

Law 23 – Comparable Call

This is a completely new Law. The old Law 23 dealt with damage from things such as enforced passes and other situations where the offenders could have known at the time of their irregularity that it could benefit their own side. Its content is now part of Law 72.

Law 23 defines a new concept: the comparable call. This concept was introduced in the 2007 laws in relation to Law 27 (insufficient bid) and is now implemented in a more general way. The concept is broadened to say that a call replacing another normally does not create harmful information if it is more precise. The application of this concept means that after such a call the auction may continue normally without damaging the other side. In this approach the emphasis is more on the suits shown than on the strength. If however the strength differs too much then the calls cannot be considered comparable.

To deem a call comparable, it must be one of the following:

- It must have the same or similar meaning as the replaced call
- It must define a subset of the meanings of the replaced call, or
- It must have the same purpose (such as a relay or asking bid) as the replaced call

If the replacement call has the same purpose, then it doesn't even matter whether the strength or suits referred to are the same; the call is comparable by definition. This also means there is no unauthorized information when the cancelled call and subsequent call are comparable.

Examples of comparable and non-comparable replacement calls can be found in those sections of the Commentary that explain the application of Laws 27B1(b), 30B1(b)(i), 31A2(a) and 32A2(a)