

Changes to Code of Disciplinary Regulations
Effective August 2006

(Deletions are indicated by strikethroughs and additions are underlined)

2. Jurisdiction

2.1 Of Units, Districts and ACBL (see also 2.2)

2.1.1 A Unit has jurisdiction over:

- (a) Members of the Unit when such a member is participating in a sanctioned event or other activity sponsored by a Unit, District or ACBL ~~sponsored activity~~.
- (b) Persons participating in a sanctioned event or other activity sponsored by a Unit, District or ACBL held within the Unit's geographical boundaries.
- (c) Managers and or staff of clubs located in a unit's geographical area in relation to complaints brought pursuant to CDR 2.1.6.
- (d) Persons participating in a club sponsored ACBL sanctioned event held within the Unit's geographical boundaries relating to complaints of alleged cheating by use of signals, other unauthorized information, other forms of cheating, or serious breaches of ethics.

2.1.2 A District has jurisdiction over:

- (a) Persons participating in a sanctioned event or other activity sponsored by a Unit, District or ACBL ~~Unit, District or ACBL sponsored activity~~ held within its geographical boundaries (District Disciplinary Committee).
- (b) Those residing within the District, for appellate purposes only (District Appellate Committee).

2.1.3 The ACBL has jurisdiction over:

- (a) Members of ACBL or others disciplined, for appellate purposes only, except where otherwise specified in the CDR.

- (b) Persons participating in a sanctioned event or other activity sponsored by a Unit, District or ACBL ~~sponsored activity~~ held under its jurisdiction.
 - (c) ACBL members who have been disciplined or sanctioned by any other bridge organization.
- 2.1.4 A Tournament Disciplinary Committee, as well as the disciplinary committee of the sponsoring organization, has jurisdiction over persons in attendance at that tournament. Notwithstanding the above, the disciplinary committee of the sponsoring organization has the right to hear a matter within its jurisdiction beyond the date or dates of the tournament. If such right is not exercised, the matter may be referred to the member's Unit pursuant to CDR 2.1.1.
- 2.1.5 None of the disciplinary bodies noted in CDR 2.2 has jurisdiction over an ACBL employee (member or not) in pursuit of his or her employment with the ACBL.
- 2.1.6 Except for ACBL Management in accordance with CDR 2.2.5, none of the disciplinary bodies noted in CDR 2.2 has jurisdiction over the club's manager or staff based on actions taken in pursuit of their club activities unless the action is brought by ACBL Management in accordance with CDR 2.1.1 (c).

Discussion:

These changes were enacted to give the club manager more control over behavior at ACBL-sanctioned games sponsored by the club. Complaints from these events are to be handled by the club in which they occurred (i.e. a behavior complaint from a club sponsored game may no longer be made to the unit for charges to the unit's disciplinary committee).

In addition, the club manager and staff (e.g. the club director) are only subject to the Code of Disciplinary Regulations through ACBL Management. A player or players may no longer use the ACBL Disciplinary Regulations against a club manager or staff based on actions taken in pursuit of their club activities. Only ACBL Management has the authority to submit a complaint about the club manager or staff to the unit.

A complaint from a club sponsored sanctioned game may still be submitted to the unit when the complaint alleges cheating or other serious breaches of ethics.

A typo in section 5.2.10 is corrected as follows:

A type-written report.....

