

Q&A

VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Otagowane: GG16

Welcome to the official VEX V5 Robotics Competition Question & Answer system, where all registered teams have the opportunity to ask for official rules interpretations and clarifications. This Q&A system is the only source for official V5RC rules clarifications, and the clarifications made here from the Game Design Committee (GDC) are considered as official and binding as the written [Game Manual](#) itself.

Please review the Q&A Usage Guidelines before posting. This system is only intended for specific V5RC game rules questions.

- For event, registration, or other competition support questions, please contact your [Program Support Manager](#).
 - For VEX technical support, contact support@vex.com or sales@vex.com.
- For game questions, suggestions, or concerns outside of specific and official rules questions, contact GDC@vex.com

Wielko?? sprzeda?y i udzia? w rynku

[GG16 Clarification](#)

[Forcing an opponent to become 'stuck'](#)

[Guarding long goal in regards to GG9](#)

[Clarification on GG9 and GG16: Anchor/Entangled with Goal](#)

[SG11 Clarifications on Endgame Blocking and Park-Zone Contact](#)

[GG16: Clarification on Who Gets the Penalty](#)

3192: GG16 Clarification

27-Jul-2026

GG16

Suppose a Blue Robot is legally driving near the opposing Red Stake. A Red Robot intentionally or strategically pushes the Blue Robot into the Red Stake, causing the Stake to collapse. In this situation, the Blue Robot did not intentionally contact the Stake. The Blue Robot was attempting to escape, but contact occurred because the Red Robot continuously pushed and forced blue bots into the Stake.

How should this interaction be ruled?

More specifically:

1. Does it matter whether the Red Robot intentionally pushed the Blue Robot into the Red Stake, or is the final result—the Red Stake collapsing—alone sufficient to determine the ruling?
2. If the Blue Robot had no reasonable opportunity to avoid the contact because the Red Robot continuously and intentionally pushed it as part of a strategic action, should this be considered a forced interaction rather than a violation by the Blue Robot? Major Violation or DQ?
3. Should this situation be evaluated under the Game Manual principle that a Team may not force an opponent into a violation?

The concern is that if the ruling is based only on which Robot ultimately contacts or causes the opposing Stake to collapse, Teams may intentionally develop strategies that involve pushing an opposing Robot into their own Stake to force a penalty or Disqualification.

Clarification from the GDC would help Teams understand whether this type of strategy is legal and how Head Referees should consistently evaluate these interactions. [<GG16>](#)

Odpowiedź committee

We believe our answer to [Q&A 3194](#) addresses your question. If it does not, please feel free to rephrase and re-submit.

3121: Forcing an opponent to become 'stuck'

4-Mar-2026


GG9 GG14 GG16 GG18

Is it legal for a RED robot to intentionally push BLUE onto blocks in an attempt to get them 'stuck' and unable to move for the rest of the game. Or is this a [<GG18>](#) and [<GG14>](#) violation?

Similarly, how should refs rule interactions where RED forces BLUE to become 'stuck' to field elements, e.g:

- Wedged between the bottom of the long goal and the foam tiles
- Temporarily unable to move out of the gaps in the bottom of the long goal (part of the robot is inside of the red circled area)
- Otherwise unable to move away from the park zone or a loader

Would this count as forcing an opponent to become entangled with the field, taking into account [<GG9>](#), [<GG14>](#), and [<GG16>](#)?



Odpowiedź committee

There is no rule that prohibits pushing a Robot onto Blocks, against a Goal, into a Loader, or into the Park Zone unless it's determined to be part of a strategy specifically intended to damage an opposing Robot. If a Robot becomes entangled as a result of one of these interactions, it should generally be considered incidental to gameplay and no Violations should be awarded.

