

Naruto Mythos TCG Tournament

Infraction Guidelines

In effect as of September 7th, 2026

This document will explain the Tournament Infraction Guidelines to apply to official Tournaments for the Naruto Mythos TCG. It explains how we expect judges to act when the rules have been incorrectly applied and how to fix the situation. Anyone attending an event should get familiar with this document, which includes players, judges, spectators, organizers and other parties involved.

Introduction	3
How to use this Guide	3
Contacting the Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play	3
Philosophy	3
Judges	4
Infraction	4
Game State	5
Evaluate the Game State	5
Rewind the game state	6
Correct the game state	6
Accept the game state	7
Stop the Game State	8
Penalty	8
Warning	9
Game Loss	9
Tournament Round Loss	10
Disqualification	10
Time Extension	11
Time extensions with an overall round time	11
Time extensions in Chess Clock mode	12
Escalate and de-escalate penalties	12
Repeated Infraction	12
Age and Experience	13
Delivering the Penalty	13
Appeal Process	13
Discussing penalties	14
Reporting Penalties	14
Post-Event Disciplinary Action	15
Infractions	15
Severity	15
Game-Play Error	16
Game-Play Error: Minor	16

Game-Play Error: Major	17
Drawing Extra Cards Error	17
Drawing Extra Cards Error: Minor	17
Drawing Extra Card Error: Major	19
Deck Error	19
Deck Error: Minor	20
Deck Error: Major	20
Deck Error: Strict	21
Marked Cards Error	22
Marked Cards Error: Minor	22
Marked Cards Error: Major	23
Marked Cards Error: Important	24
Pace of Play Error	24
Pace of Play Error: Minor	24
Tardiness Error	25
Tardiness Error: Minor	26
Tardiness Error: Major	26
Tardiness Error: Important	26
Tournament Error	27
Tournament Error: Minor	27
Tournament Error: Major	27
Tournament Error: Important	27
Unsporting Conduct	28
Unsporting Conduct: Minor	29
Unsporting Conduct: Major	30
Unsporting Conduct: Important	30
Unsporting Conduct: Strict	30
Unsporting Conduct: Cheating	31

Introduction

Welcome to the competitive world of Naruto Mythos TCG! We would like our events to be fun, fast and fair for everyone. To achieve this, we need to ensure all our tournament rules and regulations are followed accordingly. Be it intentional or not, errors and infractions can happen during a tournament, and it is everyone's responsibility to protect the integrity of the games disputed and the tournament as a whole.

Casual events are designed as the first steps into the world of Naruto Mythos TCG events, and should provide an enjoyable atmosphere while also providing a learning experience with the game and tournament rules. Infractions should still be enforced, so players know what to expect when stepping into more competitive tournaments, and players should also be properly educated so they learn to not repeat the same mistakes.

The more competitive the event, the more we expect players to come prepared, not only on the strategy they play, but also on their awareness of the game and tournament rules. If a player repeats the same mistake multiple times during an event, the associated infraction may be escalated or "upgraded".

How to use this Guide

This document doesn't exist with the goal to penalize players during our tournaments. Instead, it is a guide to react to the infractions that naturally happen. Many players attend a tournament during their spare time in order to relax or have fun, and are likely to forget a rule when trying to reach a path to victory. We need to be prepared to handle those issues in a fair and consistent way between events, and these guidelines were designed to provide you with the required information to maintain the integrity of the game and event.

As we cannot list every infraction that can occur, we will instead explain the philosophy, with examples and suggestions, to help you make a tournament successful.

Contacting the Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play

This document will mention multiple times that individuals may contact the Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play for various reasons. If you need to do so: please send an email to narutomythostcg@breakflip.com.

Philosophy

We would like every tournament to be fun and fair, so every community may find their enjoyment through the game and the interactions with the playing community. The goal is to decide winners through fair gameplay. If an honest mistake derails a game in progress, judges should do their best to let the game continue and determine a winner through gameplay only. A Judge will only stop a game when every other solution to maintain a game has failed. However, should a player try to win by an interpretation of the tournament rules instead of pure gameplay, that practice is called "rule-sharking" and creates a detrimental experience for the other attendees, as such it shall be addressed quickly with the appropriate Unsporting Conduct infraction.

Judges

Judges, and Tournament Organizers acting as Judges, are staff at Naruto Mythos TCG events. They use our rules and resources to act neutral when they intervene towards players. They are called “Judge” instead of “Referee” because they are expected to listen to all players involved when intervening at a table, before they take a decision. Using their expertise as judges and also players, they determine infractions and how to fix their impact.

Because of a Judge’s role in a tournament, it is highly recommended that they stay away from situations with a relative involved and leave the situation to another Judge. When that cannot be an option, the Judge is expected to stay neutral regardless of any relationship with a competitor.

Judges are expected to provide a fun, fast and fair experience for players. When an issue happens, they should fully investigate the issue before making a decision, and they should provide a clear explanation of the situation and its consequences. Players may be awarded penalties as a consequence: penalties are a tool to help understand the game and tournament rules, to dissuade repetition of the infraction and to mitigate any advantage gained.

Every player, spectator, parent, or other staff are expected to treat Judges with respect when engaging with them about questions, rulings or appeals. Failure to display respect to Judges may result in disciplinary action.

Anyone who passed the [Judge Rulings Test](#) isn’t automatically considered a Judge for an event. If you passed the Judge test, but attend a tournament as a player, then you are expected to display an exemplary attitude in respecting the game and tournament rules, including respecting the authority of the ones acting as Judges for the tournament, even if you disagree with their interpretation of the rules. Using your Judge test achievement to try to get preferential treatment as a player may result in disciplinary action and the Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play may revoke you from the Judge Program as a consequence.

We recommend Judges to pass the Judge tests available before offering their help at an event. The current tests available are the following:

- The [Judge Rulings Test](#) will verify that you know how to apply the official Game Rules resources properly to answer questions from players. You need to succeed this test in order to join the Naruto Mythos TCG Judge community.

More tests may come in the future to challenge the Judges' understanding of the rules.

Every question or appeal to a Judge’s call must take place at the tournament it happens, and preferably during the call. Should a competitor request more information, the Judge should find the time to accommodate this request in a way that doesn’t impact the flow of the tournament.

Infraction

We call “Infraction” any error made related to the game or tournament rules.

Most infractions are considered to be accidents, rather than deliberate actions. Infractions include things like game play errors (incorrectly apply a card's effect), tournament errors (forget to provide the result of a Tournament Round), and so on.

When a Judge investigates a situation, they should consider what recommended infraction from this guide matches the current situation and deduce the right course of action accordingly. As every infraction contains a general description and some examples matching the description, a Judge may find a situation that fits only the general description but none of the examples, or vice-versa a situation fits an example but the impact on game state strongly differs from the associated general description - the Judge is then advised to use their best judgement to consider a deviation from the recommended infraction and penalty.

While we try to provide enough examples of recommended starting penalties, this document is called a Guideline because the Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play trusts judges to work towards the best solution for each infraction based on the effect on the game state and their own experience as regular players.

Game State

When an infraction occurs on a game in progress, it is important to consider the error's consequences on the game state, as it helps to find the right base infraction and the suitable correction to the game state.

The term Game State encompasses all elements of the game: cards in play, hand, discard, chakra and mission points, etc. This means that, when evaluating an infraction, a Judge must consider how the infraction affects every aspect of what is on board, in competitors' hands and the potential actions that the competitors could have taken as a result.

Both players are responsible for maintaining a correct Game State, using clear communication and verifying that the effects of each player are applied correctly. A player is also responsible to ensure that their opponent doesn't make any mistake.

Evaluate the Game State

A Judge should evaluate first what error happened, what is the current damage to the game state, and how it can be corrected. Only with these information, the Judge may decide the infraction and penalty as well.

- Every person involved should explain the situation and answer truthfully to the Judge.
 - The Judge may draw from their personal experience as a Judge and player to complete the understanding of the game state when players don't agree on a given fact or if a given player fails to remember what happened.
- Based on the explanations and the current game state, the judge will determine if an infraction has occurred.
 - Certain penalties require approval. When that happens, the Judge should explain to the players that confirmation is required and that they should wait. The Judge will then discuss with the Head Judge or the appropriate staff member.

