

V. Procedures and Processes

The proceedings in the area Elite Sports are governed by the Organisational Regulation ES ([OrgR ES](#)) and where the OrgR does not provide any rules, by provisions of the Judicial Regulation (JR).

Offences can be treated and sanctioned in either tariff or ordinary proceedings.

1. Tariff proceedings (Article 23 OrgR ES, Article 50 JR)

In tariff proceedings, the decision of the referees or the request (e.g. of the PSO) is reviewed summarily. This means, that the Single Judge only examines whether the request/report is justifiable and usually no hearings are held, no statements are obtained and no deliberations are conducted. Primary evidence in tariff proceedings is the referee report. Further relevant evidence may also be consulted

Tariff proceedings are concluded with a fine and/or a one-game suspension.

2. Ordinary Proceedings (Article 26 OrgR ES, Article 48 JR)

Ordinary proceedings are applicable where no other procedure (particular tariff proceedings) is provided for. In ordinary proceedings, a comprehensive examination of the facts of the case is carried out by the Single Judge and the parties are heard. In the area Player Safety, ordinary proceedings must be conducted as soon as the PSO requests more than one game suspension and also if the Single Judge himself comes to the conclusion that several games suspension are appropriate, irrespective of any request to the contrary.

Content:

- A. Rule Violation and Penalties
- B. Processes in the Area Elite Sports
- C. Processes Player Safety in particular (Processes II & III)

A. Rule Violation and Penalties

1. Rule violation

For a disciplinary sanction – especially in the area of "Player Safety" – to be possible, a violation of a rule of the IIHF Rule Book must first be established. In any disciplinary proceedings, it must therefore first be examined whether there has been any violation of the rules at all. Therefore, proceedings are dropped, if the factual circumstances of an IIHF rule have not been fulfilled (e.g. [Tanner Richard - 09/11/2017](#) N 5.6) and/or if the case constitutes an exception which is specifically permitted according to the IIHF Rule Book (e.g. [Tristan Scherwey - 27/09/2018](#) N 5).

Section 10 of the IIHF Rule Book sets out the penalties in the game, which can be imposed against players. Section 12 also contains certain additional penalties specific to goalkeepers. Penalties may be imposed during the game and immediately after the game, when players leave the ice and head to their locker rooms.

In the SIHF Videocenter explanatory videos to various rules are available (tv.sihf.ch).

Diving/Embellishment

Since the 2015/16 season, penalties on ice as well as fines and suspensions in disciplinary proceedings can be imposed for a violation of IIHF Rule 138 (Diving/Embellishment) for faking/embellishing a foul or injury. Such disciplinary proceedings are conducted by the Single Judge Tariff Proceedings according to Process I.

2. Game misconduct penalties

The first imposed game misconduct penalty against a player does not result in an automatic suspension - only a fine according to the fine tariff ES in tariff proceedings (Process II). After a second game misconduct penalty in the same season, the player is automatically suspended for one game. In the case of a third game misconduct penalty, a two-game suspension is automatically imposed. After the fourth game misconduct penalty, ordinary proceedings have to be initiated. The record of all game misconduct penalties handed out during the regular season will be cleared for the play-offs, qualification round, playoff final and league qualification games.

Fines as well as the automatic suspension(s) are generally issued in tariff proceedings by the Single Judge Tariff Proceedings (Process II).

Starting with the 2020/21 season, game misconduct penalties for “Fighting” are treated separately from the rest and are not added to the same count. Therefore, an automatic suspension will only be issued for two fighting misconducts and not already for a fighting and, for example, a misconduct penalty for a hit to the head. Furthermore, the first Fighting penalty of the season does not result in a fine or procedural costs (e.g. [Press Release Chiquet - 04.12.20](#))

3. Match penalties

For match penalties, on the other hand, (at least) a one-game suspension is issued automatically.

3.1 Mandatory match penalties

In the rules of the game, certain offences are mandatorily penalised with a match penalty (meaning at least one game suspension), irrespective of the offending player’s concrete culpability.

In the case of mandatory match penalties, a further distinction must be made as to how these are triggered. Certain rules require the reckless endangerment of an opponent, in order for a match penalty to be imposed automatically (e.g. [Marc Kämpf - 01/11/18](#) N 5.4; Rule 123 – Checking from Behind). For other offences it is already sufficient that the rule has been violated by the action, a concrete endangerment of an opponent is not necessary (e.g. [Gilles Senn - 01/12/17](#); Rule 219 – Fighting/Goaltender). As of the 2018/19 season and the new IIHF Rule Book, Slew-Footing is no longer part of the latter category and triggers an automatic match penalty whenever the rule has been violated but always in addition to that requires reckless endangerment of the opponent (cf. [Ronalds Kenins - 23/01/19](#), [Daniel Winnik - 17/03/19](#) N 5.4).

