team. Receiving team gains a point, rotates and serves.</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 what the order.       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Charge serving team a loss of rally, point for receiving team, and the receiving team is ready to serve.</li> <li>b. Receiving team rotates one position. Loss of rally is then charged to this team.</li> <li>c. The original serving team rotates one position, gains one point, and begins service 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 after the double penalty would be 25-26.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<p><b>7.5</b> The USA Men's Team was serve-receiving. Lloy Ball was the setter penetrating from the back zone. A young American receiver passed the ball so poorly that Ball had no chance to even touch the pass. In frustration, after the ball touched the floor out of play, Ball pulled on the bottom of the net. Should this have been a fault?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> According to <b>Rule 21.3</b>, the first referee is given the authority to sanction the player according to the seriousness of the offence. Pulling on 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 of the net may be considered to be rude conduct and sanctioned accordingly. Since this case was</p>

	<p>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>7.6</b></p> <p>A player is outraged by a decision of the first referee concerning a touch on the block. The offending player pulls at the net and the first referee directs him to return to his position. The player then walks toward the referee gesturing wildly and shouting at the referee even after the warning from the first referee.</p> <p>The referee considers the behaviour of the player to be offensive conduct and sanctions him with a red card which expels the player from the set. Is this appropriate response by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>The first referee's response appears to be correct. He attempted to settle the problem by a warning and by ushering the player back into the court to play. When this did not succeed, the first referee is 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 the player would receive a rude conduct penalty which would cost the offending team a "loss of rally" (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 loss of rally 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>7.7</b></p> <p>In the Brazil versus Canada match of the World League, a player was expelled directly from the court. Neither team had been issued a warning or a penalty at this stage of the match.</p> <p>What should be the first referee's response to a subsequent minor misconduct from any other member of the same team?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b></p> <p>The referee was correct in the first instance to send the first player off the court to the penalty area. Should a clear case of offensive conduct be committed, the referee must expel the player without a previous sanction.</p> <p>The first referee should normally try to prevent a team from reaching the sanctioning level.</p> <p>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 first referee may issue warnings or penalties to other team members after the expulsion.</p> <p><b>Rule 21</b></p>

## CHAPTER 8: THE REFEREES AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

<p><b>8.1</b> The coach of Brazil was overheard talking to and distracting the scorer during play. The second referee told the coach not to interfere with the scorer. Is this a correct action by the second referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> Since only the first referee may officially warn or penalize a coach, player or other team member, if the second referee feels that the situation warrants a warning, the first referee must be notified and the matter must be dealt with by the first referee.</p> <p><b>Rule 23.3.2</b> However, in the spirit of the art of refereeing, where such situations can be resolved by the second referee with a word, it would be to the advantage of the game not to stop the game for the issue of sanctions.</p>
<p><b>8.2</b> The second referee indicated to the first referee that the American substitute Eric Sato was sitting on the floor in the warm-up area rather than standing or stretching. The first referee warned the American team for a minor misconduct and made Sato stand up. Is this a correct action by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> This was an incorrect ruling by the first referee. Players are not required to be standing in the warm-up area. On the other hand, players may not sit on benches, chairs, rails or walls in this area. The warm-up area is designated so that the players can be prepared to play.</p> <p><b>Rules: 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 24.2.4, 24.2.5</b></p>
<p><b>8.3</b> The coach of the USA Junior Women's team approached the scorer and asked information as to 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> Coaches are permitted to ask the scorers for information only about their own team. They may ask the scorer only at a time which is neither distracting the scorer nor delaying the match.</p> <p>However, in the case that an electronic scoreboard is used, coaches should have no need to ask scorers for information displayed on the electronic scoreboard.</p> <p><b>Rule 25.2.2</b></p>
<p><b>8.4</b> At the US National Championships, the game captain of the Kenneth Allen Club Team asked the first referee for an interpretation of an incident during 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 first referee refused. Was this a correct ruling by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was correct. At the time of the incident, the game captain of Kenneth Allen made no mention of a protest.</p> <p><b>Rule 23.2.4</b></p>

<p><b>8.5</b> In a tournament in Scotland the match between Elliots and Grangemouth was tied at 23-23 in set three. The second referee called Grangemouth for "out of position". Grangemouth protested the judgment, but to no avail. On the next service, with the score 24-23 to Elliots, the second referee again called Grangemouth for out of position and declared the set to Elliots. Again the game captain of the Grangemouth protested to both referees. After some discussion, the first referee agreed that both judgments were incorrect. However, the first referee stated that the set was over and that no correction could be made. Despite continued protests, the referee continued play with set four. The Grangemouth team captain recorded the protest formally at the end of the match. Was this a proper action by the first referee?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The first referee was wrong. Referees are allowed to correct their decisions concerning the application of the rules. The Appeals Committee corrected this obvious mistake by restarting the match in the third set at 23-23.</p>
<p><b>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 signaled for a time out. The second referee instinctively blew his whistle but then recognized that the Chinese team had already used its final time out. He then "waved" for the teams to remain on the court and did not sanction China with an "improper request" because the delay was slight. At that moment, the Chinese coach then signaled with her hands that she desired to make a substitution. The second referee then waved the substitute away as an "improper request" and the game continued. Was the second referee correct in his handling of the situation?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The second referee was not correct. The second referee is in charge of the authorization of interruptions and controls their number. When the second referee blew the whistle at the coach's hand signal, he should have known that the Chinese team had no more time outs and should simply have rejected the request without whistling. Since there was only a momentary delay, the second referee probably showed good judgment in hastening the game to continue with no other consequences. However, concerning the request for substitution, since one substitution <b>request</b> and only one is allowed to the same team in the same game interruption between rallies, the request for substitution should have been allowed as a legal substitution. <b>Rule 15.1, 15.2.1, 15.11, 16.1, 16.2, 24.2.6, 24.2.7</b></p>

