

## 7th Edition of the Laws of Association Croquet

### Changes since August 2020 Consultative Version

This is list of the significant changes that have been made to the consultation version the WCF made available to member countries in August 2020. None affect how a full game of level singles should be played in the absence of errors or interferences. In addition, many proof-reading corrections have been applied.

The issue of accommodating players with disabilities was also discussed, but it was thought better to leave it to a general WCF initiative, along the lines of the approach used in Golf, than to further complicate the laws by giving specific relief in individual circumstances.

#### **Nomenclature of the various doubles games**

Changes have been made to the names used to distinguish the two forms of doubles that are now included in the body of the laws:

- each player of a side plays only one ball throughout the game; and
- the two players play alternate strokes throughout every turn of the side.

The former, currently the more common form of the game, has been named "ordinary doubles"; the latter has been named "alternate stroke doubles".

The basic form of singles play (no lifts or contact and not handicap) had been called "ordinary level singles". To avoid the adjective "ordinary" carrying different meanings in singles and doubles play, however, this form of singles play has been named simply "level singles". This means that the different types of singles are named as:

level singles; advanced singles; super-advanced singles; and handicap singles.

Correspondingly, the different types of ordinary doubles are named as: ordinary level doubles; ordinary advanced doubles; ordinary super-advanced doubles; and ordinary handicap doubles.

The different types of alternate stroke doubles are named as:

alternate stroke level doubles; alternate stroke advanced doubles; alternate stroke super-advanced doubles; and alternate stroke handicap doubles.

These terms are used consistently throughout the applicable laws (in particular Laws 45 to 50). No consequential change is required to the substance of the laws applicable to each form and type of play.

#### **Law 5.2**

Clarifying, but non-substantive, changes have been made to the law on checking the position of a ball before adjusting the setting of a hoop (Law 5.2.3.3) and adjusting the position of a ball following an adjustment to a hoop (Law 5.2.3.4).

#### **Law 7.6**

Law 7.6.7 (turn ending event relating to failing to take croquet when required to do so) has been deleted, as it overlaps and is adequately covered by Law 7.6.1.

#### **Law 9.2.2**

Law 9.2.2.1 has been rephrased to make it explicit that it relates to the action of lifting a ball. This avoids any (erroneous) suggestion that it relates to the movement of a ball as a result of a stroke.

#### **Law 16.4**

Law 16.4.1 has been split into two separate sub-laws to reduce its complexity (without, however, changing its sense). Law 16.4.2 specifies that the mallet to be used in the test for an impeded swing in Law 16.4.1 is the mallet the striker

last used before the relevant ball assumed its current position. This takes proper account of alternate stroke doubles, where the claimant may not have played “the turn before the relevant ball was positioned”, as specified in the old 16.4.1. It also removes the ambiguity of interpretation in the very rare case where the turn before the relevant ball was positioned was declared to have been played.

### **Law 23.1**

The phrase “in a manner capable of conveying the request to a person with normal hearing” has been replaced by “in a manner that could reasonably be expected to convey the request”. This is intended to avoid questions of what constitutes “normal hearing”.

### **Law 23.4**

This has been rewritten to focus on the opponent forestalling inappropriately and thereby distracting the striker. It reads:

**23.4 DISTRACTING THE STRIKER** The opponent must not *forestall* play after a *stroke* has started and before it has been played unless the playing of the stroke would take the issue to be raised past its *limit of claims* or there is other urgent reason related to the stroke. Forestalling in breach of this restriction constitutes *interference* with the playing of the stroke and Law 35.1 applies.

This does not change the circumstances under which it is acceptable for the opponent to forestall once a stroke has begun and before it is played. The opponent’s duty to forestall at other times is already covered by Law 23.2.

### **Law 24.2**

Playing out of sequence in alternate stroke doubles has been recognised as an error, alongside the other errors covered by Laws 26 to 29. This has implications in several places in the laws. Law 48.4 has been added to the list of errors in Law 24.2.1. See also comments on Laws 48.4 and 61.1.4 below.

### **Law 24.3.5**

Correction of faulty equipment can be delayed until it might next affect play (which may be never if the striker is on a finishing turn!). **Law 27.1.2**

The list of situations where the wrong ball law does not apply, specified in this law, has been expanded by adding “a ball of the game that has not yet become a ball in play”. This recognises that such a ball may be mistakenly brought into the game in the same manner as a ball of the game that has already been pegged out and removed from the court.