3.2 Optional match penalties

Then there are rules, which, according to the IIHF Rule Book, do not provide for a mandatory but an optional match penalty in the case of reckless endangerment at the discretion of the referee. In such

instances it may also be the case that, despite an illegal and reckless action (which was or should have been punished on the ice with a minor or major penalty), the prerequisites for subsequent sanctions are not fulfilled (e.g. [Sebastian Schilt - 23/12/18](#) N 4; Rule 152 - Kneeing).

3.3 Injury to the opponent

Until 2018 (IIHF Rule Book 2014 – 2018 and previous), a match penalty and thus at least one-game suspension was automatically applicable for certain rules if an opponent was injured on the play (e.g. [Kevin Klein - 07/04/18](#) N 6). In the new IIHF Rule Book, valid from 2018 to 2022, the term "injury" has been completely omitted and universally replaced with "reckless endangerment". Therefore, an injury alone no longer automatically leads to a mandatory suspension for certain offences, but it must in any case be assessed whether there has been a "reckless endangerment" or not. However, an injury to the opponent will usually serve as an indication of such an endangerment.

The following is an example of the new wording in the application of Rule 124: In the decision [Mark Arcobello - 17/10/18](#), a hit which, according to the Single Judge, fulfilled the conditions of Rule 124 and led to an injury of the opponent did not result in a suspension, as the hit was otherwise carried out correctly. „Apart from the fact that he hit his opponent against the head, the accused cannot be found responsible of any wrongdoing. The hit is correct in its execution and does not meet any qualifying characteristics.“ (translated from German original; N 5.6). Before, that hit to the head would have automatically resulted in a one-game suspension because of the opponent's injury. (Cf. cases from the 2017/18 season in which a suspension(s) was "only" issued because the opponent was injured: [Marco Maurer - 19/03/18](#) N 5.4; [Kevin Klein - 07/04/18](#) N 6.)

3.4 Upgrades

Since the 2017/18 season, no match penalties are directly imposed on the ice in National League and Swiss League games. If actions, which have been penalised on the ice are subject to a match penalty according to the Rule Book, the Single Judge will, at the request of the PSO, issue a suspension in tariff proceedings (Process II) at the latest by 10.00 a.m. on the following day (National League) or by 10.00 a.m. on the second day (Swiss League).

In the case of a request for an Upgrade by the PSO (request for a "one-game suspension"), the Single Judge in the tariff proceedings merely examines whether the assessment of the PSO appears justifiable to him. However, if, on the basis of this summary examination, the Single Judge assumes that a higher suspension might be necessary, ordinary proceedings have to be initiated.

3.5 Subsequent sanction for actions not penalised on the ice

In June 2020, the League Assembly decided that as of the 2020/21 season, the PSO also have the possibility to request retroactive game misconduct penalties. This new rule was used for the first time in December 2020 to issue a total of three retroactive game misconduct penalties for the game HC Thurgau vs the GCK Lions on 02.12.20 (one game misconduct penalty for HCT's Jan Mosimann and two game misconduct penalties for GCK's Nelson Chiquet, cf. [Press Release Mosimann](#), [Press Release Chiquet](#)).

Until then, it had been established practice that subsequent sanctions for actions not penalised on the ice

would only be handed out, if at least a match penalty and thus a suspension had to be issued (cf. [Mike Künzle - 19/03/18](#): The proceedings for Charging [IIHF Rule 122] were stopped because – whilst the Rule had been violated – the action was not punishable with a match penalty).

REFERENCES

Used regulations

Article 16 (2); Article 20b (1)-(4); Article 20c (1) OrgR ES.
JR Appendix: Fine tariff Elite Sports.

