

Minutes of the meeting of the WBF Laws Committee in Koningshof on

18th October 2011.

Present: J. Ortiz-Patiño, Chairman Emeritus

T. Kooijman, Chairman

G. Endicott, Secretary

M. Bavin

J. Gerard

J. Polisner

W. Schoder

J. Wignall

Apologies: C. Martel, M. Di Sacco.

Guests: Georgia Heth, Jonathan Steinberg.

1. The Chairman extended a welcome to the members of the committee as composed following changes made after its last meeting, and a particular welcome to the Chairman Emeritus.
2. Two apologies for absence were noted.
3. The committee considered Law 41B. It decided to refer to the next review of the Laws a suggestion that there may be merit in omitting mention of the leader's partner in this law. Consideration might be given also whether to clarify the effect of the phrase "instruction of the Director after an irregularity".
4. Committee members received a paper itemizing some situations where there is a problem of law relating to withdrawal of a card following a revoke. To give members time to study the paper discussion was put back to the next meeting of the committee.
5. The committee redirected its attention to its minute of 10 October 2008 concerning Law 64C. The interpretation of the committee is re-expressed in the case of one or more repeated revokes by the same player in the same suit. The penalty provisions are applied according to Law 64A for the first revoke. For the subsequent revoke(s) the Director applies Law 64C. He adjusts the score if the non-offending side would have gained more tricks had the repeated revoke(s) not occurred. (see example below)
6. The committee confirmed once again that if a player's attention is diverted as he makes an unintended call the 'pause for thought' should be assessed from the moment when he

first recognizes his error. It was decided to add to the Laws a footnote to Law 25A as follows:

“A player is allowed to replace an unintended call if the conditions described in Law 25A are met, no matter how he may become aware of his error.”

The question is referred for further examination in the next review of the Laws.

7. Items 5(a), 6 and 7, of the agenda were put aside to be revisited in the next meeting.

8. The committee received from the ACBL a communication of the ACBL’s desire that the committee express itself on the meaning of “a serious error (unrelated to the infraction)” in Law 12C1(b). The Chairman suggested that since his Commentary on the 2007 Laws does not bear the imprimatur of the committee, he should bring the relevant text to the next meeting and invite the committee to support his comments on this law. This was agreed.

9. The Committee considered it appropriate to extend a minute of its meeting of 4th September 2009 to read: “In no circumstances can the application of Law 69, 70 or 71, lead to a weighted score. The law requires that “such trick” shall be transferred or not transferred as determined by the Director’s ascertainment of facts. In determining the number of tricks in a claim or concession the Director does not assign an adjusted score. A restriction applies generally that weighting under Law 12C1(c) is applicable only where an assigned adjusted score is awarded under the laws.

10. There was a brief introduction of a discussion of the preliminary arrangements for the next review of the laws. A view was expressed that very few matters exist where a substantive review of the laws is called for. The committee should concentrate on improving the layout and wording where possible. However, it was agreed that it should be made known to the bridge community at large that the committee is willing that suggestions for desirable changes in the laws should be sent to the Secretary of the Committee as soon as may be, given the prospect that work on this may not be long delayed. Further discussion of the subject was remitted to the next meeting.

11. In closing the meeting the Chairman thanked members for their attendance and contributions and reminded them that its deliberations would resume at 12 noon on Thursday, October 20th.

.....

[Note: the intention is that an appeal from the recent Poznan Championships will be appended to these minutes for consideration in relation to a matter about which the committee has expressed its view.]

EXAMPLE

	♠ 10 ♥ QJ653 ♦ K652 ♣ AKQ	
♠ J76 ♥ 987 ♦ A10987 ♣ J10	♠ AKQ983 ♥ 4 ♦ J ♣ 97653	♠ 542 ♥ AK102 ♦ Q43 ♣ 842

South is declarer in 4♠. West leads ♣J

Play:

West	North	East	South
♣J	♣A	♣2	♣3
♣10	♣K	♣4	♦J !!
♠6	♠Q	♠8	♥4 !!
♦A	ruffed by declarer who wins all remaining tricks.		

Result: 12 tricks

The Facts:

South revoked twice, on the ♣K and ♣Q.

Decision:

The TD applies L64A2 for the first revoke: one trick transferred. There is no penalty for the second revoke but L64C applies. If South gained advantage while committing the second revoke it needs to be removed. Had South followed suit in trick 3 West could have ruffed and South would have lost another trick. The adjusted score is 4♠ just made.