

MINUTES

ACBL National Laws Commission
2011 Summer Meeting in Toronto, Canada
Saturday, July 23, 2011 – 10AM

Members Present:

Chip Martel, Chairman
Adam Wildavsky, Vice-Chairman
Robb Gordon
Georgia Heth
Eric Rodwell
Matt Smith
Roger Stern
Howard Weinstein

Members Present via Conference Call:

Ron Gerard
Gary Blaiss
Allan Falk

Also Present:

Matt Koltnow, Tournament Director
Mike Flader, Tournament Director
Al Levy, District 24 Director
Jim Miller, National Recorder
Sam Whitten, Assistant National Recorder

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

1. The Commission discussed the Louisville minutes. The Commission members discussed Item 7 from the Louisville minutes. The Louisville minutes were modified to reflect that the Commission discussed whether the Director should correct the revoke before it becomes established. Robb Gordon moved and Georgia Heth seconded the approval of the minutes from the Louisville meeting. The minutes were unanimously adopted as amended.
2. The Commission discussed the definition of “Rectify” under Law 81C.3. Matt Smith discussed the Director’s obligation when at the table to adjudicate a penalty card. Should the Director stop a player from revoking? Gary Blaiss made a distinction between situations where the Director is at the table officially versus a situation in which the Director is just observing the table. Gary Blaiss indicated that a Director at the table formally should address any irregularity within his view. Chip Martel

pointed out the Current Laws do not make this distinction. Robb Gordon argued that if a player revokes in front of the director that the non-offenders should have the right to get the revoke penalty if the revoke becomes established. Allan Falk argued that the Tournament Organizer should tell the Director how to resolve this question under Law 81a.

3. The Commission members discussed that the WBF has answered this question by determining that “Rectify” means to restore equity in the context of a revoke. Chip Martel pointed out that restoring equity is the current practice. Allan Falk pointed out that the definition of “Rectify” under the Laws indicates that “Rectify” means to impose the remedial provisions of the Law. A motion was made to adopt the WBF version of “Rectify” but no second was made. The issue was tabled for future discussion.

4. The Commission members agreed “trick” in Law 69B2 regarding Claims refers to the number of tricks taken and not any specific trick.

5. The Commission members discussed possible ambiguities in the wording of Law 12C.1.b. Adam Wildavsky pointed out that “subsequent to the irregularity” and “serious error” were discussed in previous meetings. Adam Wildavsky asked that the Commission define “unrelated to the infraction.” Roger Stern pointed out that the drafting committee wanted to distinguish between difficult bidding decisions caused by the infraction and mistakes that clearly were not caused by the infraction. He also pointed out that the drafting committee did not want to interfere with the bridge at the table. If the non-offending side makes a serious error at the table, their bridge result should reflect that error. The Laws still require an adjustment of the offending side’s score, but the non-offenders will not be saved from their error.

6. The Commission members discussed the phrase in Law 12c.1.b. that states “does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted.” Adam Wildavsky pointed out that “such part” in this phrase is ambiguous. The Commission members agreed to discuss this issue more in the future.

7. The Commission members discussed the revision of the Rubber Bridge Laws. Rubber bridge includes rubber bridge and Chicago style bridge. Roger Stern reported that it is a big job because the committee needs to determine what parts of regular laws should be integrated into the Rubber Bridge Laws. The Commission members agreed to ask frequent rubber bridge players for their input and assistance with this project.

8. Gary Blaiss gave a report on the progress of the Committee to develop the next revision of the Laws. Al Levy reported that he discussed a joint WBF/ACBL Drafting Committee at the last WBF meeting. He indicated that so far there has been a lack of interest from the WBF with regard to formulating a joint drafting committee. The Commission members agreed to proceed with a separate drafting committee with the

hope that the ACBL would have input during the drafting of the next revision of the Laws.

9. Al Levy brought up a situation where responder makes an insufficient bid of 2C after his partner's 2N opening bid. He reported that he believed that the Director should inform the non-offending side that they have right to call the Director back to the table at the conclusion of play to ask for an adjusted score if they felt that they had been damaged by the insufficient bid. The Commission members agreed with this interpretation of Law 27.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Whitten