

University Interscholastic League

State Executive Committee

Case No. 18-0814-02

CONSIDERATION OF PENALTIES

**August 14, 2018  
Pflugerville, TX**

---

On the above date, the University Interscholastic League (UIL) State Executive Committee (SEC) held a hearing to consider penalties for violations of Section 27(a)(2), individual student suspensions. Appellant was represented by his mother and father. The following members of the SEC were present and participated in the decision of this case: Mike Motheral, Chair, James Colbert, Johanna Denson, Amy Jacobs and Marcus Nelson.

**Background and Facts**

While attending School A, Appellant was involved in a fight with a student from School B during a basketball game in the previous school year. Representatives from School A and School B were required to attend an SEC hearing. After hearing the case, the SEC issued the following penalties and conditions:

Appellant – suspended from all UIL activities pending appearance before the SEC;  
Coach from School A – public reprimand and two-year probation;  
Coach from School B – public reprimand and two-year probation;  
School A and School B’s Boys Basketball Programs – public reprimand and two-year probation.

Appellant transferred to School C near the end of the previous school year.

**State Executive Committee Discussion**

Appellant was allowed to present facts relevant to the case and answer questions from the SEC. Among other things, SEC members inquired about what UIL activities Appellant participated in after the suspension, when he transferred schools and how he would handle similar situations in the future. Appellant’s father stated that they were unaware that the suspension was to extend beyond the basketball season. Therefore, Appellant competed in track for School A before transferring to School C. Appellant’s father then contended that Appellant did not hit the other student. A member of the SEC explained that they were not going to retry the original case and asked Appellant what was his biggest regret pertaining to the fight. Appellant explained that he was arrogant while attending School A, but has since walked away from similar situations. Appellant’s mother affirmed that Appellant had never responded aggressively towards another student before and should not have responded aggressively during the basketball game. Appellant’s father claimed that he has been more involved with Appellant since the

incident, which has led to an improvement. Appellant concluded his testimony by claiming he is no longer an arrogant person.

**Decision**

After hearing the argument and evidence presented by the Appellants, the SEC unanimously voted to lift the individual student suspension and impose a suspension for the first competitive football game, the first two competitive basketball games, and the first competitive track meet, and a two-year probation.