

MINUTES OF THE ACBL LAWS COMMISSION  
ADAM'S MARK, DENVER, CO  
NOVEMBER 19, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chip Martel, Co-Chairman  
Ralph Cohen, Co-Chairman  
Jim Kirkham                      Eric Rodwell  
Dan Morse                         Matt Smith  
Beth Palmer                       John Solodar  
Jeff Polisner                      Adam Wildavsky  
Ray Raskin

ALSO PRESENT:

Gary Blaiss  
Marvin French  
Joan Gerard  
Peggy Sutherlin

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 A.M.

Chip Martel chaired the meeting.

The minutes of the Atlanta meeting were approved unanimously.

Co-Chairman Cohen reported on progress of the meetings of the WBF Drafting Committee in Estoril:

Cohen reported that the suggestion of the ACBL Laws Commission to make incremental changes was adopted. After that agreement the committee proceeded to start afresh and made it through the current Law 16. An ad hoc committee went through Law25.

Further, the intent to have a new version available in 2006 for implementation in 2007 has been abandoned.

The drafting committee was not happy with the current Law 16; however, it could not arrive at an improvement. The intention remains to incorporate the present Law 73 into Law 16.

Ralph Cohen asked that Management distribute the existing proposed definitions to the entire Laws Commission.

Law 27, insufficient bid, was discussed briefly to the extent of whether a consensus existed to change the law such that a correction of a conventional call to the same conventional call one level higher could be made without penalty if the information communicated was essentially the same. There was no consensus.

Jeff Polisner asked if there was any consensus on leaving a law number blank if it was combined with an earlier law (e.g. if Law 73 is combined with Law 16, should Law 73 appear but be blank). There was no strong feeling but there was some thought to do whatever makes life easier for the tournament directors.

The claim laws were discussed. A consensus was reached on the following:

1. The director may take into account any play that took place after the claim and before his or her arrival to the table.
2. Address a declarer's claim and a defender's claim separately.

There seemed to be no consensus on whether the defenders could require play to continue after a claim has been made and if the defenders did have that right whether only in the presence of the tournament director.

Ralph Cohen asked that Management distribute to the Commission the section on claims in the Laws of Contract Bridge (rubber bridge).

There was a consensus to keep the present law on revokes as is.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.