Quoted decisions

- Tanner Richard - 09/11/2017: Decision Single Judge from 09.11.2017 (Tanner Richard GSHC, IIHF Rule 124, dropped with no suspension).
- Tristan Scherwey - 27/09/2018: Decision Single Judge from 27.09.2018 (Tristan Scherwey SCB, IIHF Rule 123, dropped with no suspension).
- Marc Kämpf - 01/11/18: Decision Single Judge from 01.11.2018 (Marc Kämpf SCB, IIHF Rule 123, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Gilles Senn - 01/12/17: Decision Single Judge from 01.12.2017 (Gilles Senn HCD, IIHF Rule 219, 1-game suspension).
- Ronalds Kenins - 23/01/19: Decision Single Judge from 23.01.2019 (Ronalds Kenins LHC, IIHF Rule 160, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Daniel Winnik - 17/03/19: Decision Single Judge from 17.03.2019 (Daniel Winnik GSHC, IIHF Rule 160, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Sebastian Schilt - 23/12/18: Opposition decision Single Judge from 23.12.2018 (Sebastian Schilt HCFG, 2nd game misconduct penalty, rejected, 1-game suspension).
- Kevin Klein - 07/04/18: Appeal decision SIHF Sports Tribunal from 07.04.2018 (Kevin Klein, IIHF Rule 124, approved, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Mark Arcobello - 17/10/18: Decision Single Judge from 17.10.2018 (Mark Arcobello SCB, IIHF Rule 124, dropped with no suspension).
- Marco Maurer - 19/03/18: Decision Single Judge from 19.03.2018 (Marco Maurer EHCB, IIHF Rule 124, 2-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Mike Künzle - 19/03/18: Decision Single Judge from 19.03.2018 (Mike Künzle ZSC, IIHF Rule 122, dropped with no suspension).

Documents

Practice Guidelines (2) & (3).
Annual Report SIHF 2015/16.

B. Processes in the Area Elite Sports

The OrgR ES distinguishes the four different "Processes I - IV".

For the procedures in the area Player Safety (health-endangering actions, Processes II and III) see also chapter C. "Processes Player Safety in particular".

1. Process I

Proceedings for all violations of directives and regulations that can be punished according to the fine tariff ES, but which do not constitute health-endangering actions on the ice are treated in Process I. This also includes proceedings concerning fines for diving/embellishment (faking a foul or injury).

Proceedings under Process I have to be initiated within five days of the incident.

Applicable procedure: Tariff proceedings

In charge: Single Judge Tariff Proceedings

Opened by the Single Judge at the request of:

- Director NL
- Chairman KOS
- Officiating

Appeal: Opposition to the Single Judge Safety

2. Process II

Proceedings in the case of health-endangering actions (Player Safety), which were penalised by the referees with a game misconduct penalty and can be settled according to the [fine tariff ES](#) (and do not require any additional disciplinary sanctions beyond that) are decided in Process II. This includes Upgrades to a match penalty as well as the automatic suspension after the 2nd or 3rd game misconduct in the relevant period according to number 8a of the fine tariff ES.

Also dealt with in this Process are actions on the ice that have not been penalised or have been penalised incorrectly, if they have to be sanctioned with a mandatory game misconduct or match penalty according to the IIHF Rule Book (e.g. unpunished slew footing), when the facts of the case are clear and it can be settled with a sanction according to the fine tariff ES (max. one-game suspension).

Applicable procedure: Tariff proceedings

In charge: Single Judge Tariff Proceedings or Single Judge Safety (if the PSO request a suspension or fine)

Opened by the Single Judge:

- on the basis of the referee reports (certain game misconduct penalties listed therein are regarded directly as requests to initiate proceedings for a fine)
- at request of the PSO (if no request for the conduct of Process III has been submitted [i.e. request for a maximum of one suspension only] and the Single Judge himself does not consider the a Process III to be necessary either)

Appeal: Opposition to the (other) Single Judge Safety

3. Process III

Process III are ordinary proceedings concerning health-endangering actions on the ice, which may result in a sanction going beyond the fine tariff ES.

Procedure applicable to health endangering actions (Player Safety) which

- have not been penalised on the ice or not sufficiently, or
- which have led to a game misconduct penalty on the play and which may result in a sanction going beyond the fine tariff ES (more than just "Upgrades").

Applicable procedure: Ordinary proceedings

In charge: Single Judge Safety

Opened by the Single Judge:

- at request of the PSO
- on the basis of a Club Request, forwarded by the PSO

Appeal: Appeal to the SIHF Sports Tribunal

4. Process IV

Procedures relating to other disciplinary offences (excluding any health-endangering actions on the ice) which for legal or other reasons are not dealt with in any of the aforementioned procedures are treated in Process IV. This includes in particular offences against

- order and security,
- Referees,
- violations of Articles 80 and 81 JR, and
- Proceedings concerning field protests according to Articles 54ff. JR.

