

ACBL Laws Commission Agenda

Date: November, 24 2018

Day: Saturday

Time: 10:00 AM

Hotel: Hilton Hawaiian Village

Room: Lahua Suite

Members Present:

Chip Martel, Chair
Adam Wildavsky, Vice-Chair
Eric Rodwell
Al Levy
Allan Falk
Howard Weinstein
Rebecca Rogers
Matt Koltnow
Matt Smith

Present telephonically:

Ron Gerard
Roger Stern

1. Meeting called to order at 10:00AM HST. Minutes were approved online.
2. Law 91 (attached, pp. 2-3).

Robb Gordon noted that the Laws say that a TD may eject for the balance of a single session. 91B says a director with sponsor approval can disqualify for cause. Matt Smith pointed out that the LC had previously interpreted 91B in a strict way. There is consensus that the DIC with approval of "tournament sponsor" may suspend a player for the balance of a tournament, understanding that this is for when a Tournament Conduct Committee is unavailable. Such discipline should be referred to the appropriate recorder in the form of a player memo or to the charging party through the recorder in the form of a direct complaint.

3. Claims with unmentioned outstanding trump: should we have more defined rules? (attached pp.4-11)
- Claims - claimer appears not aware of outstanding trump. Adam Wildavsky prefers defined rules, perhaps those suggested by Kit Woolsey¹. Roger Stern suggested we should give the TDs latitude in judgment. Matt Koltnow said different TDs have different "styles" in judgement situations. Matt Smith and others felt the experienced directors that populate our tournaments largely have enough understanding of Laws and bridge to make reasonable rulings as things stand. There was discussion of a parallel simplified set of Laws for clubs. The problem was that when club players "move up" to tournaments It will be a slightly different game.

Chip Martel said the overriding issue is whether we are comfortable with current guidelines. Matt Koltnow suggested an update of Duplicate Decisions. Matt Smith agreed to work on now TD guidelines for claims. All of this will be discussed online in the group.

4. Law 16: obligation of a player with UI (and possible UI in the case of screens). [deferred]
5. Obligation to not accept a trick the opponents could not lose, laws 72B2 and 79A2. (pp. 11-12)
A player is not required to reveal a revoke during the penalty phase. After the penalty phase a player should make his infraction known so equity may be restored.

Also, the LC encourages the ACBL to extend the correction period until the beginning of the next session for these situations.

Back to #4 - how do we make people clearly understand their obligations? People think that with the presence of UI, they should do whatever they would, but this is not correct.

While there is clearly consensus among the LC as to what these obligations are, there was much discussion about how to communicate that to players. Robb Gordon volunteered to write something up.

Then Chip Martel mentioned the situation where the UI may be ambiguous behind screens. The existing policy is that 20-25 seconds on one side of the screens is considered "in tempo".

¹ A. The order of play of non-trump suits should be the worst possible for claimer (although play within the suit is normally from the top down).

B. Declarer may never attempt to draw any trumps of which he was likely unaware, if this is to his advantage.

C. It is considered a normal play for declarer to take a safety check with a "high" trump

D. Declarer should not be forced to play the remainder of his trumps to his disadvantage if both opponents have shown out of the suit.

6. Old Business - none

7. New Business - none

Adjourned at 11:37AM HST.