

ACA Laws Committee RULING AND RATIONALE

Law 16(a): Ignore the clause “unless the striker is already required to take croquet”

This Ruling is to apply to the application of Law 16(a) in all events held under the auspices of the ACA, and State, Regional and Club events.

It is recommended that the clause to be ignored be lined through in copies of the Australian Laws Book, and a note made “ACA LC Ruling, September, 2009.

Rationale:

Laws 16(a) currently states “A roquet may be made by the striker’s ball on any live ball, *unless the striker is already required to take croquet.*” If this were so, it follows that if a striker fails to take croquet when required to do so [Law 27(f)], he cannot play a stroke and ‘roquet’ a live ball. If he attempted to cause the striker’s ball to hit a live ball and the attempt was successful, it would not be a roquet. If play was forestalled and the error rectified, his turn would end under Law 4(d)(1).

This provision in Law 16(a) is contradicted by the intent of Law 27(f) as expressed in ORLC Part D - Commentary. In the Commentary 27.6.1 [re Law 27(f)], mention is made of strokes that could be played (in error) instead of the striker taking croquet when required to do so – “(e.g. attempts to roquet the same ball again or another ball or. . .)”. If play was forestalled and the error rectified, such a stroke, if unsuccessful, would result in end of turn. If such a stroke was successful, “The striker would remain entitled to play unless his turn ended under Law 4(d) during a stroke in error.”

The ACA representative on the ILC has been notified of this contradiction, and the ILC is considering a solution.

Nell Hass Chairman ACA Laws Committee.

September 25, 2009