

MINUTES OF THE ACBL LAWS COMMISSION  
Manchester Grand Hyatt Hotel, San Diego, CA  
November 28, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chip Martel, Chairperson	Georgia Heth	Chris Compton
Adam Wildavsky, Vice-Chair	Matt Smith	Eric Rodwell
Robb Gordon	John Solodar	
Allan Falk	Howard Weinstein	
Ron Gerard (by phone)	Jeff Polisner	

ALSO PRESENT:

Gary Blaiss, ACBL Executive Administrative Officer  
Mike Flader, ACBL Tournament Director and scribe  
Matt Koltnow, ACBL Tournament Director  
Al Levy, ACBL Board of Directors  
Tad Yoshida, Japanese Contract Bridge League Executive Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 AM.

A motion was made by Adam Wildavsky to approve the Washington DC minutes. Seconded by Robb Gordon. Approved.

Adam Wildavsky reported on the WBF LC meetings in Sao Paulo.

The minutes from the WBF meetings in Sao Paulo were discussed.

Al Levy asked if the wording of the Laws can be changed by ACBL and/or should it be a footnote/asterisk to the Laws.

Jeff Polisner was of the opinion that members (i.e. country federations) of the WBF are required to follow the WBF version of the Laws, but that organizations like the ACBL which is not a member may differ.

Gary Blaiss agreed with Polisner. The ACBL Laws Commission is responsible for the set of Laws used by the ACBL. He also noted that in the past there was cooperation between essentially the ACBL and WBF to agree on a uniform set of Laws. This set of laws does not follow that paradigm, and Blaiss would like to see a return to the previous situation of cooperation between the ACBL and WBF to draft the Laws of Duplicate Bridge.

Robb Gordon wondered at what point of divergence are the two organizations playing different games.

Adam Wildavsky made a motion to make the ACBL Laws Commission's interpretation of Law 12C1e(ii) a footnote to the ACBL's laws, rather than embedding it in the text of the law as at present. There was no second, as it was felt further discussion should be deferred to the Spring meeting." Law 23's place in the laws was briefly discussed. Since the WBF version of the Laws contains no chapters and sections, it was the opinion of the group that law 23 was designed to apply to all phases of a bridge hand not just the auction.

Allan Falk's motion regarding law 21 was tabled until the next meeting.

A discussion of what information is authorized for the opponents of a pair having a misunderstanding followed. Eric Rodwell moved that the information that the opponents are having a misunderstanding is authorized if you are aware of it. This motion did not get a second as it was felt it was premature to finalize policy now, so discussion of questions asked during the auction was deferred until next spring.

Law 7B1 was discussed. Suppose North-South look at their hands before a member of the other side or the director is present. Should law 6C apply? A footnote to the Law was proposed. It was suggested that such a footnote be drafted and then discussed online. "

#### OLD BUSINESS:

Law 20F and concerns regarding what questions are allowed to be asked about the auction was brought up. It was decided to discuss this issue online and decide in Reno.

#### NEW BUSINESS:

Regarding responsibility for responding to a question by a defender about whose lead it is, whose responsibility is it to correct bad information?

It was pointed out that in the auction all players are responsible for correcting a misstatement in the review. It was the opinion of the speaker that this same standard should be applied to this question.

A discussion ensued regarding the standards applied to the non-offending side when assigning an adjusted score. Matt Smith volunteered to write an opinion and to discuss online and in Reno.

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Flader, Scribe