Proceedings under Process IV have to be initiated within five days of the incident unless the relevant regulations stipulate otherwise (e.g. in the case of field protests).

Applicable procedure: Ordinary proceedings

In charge: Single Judge Security or Safety (for offences against referees)

Opened by the Single Judge on the request of:

- Director NL
- Chairman KOS
- Officiating
- Any other party that can prove a factual interest

Appeal: Appeal to the SIHF Sports Tribunal

REFERENCES

Used regulations

Article 4; Article 12 (8)-(11); Articles 13-15; Articles 21-22 OrgR ES.
JR Appendix: Fine tariff Elite Sports No. 8a & 8b.

C. Processes Player Safety in particular (Processes II & III)

The procedures for "Player Safety" apply to actions on ice that are endangering a player's health (tariff [Process II] and ordinary proceedings [Process III]) . They are governed by special provisions regarding the initiation of proceedings as well as deadlines and provisional suspensions.

The sentencing in the event of such an action is carried out based on Art. 90 JR and is described in detail in the Practice Guidelines in paragraphs 5 et seq.

An overview of the SIHF processes and deadlines in the area of Player Safety in the National League and Swiss League can be found in the appendix to the OrgR ES:

- Appendix 1: Processes and Deadlines (PSO/SJ) National League ([Link](#))
- Appendix 2: Processes and Deadlines (PSO/SJ) Swiss League ([Link](#))

1. Tariff proceedings in the area „Player Safety“ (Process II)

Tariff proceedings in the area „Player Safety are conducted either before the Single Judge Tariff Proceedings or – if the PSO requested a suspension or fine – the Single Judge Safety.

1.1 Tariff proceedings before the Single Judge Tariff Proceedings

Initiation of proceedings

In the case of a game misconduct penalty pronounced on ice, the Single Judge initiates tariff proceedings based on the referee report referred to him under Process II if the matter can be settled in accordance with the fine tariff ES (e.g. [Gilles Senn - 01/12/17](#)).

The referee report alone constitutes a request only in respect to the conduct of tariff proceedings to impose a fine. Without an additional request from the PSO (which does not necessarily have to demand a suspension), no suspensions can be imposed. (Exception: Automatic suspensions due to a second or third game misconduct penalty).

If the PSO has requested a suspension or fine, the Single Judge Safety is responsible for the tariff proceedings (see below).

Examination by the Single Judge Tariff Proceedings

The Single Judge Tariff Proceedings must examine if the game misconduct penalty should be confirmed and therefore a corresponding fine has to be issued. In assessing whether such a foul has been committed, the Single Judge is generally bound by the findings of the referees.

If a video is available, the Single Judge can only deviate from this and rescind the penalty if the referee's decision is incorrect in a qualified manner, i.e. if the referee's decision appears to be unjustifiable. This is only the case if

- a player other than the accused player committed the foul,
- in the opinion of the Single Judge there is no rule violation at all which can be penalised with a game misconduct penalty or
- the referee's decision appears arbitrary for any other reason.

Example: [Matt D'Agostini - 14.01.18](#), Game Misconduct penalty rescinded.

This means that if there is an action where the referee's assessment and the award of a game misconduct penalty is a possible sanction, it will be confirmed, even if the Single Judge himself considers it a harsh punishment (e.g. [Simon Moser - 26/11/18](#) or [Mathias Joggi - 19/10/17](#), no suspension but game misconduct penalty upheld).

1.2 Tariff proceedings before the Single Judge Safety

Initiation of proceedings

The Single Judge Safety is responsible for tariff proceedings in Process II if the PSO have requested a suspension or a fine. The PSO can either request a suspension for an unpunished offence (e.g. [Dominic Lammer - 14/01/18](#); [Ronalds Kenins - 23/01/19](#)) or an Upgrade to a match penalty (e.g. [Robbie Earl - 19/11/17](#); [Simon Kindschi - 04/11/18](#) N 4)

Examination by the Single Judge Safety

Tariff proceedings in Process II can be carried out by the Single Judges Safety upon request by the PSO for actions on the ice, which have to result in a mandatory game misconduct or match penalty and which in the concrete case are sufficiently sanctioned with a fine or one-game suspension. However, this only applies if the facts of the case are clear, otherwise ordinary proceedings must be initiated (e.g. [Ronalds Kenins - 23/01/19](#) N 2).

