

# Continued Participation



Would you rule the player who lost his helmet committed a foul for "continued participation"?

		Response Percent	Response Count
YES		28.4%	46
NO		71.6%	116
		Comments?	25
		answered question	162
		skipped question	1



**Q1. Would you rule the player who lost his helmet committed a foul for "continued participation"?**

1	The player doesnt participate in the action	Oct 7, 2012 8:15 PM
2	the play was over	Oct 7, 2012 6:12 PM
3	by rule, yes	Oct 7, 2012 11:07 AM
4	While he did not stop immediately he did nothing to participate in the play.	Oct 5, 2012 10:48 AM
5	The play ended just about the same time the player jogged over toward the pile.	Oct 4, 2012 2:09 PM
6	runner was down at time he attempted to participate	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 AM
7	To ,me # 49 was not in a chase mode.	Oct 3, 2012 5:08 PM
8	It appears he was already heading that direction when his helmet came off. We don't get a good view of how yhe helmet came off but it appears it may have been ripped off.	Oct 3, 2012 5:19 AM
9	Based on the interpretation of the rule, pursuing the play was not part of an immediate action. He ran for several yards which is more than two or three steps. Additionally, this could be part of an offsetting foul.	Oct 2, 2012 12:07 PM
10	Had the player who lost his helmet engaged a member of the receivers than yes. In the instance shown, no foul.	Oct 2, 2012 11:52 AM
11	Play was practically over, talk to would have been appropriate.	Oct 2, 2012 11:26 AM
12	The rule is terrible.....	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM
13	Play was basically over. He just jogged over. Should have been a talk to.	Oct 2, 2012 9:56 AM
14	Another official, i.e. R or LJ need to come into the conversation	Oct 2, 2012 9:42 AM
15	Tackle being made as player starts to move towards action. Not to mention, can either official tell us how the helmet came off. It appears that the helmet was pulled of by an opponent.	Oct 2, 2012 9:21 AM
16	He did not stop until the player was down, therefore it's a foul. I understand the intent of the rule, but I don't like the rule.	Oct 2, 2012 9:15 AM
17	Foul was called with no regard to the spirit and intent...player was never in any jeopardy. That's like calling a hold on the opposite side of the play!	Oct 2, 2012 9:05 AM
18	49 moves towards the play as the ball carrier is tackled. No foul. Counsel 49.	Oct 2, 2012 7:30 AM
19	The player did continue to approach the action but the play was over so I would have given him a verbal warning with him exiting for a play because the helmet came off.	Oct 2, 2012 7:09 AM
20	I say no, but on the other hand, if he gets blown up by another player, it's hard to have a penalty on that player for blocking a helmetless opponent without also having a flag on 49 for continuing to participate in the play. I'd like to see how the helmet came off. :)	Oct 2, 2012 6:57 AM

**Q1. Would you rule the player who lost his helmet committed a foul for "continued participation"?**

21	Mere pursuit is not participation; the point of the rule is player safety, so it should be changed to prohibit intentionally contacting an opponent after the helmet comes off.	Oct 2, 2012 6:34 AM
22	Ball was dead whn he "jogged toward the play"	Oct 2, 2012 6:09 AM
23	The play is to close to being dead when the player moves to participate	Oct 2, 2012 6:08 AM
24	The spirit of the rule is that the continued participation is a danger to the player who lost his helmet. This player was not engaged in any contact, therefore, no foul.	Oct 2, 2012 5:50 AM
25	Common Sense. 7 grown men can't miss this.....	Oct 2, 2012 5:03 AM