

MINUTES

ACBL National Laws Commission
2016 Spring Meeting in Reno, Nevada
Saturday, March 19, 2016

Members Present:

Chip Martel, Chairman
Adam Wildavsky, Vice-Chairman
Peter Boyd
Chris Compton
Allan Falk (phone)
Ron Gerard
Rob Gordon
Matt Koltnow
Al Levy
Eric Rodwell
Rebecca Rogers
Matt Smith
Howard Weinstein

Also Present:

Jeff Polisner
Sam Whitten

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

1. The minutes from the Denver meeting, Fall 2015, were approved.
2. Adam Wildavsky gave a report from the WBF Drafting Committee. The WBF Laws Committee has completed a preliminary review of the Laws and is now focusing on some of the more complicated issues. The ACBL Laws Commission discussed clarifying Law 12C.1.(b), by adding examples and clarifying the language. In particular, the Laws Commission felt that serious error and the provision, “unrelated to the infraction” required clarification.

Adam Wildavsky reported that the WBF Drafting Committee intended to have a final version of the new Laws by the next meeting. The ACBL Laws Commission agreed to ask the WBF to provide them an opportunity to make comments before the final version was announced.

3. The Laws Commission discussed an example wherein the Declarer held Kx of Spades and KTxxx of Clubs and the Dummy held AQJx of Spades and AJx of Clubs. Declarer claimed the remainder of the tricks. The Commission discussed how this claim ruling should be adjudicated.

After discussion, the Commission agreed that Declarer must cash the AK of Clubs and would be awarded a third Club trick if the Queen of Clubs fell doubleton or singleton.

4. The Commission discussed the meaning of Law 20 F.1, "During the auction and before the final pass, any player may request, but only at his own turn to call, an explanation of the opponent's prior auction." The Commission generally agreed that the proper form of the question was "Please review the bidding with explanations." Although the Commission felt that UI issues could arise even with this form of the question, it minimized potential UI.

The Commission felt that players who ask about specific bids are endangering their own score and risking a potential score adjustment. The Commission felt that this issue was more of an education issue for players who ask questions about specific bids instead of the entire auction.

5. The Commission discussed a situation wherein a defender has a major penalty card and the declarer exercises his option to require the lead of that suit. Upon declarer exercising his option, it is discovered that the other defender is void in that suit. Later in the play, the defender that had a penalty card is able to give his partner a ruff in that suit.

The Commission was asked whether this knowledge of the void suit is authorized or not. The Commission agreed that this information was authorized pursuant to Law 16 A.1.(c), "it is information specified in any law or regulation to be authorized or, when not otherwise specified, arising from the legal procedures authorized in these Laws and in regulations (but see B1 below)."

6. Having no further business, the Commission adjourned.