The Single Judge Safety will examine in a summary assessment without comprehensive gathering of evidence if the PSO request appears justifiable (limited cognition).

REFERENCES

Used regulations

Article 90 JR.
Article 16 (1)-(2); Articles 17-20d; Article 24a (1)–(2); Article 25 OrgR ES.
OrgR ES Appendix 1 & 2: Processes and Deadlines (PSO/SJ) NL and SL from 22.06.2020.

Quoted decisions

- Gilles Senn - 01/12/17: Decision Single Judge from 01.12.2017 (Gilles Senn HCD, IIHF Rule 219, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Matt D'Agostini - 14.01.18: Decision Single Judge from 14.01.2018 (Matt D'Agostini HCAP, game misconduct penalty rescinded).
- Simon Moser - 26/11/18: Decision Single Judge from 26.11.2018 (Simon Moser SCB, IIHF Rule 124, no suspension).
- Mathias Joggi - 19/10/17: Decision Single Judge from 19.10.2017 (Mathias Joggi EHCB, IIHF Rule 127, no suspension).
- Dominic Lammer - 14/01/18: Decision Single Judge from 14.01.2018 (Dominic Lammer EVZ, IIHF Rule 159, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Ronalds Kenins - 23/01/19: Decision Single Judge from 23.01.2019 (Ronalds Kenins LHC, IIHF Rule 160, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Robbie Earl - 19/11/17: Decision Single Judge from 19.11.2017 (Robbie Earl EHCB, IIHF Rule 159, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Simon Kindschi - 04/11/18: Decision Single Judge from 04.11.2018 (Simon Kindschi EHCK, IIHF Rule 160, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).

Documents

Practice Guidelines (2).

2. Ordinary proceedings in the area „Player Safety“ (Process III)

The Single Judge Safety initiates proceedings in Process III at the request of the PSO (whenever the PSO requests more than one game suspension) or based on a Club Request forwarded by the PSO. The Single Judge Safety examines these cases – as in any ordinary proceeding – with complete cognition. This means they consider and weigh all facts of the offence in full and can issue any sanction they deem appropriate even if a different request by the PSO was also justifiable.

If ordinary proceedings have been opened, and it turns out that it should have been clear that only an Upgrade to a match penalty would have been necessary, the procedural costs are set according to the provisions of tariff proceedings (e.g. [Mathias Joggi - 19/10/17](#)).

2.1 Provisional suspensions (Article 25 OrgR ES)

In cases of health-endangering or any other grossly unsportsmanlike behaviour or in cases of offences against referees, the Single Judge Safety responsible may, as a precautionary measure, impose up to two games suspension. The Single Judge takes his decision on the basis of the evidence at his disposal, but without hearing the parties concerned and without a trial.

There is no right of appeal against provisional suspensions. At the same time as the provisional suspensions are imposed, ordinary proceedings according to Process III (or IV for offences against referees) must be initiated.

2.2 Non-entry notice

If the Single Judge concludes after an application of the PSO that no ordinary proceedings are to be carried out - in particular if the request was made only on the basis of Art. 17 (2) OrgR ES (“in dubio pro duriore”) – he can decide not to enter into the application (cf. [Joel Vermin - 05/10/19](#) N 5.4). According to Art. 17 (3) OrgR ES, which was newly introduced in the summer of 2019, the Single Judge takes this decision in an appealable non-entry notice, which can also be challenged by affected clubs that have not submitted a Club Request (cf. [Joel Vermin - 05/10/19](#) N 9, [Jeremy Wick – 19/11/20](#) N 2).

2.3 Confirmation of a game misconduct penalty

As of the 2019/20 season, once a PSO request was filed, the Single Judge Safety always decides directly on the confirmation of a game misconduct penalty and the according fine, even when he decides not to enter into ordinary proceedings. *“The practice that this decision is passed on to the Single Judge Tariff proceedings and that he then also carries out tariff proceedings is abandoned for reasons of efficiency”*. In such instances, the Single Judge Safety only has the limited cognition of the tariff proceedings and only examines whether the game misconduct penalty was justifiable and not wrong in a qualified manner (e.g. on-ice penalty confirmed: [Joel Vermin - 05/10/19](#) N 5.5; on-ice penalty not confirmed: [Jeremy Wick – 19/11/20](#) N4).

Previous practice

Previously, if the Single Judge did not see it necessary to open ordinary proceedings at all, he informally forwarded the case to the Single Judge Tariff Proceedings, who pronounced a fine in tariff proceedings in accordance with the fine tariff ES (cf. [Jorden Gähler - 20/12/18](#); [Sebastian Schilt - 23/12/18](#) N 3).