- In general, if a Judge must seek confirmation, or if a Judge has a doubt and wants to get confirmation from another staff member (even for a minor situation), the Judge should always seek confirmation before delivering the decision. A Judge should never announce what they *believe* is the correct infraction or penalty and get it approved afterwards.

Some investigations may require that the Judge discuss with only one player, separated from the other. The Judge should make sure that the other player isn't left alone. The most severe penalties might require to be explained in private as well, if the Judge evaluates that the penalty isn't appropriate for public knowledge.

After reviewing the game state, the Judge may decide one of the following actions. They are listed by priority.

Rewind the game state

A rewind means that the last game actions should be cancelled until we reach the last moment before the incorrect action happened.

Examples:

- Player A reveals a hidden *Nine-Tailed Fox (Breaking the Cage)* and only pays 3 Chakra cost instead of 5 because Player A only has 3 Chakra left. Player A uses its Ambush effect to defeat Player B's *Naruto Uzumaki ("Believe it!")*. Player B now plays *Ino Yamanaka (Genin of Team 10)*. Either player realizes that Player A didn't pay the Chakra cost correctly. The Judge should revert Player B's *Ino Yamanaka* being played and Player A's *Nine-Tailed Fox* being played and its Ambush effect, and the Chakra available by both players should be reverted accordingly. It is now Player A's turn to play.

Some cards may return back to the hand while they have been revealed. Some cards may need to return to the deck: if said cards were from a part of the deck that was random, then the cards should be shuffled to that part ; if said cards were from a part of the deck that has already been seen, then the cards should be placed back to that part.

Examples:

- Player A upgrades a *Kiba Inuzuka* character into *Kiba Inuzuka (All-Fours Jutsu)*, looks at all 3 cards and places the 3 cards back on top of the deck. Player A passes and then the Mission Evaluation Phase is played. When starting the next round, Player A drew 3 cards instead of 2: Player A has already seen the 3rd card, so the extra card should be placed on top of the deck without shuffling it.

Correct the game state

Sometimes too many random actions have happened after the error, and if we rewind the game state, the player might do the same random actions again with a different outcome, or the player might refuse to do the action again due to fearing a worse random outcome. The judge could also evaluate that too many actions have happened, as such, the rewind may

strongly affect the flow of the game. In this case, it is better to correct the current game state, see what card or game element isn't at its place, and move that where it should go.

Examples:

- Player A plays *Akamaru (Ninja Hound)* and forgets to pay 1 Chakra. Later, Player A upgrades a *Kiba Inuzuka* character into *Kiba Inuzuka (All-Fours Jutsu)*, looks at all 3 cards and places the 3 cards back on top of the deck. Even though Player A had enough Chakra for both actions, a rewind of the situation would change the outcome of the correct *Kiba Inuzuka*'s Upgrade effect. It is better to have Player A pay 1 Chakra to correct the game state.
- Player A draws 3 cards instead of 2 at the start of the round. Player A then upgrades a *Kiba Inuzuka* character into *Kiba Inuzuka (All-Fours Jutsu)*, looks at all 3 cards and places the 3 cards back on top of the deck. The Judge should evaluate the most likely candidate as being the extra drawn card and shuffle it back to the randomized part of the deck, without reverting the *Kiba Inuzuka* upgrade action.
 - See the **Drawing Extra Card Error** section for more details on how to correct the situation.
- During round 3, Player B realizes that Player A miscounted and should have one Mission Point less. The Judge investigates and realizes that Player A did a calculation mistake during the Round 1 Mission Evaluation Phase. The Judge decides to correct the game state and set the Mission Points to their correct value.

Accept the game state

The Judge may evaluate that the Game State is too difficult to rewind or correct, be it because the players can't describe properly what happened or too much time has passed between the error and the current Game State. However, the Judge doesn't see a significant advantage for the player at fault. The Judge may then conclude that the current Game State is accepted and the game continues.

Examples:

- Both players misread a card's effect and resolve it incorrectly. The error is caught 2 game rounds later when one of the players plays another copy of the same card. During the investigation, the Judge concludes that both players genuinely misunderstood the effect, but the Judge cannot find any satisfying correction to the game state. Both players should receive a Warning for failure to maintain a correct Game State, and the game should continue.
- Both players forgot to keep track of Mission Points and there is a disagreement about Mission Points totals. The Judge listens to both players and, combined with the current visible clues on the Game State, decides that one player's story is more likely and decides that it is the accepted Game State. No rewind or correction should happen beyond that, and players should be warned for failure to keep track of the Game State.
- A player forgets to resolve a Mandatory effect, and neither player notices until a few game rounds later. After investigating, the Judge concludes that it was an accident, however neither player can clearly recall what happened after the error. Both players should receive a Warning because both players are responsible to maintain a correct Game State, and the game should continue.

Stop the Game State

Due to the nature of Naruto Mythos TCG, most game states can be saved and games can continue after a Judge intervention. However, there might be cases where a game state can neither be rewind or corrected, and the player at fault got too much benefit from the mistake. In that case, the game must be stopped.

If both players share fault in a single situation leading to a Game State that must be stopped, the Judge should determine who most actively(*) contributed to the fault, and should award that player a Game Loss, while the other player should get a Warning.

In some extremely rare cases, both players will get a Game Loss, either because the player who should get a Warning gets a Penalty escalation, or because both players actively(*) broke the Game State equally. See the description of the Game Loss penalty below for more details on how to apply the penalty.

(*) *Actively* assumes that a player's deliberate action contributed to the damage to the Game State. By failing to keep track of a correct game state, the player did not actively contribute to the damage.

As a reminder, getting to know about extra private knowledge isn't considered "too much benefit". We are talking about an actual game-play advantage that offers a decisive edge to win the current game.

Penalty

A Judge is, first and foremost, a staff member who understands the game rules, the tournament rules, and helps players better understand them. As such, the goal of the Judge isn't to award penalties to players, it is to answer questions and help games to go back on track. Many situations might not even be an infraction, and as such grant no penalties! Then, there are infractions that happen during the tournament, and the penalty is the consequence of an infraction.

When the infraction has been identified, the judge will ask the person if they have received any other penalties for the same infraction during the tournament.

- Players are expected to answer this question honestly. Lying to a tournament official is an Unsporting Conduct infraction.
- This information helps the judge determine if a penalty might need to be escalated (see Escalate and de-escalate penalties).
- In case of a repeated infraction, the Judge will consult with the Head Judge to see if it should be escalated.
- Otherwise, the Judge should educate the player regarding the infraction.

We will now cover the different penalties that Judges might give during a tournament. The Judges, including the Head Judge, may not create other penalties. For example, they may not adjust the victory conditions as a penalty.

Warning

A Warning is the most common penalty at tournaments. It is given to a person who commits a minor infraction that doesn't cause a significant impact on the tournament.

- A Warning means that the judge believes that the infraction committed is minor and unintentional (except in some case of Unsporting Conduct).
- While a Warning itself does not have a large impact on a person or a tournament, it is a training tool for Players and allows the tournament staff to follow a potential problem if repeated.
- Repeated Warnings for the same issue can be escalated.
- Warnings must be tracked in a written form by the tournament staff. That tracking will be visible by the tournament staff only.
- The player receiving the Warning should be educated about the mistake, and the consequences if the player repeats the infraction again.

The Judge should make sure to evaluate the experience level of the player receiving the Warning. While a more established player will understand what a Warning entails, a more beginner player might interpret a Warning in a more dramatic fashion and might not come back anymore by fear that the Warning will carry over for their future tournaments.

Game Loss

The Game Loss penalty is generally used when a mistake has a severe impact on the game state currently in progress, to the point that the game cannot continue and must be stopped. It is also used for major situations happening outside the game that would have had a comparable impact if happening during a game.

