

APPENDIX C: RULE 69 HEARING CHECKLIST (STANDARD)

For use where there is no separate person appointed to present allegations under rule 69.2(e)(1).

47 Checklist for the chair conducting rule 69 hearings

Name	of	com	petitor:
1101110	· · ·		

Boat:

Event:

Date of hearing:

Protest committee members:

ltem	Check?
Introduce the members of the protest committee by name and state any relevant judging qualifications	
Ask if there are any objections to those members and if necessary rule on any objection. Record the answer.	
Objections?: Yes/No (delete as applicable)	
If yes: Upheld / Dismissed (delete as applicable)	
Reason:	
If an investigator was appointed, check that all material collected in the investigation has been disclosed the competitor and the protest committee.	
Ask if sufficient time has been given for preparation. Record the answer. If necessary, determine how much extra time should be allowed	
Extra time requested: Yes / No (delete as applicable)	
If yes: Granted / Refused (delete as applicable)	



Reason:	
Treason.	
Ask if the competitor has received the written notification and understands the nature of the	
allegations. Record the answer. If the competitor does not speak English as a first	
language, determine if a translator is required.	
Competitor has received written notification: []	
Competitor understands allegations: []	
If not already represented, ask the competitor if they wish to be represented and/or have an	
advisor present. If they say no, explain that they can change their mind at any during the	
hearing (but that the hearing will not start again from the beginning).	
Competitor represented: Yes / No (delete as applicable)	
If yes: name of representative/advisor:	
If no: competitor understands right to representation: []	
If represented, explain that the representative can consult with the competitor, ask	
questions for them and sum up for them, but cannot answer questions on behalf of	
the competitor.	
Explain that the allegation is just that - an allegation. Explain the purpose of the hearing is	
to determine what has happened and whether misconduct has been committed.	
Explain to the competitor what the possible outcomes might be if the allegations are proven	
- a warning, penalisation and potential further action by the national authority (or if a foreign	
competitor – his/her own national authority).	
Hear the main witness supporting the allegation, and allow the competitor to question the	
witness, who may then be questioned by the committee. That person should then leave the	
hearing, unless he or she is a member of the protest committee, whose presence	
throughout has been foreseen.	
Name of witness:	
Evidence given by witness: []	
Witness questioned by competitor: []	
Witness questioned by committee: []	
williess questioned by committee. []	
	1



Hear, one by one, other witnesses supporting t question each witness, who may then be quest			
Witness Number	1 2 3		
Evidence given by witness:	[][][]		
Witness questioned by competitor:	[][][]		
Witness questioned by committee:	[][][]		
Names of witnesses:			
1.			
2.			
3.			
Hear the evidence of the competitor, who may	then be questioned by the committee.		
Evidence given by competitor: []			
Competitor questioned by committee: []			
Hear, one by one, the witnesses called by the competitor: allow the competitor to question each witness, who may then be questioned by the committee.			
Witness Number	1 2 3		
Evidence given by witness:	[][][]		
Witness questioned by competitor:	[][][]		
Witness questioned by committee:	[][][]		
Names of witnesses:			
1.			
2.			
3.			



Ask the competitor to sum up their case	
Ask the parties to confirm they have had a fair hearing and been able to make all their submissions	
Ask the competitor and all others present to withdraw, and confer.	
Find the facts, writing down exactly what happened and/or what was said. If the use of bad language is relevant to the case, write down the exact words believed to have been used. As with a protest, avoid making conclusions in the facts found.	
Apply the standard of proof set out in RRS 69.2(g).	
Conclude in writing whether the facts constitute a breach of good manners or sportsmanship, unethical behaviour or may bring of the sport into disrepute.	
Apply the standard of proof set out in RRS 69.2(g).	
Recall the competitor to announce whether the allegation is upheld or dismissed. If it is dismissed, close the hearing.	
If it is upheld, ask the competitor whether there are any mitigating circumstances the committee might consider when deciding whether to warn or penalize. Receive any apologies.	
Ask the competitor to withdraw again. Decide whether to warn, or to penalize, in which case decide the penalty.	
Recall the competitor, and announce the decision. Repeat or explain the decision if necessary, but avoid getting into further argument if the competitor is upset and does not accept the decision.	
Explain any right of appeal to the national authority.	
Advise the race committee of the decision if it affects the scores for the event, or if a competitor is to be excluded.	
Post a notice on the official notice board, giving the result of the hearing, but not facts or conclusions. It is recommended you use the wording in Appendix K.1.3.	
If a report is to be made to the national authority or World Sailing, notify the facts found, conclusions and decision to them. Include the names of the committee and the address of the chair.	
Record that the competitor was asked whether sufficient time had been given for preparation, and whether there was any objection to the composition of the committee, noting the answers given.	
It is recommended you use follow the guidance in Appendix K	



Retain all records for at least six months. The records should include the original report to the protest committee (if written - if not, produce a note of it), the written notification to the competitor, this checklist, the notes of the hearing, the written facts, conclusion and decision and the notice posted (if any) on the official noticeboard

Panel Chair

Date