

Minutes of the meeting of the WBF Laws Committee held on

30th October 2001 in Paris, France.

Present: T. Kooijman Chairman
R. Cohen Vice-Chairman
G. Endicott Secretary
J. Gerard
J. Polisner
A. Riccardi
W. Schoder
J. Wignall

Robert S. Wolff Past President

Guests: R. Colker
N. Wood

1. The Secretary presented the minutes of the previous meeting. After slight amendment these were agreed.

Arising:

- (a) The committee wished to remove from Section 6 any requirement to judge the intention of the player. It was agreed that the Director should apply Law 74A2 if he is of the opinion that there is no satisfactory bridge reason for a call made by an incoming player.
 - (b) The Secretary drew attention to the need, if it were the intention of the committee to bar a dummy who has lost his rights from making enquiry of partner under Law 42B1 concerning a play from dummy, to add a footnote to Law 43B2(b) to say “*or dummy’s hand”. The committee decided this was not its intention; a dummy who has lost his rights should still be allowed to make such an enquiry concerning a play from dummy’s hand.
2. The committee returned to the matter deferred from the previous meeting concerning Mr. Wolff’s proposed regulation. Mr. Wolff explained his reasons for wishing to make a misbid culpable at high levels of play. Expert players should know their systems and methods and it is not acceptable in his opinion that the chances are now that a misbid will be as likely to damage opponents as they are to damage the player’s own side, especially with some of the weak conventional bids that are fashionable. A tournament should not be decided upon the chances that the Director or

appeals committee will judge 'misbid' rather than 'misexplanation'.

The committee invited Mr. Schoder to consider whether he could introduce some measure of support for Mr. Wolff's objectives into his draft revised regulations for screens. The question was also remitted to the WBF Laws Revision Subcommittee.

3. The committee discussed Law 70E. It was agreed that it is assumed declarer would see cards as they would be played and to take account of what he would see.
4. The committee discussed the cross-references in the laws to Law 26, and in particular those in Laws 30, 31, and 32. The committee agreed that whilst the cross-references to Law 26 are not necessarily exhaustive in the laws the committee had not found a case where it would apply to a ruling under Law 30, 31 or 32, and the cross-reference is absent.
5. The committee agreed that references to irregularities in the laws refer to irregularities committed by players. An action by a Director may be an error but this does not constitute an 'irregularity' within the meaning of the laws.
6. The committee agreed that when Law 82C is applied the Director's error may still allow of a score being obtained normally; a rectification may allow of normal play. In these circumstances should it then be necessary to adjust the score the Director awards an adjusted score (either assigned or artificial as appropriate). The Laws Review Subcommittee was asked to seek a clearer statement of the law in this area.
7. The committee agreed with a statement concerning Law 31A published by the Secretary on the internet.
8. The committee noted extensive correspondence concerning unauthorized information derived from a question asked following an alert. The committee considered that the matter has had an exhaustive airing. Such unauthorized information can arise. The Laws Review Subcommittee will have another look at the subject.
9. The committee studied a problem put by Jan Romanski in correspondence on the internet. It found a difficulty between the statements in Law 69 and those in Law 63. This problem should be addressed by the Laws Revision Subcommittee. It was decided that Law 63A3 is to apply in

the quoted circumstances (LHO failed to follow suit in Spades at trick 9, declarer said 'OK Queen of Spades to you', hands were returned to the board and the board was scored; the revoke was discovered before the signal for the following round was given.) A member of the offending side has acquiesced "in any other fashion".

The committee adjourned. A further meeting was arranged for 9.15 a.m. on Thursday, November 1st.