

# WORLD BRIDGE FEDERATION

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WBF LAWS COMMITTEE HELD ON 1 SEPTEMBER 1998 LILLE, FLANDRES

**Present:** Ton Kooijman, Chairman  
Grattan Endicott, Secretary  
Virgil Anderson  
Joan Gerard  
Chip Martel (part of the time)  
Becky Rogers  
William Schoder (part of the time)  
Robert Wolff  
Barbara Nudelman (part of the time)

1. Minutes of the meetings of 24<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> August 1998 were each slightly amended and agreed.
2. Mr. Wolff expressed a view that non-offending sides should get their normal result as nearly as possible. The word “likely” in Law 12C2 should perhaps be emphasized. The Committee agreed to recommend this thinking to NBOs.
3. Mr. Wolff also would not wish the laws to permit a total score in excess of 100% on a board unless both sides were entirely innocent.
4. The Committee considered the situation in regard to purposeful corrections of call under Law 25B. The Chairman drew attention to the effect of Law 25B. It was agreed that the intention of the Committee in drafting this Law was to permit the correction of a “stupid mistake” (e.g. passing a cue bid after thinking whether to bid game or slam). It is not the intention that the Law should be used to allow of rectification of the player’s judgement. As the intention of the Committee this statement of intention constitutes an interpretation of the Law.
5. It was also decided that should a player’s partner call out of turn following the player’s bid, cancellation of the out-of-turn call does not re-open the door to a Law 25B purposeful correction; Law 29 now applies.
6. In Law 86C the meaning of the Law is that if one of the players who has to replay the board might know the score in the match without that board, the board shall not be redealt.

7. The Committee's attention was drawn to a suggestion that Law 17D is flawed. Both the marked change in the meaning of the bid in the example and the fact that information from the offender's withdrawn call was used meant that the action of the player is illegal.

[The example given is:

Opponents are vulnerable and we are not. I pick up a Yarborough, my RHO (who is dealer) passes, I pass and my LHO open 1NT (weak – 12-14 HCPs). I then realise that I have a hand from the wrong board and so call the TD who cancels my call. I take out the hand from the correct board to find:

AX  
AKQJT98  
AX  
AX

Now under Law 17D, I pass knowing that since I have repeated my original call my LHO must bid a weak No Trump vulnerable (because of the footnote to Law 17D) and I double this for a good score of +1100]

8. If a player knows that his partner's call is conventional but says he cannot recall what was actually agreed the Director may in his discretion send the player away from the table and allow the partner to tell opponents in his absence what the agreement is. The Director must be called and no action may be taken before he arrives.

The partner continues in the action on the basis that the player has understood his call, and does not use the unauthorized information that his partner is uncertain of the meaning.

The Director is strongly urged to remain at the table whilst the hand is completed.

This procedure is only for the exact circumstances described; it does not apply when the player says that the position is undiscussed or there is no agreement.

9. The Committee agreed that no change is to be made in the interpretation of Law that the reference in Law 43B2B to the penalty in Law 64 means the two trick penalty.
10. The Committee again acknowledged the Geneva ruling that the condition in Law 80F applies to regulations made under Law 80F but not to regulations made under Laws 40D, 80E or other powers to regulate granted in the Laws.

A consequence of this ruling is, as the Committee has previously confirmed, that the powers to regulate conventions are unrestricted and include the power to ban conventions in given circumstances.

11. The Committee considered the case of a player who normally plays a natural system but with a new partner agrees to play Precision. He forgets and opens 1C on a 12-count and five clubs. This is a misbid, not a psyche.

12. In Law 92D there should be a comma after “contest)”. The Law is interpreted to mean:

- a) that in a pairs event both members of a pair must concur in appealing;
- b) that in a teams event an appeal requires the consent of the Captain (and not necessarily of the pair).

13. A declarer or dummy who corrects his partner’s explanation at the end of the auction must explain his partnership agreement. If his hand does not conform to the corrected explanation he must be especially careful to ensure that he is right in his understanding of his partnership agreements.

Whilst no obligation exists he is free to be helpful to opponents with complete gratuitous information as to fact concerning his action (but not where such action is purposeful – e.g. psychic)

14. The Committee’s attention was drawn to an internet discussion as to whether it is legitimate for a player to address a question to the player who has made the call asked about.

This abnormal procedure can only be followed with the consent of the Director, who must be called, and at an appropriate time in the absence of the player’s partner. Furthermore the Director must be persuaded that the circumstances require it: it is to be avoided absolutely that a player should be allowed to verify from player A (who made the bid) whether the explanation of his partner B was correct.

Players must correct their partner’s explanations voluntarily at the due time specified in the Laws.

15. It is held illegal to ask a question in order that partner may be aware of the information in the reply.

16. There was a discussion on various aspects of regulation and of the effects of Law 12D3. It was agreed that regulatory matters should be referred to the Rules and Regulatory Committee where they concern WBF events. The Laws Committee could express views if it wished on regulatory matters world-wide.

17. Mr. Schoder asked for good communication of matters of substance to committee members and for avoidance of prior pronouncements on Laws Committee positions where these were not already clearly established.

18. The Chairman thanked everyone for their assistance at the three meetings in Lille now concluded.