

## 2007 – Changes to the Laws.

### Main Changes –

- A) - The Director given considerably more discretionary Powers
- B) - Word Penalty has been changed to Rectification
- C) – Word Inadvertent has been change to Unintended
- D) - **Law 12 – Directors Discretionary Powers** – Director now able to give a weighted score adjustment.
- E) **Law 17 Auction Period** – Auction period changed
- F) **Law 25 – Legal and Illegal changes of Call** – Section B – **Delayed or Purposeful Correction** has been removed
- G) **Law 27 Insufficient Bid.** – Major changes to Call allowed after an Insufficient Bid
- H) **Law 40 – Partnership Understanding** – Significant wording changes
- I) **Law 64 – Procedure after establishment of a Revoke** – Change to where the offending player does not win the Revoke trick but does win a trick later with a card they could have played to the revoke trick.
- K) **Law 70 – Contested Claim or Concession** – More detailed guide lines for the director.

### **Law 7 – Control of Boards and Cards**

7C – Returning Cards to Board - Adds in = “Player should shuffle his original 13 cards before returning them to the board”

### **Law 10 – Assessment of Penalty**

General – Change of using the word PENALTY to RECTIFICATION  
And PAYMENT to ENFORCEMENT

### **Law 12 – Directors Discretionary Powers.**

The changes to this law allow the director to, instead of a bridge score, award a Weighted score.

For Example:-

As a result of misinformation a pair defends 4HX. If they had been correctly informed they will certainly bid game in spades and possible slam, making eleven or twelve tricks depending on declarer’s line

The Director may conclude that equity is best served by substituting a single weighted score as follows.

	30% of +1430	(6S=)
plus	40% of +680	(4s +2)
plus	20% of +650	(4s +1)
PLUS	10% of -100	(6S -1)

At pairs – Assume there are 12 tables, the frequency table would look something like this

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Matchpoints</u>
2.3	+1430	20.7
5.4	+680	13.0
2.2	+650	5.4
2.1	-100	1.1

The weighted score will be:-

$(0.3*20.7) + (0.4*13.0) + (0.2*5.4) + 0.1*1.1 = 12.6$  rounded to 1 decimal place

A single score of NS 12.6 would be awarded. (9.4 to E/W)

At Teams: Assume the score in the other room was N/S +650

<u>Net Score</u>	<u>IMPs</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	<u>Adjust</u>
+1430 – 650 = +780	+13	30%	3.9
+ 680 – 650 = + 30	+1	40%	0.4
+ 650 – 650 = 0		20%	0.0
- 100 – 650 = -750	-13	10%	-1.3
-----			
	Total		3.0

The IMP total is rounded to the nearest whole number and the board scored as +3 to the non-offending side.

**Law 13 – Incorrect number of Cards –**

- A) – If director deems hand can be played normally – no longer requires the concurrence of the players BUT can still award an adjusted score.

**Law 17 – The Auction Period.**

- A) – Auction period Starts  
Has been changed to “when either partner withdraws his cards from The board.”

**Law 20 – Review and Explanation of Calls**

- A) Review after Final Pass  
Additional Wording to say that may not ask for a partial Review or halt the review.
- B) – Explanation of Calls  
New Paragraphs clearing up what can be asked about and who explains
- C) – Incorrect Procedure – New Paragraph
- 1) Improper to ask for your partner’s benefit
  - 2) Players can not consult their own System Card.

**Law 24 - Card Exposed or Led Prior to Play Period**

Adds in that Information about exposed card is Authorised to Non offenders

**Law 25 – Legal and Illegal Changes to Call**

- A) – Unintended Call – Wording Changes
- B) – Call Intended – Second call may be accepted, other wise cancelled and there could be UI. Major change from 1997 Laws

**Law 27 – Insufficient Bid**

Major Change to what the insufficient bid can be changed to without penalty

- B1(a) – If the Insufficient bid is corrected by the lowest sufficient bid in the Same denomination and in the directors opinion both the insufficient Bid and the substituted bid are incontrovertibly not artificial the auction proceeds without further rectification. Law 16D does not apply
- B1(b) – If, except as in (a), the Insufficient bid is corrected with a legal call That in the Director’s opinion has the same meaning as, or a more Precise meaning than, the insufficient bid (such meaning being fully Contained within the possible meanings of the insufficient bid) The Auction continues without further rectification.

