

Draft

MINUTES

Draft

ACBL National Laws Commission
2015 Spring Meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana
Saturday, March 14, 2015

Members Present:

Chip Martel, Chairman
Peter Boyd
Chris Compton
Allan Falk
Ron Gerard
Robb Gordon
Matt Koltnow
Al Levy
Eric Rodwell
Becky Rogers
Matt Smith
Howard Weinstein

*by telephone

Also Present:

Sam Whitten, ACBL National Recorder
Tadashi Yoshida
Jeff Polisner

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

1. The minutes from the Providence meeting, Fall 2015, were approved.
2. The Laws Commission discussed Law 25A: Unintended Calls. The Commission discussed whether a player could correct an unintended call after his partner has bid in a situation where the player making the unintended call clearly indicates that his call is unintended. The Commission specifically discussed a situation where the player says "Oops" immediately after making his call, but LHO and partner both bid before the Director was called. The Laws Commission decided that it is too late to change an unintended call in this situation after partner has bid under Law 25A.

The Laws Commission also agreed that future versions of the Laws should use "mechanical error" in place of unintended.

3. The Laws Commission discussed Law 58: Simultaneous Cards from One Hand. The Commission discussed the appropriate definition of visible under Law 58B. The Commission agreed that the appropriate definition of visible in this context is that "the face of the card can be seen." Pursuant to this definition, the Commission discussed an example where a player played two cards but the

second card was stuck underneath the top card and its face could not be seen. In this situation, the Commission agreed that the underneath card should be replaced in the player's hand without penalty and the player may not choose to play the underneath card. If the player is a defender and subsequently exposes the unseen card, it becomes a penalty card.

The Laws Commission agreed that the definition of visible should be clarified in the next version of the Laws.

4. The Laws Commission (after extensive discussion) recommends that the ACBL Board of Directors change election #1 to allow Law 12C1(c) to be used to assign adjusted scores when an infraction has caused damage to a non-offending side.

5. The Laws Commission considered partnership agreements under Law 40 and the difference between a Mistaken Explanation and a Mistaken Call under Law 75. The Laws Commission reached consensus on the following statement: "For purposes of adjudicating Mistaken Call vs. Mistaken Explanation, system notes are to be considered but not conclusive evidence of the actual partnership agreement."

6. In the matter of the Baker Team's Appeal to the ACBL Laws Commission (regarding a case from the 2014 Wagar teams), the Commission announced that the Appeal Committee's decision was not contrary to Law, and thus the original Appeals Committee's decision stands.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00.

Examples for Item 4:

The following examples illustrate when (and how) this would be used (or not used):

1 A pair gets to 3NT due to misinformation from an opponent. 3NT goes down one on normal play. When the NS hands are polled to peers in the blind, six of six pairs arrive in 6D with the correct information about the opponents' agreements. The success of 6D depends upon declarer blindly guessing a suit of Kxx opposite Q109x (a suit the opening leader would never lead).

This is the simplest kind of case to apply 12C1(c) where only the number of tricks in one possible assigned contract is the issue. The non-offenders are customarily given some consideration in the ruling, so the adjustment might be something like 60% of 6D making, and 40% of minus 50.

2. A pair gets to 3NT due to misinformation from an opponent. 3NT goes down one on normal play. When the NS hands are polled to peers in the blind, three of six pairs arrive in 6D with the correct information about the opponents' agreements. The other three pairs arrive in 5D. The success of 6D depends upon declarer blindly guessing a suit of Kxx opposite Q109x (a suit the opening leader would never lead).

Here some consideration in weighting would be given to whether the pair gets to 6D or stops in 5D

as well as how many tricks might be taken. The weighting here might be something like 30% of 6D making 6; 20% of 6D down one; 30% of 5D making 6; 20% of 5D making 5.

3. NS get to a vulnerable 4S and East bids 5H after getting unauthorized information from partner that suggests the save. 4S is cold for four, while 5H doubled goes for 300. Taking the save is a 75% action absent the UI.

This is not a case where 12C1(c) is applied in other jurisdictions. Weighting is not used to determine whether an action is a logical alternative or not. The adjustment would be 100% of 4S making four for both sides.