Due to the severity of the penalty, the Judge must seek approval from the Head Judge before they announce an infraction that comes with a Game Loss penalty.

When a Game Loss happens, the current game in progress is recorded as a loss for the player receiving the penalty. If the issue happens between two games or two Tournament Rounds, then the next game to be played will apply the Game Loss.

If multiple players contributed to a situation that requires a Game Loss, the Judge should evaluate the player more at fault and award the Game Loss to that player, while the other player will get a Warning. However, there may be extremely rare cases where two players get a Game Loss at the same time. If that were to happen, then both players would lose that game.

- During a Best-of-1 Tournament Round, or during the Game 3 of a Best-of-3 Tournament Round, both players should be recorded as losing the Tournament Round.
- During a Best-of-3 Tournament Round, if it happens during Game 1 or Game 2, then one game should receive one Game Loss and the next game should receive the other Game Loss. Should a 3rd game still be played to determine a winner, players decide who starts using a randomizer.

Because the penalty ends the game in progress, it is important to educate the player on what went wrong and why the game cannot continue, so the player avoids the same mistake during future games and tournaments.

Tournament Round Loss

During a Best-of-1 Tournament Round, Game Loss and Tournament Round Loss are the same penalty. As such, in a Best-of-1 setting, an escalation from a Game Loss should not be a Tournament Round Loss but a Disqualification instead.

During a Best-of-3 Tournament Round, however, some errors might be strong enough that the opponent would rather not play the current Best-of-3 anymore. A repeated infraction may be escalated from a Game Loss to a Tournament Round Loss in Best-of-3. In that case, the player receiving the Tournament Round Loss loses the current round, regardless of the current count of games played. If this happens between Tournament Rounds, the next Tournament Round to be played should be recorded as a loss, and the next opponent should know that they win the Tournament Round as a consequence.

Only the Head Judge may approve a Tournament Round Loss.

Disqualification

A Disqualification is the most serious penalty that can be issued at a tournament. It means that a player's actions (whether with the intent or unaware of breaking a rule) have such a negative impact on the integrity or the operation of the entire event that the player cannot be allowed at the tournament anymore.

Any player subject to Disqualification is removed from the tournament and cannot receive any Prizes anymore. Based on the circumstances, it might be required to escort the competitor outside the tournament site and not allow the player inside until the end of the event.

Even if a player decides to abandon the tournament (or "drop") or doesn't compete anymore, the player should still receive the penalties that they won, thus the Disqualification procedure should still apply. A staff member must never suggest abandoning a tournament in order to avoid a disqualification, not only because it is incorrect, but also because it undermines the responsibilities of the staff team to educate players and help improve the tournament environment over time.

Only the Head Judge can decide this penalty.

Because a Disqualification is the most severe penalty, the Head Judge should run an investigation and leave a chance for the player and other parties involved to explain their point of view, before concluding if the situation most likely matches a Strict or Unsportsmanlike Conduct behaviour. While it may be impossible to discover the truth, the Head Judge's experience as both Judge and player should be used to evaluate the situation properly and the most likely reconstitution of the facts. However, sometimes that investigation is

unnecessary: for example, if players reach an agreement to commit an Unsporting Conduct in front of the Head Judge, then the Head Judge doesn't need any other proof.

A player may be disqualified even if they were not aware that a given behaviour breaks the rule and is considered a Strict or Cheating behaviour, as long as the conclusion from the Head Judge is that the player likely intended to do the action at fault.

A Disqualification is not a Suspension. A Disqualified player is not allowed in the current tournament anymore, however they are still allowed to play other events in the future. Only a suspension can prevent a player from playing, and only Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play can decide that.

If a player is disqualified, that player should provide a written statement including:

- their full name;
- the email and any identifier used on the tournament platform used for the event;
- their physical address (the one used to receive letters);
- their version of the story that happened.

The player may provide this statement on-site. If the player wouldn't like to, or if the situation is urgent enough that the staff must evacuate the player out of the tournament area, the player may then contact Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play to provide the same statement, also explaining at what event the disqualification took place.

The Head Judge involved in the process should provide a written statement including:

- the full name of the Head Judge;
- their email address;
- their physical address;
- the event where the Disqualification happened;
- their version of the story and how they reach the conclusion for their penalty.

If any other individual contributed to the disqualification process, the Head Judge should invite those same individuals to provide the same information. The Head Judge will then collect all those statements and send them to Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play.

All Disqualification reports must be submitted during the 7 days after the disqualification happened. Any report submitted after those 7 days might be disregarded.

Time Extension

We will cover the topic of time extensions when there is an overall round time and when Chess Clock mode is used.

Time extensions with an overall round time

Judges should note the current time when arriving at a table. After the call is over, the judge will look at the time spent by the call and will give back as many minutes as time has passed during the call.

- Only the time spent during the overall time is taken into consideration. If a Judge call starts 3 minutes before the end of the Tournament Round, and the call lasts 5 minutes, then the time extension should be 3 minutes instead of 5.
- During a Tournament Round, a single table could receive multiple time extensions during the same round: the time extensions should be grouped together.

Time extensions in Chess Clock mode

If the match uses Chess Clock mode, there are no time extensions. Instead, players should pause the Chess Clock, and the Chess Clock will resume at the end of the call.

Escalate and de-escalate penalties

Judges will encounter many situations and they might require a deviation from the recommended infractions listed in this document. To ensure a more consistent experience throughout the current tournament, any deviation should be discussed with the Head Judge. The Head Judge will then use their understanding of what each Infraction tries to achieve and decide if an escalation or de-escalation is justified.

The following are considerations to keep in mind when escalating or de-escalating a penalty.

Repeated Infraction

One purpose of penalties is to educate a player about a mistake and remind them to pay more attention in not repeating the same mistake again. Because a Warning has no other consequences than a reminder, some players might forget the education received alongside the penalty and repeat the mistake.

If a player repeats the same mistake multiple times during the course of an event, it is a valid reason to escalate. Most of the time, we don't recommend escalating at the first repetition of the infraction. However, some infractions require a fast escalation.

Examples:

- A player plays a character without paying its Chakra cost correctly. A Judge realizes that the player already failed to pay a Chakra cost correctly twice during the course of the tournament. It is acceptable for the Head Judge to consider an escalation.
- A player plays a character without paying its Chakra cost correctly. A Judge realizes that the player made two other Game-Play errors previously: once, the player forgot to draw a card by accident ; once, the player forgot to take the Edge when being the first player to pass. Even though all three are Game-Play Errors, they are not the same error, and a Head Judge should not consider an escalation. If the Head Judge has reasons to believe that all three errors were intentional, the Head Judge should investigate an Unsporting Conduct instead.
- A player cuts a Judge during an intervention and wants to appeal to the Head Judge before the right timing. The Judge should award an Unsporting Conduct: Minor penalty. The player cuts the Judge again later during the intervention: it is acceptable for the Head Judge to consider an escalation.

Age and Experience

If an infraction is caused by accident, age and experience should not change what the infraction is. Inexperienced and younger players need, first and foremost, to better understand the tournament environment and limits, as such the Judge should take the time to properly educate the player and, if suited, provide advice on how to not repeat the same mistake again. The experience and age of the player should not turn an irreparable game state into a reparable one, and the opposite holds true: a player shouldn't have their game state evaluated more harshly due to "being experienced".

The age and experience of the player should be taken into consideration when a repeated infraction happens. A less experienced player, or a player that hasn't been properly educated at another store, needs to better understand the rules.

Delivering the Penalty

Through the previous steps, the Judge has determined the infraction, the solution to fix the game state, and the penalty.

The judge should explain, in that order

- what issue(s) happened;
- why it is an issue;
- what can be done to let the game continue (if applicable);
- what the penalty is;
- what the penalty means for the rest of the event;

The penalty should be the last information to explain, because it is more important that the players understand the issue so as not to repeat it again. A penalty alone is only perceived as an arbitrary punishment if it doesn't come with the explanation that leads to the penalty.