### **Law 28.5.4**

The law specifically including the case of playing a croquet stroke with the striker’s ball placed in contact with more than one live ball has been deleted. The case is implicitly covered in Law 28.5.1 and will be described in the commentary as part of the list of circumstances in which the law is applicable.

### **Law 28.6.2**

The second sentence of the law has been amended to “For this purpose, the first stroke in error shall be treated as though the *striker* was entitled to and did play a *stroke* that was not a *croquet stroke*.” This represents a clarification of the nature of the stroke described. It is not a substantive change to the law.

### **Law 28.8.2**

An initial sentence has been added, reading “The *strokes in error* must then be analysed to determine how play continues.” This makes this law more exactly equivalent to its counterparts in Laws 28.5, 28.6 and 28.7. It is not a substantive change to the law.

### **Laws 32 and 32.1**

The heading to Law 32 has been changed to match the situations described in Laws 32.1.1 to 32.1.3, and those sections have been reordered. There is no substantive change to the law.

### **Law 33**

Law 33, using a ball that is an outside agency, has been redrafted to clarify the situations to which it applies. Aiming to roquet, or play to a position relative to, a ball from a double-banked game has been explicitly excluded.

### **Laws 39.8.2, 40.10.2**

The clause “when they are in contact with each other or both are part of a *group of balls*” has been added to the text of Law 39.8.2, as it otherwise has to be inferred from the heading of the law. There is no change to the substance of the law. The same change is made in Law 40.10.2 for the same reason.

### **Laws 47.2, 50.2**

The first part of Law 47.2 has been modified to read “The first sentence of Law 42.6 does not apply.”, because the remainder of Law 42.6 does apply in doubles. This was an error in the earlier text, now corrected. The same issue occurs in Law 50.2 for alternate stroke handicap doubles.

### **Law 48.4**

As noted earlier, out-of-sequence play in alternate stroke doubles needs to be treated as an error and made subject to the laws dealing with errors, including: the remedies for them; how to deal with multiple errors; and how to determine how play resumes after their discovery. In the consultation version, this was recognised in Law 48.5 (rectification of errors) but was not properly taken into account in Law 48.4 (playing out of sequence). To fix this problem, a sub-law has been added to Law 48.4 specifying how to determine how play resumes when the error is discovered within its limit of claims. This is modelled on the similar provisions of Laws 28.5 to 28.8.

The additional law reads:

48.4.3 The *strokes in error* must then be analysed to determine how play continues. For this purpose, the strokes in error shall be treated as though they were played by the correct players. If any of the turn-ending events set out in Law 7.6 have occurred during any of the strokes in error, the side’s turn ends. Otherwise, the player who should have played the first stroke in error then plays.

This is a substantive change from the consultation version laws, but it is a necessary one.

### **Law 50.2**

See the comment on Law 47.2 above.

### **Law 51.2.3**

The following sentence has been added to this law: “A ball cannot score hoop 1 by being peeled by its *partner ball*.” Without this sentence, logical problems arise if a player peels the partner ball through hoop 1 but then fails to score the hoop for the striker’s ball.

This is a minor substantive change from the consultation version laws.

### **Law 55.3.1.4**

In the consultation version this law did not refer appropriately to the requirement to consult the opponent. It has been modified to read:

“before testing, in a manner which might disturb a ball or other equipment, whether a ball has scored a hoop point ...”

### **Law 59.2.4**

The period during which a player may be entitled to precedence when a time limit is about to expire has been shortened from 30 minutes to 15 minutes. This matches what was specified in the changes log that accompanied the consultation version.

### **Law 61.1.4**

As noted above under Law 24.2, the mistake of playing out of sequence in alternate stroke doubles has been recognised as an error. It is necessary for the law on time limits to treat this error on the same basis as the other errors for timing purposes if it occurs when time is about to expire. To do this, a new Law 61.1.4 has been created, based on the corresponding law applicable to other errors. This new law reads:

“61.1.4 In alternate stroke doubles, if a side plays the last *stroke* of a turn and it is then discovered before the first stroke of the next turn is played that the side has committed an *error* under Law 48.4 for which the *limit of claims* has not passed, for the purpose of Law Error: Reference source not found the side’s turn does not end until the error has been dealt with.”