

MINUTES OF THE ACBL LAWS COMMISSION
HILTON HOTEL, LAS VEGAS, NV
JULY 19, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chip Martel, Chairperson	Robb Gordon
Adam Wildavsky, Vice-Chair	Georgia Heth
Peter Boyd	Matt Smith
Chris Compton	John Solodar
Allan Falk	Peggy Sutherlin
Ron Gerard	Howard Weinstein

ALSO PRESENT:

Rick Beye, ACBL Chief Tournament Director
Gary Blaiss, ACBL Executive Administrative Officer
Olin Hubert, ACBL Tournament Director
Dan Morse, ACBL President
Matt Koltnow, ACBL Tournament Director
Tadashi Yoshida, Japanese Contract Bridge League Executive Secretary

The meeting was called to order at approximately 10:00 AM.

The minutes of the Detroit meeting were approved.

Laws 12B1 and 12C1(e) – Definition of “Infraction” and “Irregularity” in adjudicating unauthorized information (UI) cases: relevance of transmittal of extraneous information versus acting on that information contrary to Law 16B1(a) was discussed. There was no consensus as to whether the irregularity referred to in Law 12C1(e)(i) is the use of the UI or some combination of the creation of the UI and the use of the UI.

The commission decided to send a request to the drafting committee for its interpretation of this point.

Law 27 – parts B 1 (a) and (b) were discussed. On the point of use of Law 16D for application of part B1(b), there was a consensus that 16D may be applied as it is not stated that it is not to apply. However, a director should first apply 27D.

There was also a consensus that if there was a possible rare holding included in the meaning of the sufficient bid, but not the insufficient bid, that a change under 27B1(b) should still be permitted. For example, 2NT – Pass - 2♦, which is treated as a transfer to hearts but where 3♦ over 2N could (rarely) be the start of a slam try in a minor. The offender should be permitted to bid 3♦ over 2N without further rectification except for 27D and possibly 16D.

Law 45 D was discussed. It was unanimously judged that the law was clear that the director may not allow a later correction.

“Pause for thought” was discussed. There was a consensus that current application is acceptable.

Law 25B was discussed to question whether the director has an obligation to offer a person wanting to change an intentional call the option to substitute another call to give the offender’s LHO the opportunity to accept the substitution, which the LHO would have if the offender had just substituted a call for the intended one at any time before the director ruled. The consensus was that the director is prohibited from offering that option.

A similar situation exists in the claim laws. Law 68D is clear that play ceases once a claim is made. Law 70D3 states that the director may use play after a claim as evidence of the players’ probable subsequent play. This law (along with 25B) creates a situation in which the players’ options and the table actions differ depending upon whether the director is called or not. There was a consensus that this law is clear in that the director does not have the option to allow the players to continue play once a claim is made and the director arrives at the table.

The result of the interpretation is that calling the director in these two instances (25B and 68D) may result in a different outcome than if the offending player or the players in the case of a claim take action before calling the director.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.