Appeal Process

After the Judge explains the infraction and penalty, the Judge should ask the players if they agree with the decision. A player may disagree with the decision that the judge offers. If that is the case, the player may ask for a Head Judge to review the decision. This is called an Appeal to the Head Judge, and it makes sure that the decision took every relevant detail into account.

- Players are not allowed to request an appeal until after a Judge has announced a decision.
- If the Judge delivering the decision is the Head Judge, the decision cannot be appealed.
- The decision that the Head Judge takes during the appeal is final and may not be appealed again, even if the tournament has multiple Head Judges.

If the players accept the decision, if they cannot appeal, or if the appeal is finished, the Judge's decision may then be applied.

Discussing penalties

A penalty that happens at that tournament belongs to that tournament alone. If a player wants to discuss the decision of the Judge, they are recommended to appeal to the Head Judge when the decision is delivered. The Head Judge will either help understand the penalty, or correct the decision.

If a player doesn't feel confident to use their right to appeal, the second best timing to discuss the decision is to meet the Head Judge later during the tournament, while the Head Judge isn't busy. If a player reaches the Head Judge later during the tournament, no correction could be made to the impacted game, however the Head Judge may bring additional context to help understand the penalty.

A player or spectator may not question any staff member about a penalty that happened to another player, unless of exceptional circumstances to the discretion of the Head Judge (for example: the player is asking for a penalty that their child got, and they would like to better understand the mistake).

Players are free to discuss hypothetical scenarios online. However, if a player exposes online a situation that happened at a tournament, Judges should not discuss the described situation. Penalties reported online may lack critical context that was key to the decision taken by the Judge. Judges should also not suffer online harassment for having taken a decision at a tournament - harassment of any kind is not tolerated and that includes online behaviour that can be connected to a Naruto Mythos TCG tournament.

If a player disagrees with a penalty that they received, did properly discuss with the Head Judge as described, and is still dissatisfied with the outcome, the last resort is to reach Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play.

Reporting Penalties

The Head Judge must send Disqualification reports to the Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play. When reporting so, the Head Judge should also specify the event in which the disqualification took place, for example with a link to the event's page if applicable.

The Head Judge may send the rest of the penalties as well. Appropriate reasons to send the rest of the penalties include, for example: if a player committed an Unsporting Conduct, if they feel that one player might have done an infraction on purpose or if they believe they had to handle a situation that isn't covered in the official documents. The penalty report should include: a clear identification of the tournament; the staff team; and for each penalty: the round, the player, the judge, the infraction, the penalty, and a complementary explanation about what happened.

Any Disqualification or Penalty report should be submitted during the 7 days after the event occurred. Any report submitted after that deadline might be disregarded.

Post-Event Disciplinary Action

If a player receives a penalty that calls into question the player's impact on the community, the Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play will evaluate the situation and may decide disciplinary actions after the event. If such disciplinary action is decided, the player will be notified using the contact information that they provided.

While we would like the Naruto Mythos TCG events to be for everyone, this means that actions and behaviours that threaten the inclusivity, enjoyment, integrity and safe progress of our events may lead to consequences for those responsible. The disciplinary action depends on the severity of the situation and its frequency. As a consequence, a player might be suspended, which means not being allowed to attend any Naruto Mythos TCG event for a given period of time. Anyone suspended may not attend a Naruto Mythos TCG event for any reason, be it as a player, staff or spectator.

Infractions

This section will now discuss the different infractions, the recommended corrections and the associated penalties.

The Naruto Mythos TCG Organized Play cannot create a list of all potential errors that can be expected during a tournament. Instead, this section is a set of guidelines. Judges will need to extrapolate based on the information listed below. Sometimes, a situation will match a given example but will not match the description of the damage caused to the game or tournament in progress, and Judges will need to select the right Infraction accordingly.

Severity

Every infraction has different severity levels based on the damage caused to the game state, the well-being of the event attendees or the integrity of the event.

The following Infraction categories will use some of the following Infraction levels as a base.

Infraction Level	Penalty Associated
Minor	Warning
Major	Game Loss
Important	Tournament Round Loss
Strict	Disqualification
Cheating	Disqualification

Game-Play Error

This category covers infractions when a player accidentally doesn't apply the game rules or card effects properly during a game.

Game-Play Error: Minor

Minor game-play errors may happen to the game by accident, however the Judge is able to find a resolution so the game could still continue. See the section Evaluate the Game State above for solutions to act on the game state.

Drawing Extra Cards are not Game-Play Errors but their own category, see below.

Examples:

- Both players forget to resolve a Mandatory effect. The Judge finds a way to let the game continue. Both players should receive a Warning because they both forgot about the effect.
- A player misreads an effect and incorrectly believes that a Continuous effect is optional, thus chooses to not apply it.
- A player tries to play a Character but doesn't have enough Chakra.
- A player accidentally changes the order of the cards in the Discard Pile, and the order can be sufficiently restored.
- A player accidentally changes a character from a Mission to another one without the use of a card effect.
- Players disagree on the limit between the characters belonging to Mission D and the characters belonging to Mission C.
- A player plays a character. After having dropped the card in the field, the player tries to retract the move without asking permission from the opponent.
- A player doesn't keep track of their Mission Points.
- A player accidentally reveals a Mission card.
- A player doesn't communicate their choices and actions clearly enough with their opponent.
- A player doesn't understand how to shuffle properly and ends up not shuffling the deck enough. On top of the penalty, the player should be educated on a proper shuffle and the Judge should make sure that the player shuffles enough.
- When a player must reveal a hidden card (for example from the top 3 cards of the deck), the player forgets to reveal the card. The Judge was able to confirm what card was selected and that it was a valid selection, so the card can now be revealed properly.
- While an opponent makes another Game-Play Error, the other player didn't pay enough attention and let the error happen. The Judge should evaluate if the player had the time to react, or if the error has been caught fast and the player couldn't have reacted faster.
- A player forgets to draw a card at the start of a round. If the card was supposed to come from a random part of the deck, the Judge will ensure that a card is drawn from the random part of the deck. If the card was supposed to come from a sorted part of the deck, the Judge will ensure in priority that the card is drawn from that sorted part of the deck.

- A player uses the same tokens for Chakra and Mission points, and this leads to a confused game state. As a reminder, those two tokens should be represented by elements that are easy to differentiate.
- A player uses Mission Points to represent Power Tokens on a character, leading to a confusion when counting Mission Points awarded during Mission Evaluation Phase.

Game-Play Error: Major

Many Game-Play Errors Major may have the same cause as a Game-Play Error: Minor, however the Judge couldn't find a resolution to save the game.

The Judge should check when players realized that a mistake happened. Waiting for a penalty to become "severe enough" is a Rulesharking attitude that is listed in the Unsportive Conduct category.

Examples:

- A player shuffles the hand or Discard pile into the Deck by accident, and the Judge cannot reconstruct the element that has been shuffled incorrectly.
- A player forgets to apply a mandatory effect and doesn't catch it until a few rounds later. Said effect would have cost the player to lose the game.
- Before the players record the winner of the game, a player takes all cards in play and places them back to the deckbox. If the Judge cannot understand if a player at the table had won the game in question and cannot reconstruct the board state, the player removing the cards in play should get the Game Loss.

Drawing Extra Cards Error

This category covers infractions when a player draws too many cards by accident.

Drawing an Extra Card is a very common Game-Play error. Due to the nature of the Naruto Mythos Game, it is easy to mitigate the impact and fix the situation. However, due to the potential advantage if the issue isn't caught, this infraction requires additional attention.

Drawing an Extra Card is different from forgetting to draw a card. While both are about drawing cards, when a player doesn't draw enough cards, this very rarely provides an advantage to the player who committed it, and the situation is very easy to fix. See GamePlay Error: Minor above.

Drawing Extra Cards Error: Minor

Most of the time, players draw an extra card by accident. Also most of the time, Judges are able to fix the game state and allow players to continue.

If a player draws too many cards, the Judge should investigate what were the extra cards. The Judge may use all tools at their disposal to determine the extra cards: ideally, the opponent confirms the cards that must be returned, however the Judge may use logical deduction as well.

