

SOUTH METROPOLITAN CRICKET ASSOCIATION

SMCA PROTEST AND RESULTS TRIBUNAL



SMCA Protest & Disputes Committee – Outcome Summary

Summary

Protests & Disputes – Thornlie v Kelmscott (17 December 2025)

The Protests and Disputes Panel heard an appeal relating to a prescribed penalty imposed under By-Law 65(b)(xvi) following conduct during the Thornlie versus Kelmscott match. The charge concerned inappropriate language directed at an opposition player and argumentative behaviour towards an umpire.

Despite the player pleading not guilty and citing frustration and heightened tension surrounding the match, the panel found the umpire's statement to be clear, consistent, and credible. Repeated remarks towards the umpire and a lack of remorse were significant factors in the panel's assessment.

Late witness evidence was considered in the interests of procedural fairness but was ultimately rejected due to issues of proximity and consistency with the umpire's account. Arguments relating to past incidents were deemed irrelevant.

The panel concluded that the conduct fell squarely within the prescribed penalty framework and that no mitigating factors justified a reduction. The original four-week suspension was therefore upheld. Post-hearing behaviour further reinforced the panel's view regarding the player's attitude and respect for the game and its officials.

Protests & Disputes Hearing

Date: 17 December 2025

Match Details

Thornlie vs Kelmscott

Charge: Prescribed Penalty – By-Law 65(b)(xvi)

Allegation:

- Swearing at an opposition player

- Arguing with the umpire
Status: Appeal hearing
-

Attendees

Panel / Officials

- **Jacob Landsmeer (JL)** – SMCA
- **Norm Harris (NH)** – Umpire Advisor
- **Shamez Salim (SS)** – SMCA
- **Joe Covic (JC)** – SMCA
- **Jeremy Dowsett (JD)** – Phoenix

Thornlie Representatives

- **David King (DK)**
 - **Bryan Lutter (BL)** – Player charged
 - **Craig Salmon (CS)** – Captain
-

Proceedings and Evidence

- **BL pleaded not guilty** to the charge.
- BL stated there was **significant frustration during the match**.
 - Admitted to saying words to the effect of “**He was a fucken hack.**”

Umpire Statement (read by JL)

- Repeated comments were made by BL throughout the day regarding umpiring decisions.
 - BL stated that captain (CS) should approach the umpire to say something as BL cannot
- The umpire noted the comments caused disruption to the game and demonstrated a lack of respect.

Thornlie Submissions

- **CS stated:**
 - The game itself was “okay” but there was **heightened tension**, largely due to a final be played the next day.
 - During the incident, players **laughed and did not view it as serious at the time**.
 - Suggested the decision and course of action may have been influenced by the umpire being relatively new.

Panel Clarification

- **JC advised** that the umpire experience was not the reason for the P&D, they are **experienced and fully aware of the expectations and standards of conduct in cricket**.

Additional Matters Raised

- **BL raised an unrelated incident from the previous season**, alleging double standards.
 - This was ruled **not relevant** to the current charge.

Late Witness Evidence

- A **witness statement from Darren Clarke** was submitted.
 - The panel noted this **should have been provided prior to the hearing**.
 - In the interests of transparency, the panel **considered the evidence**, but ultimately **rejected it** due to:
 - The witness's location at the striker's end
 - The incident occurring at the non-striker's end (approximately 20 metres away)
 - The witness independently recalling similar language ("that's a fucken hack"), which aligned with the umpire's account rather than contradicted it.

Further Umpire Observations

- Comments made by BL included words to the effect of:
 - "You can't do that"
 - "The umpire is holding up the game"
 - BL showed **no remorse at the time** and demonstrated a **lack of respect towards the umpire**, contributing to the decision to apply the prescribed penalty.
-

Decision

- The **Prescribed Penalty was upheld**.
- **No change** was made to the original decision.
- **Penalty:** Four (4) weeks suspension remains in effect.

Post-Hearing Conduct

- Upon receiving the verdict and leaving the room, BL appeared **disappointed**, showed **little remorse**, and **swore under his breath**.

This behaviour was noted as **consistent with the conduct observed during both the match and the hearing**.