

# The Laws of Bridge 2007

Reg Busch

Chapter 2 – Uploaded 20 November 2007

**Remember that these will not apply for 3-4 months, so don't use them now!**

## **The Revoke Laws (61-64)**

There are some minor changes in wording in order to accommodate to the new policy of using the term 'rectification' instead of 'penalty'. In the new Laws 'rectification' = 'penalty' in the current Laws.

### **Right to Inquire about a possible revoke**

Some changes here.

- Declarer may ask a defender, defenders may ask declarer, and dummy may ask declarer (provided he hasn't lost his rights under Law 43B2). This is no different from now. In the new Laws, **dummy may not ask a defender** (and if he does Law 16 (unauthorised information) may apply).
- The big difference is when defenders ask each other. In the 1997 Laws they may not ask each other, but WBF world zones have the right to vary that. Australia (zone 7) has always exercised that right and defenders have been allowed to ask. Now the position is reversed. The default situation is that defenders may now ask, but zones have the option to vary that so that defenders may not ask **This will not affect us in Australia**. Our current practice will not change. The Law does stipulate that exercising this right may provide UI to partner. For example: my surprised tone of voice when I say 'No spades partner' carries the UI that declarer is probably stacked in spades, and, more importantly, that I don't have the spade suit stopped.

### **Rectification (penalty) following a revoke.**

Major change here, and simpler. Now the **only time when there can be a two trick penalty is where the offending player wins the revoke trick and the side wins a later trick**. If the offender did not win the revoke trick, but the side won that trick or a later trick, then there is a one trick penalty. **The reference to winning a later trick with a card in the revoke suit has gone.**

Note that a trick won by dummy is not won by declarer for the purposes of this Law.

(I've continued to use the word 'penalty' to keep the changes as simple as possible, but, where I've used that word, read 'rectification'),

### **No penalty (rectification)**

There is an addition to the list of situations where no penalty applies. This is where both sides have revoked on the same board.

Law 64C remains and requires the Director to award an adjusted score if the rectification provided does not adequately compensate for the damage. This may apply for example where the offender wins a later trick with a card in the revoke suit.

In the next chapter, I'll cover the changes in Law 27 (Insufficient Bids)., I'm predicting headaches for directors at all levels, but particularly for club directors.