

**SPORTSJUDGE.COM**  
COURT OF FANTASY BASEBALL –

-----	x	Index No. <b>3212</b>
<b>Mike Colligan</b>	:	Date: <b>April 28, 2009</b>
	:	League Type: <b>Fantasy Baseball</b>
Petitioner,	:	Dispute: <b>Transaction Limit</b>
	:	Judge: <b>Matthew Cohen</b>
- against -	:	
	:	<b>THE DROPPING OF JOEL ZUMAYA</b>
<b>Joseph Romano</b>	:	<b>DID NOT CONSTITUTE A</b>
	:	<b>TRANSACTION</b>
Respondent	:	
-----	X	

Petitioner **Mike Colligan** brings this claim in the COURT OF FANTASY BASEBALL, seeking to resolve the conflict of whether or not the activation of Joel Zumaya and subsequent releasing of Huston Street constitutes a third transaction, that would put Joe’s team in violation of the two transaction limitation that is allowed per week. This court rules that the releasing of Huston Street did not constitute a transaction and as a result was a legal move.

The League Constitution provides for a two transaction limit per week for each team, but does not provide a definition for what a transaction actually is. The transactions at issue are that Joseph Romano dropped David Aardsma (RP, Seattle Mariners) and picked up Joel Zumaya (RP, Detroit Tigers) on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. Joseph Romano then added Jordan Zimmermann (SP, Washington Nationals) off of waivers on April 24<sup>th</sup> and lastly dropped Huston Street (RP, Colorado Rockies) on April 24<sup>th</sup> in order to activate Joel Zumaya. Mike, after losing out on his waiver claim for Zimmermann, feels that this should count as three separate moves; the add/drop on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, the add/dl placement on the 24<sup>th</sup>, and the drop/dl activation on the 25<sup>th</sup>. Joe is claiming that a “normal” transaction is the add of a new player and the drop of the player being replaced, and feels that as a result only two transactions occurred.

When the league constitution does not specify a specific rule, the court must look at what the reasonable understanding was of the owners in the league in the rule at issue. (*Commissioner Winston Chung v. No Nonsense Fantasy Baseball League*, Index No. 1655, May 12, 2008). Here that question is what the owners reasonably would think would constitute a transaction. The league uses Yahoo! Fantasy Baseball to run their league, and on all Yahoo league homepages there is a transaction limit number listed to the right of the standings. When left at the default rule, as was the case here, Yahoo only counts when a player is added to a team as a transaction, they do not count any drops. Any owner that is trying to keep track of the transactions of the other owners by viewing the transaction amount would assume that it only counted as a transaction when a player was added.

Joseph Romano claims that the legislative intent of the transaction limit was to limit the number of times an owner may add players to his roster. Whether or not the entire league agrees with this is unknown at this time, but it makes sense that a reasonable owner would think this way. Typically transaction limits are used to prevent the streaming of pitchers, or to prevent an owner from overhauling

The attached template, including its intellectual property, logos, ideas, and processes included within, is the exclusive property of Highball Entertainment. This opinion may not be re-used, reproduced or otherwise copied for pecuniary gain without the express written consent of SportsJudge.com or Highball Entertainment. In addition, this opinion serves exclusively for entertainment value, and it may not in any way be construed as the practice of law by its authors. In some cases, the author may not even be a licensed attorney. Additionally, in some cases, the names of the representative league and parties are changed, at the sole discretion of SportsJudge.com

their entire team, all of which involve the adding of players. In all of my years as both a participant in fantasy baseball and as a Judge in the Court of Fantasy Baseball, I have never heard of any owner wanting to invoke a league transaction limit to prevent teams from dropping players, with the exception for attempts at collusion, which clearly did not occur here.

Now that it is settled that only the adding of a player amounts to a transaction, this court must rule on whether the adding of Joel Zumaya to the active roster from the DL should count as a transaction. It was counted as a transaction when Joel Zumaya was added to Joseph Romano's team and as a result it cannot count as a transaction when he is activated off of the DL. To do so would charge Joseph Romano with two transactions for adding the same player to the roster which would be unfair. The DL is part of a team's roster and as a result any team looking to activate an injured player should have the chance to activate that previously injured player whenever asked without having to worry about it counting as a transaction.

In order to avoid future problems when other transactions are made, it is suggested that the league add an Amendment to the League Constitution defining the term transaction to be the adding of a player off of either waivers or free agency.

In conclusion, the dropping of Huston Street (RP, Colorado Rockies) did not count towards the transaction limit, and the additions of Joel Zumaya (RP, Detroit Tigers) and Jordan Zimmermann (SP, Washington Nationals) were legal transactions meaning that both Zumaya and Zimmermann are now the property of Joseph Romano.