
The Football League shows us how it's done....

Posted by ian.64 - 07-08-2008 07:57

Rotherham docked 17 points.

http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/football/teams/r/rotherham_utd/7543195.stm

The Football League are sort of reminiscent of a stringy, muscles-like-peapods Charles Hawtrey sort who's full of bullish bravado after celebrating pushing over his first four-year-old. 'Yeah, Premier League, you may give slaps on the wrist, but here we - yeah - we kick arse!'

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it's done....

Posted by NHH - 07-08-2008 08:48

They seem to me to be like a boss who's gone out on the piss at lunchtime in the middle of a mid-life crisis, and are just barking increasingly bizarre orders to their staff which are on the verge of the ludicrous.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it's done....

Posted by NHH - 07-08-2008 08:50

I mean 17? Why 17? What's the logic? The only logic I can see is that 17 gives Luton a chance and makes League Two vaguely interesting.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it's done....

Posted by twohundredpercent - 07-08-2008 09:05

I'm not normally prone to conspiracy theories, that the Football League are making it really difficult to not think that they are just stitching up these clubs to get them relegated and take the heat off everyone else for a year.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it's done....

Posted by Jimmy Bignutz - 07-08-2008 09:12

NHH wrote:

They seem to me to be like a boss who's gone out on the piss at lunchtime in the middle of a mid-life crisis, and are just barking increasingly bizarre orders to their staff which are on the verge of the ludicrous.

I hear that Chester have been docked 10 points for leaving out a dirty coffee cup, and Brentford have ben given a five-point penalty because they keep doing this:

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it's done....

Posted by Bombanersson - 07-08-2008 09:17

How far is Don Valley from Millmoor anyway?

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it's done....

Posted by twohundredpercent - 07-08-2008 09:22

About four miles, I think.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Houdi Elbow - 07-08-2008 11:35

Whilst I'm sure that Rotherham fans don't want to be playing in Sheffield, I can't understand the 'must return to Rotherham in 4 years' clause. To put it in context, the border with Rotherham is, I guess, less than 2 miles away.

Does this mean Grimsby will have to move from Cleethorpes and West Ham from Upton Park? The FL are just making it up as they go along.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by noj - 07-08-2008 11:39

The Football League really are a bunch of twats.

Yet more commiserations to GO, Dangermouse etc.

When's the time limit up for Franchise returning to Wimbledon?

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by TonTon - 07-08-2008 11:56

Unaccustomed as I am to sticking up for the Football League, I don't see the insistence on returning to Rotherham being a bad thing. The Franchise situation shows the need for that, doesn't it?

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Houdi Elbow - 07-08-2008 12:03

Given the distances concerned it does seem a tad petty in this case.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by TonTon - 07-08-2008 12:24

Distance isn't the only marker here though, is it? The ground is in Sheffield, which isn't Rotherham. That seems pretty straightforward to me. Or are people suggesting that there is no problem at all in Rotherham moving out of Rotherham and into Sheffield, and people shouldn't worry about such things?

If the Football League had insisted that Wimbledon return to Wimbledon within four years of moving out (to another part of London, not many miles away) that would have been a good thing.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Bombanersson - 07-08-2008 12:34

Well yeah. But the club want to move back, the fans want them to move back, and there is no chance of them being successful in an athletics stadium in Attercliffe.

Asking them for £750,000 when they've got no money, to prove their desire to rectify something that is going to cost them a lot of money, is really cunty. Especially when they'll be kicked out of the FL if they don't do as they're told anyway.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by TonTon - 07-08-2008 12:42

the club want to move back, the fans want them to move back, and there is no chance of them being successful in an athletics stadium in Attercliffe

You know, I can't help thinking I've heard something similar before...

I dunno about £750k, it doesn't seem to be mentioned in that BBC article. In principle, I'm in favour of the Football League insisting on a return, but it's not obvious how that can be done reasonably, I agree.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Houdi Elbow - 07-08-2008 12:42

Or are people suggesting that there is no problem at all in Rotherham moving out of Rotherham and into Sheffield, and people shouldn't worry about such things?

Straw man.

Nobody is suggesting that RUFC should be permanently based in Sheffield and you are totally misinterpreting what I wrote. I would have thought that the major concern of a club playing in a different town (or London borough) would be the difficulty of fans travelling to games and the consequent erosion of support and finances. This isn't so much the case here - it's not ideal but hopefully gets them out of a temporary hole.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by TonTon - 07-08-2008 12:44

Then what's wrong with the Football League insisting that it is, indeed, temporary?

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Bombanersson - 07-08-2008 12:48

<http://soccernet.espn.go.com/news/story?id=560544&sec=england&&cc=5739>

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by TonTon - 07-08-2008 13:04

Well, that does seem rather odd, doesn't it? Does that mean they have to find £750k, in actual cash money, today?

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Bombanersson - 07-08-2008 13:16

TonTon wrote:

Well, that does seem rather odd, doesn't it? Does that mean they have to find £750k, in actual cash money, today?

I think so.

