

RULES COMMITTEE REPORT

MYRON THOMAS, CHAIR

The Rules Committee considered and issued decisions on seven appeals, with two appeals pending and worked on one motion this term.

A brief summary of five of the appeals considered by the committee.

Appeal No. 1. Round Robin Scoring

The appellant claimed the chief tournament director displayed bias and scored the round robin tournament incorrectly. The Chief TD added the players' scores and ranked them highest to lowest. The committee found that after a player withdrew from the tournament, the chief tournament director was incorrect in the application of US Chess Rule 30B. *Players who withdraw before playing half their scheduled games shall be scored as not having competed at all.* The completed games are rated, but not considered part of their opponents' records for prize purposes. Tournament directors who run round robin events should have an understanding of Rule 30B and know how to properly handle players who withdraw, both in scoring the event and submitting the event for rating. Based on the facts presented in the appeal, the committee found the chief tournament director's error to be a simple mistake and found no evidence of bias.

Appeal No. 2. Annoying Behavior

The appellant claimed that upon a 20G complaint made by a spectator, the tournament director intervened in the game, violating the rules of chess; enforced non-standard penalties; and resulted in the appellant losing the game. Based on the facts presented in the appeal, the committee found that the appellant refused to follow the instructions of the tournament director to not distract the opponent. As penalty, the tournament director added time to the opponent's clock. The committee found the ruling was reasonable and within the tournament director's discretion. The committee reminds tournament directors that spectators do not have a right to make claims of any kind on behalf of players.

Appeal No. 3. Player on move

The appellant claimed the opponent was allowed to move out of turn and continue the game. The appellant claimed the ruling resulted in loss of game. Both players claimed to be on move. Based on the facts presented in the appeal, the committee found the chief tournament director investigated before making the ruling and the chief tournament director found unbiased evidence that the appellant had completed the move and the opponent was on move. The chief tournament director's ruling was reasonable and within the chief's discretion.

Appeal No. 4. Touch-move

The appellant claimed the opponent violated the 10B Touch-move rule by moving a different piece than the one initially touched and then denied doing so when questioned by the chief tournament director. Based on the facts presented in the appeal, the committee found that there was no clear unbiased evidence of a 10B Touch-move rule violation. The chief tournament director denied the claim. This ruling was reasonable and within the chief's discretion.

Appeal No. 5 Prize Distribution

The appellant, *Player 5*, with 3-1/2 points in the Open section, claimed the top two U2200 prizes should be split with *Player 4*. *Player 5* should have received \$245, however *Player 5* was only awarded \$141.

32B3. Ties for more than one prize. *If winners of different prizes tie with each other, all the cash prizes involved shall be summed and divided equally among the tied winners unless any of the winners would receive*

more money by winning or dividing only a particular prize for which others in the tie are ineligible. No player may receive an amount greater from the division of those prizes than the largest prize for which he would be eligible if there were no tie. No more than one cash prize shall go into the pool for each winner.

Prize Fund. Prizes paid at 71%

1st prize = \$710

2nd prize = \$355

3rd prize = \$178

1st under 2200 = \$327

2nd under 2200 = \$163

3rd under 2200 = \$82

Name	Rate	Pts
Player 1	2167	4.0
Player 2	1928	4.0
Player 3	1900	4.0
Player 4	2302	3.5
Player 5	2107	3.5
Player 6	1916	3.5

The chief tournament director provided the following explanation to the committee:

Players 1, 2, and 3 take Overall 1st, Overall 2nd, and 1st under 2200: $(\$710 + \$355 + \$327) / 3 = \464 .

Players 4, 5, and 6 take Overall 3rd, 2nd under 2200, and 3rd under 2200: $(\$178 + \$163 + \$82) / 3 = \141 . The \$141 awarded to Player 4 is less than the \$178 Overall 3rd so the player is not receiving "an amount greater from the division of those prizes than the largest prize for which he would be eligible if there were no tie."

Based on the facts presented in the appeal, the committee found, the chief tournament director was correct in the prize distribution calculation and *Player 5* received the correct prize of \$141. *Player 5* misunderstood US Chess rule 32B3. As this rule is commonly misunderstood, tournament directors should be prepared to explain the rule to concerned parents and players.

The committee considered the following motion this term:

A motion to amend Rule 41B. This motion adds the following to the end of the first paragraph: The corner squares of the chessboard (a1, a8, h1, and h8) may contain logos, the name of the event, and other similar items. Chess boards which contain logos or similar markings in the middle of the board or in a non-corner square are nonstandard.

Thanks to committee members for volunteering their time: Enrique Huerta, Steve Immitt, Tim Just, Tom Langland, Al Losoff, Bob Messenger, Mike Regan, Ken Sloan, Jeff Smith, and Bill Smythe.