

## World Bridge Federation

### Minutes of Laws Committee meeting in Sao Paulo on Tuesday, 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Present:           Ton Kooijman (Chairman)  
                  Grattan Endicott (Secretary)  
                  John Wignall (Drafting Committee Chairman)  
                  Max Bavin  
                  Joan Gerard  
                  Al Levy  
                  Dan Morse  
                  Jeffrey Polisner  
                  Maurizio di Sacco

Guest:             Adam Wildavsky

Apologies:       Jaime Ortiz-Patino (President Emeritus)  
                  Bertrand Gignoux  
                  Jeanne van den Meiracker  
                  William J.Schoder

1. Opening the meeting the Chairman invited the committee to approve the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> September meeting. With one amendment the minutes were agreed.
2. The committee discussed the interval between the commencement of the auction period (Law 17A) and the commencement of the auction (see Definitions) and exposure of a card in this interval. Law 24 is a specific law and, where it applies (the card may be visible to partner) it overrides the generality of Law 16.
3. The committee was told of experience of a situation where a player discovered at trick ten that he had held 14 cards originally. The Director would have liked to redeal the board. Referring again to the principle that a specific law overrides a general law, the committee agreed that Law 13 must be applied and, if the board cannot be corrected and played normally, an adjusted score awarded.

2.

4. The committee considered a situation where there had been a request for a ruling only just within the time limit (Law 92B). This had created a difficulty for the Director. The committee was of the view that the Director should provide a ruling before bringing it to the appeals committee. Laws 84 and 85 are specific and take priority over any attempt to take the matter directly to the appeals committee.
5. An enquiry was brought to the committee concerning the use of the word 'convention' [see Law 40B1(b)]. The question was referred to the Systems Committee.
6. What is commonly termed a 'double shot' is a gambling action within the meaning of Law 12C1(b) - as previously affirmed in the minutes of 30<sup>th</sup> August 1998. In reference to this same law, the standard for judging a 'serious error' must be extremely high and the calibre of the player is also relevant.

These considerations arise after an adjusted score has been awarded when the Director is thinking of a split score, taking away the adjustment (wholly or in part) from the non-offending side.

7. When both sides have revoked on the same board (Laws 64B7 and 64C), each revoke is examined separately in assessing the equity when that revoke occurs.
8. With regard to 'play period' it is considered that Law 40B2(b) specifically allows a player to consult his system card or an aide-memoire in the interval between quitting one board and commencing another. Any relevant regulation should also be taken into account.

Law 9A3 contains the authority for dummy to draw attention to an irregularity (subject to Laws 42 and 43) after play of a hand is completed.

9. The committee discussed the state of the On-line Laws. The WBF On-line Laws provide a 'default' code where needed. When licensing on-line games authorities may include a condition imposing a set of laws. The committee, bearing in mind proposals for a WBF On-line Championship, recommends that the On-line Laws be revisited with regard to the provisions of the 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge.
  
10. The committee noted dictionary definitions as follows:  
  
    'infraction' - to violate or break (a law etc.), to infringe.  
    'infringe' - to violate (esp. a law), to neglect to obey.
  
11. The Chairman asked that it be noted "Counting Period" is not an authorized name for the interval between the commencement of the auction period and the commencement of the auction.
  
12. The committee returned to the subject of the status of information arising when a misexplanation is corrected. There was lengthy discussion following which it was determined:
  - (a) that Law 21B1 applies in respect of a call that has been made; the Director is required to judge whether the call "could well have been influenced by misinformation given to the player". Unless he judges that in possession of the correct information (only) the player could well have made a different call no change of call under Law 21B1 is allowed nor is an adjusted score under Law 21B3.
  
  - (b) that when under Law 20F4 an explanation is corrected before the auction has closed the Director is pointed to Law 21B. This law does not indicate how the Director should then proceed\* but it was agreed that the player may use both the misexplanation and the correct information.

*[\*Secretary's note: in these circumstances a 1998 minute indicates that the Regulating Authority may give guidance.]*

4.

13. The committee returned to the matter regarding Law 20F1 that was the subject of its minute dated 10<sup>th</sup> October 2008. After further discussion it was agreed to abide by the 2008 minute.

The Chairman thanked members and guests for their attendance and contributions to the proceedings. He then closed the meeting.