

MINUTES

ACBL National Laws Commission
2014 Summer Meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada
Saturday, July 19, 2014

Members Present:

Chip Martel, Chairman
Adam Wildavsky, Vice Chairman
Peter Boyd
Chris Compton
Allan Falk
Ron Gerard
Robb Gordon
Matt Koltnow
Al Levy
Jeff Polisner
Eric Rodwell
Becky Rogers
Aaron Silverstein
Matt Smith
*Roger Stern
Howard Weinstein

*by telephone

Also Present:

Dan Plato, Tournament Operations

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.

1. The minutes from Las Vegas, Summer 2014, were approved.
2. UI from withdrawn calls (Laws 16D2, 26, 29B, 31B)
 - a) The discussion centered on examples included with the agenda.
 - b) Noted places in Duplicate Decisions that still reference previous Law Editions
 - c) Several questions were raised about more cross-referencing of Law 16D with recommendation to do so.
 - d) Add context/example for 10C4 for minutes and Duplicate Decisions.

(4. Subject to Law 16D2, after rectification of an infraction, it is appropriate for the offenders to make any call or play advantageous to their side, even though they thereby appear to profit through their own infraction (but see Laws 27 and 50).”
For example: if North has a balanced 20 count and South is barred, it is appropriate for North to choose whatever contract he views as likely to lead to the best score, e.g. bid 1N and hope other pairs are going down (or that EW will enter the auction and be penalized).

 - e) Affirmed that the offending side cannot use UI for profit

3. Procedure for accepting/rejecting declarer's lead out of turn. Law 55A
 - a) Discussion centered on the example included with the agenda.
 - b) There is often "implicit consultation" through glances at each other and "passing" the responsibility to partner.
 - c) Pointing out the infraction must not be seen as an opponent making a choice as to where declarer must make his lead .
 - d) Clarification statement suggested for the minutes and for the pre-drafting committee for the next edition of the Laws.
 - e) LC members not clear why this Law was changed. Duplicate Decisions does include "he who speaks first speaks for the partnership." Clearly DD is out of date on several issues.
 - f) Expressed desire for the WBF to include a paragraph of explanation when they rewrite a Law.
 - g) Simplest fix may be to remove the word "simultaneously." Another suggestion is to always allow the player downstream to override the partner's choice.
 - h) Matt Smith argued that the wording presented by Matt Koltnow is indeed how TDs rule at the table. "I tell them they can either accept or reject the lead without consulting each other. If one speaks, that is the option exercised. If both speak and say the same thing, this is the option exercised. If both speak (at almost the same time) and say different things, I accept the option exercised by the defender downstream of the irregular lead. I think that allowing one defender to voice a non-binding decision (since the tie-break goes to the downstream defender) is equivalent to allowing them to consult, which is not permitted."
 - i) Aaron Silverstein's motion: "remove the concept of simultaneity." Passed with objection by Robb Gordon.
 - j) LC members expressed a desire to see this Law rewritten for clarity and DD revised to match the Law.

4. New Business: Screen Procedures Review
 - a) Laws Commission advises C&C on this issue
 - b) Robb Gordon and Eric Rodwell volunteered to consult and develop a small e-mail group to rethink screen provisions.
 - c) Chris Compton will also report to C&C to assist in setting up this consultation between the committees.

5. Old Business: Continued Review of Law 12C1(c)
 - a) The LC provided examples and discussion with attachments to the agenda.
 - b) One factor considered: that with weighted rulings players tend to be "happier" with rulings that are weighted rather than "all or none" rulings and this may reduce the number of appeals
 - c) Strong argument that this should be applied in MI cases, not UI cases.
 - d) Adam Wildavsky expressed concerned that the WBF has had 20 years to provide examples and there are no cases to review.
 - e) A straw poll revealed the following (allowed voting for more than one option):
 - a. Changing nothing (3 votes)

- b. Changing only relative to MI cases (11 votes)
- c. Changing completely for MI and UI cases (minus logical alternatives(Las)) (10 votes)
- f) 12C1(c) should NOT apply to LA or claims.
- g) Chris Compton moved that 12C1(c) be adopted for MI and UI cases, thus asking the board to change the ACBL's election on this Law. It was noted that this provision of the law would apply to questions of redress but not for determining logical alternatives. Aaron Silverstein seconded.
 - a. Adam Wildavsky argued it will be very difficult to educate directors and committees.
 - b. Issues unresolved include when (approval by Board in Fall)?; where?; which events?; methods to educate players and directors?
 - c. Second paragraph of page 10 from the Agenda attachment was read in full. (note: this is an "election" to be voted upon by the board as recommended by the LC, not new law.)
 - d. Becky Rogers recommended only the first two sentences be adopted removing the word "normally" so as to speak only to MI. This suggestion is no longer valid with the revised motion above.

The Laws Commission recommends that the ACBL allow the use of Law 12C1(c) by directors and committees in ACBL events. Weighting probabilities shall only be used to assign adjusted scores when an infraction has caused damage to a non-offending side in cases of misinformation.

- e. Will require creating examples and education through such avenues as the monthly Bulletin.
 - h) Motion passed 10 to 3.
6. Ron Gerard raised an objection concerning a recent ruling in the Bridge Bulletin concerning Law 46B and the issue of "play anything."
 - a) Matt Koltnow and Matt Smith underlined the importance of the specific umbrella statement in the Law: "except when declarer's different intention is incontrovertible."
 - b) Final agreement was that it would be better to use a crisper example in citing "incontrovertibility."
 7. Al Levy informed the LC of openings at the WBF. ACBL has five positions that are part of that executive committee. Interested parties should contact the Board. Elections at the fall meeting of the Board.
 8. Adam Wildavsky was selected by unanimous vote to attend the WBF meeting in China as a representative of the Laws Commission of ACBL (expenses paid).

Meeting adjourned at 12:05.