3024: Guarding long goal in regards to GG9

7-Jan-2026

GG9 GG15 GG16

<GG9>

In a recent event a team has guarded the long goal as seen in the video: https://youtu.be/PwN6XGxEceQ?si=_kBUQ9-GerNa1IW6&t=42

The front of the team's chassis contacts the orange portion of the long goal (circled in red) and the team has a metal channel that blocks balls from being scored as well as at times contacts the transparent plastic portion of the long goal (circled in green). [Screenshot 2026-01-07 234540.pdf](#)

These two points of contact with the long goal make it essentially impossible for the team to be removed from their position which prevents other teams from scoring or changing the control zone when they guard the goal.

My question is:

1. Is it considered anchoring and by extension a violation of GG9 to guard a goal in this manner?
2. Is any position of guarding the long goal that prevents the ability to move away by an opponent robot by being in contact with multiple points of the long goal considered anchoring regardless of whether it is in the open portion of the long goal?
3. If a team eventually becomes stuck or entangled in that position due to contact with an opposing robot should GG16 apply in this scenario?
4. If there is a scenario where it is contentious whether or not a team does qualify for anchoring in this manner should GG15 apply as the team that is guarding the long goal is in an inherently defense position?

Odpowiedź committee

It is impossible to issue a blanket answer beyond what is written in the game manual that encompasses all possible situations based on a snapshot description of a hypothetical Match, Robot, mechanism, or interaction. This ruling must be made by the Head Referee based on the context of the Match.

Head Referees should consider the specific language in rule [<GG9>] when making their decision, and ensure that their logic is applied consistently across all Matches and Robots at the event. If they are working with other Head Referees at the event, they should attempt to ensure that all Head Referees at that event have agreed on that

interpretation.

2907: Clarification on GG9 and GG16: Anchor/Entangled with Goal

10-Nov-2025

GG9 GG16

The violation notes under GG9 state that

"If a Robot is reaching inside the open top portion of a Goal, it is that Team's responsibility to ensure that the Robot doesn't become anchored to the Goal when approached by other Robots. <GG16> will not apply during related interactions, and a Robot that becomes anchored while reaching into the open top of a Goal will receive a <GG9> Violation no matter how they became anchored."

Are there any situations in which GG16 can apply when a team is interacting with a goal?

For example: a red robot is not near the long goal; a blue robot pushes a red robot into the goal and red becomes anchored as a result. Would GG16 apply or would the violation notes under GG9 supersede GG16?

Odpowiedz? committee

Thanks, Paige, for your question!

The Violation Note you've referenced only applies in scenarios where a Robot is already reaching into the open top of a Goal when other interactions begin.

In your scenario, in which a blue Robot pushes a red Robot across the Field and into an anchored position at a Goal, the blue Robot has Violated rule [<GG16>](#) by pushing the red Robot into a potential penalty. The blue Robot should receive, at minimum, a minor [<GG16>](#) Violation.

2811: SG11 Clarifications on Endgame Blocking and Park-Zone Contact

24-Sep-2025

GG16 SG11

I like to ask about [<SG11>](#).

Current situation: If a blue Alliance Robot positions itself in front of the red Alliance Park Zone to defend, the intent is to block the red Alliance Robot from Parking.

There are several ruling questions (all occurring in the last 20 seconds of the Match):

Question 1. If, during contact between the blue and red Robots, the red Robot pushes the blue Robot into the red Park Zone, is this considered a "forced" <GG16> penalty by red (and if it is a penalty, how should Match Affecting be determined), or is it a penalty on blue?

Question 2.If the blue Robot, while moving to defend, contacts the red Park Zone during the last 20 seconds, does that constitute a penalty on blue under <SG11>?

Question 3.If the blue and red Robots are entangled, and while attempting to separate the blue Robot enters the red Park Zone, does that count as a Violation by blue? (Consider <SG11> and the protected status of Robots that are at least partially within the vertical projection of their Alliance-colored Park Zone.)

Question 4.If it is not clear whether red forced blue into a Violation, blue intentionally blocked, or an accidental Violation occurred during a tussle, should advantage be given to red? (Consider <GG15> "Offensive Robots get the benefit of the doubt," and <GG16> on forced penalties.)

Odpowiedz? committee

Hello, Shan Chun Chang, and thanks for these questions!