I haven't seen anything about what happens to that money if they end up getting relegated out of the FI during that time, either.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Harri Saer - 07-08-2008 13:17

TonTon wrote:

Then what's wrong with the Football League insisting that it is, indeed, temporary?

I thought the rule they allowed Franchise to initially break was that you had to be within a certain mileage (25?) of your named conurbation?

This was to acknowledge that QPR aren't in Queen's Park any more, Bolton aren't in Bolton, Chelsea aren't in Chelsea etc.

While I agree it should be RUFCS intent to move back in to Rotherham as soon as possible (and everyone currently running or wanting to run the club has that as priority one after keeping the club solvent) the Football League's arbitrary ruling of it smacks to me of face-saving after the Franchise debacle and not actually in the interests of club or area.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 07-08-2008 13:40

Rotherham Council are so keen to get the club back into town that they've put up £500,000 of the bond. And they're working with the club and rugger club to get the new stadium built; an area has already been earmarked. This is a massive move forward.

It would be nice to finish a season with the number of points that we've actually earned on the pitch for a change...

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Phoebe - 07-08-2008 15:08

What is the reasoning behind the punishment?

The Leagues' own rules stated that punishment is demotion to League Two, nothing about points deduction - so while Leeds get to keep their League One status, and just get deducted 15 points, Luton are punished heavily for something not deemed worth punishing at the time, and Rotherham are seemingly punished for something they've already been punished for.

And despite the recommendation in the League v Leeds case being that clubs should have the right of appeal, the League forces the clubs to waive the right of appeal if they want to stay in the league.

And, I bet David Sheepshanks (one football club in administration, that he steered to debts of £36m) was on the panel, just like he was on the Luton panel.

Farcical fucking cunts.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Harri Saer - 07-08-2008 15:12

I'm being told by the office Cherry that Bournemouth have been refused their "Golden Share" (oh how I hoped I'd heard the last of them with Leeds last season) today and will have another go tomorrow.

Didn't Leeds start the season without it , last season?

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Phoebe - 07-08-2008 15:13

TonTon wrote:

Distance isn't the only marker here though, is it? The ground is in Sheffield, which isn't Rotherham. That seems pretty straightforward to me. Or are people suggesting that there is no problem at all in Rotherham moving out of Rotherham and into Sheffield, and people shouldn't worry about such things?

If the Football League had insisted that Wimbledon return to Wimbledon within four years of moving out (to another part of London, not many miles away) that would have been a good thing.

By that token, should AFC Wimbledon not have left Kingstonian by now? Or should Wimbledon be given a Grimsby/Cleethorpes free ride?

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Phoebe - 07-08-2008 15:18

Harri Saer wrote:

I'm being told by the office Cherry that Bournemouth have been refused their "Golden Share" (oh how I hoped I'd heard the last of them with Leeds last season) today and will have another go tomorrow.

Didn't Leeds start the season without it , last season?

The league have said they will announce their position on Bournemouth on Tuesday. I'm guessing they've decided to deduct them the amount of points equal to the bonus ball in Saturday's lottery.

The "golden share" means nothing, in terms of actual playing. You lose it the moment you enter administration, and you don't get it back until the league meeting after you exit administration. The "golden share" prevents you from signing players (although you can be given special dispensation if you have no keepers fit, or you've had to sell so many players you can't raise a team) and voting at league meetings.

The only implication for Bournemouth is that the players must be registered with OldCo, and not NewCo, if they want to play before the share is returned.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Jimmy Bignutz - 07-08-2008 15:21

Phoebe wrote:

TonTon wrote:

Distance isn't the only marker here though, is it? The ground is in Sheffield, which isn't Rotherham. That seems pretty straightforward to me. Or are people suggesting that there is no problem at all in Rotherham moving out of Rotherham and into Sheffield, and people shouldn't worry about such things?

If the Football League had insisted that Wimbledon return to Wimbledon within four years of moving out (to another part

of London, not many miles away) that would have been a good thing.

By that token, should AFC Wimbledon not have left Kingstonian by now? Or should Wimbledon be given a Grimsby/Cleethorpes free ride?

Kingston.

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Harri Saer - 07-08-2008 15:22

Thanks Phoebe, that's put his mind (slightly) at rest.

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 07-08-2008 15:25

Phoebe wrote:

What is the reasoning behind the punishment?

Haven't a fucking clue.

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by NHH - 07-08-2008 15:26

My understanding is that the club have to sign a letter agreeing to pay them (the League) 750K if, by 2012, they haven't moved back to Rotherham.

I agree with TT about the Wimbledon clause - indeed, it was fan concern at how Wimbledon and Brighton left town without any comeback from the FL which led to this becoming an issue. What's wrong here I think is that the policy would be fine if the reason for the move is because nasty club chairman wants to either move the club permanently or build houses on a perfectly good ground. In both cases, it assumes the club is master of its own destiny, which it quite clearly isn't here. If anything, making Rotherham's task harder makes life easier for the Booths, it seems to me.