If the Judge manages to identify exactly the cards that shouldn't have been drawn, the Judge selects them. If the Judge cannot identify exactly the extra cards, the Judge should choose random cards amongst those likely drawn during the incorrect action. If the Judge cannot identify exactly those cards, the Judge should choose random cards amongst the cards in hand. If the Judge has to choose random cards, the Judge should reveal said cards to both players.

This "extra card selection process" may have exceptions based on circumstances, see the examples below.

Once the extra cards have been either identified or randomly selected, they should return to the place they belong.

If the extra cards were previously known by one player, for example because an effect caused a player to look at cards in a given position of the deck, then the cards should come back to that known position. If the extra cards were not already known, it means they came from a part of the deck that was random, and they should be shuffled back to the part of the deck that is random. The Judge should separate the parts of the deck that are known and unknown, then place the cards back to the expected random part and shuffle it, finally replace the deck correctly.

The more difficult it is to retrieve the extra cards at fault, the more the Head Judge should consider upgrading the penalty during a repeated infraction. If a player already had a Drawing Extra Card Error infraction during the tournament, and the same player cannot help to retrieve the extra cards perfectly, it is acceptable for the Head Judge to consider an escalation to the penalty.

Examples:

- A player draws 3 cards instead of 2 at the start of a game round. However, the cards were placed from the deck to the field face-down before the player was about to see them: the Judge can easily identify the extra card and replace it on top of the deck without any shuffle.
- A player draws 3 cards instead of 2 at the start of a game round. However, the player has only seen 2 cards out of 3 because one of them is perfectly stuck behind another one. Because that card is still unknown to the player, the Judge may decide to select it as the unknown extra card and replace it on top of the deck without any shuffle.
- A player plays *Shikamaru Nara (Genin of Team 10)* and draws a card, but does not have the Edge.
- A player accidentally draws an extra card. The player later upgrades a *Sakura Haruno* character into *Sakura Haruno (The Leaf Medical Corps)* and uses the Main Effect with the Upgrade bonus. If the Judge concludes that the extra drawn card was not *Sakura Haruno (The Leaf Medical Corps)*, then the Judge should correct the game state without changing the outcome of the effect of *Sakura Haruno (The Leaf Medical Corps)*.
- A player accidentally draws an extra card. The player later upgrades a *Kiba Inuzuka* character into *Kiba Inuzuka (All Four Jutsu)* and uses the Upgrade effect. If the Judge concludes that the extra drawn card was not *Kiba Inuzuka (All Four Jutsu)*,

then the Judge should identify the extra card, place aside the cards consulted by the player due to the Upgrade effect, and shuffle the extra card with the rest of the deck.

- A player accidentally flips a few cards from the top of the deck.
- A player accidentally draws 6 cards during the setup phase and before deciding if the hand should be shuffled back to the deck.

Drawing Extra Card Error: Major

While judges should use their best judgement to identify the cards incorrectly drawn and place them back to the position they belong, there are circumstances where the consequences cannot be mitigated anymore.

The Judge should check when players realized that a mistake happened. Waiting for a penalty to become “severe enough” is a Rulesharking attitude that is listed in the Unsportive Conduct category.

Examples:

- Players notice that one of them has one card too many. The Judge investigates that the extra card was drawn during Game Round 1 or during Setup, however the current game round is Game Round 4. The player thus got a resource for the complete duration of the game and there are no rounds left to draw more cards.
- A player accidentally draws 4 or more cards from the deck and shuffles them to the hand, to the point that the hand has 50% or more cards that should belong to the deck. The Judge cannot identify enough correct targets and would need to shuffle too many cards randomly back to the deck, without being able to ensure that enough cards from the original hand were still there.

Deck Error

This category covers infractions with the deck or the associated decklist.

Errors caught during the registration process of the tournament may be corrected immediately and the Head Judge may decide to not assign any penalty. The tournament staff may offer a courtesy deck check service if they expect multiple players that are unfamiliar with decklists.

If a Judge verifies a player's deck, the Judge should pay attention to the presence of extra cards inside the deckbox. If the Judge concludes that the cards are irrelevant to the deck (for example, they are leftovers from an opened pack, or the participation card), the Judge may advise that the cards are stored in a different container. If the extra cards are relevant for the deck's strategy or could be considered as the extension of the deck, the Judge should take those relevant cards into account for the Infraction, from a Deck Error: Major up to Unsporting Conduct: Cheating.

Deck Error: Minor

Minor Deck errors are considered to not provide any potential advantage to a competitor and are more related to the Player not paying enough attention with deck registration procedures.

Examples:

- A player writes “Shizune 2nd Set” on a paper decklist without specifying the card number. However, the set Shinobi Shiren only has 1 Shizune card, so the card can be identified. It is acceptable to correct the decklist.
- A player specifies a certain card on the decklist, but the player is actually playing an alternative version of the same card. It is acceptable to correct the decklist.
- A player used a hand-made tool to generate the decklist and the tool uses internal code cards that the Judge cannot identify the cards without using said tool. The Judge should have the player demonstrate that the decklist matches the current deck, then the player should provide a proper decklist.
- A player accidentally lists 2 copies of the same Mission card on the decklist instead of 1. The deck indeed uses 3 different Mission cards and the Judge doesn’t believe that the player used a 2nd copy of that Mission card.
- A player was not aware that a card in the deck was a counterfeit. The player should be allowed to replace the card with a genuine copy instead - if that cannot happen, see the Deck Error: Major category instead.

Deck Error: Major

Some Deck errors may provide a competitive advantage if left uncaught, even if the player didn’t intend to get an advantage. As a reminder, if a player intends to gain an advantage by failing to follow the rules, this becomes an Unsporting Conduct infraction.

If there is a discrepancy between the physical deck and the decklist, the Head Judge should identify which element is correct and use it to correct the other one.

If a player’s deck has less than 30 cards left following a correction, but the player may provide strategically worse cards to complete the deck in a way that doesn’t improve the deck, the Head Judge may allow that replacement and let the player continue the tournament. The Head Judge may re-evaluate the decision if the added cards revealed to provide a new, strategic advantage, more important than the cards that went missing, and requalify the situation as an Unsporting Conduct: Cheating.

Because the player gets a Game Loss, in Best-of-1 setting they get the rest of the round to correct the deck correctly. In Best-of-3, the player loses a game but still has a round to play: if they take more than 10 minutes to fix their deck issue, the Head Judge should consider a Tardiness Error: Important in addition to the Deck Error penalty. If a competitor has not fixed the deck and has not presented the deck to the Head Judge after 2 rounds, the penalty should be escalated to a Deck Error: Strict.

Examples:

- A player's decklist doesn't contain at least 30 cards, but the deck contains at least 30 cards. Upon investigation, two *Naruto Uzumaki (Genin of the Leaf Village)* are missing in a decklist that includes many interactions with *Naruto Uzumaki* cards. The Head Judge may decide that the player intended to play with these cards, and the decklist should be updated.
- A card is found on the floor during a game in progress. Upon investigation, the Judge could not find at what point the card arrived on the floor, and the only conclusion left is that the card was on the floor before starting the game. It means that one player started the game with an incomplete deck.
- A player's deck doesn't contain at least 30 cards, but the decklist contains at least 30 cards. Upon investigation, two *Naruto Uzumaki (Genin of the Leaf Village)* are missing in the deck but were in the decklist, and likely because they were lost during lunch. The player may search for the missing copies.
- A player's deck and decklist contains 3 copies of *Naruto Uzumaki (Genin of the Leaf Village)*. The deck and decklist should be corrected and the 3rd copy should be removed. If the deck now has less than 30 cards, see the suggested correction above.
- A player plays 2 copies of *Jiraiya (Pervy Sage)* and 2 copies of *Jiraiya (Battle of the Sannin)*. After investigation, the Judge concludes that the player genuinely misunderstood that they both were the same card. The deck and decklist should be corrected to have only 2 copies left amongst those *Jiraiya* cards.
- A player's deck and decklist both have less than 30 cards. Upon investigation, the player intended to play two copies of *Naruto Uzumaki (Genin of the Leaf Village)* but couldn't get them on time before the end of registration. The player proposes two copies of *Neji Hyuga (Against Destiny)*, with comparable attributes but the deck offers minimal to no interaction with that card. The Head Judge may consider it a suitable replacement so the player can still continue the tournament, based on the player's current score.
- A player's decklist contains two *Naruto Uzumaki (Genin of the Leaf Village)* and one *Naruto Uzumaki (Substitution Jutsu)*, but the player's deck contains one *Naruto Uzumaki (Genin of the Leaf Village)* and two *Naruto Uzumaki (Substitution Jutsu)*. The Head Judge should decide if the deck or the decklist represents what the player wanted to play and correct the other one.
- A player's decklist contains two "4/130" cards but the deck contains two "4/140" instead. Upon investigation, the player's deck doesn't interact with *Tsunade* characters but does interact with *Jiraiya* characters, thus the Head Judge concludes that the decklist has a mistake and should be corrected.

