

**Minutes of the First Meeting of the WBF Laws Committee
in Maastricht, August 30th 2000.**

Present: T. Kooijman (Chairman)
J. Ortiz-Patino (WBF President Emeritus)
R. Cohen (Co Vice-Chairman)
C. Martel (Co Vice-Chairman)
G. Endicott (Secretary)
J. Wignall (Drafting sub-committee Chairman)
V. Anderson
J. Gerard
D. Morse
J. Polisner (WBF General Counsel)
A. Riccardi
W. Schoder (WBF Chief Tournament Director)

Guests: Robert S. Wolff (WBF Past President)
R. Colker
D. Stevenson
L. Trent
N. Wood

Apologies: C. Dadoun, D. Davenport, S. Ghose, A. Kearse.

1. The Chairman made welcome all those attending this first meeting in Maastricht of the Committee.

2. The Chief Tournament Director asked that the Committee expand upon its interpretation of Law 25B (see Section 3 of the minutes of 20th January 2000).

The Committee ruled that until LHO calls it is authorized information that the player may use if the player sees a call on the tray that he has not previously observed, the tray not having fully passed under the screen.

3. Discussing the text of a reported appeal decision, the Committee noted that an appeals committee which believes a Director has ruled incorrectly as to a matter of Law should invite the Chief Director to review the application of law. A committee may, however, alter the Director's ruling where it finds differently from the Director as to the facts (although this may be an infrequent occurrence).

4. The Chief Director asked the committee to take note of the fact that an appeal under Law 92 is an appeal of a Director's ruling. The ruling exists and it is for the appeals committee to uphold it or to vary it.

5. The Committee considered the possible interpretations of the footnote to Laws 69,70 and 71. It was agreed that the footnote has not been worded clearly. The Committee invites the copyright holders to change this footnote when next printing the laws, so that it will read: "For

the purposes of Laws 69, 70 and 71, 'normal' includes play that would be careless or inferior, but not irrational, for the class of player involved."

In the meantime the correct interpretation of the current footnote is in accordance with the revision of the wording to be made.

6. The Committee examined a statement that "When bidding boxes are in use the attempt to correct an inadvertent call (Law 25A) must follow instantaneously upon the player's discovery of his mistake. (Should LHO have meanwhile made a call over the player's first call Laws 25A, 21B and 16C apply)." The Committee finds this principle acceptable and urges regulating authorities to incorporate it (or an alternative statement) in their tournament regulations. Directors are recommended, where there is no regulation to cover the point, to follow the above guidelines.

7. The Committee discussed the word 'inadvertent' used in the laws. A guest suggested that an action is inadvertent if, at the time the player makes it, he decides one course of action but actually does something else through misadventure in speaking, writing or selecting a bidding card. Mr. Wignall made observation that the etymology of the word indicates a turning away of the mind, so that the action does not occur as a conscious process of the mind. The Committee acquiesced in the views expressed.

8. Mr. Martel spoke as to the difference in an all-expert game and any other in diagnosis of psychic action. The Committee did not support any view that in the sequence P – P – 1H – 1NT ? the Dealer, having eleven HCP, could now do other than double.

The Committee then commented upon the question of development of partnership understandings about psychic action. The view taken is that a partnership understanding exists when the frequency of occurrence is sufficient for the partner of a psycher to take his awareness of psychic possibilities into account, whether he does so or not.

When a partnership understanding as to psychic action exists it is subject to regulation under the laws as being part of the methods of the partnership.

9. The Committee addressed any situation when, as the result of an irregularity, a result cannot be obtained and an artificial adjusted score would normally be awarded. If a non-offending side would be disadvantaged by an award of average plus (60%, or higher where Law 88 allows) the Committee does not consider a higher percentage may be awarded under Law 12C1. If the circumstances allow the Director may assign a score under Law 12A1 or Law 84E.

The Committee adjourned at this point and appointed a time for a further meeting.