



Secretary-Rules Editor Article #4
NCAA Wrestling Case Book Updates
Updated December 4, 2023

Mat-Side Video Review

Question: From the neutral position, Wrestler A locks up a bear hug and takes Wrestler B to the mat. Wrestler A keeps their hands locked but the referee does not award a takedown as the wrestlers are still scrambling while on the mat. Five seconds later, the two wrestlers go out of bounds and the referee stops the match. The coach of Wrestler A throws a challenge brick, stating that Wrestler A scored a takedown.

The referees review the sequence and determine that Wrestler A did secure a takedown when the two wrestlers hit the mat. The referees also note after the takedown was secured, Wrestler A kept their hands locked although Wrestler B was not in near fall criteria. What corrections need to be made to this wrestling sequence?

Ruling: Wrestler A should be awarded three points for a takedown. Although the intent of the wrestling sequence in the video review process is to account for all wrestling action that occurred, the sequence ends (as outlined in Rule 3.13.4a) when the match “should have been stopped by the referee.” In this situation, a locked hands violation would warrant stopping a match. Wrestler A, however, would not be penalized for locked hands since they were not aware they had established control. The referees should declare dead time at the point that the locked hands call would have been made, adjust the time clock accordingly and restart the match with Wrestler A on top. Wrestler A would not accumulate any riding time in this scenario as no advantage can be gained because of a technical violation or illegal hold.

(Rule 3.13.4a)

Question: From the neutral position, Wrestler A shoots a double-leg and Wrestler B sprawls; both wrestlers then scramble to the mat. Wrestler A, attempting to secure the takedown, moves off the legs and locks their hands around the waist of Wrestler B. The referee still does not award a takedown when ten seconds later, Wrestler B then locks their hands around the waist of Wrestler A and completes a roll-through, putting Wrestler A onto their back. The referee awards a takedown to Wrestler B and then counts three near fall points before the wrestlers go out of bounds.

The coach of Wrestler A throws the challenge brick, stating that a takedown should have been



awarded to Wrestler A. The referees review the sequence and confirm that Wrestler A did indeed score a takedown after locking their hands around the waist of Wrestler B. The second referee points out that when Wrestler A secured the takedown, they still had their hands locked (a technical violation).

What corrections need to be made to the sequence in question? Does Wrestler A get penalized for locked hands? Does dead time apply? What about the points scored by Wrestler B?

Ruling: Rule 3.13.4a alters the video review process for the 2023-24 wrestling season with the addition of a sequence, defined as the time from the alleged error, as stated by the challenging coach, until the match was stopped (or should have been stopped) by the referee. There are several issues to address in this scenario, all of which must be accounted for in the video review process.

- Wrestler A would be awarded three points for the takedown – this is confirmed during the video review.
- Wrestler A would not be penalized for locked hands, however, since Wrestler A never knew they were in control (the referee did not initially award the takedown). Note also that Wrestler A would not accumulate any riding time as no advantage can be gained because of a technical violation or illegal hold.
- Because Wrestler B scored during the wrestling sequence, Wrestler B would be awarded two points for a reversal and three near fall points (the initial takedown awarded would be changed to a reversal as on review, Wrestler A had control).

Although a locked hands call would ordinarily require a match to be stopped (sans imminent scoring), keep in mind that in this scenario, Wrestler A is not being penalized for locked hands. As a result, all wrestling action that took place can and needs to be accounted for in the wrestling sequence.

(Rule 3.13.4a, 3.13.4b)

Stalling By Ankle Ride

Question: Wrestler A is in control and after breaking their opponent to the mat applies a bent leg turk. To counter the turk, Wrestler B begins to crawl forward when Wrestler A reaches back and grabs the ankle of the turked leg. Is the referee required to immediately start a five-second count?

Ruling: No. Mirroring the interpretation for the bow and arrow (Case Book A.R. 5-3), if the offensive wrestler (Wrestler A) attempts to put their opponent in a near fall situation (defined as on their back or in a near fall criterion), the five-second count should not be initiated. An attempt is defined as a position where, in the sole judgment of the referee, the offensive wrestler is actively progressing and/or advancing toward a near fall situation.

The referee should, without coaching, utilize appropriate verbal commands (i.e., “improve”) to ensure that the offensive wrestler is improving their position. If, however, the referee determines the offensive wrestler is no longer actively progressing and/or advancing toward a near fall situation, the five-second count shall immediately be initiated.

(Rule 5.7.13)

One-Pound Weight Allowance



Question: Team A is competing in a dual meet on Friday evening but is also planning on sending several of their wrestlers not competing in the dual to an open tournament on the following day (Saturday). Both events appear on Team A's wrestling schedule. Are the wrestlers competing in the open Team A is attending eligible for the one-pound weight allowance on Saturday?

Ruling: No. The spirit and intent of the rule for the one-pound allowance is to provide relief for wrestlers that are competing on consecutive days. Since none of the wrestlers competing in the event on Saturday are competing in the dual meet on Friday, Team A would not be eligible to trigger the one-pound allowance for all those competing in the open tournament.

Follow Up Question: Continuing with the scenario, if three of Team A's wrestlers competing in the Friday evening dual were also going to compete in Saturday's open tournament, would Team A trigger the one-pound allowance for the event?

Ruling: Rule 9.3.2 in the Wrestling Rules Book states, “In order for the 1-pound weight allowance to be utilized, all back-to-back competitions must be an official team date of competition as per NCAA bylaws.” An official team date of competition requires a minimum of 7 wrestlers competing for Division I institutions and a minimum of 6 wrestlers competing for Divisions II and III.

Therefore, for the one-pound weight allowance to be granted, a minimum of 7 wrestlers (DI) or 6 wrestlers (DII & DIII) that competed in Friday's dual meet must also be registered to compete in Saturday's tournament. If a team fails to register the minimum threshold of (eligible) wrestlers for the second day event, the one-pound weight allowance shall not be granted.

(Rule 9.3.2)