Deck Error: Strict

Deck Error: Strict is appropriate if a competitor's deck or decklist cannot be corrected and the player thus cannot continue to play.

Examples:

- A player's deck list or deck does not contain at least 30 cards. Upon investigation, two *Naruto Uzumaki (Genin of the Leaf Village)* are missing in a deck that includes many interactions with *Naruto Uzumaki* characters. The player shows two copies of

Neji Hyuga (Against Destiny), with comparable attributes, and proposes them as alternatives; however the deck offers several interactions with that character as well. The Head Judge may consider it an inappropriate replacement. If the player cannot present a more suited alternative in a short enough time, the player cannot compete due to an incomplete deck.

- A player has been asked to fix their deck, however two Tournament Rounds have finished and the player didn't return to the Head Judge to present that they have fixed their deck. Because this takes too long, the player cannot participate in the tournament anymore. Every missed Tournament Round should receive the appropriate Tardiness Error and record the player as losing said Tournament Round.

Marked Cards Error

This category covers infraction involving cards and/or their sleeves when they receive marks, and the Judge team believes that those cards and sleeves were unintentionally marked.

If a player reports a Marked Cards error to the Judge team before the round 1 is paired, the Head Judge may decide to fix the deck without applying any penalty, because the event hasn't started and thus there hasn't been any opportunity yet to take advantage of the mark.

If a card can be identified without looking at its front, the card is considered marked. A mark can be anything: dirt that can be touched, a crease or tear, a texture difference, a damaged corner, a dimension difference between two sleeves, a colour difference between two sleeves, a combination of multiple different marks, etc. If the deck uses transparent or translucent sleeves as part of the sleeving process, then both the sleeve and its content should be evaluated for marks.

Cards are meant to be played and also shuffled. These actions will inevitably lead to marks on the cards, the sleeves wrapping the cards, or both. Minor marks are harder to spot unless someone takes an excessive time looking at the deck to find them, and are considered too unlikely to provide an advantage; heavier marks may be spotted even unconsciously and must be dealt with carefully. No matter the severity of the mark, players are expected to take care of their belongings and have a deck without marks as much as possible.

While reading this infraction, the concept of "pattern" will be listed multiple times. We say that cards follow a pattern when a given group of cards have a role or characteristic in common, and when you look at one of the cards without watching the front side, you can at least deduce that characteristic. A group of cards being "good cards" don't constitute a pattern: it is the player's responsibility to choose the best cards for their strategy.

Marked Cards Error: Minor

This infraction is appropriate when the marks on a player's deck cannot be used to get a competitive advantage.

The player must replace the marked sleeves or cards appropriately. In certain circumstances, the whole deck might need to have the sleeves changed.

If caught during a game in progress, it is appropriate for a judge to allow a player to change the sleeves after the current game. If the player agrees, the Judge may help to change sleeves during a complete resleeve process.

Examples:

- A player has 2 random sleeves in the deck with minor tears.
- A sleeve suffered a minor wear due to shuffling. Because the minor wear might become a bigger mark later, the sleeve must be replaced.
- A player has 3 cards with a visible mark in the corner. However, the 3 cards have nothing in common.
- A player has used the same deck with the same sleeves at multiple tournaments or while training at home. As a consequence, all sleeves suffer various marks that all seem minor enough. The deck should get a full resleeve.
- A player has used two sets of sleeves with a very close color, but they are in fact different when exposed to light. Cards using a given sleeve model bear no pattern. The player should change sleeves so that the whole deck uses only 1 sleeve type.
- A player used two layers of sleeves for their deck. The oversleeve is transparent, however multiple oversleeves have a visible mark on the edge. The marked cards bear no pattern, so the marked oversleeves should be changed.

Marked Cards Error: Major

This infraction is appropriate when the player's cards and sleeves have a significant mark by accident, and a judge notices a partial pattern. This means that, while the pattern isn't on all the marked cards, and the situation is considered unintentional, it is still indicative enough and could be taken advantage of.

- A player has 8 cards with noticeable marks on the sleeves' edges. The marked cards are 5 *Naruto Uzumaki* cards and 3 other characters. The Judge determines that the markings were accidentally caused by the way the player shuffles the cards at the beginning of the game.
- A player has 12 bended cards. Out of the 12 cards, two are *Sasuke Uchiha* ("*I see the truth now.*") and 6 others are Sound Village characters. Because the cards are connected, there is a pattern on 8 out of 12 cards. The player should replace the bended cards with non-bended copies, and may use cards with a different artwork if necessary.
- A player has 15 upside-down cards in the deck during a deck check. 10 of them are Attachments. The Head Judge determines that these 15 cards were in the Discard during the last played game and the player incorrectly shuffled the cards together.
- A player has 3 cards with additional wear and tear on the top-bottom corner. The marking is on the only 3 Attachments of the deck, but some are to be attached to an allied character and some to an enemy character, thus they play different roles.
- A player has cards that have been altered from their original manufactured state, and other players or judges cannot recognize the card quickly or read its effects correctly because of the alteration. The cards should be replaced.

Marked Cards Error: Important

This infraction is appropriate when a player has a significant number of cards with a visible mark and a Judge notices a clear pattern, but the mark is considered to have happened by accident.

As for any Marked Cards Errors, and even more here, the Head Judge should investigate if the error is indeed an accident and not an Unsporting Conduct: Cheating.

Examples:

- During a Deck check, a Judge discovers that 6 sleeves are slightly longer than the rest of the deck. All 6 cards are the only cards in the deck with an Upgrade effect and a Chakra cost of 6 or more. Upon investigation, the Head Judge determines that the player ran out of sleeves while sleeving the deck.
- A single card is heavily bent in the deck because of its rarity. Upon investigation, the Head Judge determines that the player didn't notice the card's bent, however the card becomes easy to identify when placed on top of the deck.
- 12 cards have a clear mark on the top-right corner of the sleeve. Those 12 cards are *Naruto Uzumaki* characters.

Pace of Play Error

This category covers infractions when a player doesn't realize that they take too much time to execute their actions.

Players are excited about Naruto Mythos TCG and the different game states that they need to overcome with their own strategies and cards available. That being said, the game should still progress at a regular, dynamic enough pace. Tournaments are less enjoyable if you spend most of your game waiting for your opponent to decide their next move, they are even less enjoyable if that prevents you from playing your last moves.

If the judge team is large enough to permit it, after a player gets awarded a Pace of Play penalty, it is advised that the Judge who assigned it moves to a different tournament area and leaves the current area to a different Judge. A player who gets called out for Pace of Play multiple times by the same Judge might feel targeted; however, if different Judges reach the same conclusion, the player will be more understanding.

A Pace of Play infraction is awarded when the player doesn't realize that they are too slow. On the contrary, if a player uses every means available to let time on the clock pass, which includes playing more slowly on purpose, we are talking about an intentional behaviour (called "stalling") which is an Unsporting Conduct.

Pace of Play Error: Minor

This penalty is appropriate when a player unintentionally takes too much time to play the game, which causes a delay in the current game in progress. Both players are responsible to play at an acceptable pace, and while a board state might look "overloaded" with many cards in play, it is the result of a process that both players followed closely step-by-step.