For your scenario and related questions:

1. Yes, this would be a forced Violation and blue shouldn't receive a penalty; red should receive a Minor <GG16> Violation.
2. Yes, this would be at least a Minor Violation for blue, and could escalate to a Major Violation if it is determined to be Match Affecting.
3. Yes, this would generally be at least a Minor Violation for blue, unless red dragged them in.
4. Yes, the red Robot should get the benefit of the doubt for unclear Violations that happen during the final 20 seconds of the Match at the red Park Zone (and blue Robots get the benefit of the doubt at the blue Park Zone).

We hope these answers help!

2776: GG16: Clarification on Who Gets the Penalty

9-Sep-2025

GG16

<GG16> says:

You can't force an opponent into a penalty. Intentional strategies that cause an opponent to break a rule are not permitted, and will not result in a Violation for the opposing Alliance.

but it also has a violation note that says (Emphasis mine):

Violation Notes: In most cases, if a Team causes their opponent to break a rule, the Head Referee will simply not enforce the penalty on that opponent, and it will be considered a **Minor Violation for the Team that was forced into a Violation**. However, if the forced situation becomes Match Affecting in favor of the Team that was forced into a Violation, it will be considered a Major Violation

This means that when a team is forced into a penalty they would get a minor violation for it which contradicts the wording of the GG16 rule itself.

Also the last sentence of the violation note doesn't clarify who gets the major violation? It makes it sound like if team RED1 was forced into a match affection violation by BLUE1 that caused the red alliance to win, then RED1 gets a major violation because it was match affecting.

In the training there is a scenario specific to that last sentence of the violation note (forcing an opponent into a match affecting rule violation) but the answer it says is correct is to give a minor violation to the team that forced the rule to be broken. That doesn't make sense because it is a match affecting rule violation and should be a major violation. Could you please explain this?

Question 8

Correct

1.00 points out of 1.00

Flag question

BLUE2 forces RED1 into what is determined to be a Match Affecting Violation in a qualification Match. Which Team(s) would a Head Referee likely penalize, and why?

Select one:

- ☒ a. BLUE2 would receive a Minor Violation because you can't force an opponent into a penalty ☺
- ☐ b. Both Teams should receive a penalty because each of them broke a game rule
- ☐ c. RED1 would receive a Minor Violation because it was Match Affecting
- ☐ d. Neither Team should receive a penalty because you can't force an opponent into a penalty

Your answer is correct.

Could you please clarify the correct usage/enforcement of GG16 for the following situations and generally how the violation note is supposed to be interpreted:

1. BLUE1 forces RED1 into a match affection violation that would cause BLUE1 to win (ex: forcing RED1 to throw out 4 cubes)
2. BLUE1 forces RED1 into a minor violation (ex: forcing RED1 to throw out 1 cube, pushing RED1 into the empty blue parking zone during the last 20 seconds)
3. BLUE1 forces RED1 into a match affecting violation that causes RED1 to win (ex: pushing RED1 into BLUE2 while BLUE2 was parked during last 20 seconds causing BLUE2 to no longer be parked and the red alliance to win by less than 8 points)

Odpowiedz? committee

Thank you for your question, Afnan!

You are correct, the Violation Note for rule [<GG16>](#) includes an error. That Violation Note will be revised in the next game manual update as shown below (changes are shown in bold), and the change is effective immediately.

>Violation Notes: In most cases, if a Team causes their opponent to break a rule, the Head Referee will simply not enforce the penalty on that opponent, and it will be considered a Minor Violation for the Team **that forced a** Violation. However, if the forced situation becomes Match Affecting in favor of the Team **that forced the** Violation, it will be considered a Major Violation for the Team **that forced the Violation**.

The outcomes of your specific scenarios should be:

1. Major Violation for BLUE1, although the Match Affecting calculations should *not* consider penalties for the forced Violations themselves (including BLUE1 forcing RED1 to remove 4 Blocks from the Field).
2. Minor Violation for BLUE1
3. Minor Violation for BLUE1