The problem is that League's policies are informed by no real fan understanding and an arrogance that doesn't brook people pointing out there's flaws (and with them run by a politician known for being the rudest Tory Cabinet Minister in the last Tory government; fancy!)

The main flaws remain that they have fuck all to say about people running up millions of debt at the time when something could be done about it, and get all aggravated when the club is on its knees.

Take Luton - they said that the additional 5pts on top of the 15 points was a penalty to reflect the fact that the club had been in admin twice in recent years.

What that fails to take into account is that the second of those was not a financial fuckup - it was a supporters trust putting the club into administrative receivership in order to be able to change the locks on the club offices and get rid of John Gurney, an man of very, very dubious provenance. It goes without saying that during these existential crisis for the club, the League were utterly fucking absent.

Anyway, more worryingly is the Bournemouth situation. There's a board meeting this evening at the League where they'll decide what to do with them. I have a very real fear it'll be the first league club to go since Aldershot. The problem seems that the club have at various times had rescuers coming in to take on the club, but nothing's happened. The League I think would rather have the club not start a season than start it to go under halfway through. Unless someone can do a deal in the next 2 hours to exit administration (and do a deal = provide actual cash and stuff like real money), then things are bleak.

Which begs the question - is the reason no deal has been done because of a lack of urgency or a lack of cash? We'll know by 7pm.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Harri Saer - 07-08-2008 15:33

This can't help ;

Cherries chairman Jeff Mostyn has been in dialogue with Football League officials for a number of weeks and was understood to have been dealing with the club's case.

Mostyn, who recently joined forces with Baker and his Sport-6 partner Alastair Saverimutto, was last night unavailable for comment. He is believed to be on holiday in Spain.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Phoebe - 07-08-2008 15:50

PM for NHH, by the way.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Monty - 07-08-2008 17:52

I see the FL in their unfailing wisdom and enlightenment have hit Bournemouth with a 17 point deduction.

The integrity of the competition is intact.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Antepi Ejderha - 07-08-2008 18:30

A joke, sheer hypocrisy on the part of the football in league with the big clubs.

Looks like it is two from three for the drop and perhaps extinction.

Do any of the three have any chance of survival if they drop out of the league?

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Kid Dynamite - 07-08-2008 18:55

Unfuckingbelievable yet alltoofuckingpredictable.

What possible rationale can there be for giving us (Bournemouth) an bigger points deduction than Leeds? Obviously we should have tried to build up much bigger debts, screwed over the creditors in much more devious fashion and exited administration through a bizarre deal involving offshore companies. Then we might have got away with a fifteen point deduction. Clearly just being perpetually skint isn't glamorous and exiting enough.

Fucking clueless shower of fucking cunts.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Phoebe - 07-08-2008 19:22

The worst thing is that Leeds' "punishment" was 15 points *instead* of the one in the rules, which should have been demotion, but because of the fuss Bates made, the League now think they are seen to be fair.

There is absolutely nothing in the rules that say that clubs exiting administration should have any points deducted, merely that they should be demoted to League Two (because the share passes to a new company). And, because the league tells the club that by accepting the Golden share, they waive their right to appeal, and that hinting that if they don't, they won't be allowed to play, they have the clubs shafted.

Even though the independent arbitration panel strongly suggested to the league that they allow clubs to appeal any post-administration penalty, the league still decides to give the clubs the "no appeal" condition. As such, by accepting their league share, any arbitration panel will throw out an appeal on that basis alone - as they did with Leeds.

Gutless fucking bastards.

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Phoebe - 07-08-2008 21:22

The number one objective of the Football League's insolvency policy is "Survival of the club in membership of the League, where possible".

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 08-08-2008 09:35

So, when do we think that there'll be no clubs with negative numbers? Beginning of December?

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by NHH - 08-08-2008 10:22

They need to have:

P W Dr L Dd GF GA GD Pts

With Dd meaning deducted points.

I have to say I am totally in favour of using points deductions to control club spending and regulate finances. There is a sensible way of implementing this but we'd don't have it yet.

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by ursus arctos - 08-08-2008 10:28

We've come to expect at least one club having "(-X)" next to their point total.

Completely agreed with Nathan that it is the inconsistent and at times nonsensical application of the sanction, rather than the sanction itself, that is to be decried. The same goes for "licenses" to compete in a particular year's competition.

As usual when it comes to matters of football administration, the Germans seem to be get it right more often than anyone else.

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by NHH - 08-08-2008 10:46

All bow before the hallowed example of the DFB and DFL. In footballing terms, if everyone was a bit more German, things would be so much better.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Antepi Ejderha - 09-08-2008 09:20

So how do the Germans do it then?

Sorry if this was included on another thread.

=====

Re:The Football League shows us how it\'s done....

Posted by Alderman Barnes - 09-08-2008 09:30

Every club has to meet certain financial conditions before being allowed to compete in the division they're in that season.

It doesn't mean they're entirely consistent when it comes to big and little clubs, though. Dortmund somehow managed to run up 160 million in debts and still get a licence.

=====