If a Judge estimates that a player has a slow pace of play, to the point that the time loss can be estimated in minutes, then it is an appropriate time to award a Pace of Play: Minor penalty.

If the Tournament Round uses an overall time, the Judge should then give a time extension that includes the estimated time wasted by the behaviour. If the Tournament Round uses a Chess Clock, there is no time extension; however, while the player only wastes their own time on the clock, it still delivers a poor event experience to the opponent, and the penalty shall still be issued.

Examples:

- During Game Round 4, a player struggles to make decisions and takes an excessive time deciding every move. Upon investigation, the player doesn't take excessive time on purpose but is just excessively nervous.
- A player is expected to make a decision, but they check the content of their opponent's discard pile multiple times in a row as a stress coping mechanism.
- A table enters the first Mission Evaluation Phase after 3 minutes of gameplay. The Judge realizes that each player has only 1 Character with cost 5 into play. After investigation, the Judge concludes that both players did only 1 action each in 3 minutes, which is too slow, because the players talked together about a friend they both know from school. The Judge may find it appropriate to not assign a time extension with the penalty because both players equally contributed to the time wasted during the round.
- A player takes an unreasonable length of time to decide if they should play a character as an Upgrade in Mission D or play it normally in Mission C. The player hesitates despite not realizing that they don't have enough Chakra for the latter.
- In Chess Clock mode, a player already used 5 minutes of their time clock while the opponent only used 1 minute during a single game round. After investigation, the Judge realizes that both players used roughly as many actions each during that round, which means one player had a pace of play issue.
- After the Mission Evaluation phase, a player forgets to resume Chess Clock.

Tardiness Error

This infraction covers when a player arrives too late at the right table to play.

The goal of the tournament team is to provide a fun, fast and fair tournament. The tournament team will also wait until players are ready to play their round. However, the staff team and all the players cannot wait eternally if a few players don't arrive in a timely manner at their table, and the Tournament Round must start so the event can finish at a reasonable time.

If a player couldn't arrive at the table because they were involved in a situation with the tournament staff, then the player had a valid reason for arriving late and a Judge should make sure that the player can arrive at their table and play the complete game that they are entitled to (with a time extension if required). Otherwise, this is where the following penalties come into play.

Tardiness Error: Minor

A minor tardiness doesn't impact the tournament enough. It is still a disruption to the opponent and those around them.

Examples:

- A player arrives late at the match, but less than 5 minutes after the Tournament Round started.
- A player faces the wrong opponent. This is caught fast enough and the player reaches the correct table less than 5 minutes after the Tournament Round started.

Tardiness Error: Major

A major tardiness causes a more substantial delay or inconvenience to tournament operations and the players impacted. If left unchecked, the behaviour may be repeated and prevents a tournament from finishing in a timely manner.

Examples:

- A competitor arrives at the table 5 to 9 minutes late.
 - In Best-of-1, the game is over and the late player gets the Game Loss. In addition, the player should be removed from the tournament at the end of the current Tournament Round, unless the player reaches the tournament staff in charge of the pairings and requests to be maintained into the tournament.
 - In Best-of-3, the first game is over but the Tournament Round could still continue.
- A competitor sits at the wrong table and plays the wrong opponent. When being caught, the player cannot reach the correct table until between 5 and 9 minutes have passed.

Tardiness Error: Important

Important tardiness causes a major disruption to a round for a competitor and their opponent. Because of the tardiness, would the player still be allowed to play, the Tournament Round cannot be completed on time, even in Best-of-3.

Examples:

- A player arrives 10 minutes or more late to the table. In addition, the player should be removed from the tournament at the end of the current Tournament Round, unless the player reaches the tournament staff in charge of the pairings and requests to be maintained into the tournament.
- A player faces the wrong opponent. The error is caught too late and the player cannot reach the correct table until 10 minutes or more after the start of the Tournament Round has passed.
- A player fails to provide a decklist before the end of tournament submission time. The competitor cannot play Tournament Round 1 and will need to submit their decklist properly if they want to still be in the tournament for the next Tournament Round.

Tournament Error

This infraction covers when a player fails to apply the Tournament Rules correctly.

Every player and spectator are expected to apply the Tournament Rules properly. This ensures that every event attendee knows what to expect from an event at every given moment, and makes it easier to make the event progress in a smooth fashion.

Tournament Error: Minor

Minor tournament errors don't impact the tournament too much, and can be rectified almost immediately.

Examples:

- A player doesn't express clearly enough what action they execute.
- A player forgets to submit their Tournament Round result, and the staff team must take a minor delay to retrieve the correct information.
- A player attends an event without the appropriate accessories to keep track of Chakra and Mission points, putting the opponent into an awkward position if they have a limited amount of accessories.
- A player's phone is used for Chess Clock and runs out of battery. After an investigation, the Judge has a precise enough estimate of the time left, and the opponent can setup their own phone with the correct time left per player, so the game can continue.
- During a Tournament Round that uses Chess Clock, players forget to setup a Chess Clock tracker. After an investigation, the Judge has a precise enough estimate of the time left per player and can help players setup their own Chess Clock with the correct time left per player, so the game can continue.

Tournament Error: Major

Major tournament errors have the potential to cause a delay to the tournament or to cause an inconvenience to surrounding competitors while they are rectified.

Examples:

- A player's phone is used for Chess Clock and runs out of battery, and there is no way to setup another Chess Clock with a close enough time approximation of the time left.
- A player accidentally damages a card while trying to read its effect and cannot replace it quickly.

Tournament Error: Important

Important tournament errors happen when a player doesn't apply the Tournament Rules correctly and it makes it impossible to continue the current Tournament Round.

If the player realizes that they cannot continue the rest of the tournament as well, they should communicate to the staff that they would like to be removed (or “dropped”) from the event.

Examples:

- Two players forget to submit the result for the Tournament Round that they played. At the end of the Tournament Round, the players involved cannot be found and don't present themselves if called by the staff. The tournament must progress, so each player involved at the table with a missing result should get a Tournament Round Loss, and both lose the Tournament Round.
- A player spills water or mayonnaise on their deck and damages their cards. It becomes impossible to finish the current Tournament Round, and the player's priority is now to fix the damage caused to the deck.
- A player loses their deck between Tournament Rounds and cannot play the upcoming Tournament Round anymore. The player should reach a tournament staff as soon as possible to find a solution, and if the deck cannot be found or replaced on time for the upcoming Tournament Round, the player should get a Tournament Round Loss.

Unsporting Conduct

This infraction covers when a player has a behaviour that is inappropriate or disrespectful towards other players, spectators, tournament staff, or the behaviour questions the integrity of the event. Unsporting Conducts are considered **intentional** behaviours, even if the player recognized afterwards that they didn't intend to display the behaviour that they displayed.

Everyone joins a Naruto Mythos TCG event, hoping for a positive experience, interesting gameplay and enjoyable discussions. While some players have the right to strive for the first place, only one player can finish first, and everyone is expected to win or lose gracefully and display sportsmanship towards other attendees. A game result always has less emotional impact on others compared to the attitude displayed during that game.

An event attendee may receive an Unsporting Conduct penalty even if the individual isn't a player (or isn't a player anymore) of the current event. If a spectator is a Legal Guardian for an underage player, and the spectator displays a behaviour that requires to remove the spectator from the venue, the underage player should also be removed unless a solution is found so the underage player can still participate in the rest of the event.

Unsporting Conduct also relates to behaviour outside the tournament. As an example, if an act of Online Harassment can be related to a specific event, such behaviour may be penalized. A player may get an Unsporting Conduct awarded even before Round 1 started, and a Player may get an Unsporting Conduct even after leaving the tournament area.

While infractions related to a game play error may take time before being escalated, Unsporting Conduct threatens the integrity and positive atmosphere of the tournament and should be escalated at the first repetition of the infraction. A Head Judge may find it appropriate that a repeated infraction could escalate from Minor to Strict if deemed necessary for the safety of the other attendees.

