

## MINUTES

ACBL National Laws Commission  
2011 Fall Meeting in Seattle, Washington  
Saturday, November 26, 2011 – 10 AM-12:00 PM

### Members Present:

Chip Martel, Chairman  
Peter Boyd  
Allan Falk  
Georgia Heth  
Jeffrey Polisner  
Eric Rodwell  
Matt Smith

### Members Present via Conference Call:

Ron Gerard  
Gary Blaiss  
Robb Gordon

### Also Present:

Mike Flader, Tournament Director  
Robert Hartman, CEO ACBL  
Matt Koltnow, 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 minutes from the Toronto meeting were moved, seconded and unanimously approved.
2. The Commission discussed Item 6 from the October 18, 2011 WBF minutes. The WBF 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.”
3. The Commission discussed whether it is unauthorized information when their partner alerts an unintended call under Law 25A. The Laws Commission decided that they agree with the WBF interpretation to conform to current practice.

4. The Commission discussed Item 11 from the October 20, 2011 WBF minutes. The WBF stated, “In relation to Law 12C1(b), the Committee stated that it is in agreement with Ton Kooijman’s Commentary in its explanation of the method of calculating the consequent and subsequent damage and thus the result on the board.” Mr. Kooijman’s Commentary described that “Redress is given only for damage caused by that infraction, not for damage as a result of a subsequent serious error. This includes wild or gambling actions, and, for example, the loss of an extra trick as rectification after a revoke. The Laws Commission agreed with Mr. Kooijman’s Commentary.

5. The Laws Commission discussed the application of Mr. Kooijman’s Commentary to Law 12C1(b). The Laws Commission decided that Mr. Kooijman’s method should only be used when there is serious error after the infraction. The Laws Commission was concerned that the WBF method is more complicated than the current ACBL method.

6. Howard Weinstein moved that the WBF adopted as the ACBL rule and Peter Boyd seconded the motion. The motion was defeated with 2 Yes votes, 7 No votes, and 2 abstaining. The Laws Commission decided to continue the current ACBL method until the next revision of the Laws.

7. The Laws Commission next turned to a follow up on discussion of Law 81C3: What should a director do when he becomes aware of an infraction in a way that is not part of a normal director call.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Whitten