## **Law 40 – Partnership Understandings**

Major wording changes

### A) – Players Systemic Agreements

1A – Partnership agreements both explicit and implicit through experience

1B – Duty to make available Partnership understandings

2 – Information conveyed only through legal calls and plays

3 – Right to deviate from understandings

### B) – Special Partnership Understanding

1A - Regulating body (RB) may designate certain agreements as ‘Special Agreements’

1B – Any agreement between partners is an understanding (?)

2A – Regulating Body can regulate systems / System Cards / Alerting

2B – Player may not consult their own System Cards unless allowed by RB

2C – Consulting opponent’s System Cards

2D – RB may restrict Psychic calls

3 – RB may control system uses and changes due to questions asked

4 – Side damaged by failure to disclose Systemic meaning are entitled to rectification

5 – Systems not complying to RB Rules may be subject to Procedural Penalties

6a – Partner must disclose all special information

6b – The director may adjust if information not given and opponents are damaged

### C) – Deviation from System and Psychic Action.

1 – Player may deviate from system providing partner has no knowledge

2 – Player who deviates does not have to notify opponents

3a – Player not entitled to any memory aids

3b – Repeated violation of requirement to disclose agreements may be punished.

## **Law 50 – Disposition of Penalty Card**

No change except to add in

E1 - Knowledge of the requirements for playing a penalty card is Authorized Information to all players

E2 – Other information derived from the sight of the Penalty card is UI to offenders partner

E3 – If the Director judges that the exposed card conveyed such information as to damage the non-offending side, may award adjusted score.

## **Law 55 – Declarer’s Lead out of Turn**

No Change except

Adds in that if the defenders choose differently – then the next in rotation is accepted.

## **Law 61 – Failure to Follow Suit – Inquiries concerning a revoke**

Adds in

B – Right to inquire about a Possible Revoke

B2 (b) – Dummy can not ask a defender about a Revoke

B3 – Defenders may ask declarer and, unless prohibited by the RB, may ask one another.

## **Law 64 – Procedure after Establishment of a Revoke.**

Major Changes

A2 – Rectification following a revoke - Change

If the offending side did not win the Revoke trick but won subsequent tricks then one trick is transferred to the non offending side.

Removed is the following —~~the requirement to transfer and additional trick if a trick was won by the offending player with a card that he could legally have played to the revoke trick.~~

B – No rectification – Changed

Added in 7 – when both sides have revoked on the same board.

These changes mean more responsibility to administer 64C

### **Law 65 – Arrangement of Tricks**

Adds in

B3 – Declarer may require that a card pointing incorrectly is pointed correctly

Dummy or either defender may draw attention to a card pointed incorrectly, but for these players the right expires when a lead is made to the next trick.

### **Law 67 – Defective Trick**

B1 – After both sides play to the next trick

Add in – If the offender has a card of the suit led to the defective trick he must choose such a card to place among his played cards. He is deemed to have revoked on the defective trick.

### **Law 70 – Contested Claims**

D – ~~Claimer Proposes New Line of Play~~

Now Called – Directors Considerations

Now includes

D2 – The Director does not accept any part of a  
Defender's claim that depends on his partner selecting a  
Particular play from amongst alternative normal plays

D3 – In Accordance with Law 68D play should have ceased, but if any  
Play has occurred after the claim this may provide evidence to  
Be deemed part of the clarification of the claim. The Director  
May accept it as evidence of the players probable plays  
Subsequent to the Claim.

E – Unstated Line of Play

Added in

The RB may specify an order (e.g. from the top down) in which the  
Director shall deem a suit played if this is not clarified in the statement  
Of Claim

### **Law 76 – Spectators**

Adds in

A – Control

1 – Spectators in the playing area are subject to the control of the Director

2 – Covers Electronic transmission of play

B – At the Table – Incorporates the old A – Conduct During Bidding or Play

Wording changes

Plus adds in – which was old 76 B

5 – A Spectator at the table shall not draw attention to any aspect  
of the game.

C – Participation - old B

Adds in – Regulating Authorities and Tournament Organizers may specify  
how to deal with irregularities caused by Spectators.

D – Status – New

Any person in the playing area, other than a player or a tournament official  
has the status of spectator unless the director specifies otherwise.