

MINUTES OF THE ACBL LAWS COMMISSION  
HILTON HAWAIIAN VILLAGE, HONOLULU, HI  
NOVEMBER 18, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Allan Falk	Eric Rodwell
Robb Gordon	Matt Smith
Dan Morse	John Solodar
Jeff Polisner	Peggy Sutherlin
Ray Raskin	Adam Wildavsky

ALSO PRESENT:

Rick Beye	Olin Hubert
Gary Blaiss	Tadashi Yoshida
Joan Gerard	

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 A.M. by Jeff Polisner acting as Chairman in Chip Martel's absence.

The minutes of the Chicago meeting were approved unanimously.

Jeff Polisner reported on the status and procedures of the WBF Drafting Committee. A side by side draft of the laws has been created. This draft is being sent to some Zonal Authorities for review.

Jeff emphasized that the drafting committee is not seeking comments on philosophy as those matters have been agreed. The drafting committee is looking to eliminate confusing wording, ensure there are no omissions and closing any holes.

It is projected that the drafting committee will have a final draft submitted to the WBF Executive Counsel for approval in Shanghai. After this approval, it is expected that the new version of the Laws will become effective in 2008. Distribution to members of this Commission of the present draft will be at the discretion of its Chairman, Chip Martel. These will be distributed, most likely, by e-mail.

Jeff suggested that comments be sent to Gary Blaiss who will communicate the suggestions to the WBF Drafting Committee.

This Commission authorizes ACBL Management to add a footnote to the Laws of Contract Bridge (rubber bridge laws) that, for multi-table events, both sides may receive the bonus for an unfinished game or rubber, if appropriate.

In the matter of the use of the word acquiescence in law 63 A 3, the Commission decided (with one objection) that tournament directors must use the definition of acquiescence as stated in law 69 A to determine whether a revoke was established after the revoking side acquiesces to a claim or concession.

Jeff Polisner raised the issue of whether there could be unauthorized information (UI) arising from the non-Alert of a call which by agreement does not require an Alert when the bidder has misbid. Example: 1♣– Pass – 2♠ where the 2♠ spade call was strong by agreement but the 2♠ bidder had a weak jump shift. The Commission was in unanimous agreement (except for Polisner) that, yes, this was UI.

Rick Beye wanted confirmation that it was illegal to have conventional agreements to handle irregularities (such as insufficient bid) by an opponent. The Commission was in unanimous agreement that this was illegal as currently regulated in the ACBL.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.