

Minutes of the meeting of the WBF Laws Committee held in Bermuda
on 12th January 2000.

Present: Ton Kooijman (Chair)
The President Emeritus
Ralph Cohen (co Vice-Chairman)
Grattan Endicott (Secretary)
Virgil Anderson
Cecil Cook
Joan Gerard
Dan Morse
William Schoder

By invitation: Richard Colker
Jeffrey Polisner
Linda Trent
Nadine Wood

Apologies received from Carlos Cabanne and Santanu Ghose.

1. The meeting continued with items remaining from the meeting the previous day. Law 64 was addressed. It was confirmed that in Law 64A2 the word 'subsequently' means subsequent to the revoke.
2. The question of the 'two trick penalty in Law 64', see Law 43B2(c), was revisited. Mr. Ghose's remarks were noted. It was agreed that the wording of the minute in Ocho Rios requires amendment. Accordingly the committee confirmed its position that the legal card which is substituted for the first card determines the ownership of the revoke trick. This card is played subsequently to the revoke. Law 64 is then to be applied, so that there may be 2 trick penalty but not necessarily so.
3. The committee gave its attention to Law 63A3 and noted that if a defender revokes and Declarer then claims, whereupon a defender disputes the claim so that there is no acquiescence, the revoke has not been established. The Director must allow correction of the revoke and then determine the claim as equitably as possible, adjudicating any margin of doubt against the revoker.
4. There was further discussion concerning Law 63 and its relationship with Law 69. It was noted that Law 63 indicates how acquiescence may occur and Law 69 defines the time limits for it.

5. The committee read copies of internet correspondence concerning a situation in which, acting upon misinformation which in the Director's opinion inhibits them from a presumed 3NT contract, a side arrives in a high level contract, which may appear to be a good contract but as the cards lie cannot be made. It was agreed that a score adjustment is appropriate if the side is damaged, as in the specific example owing to the misinformation, but if the side is not damaged the laws do not allow of score adjustment. The WBF Code of Practice defines 'damage'. A player claiming to be damaged must convince the Director this is the case. The quality of the contract is not a consideration.
6. Being aware that declarers sometimes give an instruction to Dummy to run a suit and then leave him to do this without giving, as is procedurally correct, a separate instruction for each card. A question can arise as to when the second, or a later, card is played from dummy, since the Declarer is not able to stop play of the card once it is played. The Committee ruled that the card is deemed to be played when Declarer's RHO follows to the trick. However, the committee deprecates instructions given to Dummy in this irregular manner.
7. A question put by M. Lormant Philippe concerned the relationship of Law 51 to Law 50. The committee observed that Law 50 makes the general statement of the matter; Law 51 deals with the position when there is more than one penalty card but does so by reference back to Law 50.
8. At the request of the committee the Secretary undertook to retain a note that Law 79B requires attention when a major review of the laws is undertaken.
9. The committee revisited the decision taken in Lille concerning 'average minus' in Law 12C1. The committee decided to abide by its decision in Lille.
10. Mr. Wignall said that the Systems Committee would welcome advice on the manner in which 'encrypted' signals could best be disallowed. Members of the committee undertook to provide information for consideration. The subject would be revisited at the next meeting of the committee.
11. Mr Wignall drew attention to situations when, behind screens, an opening bid is followed by a 'big jump in a suit' and upon enquiry as to its meaning the side which has made the skip bid responds that they 'have no agreement'. This subject also was deferred for later examination together with generally related issues.

The meeting then concluded. It was agreed that a further meeting is needed.