The Single Judges Safety had already then confirmed the game misconduct penalties themselves if they had opened ordinary proceedings to examine the matter further but came to the conclusion that there is no need for a suspension; in particular, in cases where a Club Request was not granted (e.g. [Yannick Blaser - 04/10/18](#) N 5.7; [Simon Moser - 26/11/18](#) N 5.6).

REFERENCES

Used regulations

Article 17 (1)-(3); Article 25 OrgR ES.

Quoted decisions

- Mathias Joggi - 19/10/17: Decision Single Judge from 19.10.2017 (Mathias Joggi EHCB, IIHF Rule 127, no suspension).
- Joel Vermin - 05/10/19: Decision Single Judge from 05.10.2019 (Joel Vermin LHC, IIHF Rule 151, 1-game suspension, [video](#)).
- Yannick Blaser - 04/10/18: Decision Single Judge from 04.10.2018 (Yannick Blaser SCLT, IIHF Rule 124, no suspension).
- Simon Moser - 26/11/18: Decision Single Judge from 26.11.2018 (Simon Moser SCB, IIHF Rule 124, no suspension).
- Sebastian Schilt - 23/12/18: Opposition decision Single Judge from 23.12.2018 (Sebastian Schilt HCFG, 2nd game misconduct penalty, rejected, 1-game suspension).
- Jeremy Wick – 19/11/20: Decision Single Judge from 19.11.2020 (Jeremy Wick SCRJ, IIHF Rule 124, game misconduct penalty rescinded).

3. Deadlines in the area „Player Safety” (Processes II and III)

See OrgR ES Appendix 1: Processes and Deadlines (PSO/SJ) National League ([link](#)) and Appendix 2: Processes and Deadlines (PSO/SJ) Swiss League ([link](#)).

3.1 Deadlines National League

Requests

The PSO has to request the initiation of proceedings with the Single Judge Safety by 7 a.m. on the day after the game at the latest. For proceedings pursuant to Process II, which are opened on the basis of the referee report, the deadline is met if the facts of the case are noted on the referee report.

In the event of a health-endangering action in the National League, the club of the player concerned may send a Club Request to the PSO within two hours of the end of the game as recorded on the report (Club Request). The PSO must also forward any Club Request, for the initiation of proceedings, including those that in the PSO's opinion should not be granted, to the Single Judge Safety by 7 a.m.

The deadlines of the clubs and the PSO are final deadlines. If these deadlines are not met, no proceedings can be initiated thereafter.

Deadlines Process II (tariff proceedings)

Decisions in tariff proceedings must be issued by 10 a.m. on the following day if they result in a game suspension. If a decision in the tariff proceedings is issued after 10 a.m., it is valid but the suspension has no effect on the game day.

Deadlines Process III (ordinary proceedings)

The responsible Single Judge Safety has to order the opening of ordinary proceedings by 10 a.m. of the following day and at the same time has to decide on any provisional suspensions. Decisions of non-entry/dismissal of a Club Request also have to be made by 10 a.m. of the day after the game.

If the Single Judge Safety does not issue such an order by 10 a.m., proceedings may still be initiated later within the deadlines of the JR, but the player remains in any case eligible to play on the relevant game day.

From the beginning of the proceedings until the ruling by the Single Judge, the player remains eligible to play (exception: provisional suspensions). A suspension imposed by a decision in ordinary proceedings will only take effect for the next game day if the decision is issued no later than 8 p.m. on the day before the next game day.

3.2 Special deadlines for the Swiss League and Cup (Article 20 OrgR ES)

Article 20 OrgR ES defines special deadlines for games in the Swiss League and the Swiss Ice Hockey Cup (as well as Juniors Elite U20 und U17).

Club Requests can be submitted until 6 p.m. the following day and requests from the PSO to initiate proceedings must be submitted by 7 a.m. the second day after the game.

The responsible Single Judge Safety then has to order the opening of ordinary proceedings by 10 a.m. on the second day after the game and at the same time decide on any provisional suspensions. Decisions of non-entry/dismissal of a Club Request also have to be made by that time.

REFERENCES

Used regulations

Article 19 (1)–(7); Article 20; Article 26a (1) OrgR ES.
OrgR ES Appendix 1 & 2: Processes and Deadlines (PSO/SJ) NL and SL from 22.06.2020.