Unsporting Conduct: Minor

A minor lapse in judgement may result in a contained annoyance towards a limited group of attendees.

Examples:

- A player swears mildly during a conversation with a friend.
- When an opponent asks what a card in play does, a player answers that the opponent should read the card. The player was supposed to answer the question truthfully instead.
- A spectator disturbs a match in progress to ask for a selfie.
- A player leaves trash in the play area after their game is over.
- An attendee eats or drinks at a table during a match.
- An attendee fails to comply with tournament staff instruction, but ends up accepting to comply without opposing too much resistance.
- A player calls a Judge and asks to translate the opponent's French card to English. The Judge realizes that the player owns the same card in English in their deck and thus knows the card text.
- A player calls a Judge due to the opponent forgetting to apply a Continuous effect. The player insists that the Judge checks if the opponent has already committed the same infraction before, hoping to get a stronger penalty.
- A player calls a Judge due to the opponent drawing too many cards at once. The player requests a specific penalty instead of letting the Judge decide.
- A spectator does not respect a fair distance from tables still engaged in a game in progress despite being asked by tournament staff to move out.
- An event attendee uses clothes or tournament materials with offensive or explicit graphics. The person must remove or replace the inappropriate element, otherwise risk a penalty escalation.
- An event attendee doesn't have proper media clearance and is recording video at a tournament.
- A player calls for a Judge. When the Judge arrives, the player requests to talk to a different Judge or they request that only the Head Judge should review their decision.
- A player repeatedly interrupts the Judge while the Judge investigates or delivers their decision.
- A player requests an appeal to the Head Judge while the Judge hasn't finished presenting their decision.
- An event attendee makes a deliberately unfair trade with a less experienced player. When discovered, the event attendee complies with staff instruction to balance or cancel the trade.
- A person's lack of good hygiene negatively impacts the event. While the decision is difficult for Judges to announce, the player should be invited to take steps to address the issue. If the player requires to take a significant time off the tournament and then comes back with the issue addressed, the player should have the missing Tournament Rounds recorded as a loss and the player is then allowed to continue to play after returning with the issue fixed.
If a player cannot or doesn't want to address the hygiene issue, the infraction should be escalated to Unsporting Conduct: Strict.

- An event participant discusses trades with an event attendees and ends up not respecting the buying/selling policy at the venue. In addition to the Unsporting Conduct penalty, the person may be required to leave the venue. If a person decided to attend an event with the sole purpose of violating the buying/selling policy at the venue, this is an Unsporting Conduct: Strict situation instead.

Unsporting Conduct: Major

A Major unsporting conduct displays a lack of consideration for fair play or lack of respect towards tournament staff and event attendees.

Examples:

- An event attendee uses profanity towards another person.
- A player makes a violent move that intimidates others, such as throwing a chair, after losing a game.
- A player refuses to confirm a Tournament Round result.

Unsporting Conduct: Important

Important unsporting conduct categorizes a fault so severe that attendees involved would rather leave the venue than play a game with the one committing the infraction.

- A player makes constant, unpleasant remarks to the opponent despite being notified to stop the behaviour.
- 10 minutes before the end of the Tournament Round, a player currently has a lead in Mission Points and decides to play more slowly or to check their Discard Pile multiple times before each decision they take (Stalling).
- In Chess Clock mode, a player pauses the Clock and calls a Judge to ask irrelevant questions multiple times. After investigation, the Judge concludes that the player made those Judge calls to get extra time to think their moves without losing time on their own clock (Stalling).
- Players finished playing their own Tournament Round, but instead of reporting the result, they decided to take a lengthy time observing nearby games in progress to choose who should get the win. Both players should be penalized and lose the Tournament Round as a result.

Unsporting Conduct: Strict

The conduct displayed is so unsporting that other attendees would rather avoid the one doing the conduct for the rest of the tournament. It represents the most disrespectful behaviour towards attendees and tournament staff and should be removed from the venue as soon as possible so that the rest of the attendees can keep enjoying the event.

As a reminder, anyone impacting the tournament is subject to Unsporting Conduct penalties, even a person that abandoned (or “dropped”) the tournament and just walks around the tables, or a person that accompanies another player. If the infraction warrants a Disqualification, the Head Judge may still apply a Disqualification and submit a report about the individual at fault, and request that the person leaves the venue.

- A player uses profanity, slurs, insults or physical threats towards another player.
- A player lacks respect to their opponent's identity with the intent to provoke or cause distress.
- An event attendee engages in assault, theft or other criminal activity.
- An event attendee displays a behaviour that is forbidden by local regulations.
- A person produces content that advises how to violate Tournament Rules, such as creating a video to demonstrate how to manipulate a deck while shuffling.
- A person shows inappropriate behaviour on camera at a streamed event.
- A person is currently drunk or under the influence of mind-altering substances.
- A person brings an item that is forbidden as per the event's rules, security measures, or as per local regulations.
- A person attends an event with the sole purpose of buying and selling cards with event attendees instead of approved vendors.

Unsporting Conduct: Cheating

Cheating is the explicit behaviour of displaying a clear preference for a victory at all costs, with no respect to the opponent, the game rules and Tournament rules. Unsporting Conduct: Cheating can **never be de-escalated**, as it otherwise gives a player a "free chace at attempted cheating" and gives a player more confidence in repeating the behaviour at the current tournament or the next one.

As any penalty, and even more with a Disqualification decision, the Head Judge should carefully investigate the facts and consider if the most likely scenario is that the player decided to break the rules. This is true even if the player was not aware that such action would break the rules, as long as the player intended to do the action at fault.

Examples:

- A player decides to place characters in-between two Missions to give the illusion that a character is in a different Mission than its real position. (Deceiving Game-State)
- A player passes and decides to place the hand face-down on the field in a way to give the illusion that there is an extra character face-down. (Deceiving Game-State)
- When an opponent asks what a card in play does, the player gives a misleading, incomplete or incorrect description of the card's effect, hoping for the opponent to react incorrectly. (Lying)
- A player places a few cards in hand on the lap to give the illusion that the player has very few cards in hand. (Deceiving Game-State)
- A player tries to get extra cards from the deck or discard pile to the hand while the opponent isn't looking.
- A player moves Power tokens in play.
- A player gets asked if they have a certain card in hand. That player answers "No" despite having said card in hand. (Lying)
- A player uses a particular shuffling technique with the intent to order the deck in a specific, predictable way instead of making the deck random (Stacking).
- A player notices that they accidentally made a Game-Play Error, however they decide to act as if nothing happened and keep the advantage instead of reporting it to a Judge.

- A player notices that the opponent accidentally made a Game-Play Error, however they wait on purpose to see if the opponent is about to win and only report the error at that time in hopes of a strong penalty.
- A player checks the opponent's Discard Pile and uses their nails to mark specific cards, then next game they suggest a judge to check their opponent's deck for marked cards.
- A player is asked if they committed a specific infraction before and they answer no, however they have committed said specific infraction previously (Lying).
- A player lies to a Judge or any tournament official.
- A player knows that a Judge's decision is correct but decides to ask for an appeal in hopes that the Head Judge makes a mistake.
- A player offers money, packs, to split the value of a future prize, or any compensation for a game result. (Bribery)
- A player offers to decide the winner of a game or Tournament Round using a randomizer, using an arbitrary criteria (like who draws the stronger character in the next draw), etc, instead of regular gameplay. (Gambling)
- A player accepts to decide the winner of a game or Tournament Round using an alternative winning method instead of regular gameplay. (Gambling)
- An event attendee practices bets or wages on games in progress, or on any element of the tournament. (Gambling)
- A player takes advantage of private information that they receive from an external source during a game.
- An event attendee tries to communicate private information to a player about the game in progress. The Head Judge should also investigate if the targeted player noticed and used said communication for the current game.
- A player decides to submit an incorrect Tournament Round result or tries to modify a valid result. (Lying)
- A player decides to play under another player's identity.
- A visitor tries to impersonate a staff member in order to get access to private areas of the tournament or to give instructions to players while they shouldn't.