<p><b>8.7</b> At the Women's NORCECA Championships, the USA was playing a hard fought match with Canada. At the start of the fifth set, the American coach, Kent Miller, submitted his line up. The first referee signaled 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 by the bench. The first referee signaled for the Canadian team 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 second referee. The first referee sanctioned the Canadian coach with a "delay warning". Coach Miller protested to the Control Committee that the Canadian Team should be sanctioned with "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 first referee made the initial error by directing the American team to take the court without having received the line-up from the Canadian Coach. Once the American Team was on the court, the delay warning given by the first 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 the serve and the point.</p>
<p><b>8.8</b> During a time out in 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. Are the referees 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. Although the Cuban Coach apparently violated this rule, he did not violate the spirit of the rule. The purpose of the rule is to remove the athletes from the playing court so that the playing court can be mopped and so that the playing court will not be threatened by water or other materials which the team may use during the time out. The referees were correct by not being concerned about this event. <b>Rule 15.4.2</b></p>
<p><b>8.9</b> In the Women's Final Olympic Qualification Tournament Croatia was leading Korea 6 - 5 in the second set. After the rally, the 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 the wet spot. The first referee, then, called the Korean game captain and told her to tell the assistant coach to stay on the bench. Did the first referee make a correct decision?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> 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. The first referee was correct. <b>Rules 5.2.3.4, 5.3.1</b></p>

<p><b>8.10</b> At the Women's Final Olympic Qualification Tournament Korea was playing China. At the score of 8-6 in favour of Korea in the second set, the Korean coach asked the second referee if the server was correct. The second referee checked with the scorer and replied that the correct player was ready to serve. The first referee continued the match. Is this the correct process for the Koreans?</p>	<p><b>Ruling:</b> The only team member allowed to speak with a referee is the game captain. Thus, the coach is not authorized to speak to the second referee. <b>Rule 5.1.2</b></p>
<p><b>8.11</b> In the Youth World Championships for Women, Cuba was playing Slovakia. The Slovakian coach requested a time out. The second referee whistled for the time out. The first referee did not hear the second referee's whistle. Therefore, the first referee authorized the service by Cuba. The second referee whistled again to allow the Slovakian time out. Amid some confusion, the first 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 against Slovakia and gave Cuba a point. This point for Cuba was point 14 and took the Cubans to match point which they subsequently won. The Slovaks vehemently protested about the delay sanctions. Were the Slovaks 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 teams should not be penalized. Thus the first warning against the Slovakian Team 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 the decision by the first referee. <b>Rule 5.1.2.1</b></p>

## CHAPTER 9: SPECIAL CASES

<p><b>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 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>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. 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 first 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 cause an injury. If, according to the judgment of the first referee, the situation is dangerous, he/she 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 were intentional or a repeated occurrence, other sanctions would apply.</p> <p><b>Rule 17.2</b></p>
<p><b>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 is 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 as it was 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>

**9.4**

In a Women's World Cup match, Brazil was playing 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 the Head of Delegation from Brazil who appeared at the Control Committee table from the spectator seats reserved for Heads of Delegation.

The first referee whistled the Brazilian Game Captain and explained that he was sanctioning the Coach of Brazil with a penalty for rude conduct. Although the Brazilian Game Captain was obligated to communicate this to the Brazilian Coach, she did not do this. Furthermore, in the resulting confusion, the second referee missed the sanctioning of the Brazilian Coach and the rude conduct was not recorded on the score sheet.

By this time, the Control Committee members, without communicating that a Judges Conference was being 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?

**Ruling:**

The initial error was that of the scorer.

**Rule: 25.2.2.1**

The second was that of the scoreboard operator.

The third was that of the assistant scorer for not checking with the official scorer to be certain that they were each in agreement.

**Rule: 26.2.2.6**

The first referee, via the second referee, should have been certain that the misconduct was recorded on the score sheet.

**Rule: 25.2.2.6**

The Brazilian Game Captain should have communicated the misconduct to the Brazilian Coach. When she did not do this, she should have been required to do this.

**Rule: 21**

The Control Committee was incorrect in allowing the Brazilian Head of Delegation to approach the Control Committee 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 first referee and the Refereeing Delegate in the Judge-Conference. The second 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.

**See: Refereeing Guidelines and Instructions**

Fortunately, the score was corrected, the rude conduct sanction was maintained on the score sheet, and the game continued. The problem was compounded because both referees and the Refereeing Delegate allowed the score sheet to be signed and approved without mentioning the sanction and score correction.

**Rules 25.2.2.6, 25.2.2.7**

**9.5**

During a match between the USA Men and Brazil, an American 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 second referee into the opponent's free zone. When passing the net post and second 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 first referee?

**Ruling:**

The first referee was correct. So 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.

**Rule 9.1.3**